STANDARD INTERNATIONAL TRANSLITERATION CODE USED TO TRANSLITERATE SANSKRIT WORDS

a	=	अ	ṅa	=	ङ	pa	=	प
ā	=	आ	ca	=	च	pha	=	फ
i	=	इ	cha	=	छ	ba	=	ब
ī	=	ई	ja	=	ज	bha	=	भ
u	=	उ	jha	=	झ	ma	=	म
ū	=	ऊ	ñ	=	ञ	ya	=	य
ṛ	=	ऋ	ṭa	=	ट	ra	=	र
ṝ	=	ॠ	ṭha	=	ठ	la	=	ल
e	=	ए	ḍa	=	ड	va	=	व
ai	=	ऐ	ḍha	=	ढ	śa	=	श
o	=	ओ	ṇa	=	ण	ṣa	=	ष
au	=	औ	ta	=	त	sa	=	स
ṁ	=	अं	tha	=	थ	ha	=	ह
ḥ	=	अः	da	=	द	kṣa	=	क्ष
ka	=	क	dha	=	ध	tra	=	त्र
kha	=	ख	na	=	न	jña	=	ज्ञ
ga	=	ग						
gha	=	घ						

ABSTRACT

Introduction

One of the most quoted definitions of Yoga is *'yujyate anena iti yogaḥ'*. Here, *'Yuj'* in Sanskrit means 'to Yoke' or to unite. Here it refers to the union of the *jīvātmā* (individual soul) with the *paramātmā* (the supreme soul). Music in it true sense is said to be the union of *shruti* and *laya.* The perfect union of *shruti* and *laya* renders the listeners in a meditative trance provided they submit themselves to the music. Flow experiences (Csikszentmihalyi, 1990) are quite common in music practice, performances and composition. The novel construct introduced in this study focuses on an individual's experience listening to a given piece of music; the focus is on how he internalizes a given piece of music. 'Flow' experiences may occur quite often when an individual internalizes a given piece of music to a great extent. In this study, we proposed and developed a construct, Music Receptivity and further constructed a psychometric instrument called Music Receptivity Scale (MRS), field-tested it and data analysis revealed good psychometric properties.

Literature review

Ancient scriptures were reviewed which unraveled various aspects of music and how music could be used as a tool for personal and spiritual upliftment. Further, scientific literature review revealed multiple studies that focused on musical engagement, musical aptitude etc. Multiple psychometric instruments are available which measures the trait aspects predominantly, of music listening and engagement. Hence, we clearly saw a lacunae for state measuring instruments in music listening. However, these studies gave us rich inputs while developing the Music Receptivity Scale (MRS).

Aim

To develop an instrument to measure music receptivity in the context of Indian music.

Objectives

1. To construct an instrument to measure music receptivity by item generation and validation.

2. To test and validate the instrument amongst different individuals in the context of Indian music.
3. To find out the validity of the developed instrument (in a *bhajan* setup) amongst yoga population.

Methods

Participants

For phase 1 of the study, with the aim of generating items for the instrument, we approached music experts from the department of music, University of Kerala and also Sree Swathi Tirunal College of Music, Trivandrum, for in-depth unstructured interviews. Data redundancy was reached by the 7th interview. Further we approached another 7 experts from the field of music for a Focus Group Discussion, from above-mentioned two colleges. For phase 2, we approached two colleges, one was Marian Engineering College, Trivandrum and the other was Immanuel College, Vazhichal. We conducted the pilot study with 63 individuals from Marian Engineering College and field-testing of the tool with 212 individuals from the same college. Additionally we conducted field-testing with 101 individuals from Immanuel College, Vazhichal. Further, we field-tested the tool with 44 musicians from the Department of Music, University of Kerala. In order to validate the MRS among the Yoga population, we selected 72 Yoga students (male -28, female – 44) from S-VYASA Yoga University, Bengaluru. Mean age among male students were 26 and that among female students were 25.

Design

The research design was a mixed design, employing both qualitative and quantitative methods. Phase 1 was qualitative study and phase 2 was quantitative study employing survey method. The Music Receptivity Scale (MRS) was also validated amongst a Yoga population.

Assessment tools

For the qualitative phase:

In-depth interview guide (Probe questions)

Focus group discussion guide

For the quantitative phase:

Music Receptivity Scale (MRS)

Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability Scale (SDS)

d2 test of attention

Interest In Music (IIM) Scale

Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS-SF)

Mind Wandering Scale (MWS)

Data extraction and analysis

Three sets of data, pilot (n=63), general population (n=313), musicians (n=44) were separately analyzed. The final sample size used to report the results is 313, which is in the ratio of 13 cases per item, more than the recommended 10 cases per item. All the analyses were done using R statistical software, version 3.4.2 (R Development Core Team, 2020) and its packages psych (Revelle, 2019). To refine the construct of music receptivity, and to get inputs for item generation, we conducted unstructured in-depth interviews and focus group discussion. Items were generated based on the inputs obtained from the in-depth interviews and the FGD. The consolidated questionnaire had 23 items designed to capture the domains of attention, interest, lyrical appraisal, emotional experience and hurdles. As the aim of this study was to evaluate the structure of music receptivity scale (MRS), we used exploratory factor analysis to determine the number and nature of underlying factors of MRS. We used parallel analysis to determine the number of factors to retain (Horn, 1965); principal axis factoring was performed to evaluate the number of underlying factors by employing oblique rotation (oblimin) as the domains were anticipated to be correlated. Maximum iterations for convergence were fixed at 1000. The analyses revealed more than one solution.

