

Goal Motives and Well-Being in Student-Athletes: A Person-Centered Approach

Laura C. Healy,¹ Nikos Ntoumanis,² and Calum A. Arthur³

¹Nottingham Trent University; ²Curtin University; ³UK Sport

Using a person-centered approach, the aim of this study was to examine how student-athletes' motives for multiple-goal pursuit relate to indices of well- and ill-being. Student-athletes ($N = 362$) from British universities identified the most important sporting and academic goals that they were pursuing over the academic year. The participants rated their extrinsic, introjected, identified, and intrinsic goal motives for each goal and completed measures of well- and ill-being. Latent profile analysis revealed six distinct profiles of goal motives, with variations in both the strength of motives and the motivational quality. Follow-up analyses revealed between-profile differences for well- and ill-being; students with more optimal goal motive profiles reported higher and lower well- and ill-being, respectively, than those with less optimal goal motives. To experience well-being benefits when pursuing multiple goals, student-athletes should strive for their academic and sporting goals with high autonomous and low controlled goal motives.

Keywords: dual career, goal pursuit, latent profile analysis, multiple goals, self-concordance

In daily life, the management of goals pursued simultaneously has been described as a juggling act (Louro, Pieters, & Zeelenberg, 2007) and can present significant challenges for individuals. People regularly strive for multiple goals within a single context, such as a basketball player trying to develop his fitness while also improving his free throw percentage or a student pursuing a goal to achieve specific grades within several academic modules at one time. Equally, goals can be pursued in multiple contexts at the same time, for example, a student-athlete trying to maintain their academic performance while trying to achieve their sporting goal of reaching major championships. Multiple-goal pursuit is challenging, requiring the careful self-regulation of time, energy, and resources in order to bring about successful outcomes in a range of objectives (Riediger & Freund, 2004). Multiple goals can facilitate each other (Riediger & Freund, 2004); however, goal conflict, where the pursuit of one goal hinders progress toward another being pursued simultaneously, can have implications for psychological well-being (Gray, Ozer, & Rosenthal, 2017; Kelly, Mansell, & Wood, 2015). Building on this literature, within the present study, we examined how the motives underpinning multiple-goal pursuit across domains relate to well- and ill-being in student-athletes.

The motives underpinning multiple-goal striving—the reasons why individuals are striving for their goals—can explain why some people are more successful in their goal pursuits. In proposing the self-concordance (SC) model, Sheldon and Elliot (1999) suggested that individuals can pursue goals with different goal motives, which may vary in the extent to which they reflect their inherent values and interests. Aligned with the tenets of self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000), these motives can be broadly defined

as autonomous or controlled. Autonomous goal motives reflect intrinsic or identified motivation regulations, whereby individuals are pursuing goals because of the enjoyment the goal provides or the personal importance, value, or interest in the goal. Conversely, controlled goal motives are a product of striving due to external (e.g., to obtain rewards, avoid punishment, or to gain the approval of others) or internal (e.g., the avoidance of unpleasant emotions, such as guilt or anxiety; Sheldon & Elliot, 1999) pressures, reflecting introjected and extrinsic motivation regulations. When proposing the SC model, Sheldon and Elliot suggested that goals pursued with more self-concordant motives (i.e., higher autonomous and lower controlled motives) lead to benefits for goal attainment and psychological well-being.

Research has supported the main tenets of the SC model in work (Judge, Erez, Bono, & Locke, 2005), education (Gaudreau, 2012; Sheldon & Houser-Marko, 2001) and sport (Gaudreau & Braaten, 2016; Smith, Ntoumanis, & Duda, 2007) contexts. Autonomous goal motives have been found to be associated with a range of self-regulatory processes, including persistence toward an increasingly difficult goal (Ntoumanis, Healy, Sedikides, Duda, et al., 2014), adaptive coping strategies (Sanjuán & Ávila, 2019), and disengagement from unachievable goals to allow for the reengagement in alternative goal pursuits (Ntoumanis, Healy, Sedikides, Smith, & Duda, 2014). Despite support for the SC model, studies within the goal motives literature (and the motivation literature in general; Gillet & Vallerand, 2016; Wormington & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2017) have predominantly used variable-centered approaches. Such approaches are important for some research questions, as they allow for the examination of autonomous and controlled motives as independent variables in association with related mediators (e.g., coping strategies, task appraisals) and outcomes (e.g., goal attainment, well-being). However, it is plausible that individuals may pursue important goals with various combinations of both autonomous and controlled goal motives, which is difficult to fully examine within a variable-centered approach. A person-centered approach can allow for the naturally occurring combinations of goal motives to be examined in relation

Healy is with the Sport, Health and Performance Enhancement (SHAPE) Research Group, Dept. of Sport Science, School of Science and Technology, Nottingham Trent University, Nottingham, United Kingdom. Ntoumanis is with the Physical Activity and Well-Being Research Group, School of Psychology, Curtin University, Perth, WA, Australia. Arthur is with UK Sport, London, United Kingdom. Healy (laura.healy@ntu.ac.uk) is corresponding author.

to outcomes related to goal pursuit, such as goal attainment and well-being (Wormington & Linnenbrink-Garcia, 2017). Within the context of the present study, a person-centered approach allows for the examination of how the actual combinations of goal motives with which student-athletes pursue their goals relate to important outcomes in the goal-striving process.

To the best of our knowledge, only one study has used a person-centered approach in relation to the motives for goal pursuit. Specifically, Healy, Ntoumanis, and Duda (2016) used latent profile analysis to create profiles based on student-athletes' motives for the academic and sporting goals that they were pursuing simultaneously. They subsequently examined the between-profile differences in intergoal facilitation (e.g., the extent to which the pursuit of one goal facilitated progress in the other) and interference (e.g., how the pursuit of one goal interfered with the pursuit of the other). Their analyses found support for three distinct profiles of motives, with varying degrees of autonomous and controlled goal motives for both goals. Importantly, the profiles with higher levels of autonomous goal motives experienced higher levels of intergoal facilitation between their multiple-goal pursuits, regardless of their level of controlled goal motives. There were no differences in intergoal interference, and the participants across all profiles reported moderate levels of interference between their sporting and academic goals. The authors suggested that more adaptive forms of motivation might not stop goals in multiple domains from interfering with each other, while recognizing that further studies were needed to fully explore this finding.

Goal Motives and Well-Being

In addition to variations in goal motives explaining goal self-regulatory processes, autonomous and controlled goal motives have been found to have different relations with well- and ill-being, often defined as the cognitive and affective evaluations an individual has about their life (Diener, Oishi, & Lucas, 2009). This is of particular relevance within student-athletes, where the competing demands of academic and sporting commitments can have implications for well-being (Cosh & Tully, 2014; van Rens, Ashley, & Steele, 2019). Autonomous goal motives have been shown to be related to enhanced well-being, both directly (Healy, Ntoumanis, Veldhuijzen van Zanten, & Paine, 2014; Miquelon & Vallerand, 2006; Sheldon, Ryan, Deci, & Kasser, 2004) and indirectly through goal attainment (Smith et al., 2007), psychological need satisfaction (Bahrami & Cranney, 2018), and coping strategies (Sanjuán & Ávila, 2019). It has also been shown that autonomous motives can protect against ill-being (Healy et al., 2014; Miquelon & Vallerand, 2006), while controlled motives have been generally negatively related or unrelated to well-being and positively related to ill-being (Gaudreau & Braaten, 2016; Healy et al., 2014).

