

**On the stability and relevance of the exercise heart rate–
music-tempo preference relationship**

KARAGEORGHIS, Costas I. and JONES, Leighton <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7899-4119>>

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/9681/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

KARAGEORGHIS, Costas I. and JONES, Leighton (2014). On the stability and relevance of the exercise heart rate–music-tempo preference relationship. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 15 (3), 299-310.

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Running Head: EXERCISE HEART RATE-MUSIC TEMPO RELATIONSHIP

On the Stability and Relevance of the Exercise Heart Rate-Music Tempo Preference
Relationship

Costas I. Karageorghis and Leighton Jones

School of Sport and Education, Brunel University, UK

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to: Costas I. Karageorghis,
School of Sport and Education, Brunel University, London, Middlesex UB8 3PH, England,
United Kingdom. Tel: ++ 44 (0)1895-266 476, Fax: ++ 44 (0)1895-269 769, E-mail:
costas.karageorghis@brunel.ac.uk

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

Running Head: EXERCISE HEART RATE-MUSIC TEMPO RELATIONSHIP

On the Stability and Relevance of the Exercise Heart Rate-Music Tempo Preference
Relationship

Abstract

Objectives: To examine the stability of the cubic (two points of inflection) exercise heart rate-music tempo preference relationship found by Karageorghis et al. (2011) in cycle ergometry using a different exercise modality (treadmill exercise). To advance previous related studies through the inclusion of psychological outcome variables (e.g., state attention and intrinsic motivation) and post-experiment interviews.

Design: A mixed-model experimental design was employed with two within-subject factors (exercise intensity and music tempo) and a between-subjects factor (gender). The experiment was supplemented by qualitative data that were analyzed using inductive content analysis.

Methods: Participants ($N = 22$) exercised at six intensities (40–90% HRRmax) during which they were exposed to music tracks at four tempi and a no-music control. Music preference, affective valence, and perceived activation were assessed during the task. Immediately afterwards, an attentional focus item, the short Flow State Scale-2 and items from the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory were administered. A subsample of participants ($n = 8$) was interviewed using a schedule of open-ended questions.

Results: Results did not support a cubic relationship but rather a quadratic one (one point of inflection), and there was a weak association between the optimal choice of music tempo and positive psychological outcomes.

Conclusions: The range of preferred tempi for treadmill exercise (123–131 bpm) was narrower than that for cycle ergometry (125–140 bpm). Regardless of its tempo, music reduced the number of associative thoughts by ~10% across all exercise intensities.

Keywords: affect, association, asynchronous music, cubic relationship, dissociation, meter

1 There is a burgeoning literature on the psychophysical and ergogenic effects of music
2 in the exercise domain (see Karageorghis & Priest, 2012a, 2012b for a review). A key
3 concern for researchers is to identify the musical qualities that are germane to beneficial
4 effects across the gamut of exercise settings. Experimenters have manipulated musical
5 qualities such as intensity (volume), style, rhythm, harmony, and lyrical content (e.g., Bishop,
6 Karageorghis, & Kinrade, 2009; Copeland & Franks, 1991; Crust & Clough, 2006). From
7 both research and applied perspectives, one of the easiest facets of music to manipulate is its
8 speed or tempo as measured in beats per minute (bpm). Tempo is thought to be a key
9 determinant of musical response (e.g., Crust, 2008; Edworthy & Waring, 2006).

10 Neurophysiological and psychomusicological research has shown that the rhythmical
11 qualities of music can have a stimulative effect on humans (e.g., Khalfa, Roy, Rainville,
12 Dalla Bella, & Peretz, 2008). Through entrainment theory (Thaut, 2008, pp. 39-59) and
13 associated empirical investigation, we have gained a deeper understanding of how music
14 affects the body's main pulses such as brainwaves, heart rate, and respiratory rate (e.g.,
15 Khalfa et al.; Large, 2000). Music appears to activate neural structures in a periodic way and
16 stimulates the limbic and reticular activating systems of the brain which are thought to govern
17 arousal (e.g., Lyttle & Montagne, 1992).

18 It has been postulated that preference for different music tempi should be affected by
19 the physiological arousal of the listener and the context in which they hear the music (e.g.,
20 Berlyne, 1971, p. 70; North & Hargreaves, 2008). Thus when an individual's psychomotor
21 arousal is high, it follows that they should prefer music with faster tempi. Moreover in
22 situations that favour high arousal (e.g., during execution of highly motoric tasks), fast,
23 stimulative music is likely to be preferred. Following two exploratory studies using musical
24 excerpts and then entire music programmes (Karageorghis, Jones, & Low, 2006;
25 Karageorghis, Jones, & Stuart, 2008), Karageorghis and Terry (2009) argued that the

1 relationship between physiological arousal and preference for music tempo may not be linear
2 in nature. This was demonstrated in a subsequent study that used musical excerpts in four
3 tempo categories that were played across six intensities while participants exercised on a
4 cycle ergometer (40–90% heart rate reserve [HRR] max; Karageorghis et al., 2011; see
5 Figure 1). At low exercise intensities (40–60% HRRmax) the relationship is positive and
6 linear, and as intensity increases an *inflection point* (change of direction in the trendline) is
7 reached at 60% HRRmax, leading to a more moderate pitch. A further inflection point occurs
8 at approximately 80% HRRmax when the pitch of the line becomes negative; as exercise
9 intensity increases further, the preference is for a slight reduction in tempo.

10 The *cubic* relationship—two points of inflection in the trendline (see Figure 1)—that
11 was observed in the Karageorghis et al. (2011) study can be attributed to three main factors.
12 First, the majority of up-tempo popular music falls into a tempo band of 115–140 bpm
13 (Karageorghis et al.) and, by extension, this is also the most familiar tempo band for most
14 westerners. Second, the dip between 80 and 90% HRRmax occurs beyond the ventilatory or
15 lactate threshold; thus the slight attenuation in tempo preference may reflect the automatic
16 attentional switching that takes place during high-intensity exercise, which severely limits
17 participants' ability to focus on external stimuli such as music (Rejeski, 1985; Tenenbaum,
18 2001). Third, fast-tempo music tracks (> 140 bpm) may contain too much information for the
19 limited attentional capacity of the afferent nervous system or have too great an arousal
20 potential, irrespective of participants' heightened level of physiological arousal (Berlyne,
21 1971, p. 70; Rejeski).

22 Using a sample of tennis players, Bishop, Karageorghis, and Kinrade (2009)
23 investigated how changes in the tempo and intensity of music influenced affective valence
24 and subsequent choice-reaction task performance. Their results showed that fast-tempo music
25 elicited emotional states that were more pleasant/arousing compared to slow-tempo music,

1 although there were no associated differences for reaction time. In a similar vein, Edworthy
2 and Waring (2006) examined the effects of music tempo and intensity on self-selected speed
3 of treadmill running. Fast music was associated with higher running velocities than either
4 slow music or a white noise control. Although participants exhibited increased running
5 velocities in the two fast-music conditions, there was no corresponding increase in perceived
6 exertion. All four music conditions enhanced affect when compared to control with the
7 influence of fast music being more pronounced. A limitation of this study was that music was
8 selected only with consideration to tempo, and not other aspects that contribute to its
9 motivational qualities, such as harmony, lyrics, and extramusical associations (Karageorghis,
10 Terry, & Lane, 1999), which may have an impact on outcomes such as intrinsic motivation
11 and flow (see e.g., Karageorghis et al., 2008).

12 One of the limitations in previous work that has examined the exercise heart rate-
13 music tempo relationship is that the relevance of the relationship in terms of psychological
14 outcomes has not been assessed (e.g., Karageorghis et al., 2006, 2011). Such formative
15 studies were directed more towards establishing the nature of the relationship rather than its
16 consequences. Extant findings indicate that optimal music selection should be associated with
17 positive affective states, increased activation, dissociative attentional focus, and higher state
18 motivation (Hutchinson et al., 2011; Karageorghis & Terry, 1997; Karageorghis et al., 1999).
19 Accordingly, we do not fully comprehend the precise consequences of optimal music
20 selection or poor selection at different exercise intensities.

21 Allied to the issues surrounding psychological outcomes is the potential moderator
22 variable of gender. Past research examining complex motoric tasks (e.g., circuit-type
23 exercises) has shown that females are likely to derive greater psychological benefits from
24 music than their male counterparts (e.g., Karageorghis et al., 2010). However, in the case of
25 the simple motoric task employed in the present study, gender is not expected to have a

1 moderating influence, either on the exercise heart rate-music tempo relationship or on
2 associated psychological outcomes (see e.g., Elliott, Carr, & Orme, 2005). Also, given that
3 Karageorghis et al. (2011) employed a simple motoric task (cycle ergometry) it is not known
4 whether their findings are generalizable to other such tasks (e.g., treadmill exercise). The
5 motor patterns involved in walking/running are different to those involved in cycle
6 ergometry, while the former is also a weight-bearing activity. This factor contributed to the
7 rationale underlying a test the stability of the heart rate-music tempo relationship.

8 The purpose of the next study in this line of work is to assess the stability of the cubic
9 exercise heart rate-music tempo relationship (see Figure 1) using a different exercise
10 modality to that employed by Karageorghis et al. (2011) and to examine a number of
11 psychological outcome variables (e.g., affective valence and state attention). Thus the present
12 study is more ambitious in scope than the preceding three studies (Karageorghis et al., 2006,
13 2008, 2011), meshes the best elements of those studies (e.g., a wide range of music tempi and
14 exercise intensities), and aims to combine measurement of the relationship with an analysis of
15 whether optimal tempo selection is associated with superior psychological outcomes. This
16 will better enable practitioners to generalize extant findings to different exercise modalities
17 and gauge the impact of tempo manipulations on a range of psychological outcomes (e.g., in-
18 task affect state attentional focus, flow state).

