

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

EXPLORING SELF-PERCEPTIONS AND SOCIAL INFLUENCES AS CORRELATES OF
ADOLESCENT LEISURE-TIME PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

C.M. Sabiston (McGill University) & P.R.E. Crocker (University of British Columbia)

Running Head: SELF-PERCEPTIONS, SOCIAL INFLUENCES, AND ACTIVITY

Submitted to: Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology

Accepted: August 2007

Author's Note:

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Catherine Sabiston, Department of Kinesiology and Physical Education, McGill University, 475 Pine Avenue West, Montreal, Canada. H2W 1S4. Email: catherine.sabiston@mcgill.ca

The authors would like to thank Valerie Hadd for her technical assistance on this project, would like to extend appreciation to all adolescents who volunteered to participate in the study, and are grateful for the feedback and suggestions provided by two anonymous reviewers and the editor.

This research was funded by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Michael Smith Foundation for Health Research.

- 1 EXPLORING SELF-PERCEPTIONS AND SOCIAL INFLUENCES AS CORRELATES OF
- 2 ADOLESCENT LEISURE-TIME PHYSICAL ACTIVITY

Abstract

This study examined adolescent leisure-time physical activity correlates using the expectancy-value (EV) model. Adolescents ($N=857$) completed questionnaires to assess competence and value self-perceptions, social influences, and physical activity. Direct and indirect effects of self-perceptions and parent and best friend influences on physical activity were explored using structural equation modeling. Measurement models were a good fit to the data and gender invariance was supported. The structural mediation model was a reasonable fit to the data, whereby the indirect effects of parents and peers and the direct effects of competence beliefs and values together accounted for 49% of the variance in physical activity. In this model, the pattern of relationships was similar for adolescent males and females. Findings supporting the EV model provide theoretical and practical implications for understanding adolescent physical activity.

Key words: expectancy-value model, competence beliefs, subjective value, role-modeled behavior, emotional support

1 Several participation motivation models identify key factors influencing physical activity
2 engagement. Based on these perspectives, perceptions of competence, enjoyment and interest,
3 and the beliefs and behaviors of significant others' are important correlates of adolescent
4 physical activity (see Sallis, Prochaska, & Taylor, 2000; Weiss & Williams, 2004). However,
5 there is limited evidence of the simultaneous effects of these factors. The expectancy-value (EV)
6 model (Eccles, 1983) provides a framework to examine these coexisting relationships. In the EV
7 model, an individual's behavior is directly a function of her/his context-specific personal
8 efficacy expectations and subjective values (Eccles, 1983; Eccles & Wigfield, 1995; Wigfield,
9 Eccles, Yoon, et al., 1997). According to Eccles and Wigfield (2002), personal efficacy
10 expectations are indiscernible from competence beliefs among children and adolescents.
11 Therefore, a factor comprised of personal efficacy expectations and competence beliefs
12 combines with subjective value to predict youth behavior. Subjective value is multidimensional
13 (Eccles & Wigfield, 2002) and includes: interest value (the enjoyment an individual gains from
14 engaging in a behavior), attainment value (the importance of doing well and engaging in a
15 behavior), utility value (the usefulness of a task or behavior to one's sense of self and future
16 goals), and relative costs (the negative components of engaging in a behavior, including
17 financial, time, opportunity, and effort costs).

18 The EV model has been used primarily as a framework to examine academic
19 achievement behaviors, yet there is growing evidence that the model provides useful
20 perspectives to understand youth sport and physical activity. For instance, competence beliefs,
21 plus utility and importance values were significantly related to time spent by adolescents in sport
22 (Eccles & Harold, 1991). The EV model was partially supported in competitive high school
23 sports, where personal efficacy expectations (but not attainment value) emerged as a significant

1 correlate of effort and persistence (Cox & Whaley, 2004). Finally, competence beliefs and
2 interest value were identified as important correlates of children's leisure activity (i.e., Dempsey
3 et al., 1993; Kimiecik et al., 1996; Kimiecik & Horn, 1998). While many of the integral
4 relationships have been explored, there is limited evidence of model testing. Also, key links
5 among self-perceptions, social relationships, and behavior have not yet been examined. A unique
6 set of EV model relationships that has not been evaluated includes the proposition that
7 perceptions of significant others' beliefs and behaviors play a primary role in youths'
8 development of competence beliefs and values.

9 Based on the EV model, the methods of parent and peer influence have been broadly
10 defined as role-modeled behavior, emotional support and encouragement, and others' beliefs
11 (Eccles, 1983; Fredricks & Eccles, 2005). Role-modeling has often been explored as significant
12 others' engagement in physical activity and/or sport. Research exploring the association between
13 role-modeled behavior and youth physical activity has yielded inconclusive results (Kimiecik et
14 al., 1996; Sallis et al., 2000; Voorhees, Murray, Welk, et al., 2005). The ambiguous findings
15 might be due to the narrowly defined operationalization of the construct to be engagement only,
16 rather than the communication of beliefs and values. Significant others' beliefs have been
17 restrictively explored with youth sport and physical activity, where values such as importance
18 and usefulness are inconsistently associated with behavior (Eccles & Harold, 1991; Kimiecik &
19 Horn, 1998). Unfortunately, there is no similar research focused on adolescents and leisure
20 physical activity. Lastly, significant others are proposed to influence youths' perceptions and
21 behaviors through emotional support such as reinforcement and encouragement (Brustad, 1996;
22 Kimiecik et al., 1996; Raudsepp, 2006; Welk, Wood, & Morss, 2003). According to the EV
23 model, significant others' role-modeled behavior, emotional support, and beliefs may impact

1 adolescents' perceptions of competence and values, which in turn influence physical activity.
2 The nature of these relationships remains elusive.

3 Many motivation studies have examined the influence of parents on their children's
4 behavior (Brustad, 1996; Fredricks & Eccles, 2005; Kimiecik & Horn, 1998; Prochaska,
5 Rodgers, & Sallis, 2002; Welk et al., 2003). Parent encouragement and support has emerged as
6 the most important mechanism influencing youth physical activity and sport behavior (Ornelas,
7 Ferreira, & Ayala, 2007; Prochaska et al., 2002; Stuart, 2003; Trost, Sallis, Pate, et al., 2003).
8 Based on a review of parental correlates of youth physical activity, Gustafson and Rhodes (2006)
9 suggest that reported associations between child and parent activity may be mediated by
10 differences in parental support and encouragement, with role-modeling having little impact. In
11 fact, the importance of parental role-modeled behavior is consistently attenuated when other
12 mechanisms of influence are observed (Brustad, 1996; Dempsey et al., 1993; Trost et al., 2003);
13 and there is some evidence of no association to youth behavior (Anderssen, Wold, & Torsheim,
14 2006). Research with adolescent samples is much less prevalent.

