



**Investigating the predictive validity of implicit and explicit measures of motivation on condom use, physical activity and healthy eating**

**Author**

Keatley, David, Clarke, David D, Hagger, Martin S

**Published**

2012

**Journal Title**

Psychology and Health

**Version**

Accepted Manuscript (AM)

**DOI**

[10.1080/08870446.2011.605451](https://doi.org/10.1080/08870446.2011.605451)

**Downloaded from**

<http://hdl.handle.net/10072/171929>

**Griffith Research Online**

<https://research-repository.griffith.edu.au>

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

Investigating the Predictive Validity of Implicit and Explicit Measures of Motivation on  
Condom Use, Physical Activity, and Healthy Eating

Keatley, D. A., Clarke, D. D., & Hagger, M. S. (2012). Investigating the predictive validity of implicit and explicit measures of motivation on condom use, physical activity, and healthy eating. *Psychology & Health, 27*, 550-569. doi: 10.1080/08870446.2011.605451

**Abstract**

1  
2 The literature on health-related behaviors and motivation is replete with research involving  
3 explicit processes and their relations with intentions and behavior. Recently, interest has  
4 focused on the impact of implicit processes and measures on health-related behaviors. Dual-  
5 systems models have been proposed to provide a framework for understanding the effects of  
6 explicit or deliberative and implicit or impulsive processes on health behaviors. Informed by the  
7 dual-systems approach and self-determination theory, the aim of the present study was to test  
8 the effects of implicit and explicit motivation on three health-related behaviors in a sample of  
9 undergraduate students (N=162). Implicit motives were hypothesized to predict behavior  
10 independent of intentions while explicit motives would be mediated by intentions. Regression  
11 analyses indicated implicit motivation predicted physical activity behavior only. Across all  
12 behaviors, intention mediated the effects of explicit motivational variables from self-  
13 determination theory. This study provides limited support for dual-systems models and the role  
14 of implicit motivation in the prediction of health-related behavior. Future research could seek  
15 to further test the role of implicit motivational constructs in predicting health behavior by  
16 manipulating motives using priming methods.  
17

1 Investigating the Predictive Validity of Implicit and Explicit Measures of Motivation on  
2 Condom Use, Physical Activity, and Healthy Eating

3 Traditionally, research examining the motivational antecedents of individuals' health-  
4 related behavior (e.g., physical activity, following a healthy diet, quitting smoking, reducing  
5 alcohol consumption) has adopted an *explicit* approach. Such approaches assume that  
6 behavioral engagement is a rational, deliberative process with the antecedents measured  
7 explicitly through self-report measures. Based on trends in this explicit-oriented research,  
8 components of intervention strategies have mainly focused on changing these explicitly-  
9 conceptualized constructs to evoke behavior change and promote health-related outcomes  
10 (Chatzisarantis & Hagger, 2009; Hardeman et al., 2002; Silva et al., 2008). Existing theoretical  
11 approaches and interventions have been most effective in the prediction and manipulation of  
12 behaviors that are explicitly goal-oriented or planned (e.g., physical activity, following a  
13 healthy diet). However, behaviors that are more likely to have a spontaneous or impulsive  
14 component (e.g., condom use, smoking) have proved more difficult to predict and more  
15 resilient to intervention strategies. Consequently, theoretical models focusing solely on  
16 explicit, rational processes have been criticized for not accounting for the more impulsive  
17 processes that lead to action (e.g., Ingham, 1994).

18 Recent research has provided increasing support for the role of implicit, automatic  
19 processes in motivation and subsequent initiation of behaviors e.g., (Banting, Dimmock, &  
20 Lay, 2009; Czopp, Monteith, Zimmerman, & Lynam, 2004; Marsh, Johnson, & Scott-Sheldon,  
21 2001; Sherman, Chassin, Presson, Seo, & Macy, 2009). The process by which implicit and  
22 explicit processes affect health-related behaviors has typically been explained in terms of *dual-*  
23 *systems models* (Hofmann, Friese, & Strack, 2009; Strack & Deutsch, 2004). The aim of the  
24 current research was to provide an important advancement to this literature by developing and  
25 testing hypotheses derived from a dual-systems model, based on Strack and Deutsch's (2004)  
26 reflective-impulsive model, to investigate the independent effects of implicit and explicit

1 motivation on health-related behavior. Specifically, this investigation tested a motivational  
2 model examining the relative contribution of the reflective and impulsive systems in explaining  
3 variance in three prominent health-related behaviors: condom use, regular physical activity,  
4 and adequate fruit and vegetable consumption. The implicit association test (IAT; Greenwald,  
5 McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998) was adapted to measure individuals' motivation orientation  
6 according to dimensions set-out in Deci and Ryan's (2008) self-determination theory.

### 7 **Self-Determination Theory (SDT)**

8         Self-determination theory, an organismic theory of human motivation, has been applied  
9 extensively to health-related behaviors such as physical activity (Biddle, Soos, &  
10 Chatzisarantis, 1999; Hagger, Chatzisarantis, Culverhouse, & Biddle, 2003), eating a healthy  
11 diet (Hagger, Chatzisarantis, & Harris, 2006b; Pelletier, Dion, Slovinec-D'Angelo, & Reid,  
12 2004), and smoking cessation (Joseph, Grimshaw, Amjad, & Stanton, 2005; Williams et al.,  
13 2006). A key premise of SDT is that individuals' needs and social agents act synergistically to  
14 account for the motivation that drives behavioral engagement. The quality of individuals'  
15 motivation is also central to SDT, the focal distinction being between two main forms of  
16 motivation, *autonomous* and *controlled*. Individuals engaging in behavior for autonomous or  
17 self-determined motives do so for the inherent interest, enjoyment, and satisfaction of  
18 performing the behavior and are likely to persist with that behavior without external incentive  
19 or contingency. In contrast, individuals may perform behaviors for controlled or heteronomous  
20 motives and do so due to pressures perceived to lie outside the individual or for the attainment  
21 of external rewards (e.g., money, recognition). Self-determination theory, and interventions  
22 based on the theory, are attractive to researchers and practitioners interested in promoting  
23 health behavior because fostering autonomous motivation toward key health-related behaviors  
24 (e.g., physical activity, following a healthy diet) is likely to lead to adherence to those  
25 behaviors without the need for external reinforcement or contingencies (Chatzisarantis &  
26 Hagger, 2009; Chatzisarantis, Hagger, Biddle, Smith, & Wang, 2003). This means that

1 individuals will be more effective in self-regulating their behavior without the need for  
2 clinicians and health workers prompting, reminding, or cajoling them to persist.

3         These forms of motivation, from more autonomous to more controlled, are  
4 conceptualized as lying on a continuum, the *perceived locus of causality* (PLOC; Ryan &  
5 Connell, 1989). Externally-referenced behaviors may be adopted and endorsed so that they  
6 become part of a person's repertoire of behaviors that satisfy psychological needs. The PLOC  
7 outlines how this degree of internalization and integration of behavior with personally held  
8 values also reflects changes in the types of underlying motivation. *Intrinsic motivation* is  
9 situated at one extreme of the continuum and represents feelings of autonomy and stimulates  
10 performance of a task due to its inherent merits. *Integrated regulation* lies immediately  
11 adjacent to intrinsic motivation and is the most self-determined of the extrinsic motivation  
12 subtypes, relating to behaviors fully integrated into an individual's sense of self, but still  
13 conducted for external contingencies. *Identified regulation* is situated adjacent to integrated  
14 regulation and relates to performing behavior for outcomes that are deemed personally  
15 important. *Introjected regulation* is a less autonomous form of motivation than identified  
16 regulation and is characterized as performing behaviors in order to avoid negative internal  
17 states (e.g., shame, guilt). Finally, *external regulation*, is the most controlled form of  
18 motivation, and lies at the opposite extreme pole of the continuum relative to intrinsic  
19 motivation. External regulation is the prototypical form of extrinsic motivation, reflecting  
20 behaviors performed solely for external reinforcement (e.g., money, rewards). Persistence  
21 increases for behaviors that are performed for more autonomous reasons, and the continuum  
22 charts how some behaviors can be 'taken in' or internalized such that perceptions about them  
23 change from being externally-referenced and controlled to internally-referenced and  
24 autonomous.