19 It was hypothesized that a cubic trajectory would emerge in the exercise heart rate-
20 music-tempo preference relationship and that this would be similar in nature to that observed
21 by Karageorghis et al. (2011) in cycle ergometry (H_1). A secondary hypothesis was that the
22 most positive psychological outcomes would be associated with the most appropriate tempo
23 for each intensity (see Figure 1). Also there would not be differences between adjacent tempi
24 bands (e.g., medium and fast or fast and very fast) with the exception of slow vs. medium
25 (see Karageorghis et al., 2006, 2011). Hence differences were expected to emerge between

1 slow and medium, slow and fast, slow and very fast, and medium and very fast tempi (H_2).
2 We included gender as an independent variable in our analyses but did not expect any gender
3 differences to emerge (H_3).

4 **Materials and Methods**

5 **Stage 1: Music Selection**

6 The study received ethical approval from the authors' institutional ethics committee
7 and participants provided written informed consent. A sample of 65 volunteers who were
8 homogenous in terms of age ($M_{\text{age}} = 21.0$ years, $SD = 1.0$, years), race (Caucasian), and
9 education (UK secondary schools) took part in Stage 1 (see Karageorghis & Terry, 1997). The
10 volunteers were drawn from the body of sport sciences undergraduates at a university in
11 southeast England, UK and were asked to nominate five musical selections suitable for
12 treadmill exercise. These nominations were for use in the experimental protocol of Stage 2.
13 The 20 most frequently-nominated tracks were then rated according to their motivational
14 qualities for treadmill exercise by a panel of eight undergraduate sports science students (M_{age}
15 = 21.3 years, $SD = 1.6$ years) using the Brunel Music Rating Inventory-2 (Karageorghis,
16 Priest, Terry, Chatzisarantis, & Lane, 2006). This procedure was undertaken to ensure that,
17 although the tempi across tracks would differ, the tracks would be broadly equivalent in terms
18 of their motivational qualities. One track was used in each of the four required tempi ranges
19 following appropriate digital alteration of the tempi (slow, 95–100 bpm, *Buzzin'* by Mann ft.
20 50 Cent; medium, 115–120 bpm, *Stronger* by Kanye West; fast, 135–140 bpm, *On The Floor*
21 by Jennifer Lopez ft. Pitbull; and very fast, 155–160 bpm, *Time* by Chase and Status).

22 In the present study we equated the term tempo with the closely related concept of
23 *meter*, which concerns how the listener perceives the speed or rhythmical energy transmitted
24 by a musical work. In popular music, there are many instances of tracks with relatively slow
25 tempi (e.g., 80–95 bpm) that “feel” much faster to the listener due to the subdivision of beats

1 (see Loehr & Palmer, 2009); for example tracks from the *rap* and *grime* genres. We were
2 interested in how fast music “felt” rather than tempo per se and used a simple finger tapping
3 exercise to extract meter and ensure that it was identical to music tempo for each track.

4 **Stage 2: Experimental Investigation**

5 Based on a power analysis with alpha set at .05 and power at .95 (Cohen, 1988) and a
6 moderate effect size (partial $\eta^2 = 0.09$; Karageorghis et al., 2006), a G*Power (Faul,
7 Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007) calculation using the SPSS option indicated that 18
8 participants would be required. An extra four participants were recruited to protect the study
9 against the possibility of experimental dropout and deletions due to outliers.

10 **Participant characteristics.** Twenty-two participants comprised of 11 women (M_{age}
11 = 20.3 years, $SD = 1.6$ years) and 11 men ($M_{\text{age}} = 19.6$ years, $SD = 1.6$ years) were recruited
12 from the body of sports science undergraduates at a university in southeast England, UK.
13 These participants had not taken part in Stage 1, but did match the age profile, race, and
14 educational background of the volunteers recruited in Stage 1. Participants were drawn from
15 sports that have a significant requirement for aerobic energy production (e.g., outfield players
16 from weight-bearing sports) and all reported that they did not have a hearing deficiency.

17 **Apparatus.** A treadmill (Powerjog GXC200) was used for testing along with a wall-
18 mounted stereo system (Tascam CD-A500), and a decibel meter (AZ 8928 Sound Level
19 Meter) to standardize music intensity at a safe level of 75 dBA (see Alessio & Hutchinson,
20 1991). Target heart rate was assessed by use of a heart rate monitor strapped to the chest of
21 each participant and a sensor (Polar Accurex Plus) held by the experimenter.

22 **Measures. Music preference.** At each of the six exercise intensities, music preference
23 was assessed using a single item based on a 10-point scale anchored by 1 (*I do not like it at*
24 *all*) and 10 (*I like it very much*). This item essentially tapped *music liking* using the response
25 set “based on how you feel right now, rate how much you like this track”. Music liking is

1 used synonymously with preference in the present study (and in previous related studies; e.g.,
2 Karageorghis et al., 2011) given that *all* of the excerpts would need to be played for each
3 intensity with each participant giving a retrospective ranking in order for researchers to
4 establish preference in the strict sense (i.e., rank order of tracks).

5 ***In-task affect.*** We assessed in-task affective valence using Hardy and Rejeski's
6 (1989) 11-point Feeling Scale which has a single-item scale ranging from +5 (*very good*) to -
7 5 (*very bad*). The scale has demonstrated satisfactory validity across three experiments
8 reported by its originators that reinforced its merit as an index of in-task affect.

9 ***Perceived activation.*** We assessed perceived activation using Svebak and
10 Murgatroyd's (1985) Felt Arousal Scale. This is a single-item scale ranging from 1 (*low*
11 *arousal*) to 6 (*high arousal*) that has been shown to have a moderate-to-strong positive
12 correlation with the arousal scale of the Self-assessment Manikin and the arousal scale of the
13 Affect Grid (Ekkekakis, Hall, & Petruzzello, 2008).

14 ***Attentional focus.*** A measure of attentional focus was taken immediately after each
15 trial to assess state association and dissociation. A 20 cm bipolar scale with verbal anchors of
16 "Internal focus (bodily sensations, heart rate, breathing, etc.)" and "External focus
17 (daydreaming, external environment, etc.)" was used. Participants were required to mark the
18 scale with an "X" to indicate their predominant focus during the exercise bout and the level
19 of internal or external focus was ascertained through measuring the distance from the left-
20 hand point of the scale to the "X" in centimetres. That number was multiplied by 5 to give a
21 score out of 100 (see Tammen, 1996).

22 ***Flow state.*** The 9-item short version of the Flow State Scale-2 (S FSS-2; Jackson,
23 Martin, & Eklund, 2008) was administered immediately after each condition. Items (e.g.,
24 "The way time passed seemed different from normal") are presented on a Likert scale
25 anchored by 1 (*Strongly disagree*) and 5 (*Strongly agree*). The scale is associated with

1 acceptable goodness-of-fit indices (Jackson et al., 2008) and scores from the scale have been
2 shown to be internally consistent ($\alpha = .82$; Martin, Tipler, Marsh, Richards, & Williams,
3 2006).

4 ***Intrinsic motivation.*** Items from two of the seven subscales of the Intrinsic
5 Motivation Inventory (IMI; Ryan, 1982; interest-enjoyment [IE] and pressure-tension [PT])
6 were completed by participants immediately after each condition. Sample items include “I
7 enjoyed doing this activity very much” (IE) and “I felt very tense while doing this activity”
8 (PT). The items were rated on a 7-point Likert scale anchored by 1 (*Strongly disagree*) and 7
9 (*Strongly agree*). Scores from both IMI subscales have been shown to be internally consistent
10 (IE $\alpha = .78$; PT $\alpha = .68$; McAuley, Duncan, & Tammen, 1989).

11 **Pre-test and habituation trial.** It was necessary for participants to exercise on a
12 motorized treadmill at a constant speed of between 6 kph (walking) and 12 kph (running),
13 and the treadmill velocity/gradient was increased in a linear manner to elicit work intensities
14 of 40%, 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, and 90% HRR_{max}. In order to establish participants’
15 maximal heart rate, we used an age-based calculation ($207 - 0.7 \times \text{age}$; Gellish et al., 2007).
16 In calculating the exercise heart rate for each of the six work intensities, HRR was established
17 by application of the Karvonen formula (Karvonen, Kentala, & Mustala, 1957). This enabled
18 us to standardize work intensity across participants. Subsequently, each participant was
19 habituated to the treadmill ergometry task. Each participant spent ~20 min on the treadmill
20 ergometer during the habituation trial, during which time the experimental protocol was
21 explained to them.

22 **Experimental trial.** Participants were exposed to 30 conditions over six visits (five
23 conditions per visit). Each participant visited the laboratory on six occasions to complete the
24 experimental conditions, which were administered in a partially-counterbalanced order,
25 ensuring that the same track was not heard twice in a single visit and that the potential for

1 order effects was minimized. On each occasion, they walked/ran at a combination of the
2 intensities: 40%, 50%, 60%, 70%, 80%, and 90% HRRmax while being exposed to the four
3 tempo and no-music control conditions.

