Should we be Looking at the Forest or the Trees? Overall Psychological Needs Satisfaction and

Individual Needs as Predictors of Physical Activity

April 30th, 2016

Abstract

The objectives of this study were twofold: (a) examine if measures designed to assess satisfaction of competence, autonomy, and relatedness needs in the physical activity domain can represent both general and specific needs satisfaction, and (b) assess if the specific needs are associated with concurrent moderate-to-vigorous intensity physical activity (MVPA) participation (Time 1) and MVPA participation 4 months later (Time 2), beyond general psychological needs satisfaction (PNS). Data from 544 adolescents (M_{age}=14.12 years, SD=.64) were analyzed. A bifactor model specifying a general PNS and three specific needs factors provided a good fit to the data. Extending the model to predict Time 1 and Time 2 MVPA participation also provided a good fit to the data. General PNS and specific needs had unique and empirically distinguishable associations with MVPA participation. The bifactor operationalization of PNS has implications for future research. Specifically, it provides a framework to delineate common and distinctive antecedents and outcomes of general PNS and specific needs.

Keywords: Psychological needs satisfaction; physical activity; bifactor model; self-determination theory; longitudinal study; adolescents.

Should we be Looking at the Forest or the Trees? Overall Psychological Needs Satisfaction and

Individual Needs as Predictors of Physical Activity

Regular participation in moderate-to-vigorous intensity physical activity (MVPA) can

effectively reduce the risk of developing several health conditions (e.g., hypertension, type 2

diabetes, heart diseases, stroke, obesity, depression, and certain cancers) and enhance quality of

life and wellbeing in adolescents (Andersen, Riddoch, Kriemler, & Hills, 2011; Eime, Young,

Harvey, Charity, & Payne, 2013; Janssen & LeBlanc, 2010). However, only 5% of adolescents

12 to 17 years living in Canada meet recommendations of engaging in at least 60 minutes of

MVPA per day (ParticipACTION, 2015). As such, considerable efforts have been devoted to

identifying factors associated with MVPA participation in adolescents to inform the design of

effective behavior change interventions. Fostering the satisfaction of adolescents' basic

psychological needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness has been considered important

for promoting MVPA participation (Cox, Smith, & Williams, 2008; McDavid, Cox, &

McDonough, 2014; Taylor, Ntoumanis, Standage, & Spray, 2010).

Under the framework of self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985), Deci and Ryan

(2000) proposed the basic psychological needs theory that rests on the assumption that people

have an innate propensity to fulfill three basic psychological needs: competence, autonomy, and

relatedness. The need for *competence* refers to the necessity to feel successful in producing

aspired outcomes (White, 1959). The need for *autonomy* refers to the necessity to feel volitional

in one's actions and to be the originator of these actions (deCharms, 1968). The need for

relatedness refers to the necessity to feel connected to and understood by others (Baumeister &

Leary, 1995). Deci and Ryan (2000) emphasized the importance of satisfying each of the three

psychological needs for optimal functioning and ongoing psychological growth. Moreover, Deci

and Ryan (2011) proposed that satisfaction of the psychological needs fosters a wide range of adaptive behavioral outcomes such as MVPA participation.

Researchers have provided support for Deci and Ryan's (2000, 2011) theorizing that the three psychological needs are related, yet distinct constructs in the physical activity domain (Ng, Lonsdale, & Hodge, 2011; Vlachopoulos & Michailidou, 2006; Wilson, Rogers, Rodgers, & Wild, 2006). Many have also provided evidence that competence, autonomy, and relatedness are associated with physical activity-related outcomes in bivariate analyses (see Teixeira, Carraça, Markland, Silva, & Ryan, 2012 for review). Yet, when researchers have used multivariate analyses in which all three psychological needs are examined as correlates of physical activity-related outcomes at the same time, competence has generally demonstrated the most robust association (Edmunds, Ntoumanis, & Duda, 2006; McDonough & Crocker, 2007; Vlachopoulos & Michailidou, 2006). Accordingly, one could be led to infer that the need of competence is functionally important in the physical activity domain, whereas the need for autonomy and relatedness are not or are less important. However, such an inference may be, at least partly, based on a statistical artifact caused by the shared variance between all three psychological needs (i.e., intercorrelations among competence, autonomy, and relatedness; Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2013).

To account for the notion that higher satisfaction of one need is often associated with higher satisfaction of the other needs, researchers have computed composite scores of psychological needs satisfaction (PNS) by aggregating competence, autonomy, and relatedness scores (Hagger, Chatzisarantis, & Harris, 2006; Ntoumanis, 2005; Rahman, Thogersen-Ntoumani, Thatcher, & Doust, 2011; Sebire, Standage, & Vansteenkiste, 2009; Standage, Duda, & Ntoumanis, 2005). These scores are assumed to broadly reflect overall or general PNS,

whereby higher scores reflect an increasing satisfaction of competence, autonomy, and/or relatedness. Using this approach, researchers have found that general PNS is positively associated with physical activity-related outcomes (Hagger et al., 2006; Ntoumanis, 2005; Rahman et al., 2011; Sebire et al., 2009; Standage et al., 2005). Although this *general factor approach* (i.e., where an overall PNS variable is examined) and the previously described *specific factor approach* (i.e., where competence, autonomy, and relatedness are examined as separate variables) complement each other, the selection of one approach over the other currently has to be made in the absence of a strong a priori theoretical justification and in light of notable limitations.

The main limitation of the general factor approach is that it can lead to conceptual ambiguity (Chen, Hayes, Carver, Laurenceau, & Zhang, 2012) as it combines the three psychological needs into one overall score. Combining scores into one overall score is problematic because certain psychological needs may emerge as particularly important in certain domains as pointed out by Ryan (1995). Consequently, a composite PNS score conceals which need(s) is(are) more or less salient, and could potentially attenuate associations with physical activity-related outcomes. The specific factor approach can also lead to conceptual ambiguity (Chen et al., 2012; Reise, Morizot, & Hays, 2007) as it cannot be relied on to investigate how the potential overlap among the psychological needs relates to selected outcomes. Thus, whereas both the general and specific factor approaches are useful when they are used in isolation, they restrict researchers' ability to test tenets of self-determination theory. The bifactor model approach may offer a viable analytical alternative to account for the dilemmas inherent in the general and specific factor approaches (Reise, 2012).

