Alexandros Baltzis, Antonis Gardikiotis[*]

School of Journalism and Mass Media Studies

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (Greece)

Influence of Social Values and Music Preferences on the Use of Music Distribution Channels: An Exploratory Study

Abstract

An audience research is presented focused on the patterns of music acquisition among students in a major urban center. The study explores the relation between the use of music distribution channels on the one hand, music preferences, social values, and several demographic factors on the other. Hierarchical regression analysis and analyses of variance revealed a complex image of the factors influencing the use of various distribution channels. Music preferences, gender, and cultural background are better predictors for the use of the various distribution channels compared to social values, origin, family income and socioeconomic status. These findings contradict the rhetoric of the (major) recording industry that employs a simplistic representation of the users of informal and free distribution channels. They also indicate that further research in this direction might contribute for a better understanding of everyday cultural practices and suggest a policy more efficient and fruitful than litigation and repression.

Key words: music preference, sociology of taste, social values, music distribution, music industry

---

[*] *Address of correspondence:* Dr Alexandros Baltzis, School of Journalism and Mass Media Studies, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 46 Egnatia St., Thessaloniki, GR-54625, Greece. Email: baltzis@jour.auth.gr. Homepage: http://users.auth.gr/baltzis/en/.

Alexandros Baltzis, Antonis Gardikiotis[*]

School of Journalism and Mass Media Studies

Aristotle University of Thessaloniki (Greece)

Influence of Social Values and Music Preferences on the Use of Music Distribution Channels: An Exploratory Study

Introduction

This exploratory study focuses on the acquisition of recorded music either in a physical (like compact discs) or in a digital format (like MP3 files). Concerts, radio and television, although music distribution channels too, they are not nevertheless included in this analysis, as music is not usually obtained through them. Like any industry, the recording industry has a special interest in the distribution of its products. Unlike other cultural or creative industries, however, the (major) recording industry demonstrates intolerance to the proliferation of the distribution channels, a generic inflexibility to innovation in this field, and a purposefully ignorant attitude towards the social, cultural, and political consequences of the pursuit to control exclusively – if possible – the dissemination of cultural goods (see also Baltzis, 2006). This attitude is well documented in the literature (e.g. Frith, 1988; Jones & Lenhart, 2004; Langenderfer & Kopp, 2004; Bishop, 2005). It can also be seen in the magnitude of the litigation campaigns, at least during the past few years (20,000 individuals in 17 countries for 2005 and more than 10,000 in 18 countries for 2006; IFPI, 2006: 20, 2007: 18). During the past decade, the music market – like almost any market of intangible goods – has undergone a major shift towards a multichannel context of distribution, as the mobile phones, and mainly the internet increased the range of choices. The control of distribution has always been important to the recording industry, but it becomes pivotal in a multichannel context where the circulation of cultural goods gets priority over their production. At the same time, this pursuit conflicts with the demands of the civil society and the information

---

[*] *Address of correspondence:* Dr Alexandros Baltzis, School of Journalism and Mass Media Studies, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 46 Egnatia St., Thessaloniki, GR-54625, Greece. Email: baltzis@jour.auth.gr. Homepage: http://users.auth.gr/baltzis/en/.

economy (Condry, 2004).

Although these developments are important to understand the changes in the modes of production, dissemination, and reception of music, little attention has been given to the factors that may influence the use of the various distribution channels. This paper and the research it presents address this issue.

The sociology of taste emphasizes on the musical preferences and their relation with status and lifestyles (for a review see Lizardo & Skiles, 2008) and a major part of the sociology of music explores its functions from this perspective and in larger social and societal contexts (see for reviews Peterson & Dowd, 2004; Chan & Goldthorpe, 2007). However, to study the acquisition patterns of music, from a sociological point of view means to study some of the ways in which an important part of the cultural capital is objectified. In other words, analyzing these patterns might contribute to a better under-standing of the everyday cultural practices within the modes of production, circulation and reception of symbolic forms in societies where mediation and intermediaries are dominant. From this point of view, understanding the functions of music in everyday life and in different social environments should also include an examination of the ac-quisition patterns, because they also provide some indication about the attitudes of the audiences towards the cultural industries and the cultural market, i.e., towards the pro-ducers of the symbolic forms and the mechanisms of their circulation in society. Be-sides, the common ways through which people objectify their cultural capital, are an integral part of their *habitus* and lifestyles. As such, they might as well shed some light on several forms of cultural resistance or conformity, as well as on some subtleties of the social interactions. Hence, there is some sociological interest in studying the music acquisition patterns.

The recording industry might also benefit from the study of these patterns, since – as the brief account at the beginning of this paper suggests – they have a serious impact on its strategy and tactics in the struggle to gain the attention (and mainly the money) of the audiences. But this is a matter exceeding the scope of this paper.

Theoretical background and research questions

Economic theory cannot explain levels and patterns of cultural consumption. This can be seen in the failure to explain based on price and income only the advent and

domination of certain musical styles and not others, the emergence and the decline of the various mainstream genres, or the marginalization of some styles and the corporate annexation of others (see for a review Dolfsma, 1999). The theory of maximum utility for minimum input is not applicable here either.

On the other hand, the distribution channel theory has paid little attention to the channel choice by consumers focusing mainly on channel design and management (Black, Lockett, Ennew, Winklhofer & McKechnie, 2002; Albesa, 2007). In cases where the consumer choice of distribution channel is studied, researchers highlight important aspects related with consumer behaviour and motivation in multichannel environments, but they nevertheless concentrate on the purchase process and mainly on fields other than cultural consumption, like travel and financial services (e.g. Black et. al., 2002; Schoenbachler & Gordon, 2002; Balasubramanian, Raghunathan & Mahajan, 2005; Albesa, 2007). Rather than exploring patterns of distribution channels use, they examine the factors that influence the consumer choice of one retail channel over another (see for a review Slack, Rowley & Coles, 2008). Besides, concentrating on formal purchase and retail researchers do not examine the complete set of distribution channels excluding – for instance – social networks and informal channels or secondary markets, which are very important in the music business (see for an example on concerts Connolly & Krueger, 2006: 688-691). Hence, for music, the distribution channel theory cannot provide a satisfactory explanation about the patterns of objectification of cultural capital within the modes of production, circulation and reception of symbolic forms.

This paper takes a different stance from the economic and the distribution channel theories. It takes into account values and preferences, presuming that they are more important for the patterns of obtaining symbolic forms like music.

Values are important determinants of people's attitudes and behaviour (Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 1992; for a review, see Schwartz & Bardi, 2001). Values describe and prescribe what people think is important to them in their lives. They are motivations, broad goals that apply across contexts and time. In other words, values are desirable goals, varying in importance, that serve as guiding principles in people's life (Schwartz & Sagiv, 1995). Schwartz (1992) introduced a structural model of values describing their content and internal structure. The content of ten value types is: power, achievement, hedonism, stimulation, self-direction, universalism, benevolence, conformity, tra-

dition and security. According to the model, the ten value types can be organized into four higher-level value types: (a) self-transcendence (universalism and benevolence) emphasizing acceptance of others as equals and concern for their welfare, (b) self-enhancement (power and achievement) emphasizing pursuit of own success and dominance over others, (c) openness to change (self-direction and stimulation) emphasizing independent thought and action and favoring change, and (d) conservation (security, conformity, and tradition) emphasizing submissive self-restriction to preserve the status quo. The theory has been tested in more than 200 samples from more than 65 countries. In most samples, the distinctiveness of the values and their structural relations have been verified.

