

1 Running head: BRUNEL MUSIC RATING INVENTORY-2

2

3 Karageorghis, C. I., Priest, D. L., Terry, P. C., Chatzisarantis, N. L., & Lane, A. M. (2006).

4 Redesign and initial validation of an instrument to assess the motivational qualities of

5 music in exercise: The Brunel Music Rating Inventory-2. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 24,

6 899-909. doi:10.1080/02640410500298107

7

8

9 Redesign and initial validation of an instrument to assess the motivational qualities

10 of music in exercise: The Brunel Music Rating Inventory-2

11

12 COSTAS I. KARAGEORGHIS

13 School of Sport and Education, Brunel University, West London, Uxbridge,

14 Middlesex UB8 3PH, UK,

15 DAVID-LEE PRIEST

16 School of Sport and Education, Brunel University, West London, Uxbridge,

17 Middlesex UB8 3PH, UK,

18 PETER C. TERRY

19 Department of Psychology, University of Southern Queensland, Toowoomba,

20 Queensland, Australia 4350,

21 NIKOS L.D. CHATZISARANTIS

22 School of Sport and Education, Brunel University, West London, Uxbridge,

23 Middlesex UB8 3PH, UK

24 and

25 ANDREW M. LANE

26 School of Performing Arts and Leisure, University of Wolverhampton,

27 Walsall Campus, Walsall WS1 3BD, UK

28

29

1 Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Costas I. Karageorghis, School of  
2 Sport and Education, Brunel University, West London, Uxbridge, Middlesex UB8 3PH, UK. E-  
3 mail: [costas.karageorghis@brunel.ac.uk](mailto:costas.karageorghis@brunel.ac.uk). Tel. ++ 44 (0)1895-266 476. Nikos Chatzisarantis is  
4 now with the School of Sport and Health Sciences, University of Exeter, St Luke's Campus,  
5 Heavitree Road, Exeter EX1 2LU, United Kingdom.

6

7 **Acknowledgment**

8 The authors are indebted to David Lloyd Leisure Ltd. and the Brunel University Research  
9 Committee for supporting this research.

10

11 2nd revision submitted: 20 July, 2005

12

1

2

3           Redesign and initial validation of an instrument to assess the motivational qualities

4                           of music in exercise: The Brunel Music Rating Inventory-2

5

6   *Key words:* EQS, questionnaire development, rhythm, validity

7

8   2nd revision submitted: 20 July, 2005

9

## Abstract

1  
2 In the present study a measure to assess the motivational qualities of music in exercise was  
3 redesigned, extending previous research efforts (Karageorghis *et al.*, 1999). The original  
4 measure, the Brunel Music Rating Inventory (BMRI), had shown limitations in its factor  
5 structure and its applicability to non-experts in music selection. Redesign of the BMRI used in-  
6 depth interviews with eight participants (mean age 31.9,  $s = 8.9$  years) to establish the initial item  
7 pool, which was examined using a series of confirmatory factor analyses. A single-factor model  
8 provided a good fit across three musical selections with different motivational qualities (CFI:  
9 0.95 – 0.98; SRMR: 0.03 – 0.05). The single-factor model also demonstrated acceptable fit  
10 across two independent samples and both sexes using one piece of music (CFI: 0.86 – 1.00;  
11 SRMR: 0.04 – 0.07). The BMRI was designed for experts in selecting music for exercise (e.g.  
12 dance aerobic instructors), whereas the BMRI-2 can be used both by exercise instructors and  
13 participants. The psychometric properties of the BMRI-2 are stronger than those of the BMRI  
14 and it is easier to use. The BMRI-2 provides a valid and internally consistent tool by which  
15 music can be selected to accompany a bout of exercise or a training session. Furthermore, the  
16 BMRI-2 enables researchers to standardise music in experimental protocols involving exercise-  
17 related tasks.

18

19

## Introduction

The scope of research into the psychology of music has broadened in the past decade to include research into the effects of music in a wide variety of social contexts (for a review, see Hargreaves and North, 1999). In the context of physical training, it has been suggested that music may significantly affect the exercise experience and influence patterns of exercise adoption and adherence (Karageorghis *et al.*, 1999; Schwartz *et al.*, 1990). Research into the psychophysical effects of music in physical activity settings has been characterised by methodological limitations and uncertain theoretical bases (Karageorghis and Terry, 1997). As a possible consequence of this issue, research findings have been largely equivocal.

One of the main methodological limitations reported by Karageorghis and Terry (1997) was the haphazard selection of music for experimental conditions, with little regard for the socio-cultural upbringing of participants or the nature of the experimental task. To address this limitation, Karageorghis *et al.* (1999) developed and validated a psychometric measure to assess the motivational qualities of music in exercise and sport settings; the Brunel Music Rating Inventory (BMRI; see Appendix A). This inventory provided exercise leaders, sports coaches and researchers with a standardised method by which to select music that is intended to have a motivational effect. In the context of their study, Karageorghis *et al.* defined motivational music as that which stimulates or inspires physical activity. Moreover, they postulated that listening to motivational music would engender measurable psychophysical consequences such as improved mood, reduced perceptions of exertion and changes in arousal.

A four-factor structure for the BMRI derived from exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses was depicted in a conceptual model (see Karageorghis *et al.*, 1999), which predicts the effects of *asynchronous* or background motivational music in the context of exercise and sport.

1 When exercise participants consciously synchronize their movements with the beat of the music,  
2 the music is said to be *synchronous*. Conversely, the background music played in most gymnasias  
3 would typify the use of *asynchronous* music (i.e. no conscious synchronization occurs between  
4 movement and music tempo).

5 Factors that determine the motivational qualities of a piece of music are proposed to be  
6 rhythm response, musicality, cultural impact and association (Karageorghis *et al.*, 1999). Rhythm  
7 response refers to the rhythmical elements of music, whereas musicality refers to the response to  
8 pitch-related elements of music such as harmony (how the notes are combined) and melody (the  
9 tune). Cultural impact refers to the pervasiveness of the music in the context of the cultural  
10 experiences of the individual, while association refers to extra-musical thoughts, feelings and  
11 images that the music may evoke. The four factors in Karageorghis *et al.*'s (1999) conceptual  
12 model (which also comprised the four factors of the BMRI) showed a hierarchical structure; that  
13 is, rhythm response was the most important contributor to motivational qualities of a piece of  
14 music whereas association was the least important.