25         A further premise of self-determination theory is that individuals exhibit individual  
26 differences in dispositional motivational orientations, which are also conceptualized as

1 autonomous or controlling. Differences in these relatively-enduring motivational orientations  
2 are outlined in General Causality Orientations theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985). These differences  
3 in orientations illustrate a generalized tendency to interpret situations as autonomous or  
4 controlling across a range of behavioral contexts. Motivational orientations may moderate the  
5 effect of external contingencies and environmental factors on individuals' motivation and  
6 hence subsequent behavioral engagement. For example, individuals with an autonomous  
7 orientation will be more likely to interpret behaviors as internally-referenced and emanating  
8 from the self (i.e., self-determined), and thus persist longer (Hagger & Chatzisarantis, 2011). In  
9 terms of health-related behaviors, autonomously-oriented individuals are likely to engage and  
10 maintain healthy behaviors without the need for external reinforcement (Deci & Ryan, 1985).  
11 However, causality orientations are likely to be a distal influence more proximal motivational  
12 factors that influence health-related behavior in specific contexts, such as PLOC constructs, for  
13 behaviors like dieting, physical activity, reducing alcohol intake, and smoking cessation. It is  
14 also possible that generalized motivational constructs like causality orientations affect behavior  
15 outside of conscious awareness (Bargh & Ferguson, 2000; Bargh, Gollwitzer, Lee-Chai,  
16 Barndollar, & Trötschel, 2001). Implicitly-measured motivational orientations predicated on  
17 associative learning, such as the implicit association test, should be well-positioned to provide  
18 valid measurement of these underlying dispositional motivational orientations and permit the  
19 testing of models that incorporate such motives alongside more traditional explicit measures  
20 (Kehr, 2004).

21 Previous research has investigated the link between implicit processes and underlying  
22 chronic dispositional motivational orientations like those represented in General Causality  
23 Orientations theory (Levesque & Pelletier, 2003). Levesque and Pelletier demonstrated that  
24 priming autonomous or controlled orientations led to performance similar to individuals who  
25 were chronically oriented toward autonomous or controlled motivation. It was also shown that  
26 individuals with chronic autonomous or controlled motivational orientations were not affected

1 by priming manipulations. This gives preliminary support for the theory that implicit  
2 motivational constructs exert unique effects on behavior. Furthermore, as priming autonomous  
3 or controlled motivation leads to similar behavioral outcomes as individuals with chronic  
4 autonomous or controlled orientations, this provides support for the generalized, trait-like, and  
5 relatively stable and enduring nature of the implicit motivational constructs. Therefore, the  
6 implicit measure (IAT score) of self-determined motivation adopted in the current research is  
7 expected to represent generalized, dispositional motivational orientations and would be  
8 expected to provide generalized predictions of behavior in all three health-related contexts.

9         An alternative approach to measuring implicit motivation may be to develop measures  
10 that focus on the context of the specific content domain. This form of implicit measure is  
11 frequently adopted in the implicit attitude literature (Greenwald et al., 1998; Greenwald &  
12 Nosek, 2001; Richetin, Perugini, Prestwich, & O’Gorman, 2007). However, with respect to  
13 implicit motivation measurement, obtaining a context-specific measure presents additional  
14 challenges due to the need for three categories to be simultaneously measured (‘self’,  
15 ‘motivation’ and ‘behavior’). To the authors’ knowledge, no such measure is currently  
16 available. An alternative possibility may be to prime the contexts by presenting a picture of a  
17 particular behavior as a backdrop to the IAT trial screen. In the current research we adopted a  
18 traditional two-category IAT to measure implicit motivational orientations from SDT. The  
19 implicit measure should, therefore, reflect more global, trait-like motivation orientations and  
20 the present study will investigate whether these orientations predict engagement across a range  
21 of behaviors, rather than using several context-specific implicit measures. While the implicit  
22 measures and explicit measures are different in terms of generality, the present investigation  
23 allows us to study the generalizability of the globally-measured implicit motivational processes  
24 across behavioral domains beyond the impact of context-specific explicit motivational factors<sup>1</sup>.

25 **Combining Self-Determination Theory and Implicit Processes**

1           A growing number of studies have examined the role of implicit motives as an  
2 influence on behavior and behavioral outcomes in the context of self-determination theory  
3 (Banting et al., 2009; Burton, Lydon, D'Alessandro, & Koestner, 2006; Levesque & Brown,  
4 2007; Levesque, Copeland, & Sutcliffe, 2008; Levesque & Pelletier, 2003). For example,  
5 Burton and colleagues (2006) studied the effect of implicit intrinsic and identified forms of  
6 motivation, tapped using a lexical decision task, on students' well-being and exam  
7 performance. Results supported the significant contribution of implicit forms autonomous  
8 motivation in the prediction of exam performance, providing preliminary support for the  
9 predictive validity of implicit measures of autonomous motivation. However, a limitation of  
10 this research was that more widely-used and validated implicit measures (e.g., IAT,  
11 Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998; or single-category IAT, Karpinski & Steinman,  
12 2006) were not employed, and it did not investigate the relative contributions of implicit and  
13 explicit measures in the explanation of behavior and behavioral outcomes in the context of  
14 dual-route models of behavior.

15           Further research into the relationship between implicit processes and motivation was  
16 conducted by Levesque and Brown (2007). In their research, an IAT was developed to measure  
17 implicit self-determined motivation. The relationship between implicit and explicit measures of  
18 motivation was investigated, as well as the possibility of a moderator, *mindfulness* – the degree  
19 to which an individual has a dispositionally elevated level of attention and awareness. Results  
20 indicated that implicit autonomy orientation provided significant prediction of day-to-day  
21 behavioral motivation for participants with lower levels of mindfulness. Levesque and Brown's  
22 research provides further support for the important role of implicit motivation in the prediction  
23 of behavior in the context of self-determination theory. However, Levesque and Brown did not  
24 integrate their research with theoretical models of behavior that incorporate both implicit and  
25 explicit constructs as influencing behavior, such as dual-route models (see Strack & Deutsch,

1 2004; Hoffman, Freise, & Wiers, 2009) which may have elucidated further the psychological  
2 processes underpinning their findings.

3 Additional research on the relationship between implicit and explicit measures of  
4 motivation has also been investigated (e.g., Brunstein & Schmitt, 2004; Thrash, Elliot, &  
5 Schultheiss, 2007). For example, Brunstein and Schmitt investigated the relationship between  
6 implicit measures of motivation and self-reported task enjoyment. Implicit achievement  
7 motivation, measured by an IAT, predicted performance, but failed to predict self-reported task  
8 enjoyment. This provides some indication that implicit and explicit measures may provide  
9 prediction of independent aspects of behavior. Similarly, Thrash and colleagues suggested  
10 several methodological (e.g., correspondence of content) and dispositional (e.g., access to  
11 implicit motives, concern with social environment) factors that predicted the degree of  
12 congruence between implicitly and explicitly measured achievement motivation. In their  
13 research a picture task was used to assess implicit motivation and such imagery tasks have  
14 been shown to promote congruence between implicit motives and explicit goals (Schultheiss &  
15 Brunstein, 1999). It is important, therefore, to determine the relationship implicit and explicit  
16 measures on motivation and behavior in health related contexts.