Music, on the other hand, like any cultural product has the symbolic value of a marker. It has a highly symbolic meaning for individual and collective identity, for inclusion and exclusion (Bryson, 1997; Dolfsma, 1999; Bogt, 2003; North & Hargreaves, 2007). It marks social, cultural and subcultural divisions in an exceptional way (cf. Bourdieu, 1984: 18-19). Sociological research since the 1940s (e.g. Schuessler, 1948) has shown what Bourdieu (1984), Peterson (1992), and many other researchers keep confirming – more than half of a century now – in various countries[1]: there is no other marker of social distinction as clear as the musical preferences. In Bourdieu's words, "[…] nothing more clearly affirms one's 'class', nothing more infallibly classifies, than tastes in music" (1984: 18). Regardless of the shifts in the sociology of taste from the homology to the omnivorous paradigm and subsequently to the scenes perspective (see for a review Lizardo & Skiles, 2008), regardless of whether the distinction is perceived from Bourdieu's or Peterson's point of view, or just as variability of the individual lifestyles (see Chan & Goldthorpe, 2007), the bottom line is that research indicates that music preferences mark social distinctions.

It is this symbolic function that transforms through the process of reception the instrumental values of music (attributed through the process of production and distribution) into expressive ones. That is, while for the cultural intermediaries music as a commodity incorporates instrumental and utilitarian values, for the members of the audience it incorporates expressive values in terms of its symbolic meaning as a social

---

[1] For Spain, see López-Sintas et al., 2008; for a comparative analysis of Italy, Israel, Germany, Sweden and the United States, see Katz-Gerro, 2002; for France, see Bourdieu, 1984; for Great Britain, see Chan & Goldthorpe, 2007.

marker for status, for cultural capital, for the collective and individual identities. Hence, several researchers have been interested in the relation between values and music preferences. Research results indicate that there is actually such a relation. For example, North & Hargreaves (2007) have shown that music preferences differentiated along the dichotomy liberal-conservative are associated with behaviours, attitudes, beliefs, lifestyles and political views differentiated respectively along the same dichotomy. Gardikiotis & Baltzis (2008) found that Schwartz's four higher-level value types are strongly related with certain structures of music preferences (e.g. *openness to change* is positively associated with and predicts the preference for non-mainstream dissonant music styles; *conformity* to social harmony and the status quo is associated with the preference for sentimental and sensational music styles, etc.).

Although sociological research on music preferences as a social marker has a long pedigree, little attention has been given to the patterns of music acquisition. Addressing this issue, an exploratory study was carried out to examine the influence of values, music preferences, and demographic factors on the use of the music distribution channels.

Despite the exploratory character of this study, several research questions might be formulated. For example, people holding the value of *openness to change* and/or preferring non mainstream dissonant music styles, are expected to use more frequently non traditional and non mainstream distribution channels such as mobile phones or the internet and less frequently other types of channels, like the music stores. People holding the values of *conformity and security* and/or preferring sentimental and sensational music styles, are expected to obtain music more frequently from traditional and formal distribution channels, like music stores, and less frequently from informal and non traditional distribution channels. It is also interesting to establish the extent to which demographic factors like gender, geographical origin, family income, and cultural background may influence the patterns of use of the distribution channels. We might for example expect that in the pattern of people with higher income, social status and cultural background, the music stores may take a more significant place compared with press offers, free downloading, or mobile phones. However, since there is no previous research close enough to these questions and this is an exploratory study, the main object is not to test a complete set of hypotheses, but rather to explore which set of factors (social values, music preferences, and demographics) may be a better predictor for the use

of music distribution channels and which combination of factors might explain better the patterns of distribution channel use. To summarize, the main object of this exploratory study is to examine the differences between groups of people in terms of their "mapping" the various music distribution channels.

Research design and methods

Sample description and data collection

A convenience sample of 456 students from the three higher education institutes located in Thessaloniki, Greece, participated in the study during the winter semester of the academic year 2007-2008.

To explore the influence of socioeconomic factors, respondents were asked to indicate through a set of questions their annual family income, the place of their origin, the education and the occupation of their parents. Income level was measured on a 4-point scale[2]. The place of origin was coded as an ordinal 4-point variable taking into account the differences on the range of choices among rural, urban, and major urban centers. The fourth point on that scale represented origin from abroad (3.7% of the sample). Participants were also asked to indicate the highest level of education of their parents on a 5-point scale[3]. Finally, they were asked to indicate the occupation for both of their parents. The data on the occupation of the parents were subsequently processed and coded to construct a composite 7-point ordinal variable of socioeconomic status[4]. The occupations were codified following a modification of the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO-08) system, published by the International Labour Organization (ILO, 2008), considering the classification used by the National Statistical Service of Greece as well. Taking also into consideration several theoretical arguments and their empirical application in research (see Bourdieu, 1984; Peterson, 1992; Katz-Gerro,

---

[2] The scale is based on IRS regulations about the franked income of natural entities (€12,000) as well as on data provided by the National Statistical Service of Greece (2006) about the threshold of risk of poverty in Greece for 2005 (€11,864.54 annual income per household with two adults and two children).

[3] From 1 to 5 the points are: 9-year compulsory education, 3-year lyceum (post compulsory), higher education, postgraduate studies (Master's degree), and doctorate.

[4] The points on this scale are (from 1 to 7): employees (middle & lower rank staff, clerks) and workers; technicians, retailers, small and middle businessmen, and farmers; teachers (in primary and secondary education); managers & higher administrative staff; businessmen; professionals (with a degree, like lawyers, dentists etc.); academics and judicature.

2002; Chan & Goldthorpe, 2006), position in the hierarchy of the organization of production (administrative/managerial or subordinate) and prestige were crucial criteria for this scale. Academic credentials required for different groups of occupations were also considered as well as income. Members of the population under examination were consulted to construct and refine the scale, since prestige was considered too. Therefore, this variable reflects also the representations of this specific population about the social hierarchy.

From the initial sample, nine questionnaires were excluded either because they were incomplete (more than 20%) or because the answers were inconsistent. Age ranged from 17 to 33 years (M=20.71, SD=2.40) and the sample included 223 female and 224 male respondents. 41.4% of the respondents come from the two largest urban centers of the country (Athens and Thessaloniki), 42.9% from urban centers, 12% from rural centers and 3.7% are foreign citizens (either from Greek or foreign origin). Measured on a 4-point scale, 11.1% have a family annual income lower than €13,001; 31.1% from €13,001 to €24,000; 31.9% from €24,001 to €35,000 and 25.9% more than €35,001. 10.5% of the students are from a family with parents graduated from compulsory 9-year school, 26.2% from 3-year lyceum, 56.9% have parents graduated from higher education institutes, 3.6% have parents with a postgraduate diploma, and 2.9% with a doctorate degree. Finally, 20.72% of the respondents have parents working as managers and higher administrative staff (see footnote 4); 19.28% as employees or workers; 17.59% professionals; 14.7% technicians, retailers, small and middle businessmen or farmers; 13.49% teachers in primary and secondary education; 11.57% businessmen; 2.65% academics or judicature.

