Article

JSPR

Journal of Social and
Personal Relationships
2014, Vol. 31(1) 71–92

DOI: 10.1177/0265407513486976
spr.sagepub.com
SAGE

The influence of close others in daily goal pursuit

Jonathan S. Gore
Eastern Kentucky University, USA

Abstract

This study tested the hypothesis that daily contact with close others during goal pursuit would activate relationally autonomous reasons and would also be associated with the corresponding levels of goal effort. We also hypothesized that the association would be strongest among highly relational and agreeable people. Participants ($n = 49$) completed self-construal and agreeableness assessments at a face-to-face session, then they completed daily reports of relational motives, contact with close and distant others, and goal effort daily for the next 6 days online. The results of hierarchical linear modeling analysis showed that contact with friends and family members were associated with the corresponding levels of effort among highly relational people. Only contact with parents was associated with the corresponding effort among highly agreeable people. Contact with friends and family was also associated with daily levels of relationally autonomous motives, but not relationally controlled motives. Theoretical and practical implications are discussed.

Keywords

Motivation, close relationships, relationally autonomous reasons, relational self-construal, agreeableness

Accomplishing an important, life-changing goal rarely occurs overnight. In most cases, it requires a daily commitment and obtaining small victories on the path toward the larger goal. Many individual difference, motivational, and environmental factors have been identified as promoting daily efforts toward a goal, but most of the time researchers and the lay public focus on a person's inner drive to achieve rather than on the external and

Corresponding author:
Jonathan S. Gore, Eastern Kentucky University, 127 Cammack Bldg., 521 Lancaster Ave., Richmond, KY 40475, USA.
Email: jonathan.gore@eku.edu

social factors that can also promote their success. Even fewer researchers have examined the role of close others in the daily pursuit of important goals. The purpose of this study is to examine the role that being in contact with close others has on the daily pursuit of goals, and the types of people for whom this type of contact helps the most.

The importance of relationships

Relationships are necessary for humans' basic functioning. Simply feeling connected to others can lower incidents of morbidity and mortality (see Reis, Collins, & Berscheid, 2000 for a review), and the quality of people's relationships further predicts physical and psychological health outcomes (see Cohen, 1988 and Uchino, Cacioppo, & Kiecolt-Glaser, 1996 for reviews). Feeling connected to others (aka relatedness), along with having a sense of autonomy and competence, have been identified as the three basic human psychological needs (Deci & Ryan, 2000, 2012a, 2012b). The environments that support these three basic needs are those that also promote positive psychological functioning and physical well-being. Taken together, they are sufficient in explaining the positive effect people experience during their most satisfying experiences, more so than many other needs (Sheldon, Elliot, Kim, & Kasser, 2001), and environments that allow people to balance the three needs appear to be the most beneficial for their well-being and satisfaction (Milyavskaya et al., 2009; Patrick, Knee, Canevello, & Lonsbary, 2007; Sheldon & Niemiec, 2006). Of the three needs, however, relatedness appears to be the least understood (Matsuoka, 2003; Moller, Deci, & Elliot, 2010). The current study, therefore, focuses on relatedness in more detail, specifically the relatedness needs that can be fulfilled on a daily basis.

Most research that examines the consequences of daily experiences of relatedness focuses on psychological well-being and relationship quality rather than on motivational outcomes. Daily levels of relatedness have been linked to the daily experience of positive emotions (Brandstätter, 1983; Gagné, Ryan, & Bargmann, 2003; Hicks & Diamond, 2008; Tong et al., 2009), positive perceptions of one's relationships (Rafaeli, Cranford, Green, Shrout, & Bolger, 2008), commitment to romantic relationships (VanderDrift & Agnew, 2012), and lower relationship conflict (Marshall, Chuong, & Aikawa, 2011). Of the studies that have examined the goal attainment outcomes of daily need satisfaction, the focus is primarily on content-specific motivation, such as studying for classes (Betoret & Artiga, 2011) or participation in after-school activities (Beiswenger & Grolnick, 2010). In contrast, the goal of our study is to examine the role of close relationships in daily goal motivation toward life-changing goals and the individual difference variables that moderate that association. The following section outlines past research on how close others influence motivation and how simply being in contact with close others can serve as a motivator.

Close relationships and motivation

Relationship partners can provide the motivation to accomplish goals, but they can also infringe upon the pursuit and attainment of goals (Gore & Cross, 2006). These distinct outcomes are determined in part by the degree to which the goal integrates the needs

among relationship partners, rather than only incorporates one partner's needs (Chirkov, Ryan, Kim, & Kaplan, 2003; Kagitcibasi, 2005; Knee, Lonsbary, Canevello, & Patrick, 2005; Kumashiro, Rusbult, & Finkel, 2008; Luchies, Finkel, & Fitzsimons, 2011). In other words, motives that incorporate both relatedness and autonomy produce better results than those that create conflict between relatedness and autonomy needs.

Gore and Cross (2006) created the terms relationally autonomous reasons (RARs) and relationally controlled reasons (RCRs) to further note this distinction. RARs are motives that incorporate the needs and wishes within a close relationship, and they represent a desire to attain goals that are in the interest of both members of the relationship or to the relationship itself. In contrast, RCRs are motives that are present mostly because the goal is expected or demanded by a relationship partner, and they often represent a desire to avoid negative consequences from the relationship partner, such as guilt or isolation. In short, RARs promote the integration of relatedness and autonomy, whereas RCRs inhibit that integration.

In a series of studies, RARs were found to promote effort toward goals over time (Gore & Cross, 2006) and cross-culturally (Gore, Cross, & Kanagawa, 2009), even when controlling for other types of autonomous motives. In those studies, RARs were defined as people's tendency to pursue their goals in the interest of their close relationships. Goals were also defined broadly; they could be life-changing self-improvement goals (e.g., graduate, get married) or smaller, short-term goals (e.g., call my parents). These studies also showed that RARs seemed to promote effort and progress toward the goal regardless of the goal domain. In other words, people who pursued their goals using RARs were more successful than others, even if the goals themselves were not relational in nature (e.g., academic, health). Thus, RARs can be applied to a variety of settings.

More recently, Gore (in press) further expanded the way in which RARs could be defined, with a focus primarily on life-changing self-improvement goals. In addition to examining RARs as a general tendency, he also examined how RARs could be emphasized in a 1-week motivational program. Specifically, he found that promoting a sense of mutual benefit to oneself and to close relationships in the program led people to pursue their goal for RARs. He also found that emphasizing the importance of close others' opinions over one's own in the motivational program led people to pursue their goal for RCRs. As was the case in the previous studies, these motives promoted success regardless of the goal domain. In fact, most people reported that they were pursuing either academic or health goals. In summary, relational motives for goals can be activated in a variety of ways, but only a few of those circumstances have been identified.

