



Annual Review of Psychology

Achievement Goals: A Social Influence Cycle

Fabrizio Butera,¹ Benoît Dompnier,¹
and Céline Darnon²

¹Institute of Psychology, University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland;
email: fabrizio.butera@unil.ch, benoit.dompnier@unil.ch

²Laboratoire de Psychologie Sociale et Cognitive (LAPSCO), Université Clermont Auvergne,
Clermont-Ferrand, France; email: celine.darnon@uca.fr

Annu. Rev. Psychol. 2024. 75:10.1–10.28

The *Annual Review of Psychology* is online at
psych.annualreviews.org

<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-013123-102139>

Copyright © 2024 by the author(s).
All rights reserved

Keywords

achievement goals, social influence, culture, social value, competence, evaluation

Abstract

Achievement goals have been defined as the purpose of competence-relevant behavior. In this respect they connect one of the basic human needs, i.e., competence, to one of society's core values, i.e., achievement. We propose to look at achievement goals through the lens of social influence. We review both the influence that cultural, structural, and contextual factors have on achievement goal endorsement and the influence that endorsing achievement goals allows people to have within their social space. The review allows us to propose a circular model of the influence on and of achievement goals: The culture, social structures, and contexts that are typical of a certain society shape the specific environments in which individuals develop their achievement goals, which in turn has an influence on the expression and circulation of these achievement goals into society, in a social influence cycle.

10.1



Review in Advance first posted
on September 27, 2023.
(Changes may still occur before
final publication.)

Contents

| | |
|--|-------|
| INTRODUCTION..... | 10.2 |
| ACHIEVEMENT AND ACHIEVEMENT GOALS..... | 10.3 |
| Achievement and Achievement Motivation in Psychological Research | 10.4 |
| Achievement Goals | 10.5 |
| Summary | 10.8 |
| A SOCIAL INFLUENCE APPROACH TO ACHIEVEMENT GOALS..... | 10.9 |
| Social Influence | 10.9 |
| The Effect of Social Influence on Achievement Goals..... | 10.9 |
| The Expression of Achievement Goals as Social Influence..... | 10.13 |
| CONCLUDING REMARKS | 10.17 |
| Linear and Circular Models | 10.18 |
| Reproduction | 10.18 |
| Change..... | 10.20 |
| Conclusions | 10.20 |

INTRODUCTION

Achievement goals have been defined as the “purpose...of competence-relevant behavior” (Elliot & McGregor 2001, p. 501). In this respect they connect one of the basic human needs, competence (e.g., Ryan & Deci 2000), to one of society’s core values, achievement (e.g., McClelland 1961). Given the centrality of such matters in psychology and social psychology, it is not surprising that the study of achievement goals has attracted a wealth of research, with several meta-analyses and comprehensive reviews that delineate the properties, antecedents, and consequences of these goals (e.g., Harackiewicz et al. 2002a, Huang 2011, Hulleman et al. 2010). Achievement goals have been divided in mastery goals, with an intrapersonal focus (e.g., improving learning), and performance goals, with a normative and comparative focus (e.g., outperforming others); a number of finer distinctions have also emerged from research in this domain (e.g., Elliot & Hulleman 2017).

Although early work has treated achievement goals mostly as an individual-level construct (e.g., Dweck 1986, Nicholls 1984), the history of motivational psychology is punctuated by numerous efforts to document the contextual (Linnenbrink & Pintrich 2001, Meece et al. 2006), interpersonal (Poortvliet & Darnon 2010), and cultural (Zusho & Clayton 2011) aspects of these goals (Darnon et al. 2012). The present article provides an integrative framework of such aspects and proposes to look at achievement goals through the lens of social influence. Indeed, the psychology of social influence studies “the mechanisms through which individuals and groups transform, maintain, and diffuse their modes of thinking and action when interacting with other individuals and groups” (Butera & Mugny 2001, p. 1). In this respect, consideration of the social influence processes that surround achievement goals allows us to review both (a) the influence that cultural, structural, and contextual factors have on achievement goal endorsement and (b) the influence that endorsing achievement goals allows people to have within their social space.

We start with a brief account of the research conducted on achievement and achievement goals, as brief as the account of an extremely prolific line of research can be. We then turn to our proposition of a social influence approach to achievement goals. We argue that the culture, social structures, and contexts that are typical of a certain society shape the specific environments in which individuals develop their achievement goals, which in turn has an influence on






Figure 1

The cycle of social influence in the development and transmission of achievement goals. $F_e > F_n$: Reproduction occurs when the fit between endorsed achievement goals and the achievement goals valued in the existing culture, structure, or context (F_e) is better than the fit between endorsed achievement goals and the achievement goals valued by a new culture, structure, or context (F_n), in case they are available or salient. $F_n > F_e$: Change occurs when the relation between fits is reversed.

the expression and circulation of these achievement goals in society, in a social influence cycle (Figure 1).

ACHIEVEMENT AND ACHIEVEMENT GOALS

In her book titled *Achievement*, philosopher Gwen Bradford writes that “achievements of one kind or another are one of life’s greatest sources of meaning” (Bradford 2015, p. 2). In philosophical analysis, achievement is indeed a fundamental feature of human life. In her book, Bradford distinguishes two important lines of analysis that need to be followed in order to understand achievement. The first is a descriptive line that consists in identifying the common features of achievements. What is common to climbing a mountain, getting a university degree, and solving a crossword puzzle? According to this analysis, in all achievements there is a process related to a product: The product (the climbing or the degree) does not just exist, but it is reached by some actor through a process. The link between the process and the product is important, because products occurring by luck (e.g., winning in a lottery) are not considered as achievements. The consequence—and this will be important when we move to psychology—is that the actor must display some competence and effort for the process to culminate in the product.

The second line of analysis is evaluative: The process culminating in a product is an achievement when it is valuable (to the actor and/or meaningful others). This is also a point that we want to highlight from the outset, as we will see that achievement requires an evaluative process (e.g., writing a book is considered an achievement if somebody evaluates this feat as valuable) and

therefore social consensus on what is valuable. Thus, competence and the evaluation of such competence are at the core of a philosophical analysis of achievement. We show next that competence and evaluation have been at the core of several streams of psychological analysis of achievement.

Achievement and Achievement Motivation in Psychological Research

Recognition of the importance of achievement for human life is a long-standing feature of psychological research. In early work by McClelland, Atkinson, and colleagues, achievement is described as a fundamental need of human beings and a desire for competence, accomplishment, and superior performance (e.g., McClelland et al. 1953; see McClelland 1987). The fundamental nature of the need for achievement is also recognized in White's (1959) theory and described as emerging from effectance motivation. A similar perspective can be found in early work on social comparison, which assumes that the evaluation of one's competence (abilities) is a fundamental motive (drive) in human beings (Festinger 1954, hypothesis I).

Interestingly, in both perspectives such a fundamental human motivation to achieve is linked to the importance that society attributes to achievement. On the one hand, McClelland has compiled a great deal of economic and sociological data in a famous book, *The Achieving Society*, in which he argues that the achievement motives of a country's inhabitants are strongly linked to that country's economic achievement (McClelland 1961). Such a relationship has later been widely criticized (e.g., Beugelsdijk & Smeets 2008), but it is remarkable that achievement motivation has been quite early defined as fundamental not only because it appears to be definitional of human beings but also because it is highly valued by and functional in society. A similar feature can be found in social comparison theory, which argues that societal values, especially in the Western world, explain that people are motivated to continuously increase their abilities, according to "a value set on doing better and better which means that the higher the score on performance, the more desirable it is" (Festinger 1954, hypothesis IV, pp. 124–25; see also Butera & Darnon 2017 for a discussion).

Content of achievement. Competence (or abilities) is a core ingredient of achievement, but so is effort. As noted above, an actor's product can be evaluated as an achievement if the actor has displayed some competence and effort (Bradford 2015). This is one of the central tenets of Weiner's (1985) attributional theory of achievement motivation, in which the author reviewed the (then) existing investigations on people's perceived causes of success and failure in the achievement domain. Following the influential work of Heider (1958) on common-sense psychology, Weiner remarked that, although the number of potential explanations is virtually infinite, the dominant causes that people report are ability and effort (Weiner 1985, p. 550; see also Brun et al. 2021 for a recent meta-analytical confirmation of the validity of Weiner's model).

A stream of intercultural research has pointed out some consensus across cultures in perceiving ability as an antecedent of success, although individualistic cultures appear to emphasize effort (hard work) as an antecedent of success to a higher extent than collectivistic cultures do (Triandis et al. 1973). More recent research, however, has found different results—for instance, that East Asians prioritize effort over abilities, whereas North Americans do the opposite (Stevenson & Stigler 1992). In addition, some authors (e.g., Yu & Yang 1994) argued that it is the very definition of achievement that changes between East Asian and North Americans/Europeans, with collectivistic cultures locating the key to success in cooperation and the role of family. While the jury is out, we wish to note that there is today a growing amount of evidence and models in psychology that recognize the importance of achievement for individuals, groups, and society and emphasize that the definition of achievement—and achievement motivation—is fundamentally influenced by the specific culture and social structures of a given society (see King 2022 for a recent comprehensive model). We come back to this issue in the section titled Culture.



The societal role of achievement. One may ask why achievement is such an important feature for society. System justification theory (Jost & Banaji 1994) provides an interesting suggestion that will be helpful in the final part of our argument. This theory claims that, through their institutions, societies develop, communicate, and implement powerful ideologies that serve the purpose of justifying the political, cultural, and economic system already in place. In other words, such system justification ideologies help the dominant powers and ruling classes to maintain social cohesion and social order. Importantly for the present discussion, Jost & Hunyady (2005) list a series of system-justifying ideologies, among which we find meritocracy, according to which competence (abilities) and effort are the key to reach success (achievement). As noted above, achievement can be defined through an evaluative process based on social consensus (here, a societal ideology). Thus, meritocracy defines achievement and at the same time the justification process through which domination takes place: If competence and effort are the key to reach success, people who do not succeed are considered to be lacking in competence and effort (e.g., Batruch et al. 2019); therefore, they do not deserve a better position in society. Within this perspective, meritocracy thus helps justify the status quo—for instance, existing social inequalities—and recent studies with multinational samples indeed have showed that belief in meritocracy (Mijis 2021; 23 countries) and in school meritocracy (Batruch et al. 2023; over 40 countries) reduces the perceived unfairness of economic and social class inequalities in society.

Approach and avoidance. It is important to note that, although it may seem natural to associate achievement motivation to the pursuit of success, psychological research has traditionally maintained that achievement motivation is concerned with both the approach of success and the avoidance of failure. In a seminal article, Elliot (1999, table 1) compiled a long list of theorists, starting at the end of the nineteenth century, who have utilized the approach/avoidance distinction. In this article, Elliot provides an influential definition of achievement motivation “as the energization and direction of competence-based affect, cognition, and behavior” (p. 169). He also summarizes an equally influential program that recommends to systematically consider valence, that is, approach and avoidance, when studying achievement motivation.

