

# THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

## Young Adults, Music and Psychological Well-Being: Exploring the Prospects

**Dr. Durgesh K. Upadhyay**

Amity Institute of Behavioural and Allied Sciences (AIBAS)  
Amity University Uttar Pradesh, India

### **Abstract:**

*All humans across all cultures are exposed to music and potentially possess the innate ability to understand and respond to music. In this modern era, music is so pervasive it is unavoidable. The music of India is one of the oldest unbroken musical traditions in the world. Irish poet William Butler Yeats (1856-1939) a 1923 Nobel Laureate in Literature has aptly described Indian music "not an art but life itself." According to Indian philosophy, the ultimate goal of human existence is moksha, liberation of the Aatman (Soul) from the life-cycle or spiritual enlightenment; and Nadopasana (worship of sound) is taught as an important means for reaching this goal. The highest musical experience is ananda (the divine bliss). This devotional approach to music is a significant feature of Indian culture. Music is inextricably interwoven not only with ritualistic and devotional side of religious lives but also with day-to-day life experiences. Music accompanies a person from birth until death. Viewed against this background, this review paper necessitates appreciation and reflection on our everyday music engagements, which can lead us to a peaceful and meaningful life journey amidst today's stressors all around. Music is, even considering personality and health status, although less strongly, still significantly correlated with well-being. This paper discusses the research being done in the area of music psychology particularly dealing with the above-mentioned variables of interest and builds up the rationale for this study.*

### **1. Background and Rationale**

Music listening is enjoyed around the world. However, we have little understanding of how people use and experience music in their daily lives (cf. Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2007), and how cultural background, gender and other factors may influence the uses of music. Involvement in musical activities has been shown to have positive effects on mood (Valentine & Evans, 2001), quality of life (Clift et al., 2010) and engagement (Davidson, 2011), and to be a very rewarding leisure activity (Lamont, 2011). In recent years, researchers have been particularly interested in adolescents and young adults who are marginalized and/or experiencing major psychological issues and have found that they prefer heavier forms of music such as heavy metal and hard rock (Hansen & Hansen, 1990; Took & Weiss, 1994; Wass et al., 1989). It is presumed that these music preferences reflect their values, conflicts, and developmental issues with which these youth are dealing. Music listening is one of the most enjoyable activities reported by young adults.

Theorists define young adults as those who have reached sexual maturity, but are not married (Schindler, 1997). "The time phrase [young adulthood] embraces what has been called the most crucial age range for the creation of a distinctive and self-conscious generation" (Jennings and Niemi, 1981). Karl Mannheim relates young adulthood with the ability to question and reflect upon life and experiences. To him, this time begins about the age of seventeen (Mannheim, 1952). He justifies his age differentiation in further expressing the importance of living in the "present," "the up-to-dateness of youth therefore consists in their being closer to the 'present' problems" (pp. 300-301).

Researchers argue that the prevalence of music in daily life constitutes an 'informal learning environment' through which we learn and develop our preferences for music (Folkestad, 1998; Batt-Rawden & DeNora, 2005). Remarkably, however, little is known about the underlying principles on which such individual musical preferences are based. A challenge to such an investigation is that music is used for many different purposes.

#### *1.1. Music Preference*

So far, the focus of much of the research concerned with music preferences has been on questions pertaining to its structure and external correlates; very few studies have actually examined the contexts in which people listen to music and the particular music they listen to. As a result, most of the research in this area conceptualizes preferences as trait-like constructs and assume that preferences reflect the types of music people listen to most of the time. However, as Sloboda and O'Neill (2001) noted, music is always heard in context, so it is necessary to consider contextual forces and state-preferences in addition to trait-preferences. Weddings, funerals, sporting events or relaxation, for example, constrain musical choices, and individual preferences operate

within those constraints. One may prefer a particular piece or style of music (e.g., Pop) in a particular context (in a peer group) but never want to hear it in another context (in a funeral). Moreover, a complete theory of musical preferences must necessarily focus on the functions of music, and reflect situational constraints in interaction with personality traits.

Recent investigations have begun to examine individual differences in music preferences (for a review, see Rentfrow & McDonald, 2009). Results from these investigations suggest that there exists a structure underlying music preferences, with similar music-preference factors emerging across studies. Independent investigations (e.g., Colley, 2008; Delsing, ter Bogt, Engels, & Meeus, 2008; Rentfrow & Gosling, 2003) have also identified similar patterns of relations between the music-preference dimensions and various psychological constructs.

