

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: set	ting goals	Time 2: even	aluating the ward goals	Time 3*: ev the achieve goals	valuating ment of
	М	SD	М	SD	М	SD
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 written $(n = 48)$	were 1 down 3)	Goals y not wri down (were itten $(n = 98)$			
	М	SD	М	SD	<i>t</i> -test (<i>df</i>)	sig	d
Physical goals	3.53	0.73	3.46	0.88	t(144)=0.50	NS	<i>d</i> = .09
Technical goals	3.88	0.65	3.65	0.88	t(144)=1.60	NS	<i>d</i> = .28
Psychological goals	3.87	0.70	3.69	0.85	t(144)=1.31	NS	<i>d</i> = .23
Tactical goals	4.00	0.60	3.89	0.85	t(144)=0.81	NS	<i>d</i> = .14
Team rules	4.08	0.63	3.77	0.82	t(144)=2.53	<i>p</i> < .05	<i>d</i> = .41

Evaluation of	Time 2		Time 3				
goals							
	М	SD	М	SD	t-test (df)	sig	d
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

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*).

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.

		Playe	rs parti	cipated	Oute	ome g	goal	Proc	ess an	d	Achi	eveme	ent of	Achi	eveme	ent of		
		in set	ting of	the	was	writte	n down	perfo	ormano	ce goals	outco	ome g	oal was	proc	ess and	1		
		outco	me goa	.1				were	writte	en	evalu	ated a	after the	perfo	ormanc	e goals		
								dow	n		seaso	n		were	evalu	ated		
														after	the se	ason		
Team	Points	Yes	No	Points	Yes	No	Points	Ye	No	Point	Yes	No	Points	Yes	No	Points	Total	Goal
	per							S		S							points	setting
	game																	group
	ratio																	
Ringette	0.79	10	0	2	7	3	2	7	3	2	10	0	2	10	0	2	10/10	
1 (n=10)																		Group $1 (n =$
Floorbal	1.86	8	1	2	5	4	1	7	2	2	9	0	2	5	4	1	8/10	36):
11 (n=9)																		Consi stent
Ringette	1.57	9	0	2	7	2	2	6	3	2	8	1	2	3	6	0	8/10	goal
2 (n=9)																		setting
Floorbal	1.68	8	0	2	4	4	1	5	3	1	7	1	2	7	1	2	8/10	m
12 (n=8)																		
% within	1.48	97.2	2.8		63.	36.		69.	30.		94.	5.6		69.	30.			
group					9	1		4	6		4			4	6			
Hockey	0.81	4	2	2	0	6	0	2	4	0	5	1	2	5	1	2	6/10	
1 (n=6)																		

Ringette	0.43	9	0	2	0	9	0	4	5	1	6	3	2	5	4	1	6/10	Group
3 (n=9)																		2 (<i>n</i> =
Ringette	0.5	5	3	1	2	6	0	4	4	1	7	1	2	4	4	1	5/10	30):
4 (n=8)																		Impre
Ringette	0.46	6	1	2	1	6	0	1	6	0	5	2	2	3	4	1	5/10	cisely
5 (n=7)																		goal
																		setting
																		goal
																		setting
																		progra
																		m
% within	0.55	80.0	20.0		10.	90.		36.	63.		76.	23.		56.	43.			
GF (1) D						_		_	•			•		_				
group					0	0		7	3		7	3		7	4			
Ringette	1.96	7	4	1	0 0	0 11	0	7 0	3	0	7 8	3	2	7 3	4 8	0	3/10	Group
Ringette 6 (n=11)	1.96	7	4	1	0	0	0	7 0	3	0	7 8	3	2	7	4 8	0	3/10	Group 3 (<i>n</i> = 48):
Ringette 6 (n=11) Hockey	1.96 1.03	7	4	1 2	0 0 0 0	0 11 6	0	7 0 1	3 11 5	0	7 8 2	3 3 4	2	7 3 0	4 8 6	0	3/10 2/10	Group 3 (<i>n</i> = 48): No
Ringette 6 (n=11) Hockey 2 (n=6)	1.96 1.03	7 6	4	1 2	0 0 0 0	0 11 6	0	7 0 1	3 11 5	0	7 8 2	3 4	2 0	7 3 0	4 8 6	0	3/10 2/10	Group 3 (n = 48): No goal setting
Ringette 6 (n=11) Hockey 2 (n=6) Hockey	1.96 1.03 1.45	7 6 3	4 0 2	1 2 1	0 0 0 0	0 11 6 5	0 0 0 0	7 0 1 0	3 11 5 5	0 0 0 0	7 8 2 3	3 3 4 2	2 0 1	7 3 0 1	4 8 6 4	0 0 0 0	3/10 2/10 2/10	Group 3 (n = 48): No goal setting progra
Ringette 6 (n=11) Hockey 2 (n=6) Hockey 3 (n=5)	1.96 1.03 1.45	7 6 3	4 0 2	1 2 1	0 0 0 0	0 11 6 5	0 0 0	7 0 1 0	3 11 5 5	0 0 0 0	7 8 2 3	3 3 4 2	2 0 1	7 3 0 1	4 8 6 4	0 0 0	3/10 2/10 2/10	Group 3 (n = 48): No goal setting progra m
Ringette 6 (n=11) Hockey 2 (n=6) Hockey 3 (n=5) Ringette	1.96 1.03 1.45 0.93	7 6 3 8	4 0 2 5	1 2 1 1	0 0 0 0 0	0 11 6 5 13	0 0 0 0	7 0 1 0 0	3 11 5 5 13	0 0 0 0	7 8 2 3 7	3 3 4 2 6	2 0 1 1	7 3 0 1 1	4 8 6 4 12	0 0 0 0	3/10 2/10 2/10 2/10	Group 3 (<i>n</i> = 48): No goal setting progra m
Ringette 6 (n=11) Hockey 2 (n=6) Hockey 3 (n=5) Ringette 7 (n=13)	1.96 1.03 1.45 0.93	7 6 3 8	4 0 2 5	1 2 1 1	0 0 0 0	0 11 6 5 13	0 0 0 0	7 0 1 0 0	3 11 5 5 13	0 0 0 0	7 8 2 3 7	3 3 4 2 6	2 0 1 1	7 3 0 1 1	4 8 6 4 12	0 0 0 0	3/10 2/10 2/10 2/10	Group 3 (<i>n</i> = 48): No goal setting progra m
Ringette 6 (n=11) Hockey 2 (n=6) Hockey 3 (n=5) Ringette 7 (n=13) Ringette	1.96 1.03 1.45 0.93 1.57	7 6 3 8 8	4 0 2 5 5	1 2 1 1	0 0 0 0 0 0	0 11 6 5 13 13	0 0 0 0 0	7 0 1 0 0 0	3 11 5 5 13 13	0 0 0 0 0	7 8 2 3 7 8	3 3 4 2 6 5	2 0 1 1 1	7 3 0 1 1 1	4 8 6 4 12 12	0 0 0 0 0	3/10 2/10 2/10 2/10 2/10	Group 3 (<i>n</i> = 48): No goal setting progra m