To the best of our knowledge, no research has examined how profiles of goal motives are related to other outcomes proposed within the SC model, such as indicators of well- and ill-being. This would represent a significant addition to the literature, as it is difficult to examine the implications for well-being when individuals are pursuing goals with high levels of both autonomous and controlled motives using variable-centered approaches. Adopting a person-centered approach allows for the examination of the combinations of goal motivation regulations that lead to the most adaptive outcomes in relation to well-being. While research in the wider self-determination theory literature has shown associations between different motivation profiles and well-being

(Gustafsson, Carlin, Podlog, Stenling, & Lindwall, 2018; Van den Broeck, Lens, Witte, & Coillie, 2013), the implications for well- and ill-being when individuals are pursuing goals with different combinations of motives are as yet unknown.

The vast majority of the SC model literature has examined the relations between autonomous and controlled goal motives and well-being in relation to the pursuit of a single goal. However, it is important to examine these relations when individuals are pursuing multiple goals, particularly as a recent meta-analysis showed that goal conflict is associated with poorer psychological well-being (Gray et al., 2017). A notable exception in the literature is the work of Gorges, Esdar, and Wild (2014), who found that junior academics' conflict in multiple-goal pursuits was related to positive affect when goal SC was high. The opposite relation was found for negative affect; goal conflict was related to negative affect when SC was low. However, Gorges et al. only examined multiple-goal pursuit in one context, whereas the reality is that individuals are often pursuing goals across several domains (Louro et al., 2007).

Aims and Hypotheses

This study expands on the research by adopting a person-centered approach to examine relations between the motives for multiple goals and well-being. Our specific aim was to examine how motives for simultaneously pursued academic and sporting goals relate to student-athletes' well- and ill-being, using a person-centered approach. Based on the previous literature, we formulated two hypotheses. First, based on the literature exploring goal-specific and global motivation (e.g., Healy et al., 2016; Langan et al., 2016), we expected that students would pursue their academic and sporting goals with a diverse range of goal motives. Second, we expected that variations in the goal motives across these profiles would explain differences in indicators of well- and ill-being. Specifically, we anticipated that profiles where participants reported better quality goal motives for their sporting and academic goals (i.e., higher autonomous and lower controlled motives) would have higher well-being and lower ill-being than participants in profiles with less optimal motives (i.e., higher controlled, lower autonomous motives).

Materials and Methods

Participants

We recruited 362 student-athletes (202 males, 160 females, $M_{\text{age}} = 20.35$, $SD = 2.03$ years) from eight British universities. Students needed to be formally registered as a student at the university and represent their university in British University and College Sport competitions. The student-athletes came from a range of team ($n = 253$; e.g., hockey) and individual ($n = 109$; e.g., golf) sports, had been competing in these sports on average for 9.55 years ($SD = 4.45$), and competed at university ($n = 112$), county ($n = 41$), regional ($n = 52$), national ($n = 72$), and international ($n = 78$) levels of competition (seven athletes did not respond). One hundred fourteen athletes (32.2% of the sample) received a scholarship for their studies based on their athletic performance.

Measures

Personal Goal Motives. Student-athletes identified their most important goal for both their sporting and academic pursuits that they were currently working toward and would continue to work

toward over the academic year. The athletes were given no instruction on the types of goals (i.e., performance, process, outcome goals) they should report. The athletes subsequently rated their personal goal motives for each of these goals, using four items from previous goal motives research (Sheldon & Elliot, 1999). Specifically, the participants rated on a 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much so*) scale the extent to which they were pursuing each goal with extrinsic (“Because someone else wants you to”), introjected (“Because you would feel ashamed, guilty, or anxious if you didn’t”), identified (“Because you personally believe it’s an important goal to have”), and intrinsic (“Because of the fun and enjoyment the goal provides you”) motives.

Well- and Ill-Being. We used a range of measures in order to assess different aspects of well- and ill-being. We measured vitality (a measure of organismic well-being defined as a “positive feeling of aliveness and energy”; Ryan & Frederick, 1997, p. 529) using the five-item Subjective Vitality Scale, which has been used in previous literature (e.g., Bostic, Doris, & Hood, 2000; Rouse et al., 2015). These items (e.g., “I have energy and spirit”) were assessed on a 1 (*not true at all*) to 7 (*very true*) Likert scale. As a measure of psychological well- and ill-being, positive (four items; “happy,” “joyful,” “pleased,” and “enjoyment/fun”) and negative affect (five items; “frustrated,” “depressed/blue,” “unhappy,” “angry/hostile,” and “worried/anxious”) were measured using the items developed by Diener and Emmons (1984). Finally, physical ill-being was measured using the Physical Symptoms Checklist (10 symptoms, e.g., “Headache”; Emmons, 1991). The affect items and Physical Symptoms Checklist were both measured on a 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*all the time*) Likert scale. For all of the well- and ill-being measures, the participants were asked to respond in relation to their general experience (i.e., not domain specific) over the past week.

Procedure

Following institutional ethical approval from the Nottingham Trent University (noninvasive Human Ethics Committee application number 17/18-08), the participants were recruited through contact with sport administrators, coaches, and captains. Arrangements for data collection were made via these individuals, which included participants completing a battery of questionnaires either online (using the Survey Monkey and JISC online platforms) or in person (e.g., before a training session). The data were collected over several academic years, from 2013 to 2020. Regardless of how the data were collected, all participants were provided with information about what their participation involved, including that their participation was voluntary, and about their right to withdraw from the study. All participants provided informed consent prior to completing the questionnaire measures, which took around 15 min to complete. The participants received no form of compensation for their involvement in the study.

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations were performed using SPSS (version 26.0; IBM Corp., Armonk, NY; IBM Corp., 2019). We conducted our primary analyses using MPlus software (version 8.0; Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2017). To create the goal motives profiles, we used latent profile analysis using the maximum likelihood estimation. This approach allows for the determination of profiles based on a combination of goodness-of-fit indices, theoretical considerations, and the nature of the classes (Gerber, Jonsdottir, Lindwall, & Ahlborg, 2014), as well as testing

if a more complex model offers a better solution to the data than one that is more parsimonious. This analytic approach is appropriate for sample sizes of at least 100 participants (Williams & Kibowski, 2016). We used the four motivation regulations for both the academic and sporting goal, resulting in eight variables in total.