In summary, achievement has been described as a fundamental feature of human life, at both the individual and the collective level, one that strongly motivates people to pursue success and avoid failure. Psychological research has shown that achieving success and avoiding failure are highly valued in society—although different societies may provide different definitions of success and failure. Psychological research has also shown that the pervasive nature of evaluation processes in social settings is one of the key elements that make concern for achievement a pervasive feature of human life.

Let us now move to achievement goals, the focus of the present article. Achievement goal research has been reviewed in previous volumes of the *Annual Review of Psychology*, with integrative articles on the motivational factors that affect school achievement (Covington 2000, Winne & Nesbit 2010); the role of classroom structures on the development of goals (Meece et al. 2006); and the articulation of research on motivation, beliefs, values, and goals (Eccles & Wigfield 2002). The following section is not intended to provide an exhaustive review of more recent work on achievement goals, but it wishes to present that work to set the stage for the proposed social influence approach to achievement goals.

Achievement Goals

Social actors (e.g., teachers, coaches, bosses) evaluate achievement based on visible outcomes (e.g., problem solving, speed, productivity). The question of the link between motivational dispositions and outcomes is an ancient one in psychology, and Elliot & Church (1997) remarked that since



Table 1 The 2 × 2 achievement goal framework

| | | Definition | |
|----------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| | | Absolute/intrapersonal (mastery) | Normative (performance) |
| Valence | Positive (approaching success) | Mastery-approach goals | Performance-approach goals |
| | Negative (avoiding failure) | Mastery-avoidance goals | Performance-avoidance goals |

Table reproduced with permission from Elliot & McGregor (2001); copyright 2001 American Psychological Association.

the beginning of scientific psychology, several authors have proposed hierarchical motivational models in which goals are an intermediate construct between motives and outcomes. Motives energize behavior and orient individuals in a certain direction—in the case of achievement motives, toward attainment of success or avoidance of failure. Goals represent some specific purpose, and in this respect they are a more proximal regulation process than motives (Maehr 1989)—hence the characterization of achievement goals “as cognitive-dynamic manifestations of two underlying competence-relevant motives—the need for achievement and the need to avoid failure” (Elliot & Church 1997, p. 219). In other words, achievement goals translate into purpose the knowledge individuals possess about the value of achievement.

Varieties of achievement goals. Achievement goals were first divided in two constructs: mastery and performance goals (Ames 1992, Dweck 1986, Nicholls 1984); other terms have been used to refer to the same constructs, but we will use mastery and performance goals for simplicity and because they are utilized the most. Mastery goals refer to the desire to develop competence through task mastery, whereas performance goals refer to the desire to demonstrate competence relative to others. However, the importance of the aforementioned distinction between approach and avoidance in motivational constructs led to finer distinctions in the characterization of achievement goals. Such distinctions then led to more complex models that allowed researchers to consider the antecedents of achievement goals in a more precise fashion and to predict consequences with greater consistency.

The approach/avoidance distinction was first applied to performance goals (in the so-called trichotomous model; Elliot & Church 1997) and then to both mastery and performance goals (Elliot & McGregor 2001). In the latter article, a 2 × 2 model of achievement goals is laid out. The pursuit of competence—the “conceptual core” of achievement goals (Elliot & McGregor 2001, p. 501)—is differentiated as a function of two dimensions, namely, definition and valence (see **Table 1**). Definition distinguishes mastery from performance goals. In mastery goals, competence is evaluated with an absolute (command of a task) or intrapersonal (improved performance over time) standard; examples are whether a child can objectively solve five math exercises without mistakes or whether an athlete has improved their time in the marathon. In performance goals, competence is evaluated with a normative standard as compared to others (for instance, the relative standing of a pupil in their class’ math ranking). Valence refers to the approach/avoidance dichotomy, and it allowed Elliot & McGregor (2001) to derive four achievement goals from the mastery/performance goals distinction. On the positive end of the dimension, approaching success, mastery-approach goals refer to the desire to master a task, to acquire knowledge, and to learn; performance-approach goals refer to the desire to outperform others, to distinguish oneself positively, and to succeed in a group. On the negative end of the valence dimension, avoiding failure, mastery-avoidance goals refer to the desire to avoid failing a task; performance-avoidance goals refer to the desire to avoid being outperformed by others.

In later developments, the absolute and intrapersonal standards of mastery goals have been distinguished to reflect that mastery goals may be either task based (absolute) or self based



(intrapersonal) (Elliot et al. 2011). Moreover, recent work has incorporated in the construct reasons to pursue achievement goals through the notion of goal complexes (e.g., Elliot & Thrash 2001, Liem & Senko 2022, Sommet et al. 2021, Vansteenkiste et al. 2014). As goals can be adopted for different reasons, the goal complexes framework proposes to measure not only the achievement goals one is pursuing but also the reason one is pursuing them (e.g., based on the autonomous/controlled motivation distinction; see Vansteenkiste et al. 2014). These refinements represent important advances in achievement goal research; however, as they are not central to the development of the present circular model of the influence on and of achievement goals, we do not present them in greater detail.

Antecedents and consequences of achievement goals. These four achievement goals have provided goal theorists with coherent constructs that have an identifiable set of antecedents and consequences (Elliot & McGregor 2001). Mastery-approach goals have antecedents such as need for achievement, work mastery, self-determination, and competence valuation and consequences such as interest and deep processing. Mastery-avoidance goals have antecedents such as fear of failure, belief that intelligence is fixed, and low self-determination and consequences such as disorganization and worry. Performance-approach goals have antecedents such as need for achievement, competitiveness, and fear of failure and consequences such as surface processing and positive exam performance. Performance-avoidance goals have antecedents such as fear of failure, low self-determination, and belief that intelligence is fixed and consequences such as surface processing, disorganization, and negative exam performance (see also Elliot & Hulleman 2017 and Sommet & Elliot 2016 for reviews).

Importantly, several meta-analyses have confirmed the factorial and conceptual coherence of the dichotomous, trichotomous, and 2×2 models of achievement goals (Baranik et al. 2010; Cellar et al. 2011; Huang 2011, 2012; Rawsthorne & Elliot 1999; see also Jansen et al. 2022 for a recent review of meta-analyses), even when exposing conceptual and methodological differences (Hulleman et al. 2010). They have provided cumulative evidence on the antecedents of achievement goals, with specifications regarding cognitive ability and self-esteem (Payne et al. 2007). In addition to antecedents related to motivation, beliefs, and self-perception, Elliot & Thrash (2002) have conceptually distinguished between approach temperament (a personality variable related to extraversion, positive emotionality, and motivations that facilitate behavior) and avoidance temperament (neuroticism, negative emotionality, and motivations that inhibit behavior). Interestingly, these authors have shown that approach temperament predicts both mastery-approach and performance-approach goals, whereas avoidance temperament predicts performance-avoidance goals (and, to a lower extent, performance-approach goals).

Moreover, several meta-analyses have provided cumulative evidence on the consequences of achievement goals, with specifications regarding competence perceptions and self-regulation processes such as self-monitoring, self-evaluations, self-reactions, and self-efficacy (Cellar et al. 2011, Senko & Dawson 2017) as well as feedback seeking (Payne et al. 2007). In addition, the work by Pekrun and colleagues has provided a systematic account of the emotions occurring in achievement situations such as educational settings, organized along two dimensions (Pekrun et al. 2002; see Pekrun et al. 2023 for a refined version of the model). Achievement emotions can differ in terms of valence (positive or negative) and in terms of focus (task, prospective outcome, or retrospective outcome). For example, enjoyment, hope, and pride are positive emotions, with a focus on, respectively, task, prospective outcome, and retrospective outcome. Boredom, anxiety, and shame are negative emotions, with a focus on, respectively, task, prospective outcome, and retrospective outcome. Interestingly, Pekrun et al. (2006) showed that achievement goals systematically predict corresponding emotions: Mastery goals predict enjoyment (positively) and boredom and



anger (negatively); performance-approach goals predict hope and pride (positively); performance-avoidance goals predict anxiety, hopelessness, and shame (positively; see also Huang 2011 for a meta-analytical account with some specifications).

Overall, the conceptual foundations and the network of associated antecedents and consequences of achievement goals proposed by achievement goal theorists have received consistent support. However, it is important to mention the exception of the consequences related to performance, which we discuss separately hereafter.

The question of performance. In their quality of proximal variables, achievement goals are supposed to predict performance. This is important from a theoretical point of view but also for practice, as social actors (e.g., teachers, coaches, bosses) infer achievement from the evaluation of performance. However, the general pattern of results, especially the one that emerges from the meta-analyses, requires some specifications. Overall, mastery-approach goals appear to be positively related to performance, and this happens in the main domains in which this relationship has been studied, namely, education, sport, and work (e.g., Lochbaum & Gottardy 2015, Payne et al. 2007, Van Yperen et al. 2014). This was especially the case when mastery-approach goals were based on task-referenced standards (Noordzij et al. 2021). However, both Huang (2012) and Hulleman et al. (2010) noted that such relationship was inconsistent and its effect size small. Mastery-avoidance (e.g., Baranik et al. 2010) and performance-avoidance (e.g., Murayama & Elliot 2012, Payne et al. 2007) goals do not seem to require specifications, as they quite consistently appear to be negatively related to performance, also in different domains (but see Senko & Freund 2015 for a case in which mastery-avoidance goals are not maladaptive and Bruno et al. 2019 for moderators of the maladaptive effect of performance-avoidance goals). Mixed findings, on the contrary, emerge from the study of the relation between performance-approach goals and performance. Reviews and meta-analytical results revealed sometimes positive and sometimes weak to nonexistent effects, which also varied as a function of domain—education, work, or sports (Crouzevalle & Butera 2017, Lochbaum & Gottardy 2015, Murayama & Elliot 2012, Payne et al. 2007, Van Yperen et al. 2014). These meta-analyses are too different to draw any conclusion, but an interesting specification comes from the meta-analysis by Hulleman et al. (2010), who coded the phrasing of the items that operationalized achievement goals in the various studies. Results showed that performance-approach goals operationalized through normative items (e.g., “I try to do better in my courses than other students”) were positively related to performance, whereas performance-approach goals operationalized through appearance items (referring to the self-presentational goal of trying to look good to others; e.g., “I like school work that lets me show how smart I am”) were negatively related to performance (see Senko & Dawson 2017 for an extension).

Summary

Achievement is a fundamental feature of life in society, and achievement motivation is a fundamental feature of social beings living in family, educational, and professional environments in which they are evaluated based on their degree of success and failure. Achievement goals are the intermediate mechanism that transforms motivation to attain success and avoid failure into purpose directed toward some competence-relevant behavior. In this respect, they are also fundamental features of life in society.

The section that ends here, however, has been mainly concerned with individual processes. Traditionally, achievement goals have been characterized as an individual-level construct (e.g., Dweck 1986, Elliot & McGregor 2001, Nicholls 1984), and we have reported above a wealth of research that studied individual-level antecedents such as motivation, emotion, beliefs, self-perception, temperament, and dispositions. This is by no means a weakness, as the characterization



of such central goals required a stringent analysis to be carried out at the same level of explanation (Doise 1986). Having said that, we have noted above that achievement goals translate important societal values and functions into purpose, and several authors have already proposed to adopt a social psychological perspective in the study of achievement goals (e.g., Darnon et al. 2012). In this article, we wish to be more specific. We first review the cultural, structural, and contextual factors that shape achievement goals. We then review the effects that achievement goals allow people to yield when interacting with other people. Finally, we propose that these effects may be represented under the form of a social influence cycle, whereby societal forces shape achievement goals, which in turn influence the expression and circulation of those achievement goals in society (**Figure 1**).

