

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Journal of Sport Psychology in Action

ISSN: 2152-0704 (Print) 2152-0712 (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/uspa20

Post-Event Reflection: A Tool to Facilitate Self-Awareness, Self-Monitoring, and Self-Regulation in Athletes

Graig M. Chow & Matteo Luzzeri

To cite this article: Graig M. Chow & Matteo Luzzeri (2019): Post-Event Reflection: A Tool to Facilitate Self-Awareness, Self-Monitoring, and Self-Regulation in Athletes, Journal of Sport Psychology in Action, DOI: 10.1080/21520704.2018.1555565

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/21520704.2018.1555565

Published online: 22 Jan 2019.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 17

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=uspa20

JOURNAL OF SPORT PSYCHOLOGY IN ACTION
https://doi.org/10.1080/21520704.2018.1555565

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Check for updates

Post-Event Reflection: A Tool to Facilitate Self-Awareness, Self-Monitoring, and Self-Regulation in Athletes

Graig M. Chow and Matteo Luzzeri

Florida State University

ABSTRACT

The underlying basis of many psychological interventions is self-awareness. Systematic self-reflection enhances self-awareness, which improves self-monitoring, self-correction, and ultimately self-regulation (Kirschenbaum, 1997). Theoretically, the capability to self-reflect following performance has motivational, cognitive, and behavioral effects (Ellis, Carette, Anseel, & Lievens, 2014), increases intrinsic motivation, and results in more internal and controllable attributions (Allen, Jones, & Sheffield, 2010). This paper introduces a tool—the Post-Event Reflection (PER)—that practitioners can use to assist athletes in processing their performances in a productive, improvement-focused manner. The PER's conceptual and empirical rationale, practical implementation and implications, benefits, and challenges are presented.

KEYWORDS

mental performance; mental skills; routine; sport psychology

Introduction

Across different performance domains, the ability to self-monitor and evaluate performance is distinctive of expertise (Glaser, 2014). Despite ample literature on pre-competition and pre-performance routines to guide applied practice (see Cotterill, 2010, for a review), there is limited research and associated techniques on routines or evaluations that are beneficial for athletes to utilize post-competition (notable exceptions include Allen, Jones, & Sheffield, 2010; Holder, 1997; McArdle, Martin, Lennon, & Moore, 2010; Orlick & Partington, 1988; Pain & Harwood, 2008; Ravizza & Fifer, 2014). Evaluating performance through self-reflection promotes perspective taking, reasoning skills, logical analysis, and greater understanding of cause and effect relationships (Applegate, Burke, Burleson, Delia, & Kline, 1985). The purpose of this paper is to introduce a tool—the Post-Event Reflection (PER)—that sport psychology practitioners can use with athletes to improve self-awareness, self-monitoring, self-correction, and self-regulation. We

CONTACT Graig M. Chow gchow@fsu.edu Department of Educational Psychology and Learning Systems, Florida State University, Tallahassee, FL 32306.

© 2019 Association for Applied Sport Psychology

discuss the PER in terms of its conceptual and empirical background, implementation, benefits, and challenges. In doing so, we aim to provide sport psychology practitioners with sound and sufficient information about the PER and its application to better understand, assess, and intervene with their clients.

Conceptual and empirical rationale

Self-awareness is a staple of optimal sport performance due to its pivotal role in skill development, skill execution, arousal regulation, and emotional control (Ravizza & Fifer, 2014). It is also an underlying principle of many psychological interventions including acceptance-based approaches (Gardner & Moore, 2007). Self-awareness of one's experiences and mental states is a necessary precondition for utilization of most sport psychology methods and techniques (Ravizza & Fifer, 2014). A method to enhance self-awareness is self-reflection, which facilitates learning, adjusting, and ultimately self-regulating (Kirschenbaum, 1997). Mentally tough athletes report that lessons learned following setbacks promote their psychological development, although positive experiences are also important (Thelwell, Such, Weston, Such, & Greenlees, 2010). Similarly, a willingness to identify and work on one's weaknesses is important to the pathway toward excellence (MacNamara, Button, & Collins, 2010). Mentally tough athletes are able to adapt and adjust while competing which can be facilitated through self-awareness regarding the need to self-correct (Ravizza & Fifer, 2014). This implicates the importance of self-reflection, which can be initiated by having athletes complete training/competition diaries or evaluations (Gucciardi & Mallett, 2010) and enhanced through debriefings between coach and athlete (Hogg, 2002). Self-reflection is a key initial component of the debriefing process (Hogg, 1998). As such, the PER can be utilized to promote the self-refection necessary for effective debriefing.