We conducted analyses to explore three- up to seven-class solutions. To determine the optimum number of classes, we primarily used the bootstrapped log-likelihood ratio test (BLRT), as this has been shown to be more effective for smaller sample sizes (Nylund, Asparouhov, & Muthén, 2007). We looked for a statistically significant ($p < .05$) BLRT value to indicate that a model offered a better solution than a model with one less profile specified. Additionally, we examined the Bayesian information criteria (BIC) and sample-size adjusted BIC; lower values indicate better model fit. We also used the entropy criterion, with values closer to 1 indicating a more accurate solution (Aldridge & Roesch, 2008; Berlin, Williams, & Parra, 2014). Finally, we examined the conceptual plausibility of the profiles generated within each model in relation to our theoretical underpinnings. We avoided solutions with small profiles, as they can present issues relating to power and precision (Berlin et al., 2014).

We utilized the AUXILIARY function within MPlus (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2012) to examine between-profile differences in well- and ill-being. This approach uses a Wald chi-square test and pairwise comparisons to analyze the between-profile differences in the mean values for our outcome variables. We adjusted for multiple comparisons through false-positive rate control using the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure (Benjamini & Hochberg, 1995; Glickman, Rao, & Schultz, 2014), and set the false-positive rate to $d = 0.10$ (McDonald, 2014).

Results

Preliminary Analyses and Descriptive Statistics

The participants identified a range of sporting (e.g., “To get my highest goal count,” “To play for my country,” “To increase strength and fitness”) and academic (e.g., “Graduate with 1st class honours,” “Get my first major research project published,” “Pass the year”) goals. Following the data entry, we screened the data for missing values. Two participants were removed, as their responses revealed that they had not competed in British University and College Sport competitions (i.e., they identified their main sport as gym exercise, and their sporting goal related to exercise performance). Three participants failed to complete all of the goal motives items. Given the importance of these values to our main analyses, we removed these participants from the sample. Three further participants were removed, as they had failed to complete any of the measures of well- and ill-being. We checked for multivariate outliers using Mahalanobis’ distance (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2014). Five participants were potential outliers; however, Cook’s distance for all these participants was less than 1. Aligned with established guidelines and previous research (Gustafsson et al., 2018; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2014), we chose not to remove these participants from the sample. This left a total sample of 354 participants.

While goal motives research has generally examined data from team and individual athletes within the same analyses, based on the suggestion of an anonymous reviewer, we explored whether there were any differences in goal motive regulations across the different sport types within our sample. Given the range of sports included, we classified athletes into team and individual sports and conducted

a one-way multivariate analysis of variance on the goal motives regulations. This revealed significant multivariate, Pillai's $V = 0.07$, $F(8, 345) = 3.22$, $p = .002$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$, and univariate between-group differences for the extrinsic, $F(1, 352) = 5.74$, $p = .02$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$, and introjected, $F(1, 352) = 6.65$, $p = .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$, motives for the sporting goal, and the introjected, $F(1, 352) = 13.10$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$, and intrinsic, $F(1, 352) = 3.86$, $p = .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$, motives for the academic goal. Therefore, within our main analyses, we included sport type as a categorical variable to examine whether there were any differences across the profiles.

The descriptive statistics, scale reliabilities, and bivariate correlations are displayed in Table 1. All multi-item measures demonstrated reliability (Cronbach's α) above .70. Overall, the participants were pursuing their sporting goals with low extrinsic and introjected and high identified and intrinsic motives. There were more diverse motives for the academic goal. The participants reported very high identified motives for their academic goal, along with moderate intrinsic and introjected, and low extrinsic goal motives. The participants overall reported higher well-being and lower ill-being.

Latent Profile Analysis

Based on the BLRT, BIC, sample-size adjusted BIC, and entropy (Table 2), there was no clear cutoff in terms of the number of potential classes; each new solution with one more profile offered a better fit for the data. The BLRT was statistically significant for all

analyses. However, when running the seven-profile solution, the best likelihood value was not replicated, even when increasing the number of random starts, and inspection of this solution showed one class with a small number of participants ($n = 16$; $<5\%$ of sample). Based on this, the better BLRT, entropy values, and goal motive regulations in the different profiles, we accepted the solution with six classes as our final model.

The motivation regulations for each of the six latent profiles are displayed in Figure 1, expressed as standardized Z scores in relation to the sample mean of 0. There are no clear criteria within the literature for high and low values; therefore, we followed an approach adopted by other studies (e.g., Gustafsson et al., 2018)

Table 2 Fit Indices, Entropy, and Model Comparisons for Estimated LPA Models

Model	BLRT	BIC	SSA-BIC	Entropy	LMR
Three classes	<.001	10,563.39	10,446.01	0.79	0.007
Four classes	<.001	10,510.74	10,361.64	0.82	0.09
Five classes	<.001	10,491.38	10,310.55	0.84	0.39
Six classes	<.001	10,465.18	10,252.63	0.87	0.25
Seven classes	<.001	10,450.136	10,205.86	0.89	0.41

Note. BLRT = bootstrapped log-likelihood ratio test significance value; BIC = Bayesian information criterion; SSA-BIC = sample-size adjusted Bayesian information criterion; LMR = Lo-Mendell-Rubin likelihood ratio test significance value; LPA = latent profile analysis.

Table 1 Descriptive Statistics, Internal Reliabilities, and Bivariate Correlations Among Study Variables

	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	α	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Sport extrinsic goal motives	2.25	1.52	—	—										
2. Sport introjected goal motives	2.97	1.74	—	.43***	—									
3. Sport identified goal motives	5.61	1.30	—	.01	-.004	—								
4. Sport intrinsic goal motives	5.90	1.18	—	-.15**	-.16**	.38***	—							
5. Academic extrinsic goal motives	2.77	1.74	—	.49***	.30***	.07	.05	—						
6. Academic introjected goal motives	4.14	1.86	—	.27***	.54***	.03	-.08	.49***	—					
7. Academic identified goal motives	5.95	1.17	—	-.08	.02	.28***	.11*	-.09	.06	—				
8. Academic intrinsic goal motives	4.22	1.72	—	-.03	.01	.12*	.22***	-.16**	-.11*	.38***	—			
9. Physical symptoms	2.59	1.00	.79	.18***	.17**	.03	-.08	.12*	.14**	-.02	-.06	—		
10. Subjective vitality	4.33	1.23	.91	-.12*	-.13**	.08	.22***	-.09	-.24***	.04	.23***	-.30**	—	
11. Positive affect	5.02	1.04	.88	-.09	-.13*	.16**	.32***	.03	-.16**	.12*	.16**	-.08	.64***	—
12. Negative affect	3.16	1.29	.84	.16**	.19***	-.02	-.19**	.19**	.24***	-.08	-.07	.47***	-.44***	-.35***

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.