### 17 **Dual-Systems Models**

18 Several models of the direct and multiplicative effects of explicit and implicit processes  
19 on behavior have been proposed (Back, Schulke, & Egloff, 2009; Fazio & Towles-Schwen,  
20 1999; Strack & Deutsch, 2004; Wilson, Lindsey, & Schooler, 2000). Drawing on the existing  
21 literature, Strack and Deutsch (2004) developed the reflective impulsive model (RIM), which  
22 comprehensively and parsimoniously accounts for explicit and implicit processes that lead to  
23 behavior, which are conceptualized as the reflective and impulsive system, respectively. In the  
24 model, the reflective system encompasses those processes that are deliberative, based on the  
25 consideration of available information and intended future states. The impulsive system, in  
26 contrast, comprises processes that arise from reflective or perceptual input and schemata

1 underpinned by associative networks. To this extent, explicit measures are proposed to provide  
2 an account of the reflective system, while implicit measures gauge the impulsive system. A  
3 further relevant benefit of this model is the inclusion of motivational orientations into the  
4 processes. Essentially, the impulsive system may be oriented toward either approach or  
5 avoidance. Furthermore, the model outlines that compatibility between the dominant  
6 motivation orientation and environmental or reflective input leads to facilitation of processing,  
7 possibly leading to a reduction in cognitive depletion and more effective self-regulation  
8 (Hagger, Wood, Stiff, & Chatzisarantis, 2009, 2010; Kehr, 2004).

9         Research in health behavior contexts has adopted this dual-systems model to establish  
10 the relative contribution of impulsive and reflective processes on health-related behavioral  
11 engagement and outcomes (Back et al., 2009; Hofmann & Friese, 2008; Marsh et al., 2001).  
12 For example, Perugini (2005) examined the efficacy of different models to explain the pattern  
13 of effects of implicit and explicit constructs on health related behavior. Perugini provided  
14 support for multiplicative (interactions between the two systems) and double-dissociation  
15 (implicit influences spontaneous behavior, whereas explicit influences deliberative behavior)  
16 models. These findings are consistent with dual-systems models, such that the two systems  
17 may provide unique effects on behavior. As implicit motives tend to reflect more generalized,  
18 trait-like influences (Levesque & Pelletier, 2003), it follows that such factors are likely to  
19 determine whether behavior is perceived as being more congruent with psychological needs,  
20 thus more autonomous, or incongruent with needs, thus, more controlling.

## 21 **The Present Study**

22         The aim of the present study was to evaluate the role of implicit and explicit measures  
23 of self-determined motivation in the prediction of health-behaviors using a dual-systems model  
24 as a framework. A model, based on previous examples in the literature (Back et al., 2009), was  
25 developed to provide an account of the expected relationships between implicit motivation,  
26 explicit motivation, and health-related behavior. From this framework, a number of hypotheses

1 were derived. First ( $H_1$ ), it was predicted that an implicitly-measured autonomous motivation  
2 construct would have a direct, unique effect on behavior, independent of explicitly-measured  
3 motivational constructs. This hypothesis was based on previous studies indicating direct effects  
4 of implicit measures on health-related behaviors (Czopp et al., 2004; Marsh et al., 2001).  
5 Second ( $H_2$ ), it was predicted that intention would provide valid prediction of behavior. This  
6 hypothesis is based on previous research adopting social cognitive models such as the theory of  
7 planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen & Fishbein, 2009), which propose that intentions are the  
8 most proximal determinant of behavior in the reflective system and will provide consistently  
9 valid prediction of behavior (Ajzen & Fishbein, 2009). A further hypothesis ( $H_3$ ) was that  
10 intention would mediate the effect of explicitly-measured motivational constructs on behavior  
11 based on the hypotheses of intentional theories and supported by empirical findings (Ajzen &  
12 Fishbein, 2009; Back et al., 2009; Bagozzi, Baumgartner, & Yi, 1989).

## 13 **Method**

### 14 **Participants**

15 Undergraduate students ( $N = 162$ ; 101 female, 61 male,  $M_{\text{age}} = 22.12$ , range: 18-44  
16 years) participated in the current study. Only 150 participants' data were analyzed, due to  
17 twelve failing to complete the follow-up. Further analyses indicated no significant differences  
18 in age ( $t(160) = 0.27, p = .83$ ) and gender ( $\chi^2(1) = 3.44, p = .14$ ) for those who responded and  
19 those who did not. Students eligible to participate in the study were contacted via email with  
20 study details and provided with the opportunity to participate. An €5 inconvenience allowance  
21 was administered in return for participation. The study protocol was approved by the School of  
22 Psychology Ethics Internal Review Board at the University of [location omitted for peer  
23 review].

### 24 **Materials and Procedure**

25 **Implicit autonomous and controlled motivation.** Implicit autonomous and controlled  
26 motivational orientations were measured using the implicit association test (IAT). Words

1 representing intrinsic (choice, free, spontaneous, willing, authentic) and extrinsic (pressured,  
2 restricted, forced, should, controlled) motivation were taken from research conducted by  
3 Levesque and Brown (2007). These words were shown to offer a distinct representation of the  
4 two orientations. Words pertaining to ‘self’ (I, me, my, mine, self) and ‘others’ (others, they,  
5 them, their, theirs) were also adopted from Levesque and Brown’s lists. The label ‘others’ was  
6 adopted because it was more easy to distinguish from the label ‘self’ than ‘non-self’ was from  
7 ‘self’. Previous researchers have also used these category headings in the context of the IAT  
8 (e.g., Brunstein & Schmitt, 2004). The category ‘others’ was fully explained to participants as  
9 reflecting a ‘not-self’ category, rather than a more generalized social-comparison category. The  
10 standard five-step IAT was used in which blocks 1, 2, and 4 were practice, each lasting 20  
11 trials; test blocks (3 and 5) comprised 60 trials – 20 practice and 40 test (see Table 1). The IAT  
12 measure was calculated using the improved *D*-score algorithm (Greenwald, Nosek, & Banaji,  
13 2003). Coding was such that higher scores were indicative of an autonomous motivational  
14 orientation.

15       **Perceived locus of causality.** Participants’ explicit contextual-level forms of motivation  
16 based on the perceived locus of causality (PLOC) was measured through an adaption of Ryan  
17 and Connell’s (1989) PLOC scale. It was deemed important to evaluate the implicit measure  
18 alongside previously-adopted explicit measures in order to gain insight into the extent to which  
19 the implicit measure explains unique variance beyond the explicit measures. This would then  
20 have direct implications for advancing knowledge of the areas as it will provide some evidence  
21 to evaluate the extent to which the findings from previous research using these explicit  
22 measures would differ were implicit measures of autonomous motivation included (see  
23 McClelland, 1985). A common stem for each behavior was given (e.g., “I exercise regularly  
24 (3-4 times a week) because...”). A series of reasons, four per regulation type, relating to the  
25 various forms of motivation was then listed (e.g., intrinsic motivation: “I enjoy ...”; identified  
26 regulation: “I think it is important to...”; introjected regulation: “I feel under pressure to...”;

1 extrinsic regulation: “I will feel ashamed if I do not...”). These were measured on a four-point  
2 Likert-type scale ranging from *not true at all* (1) to *very true* (4).