Ellis, Carette, Anseel, and Lievens (2014) delineate three functions fulfilled by systematic self-reflection following performance: (a) self-explanation, (b) data verification, and (c) performance and task feedback. *Self-explanation* allows performers to identify the causes or explanations of a particular outcome, which elicits more desirable causes of behavior. *Data verification* involves the elimination of common biases (e.g., hindsight, confirmation) through exploration and exposure to different approaches and interpretations (Ellis et al., 2014). This may involve reflecting on what worked well in a poor performance or what did not work well in a good performance, or having athletes compare their self-evaluation of performance with that of their coach. Finally, systematic reflection facilitates both *performance and task feedback*. The first type of feedback is evaluative in

nature and places the performance on a success-failure continuum, a fundamental step that motivates and guides the reflective process, thereby enhancing its effectiveness (Ellis et al., 2014). On the other hand, task feedback is analytical in nature, inviting the performer to explore positive and negative aspects of the performance, as well as potential changes moving forward. The self-awareness obtained by performance and task feedback can facilitate arousal management, confidence and readiness, and attentional focus (Ravizza & Hanson, 2017). By serving these three functions, systematic reflection has motivational, cognitive, and behavioral effects (Ellis et al., 2014), including improved task performance (behavioral), more effective attributions (cognitive), and higher disposition to learn from past experiences (motivational).

The PER's focus on self-awareness and self-monitoring to achieve self-regulation is informed by several social psychology theories. Self-determination theory emphasizes the importance of autonomy and competence in enhancing one's intrinsic motivation (Deci & Ryan, 2000). The PER promotes autonomy in athlete-clients through active involvement of identifying internal and external feedback. In addition, the PER promotes competence by guiding athletes through a more holistic understanding of their performance beyond statistics and competitive outcome, allowing for comprehensive self-evaluation of one's ability. Self-efficacy theory emphasizes the importance of personal control and beliefs in one's capabilities in improving persistence in the face of adversity (Bandura, 1997). Independent and systematic self-reflection through the PER helps athletes gain a sense of control over their performance and personal development. Attribution theory (Weiner, 1986) explains the ways in which individuals cognitively appraise outcomes of achievement situations. Engaging in systematic self-reflection following a competition or practice is a useful strategy for developing desirable attributions in sport performers because it cues athletes to attend to the process of performance rather than its outcome (Allen et al., 2010). For example, Allen and colleagues (2010) found that participants who reflected on the positive elements of a previous performance had more internal and controllable causal attributions than participants in the control group, regardless of whether the participant won or loss.

The PER was developed by incorporating important elements from existing post-event reflection tools in the sport psychology literature. These include (a) recording performance statistics (Orlick, 1986) and opponent (Ravizza & Fifer, 2014), (b) assessing overall performance (Holder, 1997; Ravizza & Fifer, 2014), (c) evaluating strengths and weaknesses across different performance domains (Holder, 1997), (d) rating mental attributes (Orlick, 1986), (e) identifying arousal levels across different performance

phases (Ravizza & Fifer, 2014), (f) responding to specific journaling prompts (Orlick, 1986; Ravizza & Fifer, 2014), and (g) providing an opportunity to elaborate on anything else the athlete wants to discuss (Holder, 1997; Ravizza & Fifer, 2014). The PER is unique in that it systematically and comprehensively integrates all of these elements. In addition, it goes beyond existing tools by having athletes reflect on adjustments necessary for improvement and specific plans for how to make such adjustments, as well as rate and describe several important mental attributes during the event.