Contact with close others as a trigger for motivation

Interacting with close others while working toward one's goal may also activate the use of RARs. The salience of close others can prime relational reasons for goals (see Chen, Boucher, & Tapias, 2006, for a review; Shah, 2003a, 2003b), and this priming effect may be particularly strong when the contact with those close others occurs while working toward the goal. When close others are present during the pursuit of a goal, the self-with-other relational schema is activated, and the goals typically associated with that person are activated as well (Anderson & Chen, 2002). As was found in Gore's research, these

goals do not necessarily involve relationship goals. Fitzsimmons and Bargh (2003) demonstrated that when people had a tendency to please their mother, and were subsequently primed to think of their mother, they performed better on a verbal achievement task than people who either had no relational motive associated with their mother or were not primed to think of their mother. In summary, it appears that the salience of close others can activate relational motives. The current study seeks to expand upon these findings by showing a clear link between interacting with close others during one's goal pursuit and the use of RARs. In addition, it will test for the differences between interacting with close versus distant others during the pursuit of goals.

In an event-contingent diary study, Downie, Mageau, and Koestner (2008) demonstrated that people felt both autonomy and relatedness needs fulfilled when they interacted with family members or friends but not when they interacted with casual acquaintances. This is probably because relatedness needs are best fulfilled when interactions involve talking about meaningful topics and feeling understood and appreciated by the interaction partner (Reis, Sheldon, Gable, Roscoe, & Ryan, 2000), both of which are more likely to occur in close relationships than in other types of relationships.

The tendency for relationships with close others (i.e., parents, siblings, friends, or romantic partner) to be of higher quality than with distant others (i.e., classmates, roommates, coworkers, or distant relatives) would also suggest a tendency for those relationships to promote integrative relational motives, because the needs of close others are more likely to be incorporated into one's own goal pursuit than the needs of distant others. Due to the differences in the quality of relationships between close and distant others, we would expect to find that daily interactions with close others during the pursuit of one's goals would promote stronger activation of daily RARs than would interactions with distant others. In this study, we define close others based on the type of relationship rather than the perceived level of closeness, because intimacy tends to be higher in the types of relationships we have defined as close than in the relationships we have defined as distant. This does not mean, however, that everyone experiences positive outcomes when they are in contact with close others. The following section identifies the types of people for whom close relationships are a particularly potent motivator.

Moderators of the association between close others' involvement and motivation

Involving close others in one's goal pursuit does not produce the same positive results for everyone. For example, people from collectivistic cultures tend to experience higher levels of performance and well-being than people from individualistic cultures when close others are involved in a task (Iyengar & Lepper, 1999; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Oishi & Diener, 2001; Rudy, Sheldon, Awong, & Tan, 2007). Daily events involving others also seem to affect the well-being of people from collectivistic cultures more than others (Wirtz, Chiu, Diener, & Oishi, 2009). According to Miller and her colleagues, this is probably because close others (along with their needs, wishes, and desires) are more likely to be integrated into the self among members of collectivistic cultures than among members of individualistic ones (Miller, Das, & Chakravarthy, 2011).

This internalization of close others and their needs can also occur within individualistic cultures (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002). Specifically, people who define themselves based on their close relationships tend to integrate close others' needs with their own (Cross & Madson, 1997). Termed *relational-interdependent self-construal* (RISC), this form of self-definition is based upon relationships with close others (Cross, Bacon, & Morris, 2000), rather than a more general connection to others as is seen in a collective interdependent self-construal. For people with a highly relational self-construal, close relationships are included in the self, which results in them considering the interests, values, and beliefs of their relationship partners (Cross et al., 2000; Cross, Hardin, & Gercek-Swing, 2011; Gore & Cross, 2011a). As a result, people with a highly relational self-construal will report high levels of motivation, satisfaction, and interest, when an activity or stimulus incorporates close relationships. For example, highly relational people experience less negative effect and more relatedness than lows, when a task is framed as benefitting his or her relationships (Gore & Cross, 2011b), and they are more willing to respond to a charity when it emphasizes the impact on close others than when it only emphasizes the impact on oneself or on people they don't know (Burton, Gore, & Sturgeon, 2012).

A second individual difference variable that can moderate the association between being in contact with close others and goal attainment is agreeableness. Agreeableness typically involves a more general prosocial and communal orientation toward others in social environments compared to the relationship-specific orientation of relational self-construal (Costa & McCrae, 1992; John & Srivastava, 1999). People who score high on agreeableness measures tend to engage in behaviors that minimize conflict (Graziano, Jensen-Campbell, & Hair, 1996), maximize cooperation (Graziano, Hair, & Finch, 1997), control negative emotions, while in the presence of others (Tobin, Graziano, Vanman, & Tassinary, 2000), and maintain harmonious close relationships (Branje, Van Aken, Van Lieshout, & Mathijssen, 2003; Jensen-Campbell & Graziano, 2001). They also experience higher levels of distress than less agreeable people on days that they also experience interpersonal conflict (Suls, Martin, & David, 1998).

Despite a general tendency toward positive actions while around others, highly agreeable people seem to be particularly focused on their close relationships. They tend to have better relationship quality than people low in agreeableness, regardless of whether the relationship is with family (Branje, van Lieshout, & van Aken, 2005), friends (Jensen-Campbell, Adams, Perry, Workman, Furdella, & Egan, 2002), or a romantic partner (Donnellan, Conger, & Bryant, 2004; White, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 2004). As a result, we would expect to find similar responses to the involvement of close others among highly agreeable people as we would expect with highly relational people. Indeed, Gore (in press) found that the integration of close others into goal pursuit enhanced motivation among highly agreeable people. This suggests that highly agreeable people are not only attending to the quality of their close relationships, but they are also influenced by close others' interests similar to people with a highly relational self-construal.

Why would highly relational and agreeable people benefit from the use of RARs over other motives? For highly relational and agreeable people, it would be more in the interest of their relationship to use RARs than RCRs when pursuing their goals, because

RARs incorporate the needs of the other person into their own whereas RCRs do not. Indeed, recent work on relational motives has shown that people with a highly relational self-construal tend to pursue their goals for RARs rather than RCRs, and that these reasons in turn enhance goal progress and attainment (Gore & Cross, 2006; Gore et al., 2009). In addition, both relational self-construal and agreeableness moderate the association between the use of RARs in goal pursuit and goal attainment, in that highly relational and agreeable people attain more of their goals when they pursue their goals using RARs than when using RCRs or personally autonomous motives (Gore, in press). It was also ruled out that these individual difference variables are statistically redundant, as the moderation effects remained significant even when controlling for the other individual difference variable.

All of these studies examining RARs and goal motivation are missing two important pieces: the degree to which these motives can be triggered by daily events involving close others and the degree to which these events correspond to goal motivation. This study attempts to fill this void through a daily diary method assessing daily motives, contact with others, and efforts toward one's goal, and we examine the moderating effects of relational self-construal and agreeableness on the associations among these variables.