Figure 1 — Graphical representation of the sporting and academic goal motivation regulations for the six identified profiles. Values for each goal motive are expressed as Z scores in relation to the sample mean. Profiles are presented from left to right from the least to most adaptive goal motivation regulations.

when interpreting the nature of the profiles. Specifically, we classified values of ± 1 SD as very high/low, ± 0.5 to 1 SD as high/low, and -0.5 to 0.5 SD (encompassing 0) as above/below average. The classes are presented in order from least to most adaptive, in line with our theoretical expectations. Within Class 1 ($n = 34$; 9.6% of the sample), the participants reported very high extrinsic and high introjected motives for both goals. Identified motives for the sporting goal were above average, whereas the intrinsic motives for the sporting goal and both the identified and intrinsic motives for the academic goal were below average. Therefore, this class was labeled “High Controlled Strivers.” Class 2 ($n = 20$, 5.6%) was labeled as “Low Autonomous Strivers,” as within this class, the participants had below-average intrinsic and low identified motives for the academic goal, as well as very low identified and intrinsic motives for the sporting goal. The participants also reported high extrinsic and very high introjected motives for the sporting goal. The extrinsic and introjected motives for the academic goal were below and above average, respectively. The participants within Class 3 ($n = 32$; 9%) reported lower than group mean values for all goal motive regulations for both goals; thus, this profile was named “Low Motive Strivers.” Class 4 contained the largest number of participants ($n = 118$; 33.3%) and presented a somewhat mixed profile. The extrinsic motives for the sporting goal were low, introjected motives for the academic goal were high, and all of the other goal motive regulations for both goals were above average, with the exception of the intrinsic motives, which were below average. Therefore, this profile was named “Mixed Motive Strivers.” Class 5 ($n = 68$; 19.2%) was labeled “High Motive Strivers,” as for both goals, all of the goal motive regulations were above the group mean. The extrinsic motives for both goals were high, while all of the other goal motives were above average. Finally, Class 6 ($n = 82$; 23.2%) had below-average to low controlled (e.g., extrinsic and introjected) and above-average

autonomous (e.g., identified and intrinsic) motives for both goals. As such, we named this profile “Self-Concordant Strivers.” We deemed the “Self-Concordant Strivers” to be the most optimal motivational profile, given the relatively high autonomous and low controlled motives for both goals. Both the “High Controlled Strivers” and the “Low Autonomous Strivers” were deemed to be of the poorest motivational quality, the former because of the high controlled motives and the latter because of the low autonomous motives for both goals.

In relation to sport type (i.e., team or individual), the results showed that the participants in the “Self-Concordant Strivers” class were more likely to be from an individual sport than those in the “Mixed Motive Strivers” class (odds ratio [OR] = 2.46, 95% confidence interval, CI, [0.90, 4.67], $p = .01$), the “High Motive Strivers” class (OR = 1.95, 95% CI [0.70, 3.78], $p = .01$), and the “High Controlled Strivers” (OR = 2.76, 95% CI [0.72, 6.48], $p = .05$). The “Mixed Motive Strivers” were less likely to be from an individual sport than the “Low Motive Strivers” (OR = 0.32, 95% CI [0.09, 0.74], $p = .05$) or the “High Motive Strivers” (OR = 0.79, 95% CI [0.29, 1.50], $p = .01$). Within the latter two classes, the “Low Motive Strivers” were more likely to be from an individual sport than the “High Motive Strivers” (OR = 2.47, 95% CI [0.65, 5.89], $p = .05$).

Between-Class Analyses

Visual inspection of the mean well- and ill-being values (Table 3) across the classes revealed that the “Self-Concordant Strivers” had the highest well-being and lowest ill-being scores, respectively. Conversely, the “Low Autonomous Strivers” reported the lowest well-being and highest ill-being scores across the classes. These descriptive findings were supported by the results of the AUXILIARY analyses, which revealed between-class differences for all

Table 3 Wald Chi-Square Test Values, *M*, and *SD* of Indices of Well- and Ill-Being for Each of the Latent Profiles

Variable	Global χ^2	Class 1, High controlled strivers, <i>n</i> = 34, <i>M</i> (<i>SEM</i>)	Class 2, Low autonomous strivers, <i>n</i> = 20, <i>M</i> (<i>SEM</i>)	Class 3, Low motive strivers, <i>n</i> = 32, <i>M</i> (<i>SEM</i>)	Class 4, Mixed motive strivers, <i>n</i> = 118, <i>M</i> (<i>SEM</i>)	Class 5, High motive strivers, <i>n</i> = 68, <i>M</i> (<i>SEM</i>)	Class 6, Self-concordant strivers, <i>n</i> = 82, <i>M</i> (<i>SEM</i>)	Summary
Subjective vitality	25.97**	3.95 (0.22)	3.43 (0.26)	4.28 (0.25)	4.17 (0.1)	4.45 (0.13)	4.84 (0.17)	2 < 4, 5, 6; 1, 4 < 6
Positive affect	14.96*	4.81 (0.19)	4.27 (0.29)	4.79 (0.20)	5.02 (0.11)	5.11 (0.12)	5.32 (0.12)	2 < 4, 5, 6
Physical symptoms	15.16**	2.85 (0.17)	2.98 (0.27)	2.36 (0.20)	2.56 (0.11)	2.81 (0.12)	2.32 (0.12)	1, 5 < 6
Negative affect	24.30**	3.66 (0.22)	3.89 (0.32)	2.85 (0.27)	3.33 (0.14)	3.17 (0.15)	2.64 (0.16)	2 > 3, 6; 1, 4, 5 > 6

Note. Summary indicates significantly different means when applying the Benjamini–Hochberg procedure $d = 0.10$. Profiles are presented from left to right from the least to most adaptive goal motivation regulations.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$.

of the indicators of well- and ill-being. In relation to well-being, the “High Motive Strivers” (Wald $\chi^2 = 11.84$, $p = .001$, Hedges’ $g = 0.92$), the “Self-Concordant Strivers” (Wald $\chi^2 = 21.09$, $p < .001$, Hedges’ $g = 0.96$), and the “Mixed Motive Strivers” (Wald $\chi^2 = 6.70$, $p = .01$, Hedges’ $g = 0.57$) all reported significantly higher subjective vitality than the “Low Autonomous Strivers” class (Global Wald $\chi^2 = 25.97$, $p < .001$). For positive affect (Global Wald $\chi^2 = 14.96$, $p = .01$), the “High Motive Strivers” (Wald $\chi^2 = 7.03$, $p = .008$, Hedges’ $g = 0.81$), the “Self-Concordant Strivers” (Wald $\chi^2 = 10.98$, $p = .001$, Hedges’ $g = 0.91$), and the “Mixed Motive Strivers” (Wald $\chi^2 = 5.72$, $p = .02$, Hedges’ $g = 0.62$) reported significantly higher positive affect than the “Low Autonomous Strivers.”

