

7. APPENDICES

Appendix A: Additional Information on Instruments in Study Part 1.....	224
Appendix B: Description of Variables in Study Part 1.....	247
Appendix C: Age-Group Differences in Intergoal Conflict and Facilitation After Excluding the Exercise Goal.....	256
Appendix D: Additional Control Analyses in Study Part 1.....	259
Appendix E: Description of Variables in Study Part 2	266
Appendix F: Additional Control Analyses in Study Part 2.....	270

7.1. Appendix A: Additional Information on Instruments in Study Part 1

Box A 1. *Three Personal Goals Besides Exercising: Instruction*

Original German Wording:

Menschen haben typischerweise recht vielfältige Vorstellungen darüber, wie sie ihr Leben gestalten wollen, was sie erreichen und vermeiden möchten. Im folgenden werden wir solche Vorstellungen kurz als “Ziele” bezeichnen. Jeder Mensch hat seine ganz persönlichen Ziele. Solche Ziele können sehr unterschiedliche Lebensbereiche betreffen – z.B. Finanzen, Reisen, Gesundheit, Politik, Familie, Freizeit, Freunde, Bildung, Partnerschaft, Beruf und so fort. Beispiele sind “*Meine Nebentätigkeit als Reiseleiter ausbauen*”, “*Den Kontakt zu alten Freunden halten*” oder “*Meiner Partnerin dabei helfen, mit ihrer Arbeitslosigkeit klarzukommen*”. Im folgenden interessiert uns, welche Ziele für **Sie persönlich** momentan **neben** der sportlichen Betätigung bedeutsam sind. Bitte denken Sie einen Moment lang darüber nach, welche Ziele Sie persönlich **gegenwärtig** neben der sportlichen Betätigung haben. Wie möchten Sie Ihr Leben in der näheren Zukunft gestalten? Was möchten Sie erreichen oder verwirklichen? Was möchten Sie vermeiden? Uns interessieren dabei diejenigen Ihrer Ziele, ...

... die Sie für die **nähere** Zukunft (d.h. für die nächsten Monate oder Jahre) haben,

... deren Verwirklichung bereits **gegenwärtig** für Sie wichtig und relevant ist, und

... die voraussichtlich auch noch in **einigen Monaten** für Sie relevant sein werden.

Schreiben Sie bitte Ihre **drei** wichtigsten Ziele dieser Art auf der nächsten Seite für uns auf. Im Anschluss werden wir Ihnen eine Reihe von Fragen zu diesen Zielen stellen. Beschreiben Sie Ihre Ziele bitte mit wenigen Worten oder in kurzen Sätzen, jedoch so ausführlich, dass wir verstehen können, worum es sich dabei handelt.

English Translation:

People typically have quite a few ideas of how they want to live their life, of what they want to attain or to avoid. Below we will refer to such ideas briefly as “goals.” Everybody has his or her very personal goals. Such goals can pertain to very different life domains—for example, finances, travel, health, politics, family, leisure, friends, education, partnership, profession, and so forth. Examples are “*To extend my part-time job as a tourist guide,*” “*To keep in touch with old friends,*” or “*To help my partner cope with unemployment.*” In the following, we are interested in learning about important goals **you personally** currently have **besides** exercising. Please reflect a moment over the goals you **currently** have beside exercising. How do you want to shape your life in the future? What do you want to attain or realize? What do you want to avoid?

We are interested in those of your goals ...

... that you have for the **near** future (i.e., the coming months or years),

... the realization of which is already **currently** important and relevant for you, and

... that will presumably still be relevant for you **in a couple of months**.

On the next page, please list your **three** most important goals of that kind. Below, we will have a couple of questions on these goals. Please describe your goals with a few words or short sentences, but with sufficient detail so that we can understand what they are about.

Table A 1. *Item Characteristics of the Extended Intergoal Conflict and Facilitation Questionnaire in the Total Sample and the Younger and Older Subsamples*
Conflict I (Time Constraints): "How often can it happen, because of the pursuit of goal A, that you do not invest as much time into goal B as you would like to?"

Goal Pair ^(a)	Sample	Frequency of Endorsement of Response Options					P_{con} ^(b)	M	<i>Md</i>	<i>SD</i>	r_{con} ^(c)
		1 never/very rarely	2 seldom	3 occasionally	4 often	5 very often					
AB	Total Sample	27 (18.6%)	33 (22.8%)	41 (28.3%)	34 (23.4%)	10 (6.9%)	58.6	2.77	3	1.20	.50
	<i>Younger Subsample</i>	17 (17.2%)	12 (12.1%)	31 (31.3%)	31 (31.3%)	8 (8.1%)	70.7	3.01	3	1.21	.45
	<i>Older Subsample</i>	10 (21.7%)	21 (45.7%)	10 (21.7%)	3 (6.5%)	2 (4.3%)	32.5	2.26	2	1.02	.48
AC ^(d)	Total Sample	29 (20.0%)	26 (17.9%)	41 (28.3%)	35 (24.1%)	13 (9.0%)	61.4	2.84	3	1.26	.53
	<i>Younger Subsample</i>	17 (17.2%)	13 (13.1%)	29 (29.3%)	27 (27.3%)	12 (12.1%)	68.7	3.04	3	1.27	.48
	<i>Older Subsample</i>	12 (26.1%)	13 (28.3%)	12 (26.1%)	8 (17.4%)	1 (2.2%)	45.7	2.41	2	1.13	.57
AD	Total Sample	32 (22.1%)	40 (27.6%)	47 (32.4%)	22 (15.2%)	4 (2.8%)	50.4	2.49	3	1.08	.35
	<i>Younger Subsample</i>	17 (17.2%)	25 (25.3%)	35 (35.4%)	19 (19.2%)	3 (3.0%)	57.6	2.66	3	1.07	.22
	<i>Older Subsample</i>	15 (32.6%)	15 (32.6%)	12 (26.1%)	3 (6.5%)	1 (2.2%)	34.8	2.13	2	1.02	.49
BA	Total Sample	32 (22.1%)	50 (34.5%)	30 (20.7%)	26 (17.9%)	7 (4.8%)	43.4	2.49	2	1.16	.52
	<i>Younger Subsample</i>	18 (18.2%)	29 (29.3%)	22 (22.2%)	25 (25.3%)	5 (5.1%)	52.6	2.70	3	1.18	.44
	<i>Older Subsample</i>	14 (30.4%)	21 (45.7%)	8 (17.4%)	1 (2.2%)	2 (4.3%)	23.9	2.04	2	.99	.60
BC ^(d)	Total Sample	34 (23.4%)	35 (24.1%)	36 (24.8%)	27 (18.6%)	12 (8.3%)	51.7	2.64	3	1.26	.53
	<i>Younger Subsample</i>	19 (19.2%)	21 (21.2%)	24 (24.2%)	24 (24.2%)	10 (10.1%)	58.5	2.85	3	1.28	.47
	<i>Older Subsample</i>	15 (32.6%)	14 (30.4%)	12 (26.1%)	3 (6.5%)	2 (4.3%)	36.9	2.20	2	1.11	.58
BD	Total Sample	36 (24.8%)	36 (24.8%)	44 (30.3%)	23 (15.9%)	6 (4.1%)	50.3	2.50	3	1.15	.45
	<i>Younger Subsample</i>	21 (21.2%)	21 (21.2%)	31 (31.3%)	21 (21.2%)	5 (5.1%)	57.6	2.68	3	1.18	.43
	<i>Older Subsample</i>	15 (32.6%)	15 (32.6%)	13 (28.3%)	2 (4.3%)	1 (2.2%)	34.8	2.11	2	.99	.38
CA ^(d)	Total Sample	41 (28.3%)	49 (33.8%)	35 (24.1%)	16 (11.0%)	3 (2.1%)	37.2	2.24	2	1.05	.50
	<i>Younger Subsample</i>	25 (25.3%)	31 (31.3%)	26 (26.3%)	14 (14.1%)	2 (2.0%)	42.4	2.36	2	1.08	.46
	<i>Older Subsample</i>	16 (34.8%)	18 (39.1%)	9 (19.6%)	2 (4.3%)	1 (2.2%)	26.1	2.00	2	.97	.54

(table continues)

Table A 1. (continued)

Goal Pair ^(a)	Sample	Frequency of Endorsement of Response Options					P_{con} ^(b)	M	Md	SD	r_{con} ^(c)
		1 never/very rarely	2 seldom	3 occasionally	4 often	5 very often					
CB ^(d)	Total Sample	40 (27.6%)	45 (31.0%)	35 (24.1%)	22 (15.2%)	2 (1.4%)	40.4	2.31	2	1.08	.50
	Younger Subsample	25 (25.3%)	29 (29.3%)	26 (26.3%)	17 (17.2%)	1 (1.0%)	44.5	2.39	2	1.08	.41
	Older Subsample	15 (32.6%)	16 (34.8%)	9 (19.6%)	5 (10.9%)	1 (2.2%)	32.7	2.15	2	1.07	.66
CD ^(d)	Total Sample	41 (28.3%)	41 (28.3%)	44 (30.3%)	14 (9.7%)	4 (2.8%)	42.8	2.30	2	1.07	.54
	Younger Subsample	22 (22.2%)	28 (28.3%)	31 (31.3%)	13 (13.1%)	4 (4.0%)	48.4	2.48	2	1.11	.45
	Older Subsample	19 (41.3%)	13 (28.3%)	13 (28.3%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	30.5	1.91	2	.89	.66
DA	Total Sample	56 (38.6%)	59 (40.7%)	21 (14.5%)	8 (5.5%)	1 (0.7%)	20.7	1.89	2	.90	.42
	Younger Subsample	37 (37.4%)	32 (32.3%)	25 (25.3%)	3 (3.0%)	2 (2.0%)	30.3	2.00	2	.97	.27
	Older Subsample	24 (52.2%)	14 (30.4%)	7 (15.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.2%)	17.4	1.70	1	.89	.66
DB	Total Sample	55 (37.9%)	47 (32.4%)	32 (22.1%)	9 (6.2%)	2 (1.4%)	29.7	2.01	2	.99	.43
	Younger Subsample	37 (37.4%)	30 (30.3%)	23 (23.2%)	8 (8.1%)	1 (1.0%)	32.3	2.05	2	1.01	.37
	Older Subsample	16 (39.1%)	17 (37.0%)	9 (19.6%)	1 (2.2%)	1 (2.2%)	24.0	1.91	2	.94	.55
DC ^(d)	Total Sample	46 (31.7%)	58 (40.0%)	31 (21.4%)	9 (6.2%)	0 (0.0%)	27.6	2.02	2	.89	.49
	Younger Subsample	30 (30.3%)	36 (36.4%)	25 (25.3%)	7 (7.1%)	0 (0.0%)	32.4	2.09	2	.92	.48
	Older Subsample	16 (34.8%)	22 (47.8%)	6 (13.0%)	2 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	17.3	1.87	2	.81	.49

(a) Notation: Goals A, B, C - three self-reported goals besides exercising; goal D – exercise goal

(b) Item difficulty: Percentage of endorsements of response options ≥ 3 (i.e., “occasionally,” “often,” and “very often;” indicating goal conflict)

(c) Item discriminability: Corrected item - total correlation (total = conflict composite score)

(d) One participant in the younger age group reported only two (instead of three) personal goals besides the exercise goal. For items involving goal C, the size of the total sample and the younger subsample therefore reduced to $N = 144$ and $n = 98$, respectively.

Table A 1. *Conflict II (Financial Constraints): “How often can it happen, because of the pursuit of goal A, that you do not invest as much money into goal B as you would like to?”*

Goal Pair ^(a)	Sample	Frequency of Endorsement of Response Options					P_{con} ^(b)	M	Md	SD	r_{con} ^(c)
		1 never/very rarely	2 seldom	3 occasionally	4 often	5 very often					
AB	Total Sample	80 (55.2%)	37 (25.5%)	16 (11.0%)	8 (5.5%)	4 (2.8%)	19.3	1.75	1	1.04	.40
	<i>Younger Subsample</i>	58 (58.6%)	22 (22.2%)	12 (12.1%)	4 (4.0%)	3 (3.0%)	19.1	1.71	1	1.03	.34
	<i>Older Subsample</i>	22 (47.8%)	15 (32.6%)	4 (8.7%)	4 (8.7%)	1 (2.2%)	19.6	1.85	2	1.05	.62
AC ^(d)	Total Sample	79 (54.5%)	31 (21.4%)	20 (13.8%)	8 (5.5%)	6 (4.1%)	23.4	1.83	1	1.12	.51
	<i>Younger Subsample</i>	55 (55.6%)	20 (20.2%)	13 (13.1%)	5 (5.1%)	5 (5.1%)	23.3	1.83	1	1.16	.44
	<i>Older Subsample</i>	24 (52.2%)	11 (23.9%)	7 (15.2%)	3 (6.5%)	1 (2.2%)	23.9	1.83	1	1.06	.75
AD	Total Sample	75 (51.7%)	35 (24.1%)	16 (11.0%)	14 (9.7%)	5 (3.4%)	24.1	1.89	1	1.15	.35
	<i>Younger Subsample</i>	55 (55.6%)	20 (20.2%)	9 (9.1%)	12 (12.1%)	3 (3.0%)	24.2	1.87	1	1.18	.36
	<i>Older Subsample</i>	20 (43.5%)	15 (32.6%)	7 (15.2%)	2 (4.3%)	2 (4.3%)	23.8	1.93	2	1.08	.40
BA	Total Sample	90 (62.1%)	35 (24.1%)	12 (8.3%)	7 (4.8%)	1 (0.7%)	13.8	1.58	1	.89	.49
	<i>Younger Subsample</i>	62 (62.6%)	22 (22.2%)	8 (8.1%)	6 (6.1%)	1 (1.0%)	15.2	1.61	1	.95	.48
	<i>Older Subsample</i>	28 (60.9%)	13 (28.3%)	4 (8.7%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	10.9	1.52	1	.75	.57
BC ^(d)	Total Sample	84 (57.9%)	33 (22.8%)	16 (11.0%)	9 (6.2%)	2 (1.4%)	18.6	1.69	1	.99	.46
	<i>Younger Subsample</i>	56 (56.6%)	25 (25.3%)	10 (10.1%)	6 (6.1%)	1 (1.0%)	17.2	1.68	1	.96	.37
	<i>Older Subsample</i>	28 (60.9%)	8 (17.4%)	6 (13.0%)	3 (6.5%)	1 (2.2%)	21.7	1.72	1	1.07	.69
BD	Total Sample	79 (54.5%)	37 (25.5%)	20 (13.8%)	9 (6.2%)	0 (0.0%)	20.0	1.72	1	.93	.37
	<i>Younger Subsample</i>	57 (57.6%)	22 (22.2%)	14 (14.1%)	6 (6.1%)	0 (0.0%)	20.2	1.69	1	.93	.25
	<i>Older Subsample</i>	22 (47.8%)	15 (32.6%)	6 (13.0%)	3 (6.5%)	0 (0.0%)	19.5	1.78	2	.92	.71
CA ^(d)	Total Sample	92 (63.4%)	32 (22.1%)	15 (10.3%)	4 (2.8%)	1 (0.7%)	13.8	1.54	1	.84	.51
	<i>Younger Subsample</i>	61 (61.6%)	23 (23.2%)	10 (10.1%)	3 (3.0%)	1 (1.0%)	14.1	1.57	1	.87	.50
	<i>Older Subsample</i>	31 (67.4%)	9 (19.6%)	5 (10.9%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	13.1	1.48	1	.78	.55

(table continues)

Table A1. (continued)

Goal Pair ^(a)	Sample	Frequency of Endorsement of Response Options					P_{con} ^(b)	M	Md	SD	r_{con} ^(c)
		1 never/very rarely	2 seldom	3 occasionally	4 often	5 very often					
CB ^(d)	Total Sample	89 (61.4%)	36 (24.8%)	7 (4.8%)	9 (6.2%)	3 (2.1%)	13.1	2.31	2	1.08	.46
	Younger Subsample	60 (60.6%)	26 (26.3%)	5 (5.1%)	5 (5.1%)	2 (2.0%)	12.2	1.60	1	.95	.39
	Older Subsample	29 (63.0%)	10 (21.7%)	2 (4.3%)	4 (8.7%)	1 (2.2%)	15.2	1.65	1	1.06	.67
CD ^(d)	Total Sample	84 (57.9%)	33 (22.8%)	18 (12.4%)	7 (4.8%)	2 (1.4%)	18.6	1.68	1	.97	.41
	Younger Subsample	57 (57.6%)	24 (24.1%)	11 (11.1%)	4 (4.0%)	2 (2.0%)	17.1	1.67	1	.97	.37
	Older Subsample	27 (58.7%)	9 (19.6%)	7 (15.2%)	3 (6.5%)	0 (0.0%)	21.7	1.70	1	.96	.55
DA	Total Sample	105 (72.4%)	26 (17.9%)	13 (9.0%)	1 (0.7%)	0 (0.0%)	9.7	1.38	1	.68	.37
	Younger Subsample	78 (78.8%)	13 (13.1%)	8 (8.1%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	8.1	1.29	1	.61	.43
	Older Subsample	27 (58.7%)	13 (28.3%)	5 (10.9%)	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	13.1	1.57	1	.78	.49
DB	Total Sample	94 (64.8%)	34 (23.4%)	13 (9.0%)	3 (2.1%)	1 (0.7%)	11.8	1.50	1	.80	.41
	Younger Subsample	67 (67.7%)	24 (24.2%)	6 (6.1%)	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	8.1	1.43	1	.74	.37
	Older Subsample	27 (58.7%)	10 (21.7%)	7 (15.2%)	2 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	19.5	1.65	1	.90	.62
DC ^(d)	Total Sample	92 (63.4%)	32 (22.1%)	15 (10.3%)	4 (2.8%)	1 (0.7%)	13.8	1.54	1	.84	.57
	Younger Subsample	63 (63.6%)	22 (22.2%)	11 (11.1%)	1 (1.0%)	1 (1.0%)	13.1	1.52	1	.82	.56
	Older Subsample	29 (63.0%)	10 (21.7%)	4 (8.7%)	3 (6.5%)	0 (0.0%)	15.2	1.59	1	.91	.68

(a) Notation: Goals A, B, C - three self-reported goals besides exercising; goal D – exercise goal

(b) Item difficulty: Percentage of endorsements of response options ≥ 3 (i.e., “occasionally,” “often,” and “very often;” indicating goal conflict)

(c) Item discriminability: Corrected item - total correlation (total = conflict composite score)

(d) One participant in the younger age group reported only two (instead of three) personal goals besides the exercise goal. For items involving goal C, the size of the total sample and the younger subsample therefore reduced to $N = 144$ and $n = 98$, respectively.