% within 1.39	66.7 33	3 0	100	2.1	97.	58.	41.	12.	87.
group					9	3	7	5	5

				One-way	ANOV	A				Bonferro ni Post hoc test
Goal	Group	Group 2	Group 3		SS	df	MS	F	р	р
D11	(n=30)	(n=30)	(n=48)	D - 4	1 726	2	979	1.05		
Physical	M=3.4 9	M=3.2 5	M=3.5 5	n groups	1.730	2	.808	1.25 4	n.s.	
	SD=.7	SD=.7	SD=.9	Within	76.78	11	.692			
	6	1	5	groups Total	9 78.52 5	1 11 3				
Technical	<i>M</i> =4.0 4	<i>M</i> =3.3 5	<i>M</i> =3.6 9	Betwee n groups	7.879	2	3.93 9	6.52 5	.00 2	.001
	<i>SD</i> =.5 8	SD=.7 7	<i>SD</i> =.9 0	Within groups Total	67.01 3 74.89 1	11 1 11 3	.604			
Psychologic al	<i>M</i> =3.9 1	<i>M</i> =3.5 7	<i>M</i> =3.7 2	Betwee n groups	1.981	2	.991	1.51 8	n.s.	
	<i>SD</i> =.6 2	<i>SD</i> =.7 3	<i>SD</i> =.9 6	Within groups Total	72.42 9 74.41 0	11 1 11 3	.653			
Tactical	<i>M</i> =4.1 8	<i>M</i> =3.5 7	<i>M</i> =3.9 8	Betwee n groups	6.122	2	3.06 1	5.50 8	.00 5	.004
	<i>SD</i> =.5 2	<i>SD</i> =.6 9	<i>SD</i> =.9 0	Within groups Total	61.69 1 67.81 3	11 1 11 3	.556			
Team rules	<i>M</i> =4.0 7	<i>M</i> =3.7 7	<i>M</i> =3.7 0	Betwee n groups	2.987	2	1.49 4	2.62 6	n.s.	
	<i>SD</i> =.6 4	<i>SD</i> =.7 1	<i>SD</i> =.8 5	Within groups Total	63.13 8 66.12 5	11 1 11 3	.569			

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

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

				Robust Means The Bro ANOVA	Tests of own-Fors A	Equality sythe	y of	Dunne tt T3 Post hoc test		
Goal	Group 1 (<i>n</i> =36)	Group 2 (<i>n</i> =30)	Group 3 (<i>n</i> =48)	F	df1	df2	р	p	-	
Outcome goal	M=2.3 1 SD=1. 17	M=3.3 7 SD=1. 62	M=3.0 9 SD=1. 71	4.434	2	88.27 8	.015	.017		
				One-wa	y ANOV	/A				Bonferro ni Post hoc test
Goal	Group 1 (<i>n</i> =25*	Group 2 (<i>n</i> =17*	Group 3 (<i>n</i> =6*)		SS	df	MS	F	р	р
Physical	M=3.1 8 SD=.6 8	M=3.7 1 SD=.8 1	M=3.4 3 SD=.5 4	Betwe en groups Within groups Total	2.851 23.18 8 26.03	2 45 47	1.42 5 .515	2.766	<i>n.s</i>	
Technical	<i>M</i> =3.5 3 <i>SD</i> =.6 7	<i>M</i> =3.6 1 <i>SD</i> =.7 1	M=3.4 7 SD=.3 7	Betwe en groups Within groups Total	9 .119 19.36 1 19.48 0	2 45 47	.059 .430	.138	n.s	
Psychologi cal	<i>M</i> =3.6 9 <i>SD</i> =.5 9	<i>M</i> =3.5 8 <i>SD</i> =.8 1	<i>M</i> =3.6 3 <i>SD</i> =.6 0	Betwe en groups Within groups Total	.126 20.59 0 20.71 7	2 45 47	.063 .458	.138	n.s	
Tactical	M=3.9 1 SD=.5	<i>M</i> =3.5 1 <i>SD</i> =.6	<i>M</i> =3.9 0 <i>SD</i> =.5	Betwe en groups Within	, 1.791 15.35	2 45	.895 .341	2.624	n.s	

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

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

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.