The structures of music preferences

Lack of previous relevant research on the Greek case made necessary the identification of the music genres and subgenres that are generally known to the population under consideration. An initial pool of items was created by data drawn from the charts for Greek and non-Greek music, published by the Association of Greek Producers of Phonograms (affiliate of the International Federation of the Phonographic Industry) and by taking into account different genres broadcasted by major radio stations. The initial pool of items was checked, in a pretest, with an independent sample of students in order to produce the final questionnaire (see Christenson & Peterson, 1988; Wells & Toki-

noya, 1998). The pretest was also meant to trace non-mainstream genres, since the above mentioned sources promote generally mainstream music and it was not clear whether there are genres known to this population, but not visible in the media. In addition, the pretest was used to determine at least one typical representative singer or group for each genre or subgenre, in order to avoid ambiguity concerning the meaning of the genres. The 24 items that came up from the pretest were: alternative, funk, blues, pop (contemporary, Western-style), Greek pop, rap/hip-hop, Greek rap/hip-hop, rock, Greek rock, hard rock/heavy metal, house, jazz, punk, reggae, rock 'n' roll, soul/r & b, trance, world (ethnic) music, classical music, Greek folk (traditional), *rebetika, laika, laika-pop*, and Greek *art-popular* music. Respondents were asked to indicate their liking or disliking of the 24 music genres (on a 5-point scale, 1 = *I don't like it at all* to 5 = *I like it very much*).

For some of these genres it is necessary to make additional notes. Thus, for *classical music* it was established that there is no point in differentiating between pre-classical (e.g. renaissance or baroque) and post-classical music (e.g. romantic or serial). Therefore, for the purposes of this study, this item included Western art music, regardless of specific style or strand, as it is used in everyday discourse, often also by learned audiences. The *Greek folk (traditional)* genre includes *demotica* (rural folk music from continental Greece) and island folk music as well, both developed through oral tradition. *Rebetika* is a kind of urban popular music developed by the end of the 19th and especially by the beginning of the 20th century, based initially on a modal musical system from Arab, Turkish and Byzantine origin (*makami*, maqām) and later influenced by the Western tonal system. This kind of music was developed by marginal, marginalized, and non-conformist social strata and was heavily influenced by the musical culture of the refugees from Asia Minor (Papageorgiou, 1997; Pennanen, 1997). *Laika* is a genre related in a complex way with *rebetika*. It is a "lighter" form of urban popular music, based mainly on the Western tonal system and disseminated by the recording and film industry, as well as by radio and television. Developed during the post-war era, this genre – although clearly distinct – is influenced by a variety of popular musics: Western European, Latin American, North American, Turkish, Egyptian and Indian (Papageorgiou, 1997; Pennanen, 1997). *Laika-pop* is a hybrid genre based mainly on Western-style pop music, and incorporating also some elements of Arabic origin, as well as ele-

ments from *rebetika* and *laika* genres. This type of music originates from an older genre that emerged from the night-club culture during the '70s and the '80s (cf. Papageorgiou, 1997). The emphasis on simple rhythmic patterns, the use of naïve melodic and conventional – easily recognizable – harmonic structures, as well as the sentimental lyrics, are the main features of this genre. The *Greek art-popular music* (*entechno*) is a genre developed in the '60s by composers like Mikis Theodorakis, Manos Hadjidakis, and others that combined poetry by celebrated writers with specific musical styles (frequently including complex harmonies, polyrhythm, and counterpoint), influenced by *rebetika* music and often incorporating melodic and rhythmic elements from traditional folk and *Byzantine* music. The genre has been based on concerns over social and political involvement and the rejection of the distinction between "serious" and "light" music (cf. Papageorgiou, 1997).

To reveal latent structures of the music preferences exploratory factor analysis was employed. Following Costello and Osborne (2005) the test was carried out with 4, 5, 6 and 7 components subsequently, to determine the best solution. The purpose for running multiple factor analyses was also to establish whether there are any persistent underlying structures regardless of the number of factors retained.

Since the music preferences were not normally distributed, principal axis factoring was employed as the method of extraction (see Costello & Osborne, 2005; Leech, Barrett, & Morgan, 2005). To allow for some correlation between the extracted factors the PROMAX method of rotation was used. The decision to use an oblique method of rotation is based on the assumption that there is some relation (either negative or positive) among various groups of preferences for certain genres, i.e. that the components retained are somehow related. This assumption results from the fact that the sociological theories of music preferences (like Peterson's thesis about omnivorousness or Bourdieu's homology hypothesis, for example) as well as data resulted from relevant empirical research map the relations and correlations among the different tastes in terms of their function as symbols of inclusion or exclusion, socioeconomic status, power, cultural capital, in- and out-group differentiation etc. Thus, like in a map, each like and dislike takes up a position relative to all other genre preferences (cf. Bryson, 1997; Bogt et al., 2003; Savage, 2006).

The most meaningful solution was arrived at with 5 components (Table 1).

Table 1. Principal Axis factoring on music preferences[a,b]

Genre preference	Components				
	1 Sentimental and sensational	2 Sophisticated and complex	3 Non-mainstream dissonant	4 Established rebellious	5 Native-Greek traditional
Soul / R & B	.776				
Pop	.773				
Rap / hip-hop	.740				
Greek pop	.703				
Greek rap / hip-hop	.702				
Laika-pop	.548				
Blues		.900			
Jazz		.867			
World (ethnic) music		.677			
Classical music		.588			
Reggae		.372			
Trance			.748		
Punk			.696		
House			.662		
Funk			.570		
Alternative			.498		
Hard Rock / Metal			.491		
Greek rock				.814	
Rock				.603	
Art-popular				.570	
Rock 'n' roll				.389	
Rebetika					.763
Greek folk (traditional)					.680
Laika					.584
Eigenvalues	4.891	3.297	2.158	1.138	.915
% of variance explained	20.378	13.737	8.990	4.742	3.810
Cumulative % of variance	20.378	34.115	43.105	47.846	51.657
Cronbach's Alpha	.842	.805	.769	.721	.691

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.
[a] Rotation converged in 9 iterations.
[b] Only factor loadings with values of .37 or higher (after Promax rotation) are shown.

This solution fits best to the data: no item crossloadings, no factors with fewer than 3 items and all item loadings are above .30 (see Costello & Osborne, 2005). The lowest loading is .372 (reggae). It is also noteworthy that – excluding reggae and rock 'n' roll – all item loadings are well above .40. Current trends in music preferences should also be considered in respect of the loadings variability. However, establishing trends requires a longitudinal research using the same methodology and sampling procedures. Finally, the factor analyses with 4, 5, 6, and 7 components showed that there are actually some persistent underlying structures of music preferences, regardless of the number of fac-

tors extracted. The "sentimental and sensational" preference structure, as well as the "sophisticated and complex" extracted from each analysis comprise the same items.