15 Peers also influence adolescent self-perceptions and behaviors, and may play a more
16 prominent role in relation to parents (Beets, Vogel, Forlaw, Pitetti, & Cardinal, 2006; Harter,
17 1999). In particular, close friends (i.e., best friends) may be more influential than peer groups
18 and social crowds in academic and physical domains (Berndt & Keefe, 1995; Weiss & Stuntz,
19 2004). Despite some advancement in this area (see Smith, 2003; Weiss & Stuntz, 2004), the
20 literature exploring role-modeled behavior, emotional support, and peer beliefs as mechanisms of
21 influence on adolescent physical activity perceptions and behavior is limited. It has been reported
22 that adolescent girls who have more physically active friends report greater activity (Voorhees et
23 al., 2005), and that adaptive peer relationship profiles among youth are associated with greater

1 perceptions of sport competence and enjoyment (Smith, Ullrich-French, Walker, & Hurley,
2 2006). While more evidence with close friends is necessary, Smith (2003) has also suggested
3 focusing on combined peer relationships and other social influences in physical activity contexts.
4 Understanding both peer and parent influences on adolescents' physical activity is warranted
5 since there is limited evidence examining both parent and peer influences (Smith, 2003; Ullrich-
6 French & Smith, 2006). The EV model provides a framework to explore these relationships.

7 While the EV model suggests significant other influences on physical activity behavior
8 are mediated by perceptions of competence and values, there are competing empirical
9 approaches proposing more direct relationships. Welk and colleagues (2003) proposed and
10 supported a model whereby parental influence indirectly affected children's attraction to physical
11 activity (conceptually similar to value) and perceptions of competence, and had a direct effect on
12 children's physical activity behavior. Similarly, Trost et al (2003) proposed a model directly
13 linking parent physical activity and indirectly linking parent support to children's physical
14 activity (a relationship mediated by child self-efficacy). However, findings from their study
15 revealed no significant direct association between parent and child physical activity, and an
16 additional significant relationship emerged between parental support and child physical activity.
17 Additional models exploring direct effects of parent and peer support on youth physical activity
18 have also been tested (i.e., Beets et al., 2006; Prochaska et al., 2002). These studies found lack of
19 conclusive evidence for parent and peer direct effects. Some of the inconclusive findings may be
20 attributed to the mediating role of competence beliefs and values. Thus, comparisons between
21 the EV model of mediated effects and an alternate direct effects model is warranted to further
22 understand the nature of significant other influences on adolescent physical activity.

1 It is also important to test the structural relationships in the EV model for gender
2 differences. However, differences in the relationships among perceptions of competence, value,
3 significant other influences, and adolescent physical activity behavior for adolescent males and
4 females are not likely to emerge. There is support for invariance in measures used to capture
5 self-perceptions and behavior (Crocker et al., 2000), and there is little evidence that gender
6 moderates the relationships (Eccles & Harold, 1991; Crocker et al., 2000). Also, mean-level
7 differences on the main EV model constructs should be explored. Limited evidence suggests
8 males receive more parental support for physical activity compared to females, yet report similar
9 parental role-modeling (Gustafson & Rhodes, 2006). Additionally, consistent empirical findings
10 reveal males are more likely to engage and spend more time participating in sport and physical
11 activity and exert more effort compared to females (Sallis et al., 2000; Weiss & Williams, 2004).
12 Also, males place higher importance and/or feel more competent in sport-type domains
13 compared to females (Crocker, Eklund, & Kowalski, 2000; Sallis et al., 2000). Gender
14 differences on peer influences need to be examined, and differences on all EV model constructs
15 should be explored among older adolescent males and females.

16 The general purpose of this study was to examine the structural relationships among older
17 adolescent's self-perceptions, social influences, and physical activity. A secondary purpose was
18 examining gender differences in latent means and structural relationships among these
19 constructs. Based on theoretical assumptions and empirical findings, it was hypothesized that (i)
20 perceptions of competence and value would be correlates of physical activity; (ii) perceptions of
21 best friend and parent beliefs, role-modeled behavior and emotional support would be correlates
22 of competence beliefs and values; (iii) perceptions of competence and value would mediate the
23 effects of parent and best friend influences on physical activity, and (iv) adolescent males would

1 report higher competence beliefs, values, social influences, and physical activity behavior
2 compared to females; however, there would be no significant gender differences in the structural
3 relationships in the EV model.

4 Methods

5 *Participants and Procedures*

6 Behavioral research ethics board approvals from the university and secondary school
7 districts in Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada were obtained. Approval from six (27% of
8 those contacted) school administrators was granted. Following presentations introducing the
9 study to Grade 10 through 12 classes, information packages for parents and students were
10 distributed. A minimum of 7 days later, students between the ages of 15 and 18 years who
11 provided consent ($N=902$, 57.1% response rate) participated by completing an in-class survey.

12 *Measures*

13 *Participant characteristics.* For descriptive purposes, physical characteristics were
14 assessed by reported height (meters) and weight (kilograms) that were used to calculate body
15 mass index ($BMI=kg/m^2$). Adolescents were also asked to identify their age and ethnicity.

16 *Perceptions of competence.* Perceptions of competence were assessed as general ability
17 beliefs and personal efficacy expectations for physical activity. Ability beliefs were assessed by a
18 modified version of the Perceived Competence Scale for Exercising Regularly (Williams, Ryan,
19 & Deci, 2004). This measure was modified in two ways: (i) ‘exercising regularly’ was
20 substituted with ‘participating in regular physical activity’, and (ii) the response anchor was
21 modified to reflect how often participants felt confident in their abilities to participate in regular
22 physical activity rather than how true the statement was to them. These modifications were
23 suggested by J. Eccles (personal communication, January 11, 2004) during a review of the

1 instrument for content validity, and were supported by R. Ryan (personal communication,
2 January 20, 2004). An example of an item from the 4-item scale is: *I feel capable of*
3 *participating in regular physical activity*, responded on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from
4 1=none of the time to 7=all of the time.

5 Personal efficacy expectations were assessed with three items developed for this study
6 based on recommendations from J. Eccles (personal communication, January 11, 2004). The
7 items were: *I expect to have the skills necessary to participate in regular physical activity*, *I*
8 *expect to be good at participating in regular physical activity*, and *I am able to learn new skills*
9 *necessary to participate in regular physical activity*. These items were also responded on 7-point
10 Likert scales ranging from 1=none of the time to 7=all of the time. To test the EV model, ability
11 beliefs and personal efficacy expectations were indicators of a latent variable called perceptions
12 of competence. This method has been supported elsewhere (Fredricks & Eccles, 2005).

13 *Subjective values.* Interest, attainment, and utility values were assessed using the Self-
14 and Task-Perception Questionnaire (Eccles & Wigfield, 1995; Wigfield et al., 1997). The 6 items
15 were modified to represent physical activity behaviors rather than the physical education-based
16 sport items on the original scale. The modifications were made to reflect the leisure-time nature
17 of the behavior rather than the academic achievement focus in the original items. Examples of
18 subjective value items include: interest - *In general, I find participating in physical activity*
19 *(1=very boring to 7=interesting)*; attainment - *For me, being able to participate in regular*
20 *physical activity is (1=not at all important to 7=very important)*; and utility - *I find participating*
21 *in physical activity (1=not at all valuable to 7=very valuable)*. While distinctions among values
22 can be made at the conceptual level, it has been suggested that a good fit to the overall EV model
23 is to construct a latent variable that is analogous to a global subjective value construct (Fredricks

1 & Eccles, 2005; Eccles, Personal Communication, April 24, 2005). For this study, interest,
2 attainment, and utility values were identified as indicators of a subjective value latent factor.