Table A 1. *Conflict III (Energy Constraints): "How often can it happen, because of the pursuit of goal A, that you do not invest as much energy into goal B as you would like to?"*

Goal Pair ^(a)	Sample	Frequency of Endorsement of Response Options					P_{con} ^(b)	M	Md	SD	R_{con} ^(c)
		1 never/very rarely	2 seldom	3 occasionally	4 often	5 very often					
AB	Total Sample	26 (17.9%)	29 (20.0%)	51 (35.2%)	31 (21.4%)	8 (5.5%)	62.1	2.77	3	1.14	.59
	Younger Subsample	13 (13.1%)	12 (12.1%)	43 (43.4%)	25 (25.3%)	6 (6.1%)	74.8	2.99	3	1.07	.46
	Older Subsample	13 (28.3%)	17 (37.0%)	8 (17.4%)	6 (13.0%)	2 (4.3%)	34.7	2.28	2	1.15	.73
AC ^(d)	Total Sample	29 (20.0%)	27 (18.6%)	43 (29.7%)	36 (24.8%)	9 (6.2%)	60.7	2.78	3	1.21	.61
	Younger Subsample	15 (15.2%)	14 (14.1%)	31 (31.3%)	29 (29.3%)	9 (9.1%)	69.7	3.03	3	1.20	.50
	Older Subsample	14 (30.4%)	13 (28.3%)	12 (26.1%)	7 (15.2%)	0 (0.0%)	41.3	2.26	2	1.06	.73
AD	Total Sample	23 (15.9%)	50 (34.5%)	49 (33.8%)	17 (11.7%)	6 (4.1%)	49.6	2.54	2	1.03	.33
	Younger Subsample	11 (11.1%)	33 (33.3%)	35 (35.4%)	16 (16.2%)	4 (4.0%)	55.6	2.69	3	1.01	.27
	Older Subsample	12 (26.1%)	17 (37.0%)	14 (30.4%)	1 (2.2%)	2 (4.3%)	36.9	2.22	2	1.01	.32
BA	Total Sample	32 (22.1%)	51 (35.2%)	39 (26.9%)	18 (12.4%)	5 (3.4%)	42.7	2.40	2	1.07	.54
	Younger Subsample	17 (17.2%)	28 (28.3%)	34 (34.3%)	15 (15.2%)	5 (5.1%)	54.6	2.63	3	1.09	.46
	Older Subsample	15 (32.6%)	23 (50.0%)	5 (10.9%)	3 (6.5%)	0 (0.0%)	17.4	1.91	2	.84	.61
BC ^(d)	Total Sample	34 (23.4%)	28 (19.3%)	51 (35.2%)	22 (15.2%)	9 (6.2%)	56.6	2.61	3	1.18	.58
	Younger Subsample	20 (20.2%)	17 (17.2%)	36 (36.4%)	19 (19.2%)	6 (6.1%)	61.7	2.73	3	1.17	.48
	Older Subsample	14 (30.4%)	11 (23.9%)	15 (32.6%)	3 (6.5%)	3 (6.5%)	45.6	2.35	2	1.18	.73
BD	Total Sample	29 (20.0%)	56 (38.6%)	34 (23.4%)	22 (15.2%)	4 (2.8%)	41.4	2.42	2	1.06	.59
	Younger Subsample	16 (16.2%)	36 (36.4%)	25 (25.3%)	18 (18.2%)	4 (4.0%)	47.5	2.58	2	1.09	.49
	Older Subsample	13 (28.3%)	20 (43.5%)	9 (19.6%)	4 (8.7%)	0 (0.0%)	28.3	2.09	2	.91	.76
CA ^(d)	Total Sample	41 (28.3%)	47 (32.4%)	33 (22.8%)	18 (12.4%)	5 (3.4%)	38.6	2.30	2	1.12	.50
	Younger Subsample	21 (21.2%)	34 (34.3%)	25 (25.3%)	15 (15.2%)	3 (3.0%)	43.5	2.44	2	1.08	.41
	Older Subsample	20 (43.5%)	13 (28.3%)	8 (17.4%)	3 (6.5%)	2 (4.3%)	28.2	2.00	2	1.14	.60

(table continues)

Table A1. (continued)

Goal Pair ^(a)	Sample	Frequency of Endorsement of Response Options					P_{con} ^(b)	M	Md	SD	r_{con} ^(c)
		1 never/very rarely	2 seldom	3 occasionally	4 often	5 very often					
CB ^(d)	Total Sample	41 (28.3%)	39 (26.9%)	39 (6.9%)	19 (13.1%)	6 (4.1%)	44.1	2.38	2	1.15	.52
	Younger Subsample	25 (25.3%)	27 (27.3%)	27 (27.3%)	15 (15.2%)	4 (4.0%)	46.5	2.45	2	1.15	.47
	Older Subsample	16 (34.8%)	12 (26.1%)	12 (26.1%)	4 (8.7%)	2 (4.3%)	39.1	2.22	2	1.15	.62
CD ^(d)	Total Sample	41 (28.3%)	47 (32.4%)	36 (24.8%)	15 (10.3%)	5 (3.4%)	38.5	2.28	2	1.09	.52
	Younger Subsample	24 (24.2%)	32 (32.3%)	24 (24.2%)	13 (13.1%)	5 (5.1%)	42.4	2.42	2	1.15	.38
	Older Subsample	17 (37.0%)	15 (32.6%)	12 (26.1%)	2 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	30.4	1.98	2	.91	.81
DA	Total Sample	56 (38.6%)	59 (40.7%)	21 (14.5%)	8 (5.5%)	1 (0.7%)	20.7	1.89	2	.90	.38
	Younger Subsample	40 (40.4%)	39 (39.4%)	14 (14.1%)	6 (6.1%)	0 (0.0%)	20.2	1.86	2	.88	.30
	Older Subsample	16 (34.8%)	20 (43.5%)	7 (15.2%)	2 (4.3%)	1 (2.2%)	31.7	1.96	2	.94	.61
DB	Total Sample	51 (35.2%)	50 (34.5%)	34 (23.4%)	9 (6.2%)	1 (0.7%)	30.3	2.03	2	.95	.54
	Younger Subsample	32 (32.3%)	35 (35.4%)	24 (24.2%)	7 (7.1%)	1 (1.0%)	32.3	2.09	2	.97	.47
	Older Subsample	19 (41.3%)	15 (32.6%)	10 (21.7%)	2 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	26.0	1.89	2	.90	.67
DC ^(d)	Total Sample	47 (32.4%)	53 (36.6%)	38 (26.2%)	5 (3.4%)	1 (0.7%)	30.3	2.03	2	.89	.51
	Younger Subsample	32 (32.3%)	36 (36.4%)	26 (26.3%)	3 (3.0%)	1 (1.0%)	30.3	2.03	2	.90	.50
	Older Subsample	15 (32.6%)	17 (37.0%)	12 (26.1%)	2 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	30.4	2.02	2	.88	.62

(a) Notation: Goals A, B, C - three self-reported goals besides exercising; goal D – exercise goal

(b) Item difficulty: Percentage of endorsements of response options ≥ 3 (i.e., “occasionally,” “often,” and “very often;” indicating goal conflict)

(c) Item discriminability: Corrected item - total correlation (total = conflict composite score)

(d) One participant in the younger age group reported only two (instead of three) personal goals besides the exercise goal. For items involving goal C, the size of the total sample and the younger subsample therefore reduced to $N = 144$ and $n = 98$, respectively.

Table A 1. *Conflict IV (Incompatible Goal Attainment Strategies): "How often can it happen that you do something in the pursuit of goal A that is incompatible with goal B?"*

Goal Pair ^(a)	Sample	Frequency of Endorsement of Response Options					P_{con} ^(b)	M	Md	SD	r_{con} ^(c)
		1 never/very rarely	2 seldom	3 occasionally	4 often	5 very often					
AB	Total Sample	38 (26.2%)	35 (24.1%)	44 (30.3%)	25 (17.2%)	3 (2.1%)	49.6	2.45	2	1.12	.50
	Younger Subsample	21 (21.2%)	17 (17.2%)	37 (37.4%)	22 (22.2%)	2 (2.0%)	61.6	2.67	3	1.11	.49
	Older Subsample	17 (37.0%)	18 (39.1%)	7 (15.2%)	3 (6.5%)	1 (2.2%)	23.9	1.98	2	1.00	.37
AC ^(d)	Total Sample	42 (29.0%)	36 (24.8%)	25 (17.2%)	26 (17.9%)	15 (10.3%)	45.4	2.56	2	1.35	.48
	Younger Subsample	25 (25.3%)	19 (19.2%)	21 (21.2%)	24 (24.2%)	9 (9.1%)	54.5	2.72	3	1.33	.44
	Older Subsample	17 (37.0%)	17 (37.0%)	4 (8.7%)	2 (4.3%)	6 (13.0%)	26.0	2.20	2	1.34	.48
AD	Total Sample	39 (26.9%)	44 (30.3%)	25 (17.2%)	23 (15.9%)	14 (9.7%)	42.8	2.51	2	1.30	.33
	Younger Subsample	25 (25.3%)	29 (29.3%)	17 (17.2%)	16 (16.2%)	12 (12.1%)	45.5	2.61	2	1.35	.35
	Older Subsample	14 (30.4%)	15 (32.6%)	8 (17.4%)	7 (15.2%)	2 (4.3%)	36.9	2.30	2	1.19	.25
BA	Total Sample	38 (26.2%)	42 (29.0%)	39 (26.9%)	23 (15.9%)	3 (2.1%)	44.9	2.39	2	1.10	.58
	Younger Subsample	21 (21.2%)	23 (23.2%)	32 (32.3%)	21 (21.2%)	2 (2.0%)	55.5	2.60	3	1.11	.57
	Older Subsample	17 (37.0%)	19 (41.3%)	7 (15.2%)	2 (4.3%)	1 (2.2%)	21.7	1.93	2	.95	.51
BC ^(d)	Total Sample	39 (26.9%)	38 (26.2%)	30 (20.7%)	25 (17.2%)	11 (7.6%)	45.5	2.52	2	1.27	.50
	Younger Subsample	24 (24.2%)	23 (23.2%)	22 (22.2%)	22 (22.2%)	7 (7.1%)	51.5	2.64	3	1.27	.52
	Older Subsample	15 (32.6%)	15 (32.6%)	8 (17.4%)	3 (6.5%)	4 (8.7%)	32.6	2.25	2	1.23	.41
BD	Total Sample	41 (28.3%)	40 (27.6%)	32 (22.1%)	20 (13.8%)	12 (8.3%)	44.2	2.46	2	1.26	.57
	Younger Subsample	25 (25.3%)	23 (23.2%)	23 (23.2%)	17 (17.2%)	11 (11.1%)	51.5	2.66	3	1.33	.55
	Older Subsample	16 (34.8%)	17 (37.0%)	9 (19.6%)	3 (6.5%)	1 (2.2%)	28.3	2.04	2	1.01	.53
CA ^(d)	Total Sample	42 (29.0%)	45 (31.0%)	23 (15.9%)	23 (15.9%)	11 (7.6%)	39.4	2.42	2	1.27	.49
	Younger Subsample	25 (25.3%)	28 (28.3%)	16 (16.2%)	23 (23.2%)	6 (6.1%)	45.5	2.56	2	1.27	.54
	Older Subsample	17 (37.0%)	17 (37.0%)	7 (15.2%)	0 (0.0%)	5 (9.9%)	26.1	2.11	2	1.23	.33

(table continues)

Table A 1. (continued)

Goal Pair ^(a)	Sample	Frequency of Endorsement of Response Options					P_{con} ^(b)	M	Md	SD	R_{con} ^(c)
		1 never/very rarely	2 seldom	3 occasionally	4 often	5 very often					
CB ^(d)	Total Sample	46 (31.7%)	37 (25.5%)	30 (20.7%)	23 (15.9%)	8 (5.5%)	42.1	2.38	2	1.24	.48
	Younger Subsample	31 (31.3%)	24 (24.2%)	18 (18.2%)	21 (21.2%)	4 (4.0%)	43.4	2.42	2	1.25	.52
	Older Subsample	15 (32.6%)	13 (28.3%)	12 (26.1%)	2 (4.3%)	4 (8.7%)	39.1	2.28	2	1.22	.42
CD ^(d)	Total Sample	38 (26.2%)	38 (26.2%)	35 (24.1%)	26 (17.9%)	7 (4.8%)	46.8	2.49	2	1.20	.44
	Younger Subsample	24 (24.2%)	22 (22.2%)	27 (27.3%)	21 (21.2%)	4 (4.0%)	52.5	2.58	3	1.19	.44
	Older Subsample	14 (30.4%)	16 (34.8%)	8 (17.4%)	5 (10.9%)	3 (6.5%)	34.8	2.28	2	1.20	.40
DA	Total Sample	50 (34.5%)	46 (31.7%)	26 (17.9%)	9 (6.2%)	14 (9.7%)	33.8	2.25	2	1.26	.34
	Younger Subsample	30 (30.3%)	31 (31.3%)	20 (20.2%)	7 (7.1%)	11 (11.1%)	38.4	2.37	2	1.29	.30
	Older Subsample	20 (43.5%)	15 (32.6%)	6 (13.0%)	2 (4.3%)	3 (6.5%)	23.8	1.98	2	1.16	.37
DB	Total Sample	47 (32.4%)	52 (35.9%)	21 (14.5%)	16 (11.0%)	9 (6.2%)	31.7	2.23	2	1.19	.56
	Younger Subsample	28 (28.3%)	34 (34.3%)	17 (17.2%)	13 (13.1%)	7 (7.1%)	37.4	2.36	2	1.22	.54
	Older Subsample	19 (41.3%)	18 (39.1%)	4 (8.7%)	3 (6.5%)	2 (4.3%)	19.5	1.93	2	1.08	.54
DC ^(d)	Total Sample	58 (40.0%)	28 (19.3%)	31 (21.4%)	22 (15.2%)	5 (3.4%)	40.0	2.22	2	1.23	.49
	Younger Subsample	37 (37.4%)	17 (17.2%)	25 (25.3%)	18 (18.2%)	1 (1.0%)	44.5	2.28	2	1.18	.44
	Older Subsample	29 (63.0%)	10 (21.7%)	4 (8.7%)	3 (6.5%)	0 (0.0%)	15.2	1.59	1	.91	.59

(a) Notation: Goals A, B, C - three self-reported goals besides exercising; goal D – exercise goal

(b) Item difficulty: Percentage of endorsements of response options ≥ 3 (i.e., “occasionally,” “often,” and “very often;” indicating goal conflict)

(c) Item discriminability: Corrected item - total correlation (total = conflict composite score)

(d) One participant in the younger age group reported only two (instead of three) personal goals besides the exercise goal. For items involving goal C, the size of the total sample and the younger subsample therefore reduced to $N = 144$ and $n = 98$, respectively.