A SOCIAL INFLUENCE APPROACH TO ACHIEVEMENT GOALS

Achievement is assessed through evaluation, either self-evaluation (e.g., a mechanic observes that the engine they have repaired is now running) or evaluation from an external source (e.g., a student receives the grade on their final exam from their teacher). Value, however, requires social consensus, because it is hard to find objective measures of value (e.g., Is it enough that the engine runs for the car to be repaired? Is it enough for the student to get a good grade to enter graduate school?). In social comparison theory, Festinger (1954) had already noted that the evaluation of competence (abilities) requires a social standard, and more recent analyses have noted that “competence-relevant settings are socially relevant settings” (Sommet et al. 2015, p. 580). This is also apparent in the definition of achievement goals (see Elliot & McGregor 2001). This is obvious for performance goals, where competence is assessed through interpersonal comparison; but even in mastery goals, where competence is assessed through intrapersonal comparison, one needs internalized (social) standards to be able to determine if one is progressing, stagnating, or regressing. A child does not need external feedback to observe that they are making fewer mistakes than yesterday in playing the sonata they are learning; but what a sonata is and what constitutes a mistake are socially defined concepts. Social consensus thus influences the definition of achievement and the adoption of achievement goals. Let us see how.

Social Influence

Since we argue that achievement goals vary as a function of social influence, we should start by defining what we mean by social influence. Many definitions have been given in social psychology (see Harkins et al. 2017 for a handbook, or Spears 2021 for a recent review). Given the circular model that we wish to propose in this article, we settled for the definition presented in the opening paragraph: Social influence is a set of “mechanisms through which individuals and groups transform, maintain, and diffuse their modes of thinking and action when interacting with other individuals and groups” (Butera & Mugny 2001, p. 1).

The Effect of Social Influence on Achievement Goals

Several lines of research have pointed to the cultural, contextual, and interpersonal factors that influence achievement goals. Let us consider these factors in this order, from the more distal to the more proximal.

Culture. Culture is “a set of structures and institutions, values, traditions, and ways of engaging with the social and nonsocial world that are transmitted across generations in a certain time and place” (Oyserman & Lee 2007, p. 255). This is not the only definition available of culture, but it is an interesting one in the framework of the present discussion. Indeed, these authors view culture as a form of situated cognition and propose that culture influences not only the content of



thought but also its processes. Several studies highlight the influence of culture on achievement goals and their relation to achievement, in particular the influence of communities and countries (e.g., Murayama et al. 2009). Before we review the relevant work, let us discuss what such an influence might be.

Drawing on anthropology and intercultural studies, Zusho & Clayton (2011), and more recently King & McInerney (2019), noted that it is possible to adopt three distinct approaches to culture, based on Berry et al.'s (2002) classification. One is the absolutist approach, which contends that theories and constructs developed in one culture are valid in and generalizable to other cultures. In this case, culture has little influence on the definition of constructs. The opposite approach is the relativist one, which contends that a specific construct can only be defined and understood within a specific culture. Here, the influence of culture is total. Zusho & Clayton (2011) point out that integration is possible in a third approach, the universalist one, which contends that some key constructs are common to all countries, with culture acting as a moderator of either meaning or endorsement. This classification is informed by the etic-emic distinction (e.g., Goodenough 2003), according to which research should make explicit whether the definition of relevant constructs has been provided by the actor (emic) or the observer (etic). Both Zusho & Clayton (2011) and King & McInerney (2019) argue that such distinctions are relevant for the study of achievement goals, too, and adopt a universalist approach.

Since Maehr's (1974) seminal article on culture and achievement motivation, a great deal of research has been carried out on the influence of culture on achievement goals, with a great deal of diversity in results. The diversity is such that Urdan & Kaplan (2020, p. 4) recently declared that "clearly, there is more work to be done, both conceptually and methodologically, to understand how the meaning, endorsement, and effects of achievement goals may differ according to cultural and contextual characteristics." Overall, there is consensus that the constructs developed in the framework of achievement goal theory are relevant in several countries, not only Western countries and in the Global North. King (2015) found that achievement goal questionnaires maintain their psychometric validity in the Philippines, and achievement goal questionnaires were successfully used in culturally relevant research by, for instance, Bong (2004) in Korea, Biddle et al. (1996) in Zimbabwe, Law (2011) in Hong Kong, and Liem & Nie (2008) in Indonesia. The most recent example is a study by Guo et al. (2023) with mastery-approach goals and a sample of over half a million adolescents in 77 countries/regions drawn from the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) survey. The results revealed that the relations of achievement goals with antecedents, consequences, and performance found in these regions are similar to those found in the traditional studies reviewed above and conducted with Western samples.

Differences appear when considering the degree to which goals are endorsed and the specific relationships between achievement goals and other constructs. As for endorsement, Dekker & Fischer's (2008) meta-analysis showed that students adopt mastery goals to a higher extent, and performance-approach goals to a lower extent, in more developed countries (as measured by the Human Development Index). Lochbaum et al. (2016), in a meta-analysis of studies in the domain of sports, found that participants from individualistic countries endorse mastery goals more than participants in collectivistic countries. Furthermore, Guo et al.'s (2023) aforementioned study found that students endorse mastery-approach goals less when they belong to long-term-oriented and uncertainty-avoiding societies. As for the relationships between achievement goals and other constructs, Hulleman et al. (2010) found that nationality was a significant moderator of the relationship between mastery-approach, mastery-avoidance, and performance-avoidance goals on the one hand and performance outcomes on the other hand. King (2015) showed that achievement goals are more strongly correlated in the Philippines and are less distinct from one another, a difference also pointed out by Hulleman et al. (2010).



Differences also appear when conducting research with a clear focus on the definitions given by local actors (i.e., an emic approach). For example, in such studies—which often use qualitative, ethnographic methods—Kim & Park (2006) revealed that Korean students score particularly high on measures of filial piety and feel indebted to their parents, which in turn renders guilt and external pressure favorable for academic achievement. Similarly, with a Chinese sample, Li (2002) observed that mastery goals are described in terms of seeking knowledge and cultivating passion but also in terms of being diligent, enduring hardship, and feeling shame and guilt in case of a lack of desire to learn. Such reliance on family bonds in the expression of achievement goals, and its positive effect on performance, consistently appears in several studies in both Asian and Latin American cultures (e.g., Fuligni et al. 1999, Lee & Bong 2016).

In sum, this literature has accumulated consistent results that point to a cross-cultural tendency to pursue achievement goals, with similarities in terms of structure and validity and differences in terms of endorsement and relation with other constructs. In other words, a universalistic approach to achievement goals seems to suggest that culture has an influence on goals in that it moderates their endorsement and meaning in different populations. However, these differences are not consistent across studies, and several authors have called for a stronger focus on the role of culture in the study of achievement goals (e.g., Guo et al. 2023, Liem & Senko 2022).

Values. Arguably, values are part and parcel of culture (e.g., Hofstede 1991). However, values can also be defined as “trans-situational goals, varying in importance, that serve as guiding principles in the life of a person or group” (Schwartz et al. 2012, p. 664). In particular, achievement is one of such goals, and it refers in this research tradition to demonstrating competence according to social standards. In this framework, the finer distinctions presented above are not considered (although research has shown a significant positive link between self-enhancement values, including achievement, and performance-approach goals; Pulfrey & Butera 2013), but it is interesting to remark that achievement can be considered as a guiding principle to such an extent that it becomes a “trans-situational goal.” This might explain the relative consistency of achievement goal effects across life domains (education, sports, and work; see Van Yperen et al. 2014).

Even more interestingly, a study compared the endorsement of the value of achievement (importance of success and ambition) in 20 capitalist countries (Schwartz 2007). The author correlated the achievement score of respondents from these countries with an index that classifies national economies on a continuum ranging from competitive market coordination to strategic coordination. The results showed a large correlation whereby the higher the competitive market coordination is in one country, the more its respondents prioritize the pursuit of achievement. Thus, society-level values—here, a nation’s adherence to deregulated competitive market coordination—appear to influence individual-level, trans-situational goal—here, under the form of the pursuit of achievement.

Social structures. At a more proximal level, individuals are embedded in social structures that may yield significant influence on their goals.

Goal structure. In this respect, a prolific area of research has been that of goal structure. Ames (1992) defined goal structure as the set of instructional and institutional practices put in place in a classroom. Five dimensions are relevant in her TARGET model: task assignments (T), authority relations (A), recognition systems (R), grouping procedures (G), evaluation practices (E), and use of time (T). Subsequent research has confirmed that indeed students detect the goal structure put in place by their teachers (Midgley et al. 2000, Urdan et al. 1998; see Daumiller et al. 2023 for research showing that teachers’ achievement goals may also vary across time and contexts). Most importantly, Meece et al. (2006) reviewed the accumulating literature and



showed that students who perceive that their teacher promotes a particular achievement goal (e.g., a performance-approach goal) develop the same achievement goals for themselves. More recently, Bardach et al. (2020) provided a meta-analytical test of the relations between goal structure and achievement goals. In a study with 68 samples, the authors reported that student ratings of mastery-approach, mastery-avoidance, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance goal structures were most strongly related to the personal endorsement of, respectively, mastery-approach, mastery-avoidance, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance goals.

It is important to note, as far as the E of TARGET is concerned, that although some evaluation practices may be specific to a certain teacher, in most educational settings evaluation practices are determined by the school system. In particular, the vast majority of learners are evaluated through normative assessment (grades of one sort or another), notwithstanding the variety of other existing forms of assessment (Butera et al. 2021a). In this respect, Pulfrey et al. (2011) found that students who expected an evaluation with a grade reported a higher level of endorsement of performance-avoidance goals than students who did not expect a grade. They also found that students who expected an evaluation with a grade (normative assessment) or a grade and detailed comments (normative plus formative assessments) reported a higher level of endorsement of performance-avoidance goals than students who expected detailed comments (formative assessment only). The vast majority of the work on goal structures has been conducted in the domain of education, but the above mechanism could be fruitfully studied in other domains such as sports and work/organizational psychology.

Competitive structures. There are a number of studies on the effect of competitive structures on achievement goals. Murayama & Elliot (2012) conducted a meta-analysis of studies including some form of competition, both performance goals, and a measure of performance. Their results revealed that competition—which included trait competitiveness and, more relevant for the present contention, perceived environmental competitiveness and structural competition—positively predicted both performance-approach and performance-avoidance goals. These results were later replicated by Elliot et al. (2018) and extended in a study in which perceived competitiveness produced by more or less unequal environments (based on the Gini index of the ZIP-code area where the participants lived) predicted both performance-approach and performance-avoidance goals (Sommet et al. 2019; see Sommet & Elliot 2023 for a review).