3 Cost values were measured using items developed with consideration of the construct
4 meaning, and based on suggestions from J. Eccles (Personal Communication, October 8, 2003).
5 The items represented time, financial, opportunity losses, and physical discomfort constraints
6 associated with physical activity. An example of a financial cost item was: *Participating in*
7 *regular physical activity requires how much of your own money?* (1=none of my own money to
8 7=a lot of my own money). Costs items were assessed on 7-point Likert scales.

9 *Perceptions of significant others' influences.* The adolescents' perceptions of parent and
10 best friend beliefs, role modeled behavior, and emotional support were assessed with existing
11 measures (Fredricks & Eccles, 2005). Sport-focused items targeting parents were modified to
12 reflect the physical activity context, and comparable items were used to explore best friend
13 influences. The items were also modified to tap adolescents' perceptions of these influences
14 rather than objective responses from parents and peers. For this study, "parent/guardian" was
15 defined as the mother/female guardian or father/male guardian with whom the adolescent spends
16 the most time with outside of school; and "best friend" was defined as the peer they spend the
17 most time with at and/or away from school. The items were answered on 7-point Likert scales
18 and there were 2 items for role-modeled behavior (e.g., *how often does your [best friend/parent*
19 *or guardian] participate in regular physical activity* (1=not at all to 7=very often)), 4 items for
20 beliefs (e.g., *To your [best friend/parent or guardian], how important is participating in regular*
21 *physical activity* (1=not at all important to 7=very important)), and 2 items for emotional support
22 (e.g., *how often does your [best friend/parent or guardian] encourage you to participate in*
23 *regular physical activity* (1=not at all to 7=very often)). In the main analyses, the three methods

1 of influence were identified as indicators of global best friend and parent influence latent factors.
2 This combined approach is supported in previous work (i.e., Welk et al., 2003).

3 *Physical activity behavior.* Physical activity was assessed using the Leisure-Time
4 Exercise Questionnaire (Godin & Shephard, 1985). The first item on the scale (PA1) assessed the
5 quantity of weekly strenuous, moderate, and light activity that occurred outside of regular
6 physical education classes. A total score was calculated by multiplying the weekly frequencies of
7 strenuous, moderate, and light activities by nine, five, and three, respectively, for a total
8 metabolic equivalent intensity value. The second item on the scale (PA2) asked for the frequency
9 of regular activity (1=*often* to 3=*never/rarely*) in a typical 7-day period that results in a fast
10 heartbeat and sweating. This item has emerged as a strong predictor of aerobic fitness during
11 construct validity tests (Godin & Shephard, 1985), and there is support for the use of this
12 measure with adolescents (Sallis, Buono, Roby, Mickle, & Nelson, 1993).

13 Physical activity was also assessed using a reliable and valid 2-item moderate-to-
14 vigorous physical activity (PA3) measure (Prochaska, Sallis, & Long, 2001). The items assessed
15 frequency of 60 minutes or more of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity in the past 7 days as
16 well as in a typical week. An average score was calculated to determine a subscale score for
17 activity. In the main analyses, the LTEQ measures and this subscale were identified as indicators
18 of a physical activity latent factor.

19 Due to the modified instruments, a pilot study was conducted with an older adolescent
20 sample ($N=68$). The findings revealed adequate internal consistencies for perceptions of
21 competence ($\alpha=.94$), personal efficacy expectations ($\alpha=.83$), subjective values of interest,
22 attainment, and utility ($\alpha=.78-.92$), and parent and best friend role-modeled behavior ($\alpha =.86$ &

1 .85), beliefs ($\alpha = .86$ & $.88$), and emotional support ($\alpha = .84$ & $.77$). A copy of the instrument can
2 be obtained from the first author.

3 *Data Analysis*

4 Means, standard deviations, and Pearson correlations for all manifest variables were
5 examined using SPSS 13.0. The adequacy of the expectancy-value (EV) model was tested using
6 the maximum likelihood estimation method of structural equation modeling with the LISREL
7 8.71 program (Joreskög & Sorböm, 2004). To test the main hypotheses related to the EV model,
8 the data were analyzed in four main steps: (i) the measurement model was tested using
9 confirmatory factor analysis (Byrne, 1998); (ii) multigroup analysis of factorial and latent mean
10 structure invariance was tested for adolescent males and females using a stepwise procedure
11 (Byrne, 1998; Vandenberg & Lance, 2000); (iii) effects of parent and best friend influences,
12 perceptions of competence, and values on adolescent physical activity were tested using path
13 modeling to compare the EV model (competence beliefs and value mediating the influence of
14 parent and best friend on physical activity) and an alternate model (direct effects of parent and
15 peer influences on physical activity) to explore competing theoretical assumptions (Holmbeck,
16 1997); and (iv) gender differences in the relationships among constructs in the best-fitting model
17 determined in (iii) were explored using structural invariance.

18 For all analyses, adequate model fit was determined using several indices (Hu & Bentler,
19 1999): (a) Comparative Fit Index (CFI; values approximating $.95$), (b) Non-Normed Fit Index
20 (NNFI; values approximating $.95$); and (c) Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA;
21 values approximating $.05$). Since chi-square values can become complicated with sample size
22 and non-normal distributions, these values were not used to make decisions about model fit
23 (Byrne, 1998). Chi-square was used to determine significant differences between competing

1 models. Specifically, a significant chi-square change value, with respect to the change in degrees
2 of freedom, illustrates that one model is a better fit to the data. In all analyses, critical values of t
3 ≥ 1.96 and/or $p \leq .05$ were used to determine statistical significance.

4 Results

5 *Descriptive Statistics*

6 Data was screened for accuracy and assumptions. Forty-five individuals were excluded
7 from further analyses due to missing descriptive data ($n=27$) and not meeting the study age
8 restrictions of 15 to 18 years ($n=18$). The final sample consisted of 438 girls and 419 boys (M
9 age = 16.32, $SD=.94$) who self-described as primarily Caucasian (54.5%) and Asian (24.9%) and
10 reported mean BMI's of 21.68 kg/m² (males) and 21.17 kg/m² (females).

11 The data were relatively multivariate normal (Mardia's coefficient = 1.12 for adolescent
12 males and 1.16 for females). The normalized kurtosis values were 9.42 and 12.32, respectively.
13 Examining the instrument properties, all measures had acceptable internal consistencies ($\alpha=.76$ -
14 $.94$), except cost value ($\alpha=.46$). Cost value was excluded from all analyses. Means and standard
15 deviations and correlations for the study variables are presented in Table 1.

16 *Main Analyses*

17 *Confirmatory factor analyses.* The mediation measurement model was specified where
18 the indicators were uniquely loaded on appropriate factors, the variance of each latent factor was
19 fixed to 1.00 for identification, factors were allowed to correlate, and the uniquenesses
20 (measurement error associated with the observed variables) were not allowed to correlate. As
21 revealed in Table 2, the factor loadings were all relatively high and significant (93% greater than
22 $.60$), with low standard errors ($<.05$). The uniquenesses demonstrated moderate random error in
23 the ability of the expectancy-value items to assess the latent constructs. The correlations among

1 expectancy-value latent factors were moderate (see Table 2). Fit statistics show good fitting
2 measurement models for the total sample, females, and males (see Table 3, Model 1a-1c).