For the indicators of ill-being, the participants in the “Low Autonomous Strivers” class reported significantly higher negative affect than the “Low Motive Strivers” (Wald $\chi^2 = 6.28$, $p = .01$, Hedges’ $g = 0.70$) and the “Self-Concordant Strivers” (Wald $\chi^2 = 12.41$, $p < .001$, Hedges’ $g = 0.88$). The “Self-Concordant Strivers” also reported lower negative affect than the “Mixed Motive Strivers” (Wald $\chi^2 = 9.38$, $p = .002$, Hedges’ $g = 0.47$), the “High Controlled Strivers” (Wald $\chi^2 = 14.28$, $p < .001$, Hedges’ $g = 0.74$), and the “High Motive Strivers” (Wald $\chi^2 = 6.04$, $p = .01$, Hedges’ $g = 0.40$; Global Wald $\chi^2 = 24.30$, $p < .001$). For physical symptoms of ill-being, the “Self-Concordant Strivers” reported significantly lower symptoms than the “High Motive Strivers” (Wald $\chi^2 = 8.28$, $p = .004$, Hedges’ $g = 0.47$) and the “High Controlled Strivers” (Wald $\chi^2 = 6.34$, $p = .01$, Hedges’ $g = 0.49$; Global Wald $\chi^2 = 15.62$, $p = .008$).

Discussion

The aim of the present study was to examine, using a person-centered approach, how profiles of academic and sporting goal motives relate to student-athletes’ well- and ill-being. We hypothesized that (a) student-athletes would pursue their academic and sport goals with a broad range of goal motives and (b) more adaptive motivational profiles (i.e., higher autonomous and lower controlled goal motives) would be associated with higher and lower well- and ill-being, respectively, and our findings support these hypotheses. Within our sample, there were six distinct goal motives profiles, with student-athletes across these profiles reporting a wide range of goal motives for their sporting and academic goals. The profiles found in the present study are more diverse than those found within the previous literature

(Healy et al., 2016), with greater distinction between the quality and quantity of motivation for both the sporting and academic goals. Within the wider self-determination theory literature, person-centered research examining the motivation regulations for engagement in sporting and other contexts has shown variations across samples, in relation to both the number of profiles identified and the composition of those profiles (Gillet, Berjot, Vallerand, Amoura, & Rosnet, 2012; Gustafsson et al., 2018; Wang, Morin, Ryan, & Liu, 2016). Thus, it is perhaps not surprising that the goal motives profiles identified within the present research differ from those within the extant literature.

The profiles found within the present study do highlight some interesting aspects about how student-athletes pursue their goals. It is surprising to observe that the profile representing the largest number of participants reported mixed goal motives for both of their goals, and less than a quarter of the student-athletes reported optimum motivation for both goals. While not examined within the context of this study, the previous literature has shown that the motives underpinning goal pursuit can have important implications for goal attainment (Bahrami & Cranney, 2018; Gaudreau & Braaten, 2016; Ntoumanis, Healy, Sedikides, Duda, et al., 2014; Smith et al., 2007). As such, it is important to consider whether, within the context of U.K. university sport, student-athletes may need support from coaches, lifestyle advisors, and academic staff to pursue both their academic and sporting goals with the most adaptive of motives.

In relation to our second hypothesis, we found variations across the goal motives profiles for all of the indicators of well- and ill-being, in line with our expectations. The profile with the most optimal motives for goal pursuit (i.e., the “Self-Concordant Strivers”) reported higher well-being than the profiles with low autonomous (i.e., the “Low Autonomous Strivers”) or high controlled motives (i.e., the “High Controlled Strivers”). It is interesting to note that the profiles with above-average autonomous motives for at least one of their goals (i.e., the “Mixed Motive Strivers” and “High Motive Strivers”) also largely reported higher well-being than the profiles with lower autonomous motives, despite also having above-average controlled motives for at least one goal. However, it does appear that there is a limit to these benefits, as while the “Mixed Motive Strivers” and “High Motive Strivers” reported better well-being than the least optimal profiles, their levels were significantly lower than the “Self-Concordant Strivers.” Our findings relate to previous multiple goals research, which suggested that having higher autonomous motives for a least

one goal can have benefits for well-being (Gorges et al., 2014) and provide further support for adopting person-centered approaches to examine motivation for goal pursuit (Gillet & Vallerand, 2016). The findings also broadly align with the wider motivation literature (e.g., Langan et al., 2016), which has suggested controlled motivation is not necessarily detrimental to well-being, as long as it is accompanied by high levels of autonomous motivation. However, our results do suggest that these benefits only exist when making comparisons with profiles with a poorer quality of motivation. Thus, in order to experience the greatest benefits for well-being, it is important that student-athletes are supported to pursue their academic and sporting goals with the highest quality of motives (i.e., high autonomous and low controlled).

In relation to ill-being, we found that the most optimal profile reported the lowest levels of negative affect and physical symptoms, which were significantly lower than the least optimal profiles. This supports previous research, which has shown that autonomous goal motives can provide a buffering effect on ill-being (Healy et al., 2014; Sanjuán & Ávila, 2019). However, our results extend the literature in this area, as our person-centered approach has identified that this buffering effect only occurs when levels of controlled motives are low in relation to autonomous motives. The “Mixed Motive Strivers” and the “High Motive Strivers” both reported above-average autonomous motives, but also above-average to high controlled motives for at least one of their goals, and reported significantly higher levels of ill-being than the “Self-Concordant Strivers,” who had above-average autonomous motives and below-average to low controlled motives for both goals. This finding might be explained by goal ambivalence, defined as mixed feelings or thoughts about pursuing a goal, which has been shown to mediate the relationship between goal SC and well-being (Koletzko, Herrmann, & Brandstätter, 2015). As such, it is plausible that, when student-athletes have mixed feelings about the reasons why they are pursuing their goals, there are consequences for their ill-being.

A further interesting finding in relation to ill-being is that the “Low Motive Strivers” reported lower levels of negative affect than the “Low Autonomous Strivers,” despite reporting low levels of all goal motive regulations for both goals. This could be explained in two ways. On one hand, it could be that the relatively low levels of controlled goal motives reported by the participants in this profile resulted in fewer negative thoughts associated with goal pursuit. Alternatively, the low levels of all goal motivation regulations could be reflective of a low commitment to both their academic and sporting goals (Klein, Wesson, Hollenbeck, & Alge, 1999). Thus, they may be less likely to experience challenges in the management of these goals, in comparison with other profiles who may have higher levels of (suboptimal) goal motives. However, given that our research is the first to examine how different combinations of goal motives for multiple goals are associated with well- and ill-being, it is important that further research be conducted to replicate our findings within different populations.