The Bifactor Model and its Application Within Self-Determination Theory

Disentangling the extent to which variance in MVPA participation may be explained by general PNS and by satisfaction of specific psychological needs may be achieved through bifactor modeling, which is designed to enable the examination of multifaceted constructs that comprise several distinct, yet related constructs (Chen et al., 2012; Reise et al., 2007). When estimating a bifactor model, correlations among measured items are accounted for in: (a) a general factor representing the shared variance among *all* items, and (b) specific factors representing the shared variance among *subsets* of items assumed to be highly similar in content. A bifactor model can be tested within a confirmatory factor analytical (CFA) framework or an exploratory structural equation modeling (ESEM) framework. As shown in Figure 1, all measured items are permitted to load on a general factor (i.e., general PNS) as well as on one designated specific psychological need factor (i.e., competence, autonomy, or relatedness) in a bifactor CFA (Reise, 2012). Further, measured items are not permitted to load on non-intended specific factors as cross-loadings are set to zero. In a bifactor ESEM, all measured items are also permitted to load on a general factor as well as on one designated specific psychological needs factor, yet cross-loadings between measured items and non-intended specific factors are permitted (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2009). By testing a bifactor CFA or a bifactor ESEM, researchers can therefore model both the broad central construct of PNS (i.e., general PNS) and specific constructs of PNS (i.e., specific psychological needs) within a single model as separate latent variables instead of having to choose between the general factor approach or the specific factor approach. In turn, researchers can examine the unique contribution of each specific factor and the general factor on MVPA participation.

Although the bifactor model shares some common features with the higher-order factor model, the bifactor model offer two noteworthy advantages (Chen et al., 2012). From a

conceptual standpoint, only the bifactor model allows researchers to consider both the specific

psychological needs in addition to a general PNS factor. Within the bifactor model the

psychological needs are modeled as independent latent factors that researchers can directly

examine to determine the strength of the associations between the specific psychological needs

and relevant outcomes. In a higher-order model, researchers would have to examine the

disturbance associated with the first order latent factors in order to examine each psychological

need as predictors of outcomes. Consequently, from a practical standpoint, only the bifactor

model allows researchers to examine if each psychological need is independently associated with

MVPA participation, beyond the contribution of general PNS.[1]

The usefulness of combining the specific and general factor approaches within the

bifactor model has recently been demonstrated in the physical activity domain (Appleton,

Ntoumanis, Quested, Viladrich, & Duda, 2016; Gunnell & Gaudreau, 2015; Myers, Martin,

Ntoumanis, Celimli, & Bartholomew, 2014; Stenling, Ivarsson, Hassmén, & Lindwall, 2015).

For example, Myers et al. (2014) demonstrated the utility of the bifactor model by showing that

psychological needs thwarting (i.e., the perception that psychological needs are being actively

undermined in the sport context; Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, Ryan, Bosch, & Thøgersen-

Ntoumani, 2011) in athletes was best represented by a combination of a general psychological

needs thwarting factor and three specific psychological needs thwarting factors. However,

because researchers have stressed that the absence of needs thwarting does not imply PNS or

vice versa, and showed that PNS and thwarting differentially predict various outcomes

(Bartholomew et al., 2011; Gunnell, Crocker, Wilson, Mack, & Zumbo, 2013), it is not possible

to say whether the pattern of results reported by Myers et al. (2014) holds for PNS. Thus, using

the bifactor model to examine the structure of PNS may provide clarification to the question of

how the satisfaction of the three psychological needs are jointly and uniquely contributing to explaining variance in MVPA participation in adolescents.

The Present Study

In the present study, a bifactor model of PNS was tested with a sample of adolescents to test if the three specific psychological needs accounted for unique variance beyond the shared variance captured in general PNS (objective # 1). It was hypothesized that a bifactor model with one general PNS factor and three specific factors (i.e., competence, autonomy, and relatedness) would provide a good fit to the data. The second objective was to examine if general PNS and the specific psychological needs of competence, autonomy, and relatedness were uniquely associated with concurrent MVPA participation (Time 1) and MVPA participation assessed 4 months later (Time 2) in adolescents. It was hypothesized that general PNS and all three specific psychological needs would have significant and positive associations with Time 1 and Time 2 MVPA participation. Demonstrating that specific psychological needs accounts for unique variance in MVPA participation, beyond general PNS, has implications for theory testing and future research as it would suggest that researchers interested in examining the associations between PNS and MVPA participation should consider both general PNS and specific psychological needs. Furthermore, it would provide evidence that strategies designed to foster general PNS and/or strategies designed to foster specific psychological needs should be adopted when developing interventions to promote MVPA participation in this generally insufficiently active population.

<div style="text-align: center;">

Method

</div>

Participants and Procedures

Data for this study were drawn from the Measuring Activities of Teenagers to Comprehend their Habits (MATCH) study, an ongoing prospective study of boys and girls 8.9 to 12.5 years of age at study inception (mean age = 10.8, standard deviation [*SD*] = .6). Participants were recruited from grade five (53.2%) and six classes in 17 schools across the province of New Brunswick, Canada. Schools were selected to represent a mix of languages (French, English), geographic locations (rural, urban), and socioeconomic statuses (low, medium, high). The MATCH study was approved by the Centre Hospitalier de l'Université de Sherbrooke ethics committee prior to data collection, and all participants provided written informed assent and their parents/guardians provided written informed consent.

Further details about the methods and procedures of the MATCH study are reported elsewhere (Bélanger et al., 2013). Briefly, the first questionnaire was administered during regular class time in the Fall of 2011. Additional data collection took place every 4 months and will continue until participants complete secondary school. Data obtained from the last two completed survey cycles at the time of analyses (i.e., Winter 2015 [Time 1] and Spring 2015 [Time 2]) were used for the current study. The analytical sample comprised of 309 girls and 225 boys. Participants were on average 14.1 years of age (*SD* = 0.6; range = 12.5 - 17.0) at Time 1, and lived in neighbourhoods with a mean individual-level income of $32,067 (*SD* = $8,468, *n* = 219 not reported) as estimated by linking participants' six digit residential postal codes reported in 2014/2015 to area-level income from the 2006 Canadian Census.

Measures

MVPA participation was assessed at Time 1 and Time 2 using two items focused on the total amount of activity undertaken at moderate-to-vigorous intensity in and out of school hours. The items were developed by Prochaska, Sallis, and Long (2001) for use with children and

adolescents. Participants were provided with a definition of MVPA and given examples of physical activities. Next, they were asked to indicate: (a) how many days they were physically active for a total of at least 60 minutes per day during the past week, and (b) how many days they were physically active for a total of at least 60 minutes per day during a typical week. Participants responded to each item using a scale ranging from 0 to 7 days. The correlation coefficients for both items at Time 1 and Time 2 were .86 and .82, respectively. An average of the two scores was calculated at Time 1 and Time 2 to represent Time 1 and Time 2 MVPA participation, correspondingly. Researchers have reported acceptable score reliability (i.e., intraclass correlation = .77) and validity (i.e., scores correlated significantly with accelerometer data at $r \geq .40$) for this measure in previous studies with adolescents (Prochaska et al., 2001; Ridgers, Timperio, Crawford, & Salmon, 2012).