Table A 1. *Facilitation I (Strategy Overlap): "How often can it happen that you do something in the pursuit of goal A that is simultaneously beneficial for goal B?"*

Goal Pair ^(a)	Sample	Frequency of Endorsement of Response Options					P_{fac} ^(b)	M	Md	SD	r_{fac} ^(c)
		1 never/very rarely	2 seldom	3 occasionally	4 often	5 very often					
AB	Total Sample	23 (15.9%)	24 (16.6%)	35 (24.1%)	39 (26.9%)	24 (16.6%)	67.6	3.12	3	1.31	.31
	Younger Subsample	13 (13.1%)	19 (19.2%)	27 (27.3%)	26 (26.3%)	14 (14.1%)	67.7	3.09	3	1.25	.25
	Older Subsample	10 (21.7%)	5 (10.9%)	8 (17.4%)	13 (28.3%)	10 (21.7%)	67.4	3.17	3.5	1.47	.41
AC ^(d)	Total Sample	20 (13.8%)	32 (22.1%)	32 (22.1%)	26 (17.9%)	34 (23.4%)	63.4	3.15	3	1.38	.59
	Younger Subsample	15 (15.2%)	26 (26.3%)	22 (22.2%)	17 (17.2%)	18 (18.2%)	57.6	2.97	3	1.34	.50
	Older Subsample	5 (10.9%)	6 (13.0%)	10 (21.7%)	9 (19.6%)	16 (34.8%)	76.1	3.54	4	1.38	.68
AD	Total Sample	48 (33.1%)	29 (20.0%)	29 (20.0%)	25 (17.2%)	14 (9.7%)	46.9	2.50	2	1.36	.49
	Younger Subsample	40 (40.4%)	22 (22.2%)	16 (16.2%)	16 (16.2%)	5 (5.1%)	37.5	2.23	2	1.28	.39
	Older Subsample	8 (17.4%)	7 (15.2%)	13 (28.3%)	9 (19.6%)	9 (19.6%)	67.5	3.09	3	1.36	.51
BA ^(e)	Total Sample	25 (17.2%)	32 (22.1%)	35 (24.1%)	34 (23.4%)	18 (12.4%)	59.9	2.91	3	1.28	.41
	Younger Subsample	13 (13.1%)	27 (27.3%)	26 (26.3%)	23 (23.2%)	10 (10.1%)	59.6	2.90	3	1.20	.40
	Older Subsample	12 (26.1%)	5 (10.9%)	9 (19.6%)	11 (23.9%)	8 (17.4%)	60.9	2.95	3	1.46	.47
BC ^(d)	Total Sample	24 (16.6%)	28 (19.3%)	39 (26.9%)	26 (17.9%)	27 (18.6%)	63.4	3.03	3	1.34	.61
	Younger Subsample	19 (19.2%)	24 (24.2%)	21 (21.2%)	20 (20.2%)	14 (14.1%)	55.5	2.86	3	1.34	.50
	Older Subsample	5 (10.9%)	4 (8.7%)	18 (39.1%)	6 (13.0%)	13 (28.3%)	80.4	3.39	3	1.29	.75
BD	Total Sample	43 (29.7%)	30 (20.7%)	29 (20.0%)	27 (18.6%)	16 (11.0%)	49.6	2.61	2	1.37	.53
	Younger Subsample	33 (33.3%)	25 (25.3%)	18 (18.2%)	16 (16.2%)	7 (7.1%)	41.5	2.38	2	1.29	.37
	Older Subsample	10 (21.7%)	5 (10.9%)	11 (23.9%)	11 (23.9%)	9 (19.6%)	67.4	3.09	3	1.43	.65
CA ^(d)	Total Sample	28 (19.3%)	25 (17.2%)	32 (22.1%)	30 (20.7%)	29 (20.0%)	62.8	3.05	3	1.41	.58
	Younger Subsample	20 (20.2%)	23 (23.2%)	21 (21.2%)	18 (18.2%)	16 (16.2%)	55.6	2.87	3	1.37	.52
	Older Subsample	8 (17.4%)	2 (4.3%)	11 (23.9%)	12 (26.1%)	13 (28.3%)	78.3	3.43	4	1.41	.65

(table continues)

Table A 1. (continued)

Goal (a)	Pair	Sample	Frequency of Endorsement of Response Options					$P_{fac}^{(b)}$	M	Md	SD	$r_{fac}^{(c)}$
			1 never/very rarely	2 seldom	3 occasionally	4 often	5 very often					
CB (d)		Total Sample	22 (15.2%)	33 (22.8%)	39 (26.9%)	27 (18.6%)	23 (15.9%)	61.4	2.97	3	1.30	.57
		Younger Subsample	17 (17.2%)	26 (26.3%)	24 (24.2%)	21 (21.2%)	10 (10.1%)	55.5	2.81	3	1.25	.48
		Older Subsample	5 (10.9%)	7 (15.2%)	15 (32.6%)	6 (13.0%)	13 (28.3%)	73.9	3.33	3	1.33	.68
CD (d,e)		Total Sample	38 (26.2%)	31 (21.4%)	24 (16.6%)	36 (24.8%)	14 (9.7%)	51.1	2.71	3	1.36	.54
		Younger Subsample	26 (26.3%)	21 (21.2%)	20 (20.2%)	25 (25.3%)	6 (6.1%)	51.6	2.63	3	1.29	.47
		Older Subsample	12 (26.1%)	10 (21.7%)	4 (8.7%)	11 (23.9%)	8 (17.4%)	50.0	2.88	3	1.51	.64
DA		Total Sample	24 (16.6%)	25 (17.2%)	37 (25.5%)	31 (21.4%)	28 (19.3%)	66.2	3.10	3	1.35	.36
		Younger Subsample	17 (17.2%)	22 (22.2%)	26 (26.3%)	20 (20.2%)	14 (14.1%)	60.6	2.92	3	1.30	.37
		Older Subsample	7 (15.2%)	3 (6.5%)	11 (23.9%)	11 (23.9%)	14 (30.4%)	78.2	3.48	4	1.39	.27
DB		Total Sample	29 (20.0%)	20 (13.8%)	31 (21.4%)	42 (29.0%)	23 (15.9%)	66.3	3.07	3	1.37	.47
		Younger Subsample	22 (22.2%)	16 (16.2%)	22 (22.2%)	27 (27.3%)	12 (12.1%)	61.6	2.91	3	1.35	.43
		Older Subsample	7 (15.2%)	4 (8.7%)	9 (19.6%)	15 (32.6%)	11 (23.9%)	76.1	3.41	4	1.36	.48
DC (d)		Total Sample	28 (19.3%)	24 (16.6%)	31 (21.4%)	35 (24.1%)	26 (17.9%)	63.4	3.05	3	1.39	.55
		Younger Subsample	21 (21.2%)	15 (15.2%)	25 (25.3%)	24 (24.2%)	13 (13.1%)	62.6	2.93	3	1.34	.51
		Older Subsample	7 (15.2%)	9 (19.6%)	6 (13.0%)	11 (23.9%)	13 (28.3%)	65.2	3.30	4	1.46	.61

(a) Notation: Goals A, B, C - three self-reported goals besides exercising; goal D – exercise goal

(b) Item difficulty: Percentage of endorsements of response options ≥ 3 (i.e., “occasionally,” “often,” and “very often,” indicating intergoal facilitation)

(c) Item discriminability: Corrected item - total correlation (total = facilitation composite score)

(d) One participant in the younger age group reported only two (instead of three) personal goals besides the exercise goal. For items involving goal C, the size of the total sample and the younger subsample therefore reduced to $N = 144$ and $n = 98$, respectively.

(e) One missing value in the older subsample as well as in the total sample.

Table A 1. *Facilitation II (Instrumental Relations between Goals): "The pursuit of goal A creates good conditions for the realization of goal B."*

Goal Pair ^(a)	Sample	Frequency of Endorsement of Response Options					P_{fac} ^(b)	M	Md	SD	r_{fac} ^(c)
		1 (not at all)	2 (a little)	3 (partly)	4 (rather)	5 (very true)					
AB	Total Sample	15 (10.3%)	24 (16.6%)	33 (22.8%)	30 (20.7%)	43 (29.7%)	73.2	3.43	4	1.34	.34
	Younger Subsample	10 (10.1%)	21 (21.2%)	21 (21.2%)	23 (23.2%)	24 (24.2%)	68.6	3.30	3	1.32	.17
	Older Subsample	5 (10.9%)	3 (6.5%)	12 (26.1%)	7 (15.2%)	19 (41.3%)	82.6	3.70	4	1.36	.53
AC ^(d)	Total Sample	23 (15.9%)	32 (22.1%)	31 (21.4%)	13 (9.0%)	45 (31.0%)	61.4	3.17	3	1.48	.60
	Younger Subsample	18 (18.2%)	26 (26.3%)	21 (21.2%)	7 (7.1%)	26 (26.3%)	54.6	2.97	3	1.47	.48
	Older Subsample	5 (10.9%)	6 (13.0%)	10 (21.7%)	6 (13.0%)	19 (41.3%)	76.0	3.61	4	1.42	.75
AD	Total Sample	39 (26.9%)	34 (23.4%)	24 (16.6%)	18 (12.4%)	30 (20.7%)	49.7	2.77	2	1.49	.52
	Younger Subsample	33 (33.3%)	27 (27.3%)	17 (17.2%)	11 (11.1%)	11 (11.1%)	39.4	2.39	2	1.35	.34
	Older Subsample	6 (13.0%)	7 (15.2%)	7 (15.2%)	7 (15.2%)	19 (41.3%)	71.7	3.57	4	1.49	.62
BA	Total Sample	24 (16.6%)	30 (20.7%)	32 (22.1%)	28 (19.3%)	31 (21.4%)	62.8	3.08	3	1.39	.53
	Younger Subsample	15 (15.2%)	25 (25.3%)	24 (24.2%)	20 (20.2%)	15 (15.2%)	59.6	2.95	3	1.30	.44
	Older Subsample	9 (19.6%)	5 (10.9%)	8 (17.4%)	8 (17.4%)	16 (34.8%)	69.6	3.37	4	1.54	.63
BC ^(d)	Total Sample	27 (18.6%)	34 (23.4%)	22 (15.2%)	24 (16.6%)	37 (25.5%)	57.3	3.07	3	1.48	.57
	Younger Subsample	19 (19.2%)	28 (28.3%)	14 (14.1%)	17 (17.2%)	20 (20.2%)	51.5	2.91	3	1.44	.53
	Older Subsample	8 (17.4%)	6 (13.0%)	8 (17.4%)	7 (15.2%)	17 (37.0%)	69.6	3.41	4	1.53	.60
BD	Total Sample	44 (30.3%)	36 (24.8%)	21 (14.5%)	22 (15.2%)	22 (15.2%)	44.9	2.60	2	1.44	.61
	Younger Subsample	36 (36.4%)	29 (29.3%)	13 (13.1%)	13 (13.1%)	8 (8.1%)	34.3	2.27	2	1.30	.49
	Older Subsample	8 (17.4%)	7 (15.2%)	8 (17.4%)	9 (19.6%)	14 (30.4%)	67.4	3.30	3.5	1.49	.66
CA ^(d)	Total Sample	30 (20.7%)	31 (21.4%)	30 (20.7%)	22 (15.2%)	31 (21.4%)	57.3	2.95	3	1.44	.56
	Younger Subsample	22 (22.2%)	22 (22.2%)	23 (23.2%)	16 (16.2%)	15 (15.2%)	54.6	2.80	3	1.37	.41
	Older Subsample	8 (17.4%)	9 (19.6%)	7 (15.2%)	6 (13.0%)	16 (34.8%)	63.0	3.28	3	1.54	.73

(table continues)

Table A 1. (continued)

Goal Pair ^(a)	Sample	Frequency of Endorsement of Response Options					P_{fac} ^(b)	M	Md	SD	r_{fac} ^(c)
		1 (not at all)	2 (a little)	3 (partly)	4 (rather)	5 (very true)					
CB ^(d)	Total Sample	26 (17.9%)	29 (20.0%)	35 (24.1%)	24 (16.6%)	30 (20.7%)	61.4	3.02	3	1.39	.55
	Younger Subsample	19 (19.2%)	22 (22.2%)	27 (27.3%)	15 (15.2%)	15 (15.2%)	57.7	2.85	3	1.33	.42
	Older Subsample	7 (15.2%)	7 (15.2%)	8 (17.4%)	9 (19.6%)	15 (32.6%)	69.6	3.39	4	1.47	.68
CD ^(d)	Total Sample	34 (23.4%)	37 (25.5%)	21 (14.5%)	26 (17.9%)	26 (17.9%)	50.3	2.81	3	1.44	.58
	Younger Subsample	26 (26.3%)	26 (26.3%)	16 (16.2%)	19 (19.2%)	11 (11.1%)	46.5	2.62	2	1.36	.50
	Older Subsample	8 (17.4%)	11 (23.9%)	5 (10.9%)	7 (15.2%)	15 (32.6%)	58.7	3.22	3	1.55	.65
DA	Total Sample	17 (11.7%)	34 (23.4%)	30 (20.7%)	28 (19.3%)	36 (24.8%)	64.8	3.22	3	1.36	.52
	Younger Subsample	13 (13.1%)	25 (25.3%)	25 (25.3%)	20 (20.2%)	16 (16.2%)	61.7	3.01	3	1.28	.41
	Older Subsample	4 (8.7%)	9 (19.6%)	5 (10.9%)	8 (17.4%)	20 (43.5%)	71.8	3.67	4	1.43	.60
DB	Total Sample	20 (13.8%)	25 (17.2%)	29 (20.0%)	40 (27.6%)	31 (21.4%)	69.0	3.26	3	1.34	.52
	Younger Subsample	15 (15.2%)	21 (21.2%)	22 (22.2%)	27 (27.3%)	14 (14.1%)	63.6	3.04	3	1.29	.38
	Older Subsample	5 (10.9%)	4 (8.7%)	7 (15.2%)	13 (28.3%)	17 (37.0%)	80.5	3.72	4	1.34	.63
DC ^(d)	Total Sample	20 (13.8%)	31 (21.4%)	36 (24.8%)	30 (20.7%)	27 (18.6%)	64.1	3.09	3	1.32	.56
	Younger Subsample	14 (14.1%)	26 (26.3%)	28 (28.3%)	19 (19.2%)	11 (11.1%)	58.6	2.87	3	1.22	.49
	Older Subsample	6 (13.0%)	5 (10.9%)	8 (17.4%)	11 (23.9%)	16 (34.8%)	76.1	3.57	4	1.41	.57

(a) Notation: Goals A, B, C - three self-reported goals besides exercising; goal D – exercise goal

(b) Item difficulty: Percentage of endorsements of response options ≥ 3 (i.e., “partly,” “rather,” and “very true;” indicating intergoal facilitation)

(c) Item discriminability: Corrected item - total correlation (total = facilitation composite score)

(d) One participant in the younger age group reported only two (instead of three) personal goals besides the exercise goal. For items involving goal C, the size of the total sample and the younger subsample therefore reduced to $N = 144$ and $n = 98$, respectively.

Table A 1. Overall Evaluation (Modified Striving Instrumentality Matrix): "Overall, how does the pursuit of goal A influence the realization of goal B?"

Goal Pair ^(a)	Sample	Response Option Endorsements (Absolute and Percent)					P_{con} ^(b)	P_{fac} ^(c)	M	Md	SD	r_{con} ^(d)	r_{fac} ^(e)
		-2 very much impairs	-1 somewhat impairs	0 neither nor	+1 somewhat helps	+2 very much helps							
AB	Total Sample	8 (5.5%)	21 (14.5%)	26 (17.9%)	38 (26.2%)	52 (35.9%)	20.0	62.1	.72	1	1.24	.29	.35
	Younger Subsample	7 (7.1%)	18 (18.2%)	17 (17.2%)	27 (27.3%)	30 (30.3%)	25.3	57.6	.56	1	1.29	.24	.15
	Older Subsample	1 (2.2%)	3 (6.5%)	9 (19.6%)	11 (23.9%)	22 (47.8%)	8.7	71.7	1.09	1	1.07	.35	.49
AC ^(f)	Total Sample	7 (4.8%)	20 (13.8%)	48 (33.1%)	27 (18.6%)	42 (29.0%)	18.6	47.6	.53	0	1.19	.34	.56
	Younger Subsample	6 (6.1%)	18 (18.2%)	34 (34.3%)	16 (16.2%)	24 (24.2%)	14.3	40.4	.35	0	1.21	.30	.44
	Older Subsample	1 (2.2%)	2 (4.3%)	14 (30.4%)	11 (23.9%)	18 (39.1%)	6.5	63.0	.93	1	1.04	.35	.69
AD	Total Sample	5 (3.4%)	28 (19.3%)	59 (40.7%)	26 (17.9%)	27 (18.6%)	22.7	36.5	.29	0	1.09	.29	.54
	Younger Subsample	5 (5.1%)	27 (27.3%)	42 (42.4%)	17 (17.2%)	8 (8.1%)	32.4	23.3	-.04	0	.99	.26	.39
	Older Subsample	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.2%)	17 (37.0%)	9 (19.6%)	19 (41.3%)	2.2	60.9	1.00	1	.94	.20	.55
BA	Total Sample	6 (4.1%)	19 (13.1%)	38 (26.2%)	47 (32.4%)	35 (24.1%)	17.2	56.5	.59	1	1.11	.20	.50
	Younger Subsample	6 (6.1%)	16 (16.2%)	25 (25.3%)	35 (35.4%)	17 (17.2%)	22.3	52.6	.41	1	1.13	.14	.44
	Older Subsample	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.5%)	13 (28.3%)	12 (26.1%)	18 (39.1%)	6.5	65.2	.98	1	.98	.29	.52
BC ^(f)	Total Sample	4 (2.8%)	21 (14.5%)	50 (35.5%)	35 (24.1%)	34 (23.4%)	17.3	47.5	.51	0	1.09	.14	.51
	Younger Subsample	4 (4.0%)	16 (16.2%)	37 (37.4%)	21 (21.4%)	20 (20.2%)	20.2	41.6	.38	0	1.11	.12	.40
	Older Subsample	0 (0.0%)	5 (10.9%)	13 (28.3%)	14 (30.4%)	14 (30.4%)	10.9	60.8	.80	1	1.00	.09	.62
BD	Total Sample	3 (2.1%)	33 (22.8%)	56 (35.6%)	29 (20.0%)	24 (16.6%)	24.9	36.6	.26	0	1.05	.33	.54
	Younger Subsample	3 (3.0%)	30 (30.3%)	39 (39.4%)	16 (16.2%)	11 (11.1%)	33.3	27.3	.02	0	1.02	.29	.34
	Older Subsample	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.5%)	17 (37.0%)	13 (28.3%)	13 (28.3%)	6.5	56.6	.78	1	.94	.29	.68
CA ^(f)	Total Sample	7 (4.8%)	20 (13.8%)	53 (36.6%)	28 (19.3%)	36 (24.8%)	18.6	44.1	.46	0	1.15	.26	.47
	Younger Subsample	5 (5.1%)	20 (20.2%)	34 (34.3%)	18 (18.2%)	21 (21.2%)	25.3	39.4	.31	0	1.17	.30	.39
	Older Subsample	2 (4.3%)	0 (0.0%)	19 (41.3%)	10 (21.7%)	15 (32.6%)	4.3	54.3	.78	1	1.05	.05	.56