Post-event reflection tool

Purpose, general description, and benefits

The PER is a structured tool that helps athletes systematically process their performances (competition or practice) in a constructive manner. By doing so, the technique facilitates autonomy, self-awareness, learning, and adjusting. This is particularly important as athletes regularly receive feedback and opinions following performance from coaches, teammates, parents, and in some cases the media. The PER allows athletes to evaluate their performance non-judgmentally through open-ended description and quantitative self-assessment. By facilitating a comprehensive evaluation that broadens one's definition of success, the PER represents an improvement-focused mental performance technique. Regular use of this technique promotes deeper self-reflection and thus self-awareness, making post-performance processing more efficient through comparing one's own reflections with external sources of feedback. In turn, self-monitoring of performance feedback serves as impetus for more effective self-regulation skills while competing. Additionally, completion of the PER can function as a performance endpoint or closure by allowing the athlete to process the performance, let go of it, and shift focus toward the next performance. This is particularly important during tournaments and events, where multiple performances occur in a short period of time (e.g., golf, swimming, track and field) (Ravizza & Fifer, 2014). Another corollary purpose of the PER is the creation of a performance logbook. Quantitatively, a statistical understanding is achieved through identification of specific aspects of performance that tend to be related to overall performance. Over time, this provides an opportunity to identify the specific methods (e.g., self-talk, imagery) that are most associated with optimal performance (Ravizza & Fifer, 2014). Qualitatively, the creation of a logbook can serve as a reminder of what worked well against a specific opponent or during a previous peak performance. This has great utility for athletes who are in a performance slump and feel without direction. Finally, the PER can be used by

practitioners to guide sessions with athletes. Silva, Metzler, and Lerner (2011) emphasize the importance of devoting significant time to reviewing past performances. The PER facilitates this review because the athlete has already comprehensively processed his/her performance prior to the session, which can lead to more thoughtful and insightful conversation during the session. According to the stage of consultation and the athlete's familiarity with the technique, the PER can provide a sound structure to guide a session and, if appropriate, an opportunity to either implement intervention or evaluate intervention effectiveness as evidenced by the athlete's self-assessment scores.

Prior to implementation, it is important to introduce the purpose and procedure of the PER, as well as its positive implications. Much of what should be emphasized when introducing the PER with an athlete-client is included in the previous paragraph. For example, the practitioner should explain that the PER is a structured tool that helps athletes systematically process their performances in a constructive manner, and that it comprises both open-ended responses and self-assessment. Positive implications of the tool should be highlighted including autonomy, self-awareness, learning, monitoring, adjusting, and self-regulation. The practitioner should encourage regular use of the PER, and could discuss how it can be used to help athletes achieve closure to their performances. Lastly, it is important to emphasize that there are no right or wrong answers to promote honest responses.

The PER is presented in Appendix. In this section of the paper, we describe each area of the PER and highlight its practical application with consideration to what the client and practitioner gain by using the tool.

Section 1: Context and perceived performance

The PER begins by recording the date, whether the reflection is for a practice or a competition, the opponent, and relevant performance statistics. This information can be used as a logbook and can be beneficial to review when competing against the same opponent later in the season.

The athlete is then asked to rate his/her overall performance on an 11-point Likert-type scale, with anchors of 0 (*poor*), 5 (*acceptable*), and 10 (*excellent*). The concept of "acceptable" performance is important as it helps to prevent dichotomous thinking. The rationale for rating overall performance first is to avoid serial positioning effects. While this initial rating may be influenced by emotional reactions to the recent performance, the score provides an anchor for subsequent reflection. Over time, it also allows the practitioner to gain a baseline understanding regarding the variance of an athlete's self-assessment (see Section 3). A variation we have

included before is having the athlete re-rate overall performance after completing the PER to determine if the rating has changed as a result of systematic reflection and if it has, explore the possible reasons for change (e.g., recognizing more strengths than initially believed).

