

This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.

Author(s): Galli, Federica; Chirico, Andrea; Mallia, Luca; Alivernini, Fabio; Manganelli, Sara; Zelli, Arnaldo; Hagger, Martin S.; Lucidi, Fabio

Title: Identifying Determinants of Neuro-Enchancement Substance Use in Students : Application of an Integrated Theoretical Model

Year: 2023

Version: Accepted version (Final draft)

Copyright: © 2022Hogrefe Publishing

Rights: _{CC BY 4.0}

Rights url: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Please cite the original version:

Galli, F., Chirico, A., Mallia, L., Alivernini, F., Manganelli, S., Zelli, A., Hagger, M. S., & Lucidi, F. (2023). Identifying Determinants of Neuro-Enchancement Substance Use in Students : Application of an Integrated Theoretical Model. European Journal of Health Psychology, 30(1), 29-39. https://doi.org/10.1027/2512-8442/a000115

- 1 Identifying Determinants of Neuro-Enhancement Substances: Application of an
- 2 Integrated Theoretical Model
- 3
- 4 Published article: Galli, F., Chirico, A., Mallia, L., Alivernini, F., Manganelli, S.,
- 5 Zelli, A., Hagger, M. S., & Lucidi, F. (2023). Identifying determinants of neuro-
- 6 enhancement substances: Application of an integrated theoretical model. European
- 7 Journal of Health Psychology, 30(1), 29-39. https://doi.org/10.1027/2512-8442/
- 8 a000115

1 Abstract

2	Background: Use of Neuro-Enhancement Substances (NES) such as prescription drugs,
3	illicit drugs, or alcohol to improve cognition, prosocial behaviour, and performance is
4	increasing among students.
5	Aims: The present study applied a multi-theory, integrated theoretical model to identify
6	the motivational and social cognition determinants of NES use among students.
7	Methods: A prospective survey longitudinal design was adopted with 306 high school
8	students (66.8% female; $M_{age} = 17.31$ years, $SD = .93$) and 692 university (70.5%
9	female; $M_{age} = 24.97$ years, $SD = 6.64$) students. They completed measures of
10	motivation, social cognition constructs and planning with respect to studying behaviour
11	and NES use.
12	Results: Well-fitting structural equation models indicated the pervasive influence of
13	autonomous motivation, attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control
14	for studying, as well as of attitudes, subjective norms, and perceived behavioural control
15	for NES use. Inclusion of past NES use increased explained variance in NES use and
16	attenuated model effects, but the pattern of effects remained. Multi-group analyses
17	indicated consistency in the pattern model effects across high school and university
18	students.
19	Limitations: Some limitations should be noted: the study samples were not randomly
20	recruited stratified samples, and the exclusion of measures of implicit attitudes and
21	habits toward studying and NES use.
22	Conclusions: Findings support the predictions of the integrated model and extend
23	previous finding by demonstrating the role of motivation and beliefs with respect to a
24	parallel behaviour, studying, as influences on NES use, a health behaviour. Findings
25	provide starting points for interventions targeting the reduction in NES use.

26 Keywords:

1 Neuro-Enhancement Substances; multi-theory model; high school students; university

2 students; self-determination theory.

3 Introduction

4 The consumption of neuro-enhancement substances (NES) refers to the use of 5 prescription drugs, illicit drugs, or alcohol to improve cognition, mood, or prosocial behavior (Maier & Schaub, 2015). The "United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime" 6 7 guidelines (UNODC, 2011) recognize the rise in the use of these substances by school, 8 college, and university students to improve their academic performance. Research 9 suggests that students' use of NES is increasingly common in multiple countries, with 10 reported widespread use in the USA (e.g., Dussault et al., 2013), Canada (e.g. Kudlow 11 et al., 2013), Australia (e.g., Lucke et al., 2018), Brazil (de Oliveira Cata Preta et al., 2020), and Europe (e.g., Majori et al., 2017)¹. For instance, NES use among German 12 13 students increases from 4.% to 7% (Maier et al., 2013). Students report using NES 14 primarily to increase motivation, vigilance, concentration, productivity, learning time, 15 and mood (e.g., Maier, Haug, & Schaub, 2015). However, NES research findings are 16 not equivocal, and often suggest that NES effects on cognitive functioning can be 17 attributed to placebo effects (Franke, Bagusat, Rust, Engel, & Lieb, 2014; Repantis, 18 Schlattmann, Laisney, & Heuser, 2010). NES use might lead to several side effects. For 19 example, use of prescribed methylphenidate is linked to headache, tachycardia, and 20 nervousness (Caplan et al., 2007; Repantis et al., 2010), and the deleterious 21 consequences of misuse of drugs like alcohol or cannabis are well documented (Maier 22 & Shaub, 2015). Even excessive use of 'soft enhancers' can have detrimental side

¹Scholars identified three classes: prescription drugs include stimulant drugs usually prescribed to treat attention deficits and sleep disorders (e.g., methylphenidate); drugs of abuse include alcohol and illicit drugs such as opiates like cocaine; 'soft' enhancers include foods and beverages containing caffeine, food supplements, and nicotine (Maier & Schaub, 2015).

effects, such as short-term tachycardia, hypertonia, and bronchial dilatation (Franke et
al., 2014). Given these potential health risks, authorities have become increasingly
concerned with NES use by students, and have issued guidelines on their control and
regulation (Greely, 2008).

5 Efforts to control NES use require a comprehensive understanding of the 6 determinants of the motives for NES use. Previous research has suggested that the 7 decision to use NES in academic contexts can be considered a goal-directed and 8 intentional behavior (Zelli et al., 2015). Furthermore, research focusing on belief 9 systems has shown that students using prescription drugs without a diagnosis hold 10 stronger views about the approval of significant others (subjective norms; SN), and 11 demonstrated weaker perceived behavioral control (PBC) than do students with a specific diagnosis (Judson & Langdon, 2009). Finally, other studies have focused on the 12 13 relation between academic self-efficacy and NES consumption (Verdi et al., 2014); 14 however, such research is relatively sparse and highly descriptive.

