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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 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | M | $S D$ | M | $S D$ | M | 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 / <br> running <br> 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 | 4.45 | .89 | 3.99 | 1.08 | 3.95 | 1.06 |
| timetables |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall team | 4.38 | .59 | 3.88 | .77 | 3.91 | .82 |
| rules |  |  |  |  |  |  |

* 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 were | Goals were |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| goals | written down | not written |
|  | $(n=48)$ | down $(n=98)$ |


|  | $M$ |  | $S D$ | $M$ | $S D$ | $t$-test $(d f)$ | sig |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |$d d$

Technical goals $3.88 \quad 0.65 \quad 3.65 \quad 0.88 \quad \mathrm{t}(144)=1.60 \quad$ NS $\quad d=.28$

| Psychological | 3.87 | 0.70 | 3.69 | 0.85 | $\mathrm{t}(144)=1.31$ | NS | $d=.23$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

goals

| Tactical goals | 4.00 | 0.60 | 3.89 | 0.85 | $\mathrm{t}(144)=0.81$ | 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 | Time 2 | Time 3 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| goals |  |  |


|  | $M$ | $S D$ | $M$ | $S D$ | $t$-test $(d f)$ | sig | $d$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Physical goals | 3.62 | .75 | 3.45 | .82 |
| $\mathrm{t}(63)=1.277$ | NS | $d=.21$ |  |  |
| Psychological <br> goals | 3.97 | .61 | 3.67 | .77 |
| $\mathrm{t}(63)=3.144$ | $p<.01$ | $d=.47$ |  |  |

Technical
3.89 .67
3.56 . 75
$\mathrm{t}(63)=2.967 \quad p<.01 \quad d=.10$
goals

| Tactical goals | 4.11 | .54 | 3.76 | .73 | $\mathrm{t}(63)=3.78$ | $p<.001$ | $d=.55$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Team rules | 4.09 | .69 | 3.91 | .82 | $\mathrm{t}(63)=1.998$ | NS | $d=.25$ |

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 |  | Players participated in setting of the |  |  | 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 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Points per game ratio | Yes | No | Points | Yes | No | Points | Ye s | No | Point s | Yes | No | Points | Yes | No | Points |  |  |
| Ringette | 0.79 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 0 | 2 | 10/10 |  |
| $1(\mathrm{n}=10)$ <br> Floorbal $11(\mathrm{n}=9)$ | 1.86 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 8/10 | Group <br> 1 ( $n=$ <br> 36): <br> Consi <br> stent |
| Ringette $2(\mathrm{n}=9)$ | 1.57 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 2 | 2 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 8 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 8/10 | goal <br> setting <br> progra |
| Floorbal | 1.68 | 8 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 8/10 |  |
| 12 ( $\mathrm{n}=8$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \% within group | 1.48 | 97.2 | 2.8 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 63 . \\ & 9 \end{aligned}$ | 36. 1 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 69 \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 30. 6 |  | $\begin{aligned} & 94 . \\ & 4 \end{aligned}$ | 5.6 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 30 . \\ & 6 \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |
| Hockey | 0.81 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 1 | 2 | 6/10 |  |
| $1(\mathrm{n}=6)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| Ringette | 0.43 | 9 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 1 | 6 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 6/10 | Group |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3 ( $\mathrm{n}=9$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 ( $n=$ |
| Ringette | 0.5 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 7 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 5/10 | 30): |
| 4 ( $\mathrm{n}=8$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Impre |
| Ringette | 0.46 | 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 5 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 5/10 | cisely |
| $5(\mathrm{n}=7)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | goal |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | setting |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | goal |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | setting |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | progra |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 0.55 | 80.0 | 20.0 |  |  |  |  |  | 63. |  |  | 23. |  | 56. |  |  |  |  |
| group |  |  |  |  | 0 | 0 |  | 7 | 3 |  | 7 | 3 |  | 7 | 4 |  |  |  |
| Ringette | 1.96 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 3/10 | Group |
| $6(\mathrm{n}=11)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 3(n= \\ & 48): \end{aligned}$ |
| Hockey | 1.03 | 6 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 2/10 | No |
| 2 (n=6) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | goal setting |
| Hockey | 1.45 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2/10 | progra |
| 3 ( $\mathrm{n}=5$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | m |
| Ringette | 0.93 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 7 | 6 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 2/10 |  |
| 7 ( $\mathrm{n}=13$ ) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ringette | 1.57 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 8 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 2/10 |  |
| $8(\mathrm{n}=13)$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |


| \% 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 ( $N=114$ ).


Note: $S S=$ Sum of Squares, $d f=$ Degrees of Freedom, $M S=$ Mean Square, $n . s .=$ non significant

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



Note: $S S=$ Sum of Squares, $d f=$ Degrees of Freedom, $M S=$ Mean Square, $n . s .=$ non significant * 48 players reported that their team had evaluated the achievement of process and performance goals.