(table continues)

Table A 1. (continued)

Goal Pair ^(a)	Sample	Response Option Endorsements (Absolute and Percent)					P_{con} ^(b)	P_{fac} ^(c)	M	Md	SD	r_{con} ^(d)	r_{fac} ^(e)
		-2 very much impairs	-1 somewhat impairs	0 neither nor	+1 somewhat helps	+2 very much helps							
CB ^(f)	Total Sample	3 (2.1%)	17 (11.7%)	52 (35.9%)	38 (26.2%)	34 (23.4%)	13.8	49.6	.58	.5	1.04	.25	.54
	Younger Subsample	3 (3.0%)	14 (14.1%)	36 (36.4%)	26 (26.3%)	19 (19.2%)	17.1	45.5	.45	0	1.06	.17	.39
	Older Subsample	0 (0.0%)	3 (6.5%)	16 (34.8%)	12 (26.1%)	15 (32.6%)	6.5	58.7	.85	1	.97	.44	.72
CD ^(f)	Total Sample	3 (2.1%)	28 (19.3%)	55 (37.9%)	22 (15.2%)	35 (24.1%)	21.4	39.3	.41	0	1.12	.23	.54
	Younger Subsample	1 (1.0%)	25 (25.3%)	39 (39.4%)	15 (15.2%)	18 (18.2%)	26.3	33.4	.24	0	1.07	.22	.46
	Older Subsample	2 (4.3%)	3 (6.5%)	16 (34.8%)	17 (15.2%)	17 (37.0%)	10.8	52.2	.76	1	1.17	.17	.59
DA	Total Sample	1 (0.7%)	9 (6.2%)	47 (30.3%)	47 (32.4%)	44 (30.3%)	6.9	62.7	.86	1	.95	.15	.52
	Younger Subsample	1 (1.0%)	9 (9.1%)	30 (30.3%)	37 (37.4%)	22 (22.2%)	10.1	55.5	.71	1	.95	.13	.44
	Older Subsample	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	14 (30.4%)	10 (21.7%)	22 (47.8%)	0	69.5	1.17	1	.88	.0	.57
DB	Total Sample	0 (0.0%)	15 (10.3%)	41 (28.3%)	48 (33.1%)	41 (28.3%)	10.3	61.4	.79	1	.97	.22	.47
	Younger Subsample	0 (0.0%)	13 (13.1%)	31 (31.3%)	34 (34.3%)	21 (21.2%)	13.1	55.5	.64	1	.96	.16	.33
	Older Subsample	0 (0.0%)	2 (4.3%)	10 (21.7%)	14 (30.4%)	20 (43.5%)	4.3	73.9	1.13	1	.91	.31	.58
DC ^(f)	Total Sample	2 (1.4%)	13 (9.0%)	50 (34.5%)	37 (25.5%)	42 (29.0%)	10.4	54.5	.72	1	1.03	.12	.54
	Younger Subsample	1 (1.0%)	13 (13.1%)	37 (37.4%)	27 (27.3%)	20 (20.2%)	14.1	47.5	.53	0	1.00	.07	.49
	Older Subsample	1 (2.2%)	0 (0.0%)	13 (28.3%)	10 (21.7%)	22 (47.8%)	2.2	69.5	1.13	1	.98	.10	.51

Note. The modified Striving Instrumentality Matrix Item (SIM) entered in form of two separate, recoded variables (SIM-conflict, where responses indicating facilitation were assigned zeros, and SIM-facilitation, where responses indicating goal conflict were assigned zeros) into the intergoal conflict and facilitation composites (see 3.1.3.2). Item difficulty and discriminability are therefore reported with respect to conflict *and* facilitation.

(a) Notation: Goals A, B, C - three self-reported goals besides exercising; goal D – exercise goal

(b) Item difficulty (conflict): Percentage of endorsements of response options < 0 (i.e., “impairs very much” and “impairs somewhat”)

(c) Item difficulty (facilitation): Percentage of endorsements of response options > 0 (i.e., “helps very much” and “helps somewhat”)

(d) Item discriminability (conflict): Corrected item - total correlation (between SIM-conflict variable and the conflict composite score, see 3.1.3.2)

(e) Item discriminability (facilitation): Corrected item - total correlation (between SIM-facilitation variable and the facilitation composite score, see 3.1.3.2)

(f) One participant in the younger age group reported only two (instead of three) personal goals besides the exercise goal. For items involving goal C, the size of the total sample and the younger subsample therefore reduced to $N = 144$ and $n = 98$, respectively.

Table A 2. *Description of the Intergoal Conflict and Facilitation Subscales in the Total Sample and the Subsamples of Younger and Older Adults*

Subscale	Transformation?	Sample	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skew (SE)	Kurt (SE)
Conflict						
T1 Time constraints	None	Total	2.37	.63	-.08 (.20)	-.40 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	2.52	.57	-.09 (.24)	-.02 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	2.06	.63	.27 (.35)	-.65 (.69)
T1 Financial constraints	Squared	Total	3.12	2.70	2.10 (.20)	5.40 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	2.99	2.30	1.65 (.24)	3.34 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	3.42	3.42	2.15 (.35)	4.59 (.67)
T1 Energy constraints	None	Total	2.36	.67	.06 (.20)	-.22 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	2.49	.60	.21 (.24)	.09 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	2.10	.74	.33 (.35)	-.56 (.69)
T1 Incompatible strategies	None	Total	2.40	.78	.11 (.20)	-.86 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	2.53	.76	-.11 (.24)	-.88 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	2.12	.74	.63 (.35)	.10 (.69)
Facilitation						
T1 Strategy overlap	Logarithm (LN[X])	Total	1.04	.27	-.24 (.20)	.12 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	1.00	.25	-.48 (.24)	.49 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	1.14	.29	-.23 (.35)	-.57 (.69)
T1 Instrumental relations	Square root	Total	1.73	.24	.17 (.20)	-.36 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	1.67	.20	-.12 (.24)	.04 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	1.85	.28	-.28 (.35)	-1.03 (.69)
Overall evaluation						
T1 SIM (a)	Reflect and square root (SQRT[4.5-X])	Total	1.47	.17	.30 (.20)	.20 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	1.42	.15	.15 (.24)	1.13 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	1.58	.18	-.07 (.35)	-.62 (.69)

(a) Modified Striving Instrumentality Matrix; higher scale scores indicate more unfavorable intergoal relations

Table A 3. *Items Assessing Habitual Strategies in Managing Multiple Goals*

Scale (a)	Original German Wording	English Translation
S1	Neuen Vorhaben wende ich mich am liebsten erst dann zu, wenn ich alles andere erledigt habe.	I prefer to turn to new projects after having completed everything else first.
S2	In der Regel widme ich mich erst voll und ganz einer Sache und wende mich erst danach dem nächsten Plan zu.	Typically, I entirely focus on one project and only after having completed it I turn to working on the next plan.

(table continues)

Table A 3 (*continued.*)

Scale (a)	Original German Wording	English Translation
S3	Anstatt verschiedene Dinge gleichzeitig in Angriff zu nehmen, erledige ich lieber eines nach dem anderen.	Instead of handling various matters simultaneously, I prefer to take care of one thing after the other.
P1	Ich bin jemand, der in seinem Leben klare Prioritäten setzt.	I am a person who assigns clear priorities in life.
P2 (r)	Ich verfolge häufig mehrere verschiedene Vorhaben gleichzeitig.	I often pursue several different projects simultaneously.
P3	In der Regel gibt es eine Sache, die mir gegenwärtig am wichtigsten ist. Anderen Dingen schenke ich daneben vergleichsweise wenig Aufmerksamkeit.	Normally, there is one thing that is most important to me at a given time. Beside that one, I pay comparatively little attention to other matters.
C1 (r)	Wenn sich bestimmte Dinge nicht so realisieren lassen, wie ich es mir vorgenommen habe, fällt es mir schwer, meine Ansprüche an die Gegebenheiten anzupassen.	If certain things cannot be realized as I had intended it, I have difficulties adapting my standards to the realities.
C2	Ich bin jemand, der seine Ansprüche senkt, wenn er merkt, dass er sich übernommen hat.	I am a person who lowers his standards when realizing that he overtaxes himself.
C3 (r)	Auch dann, wenn ich merke, dass ich mich eigentlich übernommen habe, fällt es mir schwer, einen Kompromiss einzugehen.	Even when I realize that I actually overreach myself, it is hard for me to compromise.
D1	Wenn ich merke, dass ich mich mit meinen Plänen übernommen habe, nehme ich von einigen Vorhaben Abstand, um wichtigere verfolgen zu können.	When I realize that I overextend with all my plans, I refrain from some of them in order to be able to pursue the more important ones.
D2 (r)	Mir fällt es schwer, einmal gefasste Vorhaben aufzugeben, selbst wenn ich merke, dass ich nicht alles schaffen kann, was ich mir vorgenommen habe.	It is hard for me to abandon once decided plans, even if I realize that I cannot possibly manage everything I intended to do.
D3 (r)	Wenn sie einem wichtigen Ziel im Wege stehen, verzichte ich auf Dinge, die ich ursprünglich vorgenommen hatte.	If they obstruct an important goal, I abandon things I originally planned to do.

(a) Intended content domain in item development: S – Sequencing, P – Prioritizing, C – Compromising, D – Distancing; (r) coding reversed

Table A 4. *Description of Items Assessing Habitual Strategies in Managing Multiple Goals*

Item (see Table A 4)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Skew (SE)</i>	<i>Kurt (SE)</i>
Sequencing (1)	3.31	.89	-.08 (.20)	-.65 (.40)
Sequencing (2)	2.97	1.04	.13 (.20)	-.76 (.40)
Sequencing (3)	2.98	1.06	.04 (.20)	-.88 (.40)
Prioritizing (1)	3.68	.73	-.49 (.20)	.16 (.40)
Prioritizing (2)	2.79	.90	.25 (.20)	-.39 (.40)
Prioritizing (3)	2.50	.92	.29 (.20)	-.34 (.40)
Compromising (1)	3.00	.94	-.31 (.20)	-.97 (.40)
Compromising (2)	3.43	.86	-.43 (.20)	-.18 (.40)
Compromising (3)	3.15	.97	-.40 (.20)	-.48 (.40)
Distancing (1)	3.64	.85	-.44 (.20)	-.05 (.40)
Distancing (2)	3.53	.84	-.35 (.20)	-.17 (.40)
Distancing (3)	2.94	.93	-.05 (.20)	-.82 (.40)

Table A 5. *Habitual Strategies in Managing Multiple Goals: Subscale Correlations (Pearson's)*

	Prioritizing/ Sequencing	Compromising	Distancing
Prioritizing/Sequencing	1.00		
Compromising	-.07 n.s.	1.00	
Distancing	.22 **	.21 **	1.00

** $p < .01$

Table A 6. *Resource Intensity of the Four Goals under Study: Subscale Correlations (Pearson's)*

	Strength and Energy	Money	Time
Strength and Energy ^(a)	1.00		
Money ^(a)	.18 *	1.00	
Time ^(a)	.49 **	.15 +	1.00

+ $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

(a) averaged across all four goals under study

Table A 7. *Pearson's Correlations among Facets of the Multidimensional Affect Rating Scale at T1 and T2*

		Negative mood	"Positive Affect Subscale"	
			Alertness	Ease
Positive mood	T1	-.60 **	.61 **	.68 **
	T2	-.68 **	.66 **	.67 **
Alertness	T1	-.67 **	.61 **	.69 **
	T2	-.64 **	.66 **	.70 **
Ease	T1	-.55 **	.69 **	.69 **
	T2	-.57 **	.67 **	.70 **
		Positive mood	"Negative Affect Subscale"	
			Fatigue	Restlessness
Negative mood	T1	-.60 **	.60 **	.60 **
	T2	-.68 **	.54 **	.61 **
Fatigue	T1	-.67 **	.60 **	.56 **
	T2	-.64 **	.54 **	.43 **
Restlessness	T1	-.55 **	.56 **	.60 **
	T2	-.57 **	.43 **	.61 **

Notes. ** $p < .01$; correlations among aspects aggregated to one subscale are highlighted

Box A 2. *General Instruction for Self-Report of Monthly Exercise Behavior*

Original German Wording:

Im folgenden interessiert uns genauer, wie Ihre sportliche Betätigung in den vergangenen vier Monaten aussah. Haben Sie mal mehr, mal weniger intensiv Sport getrieben? Gab es Zeiten, in denen Sie pausiert haben? Haben Sie die sportliche Aktivität eventuell inzwischen wieder aufgegeben? Um ein möglichst genaues Bild darüber zu erhalten, werden wir Sie nachfolgend zu **jedem einzelnen** der vergangenen Monate getrennt befragen. Bitte versuchen Sie, sich jeden der angegebenen Zeitabschnitte möglichst genau zu vergegenwärtigen. Dabei ist es hilfreich, sich markante Ereignisse ins Gedächtnis zurückzurufen. Beantworten Sie die folgenden Fragen bitte **offen** und **ehrlich** und so genau wie möglich.

English Translation:

Below, we are interested in learning about your exercise activities in the past four months. Did you exercise at times more, at times less intensively? Were there times when you paused? Did you perhaps quit exercising in the mean time? To get a detailed picture, we will question you **separately** for **each** of the past months. Please bring to mind each of the assigned periods as precisely as possible. For doing so, it is helpful to recall prominent events. Please answer the following questions as **openly** and **honestly** and as precisely as possible.

Table A 8. *Additional and Control Variables in Study Part 1*

Construct/Scale	Instrument description
T1	Social desirability (Soziale Erwünschtheits-Skala-17)
	Author: Stöber (1999)
	Modification: Item 4 (“tried out drugs”) excluded
	Response options: 0 “not true,” 1 “true”
	Scale aggregation: Sum score after recoding of negatively formulated items
	Internal consistency: $\alpha = .73$
T1	Ambiguity tolerance (Ungewißheitstoleranzskala)
	Author: Dalbert (1999)
	Modification: None
	Response options: 1 “not at all true” to 5 “very true”
	Scale aggregation: Mean score after recoding of negatively formulated items
	Internal consistency: $\alpha = .59$
T1	Personality traits (NEO-Five-Factor-Inventory)
	Author: Costa and McCrae (1992)
	Modification: German translation by Borkenau and Ostendorf (1993), short version (30 items selected by Staudinger et al., 1999a)
	Response options: 1 “not at all true” to 5 “very true”
	Scale aggregation: Mean score after recoding of negatively formulated items
	Internal consistency: Neuroticism: $\alpha = .75$; Extraversion: $\alpha = .50$; Openness: $\alpha = .38$; Conscientiousness: $\alpha = .74$; Agreeableness: $\alpha = .53$
T1	SOC-strategies (SOC-Questionnaire)
	Author: P. B. Baltes et al. (1995, 1999)
	Modification: None (24 item version)
	Response options: Forced-choice between a target item describing SOC-behavior and a distractor item
	Scale aggregation: Relative number of target choices
	Internal consistency: Elective selection: $\alpha = .71$; Optimization: $\alpha = .30$; Compensation: $\alpha = .55$; Loss-based selection: $\alpha = .57$
T2	Goal involvement in the study interval
	Author: Newly developed
	Item: How much have you engaged in that goal in the past four months since our first questionnaire session? <i>(Wie sehr haben Sie sich in den letzten vier Monaten seit unserer ersten Befragung für dieses Ziel engagiert?)</i>
	Response options: 1 “very little” to 7 “very much”
	Scale aggregation: Mean across all four goals
	Internal consistency: $\alpha = .42$

(table continues)

Table A 8. (continued)

Construct/Scale	Instrument description
T1 Internal control over goal attainment	
Author:	Brandtstädter (1984)
Modification:	Response Options
Item:	In your opinion, to what degree does the realization of this goal depend on yourself? <i>(In welchem Maße ist nach Ihrer Meinung die Verwirklichung dieses Ziels von Ihrem eigenen Zutun abhängig?)</i>
Response options:	1 “very little” to 5 “very much”
Scale aggregation:	Mean across all four goals
Internal consistency:	$\alpha = .63$
T1 External control over goal attainment	
Author:	Brandtstädter (1984)
Modification:	Response Options
Item:	In your opinion, to what degree does the realization of this goal depend on circumstances beyond your control? <i>(In welchem Maße ist nach Ihrer Meinung die Verwirklichung dieses Ziels von Bedingungen abhängig, auf die Sie keinen Einfluss haben?)</i>
Response options:	1 “very little” to 5 “very much”
Scale aggregation:	Mean across all four goals
Internal consistency:	$\alpha = .54$
T1 Exercise motivation (Reason for Exercise Scale)	
Author:	Silberstein et al. (1988)
Modification:	None (back translation process) ^(a)
Response options:	1 “not important” to 5 “very important”
Scale aggregation:	Mean score
Internal consistency:	Weight control: $\alpha = .73$; Fitness: $\alpha = .48$; Mood: $\alpha = .65$; Health: $\alpha = .79$; Attractiveness: $\alpha = .85$; Enjoyment: $\alpha = .69$; Tone: $\alpha = .73$
T1 Exercise-specific self-efficacy	
Author:	Fuchs and Schwarzer (1994)
Modification:	None
Response options:	1 “not at all sure” to 5 “very sure”
Scale aggregation:	Mean score
Internal consistency:	$\alpha = .79$
T1 Exercise-specific intention strength	
Author:	Newly developed
Items:	How concrete are your plans concerning how often [on which days] you want to exercise in the coming three to four months? <i>(Wie konkret sind Ihre Vorstellungen davon, wie häufig [an welchen Tagen] Sie in den kommenden drei bis vier Monaten Sport treiben wollen?)</i>

(table continues)

Table A 8. (continued)

Construct/Scale	Instrument description
Response options:	1 “I do not have a concrete plan, I will spontaneously decide when to exercise,” 2 “I have a relatively concrete plan, which, however, might change according to the situation,” 3 “I have a very concrete plan from which I do not want to depart if possible” (presented without numbering)
Scale aggregation:	Mean score across both items
Internal consistency:	$\alpha = .80$
T2 Exercise context characteristics	
Author:	Newly developed
Items:	To what degree do the sports facilities that you used in the past four months ... (<i>Inwiefern bieten die von Ihnen in den letzten vier Monaten genutzten Sportmöglichkeiten ...</i>) Subscale “accessibility of social contact:” ⁸⁷ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - opportunities to be with friends and acquaintances (<i>Gelegenheiten, mit Freunden und Bekannten zusammen zu sein</i>) - opportunities to get to know new people (<i>Gelegenheiten, neue Menschen kennenzulernen</i>) Subscale “accessibility of information and instruction:” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - information/advice on suitable exercise (<i>Informationen/Beratung zu geeigneter sportlicher Betätigung</i>) - guidance for exercising (<i>Betreuung bei der sportlichen Betätigung</i>) - information/instruction on health (<i>Informationen/Beratung zur Gesundheit</i>) - health attendance (<i>Gesundheitliche Betreuung</i>) Subscale “accessibility of wellness and care facilities:” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - opportunities besides exercising to do something for one’s physical well-being (e.g., sauna, massage, etc.) (<i>Möglichkeiten, neben dem Sport etwas für sein körperliches Wohlbefinden zu tun [z.B. Sauna, Massage o.ä.]</i>) - opportunities besides exercising to do something for one’s appearance (e.g., solarium, beauty parlour) (<i>Möglichkeiten, neben dem Sport etwas für sein Aussehen zu tun [z.B. Solarium, Kosmetik]</i>)
Response options:	1 “not at all” to 5 “a lot”
Scale aggregation:	Mean score
Internal consistency:	Social: $\alpha = .57$; Information/instruction: $\alpha = .84$; Wellness: $\alpha = .87$

(table continues)

⁸⁷ I assigned items to subscales according to results of an exploratory factor analysis. Generalized least squares extraction with oblimin, direct rotation yielded a three factor solution (Eigenvalues greater than one) accounting, overall, for 72.51% of variance. Items were assigned to a subscale if the respective factor loading was larger than .30. All items could be unequivocally assigned.