15 An Integrated Theoretical Approach to Identify Behavioral Determinants

16 The examination of the determinants of NES is highly valuable as it may assist 17 in identifying potentially modifiable targets for interventions and for minimizing health 18 risks and adverse consequences of NES use. One potential research avenue is the 19 application of theories of motivation and social cognition, which not only enable the 20 identification of determinants, but also that of processes by which those determinants 21 may relate to behavior (Hagger et al., 2017).

The present study adopted a multi-theory, integrated approach to identify the determinants and processes of NES use. The promise of the integrated approach is that it encompasses multiple constructs representing key determinants and processes. Provided there is a clear conceptual basis and empirical precedent, such integration

maximizes the comprehensiveness of explanation of outcomes, it assists in addressing
 shortcomings of single theories, and it provides a means to represent different processes
 determining behavior (Hagger, 2009; Hagger & Hamilton, 2018; McMillan & Conner,
 2007; Montaño & Kasprzyk, 2015).

5 Our integrated model draws its hypotheses from two leading theories of 6 motivated action, self-determination theory (SDT; Ryan & Deci, 2000) and the theory 7 of planned behavior (TPB; Ajzen, 1991). SDT makes the distinction between two 8 qualities of motivation: autonomous motivation presumes that one engages in behavior 9 for personally endorsed reasons and out of a sense of choice and volition, and controlled 10 motivation which reflects acting for externally-references reasons such as to gain a 11 reward or external approval, or to avoid punishment, guilt, or shame. Research has 12 consistently shown that autonomous motivation is more likely to lead to behavioral 13 persistence as well as to adaptive outcomes, whereas controlled motivation leads to 14 persistence, only as long as the reinforcing contingencies are present, and tends to lead 15 to non-adaptive outcomes (Chan & Hagger, 2012; Hagger et al., 2014; Ng et al., 2012). 16 According to this type of integrated model (Chan et al., 2020; Hagger & Chatzisarantis, 17 2009), autonomous motives promote behavioral persistence, as individuals strategically 18 align their beliefs about future behavioral performance with their motives, consistent 19 with the original premise of the theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985, 2000).

Social cognition theories can model this process. Sets of beliefs from the TPB have been employed as mediators of the effects of autonomous motives on behaviors. Individuals citing autonomous reasons for adopting behavioral actions tend to hold positive attitudes about the behavior, expect that significant others would support their actions, and feel in control of the behavior. Such beliefs are proposed by scholars as the immediate antecedents of intention to perform the behavior in the future, and, therefore,

forming such beliefs is strategically important to execute the behavior. Beliefs have
 utility in enabling individuals to act on their autonomous motives.

The integrated model in general, and the mediation of autonomous motives on behavior through beliefs and intentions more specifically, have been supported in numerous studies (e.g., Chan, Zhang, Lee, & Hagger, 2020; Hagger & Chatzisarantis, 2009; Jacobs et al., 2011). The model has also demonstrated efficacy as a means to guide interventions (e.g., Hagger & Luszczynska, 2014).

8 Models integrating hypotheses from SDT and the TPB also have recognized the 9 consistently imperfect relation linking intention and behavior, often referred to as 10 "intention-behavior gap" (Hagger & Chatzisarantis, 2014; Orbell & Sheeran, 1998). 11 This means that individuals do not always 'follow through' on their intentions, as 12 evidenced by studies in which behavioral variance tends to range between 20% and 13 30% (Sheeran, 2002). Existing dual-phase models of behavior propose that motivation 14 or intention are necessary but not sufficient conditions for behavioral enactment and 15 propose that intention needs to be augmented with plans for intention to be enacted 16 (Gollwitzer & Brandstatter, 1997; Keller et al., 2020). For example, Gollwitzer (1999) 17 suggested that specific types of plans, known as if-then plans or 'implementation 18 intentions', assist individuals in linking appropriate environmental contingencies (e.g., cues) with the intended behavior, assisting in the recall and efficient enactment of the 19 20 behavior. Such plans assist individuals in intention enactment and serve to moderate the 21 intention-behavior relation. This moderation hypothesis has been added to existing 22 integrated models, to form a more comprehensive description of the determinants and 23 processes that lead to behavior (Hagger & Chatzisarantis, 2014).

24 The Present Study

25

Our hypothesized integrated model might assist research focusing on the

1 motivational determinants of NES use by students. The guiding model is diagrammed in 2 figure 1 below and in table A (available in the online supplemental materials: 3 https://osf.io/8cdyg/, see Table A. Summary of Hypothesized Direct and Indirect 4 Effects). With respect to academic performance, indicated by success on assignments 5 and in exams, students who are autonomously motivated to study are unlikely to view 6 NES as necessary, and may actively avoid taking such substances. Moreover, students 7 who are autonomously motivated might personally value studying, as it services the 8 internalized goal of learning and advancing knowledge, with resultant good grades as 9 indicators of their progress. Such students are likely to form beliefs and intentions to 10 study in the future. They may hold attitudes, SN, and PBC beliefs that do not endorse 11 NES use. In contrast, students with controlled motivated may view studying only to set 12 good grades. In the absence of personal goals to learn and progress their knowledge, 13 these students may seek any means to enhance their performance, as the outcome is 14 viewed as the sole goal, and in the end, might view NES use as a viable proposition.

Autonomous motivation toward studying can thus be highly functional and adaptive, in that it likely catalyzes alignment of beliefs toward studying and minimizes the chances of endorsing beliefs and intentions about NES use. Although autonomous motives to study might be inversely related to intention to use NES, planning is likely to be important to students enacting their NES use intentions. Implementation intentions are proposed to assist in the conversion of intention into behavior.

Based on the above considerations, the present study focused on the general mediation hypothesis that motivational states toward studying influence students' possible use of NES by influencing students' beliefs and intentions about studying, which in turn shape students' beliefs, intentions, and planning about NES use. The current study thus proposes a sort of "nested" set of relations by which students'

specific beliefs, intentions and possible use of NES at least partly depend upon (i.e., are
 nested within) students' motivational states and beliefs about the broader behavioral
 domain of studying.

