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Abstract
Theories of goal pursuit typically conceptualize goal pursuers as isolated actors; in contrast, empirical research from diverse areas of psychology has demonstrated that goal setting, pursuit, and achievement are deeply embedded within social relationships. Because much of this emerging literature is developing within subfields with minimal cross talk, the potential for integration and advances to basic theory has not been realized. The present article leverages transactive-goal-dynamics theory in an effort to bring these literatures together. In doing so, it distills a common set of primary research questions toward the goal of promoting a cumulative, integrative, interdisciplinary field of research on the ways in which goal pursuit is socially embedded.
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TGD Theory
TGD theory conceptualizes goal setting, pursuit, and achievement as multilevel phenomena, occurring both within and across relationships. The theory’s key construct is goal coordination, the tendency for a social unit to make efficient use of its goal-relevant resources. Instead of predicting goal attainment (e.g., grades, recovery from disease, career promotion) from characteristics of the individual, TGD theory predicts goal attainment from an interaction of interdependence and goal coordination in that individual’s important or domain-relevant relationships. Good goal outcomes are likeliest to emerge when interdependent partners coordinate well, efficiently drawing on the collective resources afforded by interdependence.

The theory is predicated on the assumption that highly interdependent individuals, whether in dyads or larger groups, function not as separate goal pursuers, but as one self-regulating unit—a transactive goal system (see Wegner, 1987). Relationship partners (e.g., romantic partners, coworkers, parents and children, teachers and...
students) can have such strong interdependence among their goals, goal pursuits, and goal outcomes that they become inextricably linked subparts of one self-regulating system. This system’s goal outcomes depend on how well the subparts integrate their actions to form an efficient whole (vanDellen & Baker, 2011). The system can be relevant primarily to specific domains, as for coworkers in a workplace, or across most domains, as for many spouses and family members. Without sufficient interdependence, two partners are better understood as two independent goal pursuers. With such interdependence, however, the two’s goal dynamics are better understood as subparts of the relationship system.

Recent research has found evidence of processes characteristic of transactive goal systems—displaying goal interdependence—across many relationship types and goal domains. In an obesity treatment study, weight changes were strongly correlated in parent–child dyads (Best et al., 2016). Spouses’ conscientiousness predicted employees’ likelihood of promotion, even after employees’ own conscientiousness was controlled for (Solomon & Jackson, 2014). Elderly individuals overcame their cognitive impairments when working with their spouse (Rauers, Riediger, Schmiedek, & Lindenberger, 2011). At-risk students’ mathematics performance was improved by a teacher with high energy (Klusmann, Richter, & Lüdtke, 2016). Employees’ productivity depended on the match between their own and their coach’s motivational orientations (Sue-Chan, Wood, & Latham, 2012; also see Hamstra, Orehek, & Holleman, 2014). Even young children have shown readiness to engage in the kinds of processes that are typical of members of transactive systems, such as expending effort in joint tasks to advance other people’s goals (Beier, Over, & Carpenter, 2014; Hamann, Warneken, & Tomasello, 2012).

Such examples reveal that some relationship partners, whether teacher–student pairs or spouses, have tight links among their goals, goal pursuits, and goal outcomes, to the extent that it is more accurate to conceive of the two as one unit for the purpose of understanding a given goal outcome. Close relationships with broad-ranging influence are the focus of TGD theory, the six tenets of which are illustrated in Figure 1.

**Tenet 1: the nature of goal interdependence**

Tenet 1 describes the interdependence or transactive density within transactive systems, the extent to which dyads or groups have numerous and strong links among members’ goals, goal pursuits, and goal outcomes. Tenet 1 does not lay out a prediction but describes the types of goal pursuits that exist within dense systems. According to the tenet, system members hold and pursue goals targeted not only at themselves but also at their partners and the system, and they pursue goals held not only by the self but also by other members of the system. Figure 2 illustrates these variables for a hypothetical dyad.

The existence of these extraindividual goals and pursuits is central to TGD theory. Many examples have been documented in recent research. For example, romantic partners expended effort for each other’s success (Kappes & Shrou, 2011), parents pursued their adolescents’ diabetes-management goals (Berg et al., 2013), and elderly couples pursued joint goals (Schindler, Berg, Butler, Fortenberry, & Wiebe, 2010). Research is thus accumulating on the ubiquity of goals and pursuits oriented not toward the self but toward others and is demonstrating the existence of several of the types of goals and pursuits outlined in Tenet 1. Further exploring the role of such goals, in addition to the usual self-oriented goals, is crucial to the understanding of real-life goal outcomes (Howland et al., 2016).