Table A 8. (continued)

Construct/Scale	Instrument description
T2 Exercise enjoyment	
Author:	Newly developed
Items:	The next questions pertain to your exercise activities since our first questionnaire session in ... (calendar month). If you don't exercise currently, please respond to these questions with respect to your last exercise activity. <i>(Die folgenden Fragen betreffen Ihre sportliche Betätigung in der Zeit seit unserer ersten Befragung im ... (Kalendermonat). Sollten Sie gegenwärtig keinen Sport treiben, beziehen Sie Ihre Antworten bitte auf diejenige sportliche Betätigung, die Sie zuletzt ausgeübt haben.)</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Overall, how did you like exercising? <i>(Wie hat Ihnen die sportliche Betätigung insgesamt gefallen?)</i> - How good did you typically feel while exercising? <i>(Wie wohl haben Sie sich im allgemeinen beim Sporttreiben gefühlt?)</i> - How satisfied were you typically while exercising? <i>(Wie zufrieden waren Sie im allgemeinen während des Sporttreibens?)</i> - How much fun did you typically have while exercising? <i>(Wie viel Spaß hat Ihnen im allgemeinen die sportliche Betätigung gemacht?)</i> - How good did you typically feel after exercising? <i>(Wie wohl haben Sie sich im allgemeinen nach dem Sporttreiben gefühlt?)</i> - How satisfied were you typically after exercising? <i>(Wie zufrieden waren Sie im allgemeinen nach dem Sporttreiben?)</i>
Response options:	1 "not at all/very little" to 5 "very much"
Scale aggregation:	Mean score ⁸⁸
Internal consistency:	$\alpha = .90$
(a) Stages of back translation procedures:	(1) translation of original items into German, (2) back translation into English by bilingual German, English speaker, (3) comparison original and back-translated items by native American speaker, (4) modification of critical German items, (5) back translation (bilingual person), (6) comparison with original items (native American), (7) finalization of German wording by two native Germans

⁸⁸ Generalized least squares extraction with oblimin, direct rotation yielded a one factor solution (Eigenvalue greater than one) accounting, overall, for 62.45% of variance.

7.2. Appendix B: Description of Variables in Study Part 1

Table B 1. *Description of Intergoal Conflict and Facilitation Subscales in Younger and Older Adults*⁸⁹

Subscale	Sample	Transformation? (a)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Skew (SE)</i>	<i>Kurt (SE)</i>
Conflict						
T1 Time constraints	Younger	None	2.52	.57	-.09 (.24)	-.02 (.48)
	Older	None	2.06	.63	.27 (.35)	-.65 (.67)
T1 Financial constraints	Younger	1 outlier	1.63	.61	.83 (.24)	-.15 (.48)
	Older	3 outliers	1.66	.69	1.07 (.35)	.34 (.67)
T1 Energy constraints	Younger	1 outlier	2.48	.58	.07 (.24)	-.28 (.48)
	Older	None	2.10	.74	.33 (.35)	-.56 (.67)
T1 Incompatible strategies	Younger	None	2.53	.76	-.11 (.24)	-.88 (.48)
	Older	None	2.12	.74	.63 (.35)	.10 (.69)
Facilitation						
T1 Instrumental relations	Younger	1 outlier	2.83	.65	.12 (.24)	-.33 (.48)
	Older	None	3.48	1.02	-.07 (.35)	-1.11 (.69)
T1 Strategy overlap	Younger	None	2.79	.68	.28 (.24)	-.02 (.48)
	Older	None	3.26	.92	.27 (.35)	-.90 (.69)
Overall Evaluation						
T1 SIM (b)	Younger	4 outliers	2.48	.37	.01 (.24)	-.18 (.48)
	Older	None	1.99	.56	-.15 (.35)	-.77 (.67)

(a) Univariate within-cell outliers adjusted to closest nonoutlying value in data distribution.

(b) Modified Striving Instrumentality Matrix; higher scale scores indicate more unfavorable intergoal relations

Table B 2. *Description of Intergoal Conflict and Facilitation Composite Scales in Younger and Older Adults*

Composite Scale	Sample	Transformation? (a)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Skew (SE)</i>	<i>Kurt (SE)</i>
T1 Facilitation	Younger	2 outliers	2.08	.51	.26 (.24)	-.36 (.48)
	Older	None	2.59	.78	.36 (.35)	-1.02 (.69)
T1 Conflict	Younger	None	1.88	.43	.04 (.24)	-.59 (.48)
	Older	None	1.61	.49	.45 (.35)	-.47 (.69)

(a) Univariate within-cell outliers adjusted to closest nonoutlying value in data distribution

⁸⁹ For the purpose of investigating differences in endorsements of the various sources of intergoal conflict and facilitation, I used different subscale transformations than for the purpose of investigating the dimensionality of the intergoal conflict and facilitation questionnaire (see Table A 2). The reason for this was that *differential* transformations of the various subscales were inappropriate for the purpose of within-group comparisons.

Table B 3. *Description of Potential Correlates of Intergoal Conflict and Facilitation in the Total Sample, the Subsamples of Younger and Older Adults, and Tests for Age-Group Mean Differences*

Scale	Transformation? (a)	Sample	M	SD	Skew (SE)	Kurt (SE)
Person characteristics						
T1 Social desirability	2 outliers (younger)	Total	9.81	3.20	-.37 (.20)	-.60 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	8.97	3.04	-.26 (.24)	-.52 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	11.64	2.78	-.90 (.35)	.15 (.69)
					$F(1) = 25.62, p = .00, \eta^2 = .15$	
T1 Ambiguity intolerance	None	Total	3.18	.53	.16 (.20)	-.44 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	3.29	.52	-.10 (.24)	-.37 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	2.95	.46	.73 (.35)	1.03 (.69)
					$F(1) = 14.52, p = .00, \eta^2 = .09$	
<i>Coordinating Multiple Goals</i>						
T1 Prioritizing/ Sequencing	None	Total	3.12	.68	.03 (.20)	-.16 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	2.91	.59	-.05 (.24)	-.30 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	3.57	.66	-.47 (.35)	1.01 (.69)
					$F(1) = 36.47, p = .00, \eta^2 = .20$	
T1 Compromising	None	Total	3.03	.70	-.32 (.20)	-.62 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	3.00	.68	-.29 (.24)	-.75 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	3.10	.77	-.44 (.35)	-.39 (.69)
					$F(1) = .56, p = .45, \eta^2 = .00$	
T1 Distancing	1 outlier (younger)	Total	3.54	.65	-.10 (.20)	-.24 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	3.46	.61	-.12 (.24)	-.48 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	3.70	.69	-.26 (.35)	.21 (.69)
					$F(1) = 4.68, p = .03, \eta^2 = .03$	
<i>Personality Traits</i>						
T1 Neuroticism	None	Total	2.50	.68	.24 (.20)	-.21 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	2.53	.70	.17 (.24)	-.25 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	2.43	.64	.40 (.35)	.04 (.69)
					$F(1) = .62, p = .43, \eta^2 = .00$	
T1 Extraversion	None	Total	3.46	.54	-.05 (.20)	-.38 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	3.67	.52	-.08 (.24)	-.48 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	3.28	.47	-.26 (.35)	-.52 (.69)
					$F(1) = 18.55, p = .00, \eta^2 = .12$	
T1 Openness to experi- ence	None	Total	3.58	.53	-.11 (.20)	-.63 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	3.68	.52	-.33 (.24)	-.38 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	3.36	.50	.31 (.35)	-.29 (.69)
					$F(1) = 11.83, p = .00, \eta^2 = .08$	
T1 Conscientiousness	1 outlier (younger)	Total	3.61	.61	-.20 (.20)	-.33 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	3.52	.61	-.31 (.24)	-.64 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	3.80	.57	.15 (.35)	.01 (.69)
					$F(1) = 7.02, p = .01, \eta^2 = .05$	

(table continues)

Table B 3. (continued)

Scale	Transformation? (a)	Sample	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skew (SE)	Kurt (SE)
T1 Agreeableness	1 outlier (younger)	Total	3.81	.49	-.43 (.20)	.41 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	3.75	.50	-.34 (.24)	.24 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	3.94	.46	-.62 (.35)	1.44 (.69)
$F(1) = 4.35, p = .04, \eta^2 = .03$						
<i>SOC – Strategies</i>						
T1 Elective selection	None	Total	.41	.31	.39 (.20)	-.84 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	.37	.28	.55 (.24)	-.42 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	.51	.34	-.06 (.35)	-1.22 (.69)
$F(1) = 8.19, p = .01, \eta^2 = .06$						
T1 Loss-based selection	Reflect and logarithm ($\ln[2 - X]$)	Total	.25	.19	.34 (.20)	-.63 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	.25	.20	.35 (.24)	-.79 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	.24	.18	.53 (.35)	-.11 (.69)
$F(1) = .06, p = .80, \eta^2 = .00$						
T1 Optimization	Reflect and logarithm ($\ln[2 - X]$) and 1 outlier (older)	Total	.25	.16	.21 (.20)	-.41 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	.24	.15	.22 (.24)	-.37 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	.26	.16	.17 (.35)	-.41 (.69)
$F(1) = .34, p = .57, \eta^2 = .00$						
T1 Compensation	Reflect and logarithm ($\ln[2 - X]$) and 17 out- liers (8 younger, 9 older)	Total	.21	.15	-.08 (.20)	-1.33 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	.20	.14	-.07 (.24)	-1.20 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	.22	.17	-.13 (.35)	-1.57 (.69)
$F(1) = .28, p = .60, \eta^2 = .00$						
B) Goal characteristics (average across all four goals)						
T1 Resource intensity	1 outlier (older)	Total	3.33	.44	-.04 (.20)	-.00 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	3.33	.41	.28 (.24)	-.19 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	3.32	.51	-.40 (.35)	.01 (.69)
$F(1) = .00, p = .98, \eta^2 = .00$						
T1 Internal control	Reflect and inverse ($1/[6 - X]$)	Total	.75	.20	-.17 (.20)	-.82 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	.75	.18	.09 (.24)	-.97 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	.74	.24	-.39 (.35)	-1.06 (.69)
$F(1) = .01, p = .94, \eta^2 = .00$						
T1 External control	Square root and 9 out- liers (1 younger, 8 older)	Total	1.61	.22	.20 (.20)	-.48 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	1.59	.18	.18 (.24)	-.47 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	1.65	.27	-.08 (.35)	-1.01 (.69)
$F(1) = 2.35, p = .13, \eta^2 = .02$						

Note. Multivariate age-group difference: $F(17, 126) = 6.30, p = .00, \eta^2 = .46$ (Wilks' Lambda)

(a) Univariate outliers adjusted to closest nonoutlying value in data distribution

Table B 4. *Subjective Well-Being at T1 and T2: Description of Data Distributions in the Total Sample, the Subsamples of Younger and Older Adults, and Tests for Age-Group Mean Differences*

	Transformation? (a)	Sample	M	SD	Skew (SE)	Kurt (SE)
Positive Psychological Functioning (Ryff Scales)						
T1	None	Total	3.77	.37	.05 (.20)	-.21 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	3.78	.36	-.15 (.24)	.20 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	3.74	.38	.46 (.35)	-.74 (.69)
$F(1) = .39, p = .53, \eta^2 = .00$						
T2	1 outlier (younger)	Total	3.80	.39	-.12 (.20)	-.23 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	3.82	.40	-.28 (.25)	-.07 (.49)
		<i>Older</i>	3.76	.37	.28 (.35)	-.36 (.70)
$F(1) = .82, p = .37, \eta^2 = .01$						
Emotional Well-Being						
Positive affect						
T1	None	Total	13.82	2.60	-.23 (.20)	-.40 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	13.43	2.46	-.29 (.24)	-.55 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	14.64	2.72	-.37 (.35)	-.12 (.69)
$F(1) = 7.11, p = .01, \eta^2 = .05$						
T2	None	Total	13.55	2.52	-.32 (.20)	-.26 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	13.30	2.38	-.48 (.25)	.35 (.49)
		<i>Older</i>	14.11	2.75	-.28 (.35)	-1.18 (.70)
$F(1) = 3.26, p = .07, \eta^2 = .02$						
Negative affect						
T1	None	Total	10.87	2.75	.20 (.20)	-.69 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	11.10	2.67	.36 (.24)	-.61 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	10.37	2.88	-.01 (.35)	-1.10 (.69)
$F(1) = 2.21, p = .14, \eta^2 = .02$						
T2	None	Total	10.13	2.72	.37 (.20)	-.33 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	10.79	2.48	.36 (.25)	-.29 (.49)
		<i>Older</i>	10.11	3.15	.58 (.35)	-.36 (.70)
$F(1) = 1.97, p = .16, \eta^2 = .01$						
Life Satisfaction (Global)						
T1	None	Total	-.00	.78	-.26 (.20)	-.03 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	-.02	.75	-.44 (.24)	.35 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	.04	.81	.06 (.35)	-.71 (.69)
$F(1) = .23, p = .63, \eta^2 = .00$						

(table continues)

Table B 4. (continued)

	Transformation? (a)	Sample	<i>M</i>	SD	Skew (SE)	Kurt (SE)
T2	5 outliers (3 younger, 2 older)	Total	.02	.74	-.21 (.20)	-.32 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	.03	.72	-.28 (.25)	-.01 (.49)
		<i>Older</i>	.00	.81	-.09 (.35)	-.76 (.70)
$F(1) = .03, p = .87, \eta^2 = .00$						
Goal-Specific Satisfaction (b)						
T1	6 outliers (2 younger, 4 older)	Total	4.70	.77	.01 (.20)	-.44 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	4.59	.66	-.07 (.24)	.04 (.48)
		<i>Older</i>	4.93	.94	-.34 (.35)	-.96 (.69)
$F(1) = 6.52, p = .01, \eta^2 = .04$						
T2	5 outliers (3 younger, 2 older)	Total	4.70	.84	.01 (.20)	-.37 (.40)
		<i>Younger</i>	4.59	.75	.08 (.25)	-.10 (.49)
		<i>Older</i>	4.95	.96	-.38 (.35)	-.49 (.70)
$F(1) = 5.93, p = .02, \eta^2 = .04$						

Note. Multivariate age-group differences: T1 - $F(5, 139) = 3.01, p = .01, \eta^2 = .10$ (Wilks' Lambda); T2 - $F(5, 136) = 2.49, p = .03, \eta^2 = .08$ (Wilks' Lambda)

(a) Univariate outliers adjusted to closest nonoutlying value in data distribution

(b) Average across all four goals

Table B 5. Pearson's Correlations Among Facets of Subjective Well-Being at T1 (Above Diagonal) and T2 (Below Diagonal)

	Ryff scales	Pos. affect	Neg. affect	Life satisf.	Goal satisf.
Ryff scales		.41 **	-.34 **	.75 **	.28 **
Pos. affect	.30 **		-.67 **	.55 **	.42 **
Neg. affect	-.23 **	-.72 **		-.55 **	-.42 **
Life satisf.	.66 **	.56 **	-.51 **		.49 **
Goal satisf.	.31 **	.39 **	-.33 **	.46 **	

** $p < .001$

Note. Ryff scales – Positive Psychological Functioning, Pos. affect – Positive affect, Neg. affect – Negative affect, Life satisf. – Life satisfaction (global), Goal satisf. – Goal-specific satisfaction