The structures of values

Participants completed an abbreviated version of the Schwartz Value Survey that included 24 single values (Schwartz, 1992) (see Appendix). Participants rated the importance of each value as guiding principle in their life on a 7-point scale from *opposed to my values* (-1), through *not important* (0), to *of supreme importance* (5).

Table 2. Principal Axis factoring on the social values scale

Values	Components				
	1 Universal-ism	2 Security and benevolence	3 Self-enhancement	4 Conformity and benevolence	5 Openness to change
Respecting the earth, harmony with other species	.942				
A world of peace, free of war and conflict	.797				
Protecting the environment, preserving nature	.791				
Equality, equal opportunity for all	.538				
Social justice, correcting injustices, care for the weak	.535				
Family security, safety for loved ones		.715			
Sense of belonging, feeling that others care about me		.616			
Loyal, faithful to my friends		.549			
Honoring parents and elders, showing respect		.492			
True friendship, close supportive friends		.427			
Honest, genuine, sincere		.350			
Authority, the right to lead or command			.890		
Social power; control over others, dominance			.865		
Influential, having an impact on people and events			.678		
Wealth, material possessions, money			.518		
Helpful, working for the welfare of others				.683	
Forgiving, willing to pardon others				.630	
Self-discipline, self-restraint, resistance to temptations				.558	
Mature love, deep emotional and spiritual intimacy				.545	
Obedient, dutiful, meeting obligations				.518	
An exciting life, stimulating experiences					.911
A varied life, filled with challenges, novelty and change					.846
Curious, interested in everything, exploring					.486
Enjoying life, enjoying food, sex, leisure, etc.					.425
Eigenvalues	6.681	3.065	1.918	1.598	1.371
% of variance explained	25.85	11.09	6.25	4.96	3.52
Cumulative % of variance explained	25.85	36.94	43.18	48.14	51.66
Cronbach's Alpha	.85	.79	.83	.79	.75

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.
Rotation Method: Promax with Kaiser Normalization.
[a] Rotation converged in 9 iterations.
[b] Only factor loadings with values of .35 or higher (after Promax rotation) are shown.

To reveal latent structures of values a similar analytical procedure to that of music preferences was followed. A principal axis analysis (with PROMAX rotation) revealed five factors (see Table 2). Three of them essentially reproduced two of the higher-level value types of Schwartz's model: self-enhancement (power and achievement, Cronbach's alpha=.83) and openness to change (self-direction, stimulation, and hedonism, Cronbach's alpha=.75). A third factor comprised universalism items (equality, world at peace, respecting the earth, plus the social justice item, Cronbach's alpha=.85). The last two factors comprised of value types that usually load on the social-transcendence type and conservation type: one factor with security and benevolent items (i.e., family security, sense of belonging, loyal, true friendship plus the honouring parents and elders item, Cronbach's alpha=.79); a second factor with conformity and benevolent items (i.e., self-discipline, obedience, mature love, helpfulness, forgivingness, Cronbach's alpha=.79).

The distribution channels

Respondents were asked to indicate how often they obtain music through a variety of ways (called from now on *distribution channels*): music stores, internet purchase, free downloads, mobile phone, press offers (i.e. from papers and/or magazines), peddlers, and friends. This pool of items was created by consultation with several students and then it was checked, in a pretest, with an independent sample of students to produce the final question. The participants indicated their answer on a 5-point scale (0=never through 4=always) and the ratio of the use of each channel to the total use of all channels was calculated for each respondent, to obtain the patterns of use.

The distribution channels were distinguished in four groups based on two criteria: formality of structure and type of transaction. Thus, one pair of groups includes the formal and informal distribution channels. Friends, peddlers and free downloads are informal channels, while music stores, downloads on payment, mobile phone, as well as press offers are formal. Formal distribution channels are structured through impersonal ways, i.e., the terms of trade and the division of marketing functions among the channel members are legitimized, authorized and controlled by economic and state mechanisms. There are contractual and employment regulations as well as state control through taxation and economic policy (cf. Stern & Reve, 1980; Portes & Sassen-Koob, 1987). The informal distribution channels, on the other hand, are structured mainly by non-

economic mechanisms (social networks, processes of socialization etc.). Peddlers selling unauthorized copies are a specific case: in Greece they appeared through what M. Castells calls "perverse integration" (2000: 71-73) which involves economic, social and political processes. They are beyond any conventional regulation of contracts, transactions and employment, and therefore included in the informal economy sector (see Portes & Sassen-Koob, 1987).

A second pair of groups includes channels on payment and free channels. The group of the distribution channels on payment comprises music stores and downloads on payment, mobile phones, press offers and peddlers. The free channels group includes friends and free download. Descriptive statistics for the four variables are presented in table 3.

Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for the use of channels (by channel type)

Channel types	N	M	SD
Informal channels[a]	446	.68	.185
Free channels[b]	446	.58	.205
Pay channels[c]	446	.41	.202
Formal channels[d]	446	.32	.178

[a] Free downloads, Peddlers, Friends.
[b] Free downloads, Friends.
[c] Music stores, Downloads on payment, Mobile phone, Press offers, Peddlers.
[d] Music stores, Downloads on payment, Mobile phone, Press offers.

Through this question it was also detected how often the respondents buy music (if at all) and how often they use formal and informal distribution channels. As it can be seen in table 3, the most frequently used types of channels in the population examined are the informal and the free channels.

Variables and methods

Statistical analyses were carried out using SPSS 15.0. The independent-samples T-test was employed to examine differences among males and females in respect of their use of the various music distribution channels. One-way between-groups analyses of variance were conducted to explore the extent to which the annual family income, the origin, the education of the parents and the socioeconomic status may predict the use of the various channels as well as the use of the different types of channels. Since the sam-

ple size was large enough (30+), employing these tests is acceptable, regardless of violating the normality assumption (Pallant, 2001: 172). However, since the collection of data occurred in group settings, the *alpha* was set at a more rigorous value (*p*<0.01, see Pallant, 2001: 171).

Table 4. Descriptive statistics on dependent and independent variables

Variable	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
A. Dependent variables			
A.1. Channel use			
Friends	445	0.30	0.130
Free downloads	446	0.29	0.179
Music stores	445	0.15	0.127
Press offers	445	0.11	0.105
Peddlers	445	0.09	0.101
Pay downloads	445	0.03	0.074
Mobile phones	445	0.03	0.068
A.2. Channel types			
Informal channels	446	0.68	0.185
Free channels	446	0.58	0.205
Pay channels	446	0.41	0.202
Formal channels	446	0.32	0.178
B. Independent variables			
B.1. Preference structures			
Established rebellious	446	3.53	0.858
Sentimental and sensational	441	3.35	0.947
Native-Greek traditional	441	3.30	0.886
Sophisticated and complex	446	3.11	0.872
Non-mainstream dissonant	445	2.73	0.903
B.2. Value structures			
Security and benevolence	443	4.17	0.765
Universalism	441	4.16	0.956
Openness to change	443	3.57	0.994
Conformity and benevolence	440	3.09	1.067
Self-enhancement	441	1.71	1.271
B.3. Demographics			
Origin	432	2.37	0.741
Education of parents	420	2.62	0.830
Annual family income	386	2.73	0.971
Socioeconomic status	415	3.54	1.820

Because this is an exploratory study, the Least Significant Differences post hoc test was employed for those analyses where the variances of the groups were equal. For the analyses violating this assumption, the Games-Howell post hoc test was used to establish significant differences between groups. To determine the best predictors for the use of the music distribution channels, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted for music preferences and social values predicting the use of music distribution channels ungrouped and by type (grouped).