4

Insert figure 1

5 The study relied on data collected from both high school and university students, 6 with behavioral data collected on two separate occasions over the course of several 7 months. This longitudinal assessment permitted the examination of the strength of 8 effects after controlling for the stability in students' NES use which, being a proxy of 9 students' habits and previous decision making, may empirically attenuate the 10 hypothesized effects (Hagger et al., 2016, 2017, 2018; Hagger, Polet, & Lintunen, 2018; 11 Hagger, Chan, Protogerou, & Chatzisarantis, 2016). The present study also evaluated 12 the "invariance" of the guiding model, that is, the general hypothesis that the relations 13 would empirically hold in both high school and university students. Should invariance 14 be found, it would provide strong evidence for the generalizability of the motivational 15 determinants and cognitive processes guiding NES use among students.

16 Method

17 Procedure and Sampling

The study adopted a prospective design with two data collection occasions separated by four months, and it relied on data collected on two convenience samples of high school and university students. This choice was made to maximize the generalizability of the hypotheses tested and diagrammed in the guiding model of figure 1. High school students were enrolled in a large urban district high school, and we recruited only those students who were enrolled in the last three school years. University students were from a large state university, and we included all students who

1	regularly attended the university teaching courses ² . Overall, the participants were
2	predominantly females and, in the university student sample, there was a relatively large
3	age range due primarily to nearly 20 students who were older than to 45. In particular,
4	306 high school students (66.8% female; $Mage = 17.31$ years, $SD = .93$, range = 16 to
5	19) and 692 university students (70.5% female; $Mage = 24.97$ years, $SD = 6.64$, range =
6	18 to 58) relied to both occasions. The drop put rate across the two data collection
7	occasions was 11 % ($N = 34$) in the high school sample and 15 % ($N = 105$) in the
8	university sample. Further samples characteristics (e.g., academic years, type of faculty)
9	are available in the online supplemental materials: <u>https://osf.io/8cdyg/</u> (see Appendix
10	A). The first assessment provided self-report data on the model's psychological
11	constructs and on past NES use over the previous four months, and the second
12	assessment provided self-report data on NES use since the first assessment. High school
13	students were recruited during school days and provided written consent for
14	participation. If minors, parents provided the consent. While high school students
15	provided their data via paper-and-pencil questionnaires, university students gave their
16	consent at the outset of a web-based questionnaire survey. The study was approved by
17	the Ethics Review Board of "Sapienza", University of Rome. Participants were
18	informed of the general purpose of the study, and their rights to confidentiality and to
19	withdraw at any time without prejudice.
20	Measures
21	Except for the measure of NES use, all the measures were administered in the

22 first occasion of data collection. Measures were developed for the target behavior and

23 for each target population according to published guidelines for component theories of

² For the high school sample, data were collected from January to April 2017. For the university sample, the two timing of data collection were December 2016 and March 2017. For both samples, the four months periods correspond to an intense study time, given their high school or university exams.

the integrated model (e.g., Girelli et al., 2016; Jacobs et al., 2011). Except for students' motivation toward studying, Self-regulated strategies for Learning Efficacy (SLE), and action/coping planning, all measures were formulated to be specific of either studying or NES use. Where necessary, Italian versions of the instruments were translated by two English-Italian bilinguals using standardized back translation procedures (Hambleton & Patsula, 1998). A full description of the measures is provided in the online supplemental materials: https://osf.io/8cdyg/ (see Appendix B).

8 Autonomous motivation. The Italian version of the academic motivation scale 9 was used to measure the relative degree of students' autonomous motivation toward 10 studying (Alivernini & Lucidi, 2008; Vallerand et al., 1992). The scale consisted of five 11 sets of items measuring students' amotivation, external regulation, introjected 12 regulation, identified regulation, and intrinsic motivation toward studying and learning. 13 Item responses were made on 7-point Likert scale (1 = do not agree and 7 = totally)14 *agree*) and, in order to maximize the parsimony of the proposed model, item scores 15 were aggregated into a single relative autonomy index score (RAI; Ryan & Connell, 16 1989). This score represented a weighted aggregate of the five sub-scales' scores and 17 measured students' relative degree of autonomous academic motivation (i.e., the RAI 18 ranged from 2 to -2 with higher scores indicating relatively stronger autonomous 19 motivation or, inversely, lower controlled motivation).

Self-regulated strategies for Learning Efficacy was measured using an adapted
version of the scale (Zimmerman et al., 1992). This scale included nine items measuring
students' perceived confidence to use a variety of self-regulated learning strategies.
Item responses were provided on 5-point Likert-type scales (1 = not well at all and 5 = *very well*).

Theory of Planned Behavior. Measures from the TPB were developed based on
 the recommendations of Ajzen (1991) and prior research (e.g., Girelli et al., 2016). In

1 all cases, item scores were aggregated to produce a single scale score for each variable. 2 The measure of attitudes was measured on six 7-point semantic differential scales using 3 bipolar adjectives (e.g., "interesting-boring"). SN were measured using three items 4 with students' responses collected on 7-point Likert-type scales (1 = strongly disagree 5 and 7 = *strongly agree*). PBC was measured by three items with responses collected on 6 7-point Likert-type scales (e.g., 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree). Finally, 7 students' intentions were measured using three items with responses collected on a 7-8 point Likert-type scale (1 = *strongly disagree* and 7 = *strongly agree*). 9 Planning. Students' action planning and coping planning to use NES was 10 measured by four items each based on Sniehotta et al.'s (2005) scale. Responses were 11 provided on 7-point Likert-type scales (1 = not true at all and 7 = very true).

12 NES use. The target behavior was measured on both occasions by asking 13 participants to self-report their NES use over the last four months. This assessment 14 focused on prescription drugs, illicit drugs and/or "soft-enhancers". Participants were 15 also asked if they had a specific illness-related prescription for the drugs they reported 16 to use. For all substance types, participants reported their responses on a three-point 17 scale ranging from "yes", "yes, but not in the last 4 months", or "no". The behavioral 18 measure was computed by aggregating scores across types of drugs into a binary scale 19 (i.e., 1 = yes and yes, but not in the last four months; 0 = no).