Sources of socialization. Socialization is the process by which the agents of a system (family, school, organizations) exert influence over time on individuals that are at a developmental stage (children, students, trainees; see, e.g., Baumrind 1980). In a series of studies, Sommet et al. (2017) investigated the influence that the performance-approach goals endorsed by supervisors—in this study, soccer coaches, PhD supervisors, videogame team leaders, and schoolteachers—yielded over time on the performance-approach and performance-avoidance goals of their followers—respectively, soccer players, PhD students, videogame players, and pupils. Their results revealed that the higher a supervisor's performance-approach goals, the stronger the effects of time on followers' performance-approach and performance-avoidance goals.

As for parents, there is evidence that children's perception of their parents' achievement goals is related to the children's own self-report of corresponding goals (Gonida et al. 2007). Likewise, parents' fear of failure has been shown to predict their children's adoption of performance-avoidance goals (Elliot & Thrash 2004). Several authors have provided accounts of the socializing influence of parents in the domain of achievement motives, both at a general level (Eccles 2007) and with a specific focus on STEM disciplines (Šimunović & Babarović 2020). There is also evidence of correlations between perceived peer goals and the endorsement of the corresponding goals, although both sets of goals were measured simultaneously (Hemi et al. 2023, study 1). In sum, all



the classic socializing agents (teachers, parents, and peers) appear to yield a socializing effect on achievement goals, as formalized in Liem & Elliot's (2018) and Liem & Senko's (2022) models. The latter model also provides the basis for an important observation. Liem and Senko note that academic goals depend on the socializing effect of teachers, parents, and peers, which in turn depends on the cultural context surrounding them (values, norms, aspirations, and so on; see Liem & Senko 2022, figure 2). This implies that cultural differences in how children are socialized has an impact on the development of students' achievement goals. For example, there is now a wealth of research showing that upper/middle-class and working-class children are socialized to develop, respectively, culture-specific independent versus interdependent selves, which has an impact on their adaptation to educational institutions, especially when they reach higher education (e.g., Stephens et al. 2012; see Stephens et al. 2014 for the role of homes, schools, and workplaces in the development of social class culture; see also S. Goudeau, N. Stephens, H.R. Markus, C. Darnon, J.C. Croizet & A. Cimpian, unpublished manuscript, for a comprehensive model of the consequences of social class-specific adaptation). Indeed, research has shown that working-class students report performance-avoidance goals to a higher extent than middle-class students (Jury et al. 2015).

Experimental contexts. One of the clearest tests of whether social context can influence goal endorsement can be found in experimental studies in which persuasive messages are provided to orient participants toward different goals. These experimental studies support the hypothesis that goals can be manipulated by explicitly giving students specific instructions (e.g., "Your goal should be to acquire new knowledge" or "Your goal should be to perform better than the majority of students") and have been conducted in this literature from the beginning (e.g., Crouzevialle & Butera 2013; Crouzevialle & Darnon 2019; Darnon et al. 2007a,b, 2010; Elliott & Dweck 1988; Senko & Harackiewicz 2005). The effectiveness of such manipulations in producing different levels of task performance has also been documented in meta-analytic work (e.g., Van Yperen et al. 2015). However, surprisingly enough, there are fewer experimental studies than correlational studies in the field. In addition, the relatively small effect size of goal manipulation on self-report goals (e.g., Darnon et al. 2007a) suggests that such goal manipulations may not produce similar effects on all students. Another possibility is that the manipulation of goals takes some time and requires longer sessions or repeated manipulations. In this sense, conducting larger-scale longitudinal experimental studies in which goals are explicitly manipulated may help to clarify the causal role of the contextual antecedents of achievement goals.

In this respect, and more recently, there has been a call to use targeted interventions (Harackiewicz & Priniski 2018) to address the question of large-scale, durable change in achievement goals (Urda & Kaplan 2020). Urda & Kaplan (2020) note that several whole-class and whole-school interventions have been conducted in this area, but that achievement goal research might yield a more global impact by adopting the methods and procedures of intervention research.

Summary. The reviewed literature shows that achievement goals display a rather stable structure and construct validity across cultures and social contexts. Their endorsement and relation with other constructs, however, is influenced by cultural, structural, and contextual factors that refer to the evaluation of competence.

The Expression of Achievement Goals as Social Influence

In the previous section on the effects of social influence on achievement goals we have focused on a rather classic approach in social psychology, which consists in studying how the social environment has an impact on individual constructs. Interestingly, and perhaps less discernibly, there is also



research that points to the fact that people can endorse or express achievement goals in order to obtain some influence on their environment, in particular to effectively adapt to their social environment. In this case, achievement goals are treated as (potential) sources of social influence rather than as targets.

Selective goal hypothesis. In reading the previous section, one may conclude that, given certain social- or individual-level antecedents, people endorse a specific set of achievement goals, which then drive the corresponding consequences. In fact, a stream of research has argued and documented that people may adopt multiple goals (e.g., Barron & Harackiewicz 2000, Darnon et al. 2010), an idea also supported by the view of motivation as malleable and dynamic (Kruglanski et al. 2002). As for achievement goals, much of this research has been devoted to showing that the adoption of multiple goals—mastery and performance goals—provides the optimal predictor of performance (see Harackiewicz et al. 2002a for a theoretical perspective). In this section, however, we focus on the hypotheses that can be formulated about the relation that binds multiple goals. The additive goal hypothesis proposes that mastery and performance goals independently and positively predict achievement outcomes. The interactive goal hypothesis proposes that mastery and performance goals interact to predict achievement outcomes. The specialized goal hypothesis proposes that mastery and performance goals predict different and specific achievement outcomes. Finally, the selective goal hypothesis proposes that individuals can purposefully endorse achievement goals that appear to be best suited for a particular situation. Indeed, “when individuals have the option of pursuing multiple goals, they can better negotiate their achievement experiences by focusing on the achievement goal that is most relevant at a particular time” (Barron & Harackiewicz 2001, p. 708). A student can, for instance, report performance-approach goals (desire to outperform others) to a higher extent when selection (e.g., high-stakes testing) is salient (Jury et al. 2017) and report mastery-approach goals (desire to learn) to a higher extent when in need to garner the teacher’s appreciation (Dompnier et al. 2009).

This is the most relevant hypothesis for our contention that people can endorse specific achievement goals to effectively adapt to their social environment. Indeed, Harackiewicz & Linnenbrink (2005) noted that each set of achievement goals might prove more adaptive in some contexts than others. For instance, Ziegler et al. (2008) showed that students endorsed different achievement goals to a different degree depending on whether they were addressing teachers, parents, peers, or themselves. Such differential pattern of endorsement also resulted in different relations between goals and learning outcomes.

Language. When people fill in an achievement goal questionnaire, they are not only self-reporting their actual goals but also telling something about themselves to somebody (see Ziegler et al. 2008 above). In their meta-analysis, Hulleman et al. (2010) have coded the phrasing used in the items that composed various achievement goal questionnaires. Commenting their results (see the section above titled The Question of Performance), they asked an important question: “*why* appearance-framed performance-approach goals have negative relationships with performance outcomes whereas normatively-framed performance-approach goals have positive relationships” (p. 442, their emphasis). These authors remarked that a focus on appearance (e.g., when answering on items such as “It’s important that others know that I am a good student”) may create a confusion between goals and self-worth, thereby prompting the participants to express what they think would benefit their image. On the contrary, a focus on normative social comparison (e.g., when answering on items such as “At school I try to score higher than other students”) may activate the need to succeed, thereby prompting the participants to express goals that may be instrumental to attain such success. Such considerations support the possibility that, when answering an achievement goal questionnaire, participants are indeed in a process of communication. In sum,



the linguistic framing of the questions asked would activate in respondents specific social norms (here, the importance of appearance versus social comparison) to which respondents may try to adapt.

The social value of achievement goals. We have begun this article by emphasizing that judgments related to achievement require an evaluative process and, therefore, social consensus. We have also seen that achievement goals emerge in competence-relevant environments (education, work, sports)—that is, in environments in which the attribution of value is a pervasive activity. The literature on achievement goals that we have reviewed documents (*a*) that people do indeed pursue goals that are dependent on the attribution of value (either compared to others or compared to oneself) and (*b*) that it is possible that people may also endorse specific goals to communicate their own value. In the remainder of this section we present a theory of social value and then report research that shows how people can use achievement goals to communicate their social value (i.e., provide a positive or negative image of themselves).

Social value. According to Beauvois (1984), in everyday life people develop evaluative knowledge about objects, events, themselves, and other people. Unlike descriptive knowledge—that of a scientist who observes reality with (supposedly) unbiased methods—evaluative knowledge proceeds from people’s attempts to make sense of the function that objects, events, and people (including themselves) have within a certain social system (see Dubois & Pansu 2021 for a recent summary of Beauvois’s work). In other words, evaluative knowledge allows people to attribute value, which, in this framework, can be expressed as either social desirability or social utility (Beauvois 2003, Dubois & Beauvois 2005). It is now important to look at the definition of these two constructs:

Social desirability is the transmittable knowledge we have of a person’s more or less great capacity (1) to elicit positive (versus negative) affect in others or (2) to act in accordance with (versus oppose to) their main motivation. Social utility is the transmittable knowledge we have of a person’s more or less great capacity (1) to function in accordance with the rules of society and (2) to feel comfortable with those rules. (Dubois & Beauvois 2008, p. 1748)

This definition is interesting because it clearly expresses the notion that when we attribute some social value to people, we assess the extent to which they can influence their social environment by eliciting either appreciation or perceptions of fit with the social environment and therefore of potential success—or both. Indeed, we may consider a student as high in social utility because they are very competent and competitive, but low in social desirability because such competitiveness generates a great deal of hostility among fellow students; or we may consider a worker as high in both social utility and social desirability because they are both skilled and an empathic team member. In sum, social value expresses a form of adaptation to the social environment [see applications of this theory to several social environments, such as education, (e.g., Matteucci 2014), sports (e.g., Clément-Guillotin et al. 2013), and intergroup relations (e.g., Iatridis 2019)].

Social desirability and social utility share several features with other distinctions in the area of social judgment, such as warmth and competence (Fiske et al. 2002), communion and agency (Abele & Wojciszke 2018), and friendliness and dominance (Wiggins 1979). Recently, the authors of five models of social judgement have engaged in adversarial collaboration to develop a common conceptual framework (Abele et al. 2021). The result is a common model with a horizontal dimension that refers to communion, warmth, and “getting along” on the one hand, and a vertical dimension that refers to agency, competence, and “getting ahead” on the other hand.

Although both the social desirability/social utility distinction and the collaborative framework (Abele et al. 2021) share a focus on social evaluation, the emphasis differs. In particular, the collaborative framework stresses the role and the processing modes of the perceiver as well as appropriate



properties that are used by perceivers to evaluate different types of targets. The social desirability/social utility distinction, on the other hand, puts an emphasis on the relationship between an actor and their social environment. In particular, an actor is conceived of as a social agent (Dubois & Pansu 2021), which means that the relevant evaluations are those that concern the agent's function within the social system. The consequence is that, in this framework, social judgment is aimed at assessing the extent to which an actor can adapt to their social environment and either being liked or having success. In this respect, the social value framework is particularly appropriate to study if and how people can use achievement goals to adapt to their social environment.