A surprising finding from our research, which was not originally part of our research question, relates to the differences in goal motives reported in student-athletes from team and individual sports. To the best of our knowledge, research has generally found that motivation regulations are not a function of sport type (Gillet, Berjot, & Rosnet, 2009); however, our study has shown that athletes from individual sports were more likely to belong to specific profiles, including the one deemed most optimal for goal pursuit and well-being. While unexpected, this finding may be explained by the contextual differences experienced in goal

pursuit, as it is suggested both theoretically (Deci & Ryan, 2000; Duda, 2013; Mageau & Vallerand, 2003) and empirically (Adie, Duda, & Ntoumanis, 2008; Amorose & Anderson-Butcher, 2015; Healy et al., 2014; Smith, Ntoumanis, Duda, & Vansteenkiste, 2011) that motivation can be influenced by aspects of the social environment. It is possible that the differences in the social environment between team and individual sports influenced the motives with which student-athletes were pursuing their goal. Equally, it has been shown that both goals and their underpinning motives can be influenced by others (Aarts, Gollwitzer, & Hassin, 2004; Ntoumanis, Healy, Sedikides, Duda, et al., 2014). Therefore, it may be that, for at least their sporting goals, team sport athletes were either pursuing goals that they were less personally invested in (i.e., team goals that were not important to the individual) or their goal motives were influenced by teammates with suboptimal motives. These findings warrant further investigation in future studies.

Limitations and Future Directions

This research is an important addition to the literature, given the lack of person-centered studies in goal motives research. We have extended the knowledge in this area by examining how profiles of motives for multiple goals are associated with indicators of well- and ill-being when pursuing goals in different domains, using a sample of student-athletes competing at a very high standard of competition. Despite this and other strengths of our research, including the use of validated measures and our sophisticated analytical strategy, some limitations should be acknowledged. First, the cross-sectional nature of our data means that it is hard to draw conclusions about the longer term implications of pursuing multiple goals with the various profiles of motives discovered in the present study. Extending the present research over the course of a competitive season or academic year would give a greater insight into the experiences of student-athletes simultaneously pursuing their academic and sporting goals. Research has not examined the replicability or stability of goal motives profiles, nor which combination of motives leads to the attainment of multiple goals. As such, there would be significant merit in future studies attempting to replicate profiles within the same student-athletes from one year to the next. This is particularly important given the theoretical assumptions that goal motives are dynamic and influenced by the social environment; for instance, it is plausible that the change in motive may be different across different athletes or different sports. Latent profile transition analysis, an analytical technique that allows for the examination of profiles across time and has recently been applied within sporting contexts (Martinent & Decret, 2015), may be a useful way to address the limitations within our work.

A second limitation of our work relates to the goal motives measures used in the study. These single-item measures have been used extensively in the goal striving literature (Gillet, Lafrenière, Huyghebaert, & Fouquereau, 2015; Judge et al., 2005; Sheldon & Elliot, 1999). However, using single-item measures may be problematic, as we are not able to assess the internal reliability of the measures and these items may be vulnerable to measurement error. Nevertheless, the correlations between the different goal motives in the present study were consistent with the existing theoretical and empirical research. In light of this potential issue for our own work and the literature in general, future research may wish to develop a multiple-item questionnaire that allows for the in-depth exploration of each goal motivation regulation.

The final limitation relates to our study and the literature as a whole. To the best of our knowledge, no studies have been conducted to develop, apply, and evaluate interventions that support athletes to pursue their goals with the most optimal motivation. Research has shown that goal motives can be influenced by others within the social environment, such as coaches and teammates (Healy et al., 2014; Ntoumanis, Healy, Sedikides, Duda, et al., 2014; Smith, Ntoumanis, & Duda, 2010). However, no research demonstrates the mechanisms through which individuals can become more autonomous in their goal motives. Furthermore, research could investigate whether intervening to promote more adaptive goal striving in one domain (e.g., sport) could have beneficial effects for goal pursuits in another domain (e.g., education). Such studies would be important for the literature and would have widespread practical implications.

In addition to the avenues already outlined, future research can further develop the understanding of effective goal pursuit in several ways. For example, it would be worthwhile to explore motives for single goals using a person-centered approach, given that the present study and previous research (Healy et al., 2016) show that individuals can pursue multiple goals with a range of goal motives profiles. Additionally, there are other aspects of goal self-regulation, such as goal adjustment, the disengagement from unattainable goals, and reengagement in alternative goals (Lebeau et al., 2018; Ntoumanis, Healy, Sedikides, Smith, & Duda, 2014; Smith & Ntoumanis, 2014), which have been linked to differences in individual goal motives. As such, it would be worthwhile for research to examine how person-centered examinations of goal motives can explain differences in a range of self-regulatory processes, including the self-regulation of multiple goals. For instance, it would be of interest to understand whether the motives underpinning goal pursuit can predict whether individuals can disengage from one goal in order to increase the likelihood of attaining another goal being simultaneously pursued (cf. Ntoumanis & Sedikides, 2018). Finally, given that goal motives have been shown to be influenced by important others, including coaches (Healy et al., 2014; Smith, 2016) and other individuals engaged in goal pursuit (Ntoumanis, Healy, Sedikides, Duda, et al., 2014), it would also be worthwhile to examine these variables as predictors of profile membership. Of particular relevance to the present study would be exploring if student-athletes are more likely to have adaptive motives for both their sporting and academic goals if their coach uses an interpersonal style that is high in need-supportive (Mageau & Vallerand, 2003) and low in need-thwarting (Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, 2010) behaviors.

Conclusion

To conclude, the present study has extended the goal motives and multiple goal literature by demonstrating how different profiles of student-athletes' academic and sporting goal motives relate to indices of well- and ill-being. Specifically, in order to promote benefits for well-being, it is important that student-athletes pursue both goals with higher autonomous and lower controlled goal motives. Furthermore, high autonomous goal motives cannot protect well-being for student-athletes when the controlled goal motives are also high.

Acknowledgments

The research in this manuscript was supported by a PhD studentship for L.C. Healy from the Economic and Social Research council (award no.

ES/J50001X/1) supervised by N. Ntoumanis when they were both at the University of Birmingham.