3       The PLOC scales were converted into weighted means representing controlled and  
4 autonomous motivation. The index for controlled motivation was calculated as the extrinsic  
5 regulation items, weighted by a factor of 2, added to introjected regulation items. This  
6 calculation was then repeated for the index of autonomous motivation; items measuring  
7 intrinsic motivation were weighted by 2, and added to an identified regulation items. This  
8 produced separate scales for each motivational form and reduced the number of overall  
9 variables making interpretation of analysis clearer. For example, autonomous motivation item  
10 1 = (identified item 1 x 1) + (intrinsic item 1 x 2); autonomous motivation item 2 = (identified  
11 item 2 x 1) + (intrinsic item 2 x 2) and so on. The same analysis was conducted for controlled  
12 motivation items (Cronbach’s  $\alpha$  for both scales = .71).

13       **Intention.** Intentions to perform the behaviors were measured using two items (e.g., “I  
14 intend to...” and “I plan to...”; inter-item correlations for all behaviors were > .90). Responses  
15 were given on seven-point Likert-type scales from *unlikely* (1), to *very likely* (7).

16       **Self-reported behavior.** Participants gave self-reports of their performance for each of  
17 the behaviors (e.g., “In the past 4 weeks, how often have you eaten at least five portions of fruit  
18 and vegetables?”) using seven-point Likert-type scales from *never* (1) to *almost everyday* (7).  
19 The criterion and concurrent validity of this measure has been verified against objective  
20 measures (Chatzisarantis, Hagger, Smith, & Phoenix, 2004; Hagger, Chatzisarantis, & Harris,  
21 2006a; Norman et al., 2010).

## 22 **Procedure**

23       The study adopted a prospective design with psychological measures administered at an  
24 initial time point and follow-up self-reported measures of behavior taken at a second point in  
25 time, four weeks later. All participants were tested in isolation in a sound-proofed experimental  
26 cubicle. After information on the experimental requirements was given, and informed consent

1 gained, they were left to complete the study. A researcher was close-by at all times in case  
2 further assistance was required. Participants completed the IAT administered using E-Prime  
3 experimental software. Further instructions and guidance was offered through the E-Prime  
4 introduction screens, as well as the standard practice trials within the program. The IAT  
5 procedure lasted approximately five minutes. After completion of the implicit measure,  
6 participants were asked to move on to the questionnaire, also administered using the E-Prime  
7 software, which lasted approximately 20 minutes. Trials were fully counterbalanced such that  
8 half the participants conducted the implicit measure first, while the remainder completed the  
9 explicit measures first. Participants were contacted via email or telephone, depending on  
10 personal preference, and their performance of the behaviors was subsequently assessed, four  
11 weeks later. After completion of the follow-up questionnaire, the aim of the study was  
12 explained and any further questions answered to the satisfaction of all participants.

## 13 **Results**

### 14 **Preliminary analyses**

15 The improved scoring algorithm (Greenwald et al., 2003) was used to calculate the  
16 implicit motivation score from the IAT data. No participants were eliminated due to having  
17 more than 10% of scores sub-300 ms; no values exceeded 10,000ms. *D*-scores were calculated  
18 such that higher scores were indicative of a higher level of implicit autonomous motivation  
19 orientation. Zero-order correlations (see Table 1) were computed between the implicit measure  
20 of self-determined motivation (IAT-*D* score), explicit measures of self-determined and  
21 controlled motivation, and outcome behaviors. For all behaviors, intention and explicit  
22 measures of motivation were significantly correlated. The implicit measure (IAT-*D* score) of  
23 autonomous motivation correlated significantly with explicit controlled motivation for the  
24 condom use and physical activity behaviors.

### 25 **Predicting Behavior**

1 Hierarchical regression analyses were conducted to assess the unique contribution of  
2 the implicit and explicit motivational measures (step 1) and intention (step 2). Standardized  
3 regression coefficients and  $R^2$  values from the regression analyses are shown in Table 2<sup>2</sup>. Sobel  
4 (1982) tests were used to provide a formal test of the indirect effect of explicit measures of  
5 autonomous and controlled motivation on behavior through intention<sup>3</sup>.

6 **Condom use.** The effect of the hypothesized predictor variables on condom use in the first step  
7 was significant ( $R^2 = .26, p < .001$ ),  $F(3, 73) = 8.37, p < .001$ . The effect of the implicit  
8 measure (IAT score) on condom use behavior did not reach the 0.05 alpha criterion for  
9 significance and on this basis our hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) had to be rejected<sup>4</sup>. The explicit autonomous  
10 motivation scale was not a significant predictor of behavior, but explicit controlled motivation  
11 provided a significant prediction ( $\beta = .41, p < .001$ ). There was a significant change in  $R^2$  in the  
12 second step ( $\Delta R^2 = .23, p < .001$ ),  $F(4, 73) = 16.56, p < .001$ . Intention was the sole significant  
13 predictor of behavior ( $\beta = .61, p < .001$ ), while explicit controlled motivation was no longer a  
14 predictor. This indicated that condom use was determined by explicitly-measured intention as  
15 predicted ( $H_2$ ). Sobel (1982) tests indicated that intention mediated the relationship between  
16 explicitly-measured autonomous motivation and behavior (standardized regression  
17 coefficients: autonomous motivation  $\rightarrow$  intention,  $\beta = .24, p = .003$ ; intention  $\rightarrow$  behavior,  $\beta =$   
18  $.61, p < .001$ , autonomous motivation  $\rightarrow$  behavior,  $\beta = -.03, p = .76$ ; autonomous  
19 motivation  $\rightarrow$  intention  $\rightarrow$  behavior =  $.15, p = .052$ ). Intention also significantly mediated the  
20 effect of explicitly-measured controlled motivation on behavior (standardized regression  
21 coefficients: controlled motivation  $\rightarrow$  intention,  $\beta = .36, p < .001$ ; intention  $\rightarrow$  behavior,  $\beta = .61,$   
22  $p < .001$ ; controlled motivation  $\rightarrow$  behavior,  $\beta = .13, p = .23$ ; controlled  
23 motivation  $\rightarrow$  intention  $\rightarrow$  behavior =  $.22, p < .001$ ). Hypothesis ( $H_3$ ) was therefore supported for  
24 condom use as intention mediated the relationship between both autonomous and controlled  
25 motivation and behavior.

1 **Physical activity.** There was a significant effect of the hypothesized predictors and physical  
2 activity behavior in the first step ( $R^2 = .22, p < .001$ ),  $F(3, 149) = 13.51, p < .001$ . The  
3 regression coefficient for implicit autonomous motivation was significant ( $\beta = .19, p = .01$ ),  
4 supporting hypothesis ( $H_1$ ). The explicit controlled measure did not significantly predict  
5 physical activity behavior. Explicit autonomous motivation, however, did a significantly  
6 predict behavior ( $\beta = .37, p < .001$ ). There was a significant change in  $R^2$  in the second step  
7 ( $\Delta R^2 = .01, p < .001$ ),  $F(4, 149) = 16.65, p < .001$ . Intention provided a significant prediction  
8 of behavior ( $\beta = .49, p < .001$ ), as hypothesized ( $H_2$ ). Sobel (1982) tests indicated intention  
9 significantly mediated the relationship between explicitly-measured autonomous motivation  
10 and behavior (standardized regression coefficients: autonomous motivation  $\rightarrow$  intention,  $\beta = .68,$   
11  $p < .001$ ; intention  $\rightarrow$  behavior,  $\beta = .49, p < .001$ , autonomous motivation  $\rightarrow$  behavior,  $\beta = .03, p$   
12  $= .76$ ; autonomous motivation  $\rightarrow$  intention  $\rightarrow$  behavior =  $.33, p < .001$ ). Intention also  
13 significantly mediated explicitly-measured controlled motivation (standardized regression  
14 coefficients: controlled motivation  $\rightarrow$  intention,  $\beta = .17, p < .001$ ; intention  $\rightarrow$  behavior,  $\beta = .49,$   
15  $p < .001$ ; controlled motivation  $\rightarrow$  behavior,  $\beta = .04, p = .58$ ; controlled  
16 motivation  $\rightarrow$  intention  $\rightarrow$  behavior =  $.08, p < .001$ ). This provides support for hypothesis ( $H_3$ ),  
17 as intention mediated the explicit measure-behavior relationship