The current study

The purpose of this study was to expand upon recent work on RARs and goal pursuit in several ways. First, we employed a daily diary design to examine fluctuating patterns of interpersonal contact while working on one's goals with the corresponding fluctuations in goal effort. To date, no one has examined how simply being in contact with close others during one's daily goal pursuit corresponds to effort. Second, we expanded upon the way in which RARs can be activated. Gore (in press) demonstrated that RARs can be chronically activated or they can be encouraged through a goal motivation program. In this study, we examined how daily contact with close others can activate daily levels of RARs. Third, we examined the moderating role of relational self-construal and agreeableness on the association between daily contact with close others and goal effort, which has not been examined in prior research.

For this study, we focused on life-changing self-improvement goals rather than on trivial ones. Due to the magnitude of life-changing goals, and the amount of time that it takes to achieve them, we examined the degree to which participants worked on daily subgoals related to the larger goal. The concrete nature of creating and pursuing subgoals is beneficial in the pursuit of larger goals (see Bandura, 1991; Locke & Latham, 1990; Schunk, 1994; Zimmerman, 1989, for reviews). Therefore, the amount of effort that participants report in this study is in reference to their work on a concrete subgoal related to their larger self-improvement goal.

The hypotheses for this diary study were that (a) daily contact with close others (i.e., friends, romantic partner, parents, and siblings), but not daily contact with distant others (i.e., other relatives, classmates, coworkers, and roommates), will be associated with daily levels of RARs, (b) daily contact with close others, but not daily contact with distant others, will be positively associated with daily goal effort, (c) the association

between daily contact with close others and daily goal effort will be stronger among people with a highly relational self-construal than among lows, and (d) the association between daily contact with close others and goal effort will be stronger among highly agreeable people than among lows.

Method

Participants

Participants were 122 undergraduate students (39 men, 77 women, and 6 unspecified) from Eastern Kentucky University, who participated in exchange for completion credit in psychology courses. Eighty participants returned at Time 2 (66% of the Time 1 sample; 25 men, 51 women, 4 unspecified) and 49 participants completed at least half of the daily measures (40% of the Time 1 sample; 18 men, 31 women). Only participants who had data from Time 1 and Time 2 and who had completed at least half of the daily measures were used for the analyses. Among these participants, most of the six daily surveys were completed ($M = 5.06$, $SD = 1.07$).

Materials

Relational self-construal. The 11-item RISC scale (see Cross et al., 2000 for psychometric properties) was used to measure a person's tendency to include close relationships in one's self-definition. Participants rated statements on a 5-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*). An example item is, "My close relationships are an important reflection of who I am" (Cronbach's $\alpha = .90$, $M = 3.72$, $SD = .76$).

Agreeableness. Participants were asked to complete a 25-item version of the Big Five Personality measure (John, 1989). They rated single words or phrases based on how self-descriptive they were on a 5-point scale (1 = *not at all descriptive of me*, 5 = *extremely descriptive of me*). Example items included "Affectionate" and "Appreciative." The mean scores for the five agreeableness items were obtained to indicate participants' levels of agreeableness (Cronbach's $\alpha = .72$, $M = 4.07$, $SD = .43$).

Self-improvement goal. After completing the personality questionnaire, participants were asked to generate a life-changing goal that they wanted to work toward over the next 7 days. They also classified their goal into one of the four categories: school, work, relationships, and health/appearance. The majority of the goals participants listed were school or health/appearance related (50% and 33%). Examples included "Declaring a major" and "Getting in shape."

Daily subgoals. For the daily surveys, participants answered the questions, "What is the goal you are working on?" and "What specific things did you do today to achieve your goal?" This second question assessed the daily subgoal that they pursued for the sake of attaining the larger self-improvement goal. Examples of daily subgoals that corresponded with the "Declaring a major" goal were: "Met with my advisor to discuss

Table 1. Null model and reliability estimates for day-level variables.

Day-level variables	Reliability estimate	Intercept	Variance component		$\chi^2(48)$
			Between	Within	
Effort	.75	3.44	.16	.43	137.39**
RARs	.93	2.35	.55	.22	678.35**
RCRs	.92	2.35	.67	.28	633.59**
Friend contact	.77	2.23	.87	1.04	217.42**
Partner contact	.90	1.63	.88	.47	454.30**
Parent contact	.79	1.39	.20	.44	155.13**
Sibling contact	.72	1.21	.13	.25	163.31**
Relative contact	.83	1.21	.17	.17	302.69**
Coworker contact	.82	1.28	.34	.36	270.67**
Classmate contact	.87	1.72	.79	.56	387.22**
Roommate contact	.91	1.85	1.24	.57	563.52**

RARs: relationally autonomous reasons; RCRs: relationally controlled reasons.
**$p < .01$.

options," "Looked into classes that would fit my major," and "Scheduled classes for fulfill major requirements." Examples of daily subgoals that corresponded with the "Getting in shape" goal were: "Went to the gym," "Took a long walk," and "Jogged."

Daily contact with others. To assess the amount participants were in contact with close and distant others, they were asked to answer the question, "How much contact did you have with the following people today while you were working on your goal?" Participants rated the degree of contact with each person using a 5-point scale (1 = *not at all*, 5 = *almost the whole time*). The close others participants asked to answer the question were friend, romantic partner, parent, and sibling. The distant others participants asked to answer the question were other relative, coworker, classmate, and roommate. Participants' ratings regarding contact with each type of person were kept separate for analyses. Table 1 displays the reliability estimates for each type of contact. Aggregate scores across days were also calculated for each type of contact.

Daily goal effort. For the daily surveys, participants rated five statements on a 5-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*) regarding how much effort they put toward the goal that day. These items were "I was very committed to this goal today," "I put a lot of effort into attaining my goal today," "I often found myself thinking about this goal today," "The work I put into this goal today was effective," and "I found myself 'slacking off' when I worked on this goal today" (reversed). These statements were adopted from Emmons (1986) and Sheldon and Elliot (1998), and they have been used in research examining RARs (Gore, in press; Gore & Cross, 2006; Gore et al., 2009). Table 1 displays the reliability estimates. An aggregate of effort across days was also calculated for each participant ($M = 3.44$, $SD = .76$).

Daily relational motives. To examine the degree to which contact with close others could be linked to relational reasons for goal pursuit, participants rated four items each day that completed the statement, "The reason why I worked on this goal today was because . . . " using a 5-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 5 = *strongly agree*). This preliminary phrase differs from the typical one used in a more global assessment of relational reasons, which is "I am pursuing this goal because . . . ." To date, the daily version of the relational reasons measures have not been used. The measures for RARs and for RCRs were constructed using items that assessed the relative autonomy of relational motives (see Gore & Cross, 2006, for psychometric properties). The items were categorized as assessing autonomous or controlled reasons for goals, depending on the degree to which they reflected aspects that were intrinsically valuable to a relationship or viewed as coercive. The autonomous items were " . . . the involvement of other people I am close to made it fun and enjoyable" and " . . . it is important to someone close to me." The controlled items were " . . . I would have let someone else down if I did not" and " . . . other people expected me to." RAR scores were created by obtaining the mean rating across the RARs, whereas RCR scores were created by obtaining the mean rating across the RCRs. Table 1 displays the reliability estimates for each type of motive. Aggregate scores for RARs and RCRs across days were also created for each participant ($M = 3.36$, $SD = .88$ for RARs, $M = 3.35$, $SD = .98$ for RCRs).