15 The implications of the conceptual model are that the motivational impact of music might  
16 influence exercise enjoyment and adherence and, by extension, public health. Against a backdrop  
17 of the high importance that exercise participants attach to ambient music (Priest *et al.*, 2004),  
18 there is increasing evidence to suggest that the *right music* (however this might be defined) can  
19 lead to greater frequency, intensity and duration of exercise behaviour (Atkinson *et al.*, 2004;  
20 Copeland and Franks, 1991; Hall and Erickson, 1995; Karageorghis *et al.*, 1996; Schwartz *et al.*,  
21 1990; Szabo *et al.*, 1999; Tenenbaum *et al.*, 2004). The impact of music on these components is  
22 likely to confer significant health benefits. Thus, appropriate music selection may result in the

1 reduction of one of the main “consumer resistances” associated with exercise in public gymnasias  
2 (Priest *et al.*, 2004).

3 At present, it appears that in exercise environments, practitioners select music somewhat  
4 arbitrarily without due consideration of its motivational qualities (see Priest *et al.*, 2004).  
5 Consequently, there is a need for a standardised means of selecting music according to its  
6 motivational properties that will enable practitioners to fully harness the purported benefits of  
7 motivational music such as increased exercise intensity and duration. The primary rationale for  
8 the present study therefore was to provide a means by which to facilitate the selection of  
9 motivational music in exercise settings.

10 A serious limitation of music research in sport and exercise contexts has been the  
11 haphazard selection of music conditions (Karageorghis and Terry, 1997). The equivocal findings  
12 associated with such research may stem from the non-standardised selection of music conditions.  
13 Therefore, a secondary rationale underlying the present study was to provide researchers with a  
14 means by which to select motivational music according to established standards. Greater  
15 consistency in the selection of music for experimental conditions may considerably strengthen  
16 the coherence of research into the effects of motivational music in exercise settings. In summary,  
17 the redesign of the BMRI will guide both researchers and practitioners in the effective  
18 application of music in exercise contexts.

19 In the development of the original BMRI, a number of limitations were apparent despite  
20 acceptable fit of the four-factor model (rhythm response [four items], musicality [two items],  
21 cultural impact [four items] and association [three items]) to the data (according to the criteria  
22 proposed by Bentler and Wu, 1995). Some of these limitations were reported in the original  
23 publication, whereas Karageorghis and his associates noted others following the application of

1 the BMRI in exercise, sport and research contexts. First, Karageorghis *et al.* (1999) reported a  
2 degree of instability in the rhythm response factor across the two samples used in their  
3 multisample CFA (aerobic dance exercise instructors vs. exercise participants). Second, the items  
4 in the cultural impact factor yielded low internal consistency ( $\alpha = .57$ ). Third, the variance of the  
5 melody item was entirely accounted for by the musicality factor in which it sat (measurement  
6 error = 0.00). Fourth, the familiarity item demonstrated a relatively weak relationship with the  
7 cultural impact factor that it was intended to reflect (factor loading = .35; measurement error =  
8 .94) but was retained because it was theoretically meaningful. Fifth, similar limitations were  
9 observed from the responses of exercise participants for items assessing the stimulative qualities  
10 and danceability as part of the rhythm response factor among exercise participants. Although  
11 Karageorghis *et al.* offered theoretically grounded justifications in retaining weak items,  
12 reservations about the psychometric integrity of the BMRI remain. The authors concluded that  
13 further development and validation should be an imperative.

14 A further concern we have regarding the validation process of the BMRI was that a panel  
15 of aerobics instructors assessed content validity but not exercise participants. Thus, the BMRI  
16 was developed explicitly for use by experts in musical selection rather than by exercise  
17 participants. The exercise leaders who responded to the inventory *inferred* that the music being  
18 rated would motivate exercise participants. Such inferences are unlikely to be as valid as the  
19 responses of a representative sample of exercise participants. Gluch (1993) asserted the  
20 importance of an individual's interpretation of music in determining psychophysical responses.  
21 Despite the acknowledged limitations of the instrument, the BMRI did provide researchers and  
22 practitioners with a valuable resource that enabled motivational music to be selected in a time-  
23 efficient and standardised manner.





1           A researcher interviewed participants, either at their place of study ( $n = 1$ ), their health  
2 club ( $n = 3$ ), or their home ( $n = 4$ ). Interviews lasted 45-60 minutes and were recorded for  
3 transcription. The researcher initiated each interview by presenting the BMRI to the participants,  
4 who were given an opportunity to peruse its items and instructions. During the course of each  
5 interview, three musical pieces chosen by the participant were delivered using a portable  
6 compact disc player. Participants were asked to select music that they considered appropriate as  
7 an accompaniment for the type of exercise performed in a gymnasium context (i.e. submaximal  
8 exercise utilizing cardio-vascular and resistance machines). This music was typically fast ( $> 120$   
9  $\text{beats} \cdot \text{min}^{-1}$  [beats per minute]), with a pronounced rhythmical component; described by  
10 participants as either “dance” or “pop” music.

11           After listening to each piece of music, participants rated its motivational qualities using  
12 the original BMRI. The target construct (motivational qualities of music) was presented with  
13 reference to the definition of Karageorghis *et al.* (1999). With the application of a simple  
14 schedule to provide structure (see Côté *et al.*, 1995), participants were then questioned about  
15 their responses. The schedule consisted of four themes: the relevance of each item to the  
16 motivational qualities of music; the degree to which the participant felt that he or she was able to  
17 comprehend the meaning of each item; the extent to which the participant’s interpretation of each  
18 item corresponded with its intended meaning; and fourth, the elicitation of additional items that  
19 might contribute to the new item pool.

20           Participants were invited to describe their thoughts and responses during the rating  
21 procedure to help elucidate their interpretation of the wording of each item. Such a procedure  
22 resembles protocol analysis (Ericsson and Simon, 1980), a technique used to infer thought  
23 processes based on concurrent verbal reports (see Green, 1995). Protocol analysis has been used

1 to qualify test-based quantitative data and highlight inconsistencies and erroneous reasoning on  
2 the part of respondents (for example, see Barber and Wesson, 1998). Verbatim transcripts of the  
3 interviews were made. Data pertaining to each of the 13 items of the BMRI (see Appendix 1)  
4 were content analysed (see Marshall and Rossman, 1999) in accordance with the four themes of  
5 the interview schedule. For example, responses pertaining to the comprehensibility of items were  
6 grouped under a single theme.