Data analyses and results

Gender

Males were found significantly different from females on obtaining music through free downloads ($p<0.001$), mobile phones ($p<0.005$), press offers ($p<0.05$), and from peddlers ($p<0.005$). The mean for males on obtaining music through free downloads (0.34) is significantly higher that the mean for females (0.23) and this is the only channel on which males have higher mean than females. This indicates that free downloads take a significantly more important place in the male pattern of obtaining music (34% of the total use of distribution channels) in comparison with the female pattern (23%) and this is also the only case where the magnitude of the difference is larger than typical (d=0.62). Females obtain music more often from friends (30%), through free downloads (23%), from music stores (16%), press offers (12%), peddlers (11%), through the mobile phone (4%) and internet purchase (4%). The male pattern is slightly different. Males obtain music more often through free downloads (34%), from friends (30%), music stores (13%), press offers (10%), peddlers (8%), through mobile phones (2%) and internet purchase (2%). Although statistically significant differences were found, the effect size d on obtaining music through mobile phones (d=0.29), press offers (d=0.21), and from peddlers (d=0.28) is smaller than typical. This indicates that there are no major differences between males and females on the patterns of use of the various distribution channels. No statistically significant differences were found between males and females on the patterns of music acquisition concerning the music stores, the download on payment and friends.

The independent samples T-test was also employed to explore differences in respect

of the formal channels and the pay channels. Males differ significantly from females on the use of all types of distribution channels ($p<0.001$) and the magnitude of these differences is rather typical ($d=0.43$ for the formal channels, $d=0.44$ for the informal, $d=0.53$ for the channels on payment, and $d=0.54$ for the free channels).

The informal and the free channels take a more important place in the male pattern of music acquisition (72% and 64%) compared with the female pattern (64% and 53%), while females obtain music more often through formal and pay channels (36% and 46%) than males (28% and 36%). The total sample, however, uses informal and free channels more often (68% and 58%) than the formal channels and the channels on payment (32% and 41%).

Socioeconomic factors

The one-way between-groups analysis of variance did not detect any statistically significant differences among the four levels of annual family income, neither among the groups that differ on the place of origin (rural, urban, large urban centers, and abroad). However, several groups differentiated by the education level of their parents were found to differ significantly on the frequency of obtaining music through free downloads [$F(4, 414)=2.879$, $p<0.05$] and from peddlers[5] [$F(4, 48.64)=9.865$, $p<0.001$], as well as through free channels [$F(4, 414)=2.469$, $p<0.05$] and channels on payment [$F(4, 414)=2.520$, $p<0.05$].

Fewer differences were detected among some groups defined by the occupation of their parents, i.e. according to the scale of socioeconomic status constructed for the purposes of this exploratory study. Differences were found on obtaining music through free downloads [$F(6, 407)=2.675$, $p<0.05$] and from peddlers[6] [$F(6, 98.27)=2.827$, $p<0.05$].

Education of parents

On the free downloads, post hoc Least Significant Differences tests indicate that there were significant differences between the group with parents graduated from higher education and the group with parents educated in lyceum ($p<0.005$, $d=0.38$). The first group tends to obtain music more often through free downloads (31%) than the second one (24%). On buying music from peddlers, the Games-Howell post hoc tests indicate

---

[5] The assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated and therefore the Welch F-ratio is reported.
[6] The assumption of homogeneity of variance was violated and therefore the Welch F-ratio is reported.

that the group with parents having a Master's degree differs significantly from the groups with parents educated on the compulsory level ($p<0.001$, $d=0.97$), in lyceum ($p<0.001$, $d=0.96$), and in higher education institutes ($p<0.05$, $d=0.58$). This group buys music from peddlers significantly less frequently (2.4%) than the other groups (compulsory education, 12%; lyceum, 12%; higher education, 8.4%). The group with parents having a doctorate differs significantly from the groups with parents graduated from compulsory education ($p<0.05$, $d=0.77$) and lyceum ($p<0.05$, $d=0.77$). Buying music from peddlers takes a less significant place in the pattern of this group (4.1%) compared with the patterns of the other two groups (mentioned above). Finally, the difference between the group with parents graduated from lyceum (12%) and the group with parents graduated from higher education (8.4%) was found also significant ($p<0.05$, $d=0.39$). These results show that the higher the parents' education level, the lower the frequency of buying music from peddlers.

On the use of free channels, the Least Significant Differences post hoc tests show that the group with parents having a Master's degree differs significantly from the group with parents that received compulsory education ($p=0.05$, $d=0.61$) and the group with parents graduated from lyceum ($p<0.05$, $d=0.65$). The use of free channels takes a significant place in the pattern of the group with parents having a Master's degree (67.6%), while this type of distribution channels – although also important – takes a more modest place in the patterns of the other two groups (compulsory education, 55.6%; lyceum graduates, 54.6%). A significant difference was also found between the group with parents graduated from lyceum and the group with parents having received higher education ($p<0.05$, $d=0.28$). The latter group obtains music through free channels more often than the former (60.3% and 54.6% respectively). These findings suggest that there are significant differences between respondents coming from a family with primary and secondary education on the one hand and respondents coming from a family with higher and postgraduate education, on the other. In broad strokes, the higher the education level of the parents, the higher the frequency of obtaining music through free channels (free downloads and friends). Since the uses of the free and the pay channels were calculated as mutually dependent, statistically significant differences were found between the same groups, on the same significance level and with the same magnitude of differences.

Socioeconomic status

Statistically significant differences among several groups were found only on free downloads and on buying music from peddlers. The post hoc Least Significant Differences tests indicate that students with parents working as technicians, retailers, small or middle businessmen, and farmers differ significantly on obtaining music through free downloads from students whose parents work as teachers in primary and secondary education ($p<0.005$, $d=0.55$). They also differ from the groups with parents working as managers and higher administrative staff ($p<0.05$, $d=0.43$), and as professionals with a degree ($p<0.05$, $d=0.44$). Obtaining music through free download takes a more modest place in the pattern of this group (24%), compared with the students whose parents are teachers (34%), managers/higher administrative staff (30%), or professionals with a degree, like lawyers and doctors (32%). The group with parents working as teachers differ significantly from the group whose parents are businessmen ($p<0.05$, $d=0.47$), as well as from students whose parents are academics or in judicature ($p=0.05$, $d=0.58$). Free downloading takes a more important place in the pattern of this group (34%) compared with the two others (25% and 22% respectively). Finally, on the use of this distribution channel, students whose parents are professionals with a degree differ significantly from students whose parents are businessmen ($p<0.05$, $d=0.36$). In the pattern of the former group, free downloads are more important (32%) compared with the latter (25%).

On buying music from peddlers, the analysis of variance was statistically significant ($p<0.05$), but the Games-Howell post hoc tests failed to locate significant differences between the groups defined by the socioeconomic status. As this is an exploratory study, further research might clarify this discrepancy.