Table B 6. Self-Reported Goal Progress at T2: Description of Data Distributions in the Total Sample, the Subsamples of Younger and Older Adults, and Tests for Age-Group Mean Difference

Transformation? (a)	Sample	<i>M</i>	SD	Skew (SE)	Kurt (SE)
4 outliers (1 younger, 3 older)	Total	4.88	.78	.06 (.20)	-.30 (.40)
	<i>Younger</i>	4.82	.75	.10 (.25)	-.33 (.49)
	<i>Older</i>	5.00	.84	-.08 (.35)	-.17 (.70)
$F(1) = 1.71, p = .19, \eta^2 = .01$					

(a) Univariate outliers adjusted to closest nonoutlying value in data distribution

Table B 7. *Description of Exercise-Specific Intergoal Conflict and Facilitation at T1 in the Total Sample and in the Subsamples of Younger and Older Adults*

Scale	Transformation? (a)	Sample	M	SD	Skew (SE)	Kurt (SE)
T1 Exercise-specific conflict	1 outlier (younger)	Total	1.71	.45	.13 (.20)	-.66 (.40)
		Younger	1.77	.42	.07 (.24)	-.50 (.48)
		Older	1.57	.48	.48 (.35)	-.58 (.69)
T1 Exercise-specific facilitation	Square root	Total	1.45	.25	.09 (.20)	-.29 (.40)
		Younger	1.39	.23	-.13 (.24)	-.24 (.48)
		Older	1.58	.26	-.08 (.35)	-.86 (.69)

(a) Univariate outliers adjusted to closest nonoutlying value in data distribution

Table B 8. *Description of Potential Correlates of the Exercise-Specific Intergoal Conflict and Facilitation Composites in the Total Sample, the Subsamples of Younger and Older Adults, and Tests for Age-Group Mean Differences*

Scale	Transformation? (a)	Sample	M	SD	Skew (SE)	Kurt (SE)
Reasons for Exercise						
T1 Attractiveness	None	Total	2.82	1.09	.09 (.20)	-.75 (.40)
		Younger	3.05	1.06	-.03 (.24)	-.74 (.48)
		Older	2.33	.98	.29 (.35)	-.59 (.69)
$F(1) = 15.29, p = .00, \eta^2 = .10$						
T1 Enjoyment	None	Total	3.31	.92	-.28 (.20)	-.13 (.40)
		Younger	3.20	.90	-.30 (.24)	-.05 (.48)
		Older	3.54	.95	-.39 (.35)	-.10 (.69)
$F(1) = 4.26, p = .04, \eta^2 = .03$						
T1 Fitness	None	Total	3.39	.70	-.26 (.20)	-.38 (.40)
		Younger	3.41	.70	-.29 (.24)	-.28 (.48)
		Older	3.36	.70	-.20 (.35)	-.51 (.69)
$F(1) = .16, p = .69, \eta^2 = .00$						
T1 Health	5 outliers (younger)	Total	4.20	.66	-.74 (.20)	-.33 (.40)
		Younger	4.05	.67	-.60 (.24)	-.56 (.48)
		Older	4.51	.54	-1.17 (.35)	.70 (.69)
$F(1) = 16.17, p = .00, \eta^2 = .10$						
T1 Mood regulation	None	Total	3.25	.81	.06 (.20)	-.69 (.40)
		Younger	3.21	.78	.06 (.24)	-.77 (.48)
		Older	3.34	.88	.01 (.35)	-.61 (.69)
$F(1) = .90, p = .35, \eta^2 = .01$						
T1 Tone	4 outliers (2 younger, 2 older)	Total	3.48	.98	-.59 (.20)	-.35 (.40)
		Younger	3.58	.92	-.85 (.24)	-.27 (.48)
		Older	3.25	1.09	-.11 (.35)	-.87 (.69)
$F(1) = 3.58, p = .06, \eta^2 = .02$						

(table continues)

Table B 8. (continued)

Scale	Transformation ² (a)	Sample	M	SD	Skew (SE)	Kurt (SE)
T1 Weight control	None	Total	2.98	1.13	-.11 (.20)	-.89 (.40)
		Younger	2.88	1.08	-.13 (.24)	-.95 (.48)
		Older	3.20	1.22	-.20 (.35)	-.87 (.69)
$F(1) = 2.49, p = .12, \eta^2 = .02$						
Exercise-Specific Person Characteristics						
T1 Self-efficacy	1 outliers (older)	Total	3.66	.53	.04 (.20)	-.39 (.40)
		Younger	3.65	.44	.15 (.24)	-.59 (.48)
		Older	3.69	.70	-.09 (.35)	-.95 (.69)
$F(1) = .05, p = .83, \eta^2 = .00$						
T1 Intention strength	None	Total	2.52	.51	-.37 (.20)	-1.42 (.40)
		Younger	2.44	.52	-.15 (.24)	-1.44 (.48)
		Older	2.70	.44	-.88 (.35)	-1.14 (.69)
$F(1) = 2.35, p = .19, \eta^2 = .02$						
T2 Exercise enjoyment	Inverse and logarithm (ln[8-X])	Total	.63	.39	.24 (.20)	-.80 (.40)
		Younger	.70	.36	.26 (.25)	-.57 (.49)
		Older	.46	.41	.62 (.35)	-.87 (.70)
$F(1) = 4.54, p = .04, \eta^2 = .04$ (b)						
Exercise Context – Accessibility of ...						
T2 Social contact	None	Total	3.38	.93	-.04 (.20)	-.54 (.40)
		Younger	3.36	.92	-.12 (.25)	-.44 (.49)
		Older	3.44	.96	.11 (.35)	-.72 (.70)
$F(1) = .20, p = .65, \eta^2 = .00$						
T2 Information and instruction	None	Total	2.55	.99	.34 (.20)	-.62 (.40)
		Younger	2.36	.91	.42 (.25)	-.49 (.49)
		Older	2.97	1.05	-.01 (.35)	-.74 (.70)
$F(1) = 9.29, p = .00, \eta^2 = .07$						
T2 Wellness and care facilities	None	Total	2.31	1.29	.51 (.20)	-1.09 (.40)
		Younger	2.21	1.26	.60 (.25)	-1.08 (.49)
		Older	2.53	1.33	.34 (.35)	-1.08 (.70)
$F(1) = 1.94, p = .17, \eta^2 = .02$						
Exercise Biography						
T1 Years since end of last exercise phase (c)	Inverse (1/[X + 1]) and 5 outliers (4 younger, 1 older)	Total	.26	.18	.79 (.22)	-.10 (.44)
		Younger	.29	.17	.69 (.25)	-.20 (.50)
		Older	.16	.19	1.92 (.43)	3.21 (.85)
$F(1) = 11.88, p = .00, \eta^2 = .09$ (b)						
T1 Total duration of prior exercise phases (in years) (d)	Logarithm (ln[X + 1])	Total	1.54	1.00	-.19 (.20)	-1.03 (.40)
		Younger	1.60	.84	-.36 (.24)	-.91 (.48)
		Older	1.42	1.27	.10 (.35)	-1.49 (.69)
$F(1) = .96, p = .33, \eta^2 = .01$						

(table continues)

Table B 8. (continued)

Scale	Transformation ² (a)	Sample	M	SD	Skew (SE)	Kurt (SE)
					Frequency (Percent)	
					Not yet started	Less than 1 month
						More than 1 month
T1	Duration of current exercise phase	None	Total	64 (44.4)	43 (29.9)	37 (25.7)
			Younger	59 (59.6)	30 (30.3)	10 (10.1)
			Older	5 (11.1)	13 (28.9)	27 (60.0)

 $\chi^2(2) = 46.36, p = .00$

Note. Multivariate age-group difference (excluding duration of current exercise phase): $F(15, 102) = 5.38, p = .00, \eta^2 = .44$ (Wilks' Lambda)

(a) Univariate outliers adjusted to closest nonoutlying value in data distribution

(b) Consider that variable transformation (inverse) affects interpretation: Variable mean is larger in the older age group

(c) $N_{\text{total}} = 121, n_{\text{younger}} = 92, n_{\text{older}} = 29$ (only participants who had already exercised before)

(d) Cases with no prior exercise experience set at zero; one missing case in the older subsample

Table B 9. Exercise Participation in the Study Interval: Variable Descriptions in the Total Sample and the Younger and Older Subsamples

Scale	Transformation ² (a)	Sample	M	SD	Skew (SE)	Kurt (SE)	
Self-Reported Exercise Behavior ($N_{\text{total}} = 142, n_{\text{younger}} = 97, n_{\text{older}} = 45$)							
T2	Exercise duration	2 outliers (older)	Total	2.80	1.06	.15 (.20)	-.01 (.40)
			Younger	2.73	1.03	-.09 (.25)	-.07 (.49)
			Older	2.95	1.13	.48 (.35)	-.18 (.70)
T2	Exercise regularity	None	Total	3.34	1.26	-.58 (.20)	-.34 (.40)
			Younger	3.03	1.21	-.39 (.25)	-.45 (.49)
			Older	4.00	1.12	-1.50 (.35)	2.46 (.70)
T2	Exercise frequency	7 outliers (2 younger, 5 older)	Total	5.39	2.50	.18 (.20)	-.88 (.40)
			Younger	5.22	2.47	.17 (.25)	-.81 (.49)
			Older	5.75	2.55	.19 (.35)	-1.09 (.70)
T2	Percent realization of intended monthly exercise rate (b)	4 outliers (1 younger, 3 older)	Total	.73	.30	-.04 (.20)	-.28 (.41)
			Younger	.68	.29	.17 (.25)	.09 (.49)
			Older	.85	.30	-.61 (.36)	.24 (.70)
Objective Exercise Behavior ($N_{\text{total}} = 107, n_{\text{younger}} = 90, n_{\text{older}} = 37$)							
T2	Exercise frequency	11 outlier (5 younger, 6 older)	Total	2.62	1.64	.59 (.23)	-.19 (.46)
			Younger	2.36	1.55	.80 (.29)	.22 (.57)
			Older	3.12	1.69	.27 (.39)	-.26 (.76)

(a) Univariate outliers adjusted to closest nonoutlying value in data distribution

(b) Percent realization of intended monthly exercise rate: Self-reported monthly exercise frequency (assessed at T2) divided by originally intended monthly exercise frequency (assessed at T1)

Table B 10. *Pearson Correlations of Mean Self-Reported Exercise Duration, Regularity, and Frequency (T2) in the Total Sample (N = 142)*

Average Monthly Exercise ...	Duration		Regularity		Frequency		% Realization
Regularity	.59	**	1.00				
Frequency	.47	**	.51	**	1.00		
Percent realization (a)	.45	**	.70	**	.52	**	1.00

** $p = .000$

(a) Percent realization of intended monthly exercise rate: self-reported monthly exercise frequency (assessed at T2) divided by originally intended monthly exercise frequency (assessed at T1)

7.3. Appendix C: Age-Group Differences in Intergoal Conflict and Facilitation After Excluding the Exercise Goal

Age-Group Differences on the Subscale Level

Table C 1. *Distribution of Intergoal Conflict and Facilitation Subscales in Subsamples of Younger and Older Adults after Exclusion of Exercise-Specific Responses*

Subscale	Sample	Transformation? (a)	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Skew (SE)</i>	<i>Kurt (SE)</i>
Conflict						
T1 Time constraints	Younger	None	2.71	.74	-.07 (.24)	-.52 (.48)
	Older	None	2.18	.74	.24 (.35)	-.62 (.69)
T1 Financial constraints	Younger	2 outliers	1.64	.62	.58 (.24)	-.90 (.48)
	Older	3 outliers	1.64	.75	1.08 (.35)	.09 (.69)
T1 Energy constraints	Younger	None	2.70	.71	.13 (.24)	-.40 (.48)
	Older	None	2.17	.90	.50 (.35)	-.19 (.69)
T1 Incompatible strategies	Younger	None	2.59	.89	-.19 (.24)	-.10 (.48)
	Older	1 outlier	2.11	.85	.61 (.35)	-.50 (.69)
Facilitation						
T1 Instrumental relations	Younger	2 outliers	2.96	.75	.06 (.24)	-.21 (.48)
	Older	1 outlier	3.46	1.18	-.10 (.35)	-1.37 (.69)
T1 Strategy Overlap	Younger	None	2.91	.81	-.06 (.24)	-.08 (.48)
	Older	None	3.30	1.06	.10 (.35)	-.80 (.69)
Overall Evaluation						
T1 SIM (b)	Younger	None	2.59	.67	-.04 (.24)	-.02 (.48)
	Older	None	2.09	.74	.07 (.35)	-.80 (.69)

(a) Univariate within-cell outliers adjusted to closest nonoutlying value in data distribution

(b) Modified Striving Instrumentality Matrix; higher scale scores indicate more unfavorable intergoal relations

Multivariate analysis. A 2 (age group) by 7 (subscale) repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) yielded a significant subscale main effect ($F(6, 138) = 56.50, p < .001, \eta^2 = .71$) and a significant subscale-by-age-group interaction ($F(6, 138) = 5.23, p < .001, \eta^2 = .19$) according to Wilks' Lambda, which remained significant after applying the conservative Greenhouse-Geisser correction (critical value for an alpha level of .05: $F(2.71, 62.38) = 2.84$).

Follow-up analyses 1: Within-age-group relevance of the various sources of intergoal conflict and facilitation. Repeated measures ANOVAs, conducted separately in each age group on the intergoal conflict and facilitation subscales, yielded significant effects of the within-subjects factor in the younger and the older subsample ($F(6, 93) = 54.34, p < .001, \eta^2 = .78$ and $F(6, 40) = 16.57, p < .001, \eta^2 = .71$, respectively), which remained significant after applying the Greenhouse-Geisser correction for departure from sphericity (critical values for $p = .05$: $F(2.92, 45.29) = 2.83$ and $F(2.23, 14.88) = 3.57$, respectively). Table C 2 shows results of univariate follow-up analyses (paired-sample t tests) with alpha adjustment for inflated Type I error.

Table C 2. Differences in Subscale Mean Endorsements in the Younger (Above Diagonal) and Older (Below Diagonal) Subsamples: Significance of Paired-Sample *t* Tests

	Conflict				Facilitation	
	I	II	III	IV	I	II
Conflict						
T1 Time constraints		**	n.s.	n.s.	*	*
T1 Financial constraints	**		**	**	**	**
T1 Energy constraints	n.s.	**		n.s.	*	**
T1 Incompatible strategies	n.s.	**	n.s.		**	**
Facilitation						
T1 Strategy overlap	**	**	**	**		n.s.
T1 Instrumental relations	**	**	**	**	n.s.	

** $p < .01$ (alpha adjustment for five contrast per subscale)

Follow-up analyses 2: Age-group differences in intergoal conflict and facilitation. A multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) indicated significant age-group differences of the seven combined conflict and facilitation subscale scores according to Wilks' Lambda ($F(7, 137) = 4.57, p < .001, \eta^2 = .19$). Table C 3 shows results of univariate follow-up analyses (ANOVAs).

Table C 3. Univariate Follow-Up Analyses of Age-Group Differences in Mean Scores of the Intergoal Conflict and Facilitation Subscales

Subscale	Mean (SE)		Univariate <i>F</i>	df	$p^{(a)}$	η^2
	Young Adults	Older Adults				
T1 Time constraints	2.71 (.08)	2.18 (.11)	16.18	1	.000	.10
T1 Financial constraints	1.65 (.07)	1.64 (.10)	.00	1	.975	.00
T1 Energy constraints	2.70 (.08)	2.17 (.11)	14.96	1	.000	.10
T1 Incompatible strategies	2.59 (.09)	2.11 (.13)	9.54	1	.002	.06
T1 Strategy overlap	2.92 (.09)	3.30 (.13)	5.82	1	.017	.04
T1 Instrumental relations	2.96 (.09)	3.46 (.13)	9.45	1	.003	.06
T1 Modified SIM ^(b)	2.59 (.07)	2.09 (.10)	15.87	1	.000	.10

(a) $p < .007$ (alpha adjustment for seven comparisons)

(b) Modified Striving Instrumentality Matrix, higher scale scores indicate more unfavorable intergoal relations

Comparison of results obtained in analyses with and without inclusion of exercise-specific intergoal conflict and facilitation. On an alpha level of .05, both series of analyses yielded exactly the same pattern of mean differences between subscale endorsements (both within and between age groups). In four instances, results that were significant according to the conservative alpha adjustment for multiple testing in one analysis did not meet this criterion in the other: Analyses based on intergoal relations among all four goals (i.e., including the exercise goal) showed that younger adults reported to experience significantly more intergoal facilitation (resulting from both overlap in goal attainment strategies and instrumental intergoal relations) than intergoal conflict caused by time constraints. After exclusion of exercise-specific intergoal conflict and facilitation

tion, these differences remained significant at the .05 level, but not at the level according to the conservative alpha adjustment for multiple testing. Also in the younger age group, the mean difference between the frequency of incompatible versus overlapping goal attainment strategies was only marginally significant in the analyses based on all four goals ($p < .05$), but met the conservative alpha adjustment after exclusion of the exercise goal. Finally, in both series of analyses, mean endorsements of overlap in goal attainment strategies were higher in the older than in the younger age group. After exclusion of the exercise goal, this difference was significant at the .05 level, but not according to the alpha adjustment for multiple testing. Overall, the results were remarkably stable in analyses based on all four goals and on only the three self-generated ones. The observed age-group differences thus do not appear to be an artifact of the shared goal context chosen for this study.