4 At 40–50% HRRmax participants walked at 6–7 kph to achieve the desired intensity
5 level while at 60–90% HRRmax they ran at 8–12 kph, with corresponding increases in the
6 treadmill gradient to achieve the desired work intensity. Participants were not exposed to the
7 same music tempo twice within a visit and were requested to follow identical patterns of
8 activity (no other vigorous physical activity permitted) and diet prior to each testing session.
9 Further, they were requested not to eat within 2 hr prior to testing or consume caffeine within
10 12 hr. Each participant engaged in the trial individually in the presence of a same-sex
11 experimenter. In order to negate the influence of extraneous visual stimuli, each participant
12 was requested to look straight ahead at a large blank screen.

13 Following a 5-min warm-up at a speed of 5 kph with no music, the experimenter
14 selected the appropriate exercise intensity by adjusting the velocity of the treadmill and
15 altering the gradient; there was a 1% gradient increase for every 0.5 kph increase in velocity.
16 Participants took ~60 s to reach a steady state at the prescribed exercise intensity;
17 subsequently, they heard and responded to four music tempo conditions and a no-music
18 control, each of 2-min duration. Fifteen seconds before the end of each excerpt, each
19 participant was asked to rate their preference for the musical excerpt and administered the
20 Feeling Scale and Felt Arousal Scale. The S FSS-2 and IMI items were administered at a
21 desk close to the treadmill immediately after exposure to each musical track. Thereafter, a 60-
22 s filler was used that entailed completion of the Concentration Grid (Harris & Harris, 1984, p.
23 189) in order to avoid any potential carry-over effect across experimental conditions. The
24 recovery period between each short bout of exercise was ~4 min. Each participant performed
25 a 5-min cool-down at the end of each testing session, which lasted for ~45 min.

1 **Post-test interview.** In order to corroborate the experimental findings with qualitative
2 data and incorporate the viewpoints of participants, a subsample ($n = 8$) with an even split of
3 women and men was selected randomly and interviewed by the second author for a period of
4 ~15 min. The hypothesized psychological benefits in regard to optimal music tempo exposure
5 were expected to be corroborated, to a degree, by the interview data. These data would also
6 serve as a form of manipulation check. A schedule of open-ended questions was used (which
7 can be requested from the first author) that allowed each participant's perspectives to emerge.
8 Examples of questions include "Did the music have any effects at all on how you were
9 feeling?" and "Did you notice any changes in the music other than the fact you were listening
10 to four different tracks and sometimes there was silence?" Follow-up questions (probes) were
11 used to enhance the richness of the interview and to reveal the precise meaning given by each
12 participant to their experiences during testing (see Marshall & Rossman, 2011, pp. 145-146).
13 The interviews were recorded digitally using a smartphone (iPhone 4) and transcribed
14 verbatim prior to analysis.

15 **Data Analysis**

16 Numerical data were screened for univariate and multivariate outliers. Following
17 checks to ensure that the data were suitable for parametric analysis, mixed-model $6 \times 5 \times 2$
18 (Exercise Intensity \times Music Tempo \times Gender) MANOVA and ANOVAs were applied to all
19 dependent variables except the tempo preference item, which was analyzed using a $6 \times 4 \times 2$
20 ANOVA (Exercise Intensity \times Music Tempo \times Gender). Following appropriate
21 reconfiguration of the data, significance values ($p < .05$) relating to linear, quadratic, cubic,
22 and quartic relationships were examined using a oneway ANOVA. The qualitative data
23 collected after the experimental trials were subjected to inductive content analysis (see
24 Marshall & Rossman, 2011, pp. 214–221). Specifically, statements were grouped together
25 into thematic categories and then further grouped until a point of redundancy had been

1 reached. Two researchers with experience of similar analyses in published work validated this
 2 process using the “critical friend” approach (see Marshall & Rossman, pp. 253–254).

3 **Results**

4 Checks for outliers indicated that there were five univariate outliers ($z > \pm 3.29$) and
 5 these were altered to be one unit larger or smaller than the next most extreme score in the
 6 distribution (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007, p. 77). Tests of the distributional properties of the
 7 data in each cell of each analysis ($k = 612$) revealed 38 major violations ($z > \pm 3.29$; 6.2% of
 8 cells). Specifically, the preference scores demonstrated a mild negative skew, therefore we
 9 applied a reflect and square root transformation to this variable, which served to normalize it.
 10 The IMI PT variable demonstrated a mild positive skew, therefore we applied a square root
 11 transformation, which served to normalize it. Mauchly’s test indicated 19 instances in which
 12 the sphericity assumption was violated therefore Greenhouse-Geisser adjustments were made
 13 to the relevant F tests. Collectively, the diagnostic tests indicated that the assumptions
 14 underlying a two- and threeway mixed-model MANOVA and ANOVA, and oneway
 15 ANOVA were satisfactorily met.

16 **Interaction Effects**

17 **Tempo preference.** The preference higher-order interaction of Exercise Intensity x
 18 Music Tempo x Gender was nonsignificant, as were the twoway interactions of Exercise
 19 Intensity x Gender, Music Tempo x Gender, and Exercise Intensity x Music Tempo (see
 20 Table 3 and Table 1/Figure 2 in supplementary electronic material). In relation to H_1 , the
 21 Exercise Intensity x Music Tempo interaction did not yield significant ($p > .05$) quartic or
 22 cubic trends but did exhibit significant quadratic, $F(1, 504) = 4.32, p = .038$, and linear, $F(1,$
 23 $504) = 5.46, p = .020$, trends.

24 To facilitate interpretation of the present findings we have included two
 25 visualizations: Figure 2 (in supplementary electronic material) depicts mean tempo-

1 preference ratings across exercise intensities and Figure 3 illustrates the mean and standard
2 error of participants' most preferred tempo at each exercise intensity. Although an imperfect
3 representation of music tempo preference, Figure 3 enables a better depiction of the exercise
4 HR-music tempo preference relationship and facilitates direct comparison with the
5 Karageorghis et al. (2011) data that were captured using a broadly comparable cycle
6 ergometer protocol (see Figure 1).

7 **In-task affect.** The in-task affective responses (Feeling Scale and Felt Arousal Scale)
8 higher-order interaction of Exercise Intensity x Music Tempo x Gender was nonsignificant,
9 as was the twoway interaction of Exercise Intensity x Gender (see Table 3). In relation to
10 (H_2), the Exercise Intensity x Music Tempo interaction was also nonsignificant (see Table 3).
11 In relation to H_3 , there was a significant twoway interaction of Music Tempo x Gender,
12 which was associated with a moderate effect. Step-down F tests indicated a significant
13 interaction for affective valence, $F(4, 1) = 2.66$, $p = .038$, $\eta_p^2 = .12$, and perceived activation,
14 $F(4, 1) = 4.49$, $p = .003$, $\eta_p^2 = .18$. An inspection of means and standard errors indicated that
15 affective valence scores for male participants were significantly ($p < .05$) lower under the no-
16 music control when compared against medium, fast, and very fast tempi, and lower for slow-
17 tempo when compared against medium-tempo music. Scores for female participants were
18 significantly ($p < .05$) lower for no-music control when compared against all experimental
19 conditions, and lower when slow tempi were compared against medium tempi. A similar
20 examination for perceived activation showed that scores for male participants were
21 significantly ($p < .05$) lower for the no-music control when compared against slow, medium,
22 and fast tempi. Scores for female participants were significantly ($p < .05$) lower in the no-
23 music control when compared against all experimental conditions. Scores were also
24 significantly ($p < .05$) lower in the slow-tempo condition when compared to the medium- and
25 fast-tempo conditions.

1 **State attention.** The state attention higher-order interaction of Exercise Intensity x
2 Music Tempo x Gender was nonsignificant, as were the twoway interactions of Exercise
3 Intensity x Gender, and Music Tempo x Gender (see Table 3). In relation to H_2 , the Exercise
4 Intensity x Music Tempo interaction was also nonsignificant (see Table 3).

5 **Motivation variables.** The higher-order interaction for post-task motivation variables
6 (S FSS-2, IMI IE, and IMI PT) of Exercise Intensity x Music Tempo x Gender was
7 nonsignificant, as was the twoway interaction of Exercise Intensity x Gender (see Table 3). In
8 relation to H_2 , the Exercise Intensity x Music Tempo interaction was also nonsignificant (see
9 Table 3). In relation to H_3 , there was a significant twoway interaction of Music Tempo x
10 Gender associated with a moderate-to-large effect size (see Table 3). Step-down F tests
11 indicated a significant interaction for IMI IE, $F(4, 1) = 9.15$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .31$, and flow,
12 $F(4, 1) = 5.38$ $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .21$. An examination of means and standard errors indicated
13 that IMI IE scores for male participants were significantly ($p < .05$) lower for the no-music
14 control when compared to the medium-tempo condition. Scores for female participants were
15 significantly ($p < .05$) lower in the no-music control when compared against all experimental
16 conditions, lower for slow vs. medium, and for slow vs. fast tempi. A similar examination for
17 flow showed that scores for male participants were significantly ($p < .05$) lower in the no-
18 music control compared to medium and fast tempi, lower for slow-tempo music compared to
19 medium-tempo music, and lower for slow- and fast- tempo music ($p < .05$). Scores for female
20 participants were significantly ($p < .05$) lower for the no-music control when compared to the
21 experimental conditions.