Music preferences and values

Hierarchical regression analyses were performed on all distribution channels (Table 6), as well as on the types of channels (Table 8). In both cases, music preferences were entered in the first model and value types in the second. Correlation coefficients between predictors and distribution channels, as well as between predictors and types of channels can be seen in Tables 5 and 7 respectively.

Table 5. Correlation coefficients between predictors and music distribution channels

Predictors	Music stores	Pay downloads	Free downloads	Mobile phones	Press offers	Peddlers	Friends
Preferences							
Sentimental and sensational	-0.090*	0.082*	-0.104*	0.213***	0.025	0.192***	0.029
Sophisticated and complex	0.171***	0.039	-0.090*	-0.011	0.191***	-0.068	-0.035
Non-mainstream dissonant	0.051*	0.041	0.135**	0.007	-0.033	-0.158***	0.041
Established rebellious	0.100	0.026	-0.075	-0.037	0.161***	-0.062	-0.003
Native-Greek traditional	-0.024	-0.039	-0.090*	-0.008	0.113*	0.060	0.123**
Values							
Self-enhancement	-0.104*	-0.003	0.158**	-0.017	-0.045	-0.003	-0.113*
Openness to change	0.042	0.058	0.022	0.138**	0.010	0.010	-0.066
Universalism	0.140	0.021	-0.189***	0.115*	0.097*	0.045	-0.028
Conformity and benevolence	0.166**	0.077	-0.151***	0.142**	0.033	-0.002	-0.011
Security and benevolence	0.074***	0.028	-0.071	0.097*	0.007	-0.014	0.059
	N=410	N=428	N=421	N=402	N=420	N=420	N=420

Levels of significance: ***$\leq$0.001, **$\leq$0.005, *$\leq$0.05

Table 6. Hierarchical regression models for music preferences and social values predicting the use of various music distribution channels[a]

	Standardized B Coefficients											
	Music stores		Free downloads		Mobile phones		Press offers		Peddlers		Friends	
Predictors	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Music preferences												
Sentimental and sensational	-0.068	-0.079	-0.138**	-0.141**	0.213***	0.197***	0.065	0.071	0.193***	0.204***	0.018	0.021
Sophisticated and complex	0.165**	0.162**	-0.121*	-0.108[b]	0.020	0.001	0.180**	0.171**	-0.007	-0.028	-0.075	-0.044
Non-mainstream dissonant	-0.022	-0.001	0.208***	0.189***	0.007	0.005	-0.131*	-0.129*	-0.154**	-0.165**	0.090	0.105*
Established rebellious	0.040	0.014	-0.106	-0.078	-0.010	-0.041	0.123*	0.122*	0.010	0.002	-0.031	-0.036
Native-Greek traditional	-0.064	-0.105*	-0.035	0.001	-0.006	-0.015	0.042	0.044	0.049	0.071	0.151**	0.120*
Values												
Self-enhancement		-0.092		0.100[c]		-0.038		0.006		0.010		-0.106*
Openness to change		-0.001		0.038		0.111*		-0.020		0.043		-0.053
Universalism		0.033		-0.119*		0.048		0.060		0.083		-0.083
Conformity and benevolence		0.148*		-0.113		0.116		0.005		-0.005		-0.060
Security and benevolence		-0.002		0.102		-0.063		-0.054		-0.133*		0.123
Adjusted R square	0.027	0.054	0.053	0.083	0.034	0.052	0.054	0.046	0.053	0.055	0.014	0.024
R square	0.039	0.077	0.064	0.104	0.046	0.075	0.065	0.068	0.064	0.077	0.025	0.047
R square change	0.039	0.038	0.064	0.040	0.046	0.030	0.065	0.003	0.064	0.013	0.025	0.021
Multiple R	0.197	0.278	0.253	0.323	0.214	0.274	0.255	0.262	0.253	0.278	0.160	0.217
F	3.267*	3.335***	5.698***	4.784***	3.785**	3.179**	5.756***	3.005***	5.673***	3.429***	2.166*	2.013*

[a] The models for downloads on payment are not included as they were not statistically significant.

[b] $p=0.052$; [c] $p=0.054$.

Levels of significance: *** ≤ 0.001, ** ≤ 0.005, * ≤ 0.05

Table 7. Correlation coefficients between predictors and types of music distribution channels

Predictors	Formal channels	Informal channels	Free channels	Pay channels
Preferences				
Sentimental and sensational	0.025	-0.028	-0.107[*]	0.107[*]
Sophisticated and complex	0.237[***]	-0.222[***]	-0.155[***]	0.177[***]
Non-mainstream dissonant	-0.003	0.016	0.106[*]	-0.089[*]
Established rebellious	0.147[***]	-0.147[***]	-0.103[*]	0.097[*]
Native-Greek traditional	-0.004	-0.003	-0.043	0.029
Values				
Self-enhancement	-0.066	0.066	0.067	-0.061
Openness to change	0.028	-0.017	-0.022	0.039
Universalism	0.179[***]	-0.179[***]	-0.175[***]	0.170[***]
Conformity and benevolence	0.139[**]	-0.148[***]	-0.126[**]	0.118[*]
Security and benevolence	0.033	-0.048	-0.034	0.019
	N=421	N=418	N=419	N=421

Levels of significance: ***≤0.001, **≤0.005, *≤0.05

Table 8. Hierarchical regression models for music preferences and social values predicting the use of music distribution channels by type

| | Standardized B Coefficients | | | | | | | |
| Predictors | Formal channels | | Informal channels | | Pay channels | | Free channels | |
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2	Model 1	Model 2
Music preferences								
Sentimental and sensational	0.068	0.067	-0.073	-0.069	0.146**	0.151**	-0.147**	-0.150**
Sophisticated and complex	0.257***	0.237***	-0.239***	-0.219***	0.228***	0.200***	-0.196***	-0.170**
Non-mainstream dissonant	-0.131*	-0.117*	0.137*	0.122*	-0.201***	-0.197***	0.208***	0.202***
Established rebellious	0.106	0.092	-0.116*	-0.104	0.095	0.077	-0.116*	-0.099
Native-Greek traditional	-0.084	-0.106*	0.079	0.102*	-0.047	-0.053	0.035	0.043
Values								
Self-enhancement		-0.029		0.023		-0.026		0.021
Openness to change		-0.034		0.046		0.007		0.010
Universalism		0.113ᵃ		-0.107		0.125*		-0.127*
Conformity and benevolence		0.126ᵇ		-0.128*		0.110		-0.109
Security and benevolence		-0.094		0.079		-0.150*		0.137*
Adjusted R square	0.068	0.086	0.063	0.081	0.071	0.087	0.068	0.083
R square	0.079	0.108	0.074	0.103	0.082	0.109	0.079	0.105
R square change	0.079	0.029	0.074	0.029	0.082	0.027	0.079	0.026
Multiple R	0.281	0.328	0.273	0.321	0.286	0.329	0.281	0.324
F	7.124***	4.956***	6.610***	4.664***	7.387***	4.993***	7.068***	4.780***