References

- Aarts, H., Gollwitzer, P.M., & Hassin, R.R. (2004). Goal contagion: Perceiving is for pursuing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*(1), 23–37. PubMed ID: 15250790 doi:10.1037/0022-3514.87.1.23
- Adie, J.W., Duda, J.L., & Ntoumanis, N. (2008). Autonomy support, basic need satisfaction and the optimal functioning of adult male and female sport participants: A test of basic needs theory. *Motivation and Emotion, 32*(3), 189–199. doi:10.1007/s11031-008-9095-z
- Aldridge, A.A., & Roesch, S.C. (2008). Developing coping typologies of minority adolescents: A latent profile analysis. *Journal of Adolescence, 31*(4), 499–517. PubMed ID: 17904631 doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2007.08.005
- Amorose, A.J., & Anderson-Butcher, D. (2015). Exploring the independent and interactive effects of autonomy-supportive and controlling coaching behaviors on adolescent athletes' motivation for sport. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology, 4*(3), 206–218. doi:10.1037/spy0000038
- Bahrami, Z., & Cranney, J. (2018). Integrated conative model of well-being: From motives to well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 19*(4), 961–981. doi:10.1007/s10902-017-9845-2
- Bartholomew, K.J., Ntoumanis, N., & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C. (2010). The controlling interpersonal style in a coaching context: Development and initial validation of a psychometric scale. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 32*(2), 193–216. PubMed ID: 20479478 doi:10.1123/jsep.32.2.193
- Benjamini, Y., & Hochberg, Y. (1995). Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological), 57*(1), 289–300. doi:10.1111/j.2517-6161.1995.tb02031.x
- Berlin, K.S., Williams, N.A., & Parra, G.R. (2014). An introduction to latent variable mixture modeling (Part 1): Overview and cross-sectional latent class and latent profile analyses. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 39*(2), 174–187. PubMed ID: 24277769 doi:10.1093/jpepsy/jst084
- Bostic, T.J., Doris, M.R., & Hood, M. (2000). A validation of the subjective vitality scale using structural equation modeling. *Social Indicators Research, 52*(3), 313–324. doi:10.1023/A:1007136110218
- Cosh, S., & Tully, P.J. (2014). "All I have to do is pass": A discursive analysis of student athletes' talk about prioritising sport to the detriment of education to overcome stressors encountered in combining elite sport and tertiary education. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 15*(2), 180–189. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.10.015
- Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227–268. doi:10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01
- Diener, E., & Emmons, R.A. (1984). The independence of positive and negative affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47*(5), 1105–1117. PubMed ID: 6520704 doi:10.1037/0022-3514.47.5.1105
- Diener, E., Oishi, S., & Lucas, R.E. (2009). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and life satisfaction. In S.J. Lopez, & C.R. Snyder (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of positive psychology* (pp. 186–194). Oxford University Press. doi:10.1093/oxfordhb/9780195187243.013.0017
- Duda, J.L. (2013). The conceptual and empirical foundations of Empowering Coaching™: Setting the stage for the PAPA project.

- International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 11(4), 311–318. doi:10.1080/1612197X.2013.839414
- Emmons, R.A. (1991). Personal strivings, daily life events, and psychological and physical well-being. *Journal of Personality*, 59(3), 453–472. PubMed ID: 1960639 doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.1991.tb00256.x
- Gaudreau, P. (2012). Goal self-concordance moderates the relationship between achievement goals and indicators of academic adjustment. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 22(6), 827–832. doi:10.1016/j.lindif.2012.06.006
- Gaudreau, P., & Braaten, A. (2016). Achievement goals and their underlying goal motivation: Does it matter why sport participants pursue their goals? *Psychologica Belgica*, 56(3), 244–268. PubMed ID: 30479439 doi:10.5334/pb.266
- Gerber, M., Jonsdottir, I.H., Lindwall, M., & Ahlberg, G. (2014). Physical activity in employees with differing occupational stress and mental health profiles: A latent profile analysis. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 15(6), 649–658. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.07.012
- Gillet, N., Berjot, S., & Rosnet, E. (2009). An analysis of the impact of environmental conditions on the relationships between need satisfaction and intrinsic motivation in sport. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 40(2), 249–269.
- Gillet, N., Berjot, S., Vallerand, R.J., Amoura, S., & Rosnet, E. (2012). Examining the motivation-performance relationship in competitive sport: A cluster-analytic approach. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 43(2), 79–102.
- Gillet, N., Lafrenière, M.-A.K., Huyghebaert, T., & Fouquereau, E. (2015). Autonomous and controlled reasons underlying achievement goals: Implications for the 3 × 2 achievement goal model in educational and work settings. *Motivation and Emotion*, 39(6), 858–875. doi:10.1007/s11031-015-9505-y
- Gillet, N., & Vallerand, R.J. (2016). Effects of motivation on sport performance based on self-determination theory: Towards a person-centered approach. *Psychologie Française*, 61(4), 257–271. doi:10.1016/j.psfr.2014.01.001
- Glickman, M.E., Rao, S.R., & Schultz, M.R. (2014). False discovery rate control is a recommended alternative to Bonferroni-type adjustments in health studies. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 67(8), 850–857. PubMed ID: 24831050 doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2014.03.012
- Gorges, J., Esdar, W., & Wild, E. (2014). Linking goal self-concordance and affective reactions to goal conflict. *Motivation and Emotion*, 38(4), 475–484. doi:10.1007/s11031-014-9392-7
- Gray, J.S., Ozer, D.J., & Rosenthal, R. (2017). Goal conflict and psychological well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 66, 27–37. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2016.12.003
- Gustafsson, H., Carlin, M., Podlog, L., Stenling, A., & Lindwall, M. (2018). Motivational profiles and burnout in elite athletes: A person-centered approach. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 35, 118–125. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.11.009
- Healy, L.C., Ntoumanis, N., & Duda, J.L. (2016). Goal motives and multiple-goal striving in sport and academia: A person-centered investigation of goal motives and inter-goal relations. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport*, 19(12), 1010–1014. PubMed ID: 27025304 doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2016.03.001
- Healy, L.C., Ntoumanis, N., Veldhuijzen van Zanten, J.J., & Paine, N. (2014). Goal striving and well-being in sport: The role of contextual and personal motivation. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 36(5), 446–459. PubMed ID: 25356609 doi:10.1123/jsep.2013-0261
- IBM Corp. (2019). *SPSS statistics for windows (Version 26)*. Armonk, NY: Author.
- Judge, T.A., Erez, A., Bono, J.E., & Locke, E.A. (2005). Core self-evaluations and job and life satisfaction: The role of self-concordance and goal attainment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(2), 257–268. PubMed ID: 15769236 doi:10.1037/0021-9010.90.2.257
- Kelly, R.E., Mansell, W., & Wood, A.M. (2015). Goal conflict and well-being: A review and hierarchical model of goal conflict, ambivalence, self-discrepancy and self-concordance. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 85, 212–229. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2015.05.011
- Klein, H.J., Wesson, M.J., Hollenbeck, J.R., & Alge, B.J. (1999). Goal commitment and the goal-setting process: Conceptual clarification and empirical synthesis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 84(6), 885–896. PubMed ID: 10639908 doi:10.1037/0021-9010.84.6.885
- Koletzko, S.H., Herrmann, M., & Brandstätter, V. (2015). Unconflicted goal striving: Goal ambivalence as a mediator between goal self-concordance and well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41(1), 140–156. PubMed ID: 25422314 doi:10.1177/0146167214559711
- Langan, E., Hodge, K., McGowan, S., Carney, S., Saunders, V., & Lonsdale, C. (2016). The influence of controlled motivation alongside autonomous motivation: Maladaptive, buffering, or additive effects? *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 14(1), 57–71. doi:10.1080/1612197X.2015.1016084
- Lebeau, J.-C., Gatten, H., Perry, I., Wang, Y., Sung, S., & Tenenbaum, G. (2018). Is failing the key to success? A randomized experiment investigating goal attainment effects on cognitions, emotions, and subsequent performance. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 38, 1–9. doi:10.1016/j.psychsport.2018.05.005
- Louro, M.J., Pieters, R., & Zeelenberg, M. (2007). Dynamics of multiple-goal pursuit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(2), 174–193. PubMed ID: 17645394 doi:10.1037/0022-3514.93.2.174
- Mageau, G.A., & Vallerand, R.J. (2003). The coach-athlete relationship: A motivational model. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 21(11), 883–904. PubMed ID: 14626368 doi:10.1080/0264041031000140374
- Martinet, G., & Decret, J.-C. (2015). Motivational profiles among young table-tennis players in intensive training settings: A latent profile transition analysis. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 27(3), 268–287. doi:10.1080/10413200.2014.993485
- McDonald, J.H. (2014). *Handbook of biological statistics* (3rd ed.). Baltimore, MD: Sparky House Publishing.
- Miquelon, P., & Vallerand, R.J. (2006). Goal motives, well-being, and physical health: Happiness and self-realization as psychological resources under challenge. *Motivation and Emotion*, 30(4), 259–272. doi:10.1007/s11031-006-9043-8
- Muthén, L.K., & Muthén, B.O. (1998–2017). *MPlus user's guide* (8th ed.). Muthén & Muthén
- Ntoumanis, N., Healy, L.C., Sedikides, C., Duda, J., Stewart, B., Smith, A., . . . Bond, J. (2014). When the going gets tough: The “Why” of goal striving matters. *Journal of Personality*, 82(3), 225–236. PubMed ID: 23750603 doi:10.1111/jopy.12047
- Ntoumanis, N., Healy, L.C., Sedikides, C., Smith, A.L., & Duda, J.L. (2014). Self-regulatory responses to unattainable goals: The role of goal motives. *Self and Identity*, 13(5), 594–612. PubMed ID: 25104918 doi:10.1080/15298868.2014.889033
- Ntoumanis, N., & Sedikides, C. (2018). Holding on to the goal or letting it go and moving on? A tripartite model of goal striving. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 27(5), 363–368. doi:10.1177/0963721418770455
- Nylund, K.L., Asparouhov, T., & Muthén, B.O. (2007). Deciding on the number of classes in latent class analysis and growth mixture modeling: A Monte Carlo simulation study. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 14(4), 535–569. doi:10.1080/10705510701575396
- Riediger, M., & Freund, A.M. (2004). Interference and facilitation among personal goals: Differential associations with subjective well-being and persistent goal pursuit. *Personality and Social Psychology*