20 Data Analysis

The longitudinal data were analyzed by employing VB-SEM (known as Partial Least Squares analysis), which was performed with the WARP PLS v.6.0 statistical software (Kock, 2017). VB-SEM is like a covariance-based SEM analyses in that it explicitly models measurement error through the construction of latent factors. However, unlike covariance-based SEM, VB-SEM estimates models using ranked data and is, therefore, distribution-free. Model estimation is less likely to be affected by

1	model complexity, sample size, or deviations of the variable distributions from
2	normality. VB-SEM analysis permits the evaluation of the model at the measurement
3	level and at the structural level according to published criteria for VB-SEM models. At
4	the measurement level, VB-SEM establishes construct validity of the latent factors
5	using the average variance extracted (AVE) and the composite reliability coefficients
6	(ρ), which should exceed .50 and .70, respectively. Discriminant validity is supported
7	when the square root of the AVEs for each latent variable exceeds its correlation
8	coefficient with other latent variables (Esposito et al., 2010). At the structural level, VB-
9	SEM estimates the overall adequacy of the set of hypothesized relations among the
10	model constructs using the goodness-of-fit (GoF) index given by the square root of the
11	product of the AVE and average R^2 for the model with values of .100, .250, and .360
12	correspond to small, medium, and large effect sizes for model fit, respectively
13	(Tenenhaus et al., 2005). Further information on the adequacy of the model is provided
14	by the average path coefficient (APC) and average R^2 (ARS) coefficients, both of which
15	should be statistically significantly different from zero. Furthermore, level of
16	multicollinearity is estimated using the full collinearity variance inflation factor
17	(AFVIF), with values lower than 3.300 indicative of no issues with multicollinearity.
18	Missing data was imputed using linear regression interpolation as recommended (Kock,
19	2014).
20	A WARP PLS power analysis was conducted for each sample. The minimum
21	sample size generated for both samples was $n=146$, and the criteria that produced this

estimate were a) a minimum absolute significant path coefficient of .21, with the
significance level used for hypothesis testing of p=.05 and b) a power level of .80
(Kock, 2017).

A first series of VB-SEM analyses evaluated the measurements' psychometric
 and construct characteristics, whereas a second series of VB-SEM analyses evaluated

1 the relations illustrated in figure 1. With respect to the latter analyses, at a first stage, 2 two VB-SEM analyses for each sample estimated the relations, respectively, without 3 and with the predictive effects of time 1 NES use on the key variables and on time 2 4 NES use. This permitted to test the extent to which behavioral stability over time 5 attenuated the hypothesized effects. Pending adequate fit of the proposed model, a 6 second stage of VB-SEM analyses evaluated model invariance, that is, the hypothesis 7 that model relations would be statistically equivalent in both student groups. Multi-8 group invariance was considered for both measurements and structural relations (Kock, 9 2014), and these analyses provided estimates of the difference in parameters and 10 confidence intervals about the difference. In addition, effect sizes (Cohen's d) for the 11 difference in the effects across samples were also calculated, along with the 95% 12 confidence interval for each. Details about data files and analysis output are available 13 on the online supplemental materials: https://osf.io/8cdyg/ (see "Data Files" and 14 "WARP Analysis Output Files").

15 **Results**

16 **Preliminary Analyses**

17 Composite reliability coefficients (ρ), AVE, and latent variable correlations are 18 presented in the supplemental materials: https://osf.io/8cdyg/ (see Appendix C, Table 19 C1 and C2). The coefficients indicated acceptable internal consistency for constructs (p 20 range = .62 to .96), except for high school students' PBC toward NES use ($\rho = .42$). In 21 this latter case, one item with a low item-total correlation ("Using NES to increase my 22 academic performance over the next 4 months depends..." answered from 1= mainly on 23 other people to 7 = mainly on me) was eliminated resulting in improved measurement 24 reliability ($\rho = .64$). AVE estimates also indicated adequacy of the latent variables 25 (AVE range = .42 to .88). Factor intercorrelations for all measures suggested no 26 problem of discriminant validity and collinearity.

1 Model Tests

2	Figure 2 and figure 3 summarize the path coefficients of the proposed models.
3	Overall, the pattern of estimated effects exhibited good fit with the data according to the
4	multiple fit and quality indices adopted for the high school (GoF =.321; APC =.184, $p <$
5	.001; ARS = .156, $p < .001$; AVIF = 1.244) and university students (GoF=.305;
6	APC=.163, p <.001; ARS=.129, p < .001; AVIF=1.209) student sample.
7	Insert figures 2 and 3 about here
8	Students' autonomous motivation had positive and statistically significant
9	effects on their TPB beliefs concerning studying (H_{1a}) and on their SLE (H_{1b}) . The only
10	exception was a null effect of university students' autonomous motivation on SN for
11	studying. Studying-related attitudes, SN, PBC (H_2), and academic SLE (H_{5a}), were
12	positively related to students' intention to study. The only exception was a null effect of
13	attitude on intention for high school students.
14	The analyses related to the relation between TPB constructs about studying and
15	TPB constructs about the use of NES, supported our hypotheses (H_3) and showed that
16	students who had relatively stronger attitudes and perceived control about studying were
17	less likely to endorse NES use. Furthermore, students' SLE was negatively influenced
18	students' intentions to use NES (H _{5b}), but only among university students. Finally, TPB
19	constructs about NES use were significantly and positively related to intentions to use
20	NES (H ₄).
21	NES intentions predicted higher self-reported NES use (H_{6a}), whereas intentions
22	to study negatively predicted NES use (H_{6b}) . However, the latter effect held only among
23	university students. Finally, planning moderated the relation between NES intention and
24	NES use (H ₇), but only among university students.