Procedure

Participants first completed measures of relational self-construal and agreeableness as part of a larger survey of personality and well-being assessments. They then listed a self-improvement goal they hoped to work toward over the next 7 days, and classified it into one of the four categories. Participants also were asked about their attitudes toward the goal and their planned schedule for working toward it, both of which were part of a separate set of hypotheses and will not be discussed further. Upon completion, participants were introduced to the online system used to administer the daily surveys. They were asked to complete the first daily survey by 5 p.m. the next day and were given a password to access it. They were informed that they were to complete all six daily surveys between the first and second face-to-face sessions, and they were reminded of the second face-to-face session, which would take place 7 days from the first one and dismissed.

On the day participants were to complete the first daily survey, they were e-mailed a password for the second diary survey, which they were required to complete by 5 p.m. the following day. Diary survey completion was monitored by a research assistant, who e-mailed participants the next day's password through the online system. All participants from the first face-to-face session were contacted by e-mail 2 days prior to their second session.

At the second face-to-face session, participants were first asked to complete a follow-up questionnaire assessing their psychological well-being. They then answered some questions about the goal they worked on during the past week, and what helped or hurt their progress throughout the week. Finally, they indicated how many hours in their planned schedule they had worked on the goal. All of the data from this second face-

to-face session were for another set of hypotheses and will not be discussed further. At the end of the second session, they were debriefed and dismissed.

Results

To account for the nested structure of the data, we used hierarchical linear modeling software (HLM 6.08; Bryk, Raudenbush, & Congdon, 2004) to analyze the data. Level 1 analyses examined daily within-person associations between goal motives and contact with others. Level 2 analyses examined between-person differences as either covariates or as moderators of the within-person effects. For all analyses, day-level variables were centered on the individuals' means, and person-level variables were centered on the sample means.

Null model estimates

To test the null models for each daily variable, a series of analyses were conducted by entering each daily variable separately as the dependent variable. From this analysis, the intercept, between-person variance, within-person variance were all obtained (see Table 1). Chi-square tests indicated that there was significant between-person variance for each of the daily variables. As a result, the aggregate scores were included as Level 2 independent variables whenever the daily scores were entered as Level 1 independent variables so that we could distinguish between the daily-level and person-level effects.

Associations among daily variables

Our first set of analyses examined the degree to which daily contact with close others during goal pursuit activates RARs. To test the hypothesis that daily contact with close others (i.e., friends, romantic partner, parents, and siblings), but not daily contact with distant others (i.e., other relatives, classmates, coworkers, and roommates), would be associated with daily levels of RARs, a series of analyses were conducted with the RAR and RCR scores entered as the Level 1 independent variables, the aggregate RAR and RCR scores entered as Level 2 independent variables, and each of the contact scores entered separately as Level 1 outcome variables (each type of contact was entered separately, see Table 2).

Daily amount of contact with others was estimated using the following equation

$$\text{Contact}_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}(\text{daily RARs}) + \beta_{2j}(\text{daily RCRs}) + r_i j$$

where contact_{ij} refers to the level of daily contact for each type of person, β_{0j} refers to the intercept, β_1 and β_2 represent maximum likelihood estimates of the slopes estimating daily amount of contact from daily RARs and RCRS, and r_{ij} is error.

Person-level effects were estimated using the following equation

$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(\text{average RARs}) + \gamma_{02}(\text{average RCRs}) + u_{0j}$$

where γ_{00} refers to the day-level intercept for contact, γ_{01} and γ_{02} represent maximum likelihood estimates of the slopes estimating average amount of contact across all days from person-level RARs and RCRs, and u_{0j} is error.

Table 2. Associations between daily contact with others and daily relational motives, controlling for between-person motives.[a]

	Daily RARs		Daily RCRs	
Daily contact variables	*B*	*t* (245)	*B*	*t* (245)
Friend(s)	.32	2.01*	−.20	1.35
Romantic partner	.05	.45	−.03	.32
Parent(s)	.20	2.23*	−.02	.20
Sibling(s)	.17	2.12*	−.10	1.37
Other relative(s)	−.09	1.29	.00	.04
Coworker(s)	−.12	1.19	.02	.21
Classmate(s)	.25	2.08*	−.11	.75
Roommate(s)	.12	.96	−.01	.13

RARs: relationally autonomous reasons; RCRs: relationally controlled reasons.
[a]All coefficients are unstandardized.
*$p < .05$.

The results indicated that daily RARs were positively associated with contact with one's friends, parents, siblings, and classmates during goal pursuit for that day (see Table 1). Daily contact with one's romantic partner, other relatives, coworkers, and roommates were unassociated with daily RARs. Daily RCRs were not associated with contact of any type. These results suggest that contact with close others can be considered a form of relationally autonomous motives, particularly in terms of close friends and family, which provides support for the first hypothesis.

To test the second hypothesis, which stated that daily contact with close others would be associated with daily goal outcomes, another series of analyses were conducted using each of the contact scores entered separately as Level 1 independent variables, the aggregate contact scores entered as Level 2 independent variables, and the Daily Effort scores entered as the Level 1 outcome variable. The equations were entered as follows:

Daily amount of effort was estimated using the following equation

$$\text{Effort}_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}(\text{daily contact}) + r_{ij}$$

where β_{0j} refers to the intercept, β_{1j} represent a maximum likelihood estimate of the slope estimating daily amount of effort from daily contact with others (each type of contact was examined separately), and r_{ij} is error.

Person-level effects were estimated using the following equation

$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(\text{average contact}) + u_{0j}$$

where γ_{00} refers to the day-level intercept for effort, γ_{01} represents the maximum likelihood estimate of the slope estimating average amount of effort across all days from person-level contact with others, and u_{0j} is error.

The results showed that only daily contact with classmates was associated with the daily amount of effort exerted toward the goal ($B = .11$, $t(245) = 2.39$, $p < .05$). Thus, the second hypothesis was disconfirmed.

An additional analysis examined the association between daily levels of RARs and RCRs with daily effort. Daily RAR and RCR scores were entered as Level 1 independent variables, the aggregate effort, RAR and RCR levels across days were entered as Level 2 independent variables, and the daily effort scores were entered as the outcome. The equations were entered as follows:

Daily effort was estimated using the following equation

$$\text{Effort}_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}(\text{daily RARs}) + \beta_{2j}(\text{daily RCRs}) + r_ij$$

where β_{0j} refers to the intercept, β_1 and β_2 represent maximum likelihood estimates of the slopes estimating daily effort from daily RARs and RCRS, and r_{ij} is error.

Person-level effects were estimated using the following equation

$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(\text{average RARs}) + \gamma_{02}(\text{average RCRs}) + u_{0j}$$

where γ_{00} refers to the day-level intercept for effort, γ_{01} and γ_{02} represent maximum likelihood estimates of the slopes estimating average effort across all days from person-level RARs and RCRs, and u_{0j} is error.