7         The first theme of the content analysis concerned the relevance of items to the  
8 motivational qualities of music. Participants expressed concerns about several items. In  
9 particular, Items 6 (“chart success”) and 13 (“date of release”) were felt to be irrelevant.  
10 Moreover, the scope of Items 4 (“lyrics related to physical activity”), 5 (“association of music  
11 with sport”) and 7 (“association of music with a film or video”), which related to association,  
12 was perceived to be very narrow. Results of the protocol analysis indicated that only a tiny  
13 percentage of the pieces of music used in exercise contexts would carry associations that related  
14 specifically to sport or physical activity. Participants indicated that the essential nature of music  
15 is extra-verbal (cf. Demorest, 1995): the non-verbal devices employed through the meshing of  
16 sounds that engender thoughts, feelings and reactions. Consequently, the research team decided  
17 that a wider frame of reference should be used.

18         With regard to Item 5 (“association of music with sport”), one participant suggested that  
19 many who participate in recreational exercise feel intimidated by the notion of competitive sport.  
20 In addition to the aforementioned concerns regarding the items that lean on musical  
21 terminology, the participants encountered difficulties in responding to other items. Some  
22 participants found that the chart success (Item 6) of the music they selected was difficult to  
23 recall. Furthermore, several participants stated that they were unaware of the identity of the

1 artist(s) (item 8) who performed the majority of the musical pieces that they heard during  
2 exercise. The response to item 8 was determined by the style of music that the artist in question  
3 was thought to represent. Two participants asserted that attitudes towards dancing might bias the  
4 response to item 12 (“danceability”). Item 13 (“date of release”) proved the most difficult for the  
5 participants to interpret. It was unclear whether the item implied that current music is  
6 motivational and older music is not.

7         The second theme of the content analysis was the degree to which participants were able  
8 to comprehend the meaning of each item. They reported satisfactory comprehension of items  
9 except those related to musical terms. Results of the protocol analysis revealed that participants  
10 had trouble differentiating between tempo and rhythm without further qualification from the  
11 interviewer. Moreover, the only participant who was able to distinguish between harmony and  
12 melody was a music student. With the exception of this individual, none of the participants  
13 claimed to understand the term harmony.

14         The third theme of the content analysis concerned the extent to which the participant’s  
15 interpretation of each item corresponded with its intended meaning. Results of the protocol  
16 analysis revealed certain erroneous response trends that were actually not specific to individual  
17 items. First, participants typically failed to rate the music for a pre-specified group (e.g. British  
18 pop music listeners in the age range 20-25 years) as instructed (see Appendix A). Rather,  
19 participants rated the motivational qualities of music from their own perspectives. Second,  
20 responses were impaired by the apparent complexity of the rating process. For example, in order  
21 to respond to item 9 (“harmony”), participants were required to assess the type of harmony  
22 evident in the segment of music to which they had listened, decide to what extent that harmony  
23 contributed to the motivational qualities of the piece and infer that this contribution would still

1 be applicable from the perspective of a third party. Lastly, the respondents demonstrated a  
2 tendency to ignore the piece of music that they were listening to and report generic responses  
3 that related their estimations of the contribution of certain items (e.g. “rhythm”) to the  
4 motivational qualities of music.

5         The fourth theme of the content analysis concerned the elicitation of additional items.  
6 Participants elicited relevant content for a number of items that related to the motivational  
7 qualities of music. Examples of item content mentioned by a number of participants included the  
8 impact of the style of the music, the vocal performance, the sound of instruments and the beat.  
9 The latter was a term commonly used to describe the rhythmic quality of a piece of music;  
10 however, its use deviated considerably from its musicological meaning. Musicians use the term  
11 *beat* synonymously with tempo, whereas laypersons use it with reference to the general rhythmic  
12 *feel* of a piece of music.

### 13 *Stage 2: Development of a new item pool*

14         Following detailed consideration of the qualitative data presented above by the first and  
15 second authors, during which problematic items were removed or amended and additional facets  
16 of the motivational qualities of music were incorporated, a new item pool comprising of 24 items  
17 was developed by the same authors and attached to a 7-point Likert-type scale. The scale was  
18 anchored by 1 (*strongly disagree*) and 7 (*strongly agree*). The development of the item pool was  
19 based upon recommendations in the psychometric test literature (e.g. Anastasi and Urbina, 1997;  
20 Mulaik and Millsap, 2000). Several pertinent issues were identified that bore consideration when  
21 forming the initial pool of items. First, efforts were made to ensure that the items were worded in  
22 a uniform fashion. Specifically, it has been suggested that an item should refer to an action, a  
23 time, a context and a target (Azjen and Fishbein, 1977). Also, each item should refer to these

1 four parameters at the same level of generality. Items were reworded so that they conformed to  
2 the following specification. The action would concern motivation; the time reference would be  
3 *during* exercise; the context would be exercise and the target would be a property of the musical  
4 stimulus such as rhythm or tempo. Thus, the generic form of each item-statement would be: “A  
5 property [e.g. melody] of this music would motivate me during exercise.”

6         The second issue for consideration was the operationalization of the term motivation,  
7 which was judged to be insufficiently precise. Specifically, the instruction to participants using  
8 the original BMRI implied that music motivates individuals to *initiate* exercise. Although  
9 research evidence supports the conclusion that musical accompaniment precipitates increased  
10 exercise intensity or endurance (e.g. Atkinson *et al.*, 2004; Szabo *et al.*, 1999), there is no  
11 evidence to support the contention that music affects the initiation and persistence components of  
12 motivation. Thus, the instructions of the BMRI-2 specified that participants should rate the  
13 extent to which music motivated them to exercise harder and/or longer (see Appendix 2). This  
14 amendment was deemed sufficient given that no theoretical work or research findings exist to  
15 suggest that music exerts differential effects on exercise intensity and duration. Examples of  
16 items included: “the vocal style of this piece of music would motivate me during exercise”, “the  
17 familiarity of this piece of music to me would motivate me during exercise” and “the images  
18 created by this piece of music would motivate me during exercise”.