Age-Group Differences on the Composite Score Level

Table C 4. *Description of the Intergoal Conflict and Facilitation Composite Scales in the Younger and Older Subsamples*

Composite Scale	Sample	Transformation? ^a	<i>M</i>	SD	Skew (SE)	Kurt (SE)
T1 Facilitation	Younger	1 outlier	2.18	.62	.26 (.24)	-.09 (.48)
	Older	None	2.58	.88	.23 (.35)	-1.05 (.69)
T1 Conflict	Younger	None	1.99	.52	.02 (.24)	-.75 (.48)
	Older	None	1.65	.55	.45 (.35)	-.22 (.69)

(a) Univariate within-cell outliers adjusted to closest nonoutlying value in data distribution

Multivariate analysis. A 2 (young versus old) by 2 (conflict versus facilitation) repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) yielded a significant main effect of the within-subjects factor (conflict versus facilitation: $F(1, 143) = 46.31, p < .001, \eta^2 = .25$) and a significant interaction ($F(1, 143) = 19.60, p < .001, \eta^2 = .12$) according to Wilks' Lambda.

Follow-up analyses 1: Within-age-group relevance of intergoal conflict and facilitation. Paired-sample *t* tests, conducted separately in both age groups, revealed that younger ($t(98) = -2.40, p = .019$) as well as older participants ($t(45) = -5.58, p = .000$) reported to experience significantly more often intergoal facilitation than conflict.

Follow-up analyses 2: Age-group differences in intergoal conflict and facilitation. A multivariate analysis of variance with type III sum of squares method conducted on the conflict and facilitation composite scales yielded a significant multivariate age-group effect according to Wilks' Lambda ($F(2, 142) = 10.21, p < .001, \eta^2 = .13$). Univariate follow-up analyses (ANOVAs) showed that younger participants reported significantly more total intergoal conflict ($F(1) = 13.23, p < .001, \eta^2 = .09$) and significantly less total intergoal facilitation ($F(1) = 9.71, p < .002, \eta^2 = .06$) than did the older participants.

Comparison of results obtained in analyses with and without inclusion of exercise-specific intergoal conflict and facilitation. Both series of analyses yielded the same pattern of results, which thus are not unique to the focal goal context chosen for this study.

7.4. Appendix D: Additional Control Analyses in Study Part 1

Intergoal Relations and Subjective Well-Being: Control Analyses

Control variables. To be conservative, I considered all variables with significant correlations to either intergoal conflict or facilitation at the .05 level as potential rival predictors that might account for significant associations between intergoal conflict and facilitation and various facets of psychological well-being (see Table 17). All control variables were assessed at the first measurement point.

Procedure. I obtained partial correlations to assess the stability of *bivariate* associations after controlling for rival predictors. For the assessment of the stability of *multiple* associations, I conducted sequential (hierarchical) multiple regression analyses. In the first step, the control variable(s) were entered into the models. In the second step, the intergoal conflict and facilitation composites were simultaneously added to the prediction. Table D 1 shows the change in the percentages of the variance explained (ΔR^2) after adding intergoal conflict and facilitation.

Table D 1. *Control Analyses for the Relations Between Intergoal Conflict and Facilitation and Several Indicators of Subjective Well-Being in Study Part I: Partial Correlations and R²-Change*

	Bivariate		Multiple
	Facilitation (T1)	Conflict (T1)	
I. Cross-Sectional Associations with Subjective Well-Being at T1			
<i>A) Positive Psychological Functioning (T1): Total Sample</i>			
Original relation	$r = .11$ n.s.	$r = -.23$ **	R = .25 *
<i>Controlled for</i>	<i>Partial Correlation</i>		ΔR^2
A) Person Characteristics			
Compromising	-	-.22 **	.06 *
Agreeableness	-	-.20 *	.05 *
Compensation	-	-.18 *	.03 *
B) Goal Characteristics			
Internal control	-	-.21 *	.05 *
External control	-	-.21 *	.05 *
Resource intensity	-	-.22 **	.06 *
C) All	-	-.14 +	.02 n.s.
<i>B) Positive Affect (T1): Older Subsample Only</i>			
Original relation	$r = .21$ n.s.	$r = -.40$ **	R = .40 *
<i>Controlled for</i>	<i>Partial Correlation</i>		ΔR^2
A) Person Characteristics			
Compromising	-	-.39 ** (.008)	.16 *
Agreeableness	-	-.33 *	.10 + (.091)
Compensation	-	-.36 *	.13 *

(table continues)

Table D 1. (continued)

	Bivariate		Multiple
	Facilitation (T1)	Conflict (T1)	
B) Goal Characteristics			
Internal control	-	-.31 *	.09 n.s.
External control	-	-.37 *	.13 *
Resource intensity	-	-.35 *	.12 + (.060)
C) All	-	-.17 n.s.	.03 n.s.
<i>C) Negative Affect (T1): Total Sample</i>			
Original relation	$r = .02$ n.s.	$r = -.25$ **	$R = .25$ *
<i>Controlled for</i>	<i>Partial Correlation</i>		ΔR^2
A) Person Characteristics			
Compromising	-	.23 ** (.005)	.05 *
Agreeableness	-	.24 **	.06 *
Compensation	-	.22 **	.05 *
B) Goal Characteristics			
Internal control	-	.24 **	.06 *
External control	-	.23 **	.05 *
Resource intensity	-	.20 *	.04 +
C) All	-	.14 +	.02 n.s.
<i>D) Life Satisfaction (T1): Total Sample</i>			
Original relation	$r = .00$ n.s.	$r = -.19$ *	$R = .19$ n.s.
<i>Controlled for</i>	<i>Partial Correlation</i>		ΔR^2
A) Person Characteristics			
Compromising	-	-.16 +	-
Agreeableness	-	-.16 +	-
Compensation	-	-.16 +	-
B) Goal Characteristics			
Internal control	-	-.17 *	-
External control	-	-.17 *	-
Resource intensity	-	-.16 +	-
C) All	-	.07 n.s.	-
<i>E) Goal-Specific Satisfaction (T1): Total Sample</i>			
Original relation	$r = .02$ n.s.	$r = -.24$ **	$R = .24$ *
<i>Controlled for</i>	<i>Partial Correlation</i>		ΔR^2
A) Person Characteristics			
Compromising	-	-.23 **	.05 *
Agreeableness	-	-.21 *	.04 *
Compensation	-	-.22 **	.05 *
B) Goal Characteristics			
Internal control	-	-.23 **	.05 *
External control	-	-.22 **	.05 *
Resource intensity	-	-.20 *	.04 *
C) All	-	-.14 n.s.	.02 n.s.

(table continues)

Table D 1. (continued)

	Bivariate		Multiple
	Facilitation (T1)	Conflict (T1)	
II. Longitudinal Associations with Subjective Well-Being at T2			
<i>F) Goal-Specific Satisfaction (T2): Total Sample</i>			
Original relation	$r = .15$ *	$r = -.22$ **	$R = .26$ *
<i>Controlled for</i>	<i>Partial Correlation</i>		ΔR^2
A) Person Characteristics			
Compromising	.16 +	-.21 *	.06 *
Agreeableness	.16 +	-.17 *	.05 *
Compensation	.12 n.s.	-.19 *	.05 *
B) Goal Characteristics			
Internal control	.12 n.s.	-.21 *	.05 *
External control	.16 +	-.21 *	.06 *
Resource intensity	.15 +	-.22 **	.07 *
C) All			
	.12 n.s.	-.13 n.s.	.03 n.s.

n.s. $p > .10$; + $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

Exercise-Specific Intergoal Relations and Average Exercise Participation in the Study Interval: Control Analyses

Control variables. To be conservative, I considered all variables with significant correlations to either exercise-specific intergoal conflict or facilitation at the .05 level as potential rival predictors that might account for significant associations between exercise-specific intergoal conflict and facilitation and various characteristics of the average exercise behavior during the study interval (see Table 27). All control variables were assessed at the first measurement point.

Procedure. For the assessment of the stability of multiple associations between exercise-specific intergoal conflict and facilitation and exercise behavior characteristics, I conducted sequential (hierarchical) multiple regression analyses. In the first step, the control variable(s) were entered into the models. In the second step, the exercise-specific intergoal conflict and facilitation composites were simultaneously added to the prediction. Table D 2 shows multiple correlations (R), percentages of the variance explained (R^2), and the change in the percentages of the variance explained (ΔR^2) after adding conflict and facilitation.

Table D 2. *Control Analyses for the Relation Between Exercise-Specific Intergoal Conflict and Facilitation and the Average Exercise Participation During the Study Interval: Sequential (Hierarchical) Multiple Regression*

	R	R ²	Δ R ²
<i>A) Predicting Mean Self-Reported Exercise Duration in Study Interval (N = 142)</i>			
<i>1. Control Variables: Reasons for Exercise</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> Fitness	.03 n.s.	.00	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.28 **	.08	.08 **
<i>Step 1</i> Health	.12 n.s.	.01	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.28 **	.08	.07 **
<i>Step 1</i> Mood regulation	.06 n.s.	.00	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.31 **	.09	.09 **
<i>Step 1</i> Tone	.04 n.s.	.00	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.29 **	.09	.09 **
<i>Step 1</i> Weight control	.01 n.s.	.00	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.29 **	.08	.08 **
<i>2. Control Variables: Exercise-Specific Person Characteristics</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> Exercise-specific self-efficacy	.09 n.s.	.01	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.28 **	.08	.07 **
<i>Step 1</i> Intention strength	.05 n.s.	.00	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.29 **	.08	.08 **
<i>Step 1</i> Exercise enjoyment	.31 **	.10	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.37 **	.14	.04 *
<i>3. Control Variables: Exercise Context – Accessibility of ...</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> Social contact	.19 *	.03	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.32 **	.10	.07 **
<i>Step 1</i> Information and instruction	.31 **	.09	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.39 **	.15	.05 *
<i>Step 1</i> Wellness facilities	.24 **	.06	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.33 **	.11	.05 *
<i>4. Control Variables: Exercise Biography</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> Years since end of last phase of exercising	.03 n.s.	.00	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.29 *	.09	.09 **
<i>5. Control Variables: All</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> All control variables	.45 *	.20	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.49 **	.24	.04 +
<i>B) Predicting Mean Self-Reported Exercise Regularity in Study Interval (N = 142)</i>			
<i>1. Control Variables: Reasons for Exercise</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> Fitness	.02 n.s.	.00	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.29 **	.08	.08 **
<i>Step 1</i> Health	.29 **	.08	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.36 **	.13	.05 *
<i>Step 1</i> Mood regulation	.03 n.s.	.00	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.29 **	.09	.09 **

(table continues)

Table D 2. (continues)

		R	R ²	ΔR^2
<i>Step 1</i>	Tone	.02 n.s.	.00	
<i>Step 2</i>	Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.29 **	.08	.08 **
<i>Step 1</i>	Weight control	.10 n.s.	.01	
<i>Step 2</i>	Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.29 **	.08	.07 **
<i>2. Control Variables: Exercise-Specific Person Characteristics</i>				
<i>Step 1</i>	Exercise-specific self-efficacy	.16 n.s.	.02	
<i>Step 2</i>	Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.30 **	.08	.06 **
<i>Step 1</i>	Intention strength	.23 **	.05	
<i>Step 2</i>	Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.36 **	.13	.08 **
<i>Step 1</i>	Exercise enjoyment	.39 **	.15	
<i>Step 2</i>	Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.43 **	.18	.03 n.s.
<i>3. Control Variables: Exercise Context – Accessibility of ...</i>				
<i>Step 1</i>	Social contact	.28 **	.08	
<i>Step 2</i>	Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.37 **	.14	.06 **
<i>Step 1</i>	Information and instruction	.24 **	.06	
<i>Step 2</i>	Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.35 **	.12	.06 **
<i>Step 1</i>	Wellness facilities	.06 n.s.	.00	
<i>Step 2</i>	Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.29 **	.08	.08 **
<i>4. Control Variables: Exercise Biography</i>				
<i>Step 1</i>	Years since end of last phase of exercising	.11 n.s.	.01	
<i>Step 2</i>	Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.29 *	.08	.07 *
<i>5. Control Variables: All</i>				
<i>Step 1</i>	All control variables	.55 **	.30	
<i>Step 2</i>	Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.56 **	.31	.01 n.s.

C) Predicting Mean Self-Reported Exercise Frequency in Study Interval ($N = 142$)

<i>1. Control Variables: Reasons for Exercise</i>				
<i>Step 1</i>	Fitness	.17 *	.03	
<i>Step 2</i>	Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.28 **	.08	.05 *
<i>Step 1</i>	Health	.12 n.s.	.02	
<i>Step 2</i>	Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.25 *	.06	.04 *
<i>Step 1</i>	Mood regulation	.10 n.s.	.01	
<i>Step 2</i>	Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.25 *	.07	.06 *
<i>Step 1</i>	Tone	.02 n.s.	.00	
<i>Step 2</i>	Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.25 *	.06	.06 *
<i>Step 1</i>	Weight control	.01 n.s.	.00	
<i>Step 2</i>	Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.25 *	.06	.06 *
<i>2. Control Variables: Exercise-Specific Person Characteristics</i>				
<i>Step 1</i>	Exercise-specific self-efficacy	.12 n.s.	.02	
<i>Step 2</i>	Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.25 *	.07	.05 *
<i>Step 1</i>	Intention strength	.13 n.s.	.02	
<i>Step 2</i>	Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.27 *	.08	.06 *
<i>Step 1</i>	Exercise enjoyment	.33 **	.11	
<i>Step 2</i>	Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.36 **	.13	.02 n.s.

(table continues)

Table D 2. (continues)

	R	R ²	ΔR^2
<i>3. Control Variables: Exercise Context – Accessibility of ...</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> Social contact	.20 *	.04	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.29 **	.09	.05 *
<i>Step 1</i> Information and instruction	.16 n.s.	.02	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.27 *	.07	.05 *
<i>Step 1</i> Wellness facilities	.28 **	.08	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.34 **	.12	.04 *
<i>4. Control Variables: Exercise Biography</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> Years since end of last phase of exercising	.04 n.s.	.00	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.26 *	.07	.07 *
<i>5. Control Variables: All</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> All control variables	.49 **	.24	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.50 **	.25	.01 n.s.
<i>D) Predicting Mean Percent Realization of Intended Monthly Exercise Rate (N = 142)</i>			
<i>1. Control Variables: Reasons for Exercise</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> Fitness	.08 n.s.	.01	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.28 *	.08	.07 **
<i>Step 1</i> Health	.14 +	.02	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.27 *	.07	.05 *
<i>Step 1</i> Mood regulation	.01 n.s.	.00	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.25 *	.06	.06 *
<i>Step 1</i> Tone	.04 n.s.	.00	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.26 *	.07	.07 *
<i>Step 1</i> Weight control	.07 n.s.	.01	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.26 *	.07	.06 *
<i>2. Control Variables: Exercise-Specific Person Characteristics</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> Exercise-specific self-efficacy	.09 n.s.	.01	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.25 *	.07	.06 *
<i>Step 1</i> Intention strength	.30 **	.09	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.38 **	.14	.05 *
<i>Step 1</i> Exercise enjoyment	.33 *	.11	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.36 **	.13	.02 n.s.
<i>3. Control Variables: Exercise Context – Accessibility of ...</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> Social contact	.26 **	.07	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.34 **	.13	.05 *
<i>Step 1</i> Information and instruction	.10 n.s.	.01	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.26 *	.07	.06 *
<i>Step 1</i> Wellness facilities	.06 n.s.	.00	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.28 *	.07	.07 **
<i>4. Control Variables: Exercise Biography</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> Years since end of last phase of exercising	.11 n.s.	.01	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.26 *	.07	.06 *

(table continues)

Table D 2. (continues)

	R	R ²	ΔR^2
<i>5. Control Variables: All</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> All control variables	.49 **	.24	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.51 **	.26	.02 n.s.
<i>E) Predicting Mean Objective Exercise Frequency in Study Interval (N = 107)</i>			
<i>1. Control Variables: Reasons for Exercise</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> Fitness	.14 n.s.	.02	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.33 **	.11	.09 **
<i>Step 1</i> Health	.22 *	.05	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.35 **	.12	.07 *
<i>Step 1</i> Mood regulation	.01 n.s.	.00	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.31 *	.10	.10 **
<i>Step 1</i> Tone	.16 +	.03	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.34 **	.11	.08 **
<i>Step 1</i> Weight control	.15 n.s.	.02	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.32 *	.10	.08 *
<i>2. Control Variables: Exercise-Specific Person Characteristics</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> Exercise-specific self-efficacy	.17 n.s.	.03	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.33 **	.11	.08 *
<i>Step 1</i> Intention strength	.19 *	.04	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.35 **	.13	.09 **
<i>Step 1</i> Exercise enjoyment	.31 **	.10	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.37 **	.15	.05 n.s.
<i>3. Control Variables: Exercise Context – Accessibility of ...</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> Social contact	.25 *	.06	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.37 **	.14	.08 *
<i>Step 1</i> Information and instruction	.41 **	.17	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.46 **	.21	.04 n.s.
<i>Step 1</i> Wellness facilities	.35 **	.12	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.41 **	.16	.04 n.s.
<i>4. Control Variables: Exercise Biography</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> Years since end of last phase of exercising	.05 n.s.	.00	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.31 *	.09	.09 *
<i>5. Control Variables: All</i>			
<i>Step 1</i> All control variables	.55 **	.30	
<i>Step 2</i> Add exercise-specific conflict and facilitation	.56 *	.31	.01 n.s.

n.s. $p > .10$; + $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$

7.5. Appendix E: Description of Variables in Study Part 2

Description of Person-Level Aggregates

Table E 1. Description of the Intergoal Conflict and Facilitation Composites (T1) and Subjective Well-Being Indicators in the Total Sample ($N = 81$), the Subsamples of Younger ($n = 52$) and Older Adults ($n = 29$), and Tests for Age-Group Mean Differences