For example, there is evidence of individual differences in preferences for vocal as opposed to instrumental music, fast vs. slow music, and loud vs. soft music (Rentfrow & Gosling, 2006; Kopacz, 2005; McCown, Keiser, Mulhearn, & Williamson, 1997; McNamara & Ballard 1999). Such preferences have been shown to relate to personality traits such as Extraversion, Neuroticism, Psychoticism, and sensation seeking. Researchers have found that personal preferences for musical styles do correlate with how those persons use music (Getz et al., 2010; Schäfer & Sedlmeier, 2009, 2010; Ter Bogt et al., 2010). Past music and personality research indicates that many people listen to music for emotional engagement and that individuals are attracted to music, which they find to be congruent with their self-perception. This prompts the questions: Are individual preferences for music, related to personality?

Research shows, people prefer music consistent with their personalities (Rentfrow & McDonald, 2010, p. 680-1), and many believe music preferences provide information about the personalities of themselves and others (Rentfrow & Gosling, 2003, p. 1250; Rentfrow & Gosling, 2006, p. 236-241). Although research has examined music from many different angles, there is a lack of literature addressing the influence of personality on music listening preferences. Because of the omnipresence of music, the amount of time and money spent consuming music, and its role in communicating one's personal image, it deserves to be well studied in conjunction with personality and individual preferences (Rentfrow, & Gosling, 2003, p. 1236).

A number of studies have demonstrated differences between male and female listeners' music preferences (Colley, 2008; North & Hargreaves, 2007; O'Neill, 1997), suggesting that systematic gender differences in music preferences are based on gender-role socialization into male toughness and female emotionality. Such differences in musical behaviour may be rooted in gender differences in affect proneness and personality traits, which are driven by physiological differences in emotional experience (e.g., Bradley, Codispoti, Sabatinelli & Lang, 2001). Female listeners also use music more frequently to fulfil emotional needs (North et al., 2000).

Music fulfils a broad range of functions as demonstrated in interdisciplinary research (e.g., Behne, 1997; Clayton, 2009; Hargreaves & North, 1999; Merriam, 1964; Schafer & Sedlmeier, 2009). Music psychologists focus on personal (e.g., memories, cognitive performance, emotional expression; Sloboda, 2005) and social functions (e.g., social bonding, identity and value construction; Hargreaves & North, 1999).

Previous research has suggested that a holistic topography of musical functions involves personal, social, and cultural experiences with music (Boer & Fischer, 2012), some of which may vary by gender (Maidlow, 1999) and personality (Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2007). Although different researchers give different lists of functions of music, there is a consensus that music serves arousing/energizing, cognitive, emotional, social and cultural functions (Boer & Fischer, 2012; Schäfer & Sedlmeier, 2010).

### *1.2. Models of Music Preference*

LeBlanc (1982) developed the model that directly focuses on the formation of music preferences. According to this model, the preference for a piece of music depends on input information and the characteristics of the listener. The input information consists of the "musical environment" (such as complexity or the referential meaning of the music) and the "cultural environment" (such as peers, family, educators). The characteristics of the listener are factors such as personality, gender, ethnic group, or musical ability. The input variables are thought to interact with each other and are filtered by the characteristics of the listener before they contribute to a decision about whether a given piece of music is accepted or rejected.

However, it ignores the possible functions of music and it does not give any reference to the question of why one actually starts listening to music. Thus, no conclusions can be drawn from the model regarding potential reasons for why one listens to music at all.

Hargreaves, Miell and McDonald (2005) developed a second model of music preference. The model focuses on people's responses to music. One of these responses is music preference (besides cognitive and emotional responses). As in LeBlanc's model, the characteristics of the listener, the music, and the social context have an influence on these responses. The model of Hargreaves et al. (2005) gives a vague indication of the fact that the use of music may have an impact on music preference as well. However, the specific significance of this benefit through music is not clear and the model lacks an idea about why one starts listening to music at all.

However, what needs to be clarified before formulating such model is the precise meaning of the use of music in people's lives. Insights about the ways in which music is used would also give an idea about why we listen to music at all and how music may have evolved in human history.