19

1 *Stage 3: Content and face validity of the item pool*

2           The degree to which items represent the construct that they are purported to measure is  
3 referred to as content validity, whereas face validity refers to the extent to which the items  
4 appear to be valid (American Psychological Association, 1999). In order to assess content and  
5 face validity, the first version of the redesigned BMRI (henceforth referred to as the BMRI-2)  
6 comprising 24 items was distributed to a sample of 78 fitness instructors (not exercise-to-music  
7 instructors) who were employed in 31 health clubs across the UK (mean age 24.9,  $s = 5.9$  years).  
8 Participants evaluated the relevance of each item in relation to the assessment of the motivational  
9 qualities of music in exercise. Responses were given on a 7-point Likert-type scale anchored by  
10 1 (*not at all important*) and 7 (*very important*). Participants were asked to rewrite any items they  
11 did not understand and provide any feedback they deemed relevant.

12           In terms of additional items, two participants suggested an item relating to the volume of  
13 the music. However, the music volume is a contextual variable – that is, it would vary between a  
14 music-rating session and the actual gymnasium environment owing to a variety of factors,  
15 including differences in music delivery equipment, ambient noise and the acoustic properties of  
16 the interior spaces concerned. All other suggested items diverged from the format established for  
17 the item stems or extended beyond the scope of the instrument (e.g. “What sort of music would  
18 you listen to at home?”). Six items yielded a mean response above four on the 7-point scale,  
19 which represented an endorsement of their inclusion and these were retained for the final version  
20 of the BMRI-2 that was subsequently tested using confirmatory factor analyses (CFA).

21 *Stage 4: Music selection for test of factorial validity*

22           To validate the six-item BMRI-2, music was required that could be used during  
23 subsequent rating sessions. For the purpose of providing a comprehensive test of the factorial

1 validity of the BMRI-2, it was deemed necessary to select three pieces that varied according to  
2 their motivational impact (highly motivational, moderately motivational and outdeterous  
3 [neutral]). This procedure enabled the researchers to test the tenability of the factor structure  
4 across three different pieces of music. Prior to the copying and delivery of the music selections,  
5 permission was gained from the record companies concerned. A compilation of fast ( $> 120$  bpm)  
6 musical selections ( $k = 24$ ) from the dance and rock idioms was edited onto a compact disc. A  
7 motivational quotient for each musical piece was determined using the original BMRI.  
8 Psychomusicology researchers working in the field of exercise and sport ( $n = 6$ ; mean age 23.8,  $s$   
9  $= 6.2$  years) attended a music listening and rating session administered by the researchers.  
10 Researchers were chosen to rate the music as they were deemed to be more likely to comprehend  
11 the inventory than exercise participants.

12         Prior to the rating, participants were introduced to the original BMRI and afforded an  
13 opportunity to question the researcher and clarify its meaning and the procedure of responding.  
14 Although the ratings were not being used to form experimental conditions, the instructions of the  
15 BMRI required participants to envisage a group for whom they were selecting music. Thus,  
16 participants were asked to select music for a group of students in their late teens and early  
17 twenties, mixed in terms of gender and mostly White UK or Irish in terms of their ethnic  
18 background. Such characteristics closely approximated those of the samples subsequently used to  
19 validate the BMRI-2. At this juncture, the researcher asked the participants whether there were  
20 any ambiguities for which they would require further elaboration. All participants indicated that  
21 the instructions were clear.

22         A 90 sec excerpt of each track was selected that included at least one chorus and one  
23 verse (Gluch, 1993). The music was delivered using a portable compact disc player situated on a



1 table equidistant from the seven raters, who were seated in a semi-circular formation. Following  
 2 each track, participants were given a 30 sec period to rate the piece of music using the BMRI.  
 3 The next track was delivered once all participants had completed their ratings and were ready to  
 4 attend to the following piece of music.

5 The motivational quotients assigned to each piece using the BMRI ranged from 11.99 to  
 6 26.18. The possible range of scores for the BMRI reported by Karageorghis *et al.* (1999) was  
 7 3.33 – 33.33. Scores below the middle range (18.33) are considered to represent *oudeterous*  
 8 (neutral) rather than demotivational music. Three pieces were selected to reflect the desired  
 9 motivational qualities. The first piece, *Out of Space* by *The Prodigy*, was rated as oudeterous  
 10 (Motivational Quotient = 16.95). The second piece, *Back In My Life* by *Alice DeeJay*, was rated  
 11 as moderately motivational (Motivational Quotient = 22.15). The third piece, *Set You Free* by *N-*  
 12 *Trance*, was considered to be highly motivational (Motivational Quotient = 26.18). Hereafter,  
 13 these three tracks will be referred to by number (1, 2 and 3) in the order presented above. There  
 14 were significant differences between each of the three pieces in terms of their motivational  
 15 quotients ( $F_{2,248} = 72.50, P < 0.001, \eta^2 = .37; \text{Track } 1 < 2 < 3$ ).

#### 16 *Stage 5: Factor validity of the BMRI-2*

17 The six-item BMRI-2 was administered to 151 sport and exercise science undergraduates  
 18 (mean age 19.4,  $s = 2.8$  years), which henceforth will be referred to as Sample 1. The sample  
 19 comprised of 48 females and 74 males although 29 participants did not disclose their gender.  
 20 Sport and exercise science undergraduates were chosen owing to their broad experience of  
 21 physical activity with musical accompaniment. Asynchronous music was present in all of the  
 22 student training facilities on the test site.

1           Subsequent to the first administration of the BMRI-2, data were collected from a second  
2 sample (Sample 2) that consisted of a different group of 99 sport and exercise science  
3 undergraduates (mean age 19.9,  $s = 1.4$  years) that comprised of 30 females, 58 males and 11  
4 participants who did not report their gender. The purpose of the second sample was to provide  
5 data for a multisample CFA in which sample and gender invariance was tested. Hereafter, the  
6 samples will be referred to as Samples 1 and 2, respectively. The same data collection procedure  
7 was adhered to for both samples.

8           Prior to a lecture, participants were given three copies of the BMRI-2 and directed to read  
9 the instructions and address any queries regarding the instrument to the first author. Participants  
10 were then instructed to listen to the three pieces of music that had been selected for the validation  
11 (see Stage 4). Each selection was delivered for 90 sec using a portable compact disc player and at  
12 least one verse and chorus of each selection was heard (Gluch, 1993). Following the delivery of  
13 each piece, participants were given adequate time to complete their responses.

14           Participants were requested to complete the “concentration grid” (Harris and Harris,  
15 1984) for 1 min before the rating each track. The purpose of using the concentration grid was to  
16 distract participants from cognitions induced by the music that they had just heard, and to induce  
17 cognitive fatigue so that responses to one track would not impact upon responses to the  
18 following track; a procedure known as a *filler* (Bargh and Chartrand, 2000).