22 **Main Effects**

23 **Tempo preference.** The main effects revealed significant differences according to
24 exercise intensity for preference, with pairwise comparisons indicating that the 40, 50, 60,
25 70% HRRmax intensities all yielded significantly ($p < .05$) higher scores when compared to

1 90% HRRmax, and the 50, 60, 70% HRRmax intensities all yielded significantly ($p < .05$)
2 higher scores when compared to 80% HRRmax. There was also a main effect of music tempo
3 for preference, with pairwise comparisons indicating significantly ($p < .05$) lower scores for
4 slow tempi when compared to medium- and fast-tempo conditions (see Table 3). Medium-
5 tempo scores were significantly ($p < .05$) higher when compared to very fast-tempo music, as
6 were scores for fast-tempo when compared to very fast-tempo music. In relation to H_3 , there
7 was a main effect of gender, indicating that women had higher preference scores than men.
8 Each of the main effects for preference was associated with a large effect size (see Table 3).

9 **In-task affect.** The main effects revealed significant differences according to exercise
10 intensity for affective valence and perceived activation (see Table 3). Step-down F tests
11 exhibited significant differences for both variables that were associated with large effect
12 sizes: affective valence, $F(2.29, 45.77) = 20.77, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .51$, and perceived activation,
13 $F(2.32, 46.35) = 25.49, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .56$. Pairwise comparisons for affective valence
14 indicated significantly ($p < .001$) higher scores for the 40, 50, 60, 70, and 80% HRRmax
15 intensities when compared with 90% HRRmax, and scores for the 40, 50, 60, 70% HRRmax
16 intensities were significantly ($p < .05$) higher compared with 80% HRRmax. There was also a
17 main effect of music tempo for affective valence and perceived activation (see Table 3), with
18 step-down F tests indicating that both variables exhibited significant differences that were
19 associated with large effect sizes: affect valence, $F(2.88, 57.57) = 24.62, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .55$
20 and perceived activation, $F(4, 80) = 20.87, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .51$.

21 Pairwise comparisons indicated significantly ($p < .001$) lower affective valence scores
22 during the no-music control when compared to the experimental conditions. There were also
23 significantly ($p < .05$) higher scores with the medium-tempo condition when compared to the
24 other three tempi. Pairwise comparisons for perceived activation indicated that the no-music
25 control was significantly ($p < .001$) less arousing than the four experimental conditions. In

1 addition, there were significantly ($p < .05$) higher scores with medium tempo when compared
2 to slow tempo, and between medium and very fast tempi. Moreover, scores were significantly
3 ($p = .039$) higher in response to fast-tempo music when compared to very fast-tempo music.

4 **State attention.** The main effects revealed significant differences according to
5 exercise intensity for state attention that were associated with a large effect (see Table 3).
6 Pairwise comparisons indicated that all exercise intensities differed from each other
7 significantly ($p < .05$) with greater amounts of associative thoughts at each subsequent
8 exercise intensity from 40% HRRmax through to 90% HRRmax. There was also a main
9 effect of music tempo for state attention, with pairwise comparisons indicating significantly
10 ($p < .05$) greater amounts of associative thoughts during the no-music control when compared
11 against the experimental conditions.

12 **Motivation variables.** The main effects revealed significant differences according to
13 exercise intensity for the motivation variables associated with a large effect (see Table 3).
14 Step-down F tests indicated that only IMI PT exhibited significant differences, $F(2.55, 51.01)$
15 $= 37.50, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .65$. Pairwise comparisons showed that IMI PT scores at 40%
16 HRRmax intensity were significantly ($p < .05$) lower than all other intensities, as were scores
17 at 50% HRRmax when compared against the intensities from 60-90% HRRmax. Also, IMI
18 PT scores were significantly ($p < .05$) lower at 60% HRRmax when compared to both 80 and
19 90% HRRmax, between 70% HRRmax and both 80 and 90% HRRmax, and between 80 and
20 90% HRRmax. There was also a main effect of music tempo for the motivation variables
21 associated with a large effect (see Table 3). Step-down F tests indicated that all three
22 motivation variables exhibited significant differences, flow: $F(1.82, 36.41) = 7.78, p = .002,$
23 $\eta_p^2 = .28$, IE: $F(2.40, 47.97) = 28.34, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .59$, and PT: $F(2.77, 55.46) = 5.77, p =$
24 $.002, \eta_p^2 = .22$.

1 Pairwise comparisons for flow indicated significantly ($p < .05$) lower scores with the
2 no-music control when compared to the four experimental conditions. There were also
3 significantly ($p < .05$) lower scores with slow tempo when compared with both medium and
4 fast tempi, and between fast-tempo and very fast-tempo music. Pairwise comparisons for IE
5 indicated significantly ($p < .001$) lower scores with the no-music control when compared
6 against the experimental conditions. There were also significantly ($p < .05$) lower scores with
7 slow-tempo music when compared with both medium and fast tempi, and fast-tempo music
8 led to significantly ($p < .05$) higher scores when compared with very fast-tempo music.
9 Pairwise comparisons for PT showed significantly ($p < .05$) higher scores with the no-music
10 control condition when compared to the four experimental conditions.

11 **Inductive Content Analysis**

12 We conducted interviews with a subsample of eight participants and the subsequent
13 inductive content analysis of their responses is included as a supplement to the quantitative
14 analyses. Participants indicated that the use of music per se (regardless of tempo) elicited a
15 broad category of response that we have labelled “Enhanced exercise experience” (see Table
16 4). Examining this general dimension in greater depth, the raw data themes revealed benefits
17 that reflected the three main outcomes contained in Karageorghis et al.’s (1999) conceptual
18 framework of positive mood state, increased arousal, and dissociation (first-order themes).
19 Participant 10 highlighted how “At higher intensities the music had more of an effect on me –
20 it made me feel better.” Similarly, in relation to arousal, participant 25 stated “So it really
21 made me, likeup for it.” Seven participants passed comment on the dissociative effects of
22 music; typical of these was the following “The music gives you something to concentrate on
23 other than pain.” (participant 10).

24 A second category emerged labelled “Behavioural responses to music” (see Table 4),
25 which embraces raw data themes pertaining to perceived increases in motivation with and

1 entrainment to music. In relation to the former, participant 16 revealed “There were a couple
2 of songs that stood out, that kind of made me push it more.” In regard to the latter, participant
3 1 explained “I don’t think I was trying to keep in time with the music, I think it just sort of
4 ended up going that way.” Participant 13 commented “I think I changed my steps to the beat
5 of the music, because it was easier to run along to it.” Moreover, the tempo of the music was
6 relevant to some of the participants with reference to exercise intensity; participant 1 revealed
7 “My preference for the JLo track depended on how quick I was going.”

8 Discussion

9 The main purpose of the present study was to assess the stability of a cubic exercise
10 heart rate-music tempo relationship using a different exercise modality to that employed by
11 Karageorghis et al. (2011), while the secondary purpose was to examine a number of
12 psychological outcome variables with reference to this relationship. This secondary purpose
13 represented the most novel aspect of the present study. A comparison of Figure 3, which
14 illustrates the present results for tempo preference, with Figure 1 (from Karageorghis et al.)
15 shows that the exercise heart rate-music tempo preference is not stable across exercise
16 modalities, therefore H_1 is not supported. The standard errors bars in Figure 3 also reveal
17 greater variability in music tempo preference at the low-to-moderate exercise intensities
18 when compared to the standard errors in Figure 1.

19 The most striking difference between the two figures is that the cubic relationship
20 found by Karageorghis et al. (2011) with cycle ergometer exercise is not evident with
21 treadmill exercise. The present relationship suggests no discernible differences in preference
22 among music tempi at low-to-moderate exercise intensities (40–60% HRRmax), a rise of ~4
23 bpm from 60–70% HRRmax, a levelling out in tempo preference from 70–80% HRRmax,
24 followed by a sharp rise of ~5 bpm from 80-90% HRRmax. Where there is some similarity
25 between the two studies is that the range of tempi that are preferred across a broad spectrum

1 of exercise intensities is narrow, albeit considerably narrower in treadmill running (123–131
2 bpm) than in cycle ergometry (125–140 bpm).

3 Present findings pertaining to the preference for medium-tempo music across all
4 intensities bear resemblance to those of Karageorghis et al. (2006) who showed that
5 participants engaged in a treadmill walking task reported similar scores for medium-tempo
6 music at low-to-moderate intensities with a slight dip in preference in the high-intensity
7 condition (75% HRRmax). Figure 2 (in supplementary electronic material) illustrates how the
8 only meaningful differences in preference were between medium-tempo music and the
9 remaining tempo conditions at 40–50% HRRmax, between both medium- and fast-tempo
10 conditions compared with the remaining conditions at 60–80% HRRmax, and between slow
11 tempo and medium, fast, and very fast tempi at 90% HRRmax. At running intensities of 40–
12 80% HRRmax, it appears that music in the very narrow tempo range of 123–127 bpm is
13 optimal (see Figure 3). A further similarity with the 2006 paper concerns the Exercise
14 Intensity x Music Tempo interaction which yielded identical effect sizes, of a moderate order,
15 in both studies ($\eta_p^2 = .09$).