**Tenet 2: predicting goal interdependence**

Tenets 2 to 6 outline the key predictions of TGD theory. According to Tenet 2, relationships are likely to develop into dense transactive goal systems when the opportunity and motivation to do so are high (unless constrained by external factors). The role of opportunity has not yet received much empirical attention, but evidence for the role of motivation is accumulating (Wageman & Gordon, 2005). For example, people with low self-control showed particular interest in interdependence for the role of motivation is accumulating (Wageman & Gordon, 2005). For example, people with low self-control showed particular interest in interdependence with people who have high self-control, presumably because they hoped to benefit from the others’ self-control resources (Shea, Davission, & Fitzsimons, 2013). At this point, the state of evidence for Tenet 2 is relatively weak; studying both motivation and opportunity could be useful to researchers seeking to understand when and why certain other people, such as peers, teachers, or parents, affect goal outcomes and thus could be a fruitful avenue for future research.

**Tenet 3: goal coordination**

According to Tenet 3, the effect of goal coordination on goal outcomes depends on the system’s density and interdependence. In TGD theory, goal outcomes are conceptualized in terms of transactive gain versus loss, the extent to which involvement in the social unit produces greater goal success than the individuals would have achieved independently. Well-coordinated systems
are those in which the partners (a) efficiently act to accomplish both parties' goals, (b) possess and pursue goals that facilitate rather than conflict with each other, and (c) divide tasks to leverage each person's resources.

Evidence from diverse subfields suggests that the link between goal coordination and goal achievement is robust. Mothers and adolescents more successfully regulated Type I diabetes when they enjoyed smooth collaboration in goal pursuit, elderly spouses more successfully regulated Type II diabetes when they had low goal conflict, and romantic couples made more goal progress when their goals facilitated one another (e.g., Berg, Schindler, & Maharajh, 2008; Gere & Impett, 2018; Henry, Rook, Stephens, & Franks, 2013).

Evidence also supports the tenet's Transactive Density × Goal Coordination interaction, which suggests that coordination is influential only for systems with sufficient density to be shaped by coordination's benefits and costs (Swaab, Schaerer, Anicich, Ronay, & Galinsky, 2014). Levine, Hoffer, and Chen (2017) found support for Tenet 3 in the context of immunological inflammation among adolescents. Participants reported in a daily diary on how frequently their family made demands on their time, completed interviews that assessed family closeness, and underwent a blood draw that measured inflammatory markers. Adolescents who reported frequent family demands (in TGD terms, a form of poor coordination, in which other people's actions conflicted with adolescents' ability to pursue their goals) exhibited worse inflammatory profiles, as indicated by higher cytokine production. However, this pattern was limited to families in which members reported high levels of closeness.

This study offers support for TGD theory's hypothesis that the link between goal coordination (as measured by family demands) and goal outcomes (as measured by immunological functioning) is stronger with greater transactive density (as measured by family closeness).
Goal outcomes are maximized when systems are highly interdependent and coordinate well and minimized when systems are highly interdependent and coordinate poorly. Tenet 3 may be helpful as scholars seek to further understand the complex interactions of relationship characteristics and goal processes that predict goal outcomes (see Theiss & Solomon, 2006).

**Tenet 4: predicting goal coordination**

According to Tenet 4, goal coordination is predicted by shared goal representations and relationship orientation and skills.

**Shared goal representations.** Rather than emphasizing shared views on high-level constructs such as religion and politics, the theory emphasizes shared views on more mundane everyday behaviors, such as who does what, who should do what, and how he or she should do it. When partners agree about what goals are important for each to pursue and how each partner should pursue his or her goals, their day-to-day coordination is smoother and more positive, ultimately producing better goal outcomes. Thus, in TGD theory, shared goal representations are the cognitive precursors to the development of effective coordination behaviors.

Research has supported this role for shared goal representations. People are more successful at increasing physical activity when they set joint if-then plans with their romantic partner about precisely how to do so (Prestwich et al., 2012). Similarly, people are more successful at achieving smoking and weight-loss goals when their partner also shares these goals, especially if their partner is also at the same stage of goal progress (Jackson, Steptoe, & Wardle, 2015). Such effects become stronger as transactive density increases. For example, the positive effects of shared target-oriented goals on everyday collaboration among older married couples are stronger among couples with more (vs. less) frequent collaboration in day-to-day life (Schindler et al., 2010). These studies tend to imply, rather than measure, coordination as a mediator of the effects of shared representations on goal outcomes; future work looking more directly at the mediating role of coordination behaviors would be useful.