18 **Fruit and vegetable consumption.** The effect of the hypothesized predictor variables on fruit  
19 and vegetable consumption resulted in a significant regression equation in the first step ( $R^2 =$   
20  $.22, p < .001$ ),  $F(3, 149) = 14.94, p < .001$ . The implicit measure of motivation did not provide  
21 significant prediction of behavior, thus failing to support hypothesis ( $H_1$ ). Explicit autonomous  
22 motivation significantly predicted behavior ( $\beta = .49, p < .001$ ). There was a significant change  
23 in  $R^2$  in the second step ( $\Delta R^2 = .08, p < .001$ ),  $F(4, 149) = 16.27, p < .001$ . Intention  
24 significantly predicted behavior ( $\beta = .39, p < .001$ ), as hypothesized ( $H_2$ ); explicit autonomous  
25 motivation also remained a significant predictor of behavior ( $\beta = .22, p = .03$ ). Sobel (1982)  
26 tests indicated that intention partially mediated the relationship between explicitly-measured

1 autonomous motivation and behavior (standardized regression coefficients: autonomous  
2 motivation  $\rightarrow$  intention,  $\beta = .69, p < .001$ ; intention  $\rightarrow$  behavior,  $\beta = .40, p < .001$ , autonomous  
3 motivation  $\rightarrow$  behavior,  $\beta = .22, p = .03$ ; autonomous motivation  $\rightarrow$  intention  $\rightarrow$  behavior =  $.28, p$   
4  $< .001$ ). Intention, however, did not significantly mediate explicitly-measured controlled  
5 motivation (standardized regression coefficients: controlled motivation on intention,  $\beta = .07, p$   
6 =  $.24$ ; intention on behavior,  $\beta = .40, p < .001$ ; controlled motivation on behavior,  $\beta = -.04, p$   
7 =  $.63$ ; controlled motivation  $\rightarrow$  intention  $\rightarrow$  behavior =  $.03, p > .05$ ). This provides only partial  
8 support for our hypothesis (H<sub>3</sub>).

### 9 **Discussion**

10 The aim of the present research was to examine the independent effects of implicit and  
11 explicit measures of autonomous and controlled motivation on health-behaviors using a dual-  
12 systems model (Strack & Deutsch, 2004) as a framework. A series of hypotheses, based on  
13 dual-systems models and self-determination theory, were proposed and systematically tested in  
14 a prospective study of three health-related behaviors: condom use, physical activity, and fruit  
15 and vegetable consumption. Our first hypothesis (H<sub>1</sub>) was that implicit measures of  
16 autonomous motivation (measured by the IAT) would provide unique and independent  
17 prediction of behavior. A significant effect was found for the effect of implicitly-measures  
18 autonomous motivation for physical activity behavior and there was a trend toward an effect  
19 for condom use, but the study was not sufficiently powered. No effect was found for implicit  
20 autonomous motivation on fruit and vegetable consumption. Present findings did not provide  
21 unequivocal support for the impulsive route to behavior, derived from dual-systems models, as  
22 the effect was significant in only one of the behaviors investigated. Intention consistently  
23 predicted all behaviors, supporting our second hypothesis (H<sub>2</sub>). This corroborates previous  
24 research that intention is the most proximal predictor of planned behavior, predictions (Ajzen,  
25 1991; Ajzen & Fishbein, 2009; Back et al., 2009). Sobel tests also indicated that intention  
26 significantly mediated the relationship between explicitly-measured motivational constructs

1 and behavior for all but one of the hypothesized paths, supporting hypothesis (H<sub>3</sub>) and previous  
2 research (Ajzen & Fishbein, 2009; Hagger et al., 2006a).

3         The present research provides only limited support for the RIM (Strack & Deutsch,  
4 2004). The prediction of behavior by implicit autonomous motivation was confined to physical  
5 activity in the present study and suggests that enactment of this behavior may, in part, be  
6 influenced by non-conscious, automatic processes. However, the implicit association test for  
7 autonomous motivation developed and used in the present study did not predict condom use  
8 and fruit and vegetable consumption. A possible reason for this is that neither of these  
9 behaviors are strongly influenced by generalized, dispositional, and distal motivational  
10 orientations that affect behavior beyond an individuals' awareness, as measured by the implicit  
11 motivational orientation. Instead, these behaviors are likely to be predominately determined by  
12 contextual, proximal influences that are planned and consciously determined. This is also  
13 generally the case with physical activity, which was also predicted by explicit autonomous  
14 motivation alongside the implicit route. This suggests that this particular behavior may have  
15 both implicit and explicit routes to behavioral enactment.

16         On the surface, the lack of consistent behavioral prediction for the implicit motives  
17 seems to suggest that the predictive validity of the implicit measure of autonomous motivation  
18 was relatively limited compared to the explicit measures of autonomous and controlled  
19 motivation. However, this does not mean impulsive routes and the RIM model can be  
20 unequivocally rejected on the basis of the present data. There are several possible explanations  
21 for this bias toward greater predictive validity of explicit measures of motivation. First, using  
22 self-reported measures of behavior may have introduced systematic bias. Self-reports are  
23 inherently reflective as they require deliberation over future courses of action and are therefore  
24 more likely to correspond better with explicit measures. Related to this, the types of behavior  
25 being investigated may bias measurement validity, as outlined. Behaviors like eating sufficient  
26 fruit and vegetables require a substantial degree of planning beforehand (e.g., selecting the

1 correct foods when shopping, packing the correct lunch etc.). Given the inherently deliberative  
2 nature of some behaviors, this may create a bias in favor of explicitly-measured motivation.  
3 Furthermore, some behaviors may encompass antagonistic explicit and implicit motives. For  
4 instance, condom use may be endorsed and valued explicitly, but these values may be negated  
5 in more spontaneous contexts such as when a person engages in unplanned sexual intercourse  
6 or engages in sexual intercourse when inebriated (Marsh et al., 2001). However, the self-report  
7 follow-up measures used in the current study tended to correspond with explicit deliberation  
8 over previous behavior engagement, rather than spontaneous decisions made ‘on the fly’. In  
9 addition, the measures of intention and behavior, both being self-report with the same items  
10 and anchors, had the potential to introduce common method variance to the data. This  
11 limitation could have been allayed by introducing a time gap between measurements of  
12 intention and behavior. This is a common strategy to minimize common method variance  
13 (Hagger et al., 2003). Another approach would have been to include ‘filler’ tasks between the  
14 items. Future research should seek to investigate this issue. Finally, the implicit measure of  
15 autonomous motivation reflected a more generalized, global motivational construct, whereas  
16 the perceived locus of causality (Ryan & Connell, 1989) was a direct measure of participant’s  
17 motivation toward particular behaviors, thus creating a closer correspondence.