16 **Psychological Outcomes**

17 The present study extended previous work (e.g., Karageorghis et al., 2008, 2011)
18 through the inclusion of a range of psychological outcomes to gauge whether optimizing the
19 music-tempo selection was associated with superior outcomes. When we examine the present
20 music preference findings in light of the range of psychological outcome measures, it is
21 evident that, at the highest exercise intensity (90% HRRmax), very fast music elicited the
22 most positive affective responses, whereas at the low intensities, the medium-tempo music
23 had a similar effect (see Table 2). There was no discernible trend for perceived activation or
24 flow state, although for state attention it transpired that fast- and very fast-tempo music
25 elicited the lowest levels of association at 90% HRRmax. For the two IMI subscales, it was

1 evident that IE was highest when medium-tempo music was played at intensities 60-80%
2 HRRmax, whereas PT increased as intensity increased, but was not influenced by
3 manipulations of music tempo; it was higher in the no-music control when compared to all
4 music conditions. The IE finding mirrors that of Karageorghis et al. (2008), although they
5 used a singular exercise intensity of 70% HRRmax and administered music programmes
6 comprised of varying tempi. Collectively, the results show that the modest differences in
7 music tempo preference across exercise intensities were not strongly associated with
8 psychological outcomes when there was a match between intensity and music tempo;
9 accordingly, H_2 was also not accepted.

10 The main effect of intensity on state attention results lends support to extant findings
11 regarding an attentional shift towards associative focus as exercise intensity increases that is
12 accompanied by a shift towards more negative feeling states (e.g., Hutchinson, &
13 Tenenbaum, 2007; Lind, Welch, & Ekkekakis, 2009). It is evident that affective valence
14 during the music conditions, and in particular the fast-tempo condition, is more positive than
15 in the no-music condition (see Table 2). This finding bears similarity to those of previous
16 experimental studies into the psychological effects of music (e.g., Edworthy & Waring, 2006;
17 Elliott et al., 2005; Hutchinson et al., 2011; Karageorghis et al., 2008).

18 Gender differences were not expected to emerge; nonetheless, the results revealed a
19 series of significant Music Tempo x Gender interactions among the psychological outcome
20 measures that led us not to accept H_3 . Women appeared to derive greater benefit in terms of
21 affective valence when compared to their male counterparts, as their scores were higher in
22 response to each music tempo condition relative to control. Males only appeared to benefit
23 from the medium, fast, and very fast music tempi relative to control. Women also reported
24 higher perceived activation in response to all tempo conditions when compared to control,
25 whereas males reported higher perceived activation in response to slow, medium, and fast

1 conditions only. The benefits in affective valence derived by women in response to musical
2 accompaniment in the present study are somewhat similar to those reported by Karageorghis
3 et al. (2010) in a synchronous circuit training task.

4 Concerning the variables pertaining to motivation, women reported higher flow state
5 and IE scores than men across all music tempo conditions. The implication is that women are
6 likely to experience a more positive motivational state when exposed to music of any tempo.
7 Allied to this, it was apparent that women reported greater preference overall for music ($M =$
8 7.05) when compared to men ($M = 6.00$), and this difference was of a greater magnitude than
9 that found by Karageorghis et al. (2011; women $M = 7.14$ vs. men $M = 6.67$). Nonetheless, it
10 should be noted that in both studies the difference in preference between genders did not
11 reach statistical significance ($p > .05$).

12 **Present Findings vs. Past Findings**

13 The Karageorghis et al. (2011) study was the first to test the preferences for music
14 tempo across a full range of exercise intensities. The cubic relationship that emerged
15 warranted further investigation to establish its validity and factors such as choice of exercise
16 modality, use of different musical selections, and the influence of the age of the participants
17 were unknown. Thus the 2011 results should be taken to be both preliminarily and tentative in
18 nature. One notable aspect of the 2011 findings was the narrow range of preferred tempi
19 across a range of exercise intensities and this observation was underlined by the present
20 findings. It appears that the range of preferred tempi for asynchronous music in treadmill
21 exercise is only 123-131 bpm, whereas in cycle ergometry it was 125-140 bpm. There are a
22 number of factors that might account for this disparity and these will be expounded with
23 reference to extant theory and empirical findings.

24 The most prominent difference in methodological terms between the present study
25 and the Karageorghis et al. (2011) study was the choice of exercise modality; the 2011 study

1 selected a nonweight-bearing activity (cycle ergometry) while in the present study we used a
2 weight-bearing activity (treadmill exercise). Although both are repetitive and relatively
3 simple motoric tasks, the kinetic pattern, breathing patterns, and neuromuscular demands
4 vary considerably. Also, fatigue perception is far more localized in cycle ergometry (to the
5 quadriceps) than it is in running (whole body; see Koivula & Hassmen, 1998). Despite the
6 fact that in both studies music was applied asynchronously, entrainment theory details the
7 propensity of bodily pulses such as respiration rate and motor patterns to entrain to musical
8 rhythms without conscious effort (Thaut, 2008, pp. 39-59). This was reflected in the
9 interview data which revealed that even though participants were not consciously attempting
10 to entrain their stride rate to the rhythmical qualities of the music, they often found
11 themselves doing so (see Table 4). As an illustration of this, participant 1 revealed that "...if
12 there's a song playing that I like, I like to run to the rhythm."

13 In the Karageorghis et al. (2011) study, pedal cadence was maintained at 75 rpm and
14 the cycling intensity was augmented via the addition of weights that increased pedal
15 resistance. In the present study, running intensity was augmented through a combination of
16 increases in treadmill belt velocity and gradient. Thus there was greater variability in
17 movement cadence in the present study. Owing to differences in height among participants,
18 there was also greater between-subject variability in cadence. In terms of motor patterns,
19 cycle ergometry affords fewer degrees of freedom than treadmill running.

20 Although the salience of music tempo has been repeatedly demonstrated (e.g., Crust,
21 2008, Edworthy & Waring, 2006), there are, of course, other facets of music that influence
22 response. Chief amongst these are the mode of the music (e.g., major vs. minor; van der
23 Zwaag, 2011), the lyrical content (Bishop, Karageorghis, & Loizou, 2007), and the
24 subdivisions of the beat (Loehr & Palmer, 2009). We did not strictly control for the mode or
25 harmonic content of the music other than via the BMRI-2 ratings, or how the subdivisions of

1 the beat were interpreted. Moreover, all tracks had lyrical content and there were some
2 differences in how participants responded to the lyrical content of the music that became
3 apparent through the qualitative analysis. For example, participant 16 indicated at the lower
4 exercise intensities, he found it easier to mentally process the lyrical content of the music:
5 "...with the songs playing, I was concentrating on some of the lyrics and things, so I was
6 processing that information."

7 During the postexperiment interviews, four out of the eight participants stated that
8 they found the lyrical affirmation in Kanye West's *Stronger* (medium-tempo track) to be
9 particularly powerful ("work it harder, make it better, do it faster, makes us stronger"). For
10 instance, participant 5 commented "...it keeps saying 'Stronger', so you just push yourself."
11 When tempo preference was examined independently of exercise intensity, the track *Stronger*
12 yielded the highest score ($M = 7.26$) and differed significantly ($p < .05$) from both slow and
13 very fast-tempo music. It also transpired that some participants were unable to correctly place
14 the experimental tracks in order of tempo. Specifically, four of the eight participants in the
15 interviews did not accurately identify the very fast-tempo track as the fastest piece of music.

16 Similar to the findings reported by Karageorghis et al. (2006, 2011), at the low
17 intensities (40-50% HRRmax) the medium tempo track was preferred. Figure 4 demonstrates
18 that there is greater scope for attention to be shifted voluntarily during low-to-moderate
19 intensity exercise; therefore it would have been somewhat easier for participants to process
20 the lyrical content of the music (cf. Rejeski, 1985; Tenenbaum, 2001). At the higher
21 intensities, fast-tempo and medium-tempo music is equally preferred (see Figure 2 in
22 supplementary electronic material), whereas at the low intensities, medium-tempo music is
23 preferred. These present results broadly support Berlyne's (1971, p. 70) theoretical
24 proposition and empirical findings (see North & Hargreaves, 2008 for a review) showing that
25 high arousal states should be associated with preferences for fast-tempo music.

1 Participants appear to require more stimulation through the music at moderate-to-high
2 exercise intensities, and in particular at 90% HRRmax (Figure 3). Nonetheless, a strong
3 finding that emerged is that music per se (i.e., regardless of its tempo) is less preferred at 80-
4 90% HRRmax when compared to low-to-moderate intensities (see Table 1 in supplementary
5 electronic material) while the ratings for affective valence and associated pattern of
6 differences across exercise intensities matched those for preference almost precisely.
7 Nonetheless, although the trend for affective valence did not reach significance, the medium-,
8 fast-, and very fast-tempo conditions ameliorated the decline in affect that is evident in the
9 no-music condition (see Table 2).

10 Past work has shown that affective states are more negatively valenced when
11 participants exercise beyond ventilatory threshold (Ekkekakis & Acevedo, 2006), and the
12 present findings suggest that at moderate-to-high intensities, appropriately-selected music can
13 attenuate such negative feelings. Moreover, the state attention data shows a difference in the
14 point at which the switch from a predominantly dissociative focus to a predominantly
15 associative focus occurs with music (see Figure 4); this switch is evident at ~68% HRRmax
16 in the no-music control whereas it occurs at ~78% HRRmax during the fast-tempo condition.
17 This finding is notable insofar as it demonstrates that appropriately-selected music can extend
18 the range of exercise intensities over which dissociative thoughts take place.

19 **Limitations of the Present Study**

20 Participants' responses to music may have been influenced by factors outside of
21 experimental control. For example, independent of tempo/meter, the beat was stronger or
22 more clearly discernible in the slow-, medium-, and fast-tempo conditions. It is very
23 challenging to find music in the very fast-tempo category that is equivalent in terms of
24 strength of beat, idiom, and familiarity relative to other tempo categories. It has been argued
25 recently that there is a biological premise for the fact that most music is composed/recorded

1 close to a tempo of 120 bpm (Schneider, Askew, Abel, & Strüder, 2010). This tempo is allied
2 to a “natural” walking step frequency of 2 Hz and corresponds with the notion of “natural
3 rhythmicity”; for example the preferred spontaneous tempo of finger tapping.