1	In contrast to prediction, autonomous motivation to study did not directly predict
2	intention to use NES (H_{8a}) and NES use (H_{8b}). Moreover, results indicated that
3	relatively weaker attitudes toward studying <i>indirectly</i> predicted relatively stronger
4	intentions to use NES by also increasing the chances of stronger attitudes toward NES
5	use (H ₉). Furthermore, autonomous motivation <i>indirectly</i> influenced students' intention
6	to study by exerting predictive effects on some of the TPB variables concerning
7	studying (H_{11a}) and on SLE (H_{11b}) . Details of indirect effects are provided in the
8	supplemental materials: <u>https://osf.io/8cdyg/</u> (see Appendix D, Tables D1, D2 and D3).
9	Finally, the effects remained largely unchanged after controlling for the effects
10	of past NES use. There were two exceptions to this finding: the effect of NES intentions
11	on students' NES use, and the moderation effect of planning, which were smaller and
12	no longer statistically significant when past NES use was included in the model. As
13	expected, the inclusion of past NES use led to an increase in the explained variance in
14	NES use accounted for by the model, both in high school (R^2 change =.18) and
15	university students (R^2 change=.24).
16	Invariance of model effects across samples
17	We use the multi-group analyses to test the hypothesis that the model's latent
18	relations would be equivalent across student samples. These analyses were legitimate in
19	consideration of the invariance found at the measurement level (i.e., students of both
20	groups assigned the same meaning to measures). Most of the paths in the model were
21	invariant across groups, and there were only a few differences in parameter estimates
22	across samples (H ₁₂ , see table 1). Effect sizes for all significant differences in parameter
23	estimates were small-to-medium in size (range = $.11$ to $.27$).
24	Insert table 1 about here

Discussion

1 The study adopted the general view that students who assign personal value to 2 studying and to knowledge acquisition, and freely choose to pursue their studying goals 3 and efforts, would hold positive views about studying and disregard any alternative 4 means to academic success. Empirically, the study tested the hypothesis that 5 autonomously motivated students would hold positive beliefs and intentions about 6 studying and these, in turn, would render positive views, intentions and possible use of 7 NES less likely.

8 The research relied on data collected from high school and university students 9 and examined a longitudinal model of effects in which the key outcome was students' 10 retrospective reports of their possible NES use. Well-fitting SEM supported the 11 proposed model effects in both samples, with few exceptions. As such, the findings 12 support and extend previous research, especially in academic contexts (e.g., Judson & 13 Langdon, 2009).

14 The study was novel in several respects. It contemplated the notion that 15 studying, and NES use, are distinct and yet related behavioral domains. Autonomously 16 motivated students were more likely to bring their sets of beliefs in line with their 17 motives. Such alignment is strategic, as these beliefs are proposed as the immediate 18 determinants of future action and findings suggest that individuals mobilize their beliefs 19 to pursue autonomously motivated behaviors in the future. Not surprisingly, such beliefs 20 were at loggerheads with students' NES beliefs, intentions, and use of NES. That is, 21 students' autonomous motivation, stronger attitudes, SN, and PBC beliefs concerning 22 studying were negatively related to of NES use. In other words, lower autonomous 23 motivation to study led some students to endorse NES use more strongly, and choose 24 the use of NES, perhaps as an aid to enhance their performance.

The study also considered students' past NES use as an essential means to
evaluate the *sufficiency* of the model. As it would be expected, past NES use predicted

1 most of the variables in the model and accounted for substantial variance in students' 2 later self-reports of NES use, leading to some clear attenuation of model effects. 3 Nevertheless, most of the model variables still accounted for unique variance in 4 students' intention to study, their intention to use NES, and their NES use. These 5 longitudinal findings are consistent with existing social cognition research and with 6 integrated models (Hagger et al., 2018), as they strongly support the notion that past 7 behavior attenuates, but does not extinguish, model effects, i.e., our guiding model is 8 sufficient in accounting for unique variance.

9 Not surprisingly, students' past NES use had its strongest effect on later NES 10 use, increasing explained variance in the behavioral outcome by more than half. 11 Theorists have suggested that the pervasive effects of past behavior may account for 12 habitual effects (Hagger et al., 2016, 2018). Although past behavior is not a measure of 13 habit, it may reflect habitual influences (Ouellette & Wood, 1998), and research has 14 suggested that variables representing habit as a construct mediate past behavior effects (Hagger et al., 2018; Brown, Hagger, & Hamilton, 2020), supporting this claim. This 15 16 should not come as a surprise for NES use, given that individuals who take NES are 17 likely to do so in similar contexts and in response to similar cues (e.g., in the run up to 18 exams when there is a need to study). Given that habits tend to be built up through 19 consistent behavioral responses in the face of consistent cues, it might be that 20 participants develop strong habits for NES use. We can only infer these habitual effects, 21 because we did not directly measure NES habits, and that may very well be an avenue 22 for future research (Hagger, 2019). If the effects of past behavior were mediated by a 23 measure of habit, then we would have sharp confirmation of the hypothesis that past 24 behavior effects represent habits.

The current study innovatively hypothesized a moderation effect of planning on
the intention-behavior relation for NES use, consistent with previous research

1 (Gollwitzer, 1999) and with proposals of previous integrated models (Hagger & 2 Chatzisarantis, 2014). University students who had formed clear plans to take NES were 3 more likely to enact their intentions. It is notable that effect sizes were almost identical, 4 suggesting that the effect might be present, but modest in size. Thus, while supporting 5 the notion that planning might be part of the decision-making process in the enactment 6 of NES intentions, findings also suggested that planning might not be that pertinent or 7 pervasive. This effect was further attenuated by the inclusion of past behavior. This 8 suggests that habitual NES use obviate the need for planning. However, it would be 9 interesting to assess whether students with strong or weak habits for NES use would be 10 less likely to form plans towards the NES consumption. 11 We also examined invariance of effects, that is, whether processes and their 12 effects held among both high school and university students. One of the key 13 assumptions of existing motivational and social cognitive research is that modeled

effects represent universal and generalized processes holding across behaviors, contexts,
and populations. Thus, effects' variations would be in magnitude, rather than whether
they exist.