Social utility and social desirability of achievement goals. We have noted that achievement goals are not adopted in a social vacuum, as these goals are endorsed in social environments that promote individual achievement, such as work, sports, or educational systems. In particular, educational systems pursue two main functions related to student achievement: an educational function that requires students to improve their knowledge and skills, and a selection function that requires students to be selected on a meritocratic basis, through social comparison, to steer them to the place they deserve in society (Dornbusch et al. 1996). In this respect, the educational system promotes and socially values the pursuit of achievement goals that enable the fulfillment of these two functions (Darnon et al. 2009), namely mastery goals (i.e., educational function) and performance goals (i.e., selection function).

Students are well aware of the social value that educational systems in general, and teachers in particular, attribute to achievement goals. Such a bold statement is based on a series of studies conducted to investigate the social value of achievement goals (Darnon et al. 2009). Darnon and colleagues showed that mastery goals, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance goals were all valued. However, mastery goals were valued both in terms of social desirability and social utility, which is very sensible because reporting a high level of desire to learn is appreciated by teachers and perceived as something that facilitates success at university. Performance-approach goals were not valued in terms of social desirability (the desire to outperform others does not make one nice) but they were in terms of social utility (see also Dompnier et al. 2008). Finally, performance-avoidance goals were not valued in terms of social utility but they were in terms of social desirability. The same value-goal associations were found when respondents judged another student. In sum, students are aware of the social value of achievement goals, and they are able to self-report these goals in a way that allows them to be valued in terms of social desirability and/or social utility or to attribute social value to others.

Judgments of social desirability and utility are contingent upon understanding the requirements of the social structure in which one is embedded. If it is true that social value expresses a form of adaptation to the social environment, then judgments should vary as the social environment varies. Dompnier et al. (2008) tested this assumption and showed that, indeed, students understand that social value depends on the point of view they take. From the point of view of students, other students were judged low in social desirability when these students declared to be highly motivated by performance-approach goals. Indeed, a student with a high desire to outperform others is a threat to other students. However, high performance-approach students were judged high in social utility when participants judged them from the point of view of their teachers. Indeed, teachers are agents of the educational system, and as such they should attribute social utility to persons who satisfy the requirements of the system (see also Dompnier et al. 2007 on the importance of social utility for teachers' judgment). In a similar vein, Jury et al. (2017) showed that students especially endorse performance-approach goals when selection is the salient norm at university, precisely because in that case they consider that performance-approach goals afford high social utility. In sum, the social desirability and social utility of achievement goals appear to



be transparent to students, who seem to be able to endorse them, or judge people who endorse them, as a function of the structure and requirements of their social environment.

Social value and the achievement goals–performance relationship. In addition to moderating the endorsement and judgment of achievement goals, the knowledge that people have of achievement goals' social desirability and utility also moderates the relationship between achievement goals and performance. We have noted above the inconsistent and small relationship between mastery-approach goals and performance as well as the debate on the conditions under which performance-approach goals predict performance. Dompnier et al. (2009) reasoned that such inconsistency may stem from the fact that people detect what is valued in a given social environment and may fake their reported desire to learn (e.g., by reporting mastery goals, a highly valued set of goals). They found that mastery-approach goals positively predicted performance to the extent that their social desirability was low; when their social desirability was high (e.g., when students endorsed mastery-approach goals to garner teachers' appreciation), these goals no longer predicted performance. The opposite relationship was found for social utility: The higher the social utility of mastery-approach goals, the more positive the goals–performance relationship. These findings were later replicated with high-school students and a performance measure independent from their teachers (Smeding et al. 2015) as well as with primary school children (Smeding et al. 2022).

These results suggest that social utility has a facilitating effect and social desirability an inhibiting effect on the relationship between mastery-approach goals and performance. Knowing that mastery goals are socially useful—i.e., that learning helps succeed in the educational system—reinforces the relationship between these goals and performance. However, knowing that mastery goals are socially desirable—i.e., that expressing the desire to learn is positively viewed by teachers—debilitates the relationship between these goals and performance. If this is indeed the case, then it should be possible to design intervention studies to influence the representation of achievement goals that students have in terms of social desirability and social utility. This is what Dompnier et al. (2015) did: They found that convincing students that mastery-approach goals are not particularly desirable and high in social utility resulted in a more positive association between mastery-approach goals and performance as compared to other combinations, especially for low-achieving students. Moreover, the same reasoning can be applied to performance-approach goals, and indeed Dompnier et al. (2013) showed that social utility has a facilitating effect and social desirability an inhibiting effect on the relationship between performance-approach goals and performance.

Summary. The literature reviewed in this section suggests that achievement goals can be reported with a social influence purpose: communicating that one possesses the qualities that one believes are important for adapting to one's social environment. The social value of achievement goals can be related to one's ability to adapt to the desires and preferences of relevant others (social desirability) and to one's ability to adapt to the criteria of success of one's relevant environment (social utility). Thus, people can endorse and express specific achievement goals as a function of the impression they want to induce, either as people who have the qualities needed to be appreciated or as people who have the required competences to succeed in their environment (e.g., Dompnier et al. 2013).

CONCLUDING REMARKS

The literature reviewed above depicts achievement as a fundamental feature of individual and social life. It is a fundamental need for the individual and a fundamental component of societal ideologies. Achievement goals then translate into purpose, and eventually into behavior, the value that society bestows to achievement and that motivates people to achieve. It should be noted at



this point that, in describing the various antecedents and consequences of achievement goals, the majority of models propose a linear path from antecedents to achievement goals to consequences. In the conceptual framework proposed here, we have delineated a circular model based on social influence (**Figure 1**). We have reviewed the existing research that makes this model plausible, and in this final section we speculate about research that does not exist yet but could contribute to the development of such circular model.

Linear and Circular Models

Most achievement goal models are linear. They represent the path that, through achievement goals, leads from motive dispositions to achievement-relevant outcomes (Elliot & Church 1997); from temperament to exam performance (Elliot & Thrash 2010); from competition to performance (Murayama & Elliot 2012); or from cultural contexts to several affective, behavioral, and cognitive outcomes (Liem & Elliot 2018, Liem & Senko 2022). Linearity is not at all a weakness; in fact it is a strength, as it has allowed achievement goal theorists to characterize what achievement goals are and what they do.

The circular model of achievement goals proposed here has a different goal, no pun intended. It is circular because it aims to account for the circulation and diffusion of achievement goals through society. We have reviewed the sources of social influence that shape achievement goals, namely, cultural, structural, and contextual factors (the promotion arrow in **Figure 1**). We have also reviewed the work that led us to consider that the expression of achievement goals may be a source of social influence to the extent that people can differentially endorse achievement goals as a function of the requirements of their social environment (the adaptation arrow in **Figure 1**). When people adapt to their social environment, they may strengthen the cultural, structural, and contextual factors active in a social environment through their conformity (the reproduction arrow in **Figure 1**). However, so far, no research has tested the latter statement, which remains a hypothesis. Moreover, it is also possible that this stage of the model results in change of the cultural, structural, and contextual factors active in a social environment (the change arrow in **Figure 1**). As the two latter options are plausible, we consider both of them hereafter.

Before we do so, in view of the speculative nature of these links, we take the opportunity to make a general recommendation: We believe that future research may benefit from increased use of experimental and longitudinal studies. We discussed earlier in the article the importance of developing experimental research to examine how and when persuasive messages and/or crafting specific contexts can affect goal endorsement. This issue is essential to shed light on what can be done and said in achievement-relevant contexts (work, sports, education) to promote some goals instead of others. Achievement goal research has used longitudinal designs in the past (e.g., Harackiewicz et al. 2002b), but for future research we suggest studies in which the influence source is later studied as the influence target. For example, a study that investigates the effect of the classroom goal structure on achievement goals may also investigate the effect of the adoption (or rejection) of achievement goals on the classroom goal structure. This could also take the form of targeted interventions (Harackiewicz & Priniski 2018), in which researchers could assess not only the target behavior (say, deep study) but also the extent to which the change in study strategies affects the structure in which the behavior is displayed (say, a school or an educational system). Indeed, provided that the intervention concerns a sizeable sample of a population, and it is carried out for a sufficiently long time, it is possible to hypothesize that changes in behaviors may lead to changes at the structural level.

Reproduction

In a recent article, Butera et al. (2021b) have illustrated how competition circulates from society's ideologies, values, and norms through the educational system to the students, and back to society



when students become active citizens. If the circulation encounters little resistance—e.g., educational structures are built on society's values and norms, educators work in agreement with these structures, and students are successfully socialized—then it is likely that a process of reproduction of society's values and norms will occur. In the present article, we have adopted a similar, but broader, perspective. We have proposed that specific cultures, social structures, and contexts shape specific achievement goals, which are then endorsed and communicated in a way as to conform to the requirements of the social environment. In this way, people influence their environment by contributing to the normativity of the social value attributed to achievement goals (Darnon et al. 2009). It is then most likely that this process will result in the reproduction of the status quo.

Future research is invited to produce a more integrative picture of such influence, which so far has received only fragmented attention. The promotion leg of the circle in **Figure 1** has been widely researched, and the results that emerge, for example, from the literature on the effect of goal structures (e.g., Bardach et al. 2020) can be interpreted in terms of conformity effects (e.g., Cialdini & Goldstein 2004). The adaptation leg as well can be interpreted in terms of conformity, to the extent that targeted expression of achievement goals is calibrated to help the sources of influence fit in their social environment (Darnon et al. 2009). The reproduction leg might need future research that integrates insights from psychology, sociology, and modeling to the extent that in order to study how conformity perpetuates, large-scale phenomena need to be considered.

Indirect evidence for a reproduction effect comes from research suggesting that group membership, in particular being a member of a high- versus low-status group, can induce specific goal endorsement that is congruent with—and therefore validates—group membership. For example, Butler (2014) argues that in school, boys develop an orientation toward demonstrating and promoting their abilities (the motivation to prove, i.e., performance-approach goals), while girls are more interested in working, striving, and improving their performance (the motivation to try and to improve, i.e., mastery goals). Similarly, working-class students as well as women are more likely to endorse performance-avoidance goals than upper-middle-class students and male students (Dupeyrat et al. 2011, Jury et al. 2015). Performance-avoidance goals are the most deleterious to performance (Huang 2012, Van Yperen et al. 2014) and the least valued in terms of social utility (Darnon et al. 2009). Consequently, they may contribute to maintaining and reproducing the achievement gap between lower- and higher-status groups. Similarly, we have discussed the fact that the very functioning of the education system attributes social utility value to performance-approach goals. These goals are more likely to be endorsed by male students and higher-status groups (Butler 2014, Jury et al. 2019). Consequently, the social utility value attached to performance-approach goals can also contribute to maintain, reproduce, and even increase the achievement gap between advantaged and disadvantaged groups (Crouzevialle & Darnon 2019, Smeding et al. 2013).

