

Original article

How can the impact of implementation intentions as a behaviour change intervention be improved?

Comment l'impact de l'implémentation d'intention, comme intervention de changement comportemental, peut-elle être améliorée ?

A. Prestwich^{a,*}, I. Kellar^b

^a Institute of Psychological Sciences, University of Leeds, Leeds, LS2 9JT, UK

^b University of Cambridge, UK

Received 7 November 2008; received in revised form 13 November 2009; accepted 10 March 2010

Abstract

Interventions requesting individuals to form implementation intentions, specific plans regarding how and when to enact behaviour, have been shown to be effective in changing a wide range of health, social, and organisational behaviours. A small proportion of studies have sought to identify, within full-factorial designs, under what circumstances and for whom implementation intention-based interventions are most effective. This review covers this issue. A number of potential moderators of the effects of implementation intentions on behaviour were identified (intentions, motivation type, collaboration, plan reminders, goal type, plan type, conscientiousness, perfectionism, procrastination, stress). Of these, the strength of one's intentions have been tested, and supported, most often as a moderator of implementation intention effects. For some of these moderators (e.g., conscientiousness, goal difficulty) the results were contradictory but for others the results were more consistent (e.g., motivation type, plan reminders). Additional moderators might be identified by comparing effects of implementation intentions across studies.

Published by Elsevier Masson SAS.

Keywords: Implementation intentions; Motivation; Reminders; Moderators; Conscientiousness; Perfectionism; Goals; Collaboration; Text message

Résumé

Les interventions invitant les individus à former des implémentations d'intention, programmes spécifiques concernant comment et quand réaliser un comportement se sont avérées efficaces dans le changement de nombreux comportements relatifs à la santé, au social et au domaine organisationnel. Peu d'études ont cherché à identifier dans le cadre de plans factoriels complets, les circonstances de l'efficacité de l'implémentation et quel type d'implémentation est le plus efficace. Plusieurs modérateurs potentiels des effets de l'implémentation sur les comportements ont été identifiés (intentions, type de motivation, collaboration, rappel des plans, type de buts, conscience, perfectionnismes, procrastination, stress). La force de l'intention a été testée et vérifiée comme un modérateur des effets des implémentations d'intention. Pour certains de ces modérateurs (e.g., conscience, difficulté des buts), les résultats sont contradictoires mais pour d'autres les résultats sont plus cohérents (e.g., type de la motivation, rappel des plans). Des modérateurs complémentaires sont identifiables en comparant les effets de l'implémentation des intentions au fil des études. Publié par Elsevier Masson SAS.

Mots clés : Implémentation des intentions ; Motivation ; Rappels ; Modérateurs ; Conscience ; Perfectionnisme ; Buts ; Collaboration ; Texte

1. Introduction

Implementation intentions (Gollwitzer, 1993) are a self-regulatory strategy that involves an individual planning, in

advance, the situation in which he/she will perform a particular behaviour. When applied as a behavioural intervention, participants are often required to decide when (e.g., time of day, day of the week) and where (e.g., bedroom) they will act. These manipulations have been effective in promoting desirable behaviours such as increasing fruit and vegetable intake (e.g., Kellar and Abraham, 2005) and reducing more negative actions such as saturated fat intake (e.g., Prestwich et al., 2008). Reviews have

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: a.j.prestwich@leeds.ac.uk (A. Prestwich).

Table 1
Studies testing (via interaction terms) moderators of between-subjects manipulated implementation intentions (IMPs).

Authors	Dependent variable	Self-report?	Follow-up period	Moderation effect size <i>d</i>	Conclusion regarding IMPs effectiveness
Moderator: intention (measured)					
1. de Nooijer et al. (2006)	Daily fruit intake	Yes	1 week	Not calculable (ns)	Similar effect at high/low intention
2. Elliott and Armitage (2006)	Speed-limit adherence	Yes	1 month	.35*	More effective for high intenders
3. Sheeran et al. (2005b)	Hours studying	Yes	1 week	.29*	More effective for high intenders
4. Van Osch et al. (2008)	Sunscreen use	Yes	5 months	.23*	Only effective for high intenders
5. Verplanken and Faes (1999)	Healthy eating	Yes	5 days	Not calculable (ns)	Similar effect at high/low intention
Moderator: intention (manipulated)					
1. Milne et al. (2002)	Testicular self-exam	Yes	1 month	.96*	Only effective with motivational intervention
2. Prestwich et al. (2008)	Fat intake	Yes	1 month	.35*, Standard IMP .03 (ns), reason. IMP	Standard IMPs (not Reasoning IMPs) more effective with motivational intervention
3. Sheeran and Silverman (2003)	Workplace safety Training attendance	No	3 months	.03 (ns)	Effective with/without motivational intervention
4. Sheeran et al. (2005b)	Puzzle task speed	No	< 1 day	.68*	Only effective when relevant goal was primed
Moderator: conscientiousness (measured)					
1. Walsh et al. (2005)	Watching an exercise video	Yes	3 days	.09 (ns)	Conscientiousness negatively related to behaviour in control and unrelated in IMPs condition
2. Webb et al. (2007)	Lecture attendance	No	1 semester	-.41*	More effective for low conscientious
Moderator: self-concordance (measured)					
1. Chatzisarantis et al. (2008)	Vigorous exercise	Yes	5 weeks	-.42*	More effective for non-concordant goals
2. Koestner et al. (2002)	Meeting goals	Yes	2.5 days	.49*	More effective for concordant goals
3. Koestner et al. (2002)	New Year resolutions	Yes	1 month	.53*	More effective for concordant goals
Moderator: perfectionism (measured)					
1. Powers et al. (2005) Study 1	Goal progress	Yes	3 weeks	-.68*	Negative impact for high social perfectionists
2. Powers et al. (2005), Study 2	Goal progress	Yes	3 weeks	-.69*	Negative impact for high social perfectionists
3. Powers et al. (2005), Study 2	Goal progress	Yes	3 weeks	.44*	Positive impact for self-oriented perfectionists
Moderator: goal difficulty (measured)					
1. Koestner et al. (2002)	Goal progress	Yes	3 weeks	.44*	More effective for difficult goals
Moderator: stress (measured)					
1. Budden and Sagarin (2007)	Exercise	Yes	1 week	.07 (ns)	Not effective at high/low stress
Moderator: experimenter demand (manipulated)					
1. Chapman et al. (2008)	Fruit/vegetable portions	Yes	1 week	.09 (ns)	Effective with low and high experimenter demand
Moderator: procrastination (measured)					
1. Owens et al. (2008)	Attending an appointment	No	-	.09 (ns)	Effective for high and low procrastinators
Moderator: text message reminders (manipulated)					
1. Prestwich et al. (2009)	Exercise frequency	No	4 weeks	.28†	More effective when combined with reminder

Note: † $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ns = non-significant.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/895480>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/895480>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)