Levels of significance: ***$\leq$0.001, **$\leq$0.005, *$\leq$0.05
a. Significance value = 0.061; b. Significance value = 0.051

The analyses on the distribution channels revealed a complex image. Concerning the music stores, it was evident that the more participants like *sophisticated and complex* and the less they like *native-Greek traditional* music styles the more they obtain music from music stores. Moreover, the more participants hold the values of *conformity and benevolence* the more they choose music stores. Concerning free downloads, *sentimental and sensational* and *sophisticated and complex* have a negative, whereas *non-mainstream dissonant* has a positive relationship with the use of this distribution channel. Also the more participants hold the values of *self-enhancement* and the less they hold the values of *universalism*, the more they choose free downloading. Concerning mobile phones, it was only the *sentimental and sensational* music preference structure and the *openness to change* value that predicts the use of this channel. Concerning press offers, music preferences are strong predictors of this distribution channel: *sentimental and sensational*, *sophisticated and complex* and *established rebellious* have a positive, whereas *non-mainstream dissonant* has a negative relationship with press offers. Concerning peddlers, *sentimental and sensational* has a positive and *non-mainstream dissonant* has a negative relationship with the use of this channels. Moreover, *security and benevolence* has a negative relationship with peddlers. Concerning friends, *non-mainstream dissonant* and *native-Greek traditional* positively predict this choice whereas *self-enhancement* has a negative relationship with them as a choice.

The analyses on the types of channels also showed that both music preferences and values predict their use. The more participants are fond of *sophisticated and complex* and the less they like *non-mainstream dissonant* and *native-Greek traditional* music styles, the more they choose formal channels. Moreover, the more they hold the values of *conformity and benevolence* and *universalism*, the more they choose formal channels. On the other hand, the more they like *native-Greek traditional* and the less they like *sophisticated and complex*, the more they choose the informal channels. *Conformity and benevolence* have a negative relationship with informal channels. Concerning the pay vs. free channels differentiation, *sentimental and sensational* and *sophisticated and complex* preference structures have a positive, whereas *non-mainstream dissonant* has a negative relationship with pay channels. *Universalism* has a positive relationship whereas *security and benevolence* has a negative relationship with pay channels. On the other hand, the less participants like *sentimental and sensational* and *sophisticated and*

complex and the more they like *non-mainstream dissonant* music styles the more they choose free channels. Finally, participants who hold the values of *security and benevolence* and participants who do not hold the values of *universalism* prefer the free channels.

Conclusions and further research

This study explored the influence of several factors on the patterns of obtaining music through various distribution channels placing emphasis on social values and music preferences. It also examined the influence of demographic and socioeconomic factors.

Only on one channel the analysis found a larger than typical difference between males and females. Significant differences were found between males and females, but generally, the male pattern of channel use was not very different from the female pattern. This finding is consistent with similar findings on other cases where gender has not a significant effect on patterns of channel use (Slack, Rowley & Coles, 2008). However, the male pattern of use by channel *type* was different from the female pattern.

The results show that there are major differences associated with the cultural background on buying music from peddlers. However, one should consider also the repertoire available through this channel which is usually restricted to mainstream music styles and the most popular part of the music production. Generally speaking the cultural background seems to have a rather modest effect on the use of the music distribution channels, because from the group of seven distribution channels only on one case some consistent pattern was found. The results suggest that the higher the education of the parents, the higher the use of free channels. Nevertheless, this is a general trend and no major differences were found among the different groups. The results show also that there is not a clear pattern of use related with the socioeconomic status. A general, but not very clear trend seems to be that the middle part of the socioeconomic scale uses more frequently free downloading. In conclusion, some of the demographic factors have a rather modest effect on the use of the music distribution channels.

The results of the hierarchical regression analyses suggest that music preferences are better predictors than social values. The analysis show that preferences for some music styles are related with the use of certain distribution channels (e.g. non mainstream with free downloading). The findings suggest that people who like more "pop"

music styles (e.g. sentimental and sensational) tend to obtain music through formal and pay channels. However, it should be considered that some kinds of music (like non mainstream) are easier to find through certain channels (e.g. free and informal).

To summarize, music preferences, gender, and cultural background are better predictors of the music acquisition patterns compared to social values, origin, family income and socioeconomic status. An interesting outcome of this research is that the findings suggest that the patterns of music acquisition may not overlap with the values and the socioeconomic structure that underlie the music preferences. In other words, patterns of objectification of cultural capital do not necessarily correlate with the status it signifies. Further research needs to be done to clarify several aspects of the complex image revealed by these analyses. The patterns of music acquisition are complicated processes that need further examination.

Further investigation needs also to be done to specify the reasons and motives for the frequency of use of the different distribution channels. For example, does the high use of informal and free channels to obtain music mean that these cultural goods are not regarded worthy to pay for and therefore that the work of the composers and musicians is not esteemed and appreciated enough by the population examined? Or does it mean that this is a type of rebellious attitude towards – a critique-in-practice of – the price policy employed by the recording industry? Does the purchase of music from peddlers mean carelessness and/or ignorance about the economic consequences for an industry (and its employees) or social awareness about the condition of perverse integration? We believe that these questions deserve an in-depth analysis.

References

Albesa, J. G. (2007): "Interaction Channel Choice in a Multichannel Environment, an Empirical Study". *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 25(7): 490-506.

Balasubramanian, S., Raghunathan, R., Mahajan, V. (2005): "Consumers in a Multichannel Environment: Product Utility, Process Utility, and Channel Choice". *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 19(2): 12-30.

Baltzis, A. (2006): "Freedom of Expression[®] and the Recorded Music: Control and Democracy in the Internet Era". In *The Impact of Internet on the Mass Media in Europe* (edited by Nikos Leandros), pp. 251-263. Suffolk, UK: Abramis, 2006.

Bishop, J. (2005): "Building International Empires of Sound: Concentrations of Power and Property in

the 'Global' Music Market". *Popular Music and Society*, 28(4): 443-471.

Black, N. J., Lockett, A., Ennew, C., Winklhofer, H. & McKechnie, S. (2002): "Modelling Consumer Choice of Distribution Channels: An Illustration from Financial Services". *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, 20(4): 161-173.

Bogt, T. T., Raaijmakers, Q., Vollebergh, W., Van Wel, F., & Sikkema, P. (2003): "Youngsters and their Musical Taste: Musical Styles and Taste Groups". *The Netherlands' Journal of Social Sciences*, 39(1): 35-52.

Bourdieu, P. (1984): *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Bryson, B. (1997): "What about the Univores? Musical Dislikes and Group-Based Identity Construction among Americans with Low Levels of Education". *Poetics*, 25(2-3): 141-156.

Castells, M. (2000): *End of Millennium (The Information Age – Economy, Society and Culture: Vol. 3)*. Oxford, Maden: Blackwell.

Chan, T. W. & Goldthorpe, J. H. (2007): "Social Stratification and Cultural Consumption: Music in England". *European Sociological Review*, 23(1): 1-19.

Christenson, P. G. & Peterson, J. B. (1988): "Genre and Gender in the Structure of Music Preferences. *Communication Research*, 15(3): 282-301.