Interestingly, we previously discussed the fact that avoidance goals lead to emotions like anxiety, hopelessness, and shame (Pekrun et al. 2006). In the stereotype content model [Fiske 2018, Fiske et al. 2002; see also the aforementioned synthesis by Abele et al. (2021)], such emotions are typically attributed to groups who elicit pity, namely, groups high in warmth and low in competence. Conversely, enjoyment, hope, and pride, which result from the endorsement of approach goals, are more likely to elicit envy or admiration, which are typical of higher-status groups in the stereotype content model. This parallel supports the idea that goal endorsement is likely to give rise to different social judgements and to reflect the social value associated with individuals or groups in society; this may in turn contribute to reproduction.

In sum, reproduction occurs when the fit between endorsed achievement goals and the achievement goals valued in the existing culture, structure, or context is better than the fit between endorsed achievement goals and the achievement goals valued by a new culture, structure, or



context, in case they are available or salient. This is represented by $F_e > F_n$ in **Figure 1**, where F_e is the fit in the existing context and F_n the fit in the new context.

Change

It is also possible that alternative values, norms, and ideologies concomitantly influence the expression of achievement goals, which may, in the long run, result in change in the societal-level social value of achievement goals. How can change come about? Social impact theory (Latané 1981) is a theory of social influence that considers the fact that we are all the targets of countless sources of influence (see also Latané 1996 for an application to the creation of cultures). According to this theory, these sources have an impact that depends on three characteristics: strength (power, importance), immediacy (their spatial distance from or relevance to the target), and number. Social impact is then defined as a multiplicative function of these characteristics: $\text{Impact} = f(\text{Strength} \times \text{Immediacy} \times \text{Number})$. If the various sources of influence (e.g., school programs, teachers, bosses, coaches, parents, peers, and so on) converge in the values and norms they promote, reproduction should ensue. If the various sources of influence diverge, however, the theory implies that the most impactful source(s) will prevail. It is then possible that the value attached to achievement goals changes because new cultures become more dominant, because new organizational or educational structures are put into place following reforms, or because closer sources (e.g., a dissident teacher) have more impact than overarching but distal sources (e.g., the educational system in place).

There is also another possible outcome in case of diverging or dissenting influence sources: integration. The work conducted on sociocognitive conflict (Doise & Mugny 1984, Perret-Clermont 2022) reveals that, when a divergence in points of view arises, people can regulate this conflict in two ways (see also Pérez & Mugny 1996 for a general theory of conflict elaboration). A relational regulation, focusing on who is right and who is wrong, would lead one side to prevail. By contrast, an epistemic regulation of conflict would lead people to focus on the knowledge that might explain the origin of such divergence. In this case, it is possible to observe an integration of the various points of view and possibly the emergence of a synthesis (see Butera et al. 2011, 2019; Darnon et al. 2007a,b for incorporation of achievement goals in this perspective). Integration may therefore be a step toward change in the direction of more integrative and inclusive social systems. In sum, change occurs when the fit between endorsed achievement goals and the achievement goals valued by a new, emerging, dissident, or integrative culture, structure, or context is better than the fit between endorsed achievement goals and the achievement goals valued by the existing culture, structure, or context. This is represented by $F_n > F_e$ in **Figure 1**.

Conclusions

More than 40 years of research on achievement goals have generated an impressive amount of interest and knowledge on this central construct. This interest is justified by the position of achievement as a fundamental feature of human life for both individuals and societies, as achievement motivates people to pursue success and avoid failure, and by the position of achievement goals as an intermediary that translates individuals' knowledge of the value of achievement into purpose and, eventually, action. The knowledge generated in this domain has been synthesized in the models we have reviewed, that identify cultural, structural, and contextual antecedents that shape achievement goals, which in turn predict achievement-relevant outcomes. We have noted that such models are linear (from antecedents to achievement goals to consequences), which is instrumental to characterize where achievement goals come from and what their outcomes are. In this article we have proposed a complementary approach, a circular model whose objective is to formalize the circulation of achievement goals through society. The above sections have argued for the plausibility of a circular model; it is now time to reflect upon its possible added value.



The first contribution of circularity pertains to a question we have asked at the beginning of this article: Why is achievement such an important feature for society? One possible answer is that effort and ability, two defining features of achievement, are also the ingredients of a major self-justification ideology, namely, meritocracy. We have seen that meritocracy posits that students, workers, and athletes are rewarded based on their achievements (i.e., on their effort and ability), not based on their social background. As meritocracy assumes equal opportunities, underachievement is therefore attributed to lack of effort or ability, thereby justifying the observed inequalities and the status quo in terms of dominant and dominated groups. Such circular reasoning is what allows meritocracy to be a system-justification ideology. We believe that a circular model of achievement goals may help researchers reflect upon the possible system-justifying role of achievement goals. Such possibility has not been addressed so far, because linear models have studied the question of social influence *on* achievement goals. The work we have reviewed on the social value of achievement goals allowed us to tackle the question of the social influence *of* achievement goals, thereby opening the way to the elaboration of a circular model. Group norms, values, and ideologies need the consensus of their members to be perpetuated, but consensus is not only acceptance but also reproduction. The proposed circular model may help future research to explore uncharted territory such as, for example, studying how selection structures—e.g., tracking in education or bonuses in organizations—foster adherence to performance-approach goals, whose social utility contributes to keeping in place those selection structures.

The second contribution of circularity pertains to the question of the evolution of social structures. How can social structures transform themselves if there is not a source of social influence to initiate change? Change, of course, may proceed from top-down processes such as school reforms, changes in parliamentary majorities, or organizational restructuring. A circular model, however, allows us to conceive social change as also proceeding from a change in the endorsement and communication of the value of achievement goals. Take for instance the case of the debate concerning inclusive education. Political and institutional discourse has not produced substantial change in the inclusion of children with disabilities in regular classes, to the point that UNICEF declares on its website that “children with disabilities are often overlooked in policymaking” (<https://www.unicef.org/education/inclusive-education>). The question of the definition of achievement and ability is at the core of the debate on inclusive education (Khamzina et al. 2021). It is then possible that change in the value attributed to competitive goals may lead to a reflection on normative assessment and, eventually, to a change in assessment structures. All these ideas are speculative, but they are grounded in thriving areas of investigation; we hope that future research will take up one or the other of these challenges.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The authors are not aware of any affiliations, memberships, funding, or financial holdings that might be perceived as affecting the objectivity of this review.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The preparation of this work was supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation. The authors wish to thank Andrew Elliot for his important comments and suggestions on a previous version of this article.

LITERATURE CITED

Abele AE, Ellemers N, Fiske ST, Koch A, Yzerbyt V. 2021. Navigating the social world: toward an integrated framework for evaluating self, individuals, and groups. *Psychol. Rev.* 128:290–314



- Abele AE, Wojciszke B, eds. 2018. *The Agency–Communion Framework*. London: Routledge
- Ames C. 1992. Achievement goals and the classroom climate. In *Student Perceptions in the Classroom*, ed. DH Schunk, JL Meece, pp. 327–48. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Baranik LE, Stanley LJ, Bynum BH, Lance CE. 2010. Examining the construct validity of mastery-avoidance achievement goals: a meta-analysis. *Hum. Perform.* 23:265–82
- Bardach L, Oczlon S, Pietschnig J, Lüftenegger M. 2020. Has achievement goal theory been right? A meta-analysis of the relation between goal structures and personal achievement goals. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 112:1197–220
- Barron KE, Harackiewicz JM. 2000. Achievement goals and optimal motivation: a multiple goals approach. In *Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: The Search for Optimal Motivation and Performance*, ed. C Sansone, JM Harackiewicz, pp. 229–54. San Diego, CA: Academic
- Barron KE, Harackiewicz JM. 2001. Achievement goals and optimal motivation: testing multiple goal models. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 80:706–22
- Batruch A, Autin F, Butera F. 2019. The paradoxical role of meritocratic selection in the perpetuation of social inequalities at school. In *The Social Psychology of Inequality*, ed. J Jetten, K Peters, pp. 123–37. Cham, Switz.: Springer Nature
- Batruch A, Jetten J, Van de Werfhorst H, Darnon C, Butera F. 2023. Belief in school meritocracy and the legitimization of social and income inequality. *Soc. Psychol. Pers. Sci.* 14(5):621–35
- Baumrind D. 1980. New directions in socialization research. *Am. Psychol.* 35:639–52
- Beauvois JL. 1984. *La psychologie quotidienne*. Paris: PUF
- Beauvois JL. 2003. Judgment norms, social utility, and individualism. In *A Sociocognitive Approach to Social Norms*, ed. N Dubois, pp. 123–47. London: Routledge
- Berry JW, Poortinga YH, Segall MH, Dasen PR. 2002. *Cross-Cultural Psychology: Research and Applications*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press. 2nd ed.
- Beugelsdijk S, Smeets R. 2008. Entrepreneurial culture and economic growth: revisiting McClelland's thesis. *Am. J. Econ. Sociol.* 67:915–39
- Biddle S, Akande A, Vlachopoulos S, Fox K. 1996. Towards an understanding of children's motivation for physical activity: achievement goal orientations, beliefs about sport success, and sport emotion in Zimbabwean children. *Psychol. Health* 12:49–55
- Bong M. 2004. Academic motivation in self-efficacy, task value, achievement goal orientations, and attributional beliefs. *J. Educ. Res.* 97:287–98
- Bradford G. 2015. *Achievement*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
- Brun L, Pansu P, Dompnier B. 2021. The role of causal attributions in determining behavioral consequences: a meta-analysis from an intrapersonal attributional perspective in achievement contexts. *Psychol. Bull.* 147:701–18
- Bruno A, Jury M, Toczec-Capelle MC, Darnon C. 2019. Are performance-avoidance goals always deleterious for academic achievement in college? The moderating role of social class. *Soc. Psychol. Educ.* 22:539–55
- Butera F, Batruch A, Autin F, Mugny G, Quiamzade A, Pulfrey C. 2021a. Teaching as social influence: Empowering teachers to become agents of social change. *Soc. Issues Policy Rev.* 15:323–55
- Butera F, Darnon C. 2017. Competence assessment, social comparison and conflict regulation. In *Handbook of Competence and Motivation: Theory and Application*, ed. A Elliot, C Dweck, D Yaeger, pp. 192–213. New York: Guilford
- Butera F, Darnon C, Mugny G. 2011. Learning from conflict. In *Rebels in Groups: Dissent, Deviance, Difference and Defiance*, ed. J Jetten, M Hornsey, pp. 36–53. New York: Wiley-Blackwell
- Butera F, Mugny G. 2001. The use of social influence research. In *Social Influence in Social Reality*, ed. F Butera, G Mugny, pp. 1–5. Newburyport, MA: Hogrefe & Huber
- Butera F, Sommet N, Darnon C. 2019. Sociocognitive conflict regulation: how to make sense of diverging ideas. *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* 28:145–51
- Butera F, Świątkowski W, Dompnier B. 2021b. Competition in education. In *The Oxford Handbook on the Psychology of Competition*, ed. S Garcia, A Tor, AJ Elliot. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780190060800.013.24>
- Butler R. 2014. Motivation in educational contexts: Does gender matter? *Adv. Child Dev. Behav.* 47:1–41



