This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.

Author(s): Forsblom, Kim; Konttinen, Niilo; Weinberg, Robert; Matilainen, Pertti; Lintunen, Taru

Title: Perceived goal setting practices across a competitive season

Year: 2019

Version: Accepted version (Final draft)

Copyright: © SAGE Publications, 2019

Rights: In Copyright

Rights url: <http://rightsstatements.org/page/InC/1.0/?language=en>

Please cite the original version:

Forsblom, K., Konttinen, N., Weinberg, R., Matilainen, P., & Lintunen, T. (2019). Perceived goal setting practices across a competitive season. *International Journal of Sports Science and Coaching*, 14(6), 765-778. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1747954119880994>

Table 1: Means regarding setting of (Time 1) and evaluating the progress (Time 2) and the achievement (Time 3) of 25 different process and performance goals ($N = 146$). The scale was from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 5 (*totally agree*).

Goals	Time 1: setting goals		Time 2: evaluating the progress toward goals		Time 3*: evaluating the achievement of goals	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Strength	4.10	.90	3.35	1.14	3.49	1.11
Quickness	4.22	.82	3.68	1.00	3.38	.95
Endurance	4.43	.77	3.81	.98	3.80	.93
Flexibility	3.75	1.07	3.16	1.02	3.09	1.17
Agility	4.01	1.04	3.42	.97	3.39	1.00
Overall physical	4.10	.73	3.48	.83	3.45	.82
Special teams	4.29	.76	3.65	1.03	3.35	1.00
Defense	4.60	.63	4.00	.92	3.83	1.02
Forechecking	4.58	.61	4.02	.87	3.81	.91
Offence	4.61	.59	4.01	.96	3.89	.95
Breakouts	4.58	.67	3.97	.92	3.83	.88
Overall tactical	4.53	.51	3.92	.77	3.76	.73
Self-confidence	4.33	.83	3.60	1.13	3.52	1.11

Concentration	4.23	.84	3.66	.94	3.45	1.05
Motivation	4.08	.83	3.59	.99	3.52	1.05
Persistence	4.46	.72	3.84	.94	3.80	.98
Willingness to win	4.52	.73	4.04	.87	3.98	.92
Overall psychological	4.32	.59	3.75	.81	3.67	.77
Shooting	4.27	.90	3.60	1.07	3.35	1.08
Skating / running techniques	4.1	.88	3.52	1.03	3.11	1.02
Passing	4.60	.64	3.92	1.00	3.77	.87
Stick handling	4.29	.78	3.65	.97	3.56	.94
One on one	4.55	.69	3.92	.92	3.92	.95
Overall technical	4.36	.62	3.72	.82	3.56	.75
High level of attendance	4.38	.90	3.63	1.29	3.71	1.40
Having fun in games and practices	4.08	.90	3.79	1.10	3.74	1.08
Quality of training	4.48	.73	3.88	.94	4.05	1.00

Team spirit	4.49	.75	4.08	1.01	4.00	1.13
Sticking to timetables	4.45	.89	3.99	1.08	3.95	1.06
Overall team rules	4.38	.59	3.88	.77	3.91	.82

* *Note:* In Time 3, a total of 64 players reported that the achievement of goals was evaluated, whereas 82 players reported their team did not evaluate the achievement of process and performance goals. The means in Time 3 includes only 64 players.

Table 2: Differences in the prevalence of evaluating progress in process and performance in Time 2 between players whose team had, and had not written the goals down ($N = 146$). Scale was from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 5 (*totally agree*).

Evaluation of goals	Goals were written down ($n = 48$)		Goals were not written down ($n = 98$)		t -test (df)	sig	d
	M	SD	M	SD			
Physical goals	3.53	0.73	3.46	0.88	$t(144)=0.50$	NS	$d = .09$
Technical goals	3.88	0.65	3.65	0.88	$t(144)=1.60$	NS	$d = .28$
Psychological goals	3.87	0.70	3.69	0.85	$t(144)=1.31$	NS	$d = .23$
Tactical goals	4.00	0.60	3.89	0.85	$t(144)=0.81$	NS	$d = .14$
Team rules	4.08	0.63	3.77	0.82	$t(144)=2.53$	$p < .05$	$d = .41$

Table 3: Results of a paired sample *t*-test comparing the prevalence of goal evaluation between Time 2 and Time 3 (*N* = 64). Scale was from 1 (*totally disagree*) to 5 (*totally agree*).