4 A related issue concerns the lyrical content of the tracks used, which could have been
5 interpreted differently by participants (as suggested by the qualitative data), despite the fact
6 that the tempo and motivational qualities of the music were standardized. Thus a potential
7 limitation is that participants’ preference scores may have been influenced by the lyrical
8 content of music (c.f. Crust, 2008). One way by which to overcome this limitation is to use a
9 single track and to digitally alter the tempo in order to create the required experimental
10 conditions (e.g., Bishop et al., 2009). Nonetheless, this approach can lead to a further set of
11 limitations insofar as participants are either irritated by repeated exposure to the same track or
12 if it is an already familiar track, engenders a negative response when it is played at non-
13 familiar tempi.

14 We assessed the influence of music in a visually-sterile environment which does not
15 represent how it is used in vivo. Moreover, given that our participants were physically active
16 undergraduate students, the results cannot necessarily be generalized to the wider population.
17 The inherent problem with replicating the present study with other groups is that
18 unfit/sedentary and older participants might struggle to exercise at the high intensities
19 required to address the research question. The “perfect experiment” is simply not attainable in
20 this domain of scientific endeavour given that when researchers strive to release some of the
21 controls, such as through using participant-selected music or conducting the study with gym
22 users, internal validity is immediately compromised.

23 **Practical Implications**

24 Although the suite of recent studies has not established a clear exercise heart rate-
25 music tempo preference relationship, we do know that the range of preferred tempi in bipedal

1 activities (cycling and walking/running) is much narrower than previously thought (see e.g.,
2 Karageorghis & Terry, 2009). In order to optimize tempo selections across a range of exercise
3 intensities, selections in the range 123–140 bpm should be considered. Nonetheless, the
4 present findings show only a weak association between preferred tempo across six exercise
5 intensities and a broad range of psychological outcomes (see Exercise Intensity x Music
6 Tempo effect sizes in Table 3). This means that as long as a piece of music is perceived by an
7 exerciser to be motivational, it is likely to have a positive influence on psychological
8 outcomes. Practitioners should, however, avoid using slow selections (< 100 bpm) for high-
9 intensity activity or very fast selections (> 140 bpm) for low-intensity activity. The weak
10 associations evident in Table 3 along with the means in Table 2 suggest that incongruence
11 between exercise intensity and music tempo would not optimize psychological outcomes.

12 The findings reinforce the notion that, at the very highest exercise intensities (i.e., 80–
13 90% HRRmax), there is the least potential in absolute terms for participants to derive
14 psychological benefits from music of any tempo (Karageorghis et al., 2011; Rejeski, 1985;
15 Tenenbaum, 2001). However, the relative benefits of music vs. no-music conditions at these
16 highest intensities are notable from an applied perspective; for example, at 90% HRRmax
17 there is a mean difference of 1.45 in affective valence scores between the very fast music and
18 no-music conditions (see Table 2). What is striking from a public health perspective is that at
19 the moderate-to-high exercise intensities that are associated with cardio-respiratory benefits,
20 the use of music appears to assuage the rapid deterioration of affect and promotes situation-
21 specific motivation (see e.g., Hutchinson et al., 2011).

22 The present findings indicate that music per se is likely to promote ~10% more
23 dissociation at moderate-to-high exercise intensities. This is noteworthy as it is at these
24 intensities that the general population can derive significant cardiorespiratory benefits from
25 exercise (Ekkekakis & Acevedo, 2006). An obstacle to exercise adherence for many people is

1 the negative affect that is experienced close to and beyond ventilatory threshold (Hall,
2 Ekkekakis, & Petruzzello, 2002). The present findings indicate that moderate- and fast-tempo
3 music reduced the number of associative thoughts and had a corresponding positive influence
4 on affective valence. This small influence may be very significant in terms of exercise-related
5 affect and adherence among the general population (Hall et al.). Moreover, the affective
6 benefits of music seem to be particularly pronounced for women, as they reported higher
7 affective valence scores in every music condition relative to control (see Table 2).

8 **Conclusions and Recommendations**

9 The cubic trajectory (two points of inflection) reported by Karageorghis et al. (2011)
10 using cycle ergometry was not replicated in the present study using treadmill exercise. Rather
11 a significant ($p < .05$) quadratic relationship emerged, which means that there was just one
12 inflection point in the trendline (at 80% HRRmax; see Figure 3). The trendline shows that at
13 the highest exercise intensity (90% HRRmax) participants preferred music at ~131 bpm. The
14 range of preferred tempi for treadmill exercise (123–131 bpm) was narrower than that for
15 cycle ergometry (125–140 bpm). There is only a weak association between optimal selection
16 of music tempo at various exercise intensities and a range of psychological outcomes (e.g.,
17 affective valence). The implication of this is that to optimize such outcomes, a tempo range as
18 broad as 100–140 bpm might be considered by practitioners. One of the original contributions
19 of this study is that it shows how asynchronous music reduces the number of associative
20 thoughts at all exercise intensities by ~10%. Also, regardless of its tempo, music is less
21 preferred at high intensities when compared to low-to-moderate intensities, which supports
22 theoretical propositions (Rejeski, 1985; Tenenbaum, 2001).

23 Despite the fact that tempo appears to be a strong determinant of music preference,
24 given the information processing demands that are placed by high-intensity exercise in
25 particular (Rejeski, 1985), future research might examine music *complexity* (how predictable

1 it is; see e.g., North & Hargreaves, 2008). Complexity could be coupled with music's
2 affective valence and arousing properties to establish a more sophisticated approach by which
3 to advance this line of research. One possible extension of the present protocol would be to
4 examine the interactive effects of music tempo and intensity (volume) across exercise
5 intensities in a similar vein to past studies (e.g., Copeland & Franks, 1991; Edworthy &
6 Waring, 2006). Moreover, given that our qualitative analysis indicated the lyrical content of
7 music was easier to process at the lower intensities, it would be worthwhile to repeat the
8 present protocol using tracks with lyrical and instrumental versions. Such a study might
9 demonstrate that instrumental music is most appropriate for the highest intensities. Finally,
10 gender differences should be further examined, and given the similar age range/athletic
11 background of participants used in this line of studies, there is a need to extend the work to
12 more diverse groups. Such an approach would allow researchers to gauge the degree to which
13 the present findings generalize to the wider population.

14

References

- 1
2 Alessio, H. M., & Hutchinson, K. M. (1991). Effects of submaximal exercise and noise
3 exposure on hearing loss. *Research Quarterly*, 62, 413–419.
- 4 AZ 8928 Sound Level Meter [Apparatus]. (1997). Taichung City, Taiwan: AZ Instrument
5 Corporation.
- 6 Berlyne, D. E. (1971). *Aesthetics and psychobiology*. New York, NY: Appleton Century
7 Crofts.
- 8 Bishop, D. T., Karageorghis, C. I., & Kinrade, N. P. (2009). Effects of musically-induced
9 emotions on choice reaction time performance. *The Sport Psychologist*, 23, 59–76.
- 10 Bishop, D. T., Karageorghis, C. I., & Loizou, G. (2007). A grounded theory of young tennis
11 players' use of music to manipulate emotional state. *Journal of Sport & Exercise*
12 *Psychology*, 29, 584–607.
- 13 Copeland, B. L., & Franks, B. D. (1991). Effects of types and intensities of background
14 music on treadmill endurance. *The Journal of Sports Medicine and Physical Fitness*,
15 31, 100–103.
- 16 Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale,
17 NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 18 Crust, L. (2008). Perceived importance of components of asynchronous music during
19 circuit training. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 26, 1547–1555.
20 doi:10.1080/02640410802315427
- 21 Crust, L., & Clough, P. J. (2006). The influence of rhythm and personality in the endurance
22 response to motivational asynchronous music. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 24, 187–
23 195. doi:10.1080/02640410500131514
- 24 Edworthy, J., & Waring, H. (2006). The effects of music tempo and loudness level on
25 treadmill exercise. *Ergonomics*, 49, 1597–1610. doi:10.1080/00140130600899104
26

- 1 Ekkekakis, P., & Acevedo, E. O. (2006). Affective responses to acute exercise: toward a
2 psychobiological dose-response model. In: E. O., Acevedo, & P. Ekkekakis (Eds), (pp.
3 91–109). *Psychobiology of physical activity*. Human Kinetics: Champaign, IL.
- 4 Ekkekakis, P., Hall, E. E., & Petruzzello, S. J. (2008). The relationship between exercise
5 intensity and affective responses demystified: To crack the 40-year-old nut, replace
6 the 40-year-old nutcracker! *Annals of Behavioral Medicine*, *35*, 136–149.
7 doi:10.1007/s12160-008-9025-z
- 8 Elliott, D., Carr, S., & Orme, D. (2005). The effect of motivational music on sub-maximal
9 exercise. *European Journal of Sport Science*, *5*, 97–106.
10 doi:10.1080/17461390500171310
- 11 Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A. G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical
12 power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior*
13 *Research Methods*, *39*, 175–191.
- 14 Gellish, R. L., Goslin, B. R., Olson, R. E., McDonald, A., Russi, G. D., & Moudgil, V. K.
15 (2007). Longitudinal modeling of the relationship between age and maximal heart
16 rate. *Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise*, *39*, 822–829.
17 doi:10.1097/mss.0b013e31803349c6
- 18 Hall, E. E., Ekkekakis, P., & Petruzzello, S. J. (2002). The affective beneficence of vigorous
19 exercise revisited. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, *7*, 47–66.
- 20 Hardy, C. J., & Rejeski, W. J. (1989). Not what but how one feels: The measurement of affect
21 during exercise. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *11*, 304–317.
- 22 Harris, D. V., & Harris, B. L. (1984). *The athlete's guide to sport psychology: Mental skills for*
23 *physical people*. New York, NY: Leisure Press.
- 24 Hutchinson, J. C., Sherman, T., Davis, L. K., Cawthon, D., Reeder, N. B., & Tenenbaum, G.
25 (2011). The influence of asynchronous motivational music on a supramaximal
26 exercise bout. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, *42*, 135–142.
- 27