It can be concluded that preferences for a particular style or genre of music may vary as a function of personality traits, social class, ethnicity, country of residence, and cohort, as well as the culture-specific associations with that style of music.

Nevertheless, findings about music preference—why we prefer one piece of music over another—are still very rare. Is there something inherent in music that influences people's preferences? Alternatively, are music preferences shaped by social factors? And this may be one reason why to date there is still no conclusive theory on music preference. Such a theory is necessary to integrate the findings on music preference accumulated through the last decades, to organize (further) research in this area, and to

gain a deeper understanding of why we listen to music at all which may, in turn, help to understand the role of music in promoting well-being (Upadhyay, 2013). Current research on music preferences draws from interactionist theories (e.g., Buss, 1987; Swann, Rentfrow, & Guinn, 2002) by hypothesizing that people seek musical environments that reinforce and reflect their personalities, attitudes, and emotions.

Moreover, we do not know what it is about people's preferred music that appeals to them. Are there particular sounds or instruments that guide preferences? Do people prefer music with a particular emotional valence or level of energy? Are people drawn to music that has desirable social overtones? Such questions need to be addressed if we are to develop a complete understanding of the social and psychological factors that shape music preferences.

### 1.3. Music and Emotion

A wide range of emotions have been studied and described in terms of physiological responses, accompanying cognitions and associated environmental events. However, the feeling, which is the experiential component, has often been neglected (Ramaprasad, 2013). Feeling, termed as "affect" is the most complex component and cannot be understood by analyzing emotions into parts. This experiential aspect has been central to the Indian approach to understanding human nature. "Affect" as a feature and function of the "person" and the nature of one who experiences it, has been the focus of Indian tradition of understanding human nature.

Concept of *rasa* or aesthetic relish or aesthetic mood is central to this approach to understanding effective experiences as dealt in the *Natyashastra* of Bharathamuni (commentary by Abhinavagupta, 11 century). Sage Bharata conceptualized the *rasa* theory in the context of drama and theatre, which was later, extended to all poetry and other performing art forms. In this ancient Indian text of dramatics, all three components, i.e., physiological/behavioural, cognitive, and feelings are dealt with in detail. Bharatha suggests eight aesthetic moods or *rasas* corresponding to eight major emotions or *bhavas*. *Natyashastra* lists 49 emotional and non-emotional states.

Like all traditional Indian approaches, distinction is made between the major or basic emotions, and the accessory ones. Major emotions are permanent emotional dispositions, sentiments, or *sthayibhava*. These transform other emotions into themselves. These are also considered innate. Permanent emotions are considered as permanent mental traces (*samskaras*). These when accompanied with source (*vibhava*), transitory emotions (*vyabhicaribhava*), and expressions (*anubhava*) can give rise to *rasa*. Transitory emotions are not innate and they give rise to permanent emotions and disappear after the permanent emotions show up. It is also suggested that transitory emotions represent the day-to-day normal life where similar emotions are expressed and experienced in changing situations. Accessory emotions are transitory states, i.e., *vyabhicari bhava* and are subordinate to the permanent emotional dispositions. These theories have dealt with the causes of emotions and also provide cues for managing heightened affect.

In the Indian perspective, "happiness" or "bliss" i.e., *ananda* is the true nature of "self" or *atman*. This state of *atman* has been described as *sat-chit-anand*, i.e., the oneness of existence (*sat*), consciousness (*chit*) and bliss (*anand*). This state is the conquest and transcendence of pleasure and pain or the egocentric emotions. This is the state of non-involvement of ego and experience of true empathy wherein the feelings are experienced as one's own and still not one's own as this experience is independent of the objects of the external world. In this sense, emotion and emotional experiences provide a pathway towards personal growth or transformation.

Systematic efforts to understand emotions to music are quite recent (Juslin & Sloboda, 2010). Music psychology mostly came to explore more 'basic' perceptual and cognitive processes involved in music listening (Deutsch, 1999). In reviving Leonard B. Meyer's (1956) classic theory about musical expectations, Sloboda (1991) showed that 'cognition' and 'emotion' might not be far apart as one would think. Indeed, emotional responses to music *require* cognition (broadly defined).