Evaluation of goals	Time 2		Time 3		<i>t</i> -test (<i>df</i>)	sig	<i>d</i>
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
Physical goals	3.62	.75	3.45	.82	t(63)=1.277	NS	<i>d</i> = .21
Psychological goals	3.97	.61	3.67	.77	t(63)=3.144	<i>p</i> < .01	<i>d</i> = .47
Technical goals	3.89	.67	3.56	.75	t(63)=2.967	<i>p</i> < .01	<i>d</i> = .10
Tactical goals	4.11	.54	3.76	.73	t(63)=3.78	<i>p</i> < .001	<i>d</i> = .55
Team rules	4.09	.69	3.91	.82	t(63)=1.998	NS	<i>d</i> = .25

Note: A total of 82 players reported their team did not evaluate the achievement of process and performance goals. Those players were excluded from this longitudinal analysis.

Table 4:

Team	Points per game ratio	Players participated in setting of the outcome goal			Outcome goal was written down			Process and performance goals were written down			Achievement of outcome goal was evaluated after the season			Achievement of process and performance goals were evaluated after the season			Total points	Goal setting group
		Yes	No	Points	Yes	No	Points	Yes	No	Points	Yes	No	Points	Yes	No	Points		
Ringette 1 (n=10)	0.79	10	0	2	7	3	2	7	3	2	10	0	2	10	0	2	10/10	Group 1 (n = 36): Consistent goal setting program
Floorball 1 (n=9)	1.86	8	1	2	5	4	1	7	2	2	9	0	2	5	4	1	8/10	
Ringette 2 (n=9)	1.57	9	0	2	7	2	2	6	3	2	8	1	2	3	6	0	8/10	
Floorball 2 (n=8)	1.68	8	0	2	4	4	1	5	3	1	7	1	2	7	1	2	8/10	
% within group	1.48	97.2	2.8		63.9	36.1		69.4	30.6		94.4	5.6		69.4	30.6			
Hockey 1 (n=6)	0.81	4	2	2	0	6	0	2	4	0	5	1	2	5	1	2	6/10	

Ringette 3 (n=9)	0.43	9	0	2	0	9	0	4	5	1	6	3	2	5	4	1	6/10	Group 2 (n = 30): Imprecisely goal setting goal setting program
Ringette 4 (n=8)	0.5	5	3	1	2	6	0	4	4	1	7	1	2	4	4	1	5/10	
Ringette 5 (n=7)	0.46	6	1	2	1	6	0	1	6	0	5	2	2	3	4	1	5/10	
% within group	0.55	80.0	20.0		10.0	90.0		36.7	63.3		76.7	23.3		56.7	43.3			
Ringette 6 (n=11)	1.96	7	4	1	0	11	0	0	11	0	8	3	2	3	8	0	3/10	Group 3 (n = 48): No goal setting program
Hockey 2 (n=6)	1.03	6	0	2	0	6	0	1	5	0	2	4	0	0	6	0	2/10	
Hockey 3 (n=5)	1.45	3	2	1	0	5	0	0	5	0	3	2	1	1	4	0	2/10	
Ringette 7 (n=13)	0.93	8	5	1	0	13	0	0	13	0	7	6	1	1	12	0	2/10	
Ringette 8 (n=13)	1.57	8	5	1	0	13	0	0	13	0	8	5	1	1	12	0	2/10	

% within	1.39	66.7	33.3	0	100	2.1	97.	58.	41.	12.	87.
group						9		3	7	5	5

Table 5: The differences between the three groups in evaluating the progress toward goals ($N=114$).