Scale	Transformation ^a (a)	Sample	M	SD	Skew (SE)	Kurt (SE)
Intergoal Relations						
T1 Facilitation	Logarithm	Total	.35	.12	.25 (.27)	-.43 (.53)
		Younger	.33	.10	.03 (.33)	-.02 (.65)
		Older	.40	.14	-.03 (.43)	-1.16 (.85)
$F(1) = 5.77, p = .02, \eta^2 = .07$						
T1 Conflict	None	Total	1.81	.47	.21 (.27)	-.35 (.53)
		Younger	1.94	.41	.45 (.33)	-.52 (.65)
		Older	1.58	.50	.57 (.43)	.01 (.85)
$F(1) = 11.77, p = .00, \eta^2 = .13$						
Average Subjective Well-Being in the Diary Study ^(b)						
D Positive affect	1 outlier (younger)	Total	3.14	.34	.03 (.27)	.11 (.53)
		Younger	3.09	.30	.10 (.33)	.35 (.65)
		Older	3.23	.40	-.33 (.43)	.07 (.85)
$F(1) = 3.16, p = .08, \eta^2 = .04$						
D Negative affect	None	Total	2.07	.51	.07 (.27)	-.90 (.53)
		Younger	2.17	.46	-.02 (.33)	-1.03 (.65)
		Older	1.90	.56	.52 (.43)	-.50 (.85)
$F(1) = 5.83, p = .02, \eta^2 = .07$						
D Activity enjoyment	3 outliers (1 younger, 2 older)	Total	1.09	.38	.43 (.27)	.06 (.53)
		Younger	1.00	.30	.10 (.33)	.35 (.65)
		Older	3.23	.40	-.33 (.43)	.07 (.85)
$F(1) = 10.46, p = .00, \eta^2 = .12$						
D Activity displeasure	4 outliers (3 younger, 1 older)	Total	.17	.12	1.06 (.27)	.58 (.53)
		Younger	.20	.12	.90 (.33)	.15 (.65)
		Older	.10	.10	2.19 (.43)	5.98 (.85)
$F(1) = 14.64, p = .00, \eta^2 = .16$						

Note. Multivariate age-group effect: $F(6, 74) = 4.78, p = .000, \eta^2 = .28$

(a) Univariate within-cell outliers adjusted to closest nonoutlying value in data distribution

(b) All indicators averaged across entire diary phase

Table E 2. *Description of Situational Conflict Variables in the Total Sample, the Subsamples of Younger and Older Adults, and Tests for Age-Group Mean Differences*

Scale ^(a)	Transformation? ^(b)	Sample	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skew (<i>SE</i>)	Kurt (<i>SE</i>)	
Percentage of Activities with Endorsements of ...							
D	Want to do something else	1 outlier (younger)	Total	.07	.05	.87 (.27)	-.03 (.53)
			<i>Younger</i>	.08	.05	.69 (.33)	-.33 (.65)
			<i>Older</i>	.03	.04	1.42 (.43)	.77 (.85)
					<i>Mann-Whitney-Test:</i>		
					<i>U</i> = 304.50, <i>p</i> = .00		
D	Should do something else	4 outliers (younger)	Total	.04	.05	1.18 (.27)	.14 (.53)
			<i>Younger</i>	.05	.05	.76 (.33)	-.89 (.65)
			<i>Older</i>	.02	.02	2.05 (.43)	3.95 (.85)
					<i>Mann-Whitney-Test:</i>		
					<i>U</i> = 350.00, <i>p</i> = .00		
D	Mean of “Want” and “Should”	3 outliers (younger)	Total	.05	.05	.93 (.27)	-.09 (.53)
			<i>Younger</i>	.07	.05	.67 (.33)	-.65 (.65)
			<i>Older</i>	.02	.03	1.61 (.43)	1.85 (.85)
					<i>Mann-Whitney-Test:</i>		
					<i>U</i> = 272.50, <i>p</i> = .00		

(a) All indicators averaged across entire diary phase

(b) Univariate within-cell outliers adjusted to closest nonoutlying value in data distribution

Table E 3. *Description of Engagement in (Positive and Negative) Goal-Relevant Activities in the Total Sample, the Subsamples of Younger and Older Adults, and Tests for Age-Group Mean Differences*

Scale (a)	Transformation? ^(b)	Sample	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skew (<i>SE</i>)	Kurt (<i>SE</i>)	
Average Involvement in Activities ...							
D	... Furthering goals	Square root and 2 outliers (1 younger, 1 older)	Total	.77	.19	.35 (.27)	-.21 (.53)
			<i>Younger</i>	.70	.19	.43 (.33)	.87 (.65)
			<i>Older</i>	.90	.22	-.07 (.43)	-.77 (.85)
					<i>F</i> (1) = 18.61, <i>p</i> = .00, $\eta^2 = .19$		
D	... Hindering goals	Square root and 2 outliers (younger)	Total	.18	.17	.87 (.27)	.14 (.53)
			<i>Younger</i>	.20	.17	.73 (.33)	.13 (.65)
			<i>Older</i>	.15	.17	1.24 (.43)	.78 (.85)
					<i>F</i> (1) = 1.57, <i>p</i> = .21, $\eta^2 = .02$		
Average Occurrence of Goal Relevance Patterns ...							
D	... “Facilitation” (++)	7 outliers (2 younger, 5 older)	Total	.06	.07	1.06 (.27)	.03 (.53)
			<i>Younger</i>	.05	.06	1.39 (.33)	1.45 (.65)
			<i>Older</i>	.09	.08	.54 (.43)	-1.18 (.85)
					<i>Mann-Whitney-Test:</i>		
					<i>U</i> = 588.00, <i>p</i> = .10		

(table continues)

Table E 3. (continues)

Scale	Transformation [?] (b)	Sample	<i>M</i>	SD	Skew (SE)	Kurt (SE)
D ... “Conflict” (+/-/+)	10 outliers (younger)	Total	.003	.005	1.47 (.27)	.83 (.53)
		<i>Younger</i>	.004	.005	.99 (.33)	-.59 (.65)
		<i>Older</i>	.001	.002	2.13 (.43)	4.16 (.85)
<i>Mann-Whitney-Test:</i>						
<i>U = 590.50, p = .05</i>						

Note. Multivariate age-group effect (involvement in activities furthering and hindering goals only): $F(2,78) = 11.04, p = .00, \eta^2 = .22$

(a) All indicators averaged across entire diary phase

(b) Univariate within-cell outliers adjusted to closest nonoutlying value in data distribution

Description of Goal-Level Aggregates

Table E 4. *Description of Average Enjoyment of Pursuing Personal Goals and Tests for Age-Group Mean Differences: Level of Analysis – Single Reported Goal* ($N_{total} = 316, n_{younger} = 201, n_{older} = 115$)

Scale (a)	Transformation [?]	Sample	<i>M</i>	SD	Skew (SE)	Kurt (SE)
D Average enjoyment of goal-relevant activities	None	Total	1.60	.73	-.18 (.14)	-.60 (.27)
		<i>Younger</i>	1.40	.68	.09 (.17)	-.41 (.34)
		<i>Older</i>	1.96	.66	-.81 (.23)	.54 (.45)
$t(79.2) = -4.76, p = .00$ (b)						

(a) For 8 goals (7 of younger, 1 of older participants) no activities were indicated as furthering that goal.

(b) Because of hierarchical data structure, age-group differences were determined using a multilevel regression model with age group as only explanatory variable: *t*-ratio test using Satterthwaite approximation for determining degrees of freedom (Littell et al., 1996).

Description of Diary-Entry-Level Aggregates

Table E 5. *Description of Short-Term Emotional Well-Being, Goal Involvement, and Situational Conflict, and Tests for Age-Group Mean Differences: Level of Analysis – Single Diary Entry* ($N_{total} = 2,243$, $n_{younger} = 1,426$, $n_{older} = 817$)

Scale	Transformation? (a)	Sample	M	SD	Skew (SE)	Kurt (SE)
Short-Term ...						
D ... Positive affect (b)	3 outliers (older)	Total	3.14	.68	-.20 (.05)	-.17 (.10)
		<i>Younger</i>	3.09	.64	-.17 (.07)	-.34 (.13)
		<i>Older</i>	3.23	.74	-.33 (.09)	.00 (.17)
$t(2,127) = -1.87, p = .06$ (c)						
D ... Negative affect (d)	40 outliers (17 younger, 23 older)	Total	2.07	.77	.50 (.05)	-.62 (.10)
		<i>Younger</i>	2.17	.73	.38 (.07)	-.60 (.13)
		<i>Older</i>	1.88	.81	.86 (.09)	-.28 (.17)
$t(2,126) = 2.58, p = .01$ (c)						
D ... Goal involvement	Inverse (1/[X + 1])	Total	.68	.22	-.02 (.05)	-.94 (.10)
		<i>Younger</i>	.72	.21	-.13 (.07)	-1.04 (.13)
		<i>Older</i>	.61	.22	.27 (.09)	-.65 (.17)
$t(2,162) = 4.01, p = .00$ (c) (e)						
Frequency (Percent)						
D ... Situational conflict (f)	None	Total	1,272 (56.7%)		971 (43.3%)	
		<i>Younger</i>	670 (47.0%)		756 (53.0%)	
		<i>Older</i>	602 (73.7%)		215 (26.3%)	
$\chi^2(1) = 150.83, p = .00$						

(a) Univariate within-cell outliers adjusted to closest nonoutlying value in data distribution

(b) Reduced sample size because of missing cases: $N_{total} = 2,208$, $n_{younger} = 1,414$, $n_{older} = 794$

(c) Because of hierarchical data structure, age-group differences were determined using a multilevel regression model with age group as only explanatory variable and Spatial Power Law to accommodate covariance structure of unequally spaced repeated measures: t -ratio test (Littell et al., 1996).

(d) Reduced sample size because of missing cases: $N_{total} = 2,207$, $n_{younger} = 1,414$, $n_{older} = 793$

(e) Consider that variable transformation (inverse) affects interpretation: Older adults tended to report more goal involvement than did younger adults.

(f) Occurrence versus nonoccurrence of “want to do something else” or “ought to do something else”

7.6. Appendix F: Additional Control Analyses in Study Part 2

Control variables. To be conservative, I considered all variables with significant correlations to either intergoal conflict or facilitation at the .05 level as potential rival predictors that might account for significant associations between intergoal conflict and facilitation and various facets of subjective well-being in the diary phase (see Table 17). These control variables were assessed at the first measurement point of study 1. Furthermore, I considered the frequency of exercising reported in the first nine diaries as additional rival predictor.

Procedure. I obtained partial correlations to assess the stability of *bivariate* associations after controlling for rival predictors (see Table F 2). For the assessment of the stability of *multiple* associations, I conducted sequential (hierarchical) multiple regression analyses. In the first step, the control variable(s) were entered into the models. In the second step, the intergoal conflict and facilitation composites were simultaneously added to the prediction. Table F 2 shows the change in the percentage of explained variance (ΔR^2) after adding intergoal conflict and facilitation.

Table F 1. *Description of Control Variables in the Diary Study, and Tests for Age-Group Mean Differences*

Scale	Transformation? (a)	Sample	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skew (<i>SE</i>)	Kurt (<i>SE</i>)
Person Characteristics						
T1 Compromising	None	Total	2.97	.73	-.19 (.27)	.79 (.53)
		<i>Younger</i>	2.92	.70	-.11 (.33)	-.85 (.65)
		<i>Older</i>	3.07	.77	-.38 (.43)	-.57 (.85)
$F(1) = .64, p = .43, \eta^2 = .01$						
T1 Agreeableness	8 outliers (6 younger, 2 older)	Total	3.80	.47	-.17 (.27)	-.31 (.53)
		<i>Younger</i>	3.71	.49	.04 (.33)	-.54 (.65)
		<i>Older</i>	3.97	.40	-.32 (.43)	1.21 (.85)
$F(1) = 5.58, p = .02, \eta^2 = .07$						
T1 Compensation	20 outliers (4 younger, 6 older)	Total	.74	.18	.09 (.27)	-1.23 (.53)
		<i>Younger</i>	.73	.16	.09 (.33)	-.94 (.65)
		<i>Older</i>	.75	.21	.04 (.43)	-1.65 (.85)
$F(1) = .00, p = .98, \eta^2 = .00$						
Goal Characteristics						
T1 Internal control	2 outliers (2 younger)	Total	4.64	.34	-.51 (.27)	-.89 (.53)
		<i>Younger</i>	4.62	.33	-.39 (.33)	-.97 (.65)
		<i>Older</i>	4.67	.35	-.78 (.43)	-.56 (.85)
$F(1) = .83, p = .37, \eta^2 = .01$						
T1 External control	1 outlier (older)	Total	2.58	.73	.15 (.27)	-.25 (.53)
		<i>Younger</i>	2.56	.60	.29 (.33)	-.77 (.65)
		<i>Older</i>	2.62	.93	-.01 (.43)	-.60 (.85)
$F(1) = .33, p = .57, \eta^2 = .00$						

(table continues)

Table F 1. (continued)

Scale	Transformation ² (a)	Sample	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skew (<i>SE</i>)	Kurt (<i>SE</i>)
T1 Resource intensity	1 outlier (older)	Total	3.32	.44	.03 (.27)	-.09 (.53)
		<i>Younger</i>	3.35	.43	.12 (.33)	-.21 (.65)
		<i>Older</i>	3.26	.46	-.05 (.43)	.16 (.85)
$F(1) = .61, p = .44, \eta^2 = .01$						
Exercise Behavior						
D Exercise frequency in first nine diaries (b)	None	Total	1.12	.74	.15 (.27)	-.75 (.53)
		<i>Younger</i>	.91	.72	.61 (.33)	.10 (.65)
		<i>Older</i>	1.51	.62	-.55 (.44)	-.37 (.86)
$F(1) = 13.69, p = .00, \eta^2 = .15$						

Note. Multivariate age-group effect: $F(7, 72) = 3.52, p = .003, \eta^2 = .26$

(a) Univariate outliers adjusted to closest nonoutlying data value in distribution

(b) $N = 80$ (exclusion of one participant with only three diaries, frequency restricted to first nine diary days to ensure equal time frame for all participants)

Table F 2. Control Analyses for the Relations Between the Intergoal Conflict and Facilitation Composites and Several Indicators of Subjective Well-Being in the Diary Study: Partial Correlations and R^2 -Change

	Bivariate		Multiple
	Facilitation (T1)	Conflict (T1)	
<i>A) Average Positive Affect During Diary Phase</i>			
Original relation	$r = .26^*$	$r = -.28^{**}$	$R = .35^{**}$
<i>Controlled for</i>	<i>Partial Correlation</i>		ΔR^2
A) Person Characteristics			
Compromising	.24 *	-.25 *	.10 *
Agreeableness	.26 *	-.27 *	.11 **
Compensation	.21 +	-.23 *	.08 *
B) Goal Characteristics			
Internal control	.21 +	-.26 *	.09 *
External control	.31 **	-.25 *	.12 **
Resource intensity	.25 *	-.25 *	.10 *
C) Exercise frequency in first nine diaries			
D) All	.20 +	-.17 n.s.	.05 n.s.
<i>B) Average Negative Affect During Diary Phase</i>			
Original relation	$r = -.24^*$	$r = .44^{**}$	$R = .47^{**}$
<i>Controlled for</i>	<i>Partial Correlation</i>		ΔR^2
A) Person Characteristics			
Compromising	-.23 *	.44 **	.21 **
Agreeableness	-.24 *	.44 **	.21 **
Compensation	-.17 n.s.	.39 **	.16 **

(table continues)

Table F 2. (continued)

	Bivariate		Multiple
	Facilitation (T1)	Conflict (T1)	
B) Goal Characteristics			
Internal control	-.19 +	.44 **	.19 **
External control	-.26 *	.43 **	.21 **
Resource intensity	-.23 *	.40 **	.17 **
C) Exercise frequency in first nine diaries	-.27 *	.44 **	.22 **
D) All	-.13 n.s.	.34 **	.10 **
<i>C) Average Enjoyment of Everyday Activities</i>			
Original relation	$r = .19 *$	$r = -.28 **$	$R = .31 *$
<i>Controlled for</i>	<i>Partial Correlation</i>		ΔR^2
A) Person Characteristics			
Compromising	.19 +	-.28 *	.10 *
Agreeableness	.19 +	-.26 *	.09 *
Compensation	.11 n.s.	-.21 +	.05 n.s.
B) Goal Characteristics			
Internal control	.14 n.s.	-.27 *	.08 *
External control	.23 *	-.26 *	.09 *
Resource intensity	.19 +	-.28 *	.10 *
C) Exercise frequency in first nine diaries	.21 +	-.28 *	.10 *
D) All	.11 n.s.	-.20 +	.04 n.s.
<i>D) Average Displeasure from Everyday Activities</i>			
Original relation	$r = -.23 *$	$r = .29 **$	$R = .34 **$
<i>Controlled for</i>	<i>Partial Correlation</i>		ΔR^2
A) Person Characteristics			
Compromising	-.23 *	.29 **	.12 **
Agreeableness	-.24 *	.26 *	.10 *
Compensation	-.18 n.s.	.25 *	.09 *
B) Goal Characteristics			
Internal control	-.21 +	.29 **	.11 *
External control	-.23 *	.29 **	.12 **
Resource intensity	-.22 *	.26 *	.10 *
C) Exercise frequency in first nine diaries	-.24 *	.29 **	.11 *
D) All	-.14 n.s.	.20 +	.05 n.s.

n.s. $p > .10$; + $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$