Sloboda would later be one of the researchers who helped to bring 'music and emotion' to the forefront, as a primary topic in music psychology (e.g., Thompson, 2009). In his commentary on the 'Current trends in the study of music and emotion' (Juslin & Zentner, 2002), Sloboda raised a question 'to what extent the research reported in this issue points to, explicates, and encourages an understanding of diversity and complexity in musical experience' (Sloboda, 2002, p. 242). He urged scholars to consider the social benefits of their work, and underlined the need to provide 'better answers' to important questions (Sloboda, 2005).

In answer to the question, 'how does music arouse emotions?', research has revealed a number of factors in the individual that could potentially affect emotional responses to music, such as the listener's age, gender, personality, musical training, music preference, and current mood (Abeles & Chung, 1996). Similarly, Gabrielsson (2001) suggested several factors in the situation that may potentially influence emotions, such as 'physical factors' (e.g., acoustic and visual conditions, time and place), 'social factors' (e.g., listening alone vs. with others, type of audience), and 'special occasions and circumstances' (e.g., a vacation). However, most studies have focused on causal factors in the music itself.

Research on music and emotion has also revealed individual differences in preferences for pieces of music that evoke emotions like happiness, joy, sadness, and anger (Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2007; Rickard, 2004; Schellenberg, Peretz, & Viellard, 2008; Zentner, Grandjean, & Scherer, 2008). Positive emotions were the most frequently felt reactions to music (Laukka, 2006). Moreover, it was shown that such positive emotions are related to increased well-being (Laukka, 2006) and promoting well-being can have important health effects.

### 1.4. Music and Psychological Well-Being

Listening strategies mean that one uses consciously music to reach the different basic psychological goals, which are the mentioned facets of well-being. There are four different categories of listening strategies. The first is *identity and agency and means* that one uses music to contribute to, or strengthen his or her personality, self-esteem or self-image. The next is *mood*

*regulation*, which means to use music to regulate one's own emotional state. The third is *relaxation and company* and means to come down, relax and build an appropriate background with music. Last is *enjoyment*, which stands only for using music for pleasure and fun and nothing more.

Over the last few years, academic debate, from scientific perspectives, has returned to two old philosophical orientations. The first of these perspectives has generally been called *hedonism* (Kahneman *et al.*, 1999) which defines well-being as the presence of positive affect and the absence of negative effect. The second perspective, both as ancient and modern as the hedonic perspective, suggest that well-being does not consist in maximizing positive experiences and minimizing negative ones (Ryan & Deci, 2001) but refers to fully or to allow for the richest human potential possible (Ryan, Huta & Deci, 2008). This second perspective is widely known as *eudaimonia*.

The *eudaimonic* conception establishes that well-being lies in the performance of actions coherent with deep values that imply a full commitment with which people feel alive and real (Waterman, 1993). By proposing the term *psychological well-being* to distinguish the concept from that of *subjective well-being*, which is more typical of the hedonistic conception, Carol Ryff has tried to overcome such limits and defines well-being as the development of a person's real potential (Ryff, 1989, 1995). In this way, happiness or psychological well-being is not the main motivation of a person but rather the result of well-lived life (Ryff & Keyes, 1995; Ryff & Singer, 1998).

Results of previous research also show that personality and health status were the most important predictors of well-being. Thus the question is, whether music has the ability to increase well-being if these variables were not positive. This could serve as a counterargument. However, it does not necessarily mean that music does not have the power to do so. According to this, it was identified that considering personality and health status, music was, although less strongly, still significantly correlated with well-being. Thus, there is a possibility that music enhances well-being, even though personality and/or health status are negative.

At a global level, wellbeing varies with genetics (factors such as personality and positive dispositions), demographics and circumstances, but under normal circumstances individuals can control around 40% of their wellbeing through the pursuit of intentional, chosen, effortful activities (Lyubomirsky, Sheldon, & Schkade, 2005).

## 2. Research Questions

Within this broad scenario, the present review identifies several unattended questions that will help to explore music-person interface within a particular context by taking the young adults' subjective experience. It includes a number of parameters, like age of the listener, gender, socioeconomic status (SES), musical training, personality types, as well as the music preferences of young adults. A promising approach to the question of better psychological well-being focuses on how music is used by the young adults - that is, its various functions.