- Bulletin*, 30(12), 1511–1523. PubMed ID: [15536236](#) doi:[10.1177/0146167204271184](#)
- Rouse, P.C., Veldhuijzen Van Zanten, J.J., Ntoumanis, N., Metsios, G.S., Yu, C.-A., Kitas, G.D., . . . Duda, J.L. (2015). Measuring the positive psychological well-being of people with rheumatoid arthritis: A cross-sectional validation of the subjective vitality scale. *Arthritis Research & Therapy*, 17(1), 312. PubMed ID: [26542467](#) doi:[10.1186/s13075-015-0827-7](#)
- Ryan, R.M., & Frederick, C. (1997). On energy, personality, and health: Subjective vitality as a dynamic reflection of well-being. *Journal of Personality*, 65(3), 529–565. PubMed ID: [9327588](#) doi:[10.1111/j.1467-6494.1997.tb00326.x](#)
- Sanjuán, P., & Ávila, M. (2019). The mediating role of coping strategies on the relationships between goal motives and affective and cognitive components of subjective well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 20(4), 1057–1070. doi:[10.1007/s10902-018-9987-x](#)
- Sheldon, K.M., & Elliot, A.J. (1999). Goal striving, need satisfaction, and longitudinal well-being: The self-concordance model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(3), 482–497. PubMed ID: [10101878](#) doi:[10.1037/0022-3514.76.3.482](#)
- Sheldon, K.M., & Houser-Marko, L. (2001). Self-concordance, goal attainment, and the pursuit of happiness: Can there be an upward spiral? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 80(1), 152–165. PubMed ID: [11195887](#) doi:[10.1037/0022-3514.80.1.152](#)
- Sheldon, K.M., Ryan, R.M., Deci, E.L., & Kasser, T. (2004). The independent effects of goal contents and motives on well-being: It's both what you pursue and why you pursue it. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(4), 475–486. PubMed ID: [15070476](#) doi:[10.1177/0146167203261883](#)
- Smith, A.L. (2016). *Coach behaviors and goal motives as predictors of attainment and well-being in sport*. Elsevier. doi:[10.1016/b978-0-12-803634-1.00019-4](#)
- Smith, A.L., & Ntoumanis, N. (2014). An examination of goal motives and athletes' self-regulatory responses to unattainable goals. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*, 45(6), 538–558. doi:[10.7352/IJSP2014.45.538](#)
- Smith, A., Ntoumanis, N., & Duda, J. (2007). Goal striving, goal attainment, and well-being: Adapting and testing the self-concordance model in sport. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 29(6), 763–782. PubMed ID: [18089903](#) doi:[10.1123/jsep.29.6.763](#)
- Smith, A., Ntoumanis, N., & Duda, J. (2010). An investigation of coach behaviors, goal motives, and implementation intentions as predictors of well-being in Sport. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 22(1), 17–33. doi:[10.1080/10413200903403190](#)
- Smith, A.L., Ntoumanis, N., Duda, J.L., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2011). Goal striving, coping, and well-being: A prospective investigation of the self-concordance model in sport. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 33(1), 124–145. PubMed ID: [21451174](#) doi:[10.1123/jsep.33.1.124](#)
- Tabachnick, B.G., & Fidell, L.S. (2014). *Using multivariate statistics* (6th ed.). Pearson.
- Van den Broeck, A., Lens, W., Witte, H.D., & Coillie, H.V. (2013). Unraveling the importance of the quantity and the quality of workers' motivation for well-being: A person-centered perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 82(1), 69–78. doi:[10.1016/j.jvb.2012.11.005](#)
- van Rens, F.E.C.A., Ashley, R.A., & Steele, A.R. (2019). Well-being and performance in dual careers: The role of academic and athletic identities. *The Sport Psychologist*, 33(1), 42–51. doi:[10.1123/tsp.2018-0026](#)
- Wang, J.C.K., Morin, A.J.S., Ryan, R.M., & Liu, W.C. (2016). Students' motivational profiles in the physical education context. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 38(6), 612–630. PubMed ID: [28033022](#) doi:[10.1123/jsep.2016-0153](#)
- Williams, G.A., & Kibowski, F. (2016). Latent class analysis and latent profile analysis In L.A. Jason, & D.S. Glenwick (Eds.), *Handbook of methodological approaches to community-based research: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods* (pp. 143–152). Oxford University Press.
- Wormington, S.V., & Linnenbrink-Garcia, L. (2017). A new look at multiple goal pursuit: The promise of a person-centered approach. *Educational Psychology Review*, 29(3), 407–445. doi:[10.1007/s10648-016-9358-2](#)