3 *Group invariance.* To test invariance across the measurement models for males and
4 females, equality constraints (or restrictions) were set for the factor structure, loadings,
5 variances, and covariances, and residuals in successive models (Byrne, 1998; Vandenberg &
6 Lance, 2000). Invariance was evaluated by a chi-square (χ^2) difference test between nested
7 models, in addition to RMSEA, CFI, and NNFI fit indices (Byrne, 1998). Results revealed
8 significant chi-square difference tests between Models 2b through 2e (Table 3), however the fit
9 indices of the various nested models were nearly identical to the baseline model. There were no
10 significant changes in model fit for the equivalency of factor structure and loadings (Table 3,
11 Model 2a and Model 2b). A non-significant test of invariant factor loadings, coupled with
12 minimal change in fit indices, is an adequate observation to demonstrate a non-difference in
13 simultaneous group analyses (Dishman, Motl, Saunders, et al., 2002; Marsh, Hey, Johnson, &
14 Perry, 1997). Therefore, findings support factorial equivalency of the measurement model.

15 *Invariance of latent means.* To explore latent mean differences for adolescent males and
16 females, it was necessary to specify a model with invariant factor loadings and invariant item
17 intercepts across groups, and to fix the factor intercepts of one group (adolescent females) to zero
18 (Byrne, 1998). While a test of invariant item intercepts is not of substantive interest, an adequate
19 fitting model is necessary to accurately interpret the latent mean estimates (Byrne, 1998). As
20 shown in Table 3 (Model 3), the invariant factor loading and intercept model was acceptable
21 based on the fit statistics. Differences in latent factor means were identified by examining the
22 Kappa matrix in the LISREL output, which shows parameter estimates, standard errors, and *t*-
23 values for the latent means of the male group in comparison to the female group. In addition to

1 reporting the t -values, standardized effect sizes were calculated using the following equation
 2 from sample data: $d = |\kappa_1 - \kappa_2| / \phi^{1/2}$, where $\kappa_1 - \kappa_2$ are sample latent variable means for each group
 3 and ϕ is a within-groups pooled variance estimate for latent variable scores. A value for ϕ was
 4 determined by $\phi = [(n_1 * \phi_1) + (n_2 * \phi_2)] / (n_1 + n_2)$, where ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 are estimated variances from the
 5 latent variables, and n_1 and n_2 are the group sample sizes (Hancock, 2001). With two groups and
 6 the use of reliable instruments, these effect sizes can be interpreted based on social science
 7 guidelines of $d = .2, .5,$ and $.8$ equating to small, medium, and large effect sizes, respectively
 8 (Hancock, 2001). Adolescent males had significantly higher perceptions of competence ($t = 7.17,$
 9 $d = .50$), subjective value ($t = 3.57, d = .23$), and physical activity ($t = 6.92, d = .54$) and lower parent
 10 influence ($t = -2.29, d = .17$) compared to females. There were no differences in the latent means
 11 for best friend influence ($t = 1.79, d = .13$). These results supported the hypothesis of gender
 12 differences for all factors with the exception of best friend influence.

13 *Path models.* The adolescent male and female samples were pooled to test the structural
 14 models. In the path analysis, the first loading of each congeneric set of measures was set to 1.0
 15 for identification, and the parent-best friend and competence beliefs-value latent factors were
 16 free to correlate. Two conceptual latent path models were examined to compare a mediation
 17 model and a competing direct effects model. The direct effects model (see Figure 1) was tested
 18 in which best friend and parent influences, in addition to perceptions of competence and
 19 subjective value, were hypothesized to relate to physical activity directly. Goodness-of fit
 20 statistics revealed an adequate structural model (see Table 3, Model 4a). This model accounted
 21 for 50% of the variance in adolescent physical activity. The significance of the direct and indirect
 22 effects were identified by examining the gamma (direct) and indirect effects matrices in the
 23 LISREL output. These matrices show the parameter estimates, standard errors, and t -values for

1 the relationships among endogenous and exogenous latent variables. The relative contribution of
2 the direct and indirect effects can be calculated using the following formula: Percentage (%) of
3 indirect (or direct) effects = (indirect (or direct) effects/total effects)*100, where total effects =
4 indirect + direct effects. As revealed in Table 4, best friend influences on physical activity were
5 primarily indirect effects ((.27/.38)*100=71%), with significant direct effects also emerging in
6 the model. Only the indirect effects of parent influences on physical activity were significant,
7 accounting for more than 94% ((.17/.18)*100) of the total effects.

8 The mediation model (see Figure 2) was tested in which best friend and parent influences
9 were hypothesized to relate to physical activity indirectly through perceptions of competence and
10 values. Fit statistics suggested this model was a good fit to the data (Table 3, Model 4b), and
11 accounted for 49% of the variance in activity. The direct and indirect effects are presented in
12 Table 4. The competing models were then compared to determine the best representation of the
13 data. The direct effects model was a statistically significantly better fitting model compared to
14 the mediation model based on the chi-square difference ($\Delta\chi^2 = 7.16$) for 2 degrees of freedom. A
15 closer look at the evidence, however, suggests that there is little gained by allowing the direct
16 relationships between parent and best friend influences and physical activity. The evidence
17 consists of the stable fit indices, insubstantial change in R^2 moving from the direct model
18 ($R^2=.50$) to the mediation model ($R^2=.49$), the path from parent to physical activity emerging as
19 non-significant, and the path from best friend to physical activity being relatively weak.
20 Furthermore, the decomposition of effects did not provide substantial support for direct effects.
21 Therefore, the mediation model is deemed an appropriate fit to the data based on model
22 parsimony and conceptual considerations. Based on this model and in support of three main
23 study hypotheses: (i) perceptions of competence and value were correlates of physical activity;

1 (ii) perceptions of best friend and parent influences were correlates of competence beliefs and
2 values; (iii) perceptions of competence and value mediated the effects of parent and best friend
3 influences on physical activity.

4 *Structural group invariance.* A final test was conducted to explore significant gender
5 differences on path coefficients in the mediation model. The baseline model (Table 3, Model 5a)
6 shows all paths free to be estimated for both genders. This model was compared to a fully
7 constrained model where all paths were set equal (Table 3, Model 5b). Based on the chi-square
8 difference ($\Delta\chi^2=7.97$) for 6 degree of freedom, the paths were not significantly different for
9 adolescent males and females. These findings defend the hypothesis of no gender differences in
10 the model relationships, and provide further support for the EV model.¹

11 Discussion

12 This research explored the applicability of the expectancy-value (EV) model in
13 understanding physical activity in older adolescents. The findings of good-fitting measurement
14 and structural models, coupled with the 49% of accounted variance in adolescent physical
15 activity exemplify the utility of the EV model. Consistent with the conceptual framework,
16 competence beliefs and values were strong correlates of physical activity, and both parent and
17 best friend influences were significant sources of competence beliefs and value. The significant
18 indirect effects of best friend and parent influences on physical activity and the strong support
19 for gender invariance in the measurement and structural models further support the EV tenets.
20 This study is one of the first to confirm the salient relationships of the EV model with physical
21 activity in older adolescents.