19           A single univariate outlier was identified and deleted from Sample 1 ( $z > \pm 3.29$ ;  
20 Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001). A single multivariate outlier was identified and deleted using the  
21 Mahalanobis distance method ( $P < 0.001$ ). There were no outliers identified in Sample 2.  
22 Thereafter, the distributional properties of each item were examined separately for each sample.  
23 None of the items exhibited a leptokurtic (Standard Kurtosis [Std. Kurt.]  $> 1.96$ ), platykurtic

1 (Std. Kurt. < -1.96), positively skewed (Standard Skewness [Std. Skew.] < -1.96), or negatively  
2 skewed (Std. Skew. > 1.96) distribution for any of the three tracks. A check was made on the  
3 mean scores for the three tracks rated using the BMRI-2 to ensure that the instrument  
4 discriminated between pieces of music with different motivational qualities. A repeated-  
5 measures ANOVA with Greenhouse-Geisser adjustment revealed significant differences between  
6 the three tracks ( $F_{1.56,230.59} = 58.48, P < 0.001, \eta^2 = .28; \text{Track } 1 < 2 < 3$ ), indicating that 28% of  
7 the overall variance was attributable to the music manipulation. This mirrored the results  
8 obtained in Stage 4 using the original BMRI with expert raters.

9       Because only two of the items (“the melody [tune] of this music would motivate me  
10 during exercise” and “the sound of the instruments used (i.e. guitar, synthesizer, saxophone, etc.)  
11 would motivate me during exercise”; see Appendix 2) related specifically to musicality as  
12 opposed to rhythm response, there was no conceptual justification to test multiple-factor models  
13 as the items were directly related to the music factors component of Karageorghis and  
14 colleagues’ (1999) conceptual model. The recommendation of psychometricians is that,  
15 preferably, a factor should consist of at least six items (see Loewenthal, 2001). Consequently, the  
16 fit of a single-factor model was tested on the data pertaining to each musical track from Sample 1  
17 using CFA (EQS v. 5.7).

18       According to Hu and Bentler (1999), the cutoff value required before one can assert a  
19 relatively good fit between the hypothesised and observed models should be close to 0.95 for the  
20 robust comparative fit index (CFI), and close to 0.08 for the standardised root mean residual  
21 (SRMR). These indices were used to evaluate the adequacy of model fit. In order to assess the  
22 extent to which the derived factor structure was invariant across different samples, a multisample  
23 CFA was computed with data from both samples using the maximum likelihood estimation

1 method. The invariance of the factor structure across gender was tested by dividing the two  
2 samples to yield four separate groups (sample x gender). Although this procedure created  
3 relatively small sub-samples for CFA with fewer than 10 participants per parameter to be  
4 estimated, the factor loadings were consistently high and the items were all normally distributed  
5 (see Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001).

6 A multisample CFA with factor loadings constrained to be equal across all four groups,  
7 was undertaken. In the interests of simplicity and brevity, only the data pertaining to Track 1  
8 were used. This delimitation was deemed acceptable because the single-factor solution that was  
9 tested on the first sample met the specified goodness-of-fit criterion ( $CFI > 0.95$ ) in the case of  
10 each of the three tracks. No Monte Carlo simulations have been performed using multisample  
11 CFA (see Marcoulides and Hershberger, 1997) and consequently, the CFI criterion of 0.90 is  
12 applicable in this instance (see Bentler and Wu, 1995).

13 The single-factor model produced an acceptable fit to the data ( $CFI > 0.95$ ) in the case of  
14 each of the three tracks and for both genders (see Table 1) with the exception of females in  
15 Sample 1, who yielded a CFI slightly below the criterion value ( $CFI = 0.86$ ). Multisample CFA  
16 indicated a CFI of 0.96 for the sample-by-gender analysis, which is well in excess of the  
17 accepted cutoff value of 0.90. The SRMR was close to the accepted criterion ( $SRMR = 0.11$ ),  
18 although this index is particularly sensitive to simple model misspecification (Hu and Bentler,  
19 1999). The marginally low CFI of 0.86 in respect of the females in Sample 1 is attributable to the  
20 limited sample size ( $n = 48$ ); such fit indices are highly sensitive to sample size (Tabachnick and  
21 Fidell, 2001). However, the SRMR was inside the 0.08 cut-off, which indicated an adequate fit  
22 between the observed and hypothesised (single-factor) models. The internal consistency  
23 estimates for the single factor of the BMRI-2 across the four multisample groups using

1 Cronbach's (1951) alpha coefficient were as follows: Sample 1 (male) = 0.86, Sample 1 (female)  
 2 = 0.92, Sample 2 (male) = 0.88, and Sample 2 (female) = 0.90. These figures exceed the criterion  
 3 value of 0.70 specified by Nunnally (1978).

4 \*\*\*\*Table 1 near here\*\*\*\*

5 The standardised solutions for each item were examined in order to assess the amount of  
 6 unique variance accounted for by the single factor (see Table II). Only in the case of the males in  
 7 Sample 2 was the measurement error for Item 3 ("the melody [tune] of this music would  
 8 motivate me during exercise") marginally high (0.91). However, the factor loadings for item 3 in  
 9 all of the samples were in excess of the 0.40 criterion (Ford *et al.*, 1986). In summary, each item  
 10 demonstrated a sufficiently strong relationship with the single factor of the BMRI-2.

11 \*\*\*\*Table 2 near here\*\*\*\*

## 12 **Discussion and Conclusions**

13 The present study offers some initial support for the factorial validity of an instrument  
 14 with which to rate the motivational qualities of music in exercise settings. The single-factor  
 15 model attained an adequate level of fit with the data in the case of all three tracks. Furthermore,  
 16 the factor structure generalised well across two independent samples and both sexes. The  
 17 standardised solutions indicated that each item bears a distinct relationship to the single factor.  
 18 The prevailing single-factor model demonstrated higher psychometric integrity than the factor  
 19 structure of the original BMRI. Indeed, the residual concerns relating to the structure and items  
 20 of the BMRI have been almost entirely resolved.

21 The limitations of psychometric instruments in the field of motivational music research  
 22 have also been exemplified. For example, despite the acceptable fit indices that the original  
 23 BMRI demonstrated, participants experienced notable difficulties in comprehending the items.