The results indicated that daily RARs were positively related to daily effort ($B = .29$, $t(245) = 2.34$, $p < .05$), but daily RCRs were not ($B = .08$, $t(245) = .89$, *ns*). Person-level RARs were also related to daily effort ($G = .15$, $t(48) = 1.98$, $p < .05$), but person-level RCRs were not ($G = .03$, $t(48) = .14$, *ns*).

RISC × contact with others on goal effort

To test the hypothesis that highly relational individuals will be more motivated toward their goals on days in which they have contact with close others, a series of analyses were conducted with the daily contact scores for each type of person entered separately as Level 1 independent variables, RISC scores and aggregate contact for each type of person as Level 2 independent variables, and daily effort entered as the Level 1 outcome variable.

Daily effort was estimated using the following equation

$$\text{Effort}_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}(\text{contact}) + r_ij$$

where β_{0j} refers to the intercept, β_1 represents the maximum likelihood estimate of the slope estimating daily effort from daily contact (each type of contact was tested separately), and r_{ij} is error.

Person-level effects were estimated using the following equation:

$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(\text{RISC}) + \gamma_{02}(\text{average contact}) + u_{0j}$$

$$\beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11}(\text{RISC}) + u_{1j}$$

where γ_{00} refers to the day-level intercept for effort, γ_{01} and γ_{02} represent maximum likelihood estimates of the slopes estimating average effort across all days from RISC scores and person-level contact with others (each type of contact was tested separately), γ_{10} represents the intercept for the slope estimating effort from daily contact, γ_{11} represents the maximum likelihood estimate of the slope of estimating the slope between daily contact

Table 3. Personality × close other contact interaction effects predicting daily effort, controlling for between-person contact with close others.[a]

	Type of close other							
RISC × close other contact	Friend		Partner		Parent		Sibling	
Daily level	Coeff.	*t*	Coeff.	*t*	Coeff.	*t*	Coeff.	*t*
Daily contact	.03	.74	−.02	.20	−.08	1.12	−.12	1.01
Person level								
RISC	.15	1.69^{+}	.17	1.86^{+}	.16	1.70^{+}	.16	1.72^{+}
Aggregate contact with other	.07	.84	−.02	.46	−.07	.97	.03	.35
Cross-level								
RISC × daily contact	.15	2.53*	.01	.08	.27	2.18*	.29	2.54*
Agreeableness × close other contact	Friend		Partner		Parent		Sibling	
Daily level	Coeff.	*t*	Coeff.	*t*	Coeff.	*t*	Coeff.	*t*
Daily contact	.03	.63	−.01	.18	−.01	.09	.00	.04
Person level								
Agreeableness	.19	1.16	.17	1.05	.19	1.16	.19	1.16
Aggregate contact with other	.06	.81	−.03	.67	−.09	1.06	.01	.12
Cross-level								
Agreeableness × daily contact	−.03	.23	−.21	1.98*	.34	1.97*	.12	.57

Coeff.: coefficient; RISC: relational-interdependent self-construal.
[a]Within-person $df = 244$; between-person $df = 47$.
*$p < .05$; $^{+}p < .10$.

with others and daily effort from RISC scores (i.e., the moderation effect), and u_{0j} and u_{1j} are error terms.

The results showed four marginal main effects of RISC on effort, and three significant RISC × contact interaction effects on effort for friend contact, parent contact, and sibling contact (p values <.10, see Table 3). Additional analyses were conducted by adding agreeableness as a Level 2 independent variable. All three interaction effects remained significant (p values <.05). Also, the RISC × contact with distant others interaction effects were tested using the same process outlined above. The results yielded no significant interaction effect for daily contact with any of the distant others (p values >.10).

Follow-up analyses to examine the simple slopes involved entering the coefficient values from the HLM analyses into a simple slopes calculator on a website (www.quantpsy.org/interact/hlm2.htm) created by Kristopher Preacher and based upon calculations specified by Bauer and Curran (2005) and Preacher, Curran, and Bauer (2006). The results indicated that the daily amount of contact with friends, parents, and siblings was all positively associated with the daily amount of effort among people who scored high on the RISC scale (see Table 4). In contrast, the daily amount of contact with parents was negatively associated with effort among people who scored low on the RISC scale, and the daily amount of contact with friends and siblings was unrelated to effort for low scorers.

Table 4. Associations between daily contact and daily goal effort by high and low scorers on risk and agreeableness.[a]

Daily contact variables	High RISC	Low RISC	High agreeableness	Low agreeableness
Friend(s)	.08*	−.04	.05	.02
Romantic partner	.02	−.07	−.13*	.17*
Parent(s)	.05*	−.14*	.08*	−.23**
Sibling(s)	.09*	−.07	.02	−.02

RISC: relational-interdependent self-construal.
[a]All coefficients are unstandardized.
**$p < .01$; *$p < .05$.

Taken together, these results supported the hypothesis that contact with close friends and family can serve as a motivator for people with a highly relational self-construal.

Agreeableness × contact with others on goal motivation

To test the hypothesis that highly agreeable individuals are more motivated toward their goals on days in which they have contact with close others, a similar series of analyses were conducted with the daily contact scores for each type of person entered separately as Level 1 independent variables, agreeableness scores and aggregate contact for each type of person as Level 2 independent variables, and daily effort entered as the Level 1 outcome variable.

Daily effort was estimated using the following equation

$$\text{Effort}_{ij} = \beta_{0j} + \beta_{1j}(\text{contact}) + r_i j$$

where β_{0j} refers to the intercept, β_1 represents the maximum likelihood estimate of the slope estimating daily effort from daily contact (each type of contact was tested separately), and r_{ij} is error.

Person-level effects were estimated using the following equation

$$\beta_{0j} = \gamma_{00} + \gamma_{01}(\text{agreeableness}) + \gamma_{02}(\text{average contact}) + u_{0j}$$

$$\beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + \gamma_{11}(\text{agreeableness}) + u_{1j}$$

where γ_{00} refers to the day-level intercept for effort, γ_{01} and γ_{02} represent maximum likelihood estimates of the slopes estimating average effort across all days from agreeableness scores and person-level contact with others (each type of contact was tested separately), γ_{10} represents the intercept for the slope estimating effort from daily contact, γ_{11} represents the maximum likelihood estimate of the slope of estimating the slope between daily contact with others and daily effort from agreeableness scores (i.e., the moderation effect), and u_{0j} and u_{1j} are error terms.

There were two significant agreeableness × contact interaction effects on effort for partner contact and parent contact (see Table 3). Similar to the earlier analysis, additional analyses were conducted by testing the same interaction effect after adding RISC scores as an additional Level 2 independent variable. The two interaction effects remained

significant (p values <.05). Also, none of the agreeableness × contact with distant others interaction effects were significant (p values >.10).