22 Based on the EV model, the main purpose of this study explored perceptions of
23 competence and values as mediators of the relationship between best friend and parent influences

1 and adolescent physical activity behavior. The benefit of this study over others with similar
2 objectives (i.e., Beets et al., 2006; Prochaska et al., 2002; Trost et al., 2003; Welk et al., 2003) is
3 the model testing of competing theoretical perspectives. With this approach, it was clear that
4 mediation was supported and the EV model is a logical framework to study adolescent physical
5 activity. Furthermore, the findings provide evidence that physical activity perceptions of
6 competence and value are both integral to understanding adolescent physical activity and should
7 be included in conceptual models of participation motivation. This finding is consistent with
8 expectancy-value research targeting youth participation in sport and physical activity (Brustad,
9 1996; Eccles & Harold, 1991; Dempsey et al., 1993; Kimiecik et al., 1998). Finally, the results
10 support developmental perspectives associated with behavioral influences (Harter, 1999; Horn,
11 2004). Specifically, parents continue to act as sources of physical activity self-perceptions and
12 behavior into older adolescence, but play a smaller role compared to peers. This is evident in the
13 small significant direct effect of best friend on physical activity. However, it is clear that the key
14 correlates of behavior are self-perceptions of competence and value.

15 Perceptions of parent and best friend influences were hypothesized correlates of
16 competence beliefs and values. The final model revealed that these influences combined to
17 account for 17% of the variance in perceptions of competence. This finding supports the growing
18 body of literature exploring sources of competence beliefs (i.e., Harter, 1999; Horn, 2004; Weiss
19 & Amorose, 2005) while extending the evidence to an older adolescent sample. Both parent and
20 best friend influences were also sources of physical activity values, accounting for 27% of the
21 variance. There is limited evidence of the sources of subjective values in sport and physical
22 activity. Stuart (2003) found that social influences were key factors associated with multiple
23 dimensions of youth sport values. Stuart reported that among youth who reported low sport

1 values, significant other behaviors (role-modeling) were linked to interest and attainment values
2 whereas peer and parent beliefs were associated with the usefulness of sport. Encouragement
3 (support) from significant others was also associated with high sport values among youth. Using
4 a person-centered approach, Smith and colleagues (2006) reported adaptive peer relationship
5 profiles among early adolescent sport participants were associated with greater perceptions of
6 sport enjoyment and competence beliefs. Little is known of the associations between significant
7 other influences and older adolescent's physical activity values. The current study suggests
8 parent and best friend influences should continue to be explored as sources of adolescent
9 physical activity values. As such, the EV model provides a framework to test sources of values
10 and perceptions of competence and can guide further research and intervention strategies in this
11 area. The practical application of these findings needs to be explored, as well as examining
12 teachers, siblings, and significant others as additional sources of beliefs, role-modeled behavior
13 and emotional support for adolescent physical activity behavior.

14 In support of the hypothesis for mean-gender differences, adolescent males reported greater
15 perceptions of competence, value, and physical activity. Boys consistently report greater
16 perceptions of competence, are more interested in and enjoy physical activity, and more
17 frequently engage in activity compared to girls (Crocker et al., 2000; Fredricks & Eccles, 2005;
18 Sallis et al., 2000). Common reasons for these gender differences include propositions such as:
19 (i) parent/guardian stereotypes support the traditional notion that males *should* be better at sports
20 and physical activity (Fredericks & Eccles, 2005); (ii) continued societal valence placed on the
21 masculine nature of sport and physical activity (Eccles, Barber, Jozefowicz, Malanchuk, & Vida,
22 1999; Trost et al., 2003); and (iii) strong theoretical links between sport competence, sport skills,
23 and male self-esteem (Eccles et al., 1999; Harter, 1999). Based on the EV model and current

1 findings, males were more likely to be physically active because they have enhanced perceptions
2 of competence and value compared to females. Contrary to the hypothesis, males reported
3 significantly less parental influence compared to females, and there were no gender differences
4 on reporting of best friend influences. While there is generally limited evidence of gender
5 differences pertaining to best friend influences on adolescent physical activity, research has both
6 supported (Brustad, 1996; Kimiecik & Horn, 1998; Raudsepp, 2006) and contradicted
7 (Gustafson & Rhodes, 2006; Trost et al., 2003) the finding of greater parental influence among
8 females. Most of this evidence has been with younger children and early adolescents, and has
9 involved actual parental reports instead of adolescent perceptions of parental influences. The EV
10 tenets suggest that adolescents' perceptions of significant other influences are integral to their
11 physical activity behavior, thus more research is needed to explore differences in these
12 perceptions for adolescent males and females. Nonetheless, it is generally understood that
13 parental influences are important for enhancing youth physical activity. Some researchers have
14 also suggested that parental physical activity support is particularly relevant for girls (Fogelholm,
15 Nuutinen, Pasanen, Myohanen, & Saatela, 1999), and that girls may be more responsive to
16 parental influences (Ornelas et al., 2006). The higher perceptions of parental influence reported
17 by females in the current study may be confirming this latter point with an older adolescent
18 sample. It is important to note that higher perceptions of parental influence were not reflected in
19 females' higher self-perceptions or behaviors. Likewise, lower perceptions of parental influence
20 for males did not appear to influence their self-perceptions or behavior. More research is
21 warranted to understand gender differences on perceptions of social influences. The EV model
22 suggests the adolescent's cultural milieu (i.e., gender role stereotypes, cultural stereotypes, and
23 family demographics) and significant others' own beliefs and behaviors need to be explored in

1 order to understand the reported gender differences (Eccles, 1983; Eccles et al., 1999; Eccles &
2 Wigfield, 2002). These propositions require further research, and longitudinal designs would
3 enable the exploration of when and why these gender differences emerge.

4 In spite of the mean-level gender differences that emerged in this study, there were no
5 differences in the proposed structural relationships. This is an important observation implying
6 that parent and peer influences similarly impact adolescent male and female perceptions of
7 competence and values, which in turn similarly affect their physical activity. Thus, intervention
8 strategies targeting adolescent physical activity should focus on these main constituents. Separate
9 interventions for males and females would be most practical provided the mean-level gender
10 differences, but similar strategies could (and should) be implemented. Unfortunately, most
11 studies to date have either not explored gender differences in the relationships among social
12 influences, self-perceptions, and physical activity or have only partially tested the proposition.
13 Thus it is recommended that future studies test the significance of relationship differences for
14 males and females so that intervention strategies can be appropriately tailored.