1 Specifically, the personal response to motivating music proved an inappropriate subject for  
2 objective measurement. The interview data revealed that the subjective bias evident in the  
3 scoring of such items rendered them unsuitable for inclusion in the BMRI-2. Hence, the single  
4 factor of the BMRI-2 consists of items that relate to the musical stimulus itself and not one's  
5 personal interpretation of the music. This outcome is concurrent with the revised conceptual  
6 model (Karageorghis *et al.*, 1999), to the extent that music factors were regarded as more salient  
7 than personal factors.

8 Notably, the BMRI-2 is less than half the length of its predecessor (6 items as opposed to  
9 13). This characteristic renders the newer instrument particularly suitable for rating a large  
10 number of musical selections, a purpose for which it was specifically designed. The relative  
11 importance of the rhythmic qualities of music over melodic qualities (see Karageorghis *et al.*,  
12 1999) has been underlined; the rhythm, tempo and beat items demonstrated a stronger  
13 relationship with the single factor of the BMRI-2 than the melody item (see Table II). Atkinson  
14 *et al.* (2004) asked those who participated in a simulated cycle time-trial to rate the motivational  
15 qualities of the music that had accompanied the trial. The rhythmical components of the music  
16 were reported to have made a greater contribution to its motivational qualities than the melodic  
17 or harmonic components.

18 There are two principal reasons that explain the absence of the distinction between  
19 rhythm response and musicality that was reported by Karageorghis *et al.* (1999). First, the BMRI  
20 was developed for expert respondents (qualified exercise-to-music instructors), whereas the  
21 BMRI-2 was developed for the use of non-expert respondents who may not have been able to  
22 distinguish between the rhythm- and pitch-related qualities of music. Second, the results of the  
23 interviews undertaken during the present study support the conclusion that musical terms such as

1 “harmony” are poorly understood by those lacking a music education (see Stage 1). It would be  
2 misleading to cite the present results as evidence that the pitch- and rhythm-based components of  
3 music do not exert different psychophysical effects. Specifically, the pitch-related elements of  
4 music are thought to determine affective responses whereas the rhythm-related components of  
5 music elicit a physical response (Lucaccini and Kreit, 1972).

6 Unlike the original BMRI, which was developed with reference to exercise and sport  
7 contexts, the BMRI-2 has been developed to enable the selection of music for exercise settings.  
8 However, practitioners may wish to amend the instructions of the instrument so that music can  
9 be selected for a physical training context that relates to sport, such as weight training or circuit  
10 training. Although such a minor amendment is unlikely to compromise the psychometric  
11 integrity of the instrument, further research in the sport context is warranted. Notably, the BMRI-  
12 2 was validated by samples of participants who engaged in a broad range of physical activity,  
13 including both sport training and exercise (see Stage 5), thus increasing the likelihood that the  
14 instrument will generalise well to sport settings. In addition to validation of the instrument in the  
15 sport context, given that the present study was delimited to an examination of initial validity,  
16 work to examine convergent, discriminant and predictive validities as well as temporal stability  
17 is warranted.

18 An issue raised during the course of the present study is the appropriateness of the term  
19 “motivational music”. Such terminology has intuitive appeal and is favoured by exercise  
20 participants themselves (see Priest *et al.*, 2004). However, it is conceivable that different musical  
21 properties may separately influence mood, attention and arousal. Mood-enhancing music may  
22 not necessarily prove to be arousing music. Thus, to subsume these different effects under the  
23 banner of “motivating music” may represent an over-simplification. The operational definition

1 that Karageorghis *et al.* (1999) offered of motivational music is practically synonymous with  
2 Gaston's definition of stimulative music (1951): "Motivational music tends to have a fast tempo  
3 (>120 bpm) and a strong rhythm and is proposed to enhance energy and induce bodily action" (p.  
4 2). The differentiation between motivating and stimulative music may be regarded as insufficient  
5 and the concept of stimulative music may prove to be more parsimonious. Although the  
6 psychophysical effects of music may invoke a state that contributes to an individual's decision to  
7 increase the intensity and/or the duration of a bout of exercise (see Priest *et al.*, 2004), these  
8 effects are not easily reconciled with extant theoretical frameworks relating to motivation (e.g.  
9 Bandura, 1986; Vallerand, 1997).

10         The limitations of the psychometric measurement technique preclude the development of  
11 an inventory that censors for the multitudinous facets of musical response. There are aspects of  
12 aesthetic experience that transcend scientific evaluation; however, the brevity and simplicity of  
13 the BMRI-2 mean that large quantities of music can be rated on a scale that permits comparisons  
14 between the responses of different subgroups. In order to elicit the optimum selection of music in  
15 exercise settings, it may be necessary to use the BMRI-2 in tandem with qualitative methods that  
16 enable the subtler aspects of musical response to be assessed. For example, the BMRI-2 may be  
17 used as a wide filter to identify musical pieces that can then be considered on additional grounds.  
18 Subsequently, an exercise leader may wish to employ the following framework of criteria when  
19 selecting music:

- 20         • Music with clear associations to sport or physical activity may prove motivating (see  
21         Karageorghis and Terry, 1997). It should be noted that not all exercise participants are  
22         motivated by music that is associated with sport (Priest *et al.*, 2004).



- 1       • Associations that are unrelated to sport or physical activity may also prove motivating. For  
2       example, the theme to a popular television adventure series may promote the desire to  
3       engage in physical activity. Moreover, lyrics that are related to determination and strength  
4       may also conceivably enhance motivation to exercise more intensely and/or for a longer  
5       duration.
- 6       • The musical idiom, date of release and artist of the music in question must be allied to the  
7       age and socio-cultural background of the exercise participants. When a very diverse group  
8       is being considered, a systematic attempt must be made to vary these factors (see Priest *et*  
9       *al.*, 2004).
- 10      • When selecting music for a pre-determined exercise intensity, music tempo should be  
11      linked to exercise heart rate, particularly during high intensity exercise (see Karageorghis,  
12      Jones, & Low, 2006).
- 13      • When selecting music for an individual, the effects of personal associations should be  
14      considered. For example, a boxer may have conditioned him or herself by listening to a  
15      certain piece of music prior to fighting. Where possible, practitioners should attempt to  
16      encourage the formation of such personal associations and harness their power.

17      Although extra-musical associations are an important determinant of musical response, music  
18      with certain structural qualities can predispose listeners to form such associations (Trehub and  
19      Schellenberg, 1995). It is conceivable that music which is high in motivating qualities, as  
20      determined by the BMRI-2, may predispose exercise participants to form extra-musical  
21      associations that relate the music to physical activity.