- 1 Hutchinson, J. C., & Tenenbaum, G. (2007). Attention focus during physical effort: The
2 mediating role of task intensity. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 8, 233–245.
3 doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2006.03.006
- 4 iPhone 4 [Apparatus and Software]. (2010). Cupertino, CA: Apple Inc.
- 5 Jackson, S. A., Martin, A. J., & Eklund, R. C. (2008). Long and short measures of flow:
6 Examining construct validity of the FSS-2, DFS-2, and new brief counterparts.
7 *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 30, 561–587.
- 8 Kennard, W., Milton, S., Ayanan, P., Drew, B. (2011). Time [Recorded by Chase & Status and
9 Delilah]. On *No More Idols* [CD]. London: Mercury Records UK.
- 10 Khalfa, S., Roy, M., Rainville, P., Dalla Bella, S., & Peretz, I. (2008). Role of tempo
11 entrainment in psychophysiological differentiation of happy and sad music?
12 *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, 68, 17–26.
13 doi:10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2007.12.001
- 14 Khayat, N., Hamind, K., Junior, A. J., Sky, T., Perez, A. C., Hermosa, G., Hermosa, U.
15 (2011). On The Floor [Recorded by Jennifer Lopez and Pitbull]. On *Love?* [CD].
16 New York, NY: Island Records.
- 17 Karageorghis, C. I., Jones, L., & Low, D. C. (2006). Relationship between exercise heart rate
18 and music tempo preference. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 26, 240–
19 250.
- 20 Karageorghis, C. I., Jones, L., Priest, D. L., Akers, R. I., Clarke., Perry J., ... Lim, H. B. T
21 (2011). Revisiting the exercise heart rate-music tempo preference relationship.
22 *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 82, 274–284.
- 23 Karageorghis, C. I., Jones, L., & Stuart, D. P. (2008). Psychological effects of music tempi
24 during exercise. *International Journal of Sports Medicine*, 29, 613–619.
25 doi:10.1055/s-2007-989266
26

- 1 Karageorghis, C. I., & Priest, D. L. (2012a). Music in the exercise domain: a review and
2 synthesis (Part I). *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *5*, 44-66.
3 doi:10.1080/1750984X.2011.631026
- 4 Karageorghis, C. I., & Priest, D. L. (2012b). Music in the exercise domain: a review and
5 synthesis (Part II). *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *5*, 67–
6 84. doi:10.1080/1750984X.2011.631027
- 7 Karageorghis, C. I., Priest, D. L., Terry, P. C., Chatzisarantis, N. L. D., & Lane, A. M.
8 (2006). Redesign and initial validation of an instrument to assess the motivational
9 qualities of music in exercise: The Brunel Music Rating Inventory-2. *Journal of*
10 *Sports Sciences*, *24*, 899–909. doi:10.1080/02640410500298107
- 11 Karageorghis, C. I., Priest, D. L., Williams, L. S., Hirani, R. M., Lannon, K. M., & Bates, B.
12 J. (2010). Ergogenic and psychological effects of synchronous music during circuit-
13 type exercise. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *11*, 551-559.
14 doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2010.06.004
- 15 Karageorghis, C. I., & Terry, P. C. (1997). The psychophysical effects of music in sport and
16 exercise: A review. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, *20*, 54–68.
- 17 Karageorghis, C. I., & Terry, P. C. (2009). The psychological, psychophysical and ergogenic
18 effects of music in sport: A review and synthesis. In A. J. Bateman & J. R. Bales
19 (Eds.). *Sporting sounds: Relationships between sport and music* (pp. 15–46). London,
20 UK: Routledge.
- 21 Karageorghis, C. I., Terry, P. C., & Lane, A. M. (1999). Development and initial validation of
22 an instrument to assess the motivational qualities of music in exercise and sport: The
23 Brunel Music Rating Inventory. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *17*, 713–724.
24 doi:10.1080/026404199365579
- 25 Karvonen, M. J., Kentala, E., & Mustala, O. (1957). The effects of training heart rate: A
26 longitudinal study. *Annals Medicinae Experimentalis et Biologiae Fenniae*, *35*, 307–
27 315.

- 1 Koivula, N., & Hassmen, P. (1998). Central, local and overall ratings of perceived exertion
2 during cycling and running in women with an external or internal locus of control.
3 *The Journal of General Psychology*, *125*, 17–29.
- 4 Large, E. W. (2000). On synchronizing movements to music. *Human Movement Science*, *19*,
5 527–566.
- 6 Lind, E., Welch, A. S., & Ekkekakis, P. (2009). Do ‘mind over muscle’ strategies work?
7 Examining the effects of attentional association and dissociation on exertional,
8 affective and physiological responses to exercise. *Sports Medicine*, *39*, 743–764.
- 9 Loehr, J. D., & Palmer, C. (2009). Subdividing the beat: Auditory and motor contributions to
10 synchronization. *Music Perception: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, *26*, 415–425.
- 11 Lyttle, T., & Montagne, M. (1992). Drugs, music, and ideology: A social pharmacological
12 interpretation of the acid house movement. *Substance Use & Misuse*, *27*, 1159–1177.
13 doi:10.3109/10826089209047341
- 14 Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing qualitative research* (5th ed.). Thousand
15 Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- 16 Martin, A. J., Tipler, D. V., Marsh, H. W., Richards, G. E., & Williams, M. R. (2006).
17 Assessing multidimensional physical activity motivation: A construct validity study of
18 high-school students. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *28*, 171–192.
- 19 McAuley E., Duncan T. E., Tammen, V. V. (1989). Psychometric properties of the Intrinsic
20 Motivation Inventory in a competitive sports setting: A confirmatory factor analysis.
21 *Research Quarterly in Exercise and Sport*, *60*, 48–58.
- 22 North, A. C. & Hargreaves, D. J. (2008). Music and taste. In A. C. North, & D. J. Hargreaves
23 (Eds.), *The social and applied psychology of music* (pp. 75–142). Oxford, UK: Oxford
24 University Press.
- 25 Polar Accurex Plus [Apparatus]. (1996). Kempele, Finland: Polar Electro.
- 26 Powerjog GXC200 [Apparatus]. (1998). Brigend, UK: Powerjog.
- 27 Rejeski, W. J. (1985). Perceived exertion: An active or passive process? *Journal of Sport*
28 *Psychology*, *75*, 371–378.

- 1 Ryan, R. M. (1982). Control and information in the intrapersonal sphere: An extension of
2 cognitive evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *43*, 450–
3 461.
- 4 Schneider, S., Askew, C. D., Abel, T., & Strüder, H. K. (2010). Exercise, music, and the brain:
5 is there a central pattern generator? *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *28*, 1337–1343.
- 6 Shariff, D. T., Rotem, J. R., Battey, C., Battey, S., Jackson, C. J. (2010). Buzzin' [Recorded
7 by Mann and 50 Cent]. On *Mann's World* [CD]. California, LA: Beluga Heights
8 Records.
- 9 Svebak, S., & Murgatroyd, S. (1985). Metemotivational dominance: A multimethod
10 validation of reversal theory constructs. *Journal of Personality and Social*
11 *Psychology*, *48*, 107–116.
- 12 Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics* (5th ed). Needham
13 Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- 14 Tammen, V. V. (1996). Elite middle and long distance runners associative/dissociative
15 coping. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *8*, 1–8.
16 doi:10.1080/10413209608406304
- 17 Tascam CD-A500 [Apparatus]. (1999). Tokyo, Japan: TEAC Corp.
- 18 Tenenbaum, G. (2001). A social-cognitive perspective of perceived exertion and exertion
19 tolerance. In R. N. Singer, H. Hausenblas, & C. Janelle (Eds.), *Handbook of sport*
20 *psychology* (pp. 810–820). New York, NY: Wiley & Sons.
- 21 Thaut, M. H. (2008). Rhythm, music and the brain: Scientific foundations and clinical
22 applications. New York, NY: Routledge.
- 23 van der Zwaag, M. D., Westerink, J. H. D. M., and van den Broek, E. L. (2011). Emotional
24 and psychophysiological responses to tempo, mode, and percussiveness. *Musicae*
25 *Scientiae*, *15*, 250-269. doi:10.1177/1029864911403364
- 26 West, K. O., Bangalter, T., de Homem-Christo, G. E., & Birdsong, E. L. (2007). Stronger
27 [Recorded by Kanye West and Daft Punk]. On *Graduation* [CD]. New York, NY:
28 Roc-A-Fella Records.