Condry, I. (2004): "Cultures of Music Piracy. An Ethnographic Comparison of the US and Japan". *International Journal of Cultural Studies*, 7(3): 343-363.

Connolly, M. & Krueger, A. B. (2006): "Rockonomics: The Economics of Popular Music". In *Handbook of the Economics of Art and Culture*, Vol. 1 (edited by Victor A. Ginsburgh & David Throsby), pp. 667-719. Elsevier B.V.

Costello, A. B. & Osborne, J. W. (2005): "Best Practices in Exploratory Factor Analysis: Four Recommendations for Getting the Most from your Analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research & Evaluation*, 10(7): 1-9.

Dolfsma, W. (1999): "The Consumption of Music and the Expression of VALUES: A Social Economic Explanation for the Advent of Pop Music". *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 58(4): 1019-1046.

Frith, S. (1988): "Copyright and the Music Business". *Popular Music*, 17(1): 57-75.

Gardikiotis, A. & Baltzis, A. (2008): 'Rock Music for Myself and Justice to the World!' Music Preferences, Self-Identities and Social Values (forthcoming).

IFPI (2006): *06 Digital Music Report* (http://www.ifpi.org/content/library/digital-music-report-2006.pdf).

IFPI (2007): *07 Digital Music Report* (http://www.ifpi.org/content/library/digital-music-report-2007.pdf).

ILO – International Labour Organization (2008): *Resolution Concerning Updating the International Standard Classification of Occupations*. ILO (http://www.ilo.org/public/english/bureau/stat/isco/docs/resol08.pdf).

Jones, S. & Lenhart, A. (2004): "Music Downloading and Listening: Findings from the Pew Internet and American Life Project". *Popular Music and Society*, 27(2): 185-199.

Katz-Gerro, T. (2002): "Highbrow Cultural Consumption and Class Distinction in Italy, Israel, West

Germany, Sweden, and the United States". *Social Forces*, 81(1): 207-229.

Langenderfer, J. & Kopp, S. W. (2004): "The Digital Technology Revolution and its Effect on the Market for Copyrighted Works: Is History Repeating Itself?" *Journal of Macromarketing*, 24(1): 17-30.

Leech, N. L., Barrett, K. C. & Morgan, G. A. (2005): *SPSS for Intermediate Statistics. Use and Interpretation*. Mahwah, New Jersey, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lizardo, O. & Skiles, S. (2008): "Cultural Consumption in the Fine and Popular Arts Realms". *Sociology Compass* 2(2): 485-502.

López-Sintas, J., Garcia-Alvarez, M. E. & Filimon, N. (2008): "Scale and Periodicities of Recorded Music Consumption: Reconciling Bourdieu's Theory of Taste with Facts". *The Sociological Review*, 56(1): 78-101.

National Statistical Service of Greece (2006): *Statistics on Income and Living Conditions*. Pireus: General Secretariat of the NSS of Greece.

North, A. C. & Hargreaves, D. J. (2007): "Lifestyle Correlates of Musical Preference: 1. Relationships, Living Arrangements, Beliefs, and Crime". *Psychology of Music*, 35(1): 58-87.

Pallant, J. (2001): *SPSS Survival Manual: A Step-by-step Guide to Data Analysis Using SPSS for Windows* (Version 10). Crows Nest, N.S.W.: Allen & Unwin.

Papageorgiou, F. T. (1997): "Popular Music and the Music Industry in Greece. In *Whose Master's Voice? The Development of Popular Music in Thirteen Cultures* (edited by Alison J. Ewbank and Fouli T. Papageorgiou), pp. 67-98. Westport, Connecticut, London: Greenwood Press.

Pennanen, R. P. (1997): "The Development of Chordal Harmony in Greek Rebetika and Laika Music, 1930s to 1960s". *Ethnomusicology Forum*, 6(1): 65-116.

Peterson, R. A. & Dowd T. (2004): "Making Music Sociology: An Introduction". Poetics, 32(3-4): 195-196.

Peterson, R. A. (1992): "Understanding Audience Segmentation: From Elite and Mass to Omnivore and Univore". *Poetics*, 21(4): 243-258.

Portes, A. & Sassen-Koob, S. (1987): "Making it Underground: Comparative Material on the Informal Sector in Western Market Economies". *The American Journal of Sociology*, 93(1): 30-61.

Rokeach, M. (1973): *The Nature of Human Values*. New York: Free Press.

Savage, M. (2006): "The Musical Field". *Cultural Trends*, 15(2-3): 159-174.

Schoenbachler, D. D. & Gordon, G. L. (2002): "Multi-Channel Shopping: Understanding what Drives Channel Choice". *The Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 19(1): 42-53.

Schuessler, K. F. (1948): *Musical Taste and Socio-Economic Background*. Ph. D. Indiana: Indiana University.

Schwartz, S. H. & Bardi, A. (2001): "Value Hierarchies across Cultures: Taking a Similarities Perspective". *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 32(3): 268-290.

Schwartz, S. H. & Sagiv, L. (1995): "Identifying Culture-Specifics in the Content and Structure of Values". *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 26(1): 92-116.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992): "Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (edited by M.

Zanna), Vol. 25, pp. 1-65. New York: Academic Press.

Slack, F., Rowley, J. & Coles, S. (2008): "Consumer Behaviour in Multi-Channel Contexts: The Case of a Theatre Festival". *Internet Research*, 18(1): 46-59.

Stern, L. W. & Reve, T. (1980): "Distribution Channels as Political Economies: A Framework for Comparative Analysis". *Journal of Marketing*, 44(3): 52-64.

Wells, A. & Tokinoya, H. (1998): "The Genre Preferences of Western Popular Music by Japanese Adolescents". *Popular Music and Society*, 22(1): 41-53.

Appendix

Value items and value types[*]

Value Type	Description	Items
Power	Social power	Social power; control over others, dominance
	Authority	Authority, the right to lead or command
Achievement	Wealth	Wealth, material possessions, money
	Influence	Influential, having an impact on people and events
Hedonism	Enjoying life	Enjoying life, enjoying food, sex, leisure, etc.
Stimulation	Varied life	A varied life, filled with challenges, novelty and change
	Exciting life	An exciting life, stimulating experiences
Self-direction	Curious	Curious, interested in everything, exploring
Universalism	Equality	Equality, equal opportunity for all
	World at peace	A world of peace, free of war and conflict
	Respecting the earth	Respecting the earth, harmony with other species
	Protecting the environment	Protecting the environment, preserving nature
	Honesty	Honest, genuine, sincere
Benevolence	True friendship	True friendship, close supportive friends
	Social justice	Social justice, correcting injustices, care for the weak
	Mature love	Mature love, deep emotional and spiritual intimacy
	Helpfulness	Helpful, working for the welfare of others
	Forgivingness	Forgiving, willing to pardon others
	Loyal	Loyal, faithful to my friends
Conformity	Obedience	Obedient, dutiful, meeting obligations
	Self-discipline	Self-discipline, self-restraint, resistance to temptations
	Honoring parents and elders	Honoring parents and elders, showing respect
Security	Family security	Family security, safety for loved ones
	Sense of belonging	Sense of belonging, feeling that others care about me

[*]Measures of the value of tradition have been omitted due to a technical error.