18       Intention is proposed as the final mechanism in the reflective system (Strack &  
19 Deutsch, 2004) and, consistent with this hypothesis, the inclusion of intention in the regression  
20 analyses in the current study resulted in the most pervasive prediction of behavior, especially  
21 behaviors likely to require planning in terms of when to conduct the behavior and what actions  
22 are needed to conduct the behavior. For example, the indirect, intention-mediated path for  
23 physical activity indicated that the effect of explicit autonomous motives to pursue physical  
24 activity was a deliberative process. Physical activity, like going to the gym, or playing a game  
25 of football entails planning equipment to use and making arrangements and there is, therefore,  
26 a stage of deliberative planning before performance of the activity as implied by the mediated

1 path from autonomous motivation via intentions. Similarly, for fruit and vegetable  
2 consumption, the explicit autonomous motivation measure and behavior relationship was  
3 significant, indicating partial mediation by intention. As with physical activity, the indirect  
4 path suggests that those motivated to eat fruit and vegetables for autonomous motives need to  
5 engage in deliberative, intentional thought prior to engaging in behavior. An explanation of the  
6 direct relationship may be that intentions did not adequately capture the effects of the explicit  
7 motivational orientation on behavior; or, this reflected more spontaneous, less deliberative  
8 influences of motives on behavior (Hagger et al., 2006a). These results suggest that it is  
9 important to identify the characteristics of the behavior being investigated in terms of the  
10 inherent level of deliberation or spontaneity required for its enactment. Variation in terms of  
11 some behaviors being more spontaneous (e.g., having another drink at a bar when offered)  
12 compared to others that are more deliberative (e.g., attending a gym for a workout), should be  
13 taken into account in studies comparing the relative strength of the effects of implicit and  
14 explicit measures of motivation on behavior.

### 15 **Limitations and Future Directions**

16       There is a general lack of consistency in the literature in the types of measurement  
17 instrument used to assess implicit processes (Jung & Lee, 2009). This limitation may also  
18 apply to the current research. Essentially, the IAT developed for the current study may not  
19 have adequately captured implicit motives from SDT. Though the current implicit measure of  
20 motivation was based on previous examples in the literature (Levesque & Brown, 2007),  
21 definitive comparisons are difficult to make due to inconsistencies and limitations of the  
22 measures of implicit constructs used in previous research (e.g., stimuli used, analyses  
23 conducted). Future research should seek to corroborate the current approach using  
24 differentiated implicit and explicit motivational constructs and different behavioral contexts to  
25 support the unique prediction of the two types of motivation and generalizability of these  
26 findings across behavioral contexts (Hagger, Biddle, Chow, Stambulova, & Kavussanu, 2003).

1 In addition, research may seek to include multiple measures of implicit constructs to offer more  
2 direct comparisons between implicit measures. One such development could be to include  
3 measures that include some reference to the specific content domain (e.g., presenting a  
4 background picture during each of the IATs to prime context). A further development could be  
5 to use single-category implicit measures, for example: the go/no-go association task; (Nosek &  
6 Banaji, 2001); or single-category IAT, (Karpinski & Steinman, 2006). These measures would  
7 allow parallel autonomous and controlled motivation scores to look for congruence patterns.

8 In addition, future research should investigate the effects of these differentiated implicit  
9 and explicit motivational constructs on different behaviors and contexts classified as  
10 predominantly implicit or explicit in nature. This would greatly aid understanding of the  
11 relative contribution of implicit and explicit motivational orientations and serve to provide  
12 further evidence for their predictive validity. Finally, use of other implicit techniques to  
13 manipulate implicit constructs, such as priming autonomous and controlled motivation, and  
14 examining their effects on behavior, as in Levesque and Pelletier's (2003) studies, could also  
15 assist in furthering understanding of the role of implicit processes. As priming should affect the  
16 same associative perceptions measured by the IAT, testing whether priming affects implicit  
17 measures would provide possible further validation of the implicit measure.

18 In terms of practical recommendations emerging from the current research, the results  
19 may be used to inform health interventions. Traditionally, health interventions have adopted an  
20 explicit approach, encouraging individuals to reflect on their current behavior and develop  
21 plans and aims to attain successful changes (Bryan, Aiken, & West, 1996; Markland, Ryan,  
22 Tobin, & Rollnick, 2005; Silva et al., 2008). While this has been largely successful, training  
23 (e.g., how to cope in spontaneous decision making situations) and reinforcement aimed at  
24 managing implicit effects may improve the overall efficacy of health interventions for some  
25 behaviors. In addition, the current research may indicate that some individuals are more  
26 vulnerable to autonomous explicit forms of motivation, which would indicate that they would

1 be better able to respond to interventions designed to target explicit forms of motivation.  
2 However, it must be stressed that given the highly consistent effects of explicit, deliberative  
3 forms of autonomous motivation on behavior across the health-related contexts in the present  
4 study, it seems that interventions targeting explicit forms of autonomous motivation are likely  
5 to have the most pervasive generalized effect on promoting behavioral engagement in multiple  
6 contexts.

## 7 **Conclusion**

8 In conclusion, the current study provided only limited support for the predictive validity  
9 of implicit measures of autonomous motivation and the dual-systems models in on the  
10 prediction of health-related behavior in three contexts. Current data demonstrate that health-  
11 related behaviors are more effectively predicted on the basis of explicit motivational constructs  
12 from self-determination theory relative to implicitly-measured motivational constructs.  
13 However, findings also indicate that implicit motivational orientations explain variance in  
14 behavior in at least one of the contexts (physical activity) and demonstrated a significant trend  
15 in another (condom use). There is a need to further explore this relatively new area in the  
16 context of self-determination theory and dual process models of behavior. Future research  
17 should examine the relative contribution of implicit and explicit motivational orientations from  
18 self-determination theory to the prediction of behavior in sets of behaviors considered to vary  
19 in the extent to which they are inherently planned or spontaneous in their enactment  
20 (McClelland, 1985). While health-related behavior has traditionally been researched within an  
21 explicit framework, the current research follows a growing trend in the literature, supporting  
22 the role of implicit processes. Future research should seek to extend this important area through  
23 the manipulation of implicit motivational orientations using priming techniques.

24

25

## References

- 1
- 2 Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human*  
3 *Decision Processes*, 50, 179-211.
- 4 Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (2009). *Predicting and changing behaviour: The reasoned action*  
5 *approach*: Psychology Press.
- 6 Back, M. D., Schmulke, S. C., & Egloff, B. (2009). Predicting actual behaviour from the  
7 explicit and implicit self-concept of personality. *Journal of Personality and Social*  
8 *Psychology*, 97, 533-548.
- 9 Bagozzi, R. P., Baumgartner, J., & Yi, Y. (1989). An investigation into the role of intentions as  
10 mediators of the attitude-behavior relationship. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 10(1),  
11 35-62.
- 12 Banting, L. K., Dimmock, J. A., & Lay, B. S. (2009). The role of implicit and explicit  
13 components of exerciser self-schema in the prediction of exercise behaviour.  
14 *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 10, 80-86.
- 15 Bargh, J. A., & Ferguson, M. J. (2000). Beyond Behaviorism: On the Automaticity of Higher  
16 Mental Processes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 925-945.
- 17 Bargh, J. A., Gollwitzer, P. M., Lee-Chai, A., Barndollar, K., & Trötschel, R. (2001). The  
18 Automated Will: Nonconscious Activation and Pursuit of Behavioral Goals. *Journal of*  
19 *Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(6), 1014-1027.
- 20 Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social  
21 Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations. *Journal*  
22 *of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51, 1173-1182.
- 23 Biddle, S., Soos, I., & Chatzisarantis, N. (1999). Predicting Physical Activity Intentions Using  
24 Goal Perspectives and Self-Determination Theory Approaches. *European Psychologist*,  
25 4(2), 83-89.
- 26 Brunstein, J. C., & Schmitt, C. H. (2004). Assessing individual differences in achievement  
27 motivation with the Implicit Association Test. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 38,  
28 536-555.
- 29 Bryan, A. D., Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1996). Increasing Condom Use: Evaluation of a  
30 Theory-Based Intervention to Prevent Sexually Transmitted Diseases in Young  
31 Women. *Health Psychology*, 15(5), 371-382.
- 32 Burton, K. D., Lydon, J. E., D'Alessandro, D. U., & Koestner, R. (2006). The differential  
33 effects of intrinsic and identified motivation on well-being and performance:  
34 Prospective, experimental, and implicit approaches to self-determination theory.  
35 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 750-762.
- 36 Chatzisarantis, N. L. D., & Hagger, M. S. (2009). Effects of an intervention based on self-  
37 determination theory on self-reported leisure-time physical activity participation.  
38 *Psychology & Health*, 24(1), 29-48.
- 39 Chatzisarantis, N. L. D., Hagger, M. S., Biddle, S. J. H., Smith, B., & Wang, J. C. K. (2003). A  
40 meta-analysis of perceived locus of causality in exercise, sport, and physical education  
41 contexts. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 25, 284-306.
- 42 Chatzisarantis, N. L. D., Hagger, M. S., Smith, B., & Phoenix, C. (2004). The influences of  
43 continuation intentions on execution of social behaviour within the theory of planned  
44 behaviour. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 43, 551-583.
- 45 Czopp, A. M., Monteith, M. J., Zimmerman, R. S., & Lynam, D. R. (2004). Implicit attitudes  
46 as potential protection from risky sex: Predicting condom use with the IAT. *Basic and*  
47 *Applied Social Psychology*, 26, 227-236.
- 48 Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). The general causality orientations scale: Self-determination  
49 in personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 19, 109-134.