Goal	Group 1 ($n=36$)	Group 2 ($n=30$)	Group 3 ($n=48$)	One-way ANOVA						Bonferro ni Post hoc test p
					SS	df	MS	F	p	
Physical	$M=3.49$	$M=3.25$	$M=3.55$	Between groups	1.736	2	.868	1.254	$n.s.$	
	$SD=.76$	$SD=.71$	$SD=.95$	Within groups	76.789	11	.692			
				Total	78.525	113				
Technical	$M=4.04$	$M=3.35$	$M=3.69$	Between groups	7.879	2	3.939	6.525	.002	.001
	$SD=.58$	$SD=.77$	$SD=.90$	Within groups	67.013	11	.604			
				Total	74.891	113				
Psychological	$M=3.91$	$M=3.57$	$M=3.72$	Between groups	1.981	2	.991	1.518	$n.s.$	
	$SD=.62$	$SD=.73$	$SD=.96$	Within groups	72.429	11	.653			
				Total	74.410	113				
Tactical	$M=4.18$	$M=3.57$	$M=3.98$	Between groups	6.122	2	3.061	5.508	.005	.004
	$SD=.52$	$SD=.69$	$SD=.90$	Within groups	61.691	11	.556			
				Total	67.813	113				
Team rules	$M=4.07$	$M=3.77$	$M=3.70$	Between groups	2.987	2	1.494	2.626	$n.s.$	
	$SD=.64$	$SD=.71$	$SD=.85$	Within groups	63.138	11	.569			
				Total	66.125	113				

Note: SS = Sum of Squares, df = Degrees of Freedom, MS = Mean Square, $n.s.$ = non significant

Table 6: The differences in perceptions of outcome, process and performance goal achievement between the three groups.

				Robust Tests of Equality of Means					Dunnett T3 Post hoc test	
Goal	Group 1 (n=36)	Group 2 (n=30)	Group 3 (n=48)	The Brown-Forsythe ANOVA					<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>
				<i>F</i>	<i>df1</i>	<i>df2</i>	<i>p</i>			
Outcome goal	<i>M</i> =2.3 1 <i>SD</i> =1.17	<i>M</i> =3.3 7 <i>SD</i> =1.62	<i>M</i> =3.0 9 <i>SD</i> =1.71	4.434	2	88.278	.015		.017	
				One-way ANOVA					Bonferroni Post hoc test	
Goal	Group 1 (n=25*)	Group 2 (n=17*)	Group 3 (n=6*)						<i>p</i>	<i>p</i>
					<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>		
Physical	<i>M</i> =3.18 <i>SD</i> =.68	<i>M</i> =3.71 <i>SD</i> =.81	<i>M</i> =3.43 <i>SD</i> =.54	Between groups	2.851	2	1.425	2.766	<i>n.s.</i>	
				Within groups	23.188	45	.515			
				Total	26.039	47				
Technical	<i>M</i> =3.53 <i>SD</i> =.67	<i>M</i> =3.61 <i>SD</i> =.71	<i>M</i> =3.47 <i>SD</i> =.37	Between groups	.119	2	.059	.138	<i>n.s.</i>	
				Within groups	19.361	45	.430			
				Total	19.480	47				
Psychological	<i>M</i> =3.69 <i>SD</i> =.59	<i>M</i> =3.58 <i>SD</i> =.81	<i>M</i> =3.63 <i>SD</i> =.60	Between groups	.126	2	.063	.138	<i>n.s.</i>	
				Within groups	20.590	45	.458			
				Total	20.717	47				
Tactical	<i>M</i> =3.91 <i>SD</i> =.5	<i>M</i> =3.51 <i>SD</i> =.6	<i>M</i> =3.90 <i>SD</i> =.5	Between groups	1.791	2	.895	2.624	<i>n.s.</i>	
				Within groups	15.35	45	.341			

	2	8	5	groups	6				
				Total	17.14	47			
					7				
Team rules	<i>M</i> =4.0	<i>M</i> =3.7	<i>M</i> =3.4	Betwe	1.853	2	.927	1.948	<i>n.s</i>
	2	6	3	en					
				groups					
	<i>SD</i> =.6	<i>SD</i> =.6	<i>SD</i> =.7	Within	21.40	45	.476		
	9	7	6	groups	6				
				Total	23.25	47			
					9				

Note: *SS* = Sum of Squares, *df* = Degrees of Freedom, *MS* = Mean Square, *n.s.* = non significant

* 48 players reported that their team had evaluated the achievement of process and performance goals.