15 The findings from this study must be considered within the context of inherent
16 limitations. With the cross-sectional nature of the study, there is an inability to determine causal
17 links and direction of relationships. The results here support only the initial directions proposed
18 in the EV model, yet reciprocal effects are possible and should be explored using longitudinal
19 designs. For example Crocker, Sabiston, Kowalski, McDonough, and Kowalski (2006) recently
20 reported reciprocal effects between physical competence perceptions and physical activity levels
21 in a three-year longitudinal study of adolescent girls. Furthermore, the current study sampled
22 adolescents from classes at various schools and it is appropriate to acknowledge the possible
23 clustering of responses that have not been accounted for in the current analyses. An additional

1 limitation of this study is the inability to adequately measure cost value, which has been reported
2 elsewhere (Cox & Whaley, 2004; Eccles & Wigfield, 2002). It is clear that the construct is
3 multidimensional, and improving the assessment of costs would include exploring additional
4 items for each of the dimensions of time, effort, financial, and effort/difficulty. The
5 developmental period of adolescence is at the cusp of independence, and the costs associated
6 with behavior may be more informative than at any other time. Unfortunately, the
7 conceptualization and measurement of cost value is still in its infancy, and requires rigorous
8 testing and implementation to accurately examine the possible effects on the EV model.

9 In spite of the limitations, the results provide support for the expectancy-value model
10 tenets and advance the literature on correlates of leisure physical activity among older
11 adolescents – a population often ignored in studies of this kind (Sallis et al., 2000). The findings
12 from this study, coupled with supporting recommendations from the field, suggest that the
13 effectiveness of intervention programs should be maximized when adolescents: (i) report
14 competence in their ability to engage in physical activity; (ii) enjoy the behaviors they have
15 chosen and find them personally important and useful; and (iii) perceptions of competence and
16 value would be enhanced by maximizing encouragement and support from parents and peers.

17 *Notes*

18 ¹ Given the recent emphasis on the combined effects of parent and peer influences (Smith, 2003;
19 Ullrich-French & Smith, 2006), interaction effects were also examined. Since the EV model does
20 not necessarily suggest interactive effects, it was not a main hypothesis in this study. Interactive
21 effects were explored for males and females separately (using group-mean centered data) and as
22 a combined sample (grand-mean centered data). Interactions were explored using hierarchical
23 regression analyses following guidelines provided by Jaccard, Turrisi, & Wan (1990). The
24 analyses included exploring the interaction of best friend and parent beliefs, emotional support,
25 and role-modeled behavior on: (i) competence beliefs; (ii) subjective value; and (iii) physical
26 activity. In all analyses, the second steps in the regressions were not significant, and none of the
27 interaction terms significantly accounted for additional variance of competence beliefs, values,
28 or physical activity.

References

- 1
2
3 Anderssen, N., Wold, B., & Torsheim, T. (2006). Are parental health habits transmitted to their
4 children? An eight-year longitudinal study of physical activity in adolescents and their
5 parents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 29, 513-524.
- 6 Beets, M. W., Vogel, R., Forlaw, I., Pitetti, K. H., & Cardinal, B. J. (2006). Social support and
7 youth physical activity: The role of provider and type. *American Journal of Health*
8 *Behavior*, 30, 278-289.
- 9 Berndt, T. J., & Keefe, K. (1995). Friend's influence on adolescents' adjustment to school. *Child*
10 *Development*, 66, 1312-1329.
- 11 Brustad, R. J. (1996). Attraction to physical activity in urban schoolchildren: Parental
12 socialization and gender influences. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 67, 316-
13 323.
- 14 Byrne, B. M. (1998). *Structural equation modeling with LISREL, PRELIS, and SIMPLIS: Basic*
15 *concepts, applications, and programming*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- 16 Cox, A. E., & Whaley, D. E. (2004). The influence of task value, expectancies for success, and
17 identity on athletes' achievement behaviors. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 16, 103-
18 117.
- 19 Crocker, P. R. E., Sabiston, C. M., Kowalski, K. C., McDonough, M. H., & Kowalski, N.
20 (2006). Longitudinal assessment of the relationship between physical self-concept and
21 health related behavior and emotion in adolescent girls. *Journal of Applied Sport*
22 *Psychology*, 185-200.
- 23 Crocker, P. R. E., Eklund, R. C., & Kowalski, K. C. (2000). Children's physical activity and
24 physical self-perceptions. *Journal of Sport Science*, 18, 383-394.

- 1 Dempsey, J. M., Kimiecik, J. C., & Horn, T. S. (1993). Parental influence on children's moderate
2 to vigorous physical activity participation: An expectancy-value approach. *Pediatric*
3 *Exercise Science, 5*, 151-167.
- 4 Dishman, R. K., Motl, R. W., Saunders, R. P., Dowda, M., Felton, G., Ward, D. S., & Pate, R. R.
5 (2002). Factorial invariance and latent mean structure of questionnaires measuring social-
6 cognitive determinants of physical activity among black and white adolescents girls.
7 *Preventive Medicine, 34*, 100-108.
- 8 Eccles, J. S. (1983). Expectancies, values, and academic behavior. In J. T. Spence (Ed.),
9 *Achievement and achievement motives* (pp. 75-146). San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman.
- 10 Eccles, J. S., Barber, B., Jozefowicz, D., Malanchuk, O., & Vida, M. (1999). Self-evaluations of
11 competence, task values, and self-esteem. In N. G. Johnson, M. C. Roberts & J. Worell
12 (Eds.), *Beyond appearance: A new look at adolescent girls* (pp. 53-84). Washington, D.C.:
13 American Psychological Association.
- 14 Eccles, J. S., & Harold, R. D. (1991). Gender differences in sport involvement: Applying the
15 Eccles' expectancy-value model. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 3*, 7-35.
- 16 Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (1995). In the mind of the actor: the structure of adolescents'
17 achievement task values and expectancy-related beliefs. *Personality and Social Psychology*
18 *Bulletin, 21*, 215-225.
- 19 Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of*
20 *Psychology, 53*, 109-132.

- 1 Fogelholm, M., Nuutinen, O., Pasanen, M., Myohanen, E., & Saatela, T. (1999). Parent-child
2 relationship of physical activity patterns and obesity. *International Journal of Obesity and*
3 *Related Metabolic Disorders*, 23, 1262-1269.
- 4 Fredricks, J. A., & Eccles, J. S. (2005). Family socialization, gender, and sport motivation and
5 involvement. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 27(1), 3-31.
- 6 Godin, G., & Shephard, R. J. (1985). A simple method to assess exercise behavior in the
7 community. *Canadian Journal of Applied Sport Science*, 10, 141-146.
- 8 Gustafson, S. L. & Rhodes, R. E. (2006). Parental correlates of physical activity in children and
9 early adolescents. *Sports Medicine*, 36, 79-97.
- 10 Hancock, G. (2001). Effect size, power, and sample size determination for structured means
11 modeling and MIMIC approaches to between-groups hypothesis testing of means on a
12 single latent construct. *Psychometrika*, 66, 373-388.
- 13 Harter, S. (1999). *The construction of the self: A developmental perspective*. New York:
14 Guilford.
- 15 Holmbeck, G. N. (1997). Toward terminological, conceptual, and statistical clarity in the study
16 of mediators and moderators: Examples from the child-clinical and pediatric psychology
17 literatures. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 65, 599-610.
- 18 Horn, T. S. (2004). Developmental perspectives on self-perceptions in children and adolescents.
19 In M. R. Weiss (Ed.), *Developmental sport and exercise psychology: A lifespan perspective*
20 (pp. 101-144). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- 21 Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis:
22 Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55.
- 23 Jaccard, J., & Turrisi, R. (2003). *Interaction effects in multiple regression*. Thousand Oaks, CA:

- 1 Sage.
- 2 Kimiecik, J. C., & Horn, T. S. (1998). Parental beliefs and children's moderate-to-vigorous
3 physical activity. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 69, 163-175.
- 4 Kimiecik, J. C., Horn, T. S., & Shurin, C. S. (1996). Relationships among children's beliefs,
5 perceptions of their parents' beliefs, and their moderate-to-vigorous physical activity.
6 *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 67, 324-336.
- 7 Marsh, H. W., Hey, J., Johnson, S., & Perry, C. (1997). Elite athlete self-description
8 questionnaire: hierarchical confirmatory factor analysis of responses by two distinct groups
9 of elite athletics. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 28, 237-258.
- 10 Ornelas, I. J., Perreira, K. M., & Ayala, G. X. (2007, February 2). Parental influences on
11 adolescent physical activity: a longitudinal study. *International Journal of Behavioral*
12 *Nutrition and Physical Activity*. Retrieved May 18, 2007, from
13 <http://www.ijbnpa.org/content/4/1/3>
- 14 Prochaska, J. J., Rodgers, M. W., & Sallis, J. F. (2002). Associate of parent and peer support
15 with adolescent physical activity. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 73, 206-211.
- 16 Prochaska, J. J., Sallis, J. F., & Long, B. (2001). A physical activity screening measure for use
17 with adolescents in primary care. *Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine*, 155, 554-
18 559.
- 19 Raudsepp, L. (2006). The relationship between socio-economic status, parental support and
20 adolescent physical activity. *Acta Paediatrica*, 95, 93-98.

- 1 Sallis, J. F., Buono, M. J., Roby, J. J., Mickle, F. G., & Nelson, J. A. (1993). Seven-day recall
2 and other physical activity self-report in children and adolescents. *Medicine and Science in*
3 *Sport and Exercise*, 25, 99-108.
- 4 Sallis, J. F., Prochaska, J. J., & Taylor, W. C. (2000). A review of correlates of physical activity
5 of children and adolescents. *Medicine and Science in Sport and Exercise*, 32(5), 963-975.
- 6 Smith, A. L. (2003). Peer relationships in physical activity contexts: A road less traveled in
7 youth sport and exercise psychology research. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 4, 25-39.
- 8 Smith, A. L., Ullrich-French, S., Walker, E., & Hurley, K. S. (2006). Peer relationship profiles
9 and motivation in youth sport. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 28, 362-382.
- 10 Stuart, M. E. (2003). Sources of subjective task value in sport: An examination of adolescents
11 with high or low value for sport. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 15, 239-255.
- 12 Trost, S.G., Sallis, J.F., Pate, R.R., Freedson, P.S., Taylor, W.C., & Dowda, M. (2003)
13 Evaluating a model of parental influence on youth physical activity behavior. *American*
14 *Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 25, 277-82.
- 15 Ullrich-French, S., & Smith, A. L. (2006). Perceptions of relationships with parents and peers in
16 youth sport: Independent and combined prediction of motivational outcomes. *Psychology of*
17 *Sport and Exercise*, 7, 193-214.
- 18 Voorhees, C. C., Murray, D., Welk, G. J., Birnbaum, A., Ribisl, K. M., Johnson, C. C., et al.
19 (2005). The role of social network factors and physical activity in adolescent girls.
20 *American Journal of Health Behavior*, 29, 183-190.

- 1 Weiss, M. R., & Amorose, A. J. (2005). Children's self-perceptions in the physical domain:
2 Between-and within-age variability in level, accuracy, and sources of perceived
3 competence. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 27, 226-244.
- 4 Weiss, M. R., & Stuntz, C. P. (2004). A little friendly competition: Peer relationships and
5 psychosocial development in youth sport and physical activity contexts. In M. R. Weiss
6 (Ed.), *Developmental sport and exercise psychology: a lifespan perspective* (pp. 165-196.).
7 Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.
- 8 Weiss, M. R., & Williams, L. (2004). The why of youth sport involvement: A developmental
9 perspective on motivation processes. In M. R. Weiss (Ed.), *Developmental sport and*
10 *exercise psychology: a lifespan perspective*. (pp. 223-268). Morgantown, WV: Fitness
11 Information Technology.
- 12 Welk, G. J., Wood, K., & Morss, G. (2003). Parental influences on physical activity in children:
13 an exploration of potential mechanisms. *Pediatric Exercise Science*, 15, 19-33.
- 14 Wigfield, A., Eccles, J. S., Yoon, K. S., Harold, R. D., Arbreton, A. J., Freedman-Doan, C., et al.
15 (1997). Change in children's competence beliefs and subjective task values across the
16 elementary school years: A 3-year study. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 89, 451-469.
- 17 Williams, G.C., Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2004). Health care, self-determination theory
18 questionnaire packet. Retrieved September 18, 2004. Available online:
19 <http://www.psych.rochester.edu/SDT/measures/health.html>

1 Table 1.

2 *Correlation Coefficients for Adolescent Males (n=419; top) and Females (n=438; bottom), and Means and Standard Deviations (SD)*

3 *for Significant Other Influences, Perceptions of Competence, Values, and Physical Activity.*

Variables	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.	11.	12.	13.	14.
1. PA1	-	.53*	.49*	.33*	.35*	.20*	.24*	.20*	.16*	.15*	.18*	.09	.08	.04
2. PA2	.62*	-	.55*	.43*	.41*	.37*	.36*	.39*	.21*	.20*	.23*	.14*	.14*	.05
3. PA3	.62*	.62*	-	.57*	.56*	.45*	.46*	.47*	.30*	.32*	.31*	.27*	.23*	.17*
4. AB	.44*	.51*	.56*	-	.87*	.62*	.63*	.64*	.28*	.26*	.30*	.31*	.25*	.13*
5. PE	.42*	.49*	.50*	.89*	-	.61*	.63*	.62*	.23*	.26*	.26*	.32*	.26*	.13*
6. IN	.35*	.44*	.44*	.62*	.57*	-	.68*	.67*	.31*	.30*	.33*	.35*	.27*	.13*
7. AT	.32*	.46*	.40*	.62*	.56*	.73*	-	.80*	.30*	.34*	.33*	.41*	.35*	.17*
8. UT	.37*	.52*	.47*	.64*	.61*	.71*	.76*	-	.29*	.35*	.31*	.43*	.41*	.20*
9. BES	.28*	.31*	.37*	.39*	.37*	.36*	.36*	.39*	-	.77*	.62*	.22*	.18*	.19*
10. BB	.23*	.23*	.28*	.34*	.32*	.27*	.34*	.35*	.79*	-	.75*	.27*	.28*	.21*
11. BRM	.24*	.21*	.29*	.32*	.31*	.29*	.30*	.33*	.68*	.80*	-	.27*	.27*	.20*
12. PES	.20*	.33*	.26*	.31*	.30*	.32*	.34*	.36*	.35*	.25*	.25*	-	.74*	.41*