- 1 Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-Determination Theory: A Macrotheory of Human  
2 Motivation, Development, and Health. *Canadian Psychology*, 49, 182-185.
- 3 Fazio, R. H., & Towles-Schwen, T. (1999). The MODE model of attitude-behaviour processes.  
4 In S. Chaiken & Y. Trope (Eds.), *Dual-process theories in social psychology* (pp.97-  
5 116). New York: Guilford Press.
- 6 Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. K. (1998). Measuring individual  
7 differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal of Personality*  
8 *and Social Psychology*, 74, 1464-1480.
- 9 Greenwald, A. G., & Nosek, B. A. (2001). Health of the implicit association test at age 3.  
10 *Zeitschrift Fur Experimentelle Psychologie*, 48, 85-93.
- 11 Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2003). Understanding and using the implicit  
12 association test: I. An improved scoring algorithm. *Journal of Personality and Social*  
13 *Psychology*, 85, 197-216.
- 14 Hagger, M. S., Biddle, S. J. H., Chow, E. W., Stambulova, N., & Kavussanu, M. (2003).  
15 Physical self-perceptions in adolescence - Generalizability of a hierarchical  
16 multidimensional model across three cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*,  
17 34(6), 611-628.
- 18 Hagger, M. S., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. D. (2011). Causality orientations moderate the  
19 undermining effect of rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Experimental Social*  
20 *Psychology*, Advance online publication. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2010.1010.1010.
- 21 Hagger, M. S., Chatzisarantis, N. L. D., Culverhouse, T., & Biddle, S. J. H. (2003). The  
22 processes by which perceived autonomy support in physical education promotes  
23 leisure-time physical activity intentions and behavior: A trans-contextual model.  
24 *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95(4), 784-795.
- 25 Hagger, M. S., Chatzisarantis, N. L. D., & Harris, J. (2006a). From psychological need  
26 satisfaction to intentional behavior: Testing a motivational sequence in two behavioral  
27 contexts. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 131-138.
- 28 Hagger, M. S., Chatzisarantis, N. L. D., & Harris, J. (2006b). The process by which relative  
29 autonomous motivation affects intentional behavior: Comparing effects across dieting  
30 and exercise behaviors. *Motivation and Emotion*, 30, 306-320.
- 31 Hagger, M. S., Wood, C., Stiff, C., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. D. (2009). The strength model of  
32 self-regulation failure and health-related behaviour. *Health Psychology Review*, 3, 208-  
33 238.
- 34 Hagger, M. S., Wood, C., Stiff, C., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. D. (2010). Ego-depletion and the  
35 strength model of self-control: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136, 495-525.
- 36 Hardeman, W., Johnston, M., Johnston, D. W., Bonetti, D., Wareham, N. J., & Kinmonth, A.  
37 L. (2002). Application of the theory of planned behaviour in behaviour change  
38 interventions: A systematic review. *Psychology & Health*, 17(2), 123-158.
- 39 Hofmann, W., & Friese, M. (2008). Impulses got the better of me: Alcohol moderates the  
40 influence of implicit attitudes toward food cues on eating behavior. *Journal of*  
41 *Abnormal Psychology*, 117(2), 420-427.
- 42 Hofmann, W., Friese, M., & Strack, F. (2009). Impulse and self-control from a dual-systems  
43 perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 4, 162-176.
- 44 Ingham, R. (1994). Some speculations on the concept of rationality. *Advances in Medical*  
45 *Sociology*, 4, 89-111.
- 46 Joseph, S., Grimshaw, G., Amjad, N., & Stanton, A. (2005). Self-motivation for smoking  
47 cessation among teenagers: Preliminary development of a scale for assessment of  
48 controlled and autonomous regulation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39(5),  
49 895-902.
- 50 Jung, K. H., & Lee, J.-H. (2009). Implicit and explicit attitude dissociation in spontaneous  
51 deceptive behavior. *Acta Psychologica*, 132, 62-67.

- 1 Karpinski, A., & Steinman, R. B. (2006). The Single Category Implicit Association Test as a  
2 Measure of Implicit Social Cognition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,  
3 91, 16-32.
- 4 Kehr, H. M. (2004). Implicit/explicit motive discrepancies and volitional depletion among  
5 managers. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 315-327.
- 6 Levesque, C., & Brown, K. W. (2007). Mindfulness as a moderator of the effect of implicit  
7 motivational self-concept on day-to-day behavioral motivation. *Motivation and*  
8 *Emotion*, 31, 284-299.
- 9 Levesque, C., Copeland, K. J., & Sutcliffe, R. A. (2008). Conscious and Nonconscious  
10 Processes: Implications for Self-Determination Theory. *Canadian Psychology*, 49, 218-  
11 224.
- 12 Levesque, C., & Pelletier, L. G. (2003). On the investigation of primed and chronic  
13 autonomous and heteronomous motivational orientations. *Personality and Social*  
14 *Psychology Bulletin*, 29, 1570-1584.
- 15 Markland, D., Ryan, R. M., Tobin, V. J., & Rollnick, S. (2005). Motivational interviewing and  
16 self-determination theory. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 24(6), 811-831.
- 17 Marsh, K. L., Johnson, B. T., & Scott-Sheldon, L. A. J. (2001). Heart versus reason in condom  
18 use: Implicit versus explicit attitudinal predictors of sexual behavior. *Zeitschrift Fur*  
19 *Experimentelle Psychologie*, 48, 161-175.
- 20 McClelland, D. C. (1985). How motives, skills, and values determine what we do. *American*  
21 *Psychologist*, 40, 812-825.
- 22 Norman, G., Carlson, J., Sallis, J., Wagner, N., Calfas, K., & Patrick, K. Reliability and  
23 validity of brief psychosocial measures related to dietary behaviors. *International*  
24 *Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 7(1), 56.
- 25 Norman, G., Carlson, J., Sallis, J., Wagner, N., Calfas, K., & Patrick, K. (2010). Reliability and  
26 validity of brief psychosocial measures related to dietary behaviors *International*  
27 *Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 7(56).
- 28 Nosek, B. A., & Banaji, M. R. (2001). The Go/No-go Association Task. *Social Cognition*,  
29 19(6), 625-666.
- 30 Pelletier, L. G., Dion, S. C., Slovinec-D'Angelo, M., & Reid, R. (2004). Why do you regulate  
31 what you eat? Relationships between forms of regulation, eating behaviors, sustained  
32 dietary behavior change, and psychological adjustment. *Motivation and Emotion*, 28,  
33 245-277.
- 34 Perugini, M. (2005). Predictive models of implicit and explicit attitudes. *British Journal of*  
35 *Social Psychology*, 44, 29-45.
- 36 Richetin, J., Perugini, M., Prestwich, A., & O'Gorman, R. (2007). The IAT as a predictor of  
37 food choice: The case of fruits versus snacks. *International Journal of Psychology*,  
38 42(3), 166-173.
- 39 Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived Locus of Causality and Internalization:  
40 Examining Reasons for Acting in Two Domains. *Journal of Personality and Social*  
41 *Psychology*, 57, 749-761.
- 42 Schultheiss, O. C., & Brunstein, J. C. (1999). Goal imagery: Bridging the gap between implicit  
43 motives and explicit goals. *Journal of Personality*, 67, 1-38.
- 44 Sherman, S. J., Chassin, L., Presson, C., Seo, D.-C., & Macy, J. T. (2009). The  
45 intergenerational transmission of implicit and explicit attitudes toward smoking:  
46 Predicting adolescent smoking initiation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*,  
47 45(2), 313-319.
- 48 Silva, M. N., Markland, D., Minderico, C. S., Vieira, P. N., Castro, M. M., Coutinho, S. R., et  
49 al. (2008). A randomized controlled trial to evaluate self-determination theory for  
50 exercise adherence and weight control: rationale and intervention description. *Bmc*  
51 *Public Health*, 8.