1 Table 1

2

3 *Descriptive Statistics for Combined Female and Male Music Preference Scores Across Six Exercise Intensities*

4

Exercise intensity	Music Tempi							
	Slow		Medium		Fast		Very fast	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
40% HRRmax	5.91	2.04	7.91	1.24	6.23	2.15	6.23	2.21
50% HRRmax	6.09	2.47	7.55	1.78	6.68	2.16	6.32	2.18
60% HRRmax	6.59	2.06	7.32	1.36	7.27	1.48	6.32	2.08
70% HRRmax	5.82	2.46	7.68	1.18	7.64	1.19	6.41	1.30
80% HRRmax	5.59	2.25	6.73	1.48	6.82	1.80	5.55	2.08
90% HRRmax	5.05	1.92	6.36	2.10	6.41	1.75	6.18	1.64
Exercise intensity	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Music tempo	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Gender	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
40% HRRmax	6.57	2.12	Slow	5.84	2.27	Male	6.00	2.10
50% HRRmax	6.66	2.24	Medium	7.26	1.66	Female	7.05	1.85
60% HRRmax	6.88	1.84	Fast	6.91	1.86			
70% HRRmax	6.89	1.82	Very fast	6.23	1.97			
80% HRRmax	6.17	2.03						
90% HRRmax	6.00	1.95						

5

6

7

8

9

1 Table 2

2

3 *Descriptive Statistics for Women and Men Combined for Each Dependent Variable Across Six*
4 *Exercise Intensities*

		Feeling Scale		Felt Arousal		State Attention		S FSS-2		IMI IE		IMI PT	
		<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
40%	N	1.82	1.71	2.36	0.66	77.59	23.56	32.32	3.51	3.36	1.09	1.70	0.82
HRR	S	2.27	1.42	3.09	0.92	85.05	12.69	33.45	4.68	4.00	1.23	1.44	0.50
max	M	3.00	1.20	3.45	1.01	86.25	19.16	36.05	4.38	4.78	0.90	1.26	0.42
	F	2.64	1.26	3.14	0.99	85.64	16.83	34.27	4.00	4.27	1.08	1.35	0.47
	VF	2.82	1.47	3.09	1.06	82.68	15.17	35.09	4.40	4.41	1.17	1.48	0.56
50%	N	1.09	1.63	2.59	0.80	64.02	33.88	32.32	4.66	3.21	0.98	1.95	0.65
HRR	S	2.50	1.60	3.32	0.99	76.27	19.14	33.91	4.26	4.13	0.97	1.77	0.84
max	M	3.45	0.96	3.77	1.07	79.11	20.03	34.86	4.06	4.70	1.04	1.55	0.66
	F	2.68	1.64	3.73	1.08	82.25	22.49	35.68	4.89	4.66	1.25	1.70	0.90
	VF	2.59	1.44	3.14	0.71	77.34	21.05	33.86	4.96	4.36	1.06	1.56	0.63
60%	N	1.41	1.79	2.77	0.87	63.18	29.63	32.77	4.91	3.49	1.12	1.99	0.92
HRR	S	2.45	1.34	3.73	1.03	72.98	20.02	34.77	4.86	4.64	0.90	1.87	0.63
max	M	3.00	1.35	4.05	0.84	67.91	21.38	34.86	4.31	4.79	0.67	1.92	0.95
	F	3.05	0.95	3.86	0.94	71.95	23.11	35.50	4.21	4.85	0.96	1.69	0.62
	VF	2.91	1.15	3.68	0.95	70.43	19.84	34.86	4.30	4.72	0.90	1.63	0.58
70%	N	1.27	1.52	3.18	1.10	48.80	29.36	31.64	5.37	3.58	1.04	1.96	0.73
HRR	S	2.27	1.24	3.86	1.04	59.95	27.40	33.95	3.87	4.68	0.71	1.78	0.70
max	M	3.27	0.94	4.36	1.05	63.23	24.28	35.18	4.34	5.16	0.84	1.86	0.69
	F	2.73	1.20	4.23	0.87	64.55	21.78	35.36	3.81	5.12	0.98	1.85	0.84
	VF	2.45	1.34	3.77	1.07	65.73	25.60	33.86	4.29	4.65	0.97	1.89	0.78
80%	N	0.95	2.17	3.50	1.06	29.91	25.81	31.91	5.34	3.88	1.12	2.45	0.93
HRR	S	1.73	1.86	4.05	0.79	54.95	28.04	33.91	4.41	4.58	1.07	1.92	0.74
max	M	2.27	1.67	3.95	1.00	53.39	25.03	35.41	4.19	4.79	0.91	2.06	0.75
	F	2.14	1.58	4.09	0.68	47.23	22.75	34.77	4.96	4.79	0.95	1.95	0.73
	VF	1.32	1.91	4.09	0.87	51.45	26.64	33.14	4.64	4.63	0.89	2.15	0.90
90%	N	-0.36	2.13	4.05	1.05	16.68	20.10	31.32	5.38	3.74	1.18	3.10	0.91
HRR	S	0.64	2.13	4.41	1.01	26.32	22.67	32.86	3.99	4.47	0.94	2.71	1.10
max	M	0.68	1.89	4.32	0.72	28.98	25.48	33.23	3.99	4.47	1.07	2.63	1.16
	F	0.86	2.19	4.59	0.85	32.61	27.64	34.95	4.34	4.61	1.04	2.56	0.91
	VF	1.09	1.80	4.36	0.90	32.48	25.12	33.59	4.76	4.54	0.72	2.74	1.03


5 *Note.* N = No music condition, S = Slow tempo condition, M = Medium tempo condition, F = Fast tempo condition,
6 VF = Very fast tempo condition. A higher state attention score indicates greater dissociation.

1
2 Table 3
3 *Inferential Statistics Results for all Dependent Variables*

	Pillai's trace	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	η_p^2
Interaction effects					
Tempo preference					
Exercise intensity x music tempo x gender		.73	15, 300	.752	.03
Exercise intensity x gender		.60	5, 300	.702	.03
Music tempo x gender		1.01	3, 300	.393	.05
Exercise intensity x music tempo		1.86	6.43, 128.65	.088	.09
In-task affect					
Exercise intensity x music tempo x gender	.10	1.01	40, 800	.455	.05
Exercise intensity x gender	.09	.88	10, 200	.549	.04
Music tempo x gender	.24	2.78	8, 160	.007	.12
Exercise intensity x music tempo	.13	1.35	40, 800	.075	.06
State attention					
Exercise intensity x music tempo x gender		.91	20, 400	.575	.04
Exercise intensity x gender		1.07	5, 400	.383	.05
Music tempo x gender		.54	4, 400	.711	.03
Exercise intensity x music tempo		.849	8.08, 161.64	.562	.04
Motivation variables					
Exercise intensity x music tempo x gender	.15	1.01	60, 1200	.310	.05
Exercise intensity x gender	.13	.93	15, 300	.531	.04
Music tempo x gender	.39	3.02	12, 240	.001	.13
Exercise intensity x music tempo	.16	1.15	60, 1200	.206	.05
Main effects					
Tempo preference					
Exercise intensity		6.17	2.70, 54.11	.002	.24
Condition		6.49	3, 60	.001	.24
Gender		7.57	1, 20	.012	.27
In-task affect					
Exercise intensity	.87	15.36	10, 200	< .001	.43
Condition	.68	10.37	8, 160	< .001	.34
Gender	.11	1.20	2, 19	.324	.11
State attention					
Exercise intensity		54.29	2.16, 43.14	< .001	.73
Condition		6.60	1.80, 35.97	.006	.24
Gender		.20	1, 20	.656	.10
Motivation variables					
Exercise Intensity	.81	7.35	15, 300	< .001	.27
Condition	.64	5.44	12, 240	< .001	.21
Gender	.07	.46	3, 18	.717	.07

1 Table 4
 2
 3 *Results of the Inductive Content Analysis*
 4

Raw data themes ($k = 31$)	First-order themes ($k = 5$)	General dimensions ($k = 2$)	
Enjoyed listening regardless of the intensity I was pretty happy with the music throughout I wasn't worried how tired I was I prefer upbeat tracks because you get into it more	Positive mood state	Enhanced exercise experience	
The music gets you going The music livened me up a little Felt a lot more springy			Arousal
Felt more distracted Takes your mind off the pain Low intensities completely distracted The music took my mind off running I was singing in my head The music helped me zone out The lyrics stood out Concentrating on the lyrics When you had no music at the highest intensity it was even worse The music makes you forget little niggles With the music, it was automatic, I didn't think about doing it	Dissociation		
Push yourself When running was harder the music helped me carry on I was not really motivated without music You can really get going to <i>Stronger</i> Words making me go for it Music is going to help you most at the highest intensities			Increased motivation
I think I changed my steps with the music Linked to how I run My experience of the music depended on how quick I was going Mismatch in beat and movement It was easier to run along with music I like to run to the rhythm If you're running fast, then Chase and Status helps you go a little bit more	Entrainment		Behavioural responses to music



24

25 *Figure 1.* The cubic relationship between exercise heart rate and preference for music tempo
 26 reported by Karageorghis et al. (2011).

27

28 Reproduced with permission from *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, Vol. 82, No. 2,
 29 274–284, Copyright (2011) by the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education,
 30 Recreation and Dance, 1900 Association Drive, Reston, VA 20191.

31

1




Figure 2. Trendlines for music tempo preference ratings across exercise intensities.

2

3

4




Figure 3. Observed relationship between exercise heart rate and music-tempo preference. The plotted scores are means of participants' most preferred tempi at each exercise intensity with standard error bars.

1




Figure 4. Comparison of state attention scores across all exercise intensities between no-music control and fast-tempo music conditions.