Perceptions of competence, autonomy, and relatedness needs satisfaction in the physical activity domain were assessed at Time 1 using the 6-item competence subscale of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI; McAuley, Duncan, & Tammen, 1989), the 7-item autonomy subscale from the General Need Satisfaction Scale (GNSS; Gagné, 2003), and the 6-item Relatedness to Others in Physical Activity Scale (ROPAS; Wilson & Bengoechea, 2010), respectively. These measures were selected after consultation with various subject experts regarding the measurement of PNS in adolescents and because they have been used in previous studies with adolescent samples (Sebire, Jago, Fox, Edwards, & Thompson, 2013; Standage, Gillison, Ntoumanis, & Treasure, 2012; Taylor et al., 2010). The IMI and GNSS items were modified by making them specific to physical activity (see Table 1). Participants indicated their agreement with each item on the IMI and GNSS using a 7-point response scale ranging from 1 ("*not at all true*") to 7 ("*very true*"), and their agreement with each item on the ROPAS using a

6-point response scale ranging from 1 ("*false*") to 6 ("*true*"). There were three negatively-worded items on the GNSS (i.e., "When I participate in physical activity, I feel pressured", "When I participate in physical activity, I frequently have to do what I am told", and "When I participate in physical activity, there is not much opportunity for me to decide for myself how to do things"), and one on the IMI (i.e., "Physical activity is not something I can do very well"). Negatively-worded items were omitted from the analyses reported herein because they can evoke a different type of response, share variance distinct from the concepts that the factors measure (Ev, Sanderman, & Coyne, 2013), and these three specific items adversely affected model fit in another MATCH study using data from previous time points (Gunnell, Bélanger, & Brunet, 2016). Two further reasons the negatively-worded were deleted are that researchers (e.g., Bartholomew et al., 2011; Sheldon & Gunz, 2009) have argued that negatively-worded items may actually be used to assess need dissatisfaction, frustration, or thwarting, and have shown that positively- and negatively-worded items may have different effects on outcomes. Evidence of score reliability and validity for the IMI, GNSS, and ROPAS have been reported in previous studies with adolescents (Sebire et al., 2013; Standage et al., 2012; Taylor et al., 2010).

Translation of Measures and Measurement Invariance Across Language

The source language for all items used is English. All items were therefore translated into French using a rigorous back translation procedures (see Bélanger et al., 2013) for use in French-language schools. Measurement invariance of the bifactor model including the IMI, GNSS, and ROPAS items was tested using a multi-group framework described by Vandenberg and Lance (2000) to ensure data from French- and English-speaking participants ($n_{English}$ = 108; n_{French} = 421) could be pooled for analysis without introducing bias attributable to measurement non-invariance. Measurement invariance could not be tested for the MVPA measures because the

minimum number of items required for a CFA model was insufficient. Nevertheless, the

resulting MVPA French items were almost identical to those used in the World Health

Organization (WHO) Health Behaviour in School-aged Children (HBSC) study (Currie,

Gabhainn, Godeau, & Committee, 2009), which also employed back-translation and pilot

surveys to translate the two items developed by Prochaska et al. (2001) into French (Currie,

Samdal, Boyce, & Smith, 2001).

 Invariance testing for the bifactor model consisted of examining different levels of

invariance by comparing a series of nested models in which equality constraints were added

progressively to the bifactor CFA. Levels of invariance tested were: (1) no constraints (i.e.,

configural invariance), (2) factor loadings constrained (i.e., weak invariance), (3) factor loadings

and intercepts constrained (i.e., strong invariance), and (4) factor loadings, intercepts and errors

constrained (i.e., strict invariance). Language invariance was supported as (1) the change in

Comparative Fit Index (CFI) and change in Root Mean Square Error of Approximation

(RMSEA) values between successive nested models were $\leq |.010|$ and $\leq |.015|$, respectively, and

(2) each of the four measurement models had CFI, TLI, and RMSEA values that remained $\geq .90$

for the CFI and Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI), and $\leq .08$ for the RMSEA (Chen, 2007; Cheung &

Rensvold, 2002; Vandenberg & Lance, 2000).[2] Consequently, data from English- and French-

speaking participants could be pooled for analysis.

Data Analysis

 Descriptive analyses were performed in SPSS (Version 23.0). The remaining analyses

were conducted in Mplus 7.31 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2015). To address objective 1, a

bifactor CFA was tested using Time 1 PNS data in which all positively-worded items on the IMI,

GNSS, and ROPAS were permitted to load on a general PNS factor as well as their designated

specific psychological need factor (i.e., competence, autonomy, or relatedness). Furthermore, factor loadings between positively-worded items and non-intended specific psychological need factor (i.e., cross-loadings) were set to zero. To identify this model, the variance of each latent factor was set to 1.0. Recognizing that setting cross-loadings to zero might be overly-restrictive and lead to biased parameter estimates (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2009), a bifactor ESEM was also tested (Model 2). By estimating a bifactor ESEM with target rotation (Browne, 2001), a priori hypotheses about the factor structure were specified as with the bifactor CFA (i.e., a general PNS factor and three specific psychological needs factors). As well, in the bifactor ESEM each item was permitted to freely load on the general PNS factor as well as the designated specific psychological need factors it was designed to measure. However in contrast to the bifactor CFA, factor loadings between positively-worded items and non-intended specific psychological need factor were specified to be *close* to zero rather than setting them to be exactly zero. Both bifactor models were estimated using the Full Information Robust Maximum Likelihood (MLR) estimator to account for missing data at the item level (Enders, 2010) and to account for potential non-normality. Moreover, consistent with recommendations (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2009; Reise, 2012), both models were estimated with all four latent factors constrained to be uncorrelated since the intercorrelations between the specific psychological needs is captured in the general PNS and because this ensures interpretability of the results.

Model fit was assessed using a combination of common goodness-of-fit indices: CFI, TLI, and RMSEA with its 90% confidence interval (90% CI). Although there are no strict criteria for evaluating these fit indices, conventional guidelines suggest that values of .90 and .95 or higher for the CFI and TLI indicate acceptable and excellent fit of the model, respectively, and values of .08 and .06 or lower for the RMSEA indicated acceptable and excellent model fit,

respectively (Browne & Cudeck, 1983; Hu & Bentler, 1999). The strength of the factor loadings, standard errors, and the residual variances for each model were also examined to assess model fit. In order to compare both bifactor models, the Aikaike Information Criterion (AIC) and the Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) were examined. As a rule of thumb, models with lower values of AIC and BIC represent better fit (Burnham & Anderson, 2003). Composite reliability coefficients (ω; Raykov, 1997) were calculated as a function of the standardized item factor loadings (λ_i) and the variances of the measurement error (e_i).