Questions are:

- Why do young adults prefer one music genre to the other?
- How could they develop their preferences for music?
- In what contexts they prefer listening to music and the particular music they listen to?
- Does the personality type relate with music preference and nature of music engagement (time spent in music listening and listening styles) and *vice versa*?
- What are the emotions perceived by them while listening to some music genre/music piece in everyday life and the emotion the particular music genre/music piece generate?
- Are there any differences in terms of music preferences and music experiences based on demographic variables (Gender, SES, and Music Background)?
- How does functions of music relate with personality types and psychological well-being?
- Do they have clarity of different emotions and music genres?
- Does *Rasa* predict psychological well-being?

## 3. Implications of the Proposed Research

One of the major implications of satisfying the queries abovementioned will be in the field of music therapy. Music therapy, unlike other complementary and alternative treatment approaches, faces difficulty in framing a strong theoretical background for uniform practice and research globally. Research reflections and practice experiences still witness newer and relevant themes, which need to be addressed to understand more objectively the most subjective personal musical experiences contributing to the therapeutic effects of music and to vouch for its universality in being therapeutic though diversified ways of practice.

On the other hand, as the Chair for Qualitative Research in Medicine at Witten/Herdecke University, David Aldridge has always stressed that there is an art-inherent need for the diversity of research methods suitable to the unique practice settings of music therapy. We have to accept that this research topic has no generalizable orthodox methodology. In art, there will always be the diversity of methods, cultural settings, regional health belief systems, different biographies of music enculturation and reception. The practice of doing music therapy is always a unique situation and this uniqueness has to be taken into account when looking at results.

Through this discussion, I initiate a potent beginning and propose a broader framework for music therapists dealing with adolescents and young adults' psychosomatic issues. The framework, which will be, based on the principle that how everyday healthy and meaningful company of music can promote psychological well-being. This review aspires to fulfil the ultimate goal of a music recommendation system that characterizes an individual's musical preferences using an equation. Such an equation would include a number of parameters, like age of the listener, gender, SES, and music background, as well as the music preferences and

personality of the listener. I can lastly put before that this study aims to utilize everyday positive music experiences into therapeutic set ups.