17 Our multi-group analyses showed remarkable consistency in the presence and 18 magnitude of effects across samples, with very few differences in the relative strength 19 of the model effects. For university students, their attitudes about studying had a 20 relatively greater influence on their intentions to study than their self-efficacy. For high 21 school students, instead, self-efficacy, but not attitudes about studying, influenced 22 students' intentions to study. There might be two reasons for these differences. At this 23 moment, these reasons are merely speculative as, to the best of our knowledge, there are 24 no research addressing this specific issue. First, it is possible that self-efficacy or 25 personal confidence is more pertinent and paramount to high school students, when it 26 comes to studying for exams, as the context of high school calls for several abilities

1 across several study subjects. For university students, their attitudes might instead be 2 more important, perhaps because they see the advantages or values in what they have 3 chosen to study. A second related reason might be that university students focus on 4 specific subjects (majors and minors), rather than general education. For them, 5 therefore, a general measure of self-efficacy, as the one adopted in the study, might 6 have been less robust in capturing differences in personal confidence. Of course, such 7 speculations should or might be corroborated in future research that, for instance, 8 assesses students' actual abilities and/or subject-specific self-efficacy.

9 Limitations

10 Several limitations should be noted. First, there are limits in terms of the 11 generalizability of the findings to student populations, as the study samples were not 12 randomly recruited stratified samples. Second, although the adoption of behavioral self-13 reports is quite common in behavioral research, the study would have benefitted from 14 the adoption of more comprehensive measures, such as diaries or tracking NES use by 15 ecological momentary assessment (e.g., daily monitoring of target behaviors using 16 online apps). Third, we considered the different types of NES, combining them in a 17 unique category to increase the statical power of the complex model. Future studies 18 might benefit from analyzing separately the different classes of substances to take into 19 consideration the distinct characteristics of each category of NES. Moreover, the study 20 did not include measures of implicit attitudes and habits toward studying and NES use. 21 Future research should incorporate implicit constructs as predictors alongside the 22 motivational and social cognition constructs used in the current model (Hagger, 2018; 23 Hagger & Chatzisarantis, 2014).

24 **Conclusions**

The study findings may inform future interventions to curb NES use and
promote better health among both high school and university students. Prior similar

research (e.g., Reeve et al., 2020) indicated that motivational and social cognitive
 factors can be the target of intervention programs. In line with the present findings,
 future interventions may thus challenge students' views about NES use and NES
 pervasiveness on studying, as well as promote students' personal confidence through
 appropriate goals and school experiences.

References

2	Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. Orgnizational Behavior and Human
3	Decision Processes, 50, 179–211. https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T
4	Alivernini, F., & Lucidi, F. (2008). The academic motivation scale (AMS): Factorial
5	structure, invariance, and validity in the Italian context. TPM - Testing,
6	Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology, 15(4), 211–220.
7	Caplan, J. P., Epstein, L. A., Quinn, D. K., Stevens, J. R., & Stern, T. A. (2007).
8	Neuropsychiatric Effects of Prescription Drug Abuse. Neuropsychology Review
9	(17) 363–380. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11065-007-9037-7
10	Chan, D.K.C., & Hagger, M. S. (2012). Self-determined forms of motivation predict
11	sport injury prevention and rehabilitation intentions. Journal of Science and
12	Medicine in Sport, 15(5), 398-406. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsams.2012.03.016
13	Chan, Derwin King Chung, Zhang, L., Lee, A. S. Y., & Hagger, M. S. (2020).
14	Reciprocal relations between autonomous motivation from self-determination
15	theory and social cognition constructs from the theory of planned behavior: A
16	cross-lagged panel design in sport injury prevention. Psychology of Sport and
17	Exercise, 48(January), 101660. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2020.101660
18	De Oliveira Cata Preta, B., Miranda, V. I. A., & Bertoldi, A. D. (2020).
19	Psychostimulant Use for Neuroenhancement (Smart Drugs) among College
20	Students in Brazil. Substance Use and Misuse, 55(4), 613-621.
21	https://doi.org/10.1080/10826084.2019.1691597
22	Dussault, C.L. and Weyandt L.L. (2013). An Examination of Prescription Stimulant
23	Misuse and Psychological Variables Among Sorority and Fraternity College
24	Populations. Journal of Attention Disorders 17(2) 87-97. doi:

1 10.1177/1087054711428740

2	Franke, A., Christmann, M., Bonertz, C., Fellgiebel, A., Huss, M., & Lieb, K. (2011).
3	Use of Coffee, Caffeinated Drinks and Caffeine Tablets for Cognitive
4	Enhancement in Pupils and Students in Germany. Pharmacopsychiatry, 44(07),
5	331-338. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0031-1286347
6	Franke, A. G., Bagusat, C., Rust, S., Engel, A., & Lieb, K. (2014). Substances used and
7	prevalence rates of pharmacological cognitive enhancement among healthy
8	subjects. European Archives of Psychiatry and Clinical Neuroscience, 264(1), 83-
9	90. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00406-014-0537-1
10	Girelli, L., Hagger, M., Mallia, L., & Lucidi, F. (2016). From perceived autonomy
11	support to intentional behaviour: Testing an integrated model in three healthy-
12	eating behaviours. Appetite, 96, 280–292.
13	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2015.09.027
14	Gollwitzer, P. M. (1999). Implementation Intentions Strong Effects of Simple Plans •
15	American Psychologist Implementation Intentions Strong Effects of Simple Plans.
16	The American Psychologist, 54(7), 493–503. http://kops.uni-
17	konstanz.de/bitstream/handle/123456789/10101/99Goll_ImpInt.pdf?sequence=1&i
18	sAllowed=y
19	Greely, H. (2008). Towards responsible use of cognitive-enhancing drugs by the
20	healthy. Nature, 456(7224), 872. https://doi.org/10.1038/456872a
21	Hagger, M.S., Hardcastle, S. J., Chater, A., Mallett, C., Pal, S., & Chatzisarantis, N. L.
22	D. (2014). Autonomous and controlled motivational regulations for multiple
23	health-related behaviors: between- and within-participants analyses. Health
24	Psychology and Behavioral Medicine, 2(1), 565–601.