22              Future research should aim to validate the inventory for use with different age groups and  
23      with recreational exercise participants. A methodological limitation of this study was that the

1 sample sizes were relatively small for the multisample analysis given that there were 12  
2 parameters to be estimated (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2001). This did not present a statistical  
3 problem, but does limit the generalisability of the findings. Furthermore, there were insufficient  
4 data to enable the establishment of norms that will, in time, be necessary to compare the  
5 responses of different subgroups of the population.

6         The present findings offered support for content and factorial validities as well as internal  
7 consistency of the BMRI-2. Construct validity is an ongoing process and there are multiple  
8 sources of construct validity evidence. The predictive validity of the BMRI-2 may be assessed by  
9 relating the motivational quotient of music to the affective and psychophysical responses to such  
10 music in physical activity settings using measures such as the Brunel University Mood Scale  
11 (Terry *et al.*, 1999), or the Flow State Scale-2 (Jackson and Eklund, 2002).

12         The discriminant validity of the BMRI-2 may be demonstrated by testing the effects of  
13 music with different motivational quotients on physical performance. In particular, there is a  
14 need for quasi-experimental designs that test the effects of motivational music in an externally  
15 valid setting. For example, researchers may wish to investigate the effects of motivating and  
16 outdeterous music on exercise behaviour in a health club environment. There is also a need for  
17 future research to address the test-retest reliability of the BMRI-2. Qualitative research  
18 paradigms may also be used to elaborate the precise contingencies and temporal flow of the  
19 effects that music exerts on physical performance and the experience of that performance.

20

21

## References

- 1  
2 American Psychological Association (1999). *Standards for Educational Psychological Tests*.  
3 Washington, DC: Author.
- 4 Anastasi, A. and Urbina, S. (1997). *Psychological Testing*, 7th edn. Upper Saddle River, NJ:  
5 Prentice Hall.
- 6 Atkinson, G., Wilson, D. and Eubank, M. (2004). Effects of music on work-rate distribution  
7 during a cycle time trial. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 62, 413-419.
- 8 Azjen, I. and Fishbein, M. (1977). Attitude-behavior relations: A theoretical analysis and review  
9 of empirical research. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84, 888-918.
- 10 Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-  
11 Hall.
- 12 Barber, A.E. and Wesson, M.J. (1998). Using verbal protocol analysis to assess the construct  
13 validity of an empirical measure: An examination of the OCP. In *Advances in Qualitative*  
14 *Organization Research* (edited by J.A. Wagner III), Vol. 1, pp. 67-104. Stamford, CT: JAI  
15 Press.
- 16 Bargh, J.A. and Chartrand, T.L. (2000). The mind in the middle: A practical guide to priming  
17 and automaticity research. In *Handbook of Research Methods in Social Psychology* (edited  
18 by H. Reis and C. Judd), pp. 253-285. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- 19 Bentler, P.M. and Wu, E.J.C. (1995). *EQS/Windows User's Guide*. Los Angeles, CA: BMDP  
20 Statistical Software.
- 21 Copeland, B.L. and Franks, D.D. (1991). Effects of types and intensities of background music on  
22 treadmill endurance. *Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness*, 15, 100-103.
- 23 Côté, J., Salmela, J.H. and Russell, S. (1995). The knowledge of high performance gymnastic  
24 coaches: Methodological framework. *The Sport Psychologist*, 9, 65-75.
- 25 Cronbach, L.J. (1951). Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests. *Psychometrika*, 16,  
26 297-334.
- 27 Demorest, S.M. (1995). Issues of ecological validity for perceptual research in music.  
28 *Psychomusicology*, 14, 173-181.
- 29 Ericsson, K.A. & Simon, H.A. (1980). Verbal reports as data. *Psychological Review*, 87, 215-  
30 251.
- 31

- 1 Ford, J., MacCallum, R. and Tait, M. (1986). The application of factor analysis in psychology: A  
2 critical review and analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 39, 291-314.
- 3 Gaston, E.T. (1951). Musical factors influencing social behavior. *Kansas Welfare Digest*, 10, 2-  
4 4.
- 5 Gluch, P. (1993). The use of music in preparing for sport performance. *Contemporary*  
6 *Thought*, 2, 33-53.
- 7 Green, A. (1995). Verbal protocol analysis. *Psychologist*, 8, 126-9.
- 8 Hall, K.G. and Erickson, B. (1995). The effects of preparatory arousal on 60-meter dash  
9 performance. *Applied Research in Coaching and Athletics Annual*, 10, 70-79.
- 10 Hargreaves, D.J. and North, A.C. (1999). The functions of music in everyday life: Redefining the  
11 social in music psychology. *Psychology of Music*, 27, 84-95.
- 12 Harris, D.V. and Harris, B.L. (1984). *The Athlete's Guide to Sport Psychology: Mental Skills for*  
13 *Physical People*. New York: Leisure Press.
- 14 Hu, L.T. and Bentler, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariate structure analysis:  
15 Conventional criteria versus new alternative. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55.
- 16 Jackson, S.A. and Eklund, R.C. (2002). Assessing flow in physical activity: The Flow State  
17 Scale-2 and Dispositional Flow Scale-2. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 24,  
18 133-150.
- 19 Karageorghis, C.I., Drew, K.M. and Terry, P.C., (1996). Effects of pretest stimulative and  
20 sedative music on grip strength. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 83, 1347-52.
- 21 Karageorghis, C.I., Jones, L. and Low, D.C. (in press). Relationship between exercise heart rate  
22 and music tempo preference. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*.
- 23 Karageorghis, C.I. and Terry, P.C. (1997). The psychophysical effects of music in sport and  
24 exercise: A review. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 20, 54-68.
- 25 Karageorghis, C.I., Terry, P.C. and Lane, A.M. (1999). Development and initial validation of an  
26 instrument to assess the motivational qualities of music in exercise and sport: The Brunel  
27 Music Rating Inventory. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 17, 713-724.
- 28 Loewenthal, K.M. (2001). *An Introduction to Psychological Tests and Scales*, 2nd edn.  
29 Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- 30 Lucaccini, L.F. and Kreit, L.H. (1972). Music. In *Ergogenic Aids and Muscular Performance*  
31 (edited by W.P. Morgan), pp. 240-245. New York: Academic Press.