#### 4. References

1. Abeles, H. F., & Chung, J. W. (1996). Responses to music. In D. A. Hodges (Ed.), *Handbook of music psychology*, pp. 285-342. San Antonio, TX: IMR Press.
2. Batt-Rawden, K. & DeNora, T. (2005). Music and informal learning in everyday life. *Music Education Research*, 7, pp. 289-304
3. Behne, K.-E. (1997). The development of 'Musikerleben' in adolescence. How and why young people listen to music. In I. Delie'ge & J. Sloboda (Eds.), *Perception and cognition of music*, pp. 143-159. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
4. Boer, D., & Fischer, R. (2012). Towards a holistic picture of functions of music: A culturally decentred qualitative approach. *Psychology of Music*, 40(2), 179-200.
5. Buss, D.M. (1987). Selection, evocation, and manipulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(6), 1214-21.
6. Chamorro-Premuzic, T. & Furnham, A. (2007). Personality and music: Can traits explain how people use music in everyday life. *British Journal of Psychology*, 98(2), 175-85.
7. Clayton, M. (2009). The social and personal functions of music in cross-cultural perspective. In S. Hallam, I. Cross, & M. Thaut (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of music psychology*, pp. 35-44. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
8. Clift, S., Hancox, G., Morrison, I., Hess, B., Kreutz, G., & Stewart, D. (2010). Choral singing and psychological wellbeing: Quantitative and qualitative findings from English choirs in a cross-national survey. *Journal of Applied Arts and Health*, 1(1), 19-34.
9. Colley A. (2008). Young people's musical taste: Relationship with gender and gender-related traits. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38, 2039-2055.
10. Kopacz, M. (2005). Personality and music preferences: the influence of personality traits on preferences regarding musical elements. *Journal of Music Therapy*, 42(3), 216-39.
11. Davidson, J. W. (2011). Musical participation: Expectations, experiences, and outcomes. In I. Deliege & J. W. Davidson (Eds.), *Music and the mind: Essays in honour of John Sloboda*, 65-87. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
12. Delsing, M.J.M.H., ter Bogt, T.F.M., Engels, R.C.M.E., & Meeus, W.H.J. (2008). Adolescents' music preferences and personality characteristics. *European Journal of Personality*, 22, 109-130.
13. Deutsch, D. (Ed.). (1999). *The psychology of music* (2nd ed.). New York: Academic Press.
14. Folkestad, G. (1998). Musical learning as cultural practice as exemplified in computer-based creative music-making. In B. Sundril, G. E. McPherson and G. Folkestad (Eds.) *Children Composing*, pp. 97-135, Lunds University: Malmo, Sweden.
15. Gabriellsson, A. (2001). Emotions in strong experiences with music. In P. N. Juslin & J. A. Sloboda (Eds.), *Music and emotion: Theory and research*, pp. 431-449. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
16. Getz, L. M., Chamorro-Premuzic, T., Roy, M. M., & Devroop, K. (2010). The relation between affect, uses of music, and music preferences in a sample of South African adolescents. *Psychology of Music*, 40, 164-178.
17. Hansen, C. H., & Hansen, R. D. (1990). *Cultivation of Personality and Social Reality Through Music: Individual Differences Among Fans of Punk and Heavy Metal Music*. Unpublished manuscript, Oakland University.
18. Hargreaves, D. J., MacDonald, R. A. R., & Miell, D. E. (2005). How do people communicate using music? In D. E. Miell, R. A. R. MacDonald, & D. J. Hargreaves (Eds.), *Musical communication*, pp. 1-25. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
19. Hargreaves, D. J., & North, A. C. (1999). The functions of music in everyday life: Redefining the social in music psychology. *Psychology of Music*, 27, 71-83.
20. Jennings, K. M. & Richard G. N. (1981). *Generations and politics: a panel study of young adults and their parents*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
21. Juslin, P. N., & Sloboda, J. A. (2010). The past, present, and future of music and emotion research. In P. N. Juslin & J. A. Sloboda (Eds.), *Handbook of music and emotion: Theory, research, applications*, pp. 933-955. New York: Oxford University Press.
22. Juslin, P. N., & Zentner, M. R. (2002). Current trends in the study of music and emotion: Overture. *Musicae Scientiae*, Special Issue 2001-2002, 3-21.
23. Kahneman, D., Diener, E., & Schwarz, N. (Eds.). (1999). *Well-being: The foundations of hedonic psychology*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
24. Lamont, A. (2011). University students' strong experiences of music: Pleasure, engagement and meaning. *Musicae Scientiae*, 15(2), 229-249
25. Laukka, P. (2006). Uses of music and psychological well-being among the elderly. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 8, 215-241.
26. Leblanc, A. (1982). An Interactive Theory of Music Preference. *Journal of Music Therapy*, 19, 28-45.
27. Lyubomirsky, S., Sheldon, K. M., & Schkade, D. (2005). Pursuing happiness: The architecture of sustainable change. *Review of General Psychology*, 9, 111-131.
28. Maidlow, S. (1999). The role of psychology research in understanding the sex/gender paradox in music: Plus ca change. *Psychology of Music*, 27, 147-158.