13. PB	.21*	.30*	.25*	.30*	.33*	.26*	.31*	.36*	.33*	.33*	.28*	.74*	-	.52*
14. PRM	.05	.10*	.08	.17*	.18*	.16*	.16*	.15*	.20*	.23*	.20*	.42*	.53*	-
Males	61.61	2.42	3.54	21.90	16.48	11.58	11.22	11.21	7.63	14.84	9.91	10.55	18.49	7.68
	(30.58)	(.60)	(1.78)	(4.80)	(3.44)	(2.53)	(2.53)	(2.69)	(3.76)	(6.05)	(3.07)	(3.16)	(5.74)	(3.17)
Females	48.55	2.11	2.90	19.35	14.64	10.42	10.81	10.69	7.64	14.72	8.72	10.65	19.58	8.16
	(29.42)	(.71)	(1.93)	(5.86)	(4.19)	(3.11)	(2.82)	(2.94)	(3.80)	(6.51)	(3.65)	(3.47)	(6.02)	(3.50)

- 1 *Note.* PA1= Physical activity in METS; PA2= Physical activity frequency; PA3= Moderate-to-vigorous physical activity; AB=Ability
- 2 beliefs; PE=Personal efficacy expectations; IN=Interest value; AT=Attainment value; UT=Utility value; BES=Best friend emotional
- 3 support; BP=Best friend beliefs; BRM=Best friend role modeled behavior; PES=Parent emotional support; PB=Parent beliefs;
- 4 PRM=Parent role modeled behavior. All constructs, with the exception of PA2, are composite scores.
- 5 * $p < .05$

1 Table 2.
 2 *Standardized Factor Loadings and Uniquenesses for the Expectancy-Value Latent Factors, and*
 3 *Correlations among the Latent Factors in the Measurement Models for the Total Sample, and*
 4 *Separately for Adolescent Females and Males.*

Latent factors + indicators	Factor loadings	Uniqueness	Correlations				
			PA	PC	SV	Best friend	Parent
Total Sample (N=857)							
Physical activity			-	.69	.62	.37	.28
PA1	.71	.50					
PA2	.78	.39					
PA3	.81	.34					
Perceptions of competence				-	.75	.36	.31
AB	.97	.07					
PE	.92	.16					
Subjective value					-	.43	.43
IN	.81	.35					
AT	.87	.24					
UT	.88	.22					
Best friend						-	.35
BES	.82	.33					
BB	.95	.10					

	BRM	.80	.35					
Parent							-	
	PES	.80	.35					
	PB	.92	.16					
	PRM	.56	.58					
				Females (<i>n</i> =438)				
Physical activity				-	.66	.63	.37	.35
	PA1	.75	.44					
	PA2	.80	.36					
	PA3	.81	.35					
Perceptions of competence				-	.75	.39		.35
	AB	.98	.24					
	PE	.91	.18					
Subjective value					-	.43		.41
	IN	.83	.31					
	AT	.87	.25					
	UT	.87	.24					
Best friend							-	.38
	BES	.95	.11					
	BB	.83	.30					
	BRM	.84	.30					
Parent								-
	PES	.80	.36					

PB	.93	.13				
PRM	.56	.58				
Males (<i>n</i> =419)						
Physical activity			-	.69	.59	.37 .28
PA1	.61	.63				
PA2	.70	.51				
PA3	.83	.31				
Perceptions of competence				-	.77	.30 .33
AB	.94	.11				
PE	.91	.14				
Subjective value					-	.42 .49
IN	.77	.40				
AT	.89	.21				
UT	.89	.20				
Best friend						- .33
BES	.96	.09				
BB	.80	.36				
BRM	.78	.39				
Parent						
PES	.87	.33				
PB	.90	.19				
PRM	.55	.69				

- 1 *Note.* PA1= Physical activity in METS; PA2= Physical activity frequency; PA3= Moderate-to-
- 2 vigorous physical activity; AB=Ability beliefs; PE=Personal efficacy expectations; IN=Interest
- 3 value; AT=Attainment value; UT=Utility value; BES=Best friend emotional support; BP=Best
- 4 friend beliefs; BRM=Best friend role modeled behavior; PES=Parent emotional support;
- 5 PB=Parent beliefs; PRM=Parent role modeled behavior. All coefficients are significant, $p < .05$

1 Table 3.

2 *Goodness of Fit Statistics for Measurement, Group Invariance, and Structural Models*

Models	χ^2	<i>df</i>	<i>RMSEA</i>	<i>CFI</i>	<i>NNFI</i>
Model 1 – Measurement Model					
Total Sample	250.85	69	.055	.98	.97
Females	160.95	69	.055	.98	.97
Males	148.72	69	.053	.98	.97
Model 2 – Group Invariance					
2a. Baseline	295.05	134	.053	.98	.97
2b. FL	320.30	143	.054	.98	.97
2c. FL+FV	342.78*	148	.055	.97	.97
2d. FL+FV+FC	363.07*	158	.055	.97	.97
2e. FL+FV+FC+U	412.14*	172	.058	.97	.97
Model 3 – Latent means					
3. FL+II+LM	423.94	152	.065	.97	.96
Model 4 – Structural models					
4a. Direct effects model	243.69	67	.056	.98	.97
4b. Mediation model	250.85	69	.055	.98	.97
Model 5 – Structural invariance					
5a. Baseline	333.83	144	.056	.98	.97
5b. Equal paths	341.80	150	.055	.97	.97

- 1 *Note.* χ^2 =chi-square; *df*=degrees of freedom; RMSEA=root mean square error of approximation;
- 2 CFI=confirmatory fit index; NNFI=non-normed fit index; FL=factor loadings; FV=factor
- 3 variances; FC=factor covariances; U=uniquenesses; II=item intercepts; LM=latent means.
- 4 **p*<.05: chi-square difference between nested models.

5

6

1 Table 4.
 2 *Direct and indirect effects of best friend and parent influences, perceptions of competence, and*
 3 *subjective value on physical activity.*

	Unstandardized parameter estimates (standard error)		Standardized parameter estimate	
Direct model				
	Indirect effects	Direct Effects	Indirect effects	Direct Effects
Best friend	1.35 (.22)*	.38 (.13)*	.27*	.11*
Parent	.73 (.10)*	.06 (.29)	.17*	.01
PC	-	2.08 (.23)*	-	.51*
SV	-	1.66 (.54)*	-	.18*
Mediation model				
Best friend	.80 (.10)*	-	.22*	-
Parent	1.48 (.23)*	-	.18*	-
PC	-	2.08 (.23)*	-	.51*
SV	-	2.14 (.50)*	-	.23*

4 * $t \leq 1.96$


5

1 Figure caption

2 Figure 1. Direct effects model depicting the standardized solution for the direct effects of best
3 friend and parent influences, perceptions of competence (PC), and subjective value (SV) on
4 physical activity for adolescents.

5 Figure 2. Mediation model depicting the standardized solution for the best friend and parent
6 influences as indirect effects of physical activity and perceptions of competence (PC) and
7 subjective value (SV) as direct effects of physical activity for adolescents.

8



1
2