- Cellar DF, Stuhlmacher AF, Young SK, Fisher DM, Adair CK, et al. 2011. Trait goal orientation, self-regulation, and performance: a meta-analysis. *J. Bus. Psychol.* 26:467–83
- Cialdini RB, Goldstein NJ. 2004. Social influence: compliance and conformity. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 55:591–621
- Clément-Guillot C, Cambon L, Chalabaev A, Radel R, Michel S, Fontayne P. 2013. Social value and asymmetry of gender and sex categories in physical education. *Eur. Rev. Appl. Psychol.* 63:75–85
- Covington MV. 2000. Goal theory, motivation, and school achievement: an integrative review. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 51:171–200
- Crouzevialle M, Butera F. 2013. Performance-approach goals deplete working memory and impair cognitive performance. *J. Exp. Psychol. Gen.* 142:666–78
- Crouzevialle M, Butera F. 2017. Performance goals and task performance: integrative considerations on the distraction hypothesis. *Eur. Psychol.* 22:73–82
- Crouzevialle M, Darnon C. 2019. On the academic disadvantage of low social class individuals: Pursuing performance goals fosters the emergence of the achievement gap. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 111:1261–72
- Darnon C, Butera F, Harackiewicz JM. 2007a. Achievement goals in social interactions: learning with mastery versus performance goals. *Motiv. Emot.* 31:61–70
- Darnon C, Dompnier B, Delmas F, Pulfrey C, Butera F. 2009. Achievement goal promotion at university: social desirability and social utility of mastery and performance goals. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 96:119–34
- Darnon C, Dompnier B, Gilliéron O, Butera F. 2010. The interplay of mastery and performance goals in social comparison: a multiple-goal perspective. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 102:212–22
- Darnon C, Dompnier B, Poortvliet M. 2012. Achievement goals in educational contexts: a social psychology perspective. *Soc. Pers. Psychol. Compass* 6:760–71
- Darnon C, Harackiewicz JM, Butera F, Mugny G, Quiamzade A. 2007b. Performance-approach and performance-avoidance goals: when uncertainty makes a difference. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 33:813–27
- Daumiller M, Janke S, Rinas R, Hein J, Dickhäuser O, Dresel M. 2023. Different time and context = different goals and emotions? Temporal variability and context specificity of achievement goals for teaching and associations with discrete emotions. *Contemp. Educ. Psychol.* 72:102139
- Dekker S, Fischer R. 2008. Cultural differences in academic motivation goals: a meta-analysis across 13 societies. *J. Educ. Res.* 102:99–110
- Doise W. 1986. *Levels of Explanation in Social Psychology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- Doise W, Mugny G. 1984. *The Social Development of the Intellect*. Oxford, UK: Pergamon
- Dompnier B, Darnon C, Butera F. 2009. Faking the desire to learn: a clarification of the link between mastery goals and academic achievement. *Psychol. Sci.* 20:939–43
- Dompnier B, Darnon C, Butera F. 2013. When performance-approach goals predict academic achievement and when they do not: a social value approach. *Br. J. Soc. Psychol.* 52:587–96
- Dompnier B, Darnon C, Delmas F, Butera F. 2008. Achievement goals and social judgment: the performance-approach paradox. *Int. Rev. Soc. Psychol.* 21:247–71
- Dompnier B, Darnon C, Meier E, Brandner C, Smeding A, Butera F. 2015. Improving low achievers' academic performance at university by changing the social value of mastery goals. *Am. Educ. Res. J.* 52:720–49
- Dompnier B, Pansu P, Bressoux P. 2007. Social utility, social desirability and scholastic judgments: toward a personological model of academic evaluation. *Eur. J. Psychol. Educ.* 22:333–50
- Dornbusch SM, Glasgow KL, Lin IC. 1996. The social structure of schooling. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 47:401–29
- Dubois N, Beauvois JL. 2005. Normativeness and individualism. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* 35:123–46
- Dubois N, Beauvois JL. 2008. The social value of internal explanations and the norm of internality. *Soc. Pers. Psychol. Compass* 2:1737–52
- Dubois N, Pansu P. 2021. Jean-Léon Beauvois (1943–2020): a key figure in social psychology. *Int. Rev. Soc. Psychol.* 34:2
- Dupeyrat C, Escribe C, Huet N, Régner I. 2011. Positive biases in self-assessment of mathematics competence, achievement goals, and mathematics performance. *Int. J. Educ. Res.* 50:241–50
- Dweck C. 1986. Motivational processes affecting learning. *Am. Psychol.* 41:1040–48
- Eccles JS. 2007. Families, schools, and developing achievement-related motivations and engagement. In *Handbook of Socialization: Theory and Research*, ed. JE Grusec, PD Hastings, pp. 665–91. New York: Guilford



- Eccles JS, Wigfield A. 2002. Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 53:109–32
- Elliot AJ. 1999. Approach and avoidance motivation and achievement goals. *Educ. Psychol.* 34:169–89
- Elliot AJ, Church MA. 1997. A hierarchical model of approach and avoidance achievement motivation. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 72:218–32
- Elliot AJ, Hulleman CS. 2017. Achievement goals. In *Handbook of Competence and Motivation: Theory and Application*, ed. AJ Elliot, CS Dweck, DS Yeager, pp. 43–60. New York: Guilford
- Elliot AJ, Jury M, Murayama K. 2018. Trait and perceived environmental competitiveness in achievement situations. *J. Pers.* 86:353–67
- Elliot AJ, McGregor HA. 2001. A 2×2 achievement goal framework. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 80:501–19
- Elliot AJ, Murayama K, Pekrun R. 2011. A 3×2 achievement goal model. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 103:632–48
- Elliot AJ, Thrash TM. 2001. Achievement goals and the hierarchical model of achievement motivation. *Educ. Psychol. Rev.* 13:139–56
- Elliot AJ, Thrash TM. 2002. Approach-avoidance motivation in personality: approach and avoidance temperaments and goals. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 82:804–18
- Elliot AJ, Thrash TM. 2004. The intergenerational transmission of fear of failure. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 30:957–71
- Elliot AJ, Thrash TM. 2010. Approach and avoidance temperament as basic dimensions of personality. *J. Pers.* 78:865–906
- Elliott ES, Dweck CS. 1988. Goals: an approach to motivation and achievement. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 54:5–12
- Festinger L. 1954. A theory of social comparison processes. *Hum. Relat.* 7:117–40
- Fiske ST. 2018. Stereotype content: Warmth and competence endure. *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* 27:67–73
- Fiske ST, Cuddy AJC, Glick P, Xu J. 2002. A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 82:878–902
- Fulgini A, Tseng V, Lam M. 1999. Attitudes toward family obligations among American adolescents with Asian, Latin American, and European backgrounds. *Child Dev.* 70:1030–44
- Gonida EN, Kiosseoglou G, Voulala K. 2007. Perceptions of parent goals and their contribution to student achievement goal orientation and engagement in the classroom: grade-level differences across adolescence. *Eur. J. Psychol. Educ.* 22:23–39
- Goodenough WH. 2003. In pursuit of culture. *Annu. Rev. Anthropol.* 32:1–12
- Guo J, Hu X, Elliot AJ, Marsh HW, Murayama K, et al. 2023. Mastery-approach goals: a large-scale cross-cultural analysis of antecedents and consequences. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 125:397–420
- Harackiewicz JM, Barron KE, Pintrich PR, Elliot AJ, Thrash TM. 2002a. Revision of achievement goal theory: necessary and illuminating. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 94:638–45
- Harackiewicz JM, Barron KE, Tauer JM, Elliot AJ. 2002b. Predicting success in college: a longitudinal study of achievement goals and ability measures as predictors of interest and performance from freshman year through graduation. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 94:562–75
- Harackiewicz JM, Linnenbrink EA. 2005. Multiple achievement goals and multiple pathways for learning: the agenda and impact of Paul R. Pintrich. *Educ. Psychol.* 40:75–84
- Harackiewicz JM, Priniski SJ. 2018. Improving student outcomes in higher education: the science of targeted intervention. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 69:409–35
- Harkins SG, Williams KD, Burger JM, eds. 2017. *The Oxford Handbook of Social Influence*. Oxford, UK: Oxford Univ. Press
- Heider F. 1958. *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons
- Hemi A, Madjar N, Rich Y. 2023. Perceived peer and teacher goals: relationships with students' academic achievement goals. *J. Exp. Educ.* 91:145–65
- Hofstede G. 1991. *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Huang C. 2011. Achievement goals and achievement emotions: a meta-analysis. *Educ. Psychol. Rev.* 23:359–88
- Huang C. 2012. Discriminant and criterion-related validity of achievement goals in predicting academic achievement: a meta-analysis. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 104:48–73
- Hulleman CS, Schrager SM, Bodmann SM, Harackiewicz JM. 2010. A meta-analytic review of achievement goal measures: different labels for the same constructs or different constructs with similar labels? *Psychol. Bull.* 136:422–49



- Iatridis T. 2019. The Janus of diversity: May the ideology of individual diversity rationalize social inequalities? *Political Psychol.* 40:183–201
- Jansen T, Meyer J, Wigfield A, Möller J. 2022. Which student and instructional variables are most strongly related to academic motivation in K-12 education? A systematic review of meta-analyses. *Psychol. Bull.* 148:1–26
- Jost JT, Banaji MR. 1994. The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *Br. J. Soc. Psychol.* 33:1–27
- Jost JT, Hunyady O. 2005. Antecedents and consequences of system-justifying ideologies. *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* 14:260–65
- Jury M, Darnon C, Dompnier B, Butera F. 2017. The social utility of performance-approach goals in a selective educational environment. *Soc. Psychol. Educ.* 20:215–35
- Jury M, Quiazade A, Darnon C, Mugny G. 2019. Higher and lower status individuals' performance goals: the role of hierarchy stability. *Motiv. Sci.* 5:52–65
- Jury M, Smeding A, Court M, Darnon C. 2015. When first-generation students succeed at university: on the link between social class, academic performance, and performance-avoidance goals. *Contemp. Educ. Psychol.* 41:25–36
- Khamzina K, Jury M, Ducreux E, Desombre C. 2021. The conflict between inclusive education and the selection function of schools in the minds of French teachers. *Teach. Teacher Educ.* 106:1–11
- Kim U, Park Y. 2006. Indigenous psychological analysis of academic achievement in Korea: the influence of self-efficacy, parents, and culture. *Int. J. Psychol.* 41:287–91
- King RB. 2015. Examining the dimensional structure and nomological network of achievement goals in the Philippines. *J. Adolesc.* 44:214–18
- King RB. 2022. Sociocultural and ecological perspectives on achievement motivation. *Asian J. Soc. Psychol.* 25:433–48
- King RB, McInerney DM. 2019. Family-support goals drive engagement and achievement in a collectivist context: integrating etic and emic approaches in goal research. *Contemp. Educ. Psychol.* 58:338–53
- Kruglanski AW, Shah JY, Fishbach A, Friedman R, Chun WY, et al. 2002. A theory of goal systems. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 34, ed. M Zanna, pp. 331–78. San Diego, CA: Academic
- Latané B. 1981. The psychology of social impact. *Am. Psychol.* 36:343–56
- Latané B. 1996. Dynamic social impact: the creation of culture by communication. *J. Commun.* 46:13–25
- Law YK. 2011. The effects of cooperative learning on enhancing Hong Kong fifth graders' achievement goals, autonomous motivation and reading proficiency. *J. Res. Read.* 34:402–25
- Lee M, Bong M. 2016. In their own words: reasons underlying the achievement striving of students in schools. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 108:274–94
- Li J. 2002. A cultural model of learning. *J. Cross-Cult. Psychol.* 33:248–69
- Liem GAD, Elliot AJ. 2018. Sociocultural influences on achievement goal adoption and regulation: a goal complex perspective. In *Big Theories Revisited 2*, ed. GAD Liem, DM McInerney, pp. 41–67. Charlotte, NC: Inf. Age Publ.
- Liem GAD, Nie Y. 2008. Values, achievement goals, and individual-oriented and social-oriented achievement motivations among Chinese and Indonesian secondary school students. *Int. J. Psychol.* 43:898–903
- Liem GAD, Senko C. 2022. Goal complexes: a new approach to studying the coordination, consequences, and social contexts of pursuing multiple goals. *Educ. Psychol. Rev.* 34:1–29
- Linnenbrink EA, Pintrich PR. 2001. Multiple goals, multiple contexts: the dynamic interplay between personal goals and contextual goal stresses. In *Motivation in Learning Contexts: Theoretical Advances and Methodological Implications*, ed. S Volet, S Järvelä, pp. 251–69. Oxford, UK: Pergamon Press
- Lochbaum M, Gottardy J. 2015. A meta-analytic review of the approach-avoidance achievement goals and performance relationships in the sport psychology literature. *J. Sport Health Sci.* 4:164–73
- Lochbaum M, Zazo R, Kazak Z, Wright T, Graham KA, Konttinen N. 2016. A meta-analytic review of achievement goal orientation correlates in competitive sport: a follow-up to Lochbaum et al. 2016. *Kinesiology* 48:159–73
- Maehr ML. 1974. Culture and achievement motivation. *Am. Psychol.* 29:887–96
- Maehr M. 1989. Thoughts about motivation. In *Research on Motivation in Education*, Vol. 3, ed. C Ames, R Ames, pp. 299–315. San Diego, CA: Academic