The final part of the analysis was to examine the extent to which the general PNS and the specific psychological needs of competence, autonomy, and relatedness were associated with MVPA participation (i.e., objective 2) using the best fitting bifactor model (i.e., either bifactor CFA or bifactor ESEM). To this end, a structural equation model was tested by regressing Time 1 and Time 2 MVPA onto the general PNS and the specific psychological needs factors, and by regressing Time 2 MVPA participation on Time 1 MVPA participation. The fit of this model was assessed using the CFI, TLI, and RMSEA, and path coefficients were examined.[3] To test the indirect associations of general PNS and the specific psychological needs with Time 2 MVPA participation via Time 1 MVPA participation, the same structural equation model was re-estimated using bootstrapping resampling procedures ($N = 5,000$) to compute 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals (95% BcCI; Preacher & Hayes, 2008). If the 95% BcCI did not included zero, the indirect association was deemed significant. This model was estimated using the Maximum Likelihood (ML) estimator since MLR with bootstrapping is not available in Mplus 7.31.

Results

Comparison Between the Bifactor Models Obtained with CFA and ESEM

The bifactor CFA (MLR$\chi^2_{(75)}$ = 233.51, p < .001, CFI = .96, TLI = .95, RMSEA = .06

(90% CI = [.05, .07]), BIC = 24516.82, AIC = 24158.05) provided an acceptable degree of fit to

the data. In contrast, the bifactor ESEM model was inadmissible because the residual covariance

matrix was positive definite on account of a large and significant negative residual associated

with the item "I feel like I fit in well with others." To rectify the negative residual, the residual

variance for this item was constrained to > .0001 based on recommendation by Chen, Bollen,

Paxton, Curran, and Kirby (2001). However, the model remained inadmissible because of the

positive definite residual covariance matrix and the negative residual was still present. Thus,

because the bifactor CFA model was associated with acceptable model fit, it was retained to

address objective 2.

The means, *SD*, standardized factor loadings, and standard errors for each item derived

from the bifactor CFA are presented in Table 1. The hierarchical omega coefficient for general

PNS was .97, and the subscale omega coefficients were .91, .91, and .94 for the specific factors

of competence, autonomy, and relatedness, respectively. Each item loaded significantly onto the

general PNS factor ($\lambda \geq .53, p < .001$), as well as onto its intended specific psychological need

factor ($\lambda \geq .14, p < .01$), with the exception of one item from the GNSS (i.e., "When I participate

in physical activity, I feel like I can pretty much be myself") that had a near zero factor loading

($\lambda = .09, p = .10$) on its designated specific factor of autonomy. Although unexpected,

researchers (Jennrich & Bentler, 2011; Myers et al., 2014) have noted that it is possible for items

to load significantly onto only the general factor but not the specific factor within bifactor

models. Therefore, the variance of this particular autonomy item was solely explained by the

general PNS factor. Most of the items displayed stronger factor loadings on the general PNS

factor compared to their designated specific psychological need factor, suggesting that most of

their variances were shared with the general PNS factor, but that there were still well defined

specific psychological needs factors. Hence, even when extracting the variance shared among the

psychological needs by creating a general PNS latent factor, three additional psychological needs

factors were still necessary to capture the leftover variance that was unique to subsets of items

(i.e., each individual psychological need).

Associations of General and Specific Factors of PNS With MVPA Participation

The fit statistics for the structural equation model including Time 1 and Time 2 MVPA

participation as outcomes were: $MLR\chi^2_{(97)} = 258.63$, $p < .001$, CFI = .97, TLI = .96, RMSEA =

.06 (90% CI = [.05, .07]). An examination of the path coefficients shown in Figure 2 indicated

that: (1) general PNS was significantly and directly associated with Time 1 MVPA participation

($\beta = .40$), (2) competence ($\beta = .14$) and relatedness ($\beta = .11$) were significantly and directly

associated with Time 1 MVPA participation, beyond general PNS, and (3) relatedness ($\beta = .11$),

general PNS ($\beta = .22$), and Time 1 MVPA participation ($\beta = .54$) were significantly and directly

associated with Time 2 MVPA participation. Examination of the indirect effects obtained from

the model re-estimated using bootstrap approach indicated that competence ($\beta = .08$, 95% BcCI

= [.03, .27]) and general PNS ($\beta = .22$, 95% BcCI = [.27, .53]) were significantly and indirectly

associated with Time 2 MVPA participation via Time 1 MVPA participation, but autonomy ($\beta =$

-.03, 95% BcCI = [-.19, .07]) and relatedness ($\beta = .06$, 95% BcCI = [-.01, .24]) were not

significantly indirectly associated with Time 2 MVPA participation via Time 1 MVPA

participation. A total of 19.5% and 47.8% of the variance in Time 1 and Time 2 MVPA

participation were explained, respectively.

Discussion

There has been much interest in how psychological factors such as those embedded in basic psychological needs theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000) relate to adolescents' MVPA participation. Studying the role of PNS, two different approaches have been used by researchers, namely the *specific factor approach* which focuses on the specific needs of competence, autonomy, and relatedness, and the *general factor approach* which focuses on overall PNS. Using either approach, researchers have provided evidence that satisfaction of each specific psychological need and general PNS are associated with physical activity-related outcomes (Hagger et al., 2006; McDavid et al., 2014; Sebire et al., 2009; Taylor et al., 2010). To reconcile the advantages of both approaches, the objectives of the current study were to investigate the specific psychological needs and general PNS simultaneously by using bifactor modeling, and examine its utility in predicting MVPA in adolescents.

A Bifactor Perspective on PNS

To test Deci and Ryan's (2000) assertions that PNS serves as an antecedent to behaviors such as MVPA, the bifactor model builds on previous research wherein research had only been able to operationalize PNS as either specific psychological needs or as general PNS. In the current study, support for the bifactor CFA operationalization on PNS was found, which suggests that adolescents' fulfillment of basic psychological needs could be represented simultaneously by a general PNS factor and three specific psychological needs factors. This finding shares similarities with those recently described by Myers et al. (2014). Specifically, Myers et al. (2014) found support for a bifactor ESEM consisting of a broad general factor (i.e., psychological need thwarting) and three narrower specific factors (i.e., competence, autonomy, and relatedness thwarting) among 654 athletes between the ages of 12 and 17 years. Although Myers et al. (2014) applied bifactor ESEM to a different scale (i.e., Psychological Need Thwarting Scale)

among athletes and focused on psychological needs thwarting which is conceptually distinct

from psychological needs satisfaction (Bartholomew et al., 2011; Gunnell et al., 2013), the

implications of the current findings in combination with theirs is that general PNS and each

psychological need, whether one is considering needs satisfaction or thwarting, could be

examined simultaneously in future research. Accordingly, the bifactor model provides a useful

framework to do so in future research. For example, the bifactor model would allow researchers

to identify which antecedents and/or outcomes are associated with general PNS and which are

uniquely associated with the distinct psychological needs.