1	https://doi.org/10.1080/21642850.2014.912945
2	Hagger, Martin S. (2009). Theoretical integration in health psychology: Unifying ideas
3	and complementary explanations. British Journal of Health Psychology, 14(2),
4	189–194. https://doi.org/10.1348/135910708X397034
5	Hagger, Martin S. (2019). Habit and physical activity: Theoretical advances, practical
6	implications, and agenda for future research. Psychology of Sport and Exercise,
7	42(December 2018), 118–129. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.12.007
8	Hagger, Martin S., Chan, D. K. C., Protogerou, C., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. D. (2016).
9	Using meta-analytic path analysis to test theoretical predictions in health behavior:
10	An illustration based on meta-analyses of the theory of planned behavior.
11	Preventive Medicine, 89, 154–161. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ypmed.2016.05.020
12	Hagger, Martin S., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. D. (2009). Integrating the theory of planned
13	behaviour and self-determination theory in health behaviour: A meta-analysis.
14	British Journal of Health Psychology, 14(2), 275–302.
15	https://doi.org/10.1348/135910708X373959
16	Hagger, Martin S., & Hamilton, K. (2018). Motivational predictors of students'
17	participation in out-of-school learning activities and academic attainment in
18	science: An application of the trans-contextual model using Bayesian path analysis.
19	Learning and Individual Differences, 67(July), 232–244.
20	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2018.09.002
21	Hagger, Martin S., & Luszczynska, A. (2014). Implementation intention and action
22	planning interventions in health contexts: State of the research and proposals for
23	the way forward. Applied Psychology: Health and Well-Being, 6(1), 1–47.
24	https://doi.org/10.1111/aphw.12017

1	Hagger, Martin S., Polet, J., & Lintunen, T. (2018). The reasoned action approach
2	applied to health behavior: Role of past behavior and tests of some key moderators
3	using meta-analytic structural equation modeling. Social Science and Medicine,
4	213(July), 85–94. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2018.07.038
5	Hagger, Martin S., Trost, N., Keech, J. J., Chan, D. K. C., & Hamilton, K. (2017).
6	Predicting sugar consumption: Application of an integrated dual-process, dual-
7	phase model. Appetite, 116, 147-156. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appet.2017.04.032
8	Hagger, Martin S. (2018). Psychology of Sport & Exercise Habit and physical activity :
9	Theoretical advances, practical implications, and agenda for future research.
10	Psychology of Sport & Exercise, September, 0–1.
11	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.12.007
12	Hagger, Martin S, & Chatzisarantis, N. L. D. (2014). An Integrated Behavior Change
13	Model for Physical Activity. Exercise and Sport Sciences Reviews, 42(2), 62-69.
14	https://doi.org/0091-6331/4202/62Y69
15	Hambleton, R. K., & Patsula, L. (1998). Adapting tests for use in multiple languages
16	and cultures 1. Social Indicators Research, 45(1), 153–171.
17	https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006941729637
18	Jacobs, N., Hagger, M. S., Streukens, S., De Bourdeaudhuij, I., & Claes, N. (2011).
19	Testing an integrated model of the theory of planned behaviour and self-
20	determination theory for different energy balance-related behaviours and
21	intervention intensities. British Journal of Health Psychology, 16(1), 113-134.
22	https://doi.org/10.1348/135910710X519305
23	Judson, R., & Langdon, S. W. (2009). Illicit use of prescription stimulants among
24	college students: Prescription status, motives, theory of planned behaviour,

1	knowledge and self-diagnostic tendencies. Psychology, Health and Medicine,
2	14(1), 97–104. https://doi.org/10.1080/13548500802126723
3	Kock, N. (2014). Advanced mediating effects tests , multi-group analyses , and
4	measurement model assessments in PLS-based SEM. International Journal of E-
5	<i>Collaboration</i> , <i>10</i> (1), 1–13.
6	Kock, N. (2017). WarpPLS User Manual : Version 6. 0 WarpPLS User Manual : 1–
7	121.
8	Kudlow, P. A., Treurnicht Naylor, K., Xie, B., & McIntyre, R. S. (2013). Cognitive
9	Enhancement in Canadian Medical Students. Journal of Psychoactive Drugs,
10	45(4), 360–365. https://doi.org/10.1080/02791072.2013.825033
11	Lazuras, L., Ypsilanti, A., Lamprou, E., & Kontogiorgis, C. (2017). Pharmaceutical
12	cognitive enhancement in Greek university students : differences between users
13	and non-users in social cognitive variables, burnout and engagement. Substance
14	<i>Use and Misuse</i> , <i>52</i> , 950–958.
15	Lucke, J., Jensen, C., Dunn, M., Chan, G., Forlini, C., Kaye, S., Partridge, B., Farrell,
16	M., Racine, E., & Hall, W. (2018). Non-medical prescription stimulant use to
17	improve academic performance among Australian university students: Prevalence
18	and correlates of use. BMC Public Health, 18(1), 1-7.
19	https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-018-6212-0
20	Maier, L. J., Haug, S., & Schaub, M. P. (2015). The importance of stress, self-efficacy,
21	and self-medication for pharmacological neuroenhancement among employees and
22	students. Drug and Alcohol Dependence, 156, 221–227.
23	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.drugalcdep.2015.09.012
24	Maier, L. J., Liechti, M. E., Herzig, F., & Schaub, M. P. (2013). To Dope or Not to