- Matteucci MC. 2014. Social utility versus social desirability of students' attributional self-presentation strategies. *Soc. Psychol. Educ.* 17:541–63
- McClelland DC. 1961. *The Achieving Society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand
- McClelland DC. 1987. *Human Motivation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Univ. Press
- McClelland DC, Atkinson JW, Clark RA, Lowell EL. 1953. *The Achievement Motive*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts
- Meece JL, Anderman EM, Anderman LH. 2006. Classroom goal structure, student motivation, and academic achievement. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 57:487–503
- Midgley C, Maehr ML, Hruda LZ, Anderman E, Anderman L, et al. 2000. *Manual for the Patterns of Adaptive Learning Scales*. Ann Arbor: Univ. Mich.
- Mijs JJB. 2021. The paradox of inequality: Income inequality and belief in meritocracy go hand in hand. *Socio-Econ. Rev.* 19:7–35
- Murayama K, Elliot AJ. 2012. The competition-performance relation: a meta-analytic review and test of the opposing processes model of competition and performance. *Psychol. Bull.* 138:1035–70
- Murayama K, Zhou M, Nesbit JC. 2009. A cross-cultural examination of the psychometric properties of responses to the achievement goal questionnaire. *Educ. Psychol. Meas.* 69:266–86
- Nicholls JG. 1984. Achievement motivation: Conceptions of ability, subjective experience, task choice, and performance. *Psychol. Rev.* 91:328–46
- Noordzij G, Giel L, van Mierlo H. 2021. A meta-analysis of induced achievement goals: the moderating effects of goal standard and goal framing. *Soc. Psychol. Educ.* 24:195–245
- Oyserman D, Lee SWS. 2007. Priming “culture”: culture as situated cognition. In *Handbook of Cultural Psychology*, ed. S Kitayama, D Cohen, pp. 255–79. New York: Guilford
- Payne SC, Youngcourt SS, Beaubien JM. 2007. A meta-analytic examination of the goal orientation nomological net. *J. Appl. Psychol.* 92:128–50
- Pekrun R, Elliot AJ, Maier MA. 2006. Achievement goals and discrete achievement emotions: a theoretical model and prospective test. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 98:583–97
- Pekrun R, Goetz T, Titz W, Perry RP. 2002. Academic emotions in students' self-regulated learning and achievement: a program of qualitative and quantitative research. *Educ. Psychol.* 37:91–105
- Pekrun R, Marsh HW, Elliot AJ, Stockinger K, Perry RP, et al. 2023. A three-dimensional taxonomy of achievement emotions. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 124:145–78
- Pérez JA, Mugny G. 1996. The conflict elaboration theory of social influence. In *Understanding Group Behavior*, Vol. 2: *Small Group Processes and Interpersonal Relations*, ed. E Witte, JH Davis, pp. 191–210. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Perret-Clermont AN. 2022. Socio-cognitive conflict. In *The Palgrave Encyclopedia of the Possible*, ed. VP Glăveanu. Cham, Switz: Palgrave Macmillan. https://link.springer.com/referenceworkentry/10.1007/978-3-319-98390-5_214-1
- Poortvliet PM, Darnon C. 2010. Toward a more social understanding of achievement goals: the interpersonal effects of mastery and performance goals. *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* 19:324–28
- Pulfrey C, Buchs C, Butera F. 2011. Why grades engender performance avoidance goals: the mediating role of autonomous motivation. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 103:683–700
- Pulfrey C, Butera F. 2013. Why neoliberal values of self-enhancement lead to cheating in higher education: a motivational account. *Psychol. Sci.* 24:2153–62
- Rawsthorne LJ, Elliot AJ. 1999. Achievement goals and intrinsic motivation: a meta-analytic review. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Rev.* 3:326–44
- Ryan RM, Deci EL. 2000. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development, and well-being. *Am. Psychol.* 55:68–78
- Schwartz SH. 2007. Cultural and individual value correlates of capitalism: a comparative analysis. *Psychol. Inq.* 18:52–57
- Schwartz SH, Cieciuch J, Vecchione M, Davidov E, Fischer R, et al. 2012. Refining the theory of basic individual values. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 103:663–88
- Senko C, Dawson B. 2017. Performance-approach goal effects depend on how they are defined: meta-analytic evidence from multiple educational outcomes. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 109:574–98



- Senko C, Freund AM. 2015. Are mastery-avoidance achievement goals always detrimental? An adult development perspective. *Motiv. Emot.* 39:477–88
- Senko CM, Harackiewicz JM. 2005. Achievement goals, performance and task interest: why perceived difficulty matters. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 31:1739–53
- Šimunović M, Babarović T. 2020. The role of parents' beliefs in students' motivation, achievement, and choices in the STEM domain: a review and directions for future research. *Soc. Psychol. Educ.* 23:701–19
- Smeding A, Darnon C, Souchal C, Toczec-Capelle MC, Butera F. 2013. Reducing the socio-economic status achievement gap at university by promoting mastery-oriented assessment. *PLOS ONE* 8:e71678
- Smeding A, Dompnier B, Meier E, Darnon C, Baumberger B, Butera F. 2015. The motivation to learn as a self-presentation tool among Swiss high school students: the moderating role of mastery goals' perceived social value on learning. *Learn. Individ. Differ.* 40:204–10
- Smeding A, Dompnier B, Meier E, Darnon C, Butera F. 2022. A multilevel account for social value related reasons behind mastery goals. *Br. J. Educ. Psychol.* 92:394–408
- Sommet N, Darnon C, Butera F. 2015. To confirm or to conform? Performance goals as a regulator of conflict with more-competent others. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 107:580–98
- Sommet N, Elliot AJ. 2016. Achievement goals. In *Encyclopedia of Personality and Individual Differences*, ed. V Zeigler-Hill, T Shackelford. Cham, Switz: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-28099-8_484-1
- Sommet N, Elliot AJ. 2023. A competitiveness-based theoretical framework on the psychology of income inequality. *Curr. Dir. Psychol. Sci.* In press. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214231159563>
- Sommet N, Elliot AJ, Jamieson JP, Butera F. 2019. Income inequality, perceived competitiveness, and approach-avoidance motivation. *J. Pers.* 87:767–84
- Sommet N, Elliot AJ, Sheldon KM. 2021. Achievement goal complexes: integrating the “what” and the “why” of achievement motivation. In *Handbook of Personality: Theory and Research*, ed. OP John, RW Robins, pp. 104–21. New York: Guilford
- Sommet N, Pillaud V, Meuleman B, Butera F. 2017. The socialization of performance goals. *Contemp. Educ. Psychol.* 49:337–54
- Spears R. 2021. Social influence and group identity. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 72:367–90
- Stephens NM, Fryberg SA, Markus HR, Johnson CS, Covarrubias R. 2012. Unseen disadvantage: how American universities' focus on independence undermines the academic performance of first-generation college students. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 102:1178–97
- Stephens NM, Markus HR, Phillips LT. 2014. Social class culture cycles: how three gateway contexts shape selves and fuel inequality. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 65:611–34
- Stevenson H, Stigler J. 1992. *The Learning Gap: Why Our Schools Are Failing and What We Can Learn from Japanese and Chinese Education*. New York: Simon & Schuster
- Triandis HC, Malpass RS, Davidson AR. 1973. Psychology and culture. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 24:355–78
- Urdan T, Kaplan A. 2020. The origins, evolution, and future directions of achievement goal theory. *Contemp. Educ. Psychol.* 61:101862
- Urdan T, Midgley C, Anderman EM. 1998. The role of classroom goal structure in students' use of self-handicapping strategies. *Am. Educ. Res. J.* 35:101–22
- Van Yperen NW, Blaga M, Postmes T. 2014. A meta-analysis of self-reported achievement goals and non-self-report performance across three achievement domains (work, sports, and education). *PLOS ONE* 9:e93594
- Van Yperen NW, Blaga M, Postmes T. 2015. A meta-analysis of the impact of situationally induced achievement goals on task performance. *Hum. Perform.* 28:165–82
- Vansteenkiste M, Lens W, Elliot AJ, Soenens B, Mouratidis A. 2014. Moving the achievement goal approach one step forward: toward a systematic examination of the autonomous and controlled reasons underlying achievement goals. *Educ. Psychol.* 49:153–74
- Weiner B. 1985. An attributional theory of achievement motivation and emotion. *Psychol. Rev.* 92:548–73
- White RW. 1959. Motivation reconsidered: the concept of competence. *Psychol. Rev.* 66:297–333
- Wiggins JS. 1979. A psychological taxonomy of trait-descriptive terms: the interpersonal domain. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 37:395–412



- Winne PH, Nesbit JC. 2010. The psychology of academic achievement. *Annu. Rev. Psychol.* 61:653–78
- Yu A, Yang K. 1994. The nature of achievement motivation in collectivist societies. In *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method, and Applications*, Vol. 18, ed. U Kim, HC Triandis, C Kagitcibasi, S Choi, G Yoon, pp. 239–50. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE
- Ziegler A, Dresel M, Stoeger H. 2008. Addressees of performance goals. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 100:643–54
- Zusho A, Clayton K. 2011. Culturalizing achievement goal theory and research. *Educ. Psychol.* 46:239–60