- 1 Strack, F., & Deutsch, R. (2004). Reflective and impulsive determinants of social behaviour.  
2 Personality and Social Psychology Review, 8, 220-247.
- 3 Thrash, T. M., Elliot, A. J., & Schultheiss, O. C. (2007). Methodological and dispositional  
4 predictors of congruence between implicit and explicit need for achievement.  
5 Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33, 961-974.
- 6 Williams, G. C., McGregor, H. A., Sharp, D., Levesque, C., Kouides, R. W., Ryan, R. M., et  
7 al. (2006). Testing a Self-Determination Theory Intervention for Motivating Tobacco  
8 Cessation: Supporting Autonomy and Competence in a Clinical Trial. Health  
9 Psychology, 25(1), 91-101.
- 10 Wilson, T. D., Lindsey, S., & Schooler, T. Y. (2000). A model of dual attitudes. Psychological  
11 Review, 107, 101-126.
- 12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

## Footnotes

<sup>1</sup>In additional analyses, explicit generalized measures (Generalized Causality Orientations Scale; Deci & Ryan, 1985) were entered into the regressions. These were not correlated with any of the behaviors, and did not offer significant predictions for any behavior. This demonstrates that generalized explicit motivational orientations do not have any efficacy in predicting behavior, which means it is only context-specific explicit motivation that has any effect. The current data suggests the same may not apply to implicit measures, such as the IAT, which provided only a generalized measure of autonomous motivation.

<sup>2</sup>We thank an anonymous reviewer for highlighting the possible problem of scale correspondence, in terms of aggregated and disaggregated implicit and explicit measures. Essentially, the IAT provided a relative measure of implicit autonomous motivation, whereas separate explicit measures of autonomous and controlled motivation were tested. The pattern of effects was therefore tested using an alternative scaled version of the explicit measures to produce relative autonomy indices (RAI), which overcomes this difference in scale measurements. The pattern of effects for each behavior was similar as for the separate motivation construct. Additional analyses are available from the first author.

<sup>3</sup>In all Sobel analyses testing for significant indirect effects, the following criteria proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986) were met: (1) significant correlations between the dependent variable and the independent (predictor) variable(s); (2) significant correlations between the mediator and the independent variable(s); (3) a significant unique effect of the mediator on the dependent variable when it is included alongside the independent variable(s) in a multivariate test of these relationships; and (4) the significant effect of independent variable on the dependent is attenuated or extinguished when the mediator is included as an independent predictor of the dependent variable.

<sup>4</sup>It should be noted that the size of the effect ( $\beta = .18$ ) and associated probability value ( $p = .09$ ) indicated that the effect did, in fact, exist but the present study was underpowered.

1 Table 1

2

3 *Zero-Order Correlations Among Study Variables*

Variable	1	2	3	4
1. Autonomous Motivation (Explicit)	–			
2. Controlled Motivation (Explicit)	.52**			
	.30**	–		
	.39**			
3.IAT (Implicit)	-.04	.17*		
	-.02	-.02	–	
	.09	.03		
4. Intention	.43**	.50**	.13	
	.73**	.37**	.05	–
	.73**	.34**	.11	
5. Behavior	.24*	.47**	-.13	.69**
	.41**	.24**	.18*	.53**
	.48**	.19*	.05	.54**

4 *Note.* In each cell, row 1 = condom use (N= 73), row 2 = physical activity (N = 150), row 3 =5 fruit and vegetable consumption (N = 150); IAT = Implicit Association Test *D*-score

6 representing generalized implicit measure of autonomous motivation; Intention = mean of

7 intention and planning to conduct behavior over a 4-week period; Behavior – self-reported

8 behavioral enactment over a four-week period.

9 \*\*  $p < .05$ . \*  $p < .01$

1 Table 2

2

3 *Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analyses predicting Condom use, Physical Activity, and Fruit and Vegetable Consumption*

Predictor	Condom			Physical Activity			FruitVeg		
	R <sup>2</sup>	β	<i>t, p values</i>	R <sup>2</sup>	β	<i>t, p values</i>	R <sup>2</sup>	β	<i>t, p values</i>
Step 1	.26			.22			.23		
IAT		.18	<i>t</i> = 1.75, <i>p</i> = .09		.19*	<i>t</i> = 2.53, <i>p</i> = .01		-.01	<i>t</i> = -.17, <i>p</i> = .86
Aut		.10	<i>t</i> = 0.87, <i>p</i> = .39		.37**	<i>t</i> = 4.82, <i>p</i> < .01		.49**	<i>t</i> = 6.13, <i>p</i> < .001
Con		.41**	<i>t</i> = 3.44, <i>p</i> < .001		.13	<i>t</i> = 1.69, <i>p</i> = .09		-.01	<i>t</i> = -.10, <i>p</i> = .92
Step 2	.49			.31			.31		
IAT		.09	<i>t</i> = 1.04, <i>p</i> = .30		.17*	<i>t</i> = 2.47, <i>p</i> = .02		-.04	<i>t</i> = -.52, <i>p</i> = .60
Aut		-.03	<i>t</i> = -0.31, <i>p</i> = .76		.03	<i>t</i> = 0.30, <i>p</i> = .76		.22*	<i>t</i> = 2.19, <i>p</i> = .03
Con		.13	<i>t</i> = 1.20, <i>p</i> = .23		.04	<i>t</i> = 0.56, <i>p</i> = .58		-.04	<i>t</i> = -.49, <i>p</i> = .63
Intention		.61**	<i>t</i> = 5.53, <i>p</i> < .001		.49**	<i>t</i> = 4.54, <i>p</i> < .001		.39**	<i>t</i> = 3.97, <i>p</i> < .001
<i>n</i>	73			150			150		

4 *Note.* IAT = Implicit Association Test *D*-score representing generalized implicit measure of autonomous motivation. Aut = explicit measure of

5 autonomous motivation; Con = explicit measure of controlled motivation; Intention = behavioral intention to conduct behavior over a 4-week

6 period; Condom – Condom use over a four-week period; Physical Activity = regular exercise over a four-week period; FruitVeg – Eaten at least 5

7 portion of fruit and vegetables, per day, over a four-week period. It should also be noted that the IAT score was a generalized score of individuals'

8 implicit motivation, rather than a domain-specific score. Furthermore, non-corresponding content-domain correlations are excluded from the table.

9 \*\* *p* < .05. \*\*\* *p* < .01.