- 1 Marcoulides, G.A. and Hershberger, S.L. (1997). *Multivariate Statistical Methods: A First*  
2 *Course*. Hillside, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 3 Marshall, C. and Rossman, G.B. (1999). *Designing Qualitative Research*. London:  
4 Sage.
- 5 Mason, J. (2002). *Qualitative Researching*, 2nd edn. London: Sage.
- 6 Mulaik, A. and Millsap, R.E. (2000). Doing the four-step right. *Structural Equation Modeling: A*  
7 *Multidisciplinary Journal*, 7, 36-73.
- 8 Nunnally, J.C. (1978). *Psychometric Theory*, 2nd edn. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 9 Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative Evaluation and Research Methods*. New York: Sage.
- 10 Priest, D.L., Karageorghis, C.I. and Sharp, N.C.C. (2004). The characteristics and effects of  
11 motivational music in exercise settings: The possible influence of gender, age, frequency  
12 of attendance, and time of attendance. *Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness*,  
13 44, 77-86.
- 14 Schwartz, S.E., Fernhall, B. and Plowman, S.A. (1990). Effects of music on exercise  
15 performance. *Journal of Cardiopulmonary Rehabilitation*, 10, 312-316.
- 16 Szabo, A., Small, A. and Leigh, M. (1999). The effects of slow- and fast- rhythm classical music  
17 on progressive cycling to voluntary physical exhaustion. *Journal of Sports Medicine and*  
18 *Physical Fitness*, 39, 220-225.
- 19 Tabachnick, B.G. and Fidell, L.S. (2001). *Using Multivariate Statistics*, 4th edn. Needham  
20 Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- 21 Tenenbaum, G., Lidor, R., Lavyan, N., Morrow, K., Tonnel, S., Gershgoren, A., *et al.* (2004).  
22 The effect of music type on running perseverance and coping with effort sensations.  
23 *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 5, 89-109.
- 24 Terry, P.C., Lane, A.M., Lane, H.J. and Keohane, L. (1999). Development and validation of a  
25 mood measure for adolescents. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 17, 861-872.
- 26 Trehub, S.E. and Schellenberg, E.G. (1995). Music: Its relevance to infants. *Annals of Child*  
27 *Development*, 11, 1-24.
- 28 Vallerand, R.J. (1997). A hierarchical model of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. In *Advances in*  
29 *Experimental Social Psychology* (edited by M.P. Zanna), Vol. 29, pp. 271-360. New York:  
30 Academic Press.
- 31

1 Table I. BMRI-2 fit indices following confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and multisample CFA

---

3 Model and sample	$\chi^2$ (d.f.)	CFI	SRMR
4 <b>Single-factor, 6-item version (Sample 1)</b>			
6 Track 1	22.70* <sup>(9)</sup>	0.98	0.03
7 Track 2	22.35* <sup>(9)</sup>	0.97	0.03
8 Track 3	30.19* <sup>(9)</sup>	0.95	0.05
9 <b>Multisample CFA with data from Track 1</b>			
10 Sample 1 (Male)	22.86* <sup>(9)</sup>	0.96	0.04
11 Sample 1 (Female)	33.98* <sup>(9)</sup>	0.86	0.07
12 Sample 2 (Male)	9.85* <sup>(9)</sup>	1.00	0.03
13 Sample 2 (Female)	12.67* <sup>(9)</sup>	0.98	0.05
14 Constrained multisample	90.67* <sup>(54)</sup>	0.96	0.11

---

16 *Abbreviations:* CFI = comparative fit index; SRMR = standardised root mean residual; d.f. =  
 17 degrees of freedom.

18 \* $P < 0.001$ .

19

1 Table II. Standardised factor loadings and measurement errors resulting from the confirmatory  
 2 factor analysis of the responses to the 6-item BMRI-2

3

---

4

	Sample 1				Sample 2			
	Male		Female		Male		Female	
6 Item	FL	ME	FL	ME	FL	ME	FL	ME
8 Rhythm	0.88	0.48	0.87	0.49	0.81	.058	0.78	0.62
9 Style	0.90	0.44	0.88	0.48	0.82	0.58	0.91	0.42
10 Melody	0.76	0.65	0.64	0.77	0.41	0.91	0.71	0.71
11 Tempo	0.85	0.52	0.86	0.51	0.88	0.48	0.69	0.72
12 Instruments	0.79	0.62	0.80	0.60	0.76	0.65	0.69	0.72
13 Beat	0.76	0.65	0.78	0.62	0.84	0.55	0.80	0.61

14

---

15 *Abbreviations:* FL = factor loading; ME = measurement error.

16

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

Appendix A

*Directions:* Very soon you will hear a series of musical selections. Imagine that you are selecting music for ..... (state activity; e.g. treadmill running) and the participants will be ..... (state musical background; e.g. British pop music listeners) in the age range..... (e.g. 20-25 years). [*Play the music now*]. Rate the piece of music you have just heard by indicating the extent each of the items below contributes to its motivational qualities. The term ‘motivational qualities’ refers to the extent to which the music inspires or stimulates physical activity. Rate each item on a scale from 1 (not at all motivating) to 10 (extremely motivating).

	<i>Not at all motivating</i>					<i>Extremely motivating</i>				
1. Familiarity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
2. Tempo (beat)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
3. Rhythm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
4. Lyrics related to physical activity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
5. Association of music with sport	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
6. Chart success	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
7. Association of music with a film or video	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
8. The artist/s	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
9. Harmony	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
10. Melody	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
11. Stimulative qualities of music	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
12. Danceability	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
13. Date of release	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

*Please use a separate sheet for each musical selection*



Appendix B

The purpose of this questionnaire is to assess the extent to which the piece of music you are about to hear would motivate you during exercise. For our purposes, the word ‘motivate’ means music that would make you want to exercise harder and/or longer. As you listen to the piece of music, indicate the extent of your agreement with the statements listed below by circling one of the numbers to the right of each statement. We would like you to provide an honest response to each statement. Give the response that best represents your opinion and avoid dwelling for too long on any single statement.

Strongly disagree      In-between      Strongly agree

1	The rhythm of this music would motivate me during exercise	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2	The style of this music (i.e. rock, dance, jazz, hip-hop, etc.) would motivate me during exercise	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3	The melody (tune) of this music would motivate me during exercise	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4	The tempo (speed) of this music would motivate during exercise	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5	The sound of the instruments used (i.e. guitar, synthesizer, saxophone, etc.) would motivate me during exercise	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6	The beat of this music would motivate me during exercise	1	2	3	4	5	6	7