The simple slopes were obtained using the same simple slopes calculator as was mentioned above (see Table 4). The results indicated that the daily amount of contact with parents was positively associated with daily effort among people scoring high in agreeableness, whereas the daily amount of contact with parents was negatively associated with effort for low scorers on the agreeableness scale. Surprisingly, the results were reversed when we examined the amount of contact with a romantic partner. The daily amount of contact with a romantic partner was negatively associated with the daily amount of effort exerted toward the goal among people scoring high on the agreeableness scale, whereas this association was positive for low scorers. This only supports the hypothesis in terms of parental contact and offers some disconfirmatory evidence in regard to contact with a romantic partner.

Discussion

This study demonstrated that daily contact with close others while working toward a goal can serve as a trigger for RARs, particularly with close friends and family. This study also replicated the findings from Gore (in press) by showing that RARs (defined in this study as being in contact with close others) are particularly effective for highly relational individuals. When they were in contact with their friends, parents, or siblings, highly relational individuals reported working harder toward their goals than when they had little or no contact.

Despite the noteworthy findings regarding contact with others and goal motivation among high relationals, this was not as evident among highly agreeable people. The only close relationship that seemed to provide a daily boost for highly agreeable people was the one they have with their parents. This suggests that highly agreeable people only experience a boost when in contact with persons of authority (i.e., parents) rather than when they are in contact with close others with whom they have relatively equal status (i.e., friends and siblings). Past research confirms that highly agreeable people not only favor a low degree of power assertion while interacting with close others, but they are more likely to adopt a cooperative strategy when resolving conflicts with parents than with others (Graziano et al., 1996). Taken together, this suggests that highly agreeable people take great care in attending to the needs of their parents when making decisions, whether it involves making a decision or pursuing a goal.

It also appears from these results that contact with a romantic partner while working toward a goal can actually hinder goal motivation among highly agreeable individuals. As a result, highly agreeable people will not always benefit from the involvement of close others in their daily lives. Indeed, it has been noted that romantic relationships function differently than other close relationships, and behavior with a romantic partner is particularly likely to be inconsistent with one's usual behavior (Moskowitz, 1994). It is possible that this phenomenon is especially likely among highly agreeable people, who may set aside their goal pursuit while around a romantic partner so as to avoid conflict.

Implications

These results provide several theoretical and practical implications for the study of motivation, individual differences, and close relationships. First, we expanded upon Gore's (in press) research on goal motivation by demonstrating that simply being in contact with friends and family while working toward a goal can activate RARs, which has been shown to be an effective form of intrinsic, long-term motivation (Gore & Cross, 2006). Past research has focused on the importance of distinguishing between personal versus relational motives, as they tend to predict different goal outcomes (Gore & Cross, 2006; Gore et al., 2009; Yi & Gore, 2013). Here, we have shown that further differentiation between types of relational motives is warranted as well. Although contact with family and friends activated RARs, it did not seem to activate RCRs. This suggests that such contact is generally beneficial.

We have also expanded upon past research on the daily fulfillment of relatedness by showing that it can predict more than just daily levels of positive mood and relationship quality. These results show that we may also see levels of motivation rise on the days that relatedness needs are met. This provides further evidence toward Reis and his colleagues' declaration over a decade ago (Reis et al., 2000), which called attention to the primacy of close relationships in optimal human functioning. The involvement of close others in our lives not only makes us happier and healthier, but simply being around loved ones while working on goals can trigger the types of relational motives that produce results.

Our results also demonstrate the importance of a more nuanced examination of the interplay of psychological needs than has been done in the past. Building on recent work, which shows that the balance of needs is more important than the fulfillment of any one need (Milyavskaya et al., 2009; Patrick et al., 2007; Sheldon & Niemiec, 2006; Talley, Kocum, Schlegel, Molix, & Bettencourt, 2012), we have shown that both relatedness and autonomy needs can be fulfilled by being in contact with close others, and consequently pursuing one's goals with them in mind. Integrating needs together appears to have more positive outcomes than simply pursuing goals based upon one need alone. In addition, we have shown that need fulfillment does not work the same way for everyone. In the cases where relatedness and autonomy needs are integrated, it is mostly the people who define themselves primarily in terms of their close relationships who benefit. Therefore, integrating needs together may work the best for people who define themselves based upon a similar form of integration.

These results provide some interesting practical implications for clinicians and other service providers who often meet with clients on a weekly basis, but have no way of monitoring what happens between sessions until they ask follow-up questions at the next face-to-face meeting. Our results suggest that these professional service providers might see encouraging results if they take into account several factors. First, they should account for the client's relational self-construal. People who define themselves in terms of their close relationships are motivated to integrate the needs of close others into their activities, so their close others will likely influence their progress toward the goals that are set in the weekly sessions. Second, the provider should consider encouraging the highly relational client to be in contact with friends and family (as long as they have a positive relationship) while they work toward their therapy goals, as this will likely

activate RARs and foster progress toward the goals' attainment. We recommend that future research focus on testing this approach to examine its effectiveness. Future research may also consider addressing some of the limitations of the current study.

Limitations and future directions

Despite the noteworthy contributions of this study in understanding the importance of close others in goal pursuit, there are some areas of concern that future research can address. First, only the amount of contact with others was assessed in this study. This did not allow for an examination of the quality of the interactions with them. As a result, it is difficult to say if being in contact with others simply involved being physically present or if it involved an extended or intimate interaction. It is likely that the quality of the interaction with close others would further enhance daily goal pursuit, so it is recommended that future research employ assessments such as the Rochester Interaction Record (Wheeler & Nezlek, 1977) to provide more information.

In addition to the quality of the interaction, we did not examine the quality of each relationship. It is clear that being in contact with close others while working toward goals will not benefit everyone. Although this type of contact was associated with daily RARs, and daily RARs are associated with daily levels of effort, we found no evidence that being in contact with close others during goal pursuit is linked to levels of effort for all people. This could possibly be due to differences in the degree of closeness that participants have in each of these relationships. Although relationships with friends and family tend to be closer than relationships with other people, not everyone experiences the same degree of closeness with their friends and family. This creates the need to examine variability in relationship quality as an additional component in this model. It is imperative that future studies examine this additional component to better understand when the involvement of close others will be beneficial during goal pursuit.

There were several null and some surprising effects when we examined the amount of contact people had with their romantic partner while working toward their goals. One possible reason for the null effects could be the amount of people who were in romantic relationships. Only 24 (50%) of the total sample reported being in any contact with a romantic partner during the week, which either means that they were not in a romantic relationship or they simply weren't in contact with that person (possibly due to a long-distance relationship). Regardless of the reason for these low numbers, they likely affected some of our findings. Future examinations of these effects should insure that a higher proportion of the sample, or perhaps the whole sample, reports being in a romantic relationship so that we can investigate a wide variety of relationships on equal grounds.

It is also evident from this study that we did not get a wide variety of goal types. Over 80% of all of the goals pursued by our participants either involved school or health goals. Although this lends support to our argument that relationship goals are not the only type that can involve close others, we nevertheless are restricted in the conclusions we can make about other goal types, including financial, leisure, and even relationship goals. Researchers wishing to pursue this further should focus on populations that may have goals that fit into these other domains, or they can constrain the options for participants so as to focus only on one type of domain selected by the researcher.