Results

Data analysis yielded two solutions – a two factor solution (Affect and Attention) and a four factor solution (Emotion, interest, attention and hurdles). Validation amongst Yoga population yielded mixed results for convergent and divergent validity.

Discussion

We intended to develop an instrument to measure music receptivity, field test it and assess its psychometric properties and as a culmination of which, we developed a 20-item questionnaire having four domains (emotional experience, interest, attention, hurdles) and a shorter 12-item version of the same. The two-factor solution was a reduced item version, and it yielded the two most important meta-components of music receptivity, i.e., affect and attention. The affect domain included interest and emotional experience, whereas attention remained as a separate factor. We could also observe discriminant validity between musicians and non-musicians, where the musicians had significantly higher music receptivity scores compared to non-musicians.

Conclusion

The Music Receptivity Scale was developed and it has a 20 item long form and a 12 item short form. As this tool was primarily intended for music therapy purposes, this tool needs to be field tested in music therapy settings. Further, the mode of application of this tool could be via a mobile application for the ease of use.

CONTENTS

Sl. No.	DETAILS	PAGE NO.
1.0	**INTRODUCTION**	1
1.1	Music Receptivity: Operational definition of terms	2
1.2	How is music internalized?	3
2.0	**REVIEW OF ANCIENT LITERATURE**	8
2.1	Aim	8
2.2	Objectives	8
2.3	Methodology	8
2.3.1	Reviewed classical texts on Indian music	8
2.3.2	Methods	9
2.4	Ancient Scriptures – Transliteration, translation and explanation	9
2.5	Result	47
2.6	Conclusion	48
3.0	**REVIEW OF SCIENTIFIC LITERATURE**	49
3.1	Studies related to Music Receptivity	49
3.2	Receptivity in psychological and biological processes	57
3.3	Need for a new construct – Music Receptivity	57
3.4	Other tools that attempts to assess related constructs	58
4.0	**AIM AND OBJECTIVES**	60
4.1	Aim	60
4.2	Objectives	60

4.3	Justification for the study	60
4.4	Research questions	61
5.0	**METHODS**	62
5.1	Participants	62
5.1.1	Sample size	62
5.1.2	Selection and source of participants	62
5.1.3	Inclusion criteria	63
5.1.4	Exclusion criteria	63
5.1.5	Ethical consideration	63
5.2	Design of the study	63
5.3	Variable studied	63
5.4.1	Phase 1 – Qualitative study	63
5.4.2	Phase 2 – Quantitative study	64
5.5.1	Content validity	64
5.5.2	Face validity	65
5.6	Field-testing of the tool	65
5.6.1	Pilot study	65
5.6.2	Field-validation	67
5.6.3	Field-validation with musicians	68
5.6.4	Validation amongst Yoga population	68
6.0	**RESULTS**	72
6.1	Data screening and extraction	72
6.2	Qualitative analysis of interviews and focus group discussions	72
6.2.1	Item generation	73
6.3	Factor analysis	73
6.3.1	Factor analysis of pilot data (n=63)	73

6.3.2	Factor analysis of main data (n=313)	74
6.4	Reliability of Music Receptivity Scale	81
6.4.1	Internal consistency	81
6.4.2	Test-retest reliability	81
6.5	Validation of first item	81
6.6	Factor analysis of musicians data (n=44)	81
6.7	Influence of social desirability	82
6.8	Results of validation of MRS amongst Yoga population	82
7.0	**DISCUSSION**	85
7.1	Discussion of yoga population study	89
8.0	**APPRAISAL**	91
8.1	Summary	91
8.2	Conclusion	92
8.3	Strength of the study	92
8.4	Limitation of the study	92
8.5	Application of the study	92
8.6	Suggestions for future work	93
	REFERENCES	94
	APPENDIX	
1.	Institutional Ethics Committee approval	
2.	Participant informed consent forms	
3.	Interview probe questions	
4.	Focus group discussion guide	
5.	Relevant parts from the interview	
6.	Relevant parts from the interview CODED	

7.	Common points from the interview CODED	
8.	Unique comments from the interview CODED	
9.	Common comments from the FGD CODED	
10.	Unique comments from the FGD CODED	
11.	Sociogram FGD	
12.	Content validation sheet	
13.	Face validation	
14.	Handout – Music Receptivity Scale (MRS)	
15.	Intelligent translation of the song lyrics	
16.	Social Desirability Scale (SDS)	
17.	Interest in Music Scale (IiM)	
18.	Mind Wandering Scale (MWS)	
19.	Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS-SF)	
20.	Data	
	LIST OF TABLES	Page no
1.	Studies related to Music Receptivity	51
2.	Four factor and two factor solutions for the 20 item Music Receptivity Scale (MRS)	75
3.	Two factor solution for the 12 item Music Receptivity Scale (MRS)	79
4.	Pearson's correlation values of Music Receptivity Scale (MRS) and other scales (n=72)	83
5.	P values of correlation test: Music Receptivity Scale (MRS) and other scales (df=70)	84

	LIST OF FIGURES	Page no.
1.	Conceptual framework of Music Receptivity	4
2.	Four factor solution for the 20 item Music Receptivity Scale (MRS)	77
3.	Two factor solution for the 20 item Music Receptivity Scale (MRS)	78
4.	Two factor solution for the 12 item Music Receptivity Scale (MRS)	80