29. Mannheim, K. (1952). *The Problem of Generations. Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*. pp. 22–25, 276–319. New York: Oxford University Press.
30. Merriam, A. P. (1964). *The anthropology of music*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
31. McCown, W., Keiser, R., Mulhearn, S., & Williamson, D. (1997). The role of personality and gender in preference for exaggerated bass in music. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 23, 543–547.
32. McNamara, L., & Ballard, M.E. (1999). Resting arousal, sensation seeking, and music preference. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 125, pp. 229–250.
33. Meyer, L. B. (1956). *Emotion and meaning in music*. Chicago, IL: Chicago University Press.
34. North, A. C., Hargreaves, D. J., & O'Neill, S. A. (2000). The importance of music to adolescents. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70, 255–272.
35. North, A. C., & Hargreaves, D. J. (2007). Lifestyle correlates of musical preference: Media, leisure time and music. *Psychology of Music*, 35, 179–200.
36. O'Neill, S. A. (1997). Gender and music. In D. J. Hargreaves & A. C. North (Eds.), *The social psychology of music*, pp. 46–60. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
37. Ramaprasad, D. (2013). Emotions: an Indian perspective. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 55, 153-156.
38. 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*, 84, 1236-1256.
39. Rentfrow, P.J., & Gosling, S.D. (2006). Message in a ballad: the role of music preferences in interpersonal perception. *Psychological Science*, 17(3), 236-242.
40. Rentfrow, P.J., & McDonald, J.A. (2009). Music preferences and personality. In P.N. Juslin, and J. Sloboda (eds.), *Handbook of music and emotion*, pp. 669–695. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press
41. Rentfrow, P. & McDonald, J. (2010). Preference, personality, and emotion. In Juslin P. & Sloboda, J. (Eds), *Handbook of Music and Emotion*, pp. 669-695. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
42. Rickard, N. S. (2004). Intense emotional responses to music: a test of the physiological arousal hypothesis. *Psychology of Music*, 32, 371-388.
43. Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. In S. Fiske (Ed.), *Annual review of psychology*, pp. 141-166. Palo Alto, CA: Annual Reviews, Inc.
44. Ryan, R., Huta, V., & Deci, E. L. (2008). Living well: A self-determination theory perspective on eudaimonia. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9, 139-170.
45. Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological wellbeing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 1069-1081.
46. Ryff, C. D. (1995). Psychological well-being in adult life. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 1069-1081.
47. Ryff, C. D., & Keyes, C. L. M. (1995). The Structure of Well-Being Revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(4), 719-727.
48. Ryff, C. D., & Singer, B. (1998). The contours of positive human health. *Psychological Inquiry*, 9, 1-28.
49. Schäfer, T. & Sedlmeier, P. (2009). From the functions of music to music preference. *Psychology of Music*, 37, 279-300.
50. Schäfer, T. & Sedlmeier, P. (2010). What makes us like music? Determinants of music preference. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts*, 4, 223-234.
51. Schellenberg, E.G., Peretz, I., & Viellard, S. (2008). Liking for happy and sad sounding music: Effects of exposure. *Cognition and Emotion*, 22, 218–237.
52. Schindler, N. (1997). Guardians of Disorder: Rituals of Youthful Culture at the Dawn of the Modern Age." In *A History of Young People in the West: Volume One: Ancient and Medieval Rites of Passage*, pp. 240–282. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
53. Sloboda, J. A. (1991). Music structure and emotional response: Some empirical findings. *Psychology of Music*, 19, 110-120.
54. Sloboda, J. A. (2002). The 'sound of music' versus the 'essence of music': Dilemmas for music-emotion researchers. *Musicae Scientiae, Special Issue 2001-2002*, 235-253.
55. Sloboda, J.A. (2005). *Exploring the musical mind: Cognition, emotion, ability, function*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
56. Sloboda, J. A. & Juslin, P. N. (2001). Psychological perspectives on music and emotion. In P. N. Juslin & J. A. Sloboda (Ed.), *Music and emotion: Theory and research*, pp. 71– 104. Oxford University Press.
57. Swann, W.B.Jr., Rentfrow, P.J., & Guinn, J. (2002). Self-verification: The search for coherence. In M. Leary & J. Taguey (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity*, pp. 367-383. New York: Guilford
58. Ter Bogt, T. F. M., Mulder, J., Raaijmakers, Q. A. W., & Gabbainn, S. N. (2010). Moved by music: A typology of music listeners. *Psychology of Music*, 39, 147-163.
59. Thompson, W. F. (2009). *Music, thought, and feeling. Understanding the psychology of music*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
60. Took, K. J., and Weiss, D. S. (1994). The relationship between heavy metal and rap music and adolescent turmoil: Real or artifact? *Adolescence*, 29(115), 613–621.
61. Upadhyay, D. K. (2013). Music preferences, music engagement and healing. *International Journal of Social Science and Humanity*, 3(3), 287-291.

62. Wass, H., Raup, J. L., Cerullo, K., Martel, L. G., Mingione, L. A., and Sperring, A. M. (1989). Adolescents' interest in and views of desstructive themes in rock music. *Omega*, 19, 177–186.
63. Waterman, A. S. (1993). Two conceptions of happiness: Contrasts of personal expressiveness (eudaimonia) and hedonic enjoyment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 678-691.
64. Zentner, M., Grandjean, D., & Scherer, K.R. (2008). Emotions evoked by the sound of music: characterization, classification, and measurement. *Emotion*, 8, pp. 494–521