Another limitation to our study is that we only examined a small set of possible moderators. It is evident from past research that several moderating variables influence the degree to which relatedness need fulfillment leads to enhanced goal and well-being outcomes. More specifically, our research has shown that attachment style (Gore & Rogers, 2010) and culture (Yi & Gore, 2012) moderate the association between RARs and both goal and well-being outcomes. Future studies should examine the moderating effects of these variables in another diary design to determine the extent to which the results we found among high relationals also apply to other people.

The cross-sectional nature of this study did not allow for us to test causal associations between contact with others and effort. Although other experimental research has demonstrated that relational motivation causes highly relational people to work harder toward their goals (Gore, in press), it is difficult to know whether they work harder toward their goals because they have been in contact with those close others, or perhaps they want to show off their progress to close others and therefore seek them out after they feel they have worked hard on it. These distinctions are important to make to determine if being in contact with specific people while working on a goal can be recommended for better goal outcomes.

Finally, this study relied on self-report assessments for all of the variables, which could easily be vulnerable to social desirability and acquiescence biases. Future applications of this work should utilize more objective methods of assessing daily motivation, such as the intensity and amount of exercise people at a health club engage in, or the number of units a factory worker produces. Using these objective measures of motivation and attainment would allow for a more thorough application of these findings.

Conclusions

The integration of close others' needs into one's own has been found to produce positive goal outcomes, and this integration may be activated when in contact with close others during goal pursuit. This activation is also particularly important for people who define themselves in terms of their close relationships. People with a highly relational self-construal work harder toward their goals on the days they are also in contact with friends and family. Clinicians and other professional service providers may notice more successful outcomes for their clients if they take into account those clients' self-construal and the people they will be around on a daily basis. Family and friends are an important source of psychological and physical well-being, but being around them can also provide an important boost when pursuing one's goals.

Funding

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

References

Anderson, S. M., & Chen, S. (2002). The relational self: An interpersonal social-cognitive theory. *Psychological Review*, *109*, 619–645.

Bandura, A. (1991). Self-regulation of motivation through anticipatory and self-reactive mechanisms. In R. Dienstbier (Ed.), *Perspectives on motivation: Nebraska symposium on motivation*, Vol. *38* (pp. 69–164). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

Bauer, D. J., & Curran, P. J. (2005). Probing interactions in fixed and multilevel regression: Inferential and graphical techniques. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *40*, 373–400.

Beiswenger, K. L., & Grolnick, W. S. (2010). Interpersonal and intrapersonal factors associated with autonomous motivation in adolescents' after-school activities. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, *30*, 369–394.

Betoret, F., & Artiga, A. (2011). The relationship among student basic need satisfaction, approaches to learning, reporting of avoidance strategies and achievement. *Electronic Journal of Research In Educational Psychology*, *9*, 463–496.

Brandstätter, H. (1983). Emotional responses to other persons in everyday life situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *45*, 871–883.

Branje, S. T., van Aken, M. G., van Lieshout, C. M., & Mathijssen, J. P. (2003). Personality judgments in adolescents' families: The perceiver, the target, their relationship, and the family. *Journal of Personality*, *71*, 49–81.

Branje, S. T., van Lieshout, C. M., & van Aken, M. G. (2005). Relations between Agreeableness and perceived support in family relationships: Why nice people are not always supportive. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, *29*, 120–128.

Burton, K. A., Gore, J. S., & Sturgeon, J. L. (2012). The role of self-construal in response to charity advertisements. *Self and Identity*, *11*, 343–359.

Chen, S., Boucher, H. C., & Tapias, M. (2006). The relational self revealed: Integrative conceptualization and implications for interpersonal life. *Psychological Bulletin*, *132*, 151–179.

Chirkov, V., Ryan, R. M., Kim, Y., & Kaplan, U. (2003). Differentiating autonomy from individualism: A self-determination theory perspective on internalization of cultural orientations and well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*, 97–109.

Cohen, S. (1988). Psychosocial models of the role of social support in the etiology of physical disease. *Health Psychology*, *7*, 269–297.

Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *NEO PI-R Professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.

Cross, S. E., Bacon, P. L., & Morris, M. L. (2000). The relational-interdependent self-construal and relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *78*, 791–808.

Cross, S. E., Hardin, E. E., & Gercek-Swing, B. (2011). The what, how, why, and where of self--construal. *Personality And Social Psychology Review*, *15*, 142–179.

Cross, S. E., & Madson, L. (1997). Models of the self: Self-construals and gender. *Psychological Bulletin*, *122*, 5–37.

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*, 227–268.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2012a). Motivation, personality, and development within embedded social contexts: An overview of self-determination theory. In R. M. Ryan (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of human motivation* (pp. 85–107). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2012b). Self-determination theory. In P. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski, & E. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of theories of social psychology*, Vol. 1 (pp. 416–436). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.

Donnellan, M., Conger, R. D., & Bryant, C. M. (2004). The big five and enduring marriages. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *38*, 481–504.

Downie, M., Mageau, G. A., & Koestner, R. (2008). What makes for a pleasant social interaction? Motivational dynamics of interpersonal relationships. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *148*, 523-534.

Emmons, R. A. (1986). Personal strivings: An approach to personality and subjective well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *51*, 1058–1068.

Fitzsimmons, G. M., & Bargh, J. A. (2003). Thinking of you: Nonconscious pursuit of interpersonal goals associated with relationship partners. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*, 148–164.

Gagné, M., Ryan, R. M., & Bargmann, K. (2003). Autonomy support and need satisfaction in the motivation and well-being of gymnasts. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *15*, 372–390.

Gore, J. S. (in press). Individual differences that moderate the effectiveness of relational reasons for self-improvement. *Motivation and Emotion*.

Gore, J. S., & Cross, S. E. (2006). Pursuing goal for us: Relationally-autonomous reasons in long-term goal pursuit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*, 848–861.

Gore, J. S., & Cross, S. E. (2011a). Task framing and perceived fit: The role of personality, task label, and partner involvement. *Motivation and Emotion*, *35*, 368–382.

Gore, J. S., & Cross, S. E. (2011b). Conflicts of interest: Relational self-construal and decision-making in interpersonal contexts. *Self and Identity*, *10*, 185–202.

Gore, J. S., Cross, S. E., & Kanagawa, C. (2009). Acting in our interests: Relational self and goal motivation across cultures. *Motivation and Emotion*, *33*, 75–87.

Gore, J. S., & Rogers, M. J. (2010). Why do I study? The moderating role of attachment style on academic motivation. *Journal of Social Psychology*, *150*, 560–578.

Graziano, W. G., Hair, E. C., & Finch, J. F. (1997). Competitiveness mediates the link between personality and group performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *73*, 1394–1408.

Graziano, W. G., Jensen-Campbell, L. A., & Hair, E. C. (1996). Perceiving interpersonal conflict and reacting to it: The case for agreeableness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*, 820–835.

Hicks, A. M., & Diamond, L. M. (2008). How was your day? Couples' affect when telling and hearing daily events. *Personal Relationships*, *15*, 205–228.