In addition to these specialized capabilities, the bifactor model provided information that

might stimulate a critical discussion in the literature about the meaning of PNS, and thus have

implications for the development or refinement of existing PNS measures. Conceptually, the

distinction between the psychological needs for competence, autonomy, and relatedness is clear.

As described above, the need for competence refers to the necessity to feel successful in

producing aspired outcomes (White, 1959), the need for autonomy refers to the necessity to feel

volitional in one's actions and to be the originator of these actions (deCharms, 1968), and the

need for relatedness refers to the necessity to feel close to and understood by others (Baumeister

& Leary, 1995). In spite of these clear definitions, researchers must develop multiple

questionnaire items for each psychological need to ensure high reliability and content validity

evidence through enhancing construct relevant representation and breadth. Paradoxically,

increasing construct relevant representation could increase construct-irrelevant variance which

could lead to the items being too broad and capturing variance of other distinct constructs

(Messick, 1995). In other words, attempting to capture individual psychological needs through

self-report items can make it difficult to create non-overlapping subsets of items. In support of

this notion, positively-worded items in the IMI, GNSS, and ROPAS were not pure markers of competence, autonomy, and relatedness, respectively, because these items formed an additional general PNS factor beyond the specific psychological needs factors. From this perspective, the general PNS could be capturing content overlap between the items measuring the specific psychological needs and/or general response tendencies. As a consequence, using the bifactor model may help researchers discriminate specific psychological needs in predictive models by removing the variance attributable to the general PNS. That said, seeing as the bifactor model is an analytical framework used to capture the representing the shared variance among all items (Chen et al., 2012; Reise et al., 2007), the general PNS could also be capturing the joint correlations (i.e., interdependencies) between the specific psychological needs. Thus, the bifactor model could also render it possible to examine how the covariance between the specific psychological needs relates to MVPA participation, above and beyond the absolute level of competence, autonomy, and relatedness.

The Role of PNS in Predicting MVPA Participation

Researchers have demonstrated that general PNS are positively related to physical activity-related outcomes (Hagger et al., 2006; Ntoumanis, 2005; Rahman et al., 2011; Sebire et al., 2009; Standage et al., 2005). This general pattern of relationships was supported in this study using bifactor modeling. More precisely, general PNS was associated with Time 1 and Time 2 MVPA participation, and these associations were of greater magnitude when compared to the associations between the specific psychological needs and MVPA participation. Although it would be logical to conclude that the assessment of general PNS is likely to be most useful, and thus the general factor approach should be favored, a sole reliance on general PNS without consideration of the absolute level of competence, autonomy, and relatedness may overlook

opportunities to identify which need(s) is(are) contribute more or less to MVPA participation. Indeed, above and beyond general PNS, specific psychological needs of competence and relatedness were directly associated with Time 1 MVPA participation, relatedness was directly associated with Time 2 MVPA participation, and competence was indirectly associated with Time 2 MVPA participation via Time 1 MVPA participation. These findings confirm previous findings that specific psychological needs are positively related to physical activity-related outcomes (Edmunds et al., 2006; Gunnell, Crocker, Mack, Wilson, & Zumbo, 2014; McDonough & Crocker, 2007; Wilson & Rogers, 2008) and strengthen the importance of assessing specific psychological needs. Another argument why the sole reliance on general PNS may not be optimal is that competence, autonomy, and relatedness can vary considerably within individuals and computing a composite score of PNS considers any individual differences in the specific psychological needs to be a source of measurement error. Consequently, this may distort the association between general PNS and MVPA participation. Based on these arguments and empirical evidence from the bifactor model, researchers may benefit from using the bifactor model as an analytical framework, whereby individual variability in specific psychological needs is not considered error, to evaluate the degree to which general PNS and specific psychological needs are associated with MVPA participation in future research.

It should be briefly noted though, that consistent with previous findings (Edmunds et al., 2006; McDonough & Crocker, 2007; Vlachopoulos & Michailidou, 2006), autonomy need satisfaction was not uniquely associated with MVPA participation at either time point. At first glance, this finding appears to be at odds with Deci and Ryan's (2011) contention that satisfaction of autonomy fosters participation in various activities. Yet, using the bifactor model, it is possible to see that items designed to assess autonomy need satisfaction significantly loaded

onto the general PNS factor, which in turn was related to MVPA participation, suggesting that autonomy satisfaction is important insofar as autonomy typically co-occurs with feelings of competence and/or relatedness needs (i.e., all three share something in common and typically co-occur to produce optimal outcomes; Deci & Ryan, 2000). However, when those shared aspects were removed from autonomy need satisfaction via the general PNS factor the unique components of autonomy need satisfaction (i.e., the specific factor) did not significantly predict MVPA, a finding that can be understood by considering validity evidence based on item content. For instance, McDonough and Crocker (2007) noted that autonomy items used in other subscales lack content validity (i.e., construct underrepresentation) because they may not capture the conceptual bandwidth of perceptions of autonomy. A closer inspection of the items used herein reveals that items appeared to focus on autonomy within the context of social relationships, making it clear why they shared variance with the other needs (notably relatedness) and loaded onto the general PNS factor. In fact, the items captured the extent to which participants' decisions were respected, honored, and heeded by others (e.g., "When I participate in physical activity, I generally feel free to express my ideas and opinions"). As such, positively-worded items from the GNSS may not include important predictive aspects of autonomy such as affective feelings of volition (rather than decisional feelings) and fully endorsing one's own actions (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Thus, an interesting direction for future research would be to develop additional items that capture salient aspects of autonomy need satisfaction that are not socially or relationally constituted, and determine if item content influences the unique predictive ability of autonomy need satisfaction above general PNS.

Implications

The current findings have important implications for future research directions aimed at developing interventions to foster PNS to promote MVPA participation in adolescents. Based on the current findings, promoting overall PNS as well as competence and relatedness may be complementary and provide the most robust method for increasing MVPA participation. It would be useful for researchers to extend prior research into factors that may foster PNS, and distinguish between factors that may play a role in fostering general PNS, specific psychological needs, and/or both. Drawing on self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) and research (see Hagger & Chatzisarantis, 2007; Standage, 2012, for review), autonomy support, provision of structure and optimally challenging activities, positive feedback, subjective perceptions of personal success, and perceived involvement can reflect important antecedents of need satisfaction. Thus, researchers may want to test the associations between these factors and general PNS and specific psychological needs using the bifactor model to identify strategies to prioritize based their target outcome (i.e., general PNS, specific psychological needs, and/or both). Given that all three psychological needs typically co-occur (Deci & Ryan, 2000), it is likely that some strategies foster both PNS and specific psychological needs. Yet, there may be some strategies that may be more effective in fostering general PNS versus specific psychological needs (and vice versa). For instance, interpersonal supports (i.e., autonomy support, structure, and involvement) in the social environment and autonomous forms of motivation are thought to lead to greater satisfaction of all three psychological needs collectively. Therefore, one could imagine an intervention that seeks to foster general PNS through enhancing autonomous motivation and interpersonal supports. Conversely, Sheldon and Filak (2008) have conducted experiments wherein they specifically target each specific psychological needs. They found that relatedness manipulations enhanced relatedness but not autonomy and competence

indicating that it is possible to target specific psychological needs without influencing

perceptions of other psychological needs. Thus, using bifactor modeling, researchers could begin

to conduct experiments to determine if strategies aimed at fostering general PNS are more, less

or equally effective in promoting MVPA participation compared to strategies aimed at fostering

specific psychological needs of competence and relatedness.