1	Dope: Neuroenhancement with Prescription Drugs and Drugs of Abuse among
2	Swiss University Students. 8(11). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0077967
3	Maier, L. J., & Schaub, M. P. (2015). The use of prescription drugs and drugs of abuse
4	for neuroenhancement in Europe: Not widespread but a reality. In European
5	Psychologist (Vol. 20, Issue 3, pp. 155-166). https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-
6	9040/a000228
7	Majori, S., Gazzani, D., Pilati, S., Paiano, J., Sannino, A., Ferrari, S., & Checchin, E.
8	(2017). Brain doping: stimulants use and misuse among a sample of Italian college
9	students. Journal of Preventive Medicine and Hygiene, 58(2), E130-E140.
10	http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28900353%0Ahttp://www.pubmedcentral.ni
11	h.gov/articlerender.fcgi?artid=PMC5584082
12	Michie, S., Johnston, M., Francis, J., Hardeman, W., & Eccles, M. (2008). From Theory
13	to Intervention: Mapping Theoretically Derived Behavioural Determinants to
14	Behaviour Change Techniques. Applied Psychology, 57(4), 660-680.
15	https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1464-0597.2008.00341.x
16	Ng, J. Y. Y., Ntoumanis, N., Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C., Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M., Duda,
17	J. L., & Williams, G. C. (2012). Self-Determination Theory Applied to Health
18	Contexts: A Meta-Analysis. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 7(4), 325–340.
19	https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612447309
20	Reeve, J., Cheon, S. H., & Yu, T. H. (2020). An autonomy-supportive intervention to
21	develop students' resilience by boosting agentic engagement. International Journal
22	of Behavioral Development, 44(4), 325–338.
23	https://doi.org/10.1177/0165025420911103
24	Repantis, D., Schlattmann, P., Laisney, O., & Heuser, I. (2010). Modafinil and

1	methylphenidate for neuroenhancement in healthy individuals: A systematic
2	review. Pharmacological Research, 62(3), 187–206.
3	https://doi.org/10.1016/j.phrs.2010.04.002
4	Ryan, R. M., & Connell, J. P. (1989). Perceived Locus of Causality and Internalization:
5	Examining Reasons for Acting in Two Domains. Journal of Personality and Social
6	Psychology, 57(5), 749–761. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.5.749
7	Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of
8	Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-Being. 55(1), 68–78.
9	https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.1.68
10	Shannon, S., Breslin, G., Haughey, T., Sarju, N., Neill, D., Lawlor, M., & Leavey, G.
11	(2019). Predicting Student-Athlete and Non-Athletes' Intentions to Self-Manage
12	Mental Health: Testing an Integrated Behaviour Change Model. Mental Health and
13	Prevention, 13(August 2018), 92-99. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.mhp.2019.01.006
14	Sheeran, P. (2002). Intention-behaviour relations: A conceptual and empirical review.
15	European Review of Social Psychology, 12, 1-36
16	Sniehotta, F. F., Schwarzer, R., Scholz, U., & Schüz, B. (2005). Action planning and
17	coping planning for long-term lifestyle change: Theory and assessment. European
18	Journal of Social Psychology, 35(4), 565-576. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.258
19	Unodc. (2011). The non-medical use of prescription drugs, policy direction issues.
20	United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime. http://www.unodc.org/unodc/en/drug-
21	prevention-and-treatment/non-medical-use-prescription-drugs.html
22	Vallerand, R. J., Pellettier, L. G., Blais, M. R., Brière, N. M., Senecal, C., & Vallières,
23	E. (1992). "The Academic Motivation Scale: A measure of intrinsic, extrinsic, and
24	amotivation in education." Educational and Psychological Measurement, 52,

2	Verdi, G., Weyandt, L. L., & Zavras, B. M. (2014). Non-Medical Prescription Stimulant
3	Use in Graduate Students : Relationship With Academic Self-Efficacy and
4	Psychological. Journal of Attention Disorders.
5	https://doi.org/10.1177/1087054714529816
6	Zelli, A., Lucidi, F., & Mallia, L. (2015). The complexity of neuroenhancement and the
7	adoption of a social cognitive perspective. Frontiers in Psychology, 6(DEC), 1-6.
8	https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01880
9	Zimmerman, B. J., Bandura, A., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1992). Self-Motivation for
10	Academic Attainment: The Role of Self-Efficacy Beliefs and Personal Goal
11	Setting. American Educational Research Journal, 29(3), 663-676.
12	https://doi.org/10.3102/00028312029003663

Table 1.

1

_

Model Paths		Statistics				p
	High school	University	Absolute differences	95% CI		
			_	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	_
Autonomous Motivation (study) \rightarrow Subjective Norms (study)	.229***	040	.269	.138	.400	<.001
Attitudes (study) \rightarrow Intention (study)	.058	.275***	.212	.085	.350	<.001
Subjective Norms (study) \rightarrow Subjective Norms (NES)	080	.037	.117	016	.250	.043
Self-regulated strategies for Learning Efficacy (study) $ ightarrow$ Intention (study)	.310***	.108**	.202	.072	.331	<.001
Attitudes (NES) \rightarrow Intention (NES)	.404***	.297***	.107	020	.235	.049

Differences in model path estimates and in confidence intervals across high-school and university students

3 4 *Note*. 95% CI = 95% confidence interval of path coefficient. Students resulted significantly different for p < .05 (one-tailed) using pooled standard error 5 method.

6 p < .001; ** p < .01

7



Figure 1. The proposed Integrated Theoretical Model. *Note*. NES = Neuro-Enchantment Substances; PBC = Perceived Behavioral Control

Figure 2. Estimates of the structural relations - high school students *Note*. NES = Neuro-Enchantment Substances; PBC = Perceived Behavioral Control. Estimates between parentheses were calculated controlling statistically for the stability of NES use over time. The statistically significant effects of Time 1 NES use on all model variables are as follow: on RAI (β = -.10, p = .01); on PBC about studying (β = .09, p = .05); on Self-regulated Strategies for Learning Efficacy (β = -.15, p = .001); on attitudes about NES (β = .22, p < .001); on subjective norms about NES use (β = .20, p < .001); on PBC about NES use (β = .25, p < .001); on planning NES use (β = .27, p < .001); on Time 2 NES use (β = .42, p < .001). Dashed lines refer to non-significant path estimates.



Figure 3. Estimates of the structural relations - university students



- 1 NES ($\beta = .11, p = .001$); on subjective norms about NES use ($\beta = .08, p = .01$); on PBC about NES use ($\beta = .13, p < .001$); on intentions about NES use (β
- 2 = .05, p =.06); on planning NES use (β = .12, p < .001); on Time 2 NES use (β = .49, p < .001). Dashed lines refer to non-significant path estimates.
- $^{***}p < .001; ^{**}p < .01; ^{*}p < .05$