Iyengar, S. S., & Lepper, M. R. (1999). Rethinking the value of choice: A cultural perspective on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *76*, 349–366.

Jensen-Campbell, L. A., Adams, R., Perry, D. G., Workman, K. A., Furdella, J. Q., & Egan, S. K. (2002). Agreeableness, extraversion, and peer relations in early adolescence: Winning friends and deflecting aggression. *Journal of Research In Personality*, *36*, 224–251.

Jensen-Campbell, L. A., & Graziano, W. G. (2001). Agreeableness as a moderator of interpersonal conflict. *Journal of Personality*, *69*, 323–361.

John, O. P. (1989). Towards a taxonomy of personality descriptors. In D. M. Buss & N. Cantor (Eds.), *Personality psychology: Recent trends and emerging directions* (pp. 261–271). New York, NY: Springer.

John, O. J., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives. In L. A. Pervin & O. P. John (Eds.), *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research, Second Edition* (pp. 102–138). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Kagitcibasi, C. (2005). Autonomy and relatedness in cultural context: Implications for self and family. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *36*, 403–422.

Knee, C., Lonsbary, C., Canevello, A., & Patrick, H. (2005). Self-determination and conflict in romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *89*, 997–1009.

Kumashiro, M., Rusbult, C. E., & Finkel, E. J. (2008). Navigating personal and relational concerns: The quest for equilibrium. *Journal of Personality And Social Psychology*, *95*, 94–110.

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Luchies, L. B., Finkel, E. J., & Fitzsimons, G. M. (2011). The effects of self–regulatory strength, content, and strategies on close relationships. *Journal of Personality*, *79*, 949–977.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review*, *98*, 224–253.

Marshall, T. C., Chuong, K., & Aikawa, A. (2011). Day–to–day experiences of amae in Japanese romantic relationships. *Asian Journal Of Social Psychology*, *14*, 26–35.

Matsuoka, Y. (2003). Interpersonal contexts of motivation: Reconsidering the concept of relatedness. *Japanese Psychological Review*, *46*, 46–54.

Miller, J. G., Das, R., & Chakravarthy, S. (2011). Culture and the role of choice in agency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *101*, 46–61.

Milyavskaya, M., Gingras, I., Mageau, G. A., Koestner, R., Gagnon, H., Fang, J., & Boiché, J. (2009). Balance across contexts: Importance of balanced need satisfaction across various life domains. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *35*, 1031–1045.

Moller, A. C., Deci, E. L., & Elliot, A. J. (2010). Person-level relatedness and the incremental value of relating. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, *36*, 754–767.

Moskowitz, D. S. (1994). Cross-situational generality and the interpersonal circumplex. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *66*, 921–933. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.66.5.921

Oishi, S., & Diener, E. (2001). Goals, culture, and subjective well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*, 1674–1682.

Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, *128*, 3–72.

Patrick, H., Knee, C., Canevello, A., & Lonsbary, C. (2007). The role of need fulfillment in relationship functioning and well-being: A self-determination theory perspective. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, *92*, 434–457.

Preacher, K. J., Curran, P. J., & Bauer, D. J. (2006). Computational tools for probing interactions in multiple linear regression, multilevel modeling, and latent curve analysis. *Journal of Educational and Behavioral Statistics*, *31*, 437–448.

Rafaeli, E., Cranford, J. A., Green, A. S., Shrout, P. E., & Bolger, N. (2008). The good and bad of relationships: How social hindrance and social support affect relationship feelings in daily life. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *34*, 1703–1718.

Raudenbush, S. W., Bryk, A. S. & Congdon, R. (2004). HLM 6 for Windows [Computer software]. Skokie, IL: Scientific Software International, Inc.

Reis, H. T., Collins, W., & Berscheid, E. (2000). The relationship context of human behavior and development. *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*, 844–872.

Reis, H. T., Sheldon, K. M., Gable, S. L., Roscoe, J., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). Daily well-being: The role of autonomy, competence, and relatedness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *26*, 419–435.

Rudy, D., Sheldon, K. M., Awong, T., & Tan, H. H. (2007). Autonomy, culture, and well-being: The benefits of inclusive autonomy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *41*, 983–1007.

Schunk, D. H. (1994). Self-regulation of self-efficacy and attributions in academic settings. In D. H. Schunk & B. J. Zimmerman (Eds.), *Self-regulation of learning and performance: Issues and educational applications* (pp. 75–99). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Shah, J. (2003a). Automatic for the people: How representations of significant others implicitly affect goal pursuit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*, 661–681.

Shah, J. (2003b). The motivational looking glass: How significant others implicitly affect goal appraisals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *85*, 424–439.

Sheldon, K. M., & Elliot, A.J. (1998). Not all personal goals are personal: Comparing autonomous and controlled reasons for goals as predictors of effort and attainment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *24*, 546–557.

Sheldon, K. M., Elliot, A. J., Kim, Y., & Kasser, T. (2001). What is satisfying about satisfying events? Testing 10 candidate psychological needs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *80*, 325–339.

Sheldon, K. M., & Niemiec, C. (2006). It's not just the amount that counts: Balanced need-satisfaction also affects well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*, 331–341.

Suls, J., Martin, R., & David, J. P. (1998). Person–environment fit and its limits: Agreeableness, neuroticism, and emotional reactivity to interpersonal conflict. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *24*, 88–98.

Talley, A. E., Kocum, L., Schlegel, R. J., Molix, L., & Bettencourt, B. (2012). Social roles, basic need satisfaction, and psychological health: The central role of competence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*, 155–173.

Tobin, R. M., Graziano, W. G., Vanman, E. J., & Tassinary, L. G. (2000). Personality, emotional experience, and efforts to control emotions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*, 656–669.

Tong, E. W., Bishop, G. D., Enkelmann, H., Diong, S., Why, Y., Khader, M., & Ang, J. (2009). Emotion and appraisal profiles of the needs for competence and relatedness. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, *31*, 218–225.

Uchino, B. N., Cacioppo, J. T., & Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K. (1996). The relationship between social support and physiological processes: A review with emphasis on underlying mechanisms and implications for health. *Psychological Bulletin*, *119*, 488–531.

VanderDrift, L. E., & Agnew, C. R. (2012). Need fulfillment and stay–leave behavior: On the diagnosticity of personal and relational needs. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *29*, 228–245.

Wheeler, L., & Nezlek, J. B. (1977). Sex differences in social participation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*, 742–754.

White, J. K., Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (2004). Big five personality variables and relationship constructs. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *37*, 1519–1530.

Wirtz, D., Chiu, C., Diener, E., & Oishi, S. (2009). What constitutes a good life? Cultural differences in the role of positive and negative affect in subjective well-being. *Journal of Personality*, *77*, 1167–1196.

Yi, L., & Gore, J. S. (2013). *Relational motivation and well-being: A cross-cultural comparison*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Zimmerman, B. J. (1989). A social-cognitive view of self-regulated academic learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *81*, 329–339.