**Goal responsiveness.** Even the best-intentioned goal support is risky. Health, education, and relationship researchers have repeatedly demonstrated that support can be counterproductive (e.g., Feeney & Collins, 2015; Neff & Karney, 2005). For example, although parents’ general emotional support had positive effects on teens’ academic goal pursuit and outcomes, parents’ direct academic support had mixed effects and actually increased test anxiety (Song, Bong, Lee, & Kim, 2015). Similarly, spouses’ support of HIV patients’ goals to take their medications actually led to reduced self-efficacy when patients had doubts about their spouse’s willingness to sacrifice for the relationship (VanderDrift, Ioerger, Mitzel, & Vanable, 2017). Male sleep apnea patients adhered better to medical advice, following continuous-positive-airway-pressure (CPAP) machine protocol, when they saw their wives as providing support but adhered worse when they saw their wives as providing pressure (Baron et al., 2011).
TGD theory suggests one important factor that may play a role in these effects: the support's goal responsiveness. When partners offer each other goal-relevant support, that support should be responsive to the partner's current goals, perceived efficacy, resources, and desired interdependence (Finkel, 2017; Reis, Lemay, & Finkenauer, 2017). Indeed, Wilson, Martire, and Sliwinski (2017) recently showed that patient outcomes depended on whether spouses adjusted their day-to-day behavior to patient pain levels. This is a form of goal-responsive support: As the patient feels more pain and needs more help, the spouse offers more; as the patient feels less pain and needs less help, the spouse offers less. Tenet 4 suggests that if partners (parents, spouses, teachers) adjust their behavior to each other's goal-relevant states (e.g., pain level, fatigue, expectations), they can offer more effective support. Thus, measuring the goal-relevant states of both partners would be very useful in predicting goal outcomes across domains.

**Tenet 5: goal success predicts relationship continuation**

Tenet 5 states that voluntary relationships will last longer when the partners achieve transactive gain. Although the theory specifies multiple mechanisms through which goal success will lead partners to persist with their relationships, little work has studied these effects. However, one study has supported the role of one of the mechanisms—increased subjective happiness with the partner. In a dyadic study, romantic partners who were more (vs. less) successful at achieving their own goals during a 1-week period showed a greater before-to-after increase in satisfaction with their partner (Hofmann, Finkel, & Fitzsimons, 2015), pointing to one route through which goal success promotes relationship maintenance.

**Tenet 6: postrelationship performance**

Many relationships come to an end. Tenet 6 examines postrelationship goal outcomes, positing that partnerships that are particularly effective together will experience the worst postrelationship goal outcomes. Support for this tenet comes from a longitudinal study of romantic relationships after breakup (Gomillion, Murray, & Lamarche, 2015). For individuals with helpful partners, breakup negatively affected goal outcomes; in contrast, for individuals with unhelpful partners, breakup actually had a nonsignificantly positive effect on their goal outcomes. In the context of professional relationships, a similar finding has been demonstrated: When elite scientists died at the peak of their careers, their coauthors published fewer articles in the ensuing years, while other scientists filled this gap by publishing more articles (Azoulay, Fons-Rosen, & Zivin, 2015). After a well-coordinated and successful relationship ends, individuals need to disentangle themselves from their routines of interdependence and discover new ways to pursue their goals.

**Conclusion**

Health, education, family, and organizational researchers have long known and repeatedly demonstrated that in people's everyday lives, goal outcomes are social phenomena. Whether psychologists study teenagers' diabetes outcomes, middle-schoolers' learning outcomes, elderly patients' medical adherence, or employees' career success, they find robust evidence for the importance of interpersonal processes. Given the diversity of these findings, it is clear that any satisfactory understanding of real-world goal outcomes requires a sophisticated theoretical analysis of individuals' social embeddedness. And yet the dominant theories of goal pursuit adopt an individual level of analysis, depicting people as self-regulators who enact self-control in pursuit of self-oriented goals. As a result, researchers who study life outside of the laboratory have tended to develop domain-specific hypotheses about interpersonal processes in goal outcomes or to rely on non-goal-based theories, such as those explaining support and interdependence.

TGD theory aims to provide an overarching and domain-general theory for psychological researchers, whether they are interested in predicting healthy glucose levels or good math grades. With a particular focus on how people coordinate their goals to effectively draw on shared resources, the theory provides psychologists from across our varied subfields with a common lexicon to address a coherent set of questions and could help generate new directions for research within each subfield. Such an integrated approach would promote a cumulative, integrative, interdisciplinary field of research that can not only advance scholarship but also promote the development of theory-based interventions to help people enjoy happier, healthier, and more successful lives.
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