Limitations

Despite the theoretical and methodological contributions related to this research, the

limitations of this study should be noted. First, the pool of items used in this study to assess PNS

was derived from three separate measures developed by different researchers at different time

points. It may be useful to confirm the tenability of the bifactor model with other physical

activity-based multidimensional PNS measures that were developed simultaneously to include

specific subscales assessing satisfaction of each psychological need (e.g., The Basic

Psychological Needs in Exercise Scale by Vlachopoulos & Michailidou, 2006; The

Psychological Need Satisfaction in Exercise Scale by Wilson et al., 2006). Second, four

negatively-worded items were removed for the analyses. Thus, it may be worth replacing the

negatively-worded items with positively-worded items to further enhance content validity in

future research. Third, to ensure data from English- and French-speaking participants could be

pooled, measurement invariance was tested and established. However, these tests were

conducted with a small sample for the English-speaking participants ($n = 108$). Because the

power of invariance test is reduced with small sample sizes (Meade & Bauer, 2007), replication

with larger sample sizes is therefore needed. Last, despite having used measures that have

established score reliability and validity, the self-report data could be biased by social

desirability, possibly affecting participants' responses. For example, it is possible that

participants under- or over-reported actual frequency of MVPA participation, which indicates

that there is a need for more research to determine if general PNS and the specific psychological

needs are associated with directly-measured MVPA participation in adolescents.

In addition to the limitations associated with this research, it is important to acknowledge

that using the bifactor model is not always warranted despite statistical justification. Indeed,

although the bifactor model offers researchers a viable model for analyzing and improving

precision through its explicit modeling of both general PNS and specific psychological needs, it

would be premature (and likely inappropriate) to conclude that the bifactor model should become

the de facto model to operationalize PNS. Critically though, it must be realized that assuming

that there is only one way to analyze PNS may be untenable. The bifactor model considered in

this study is one approximation of the data, but there are other simpler models with fewer

parameters that are tenable (e.g., single-factor, three-factor). More work is needed to compare the

predictive validity of the bifactor model to the predictive validity of simpler models to determine

if the added complexity of the bifactor model is warranted. Nevertheless, based on the present

findings, the bifactor model seems that it would be advantageous, relative to alternative models,

when the purpose is to facilitate discovery of the antecedents and/or outcomes associated with

general PNS and those uniquely associated with the specific psychological needs.

Conclusions

Consideration of the "forest" (i.e., general PNS) may be no better than consideration of

the "trees" (i.e., specific psychological needs) or vice versa. Rather, the current study provides

evidence that researchers should work with the "forest" and the "trees" for two reasons. First,

general PNS and the three specific psychological needs were shown to be empirically distinct

constructs. Second, general PNS and the specific psychological needs were uniquely associated

with adolescents' MVPA participation assessed concurrently and 4 months later. These findings are relevant for theoretical discussions in the context of self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) and basic psychological needs theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000) specifically, as well for its application when designing MVPA interventions to be tested with adolescents. That said, the bifactor model should not be seen as a panacea for all studies investigating PNS as there are other unidimensional and multidimensional models that would help researchers answer their research questions when the complexity of the bifactor model is unwarranted. Indeed, because different analytical approaches have respective advantages and limitations, the extent to which researchers choose to use more complex models should be guided by considerations of their research question(s) and hypothesis(es) and research contexts.

End Notes

[1] In the higher-order model, the associations between the disturbances of lower order factors (i.e., competence, autonomy, and relatedness) and external variables can be assessed in addition to the association between the higher-order factor (i.e., general PNS), but results from these non-standard models are difficult to interpret (Chen et al., 2012).

[2] The complete set of results can be obtained from the corresponding author upon request.

[3] In an initial structural equation model with the bifactor CFA, 24 participants were identified as multivariate outliers based on Mahalanobis distance criteria and removed from the database. Given the results were not significantly different from the initial structural equation model, only the results from the structural equation model excluding multivariate outliers are presented in the interest of parsimony.

Acknowledgements

References

Andersen, L. B., Riddoch, C., Kriemler, S., & Hills, A. (2011). Physical activity and

cardiovascular risk factors in children. *British Journal of Sports Medicine, 45*, 871-876.

doi: 10.1136/bjsports-2011-090333

Appleton, P. R., Ntoumanis, N., Quested, E., Viladrich, C., & Duda, J. L. (2016). Initial

validation of the coach-created Empowering and Disempowering Motivational Climate

Questionnaire (EDMCQ-C). *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 22*, 53-65. doi:

10.1016/j.psychsport.2015.05.008

Asparouhov, T., & Muthén, B. (2009). Exploratory structural equation modeling. *Structural*

Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 16, 397-438. doi:

10.1080/10705510903008204

Bartholomew, K. J., Ntoumanis, N., Ryan, R. M., Bosch, J. A., & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C.

(2011). Self-determination theory and diminished functioning: The role of interpersonal

control and psychological need thwarting. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin,*

37, 1459-1473. doi: 10.1177/0146167211413125

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal

attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 497-529.

doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497

Bélanger, M., Caissie, I., Beauchamp, J., O'Loughlin, J., Sabiston, C., & Mancuso, M. (2013).

Monitoring activities of teenagers to comprehend their habits: Study protocol for a

mixed-methods cohort study. *BMC Public Health, 13*(649), 1-7. doi: 10.1186/1471-2458-

13-649

Browne, M. W. (2001). An overview of analytic rotation in exploratory factor analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 36*, 111-150. doi: 10.1207/S15327906MBR3601_05

Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1983). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Long (Eds.), *Testing structural equation models* (pp. 136-162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Burnham, K. P., & Anderson, D. R. (2003). *Model selection and multimodel inference: A practical information-theoretic approach*. New York, NY: Springer-Verlag New York Inc.

Chen, F. F. (2007). Sensitivity of goodness of fit indexes to lack of measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 14*, 464-504. doi: 10.1080/10705510701301834

Chen, F. F., Bollen, K. A., Paxton, P., Curran, P. J., & Kirby, J. B. (2001). Improper solutions in structural equation models causes, consequences, and strategies. *Sociological Methods & Research, 29*, 468-508. doi: 10.1177/0049124101029004003

Chen, F. F., Hayes, A., Carver, C. S., Laurenceau, J.-P., & Zhang, Z. (2012). Modeling general and specific variance in multifaced constructs: A comparison of the bifactor model to other approaches. *Journal of Personality, 80*, 219-251. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2011.00739.x

Cheung, G. W., & Rensvold, R. B. (2002). Evaluating goodness-of-fit indexes for testing measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 9*, 233-255. doi: 10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_5

Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2013). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.

Cox, A. E., Smith, A. L., & Williams, L. (2008). Change in physical education motivation and physical activity behavior during middle school. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 43*, 506-513. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2008.04.020

Currie, C., Gabhainn, S. N., Godeau, E., & Committee, I. H. N. C. (2009). The Health Behaviour in School-aged Children: WHO Collaborative Cross-National (HBSC) study: origins, concept, history and development 1982–2008. *International Journal of Public Health, 54*(2), 131-139.

Currie, C., Samdal, O., Boyce, W., & Smith, R. (2001). Health behaviour in school-aged children: a WHO cross-national study (HBSC), research protocol for the 2001/2002 survey. *Child and Adolescent Health Research Unit (CAHRU), University of Edinburgh*.

deCharms, R. (1968). *Personal causation: The internal affective determinants of behavior*. New York, NY: Academic Press.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York, NY: Springer Science & Business Media.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*, 227-268. doi: 10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2011). Self-determination theory. In P. A. M. Van Lange, A. W. Kruglanski & E. T. Higgins (Eds.), *Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology* (Vol. 1, pp. 416-433). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Edmunds, J., Ntoumanis, N., & Duda, J. L. (2006). A test of self-determination theory in the exercise domain. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*, 2240-2265. doi: 10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00102.x

Eime, R. M., Young, J. A., Harvey, J. T., Charity, M. J., & Payne, W. R. (2013). A systematic review of the psychological and social benefits of participation in sport for children and adolescents: Informing development of a conceptual model of health through sport. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 10*, 1-21. doi: 10.1186/1479-5868-10-98

Enders, C. K. (2010). *Applied missing data analysis*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Ev, S., Sanderman, R., & Coyne, J. C. (2013). Ineffectiveness of reverse wording of questionnaire items: Let's learn from cows in the rain. *PloS One, 8*, 1-7. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0068967

Gagné, M. (2003). The role of autonomy support and autonomy orientation in prosocial behavior engagement. *Motivation and Emotion, 27*, 199-223. doi: 10.1023/A:1025007614869

Gunnell, K. E., Bélanger, M., & Brunet, J. (2016). A tale of two models: Changes in psychological need satisfaction and physical activity over 3 years. *Health Psychology, 35*, 167-177. doi: 10.1037/hea0000259

Gunnell, K. E., Crocker, P. R. E., Mack, D. E., Wilson, P. M., & Zumbo, B. D. (2014). Goal contents, motivation, psychological need satisfaction, well-being and physical activity: A test of self-determination theory over 6 months. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 15*, 19-29. doi: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.08.005

Gunnell, K. E., Crocker, P. R. E., Wilson, P. M., Mack, D. E., & Zumbo, B. D. (2013). Psychological need satisfaction and thwarting: A test of basic psychological needs theory in physical activity contexts. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 14*, 599-607. doi: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2013.03.007

Gunnell, K. E., & Gaudreau, P. (2015). Testing a bi-factor model to disentangle general and specific factors of motivation in self-determination theory. *Personality and Individual Differences, 81*, 35-40. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2014.12.059

Hagger, M. S., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. (Eds.). (2007). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in exercise and sport*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hagger, M. S., Chatzisarantis, N. L., & Harris, J. (2006). From psychological need satisfaction to intentional behavior: Testing a motivational sequence in two behavioral contexts. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*, 131-148. doi: 10.1177/0146167205279905

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 6*, 1-55. doi: 10.1080/10705519909540118

Janssen, I., & LeBlanc, A. G. (2010). Systematic review of the health benefits of physical activity and fitness in school-aged children and youth. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 7*, 1-16. doi: 10.1186/1479-5868-7-40

Jennrich, R. I., & Bentler, P. M. (2011). Exploratory bi-factor analysis. *Psychometrika, 76*, 537-549. doi: 10.1007/S11336-011-9218-4

McAuley, E., Duncan, T., & Tammen, V. V. (1989). Psychometric properties of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory in a competitive sport setting: A confirmatory factor analysis. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 60*, 48-58. doi: 10.1080/02701367.1989.10607413

McDavid, L., Cox, A. E., & McDonough, M. H. (2014). Need fulfillment and motivation in physical education predict trajectories of change in leisure-time physical activity in early

adolescence. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 15*, 471-480. doi: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2014.04.006

McDonough, M., & Crocker, P. R. E. (2007). Testing self-determined motivation as a mediator of the relationship between psychological needs and affective and behavioral outcomes. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 29*, 645-663.

Meade, A. W., & Bauer, D. J. (2007). Power and precision in confirmatory factor analytic tests of measurement invariance. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 14*, 611-635. doi: 10.1080/10705510701575461

Messick, S. (1995). Validity of psychological assessment: validation of inferences from persons' responses and performances as scientific inquiry into score meaning. *American psychologist, 50*, 741-749. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.50.9.741

Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (1998-2015). *Mplus user's guide* (7th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.

Myers, N. D., Martin, J. J., Ntoumanis, N., Celimli, S., & Bartholomew, K. J. (2014). Exploratory bifactor analysis in sport, exercise, and performance psychology: A substantive-methodological synergy. *Sport, Exercise and Performance Psychology, 3*, 258-272. doi: 10.1037/spy0000015

Ng, J. Y., Lonsdale, C., & Hodge, K. (2011). The Basic Needs Satisfaction in Sport Scale (BNSSS): Instrument development and initial validity evidence. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 12*, 257-264. doi: 10.1016/j.psychsport.2010.10.006

Ntoumanis, N. (2005). A prospective study of participation in optional school physical education using a self-determination theory framework. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 97*, 444-453. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.97.3.444

ParticipACTION. (2015). *The biggest risk is keeping kids indoors. The 2015 ParticipACTION report card on physical activity for children and youth*. Paper presented at the ParticipACTION, Toronto.

Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods, 40*, 879-891. doi: 10.3758/BRM.40.3.879

Prochaska, J. J., Sallis, J. F., & Long, B. (2001). A physical activity screening measure for use with adolescents in primary care. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 155*, 554-559. doi: 10.1001/archpedi.155.5.554

Rahman, R. J., Thogersen-Ntoumani, C., Thatcher, J., & Doust, J. (2011). Changes in need satisfaction and motivation orientation as predictors of psychological and behavioural outcomes in exercise referral. *Psychology & Health, 26*, 1521-1539. doi: 10.1080/08870446.2010.538849

Raykov, T. (1997). Estimation of composite reliability for congeneric measures. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 21*, 173-184. doi: 10.1177/01466216970212006

Reise, S. P. (2012). The rediscovery of bifactor measurement models. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 47*, 667-696. doi: 10.1080/00273171.2012.715555

Reise, S. P., Morizot, J., & Hays, R. D. (2007). The role of the bifactor model in resolving dimensionality issues in health outcomes measures. *Quality of Life Research, 16*, 19-31. doi: 10.1007/s11136-007-9183-7

Ridgers, N. D., Timperio, A., Crawford, D., & Salmon, J. (2012). Validity of a brief self-report instrument for assessing compliance with physical activity guidelines amongst

adolescents. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport, 15*, 136-141. doi: 10.1016/j.jsams.2011.09.003

Ryan, R. M. (1995). Psychological needs and the facilitation of integrative processes. *Journal of Personality, 63*, 397-427. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.1995.tb00501.x

Sebire, S. J., Jago, R., Fox, K. R., Edwards, M. J., & Thompson, J. L. (2013). Testing a self-determination theory model of children's physical activity motivation: A cross-sectional study. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 10*, 1-9. doi: 10.1186/1479-5868-10-111

Sebire, S. J., Standage, M., & Vansteenkiste, M. (2009). Examining goal content in the exercise domain: Intrinsic versus extrinsic goals and cognitive, affective, and behavioural outcomes, and psychological need satisfaction. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 31*, 189-210.

Sheldon, K. M., & Filak, V. (2008). Manipulating autonomy, competence, and relatedness support in a game‐ learning context: New evidence that all three needs matter. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 47*, 267-283. doi: 10.1348/014466607X238797

Sheldon, K. M., & Gunz, A. (2009). Psychological needs as basic motives, not just experiential requirements. *Journal of Personality, 77*, 1467-1492. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2009.00589.x

Standage, M. (2012). Motivation: Self-determination theory and performance in sport *The Oxford handbook of sport and performance psychology* (pp. 233-249). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Standage, M., Duda, J. L., & Ntoumanis, N. (2005). A test of self- determination theory in
     school physical education. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 75*, 411-433. doi:
     10.1348/000709904X22359

Standage, M., Gillison, F. B., Ntoumanis, N., & Treasure, D. C. (2012). Predicting students'
     physical activity and health-related well-being: A prospective cross-domain investigation
     of motivation across school physical education and exercise settings. *Journal of Sport &
     Exercise Psychology, 34*, 37-60.

Stenling, A., Ivarsson, A., Hassmén, P., & Lindwall, M. (2015). Using bifactor exploratory
     structural equation modeling to examine global and specific factors in measures of sports
     coaches' interpersonal styles. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6*, 1-12. doi:
     10.3389/fpsyg.2015.01303

Taylor, I. M., Ntoumanis, N., Standage, M., & Spray, C. M. (2010). Motivational predictors of
     physical education students' effort, exercise intentions, and leisure-time physical activity:
     A multilevel linear growth analysis. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 31*, 99-120.

Teixeira, P. J., Carraça, E. V., Markland, D., Silva, M. N., & Ryan, R. M. (2012). Exercise,
     physical activity, and self-determination theory: A systematic review. *International
     Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 9*, 1-30. doi: 10.1186/1479-5868-
     9-78

Vandenberg, R. J., & Lance, C. E. (2000). A review and synthesis of the measurement invariance
     literature: Suggestions, practices, and recommendations for organizational research.
     Organizational Research Methods, 3, 4-70. doi: 10.1177/109442810031002

Vlachopoulos, S. P., & Michailidou, S. (2006). Development and initial validation of a measure
     of autonomy, competence, and relatedness in exercise: The Basic Psychological Needs in

Exercise Scale. *Measurement in Physical Education and Exercise Science, 10*, 179-201.

doi: 10.1207/s15327841mpee1003_4

White, R. W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. *Psychological Review, 66*, 297-333. doi: 10.1037/h0040934

Wilson, P. M., & Bengoechea, E. G. (2010). The Relatedness to Others in Physical Activity Scale: Evidence for structural and criterion validity. *Journal of Applied Biobehavioral Research, 15*, 61-87. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9861.2010.00052.x

Wilson, P. M., & Rogers, W. T. (2008). Examining relationships between perceived psychological need satisfaction and behavioral regulations in exercise. *Journal of Applied Biobehavioral Research, 13*, 119-142. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9861.2008.00031.x

Wilson, P. M., Rogers, W. T., Rodgers, W. M., & Wild, T. C. (2006). The Psychological Need Satisfaction in Exercise Scale. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 28*, 231-251.

Table 1.

Item-level information, descriptive statistics, and factor loadings for the bifactor CFA.

Items	Score Range	Mean	SD	Psychological needs satisfaction λ	SE	Competence λ	SE	Autonomy λ	SE	Relatedness λ	SE
Competence											
1. I think I am pretty good at physical activity.	1-7	4.79	1.76	.71	.03	.49	.06				
2. I think I do pretty well at physical activity compared to others.	1-7	3.98	1.94	.53	.04	.49	.06				
3. After working at physical activity for a while, I felt pretty competent.	1-7	5.03	1.78	.76	.03	.14	.05				
4. I am satisfied with my performance at physical activity.	1-7	5.04	1.83	.78	.03	.30	.06				
5. I am pretty skilled at physical activity.	1-7	5.05	1.85	.79	.03	.46	.06				
Autonomy											
1. When I participate in physical activity, people I interact with regularly tend to take my feelings into consideration.	1-7	4.25	1.91	.68	.03			.35	.05		
2. When I participate in physical activity, I feel like I am free to decide for myself how to participate.	1-7	4.50	1.96	.63	.04			.59	.08		
3. When I participate in physical activity, I generally feel free to express my ideas and opinions.	1-7	4.47	1.95	.75	.03			.41	.06		
4. When I participate in physical activity, I feel like I can pretty much be myself.	1-7	5.07	1.86	.87	.02			.09 [a]	.06		
Relatedness											
1. I feel like I have developed a close bond with others.	1-6	4.29	1.69	.69	.04					.43	.06

			λ	SE			
2. I feel like I fit in well with others.	1-6	4.45	1.61	.73	.04	.48	.06
3. I feel like I am included by others.	1-6	4.58	1.61	.69	.04	.50	.05
4. I feel like I am part of a group who share my goals.	1-6	4.57	1.60	.73	.04	.54	.05
5. I feel like I am supported by others in this activity.	1-6	4.63	1.59	.70	.04	.60	.04
6. I feel like others want me to be involved with them.	1-6	4.59	1.61	.67	.04	.63	.04

Notes. CFA = confirmatory factor analysis; *SD* = standard deviations; λ = standardized factor loadings; SE = standard errors.
[a] indicates non-significant factor loading at *p* > .05.