Section 2: Reinforcing strengths & making adjustments

In this open-ended section, athletes reflect on their strengths, weaknesses, adjustments, and plans across technical, strategical, and mental domains, consistent with a deliberate practice approach. Distinguishing between these domains reinforces holistic reflection and, in turn, the holistic nature of sport performance. Akin to Holder's (1997) Performance Evaluation Sheet (PES) and in accordance with the improvement-focused nature of the PER, the strengths questions are aimed at inducing positive self-reflection. This type of reflection promotes desirable attributions (Greenlees, 2009), and recognizing positive aspects of poor performance can motivate performers to revise knowledge structures that may be taken for granted (Ellis et al., 2014). The weaknesses questions across domains also maintain the focus on improvement by allowing the athlete to identify the performance aspects that may need adjustment, even after excellent performances. Reflecting on weaknesses can assist athletes in skill improvement and help maintain adequate motivation to work on areas for growth (Allen et al., 2010). To enhance self-awareness beyond identification of strengths and weaknesses, it is important to promote adapting and adjusting (Ravizza & Hanson, 2017). Thus, the PER invites the athlete to reflect on present and future adjustments to be made and encourages specific plans for implementing the adjustments. By asking about specific adjustments, the athlete is provided autonomy to propose alternative courses of action in light of strengths and weaknesses. This gives the athlete a sense of control over his/her preparation and subsequent future performance. Finally, self-reflecting on proximal solutions—to address how potential adjustments will be made—provides a means for action planning and setting specific process goals.

Section 3: Self-assessment of mental attributes

In this section, the athlete completes a quantitative self-assessment on specific mental attributes and skills on an 11-point Likert-type scale, with anchors of 0 (*low*), 5 (*OK*), and 10 (*high*). The list is derived collaboratively between the practitioner and athlete-client and is thus tailored to athlete's presenting concerns, needs, psychological methods or skills that are being worked on, and potentially mental qualities identified by the athlete

through the revised performance profile technique (Gucciardi & Gordon, 2009). Thus, athletes have the opportunity to add or omit mental attributes and skills. For each mental attribute included, we provide a definition and discuss what they would think like, act like, or feel like for high, moderate, and low, respectively. Following self-assessment of each mental attribute, the athlete has the option of elaborating on specific scores in the "describe" section. By elaborating on specific mental attributes, the athlete can gain awareness of situations that contributed to the rating or when the mental attribute was strongest or weakest during the event. Moreover, mental attributes the athlete chooses to elaborate on may indicate those that are perceived as most salient to overall performance. Considering feasibility difficulties associated with administering psychometrically validated measures in sport psychology consultation (Chow & Gilson, 2017), this section permits a practical means to obtain athletes' self-assessment of important mental attributes. Although the utilization of validated measures is always preferred, data from this section provides practitioners with an initial assessment of the effectiveness of implemented interventions over time, as well as explore athletes' perceived mental attributes. During review of athlete's self-assessment scores, we recommend using the scaling technique to facilitate insight and motivation (Miller & Rollnick, 2013). For example, if the client rates herself a 4, the practitioner would ask a backwards question (e.g., "Why did you pick 4 and not 3?") followed by a forward question (e.g., "What would need to happen for you to get from a 4 to a 5?"). As an athlete completes several PERs over time, the practitioner can examine relationships between scores on specific mental attributes and the overall performance score or statistics (Section 1) which can elucidate patterns and potential areas for intervention. For instance, it may become apparent that an athlete scores high on self-talk when she rates her overall performance as excellent, whereas she scores low on concentration every time she rates her overall performance as poor.

Section 4: Self-assessment of arousal states

Here the athlete completes a quantitative self-assessment of arousal levels relative to different phases of performance. We educate athletes about the difference between arousal and anxiety (e.g., valence), and how arousal reflects physiological and psychological activation that varies on a continuum from deep sleep to intense excitement. Similar to Ravizza and Fifer's (2014) Performance Feedback Sheet, arousal levels are reported during warm up, just before performance, and during performance. This helps athletes gain an understanding of how arousal levels may change over time. The option to elaborate on scores can highlight the performance phase in

which arousal is suboptimal. In reviewing arousal scores and description with athletes, practitioners may choose to discuss how anxiety can be reinterpreted as excitement when arousal levels are too intense (Brooks, 2014). In addition, because Section 4 involves a retrospective self-assessment of arousal, practitioners can use the data along with perceived or objective performance (Section 1) over time to derive individual zones of optimal functioning profiles for their athletes (IZOF; Hanin, 2000). This is essential for selecting appropriate arousal-regulation interventions.

Section 5: Open-ended questions

In this final section, the athlete responds to several open-ended questions to further reflect on the performance. Structured open-ended reflections, particularly in the form of sport journals, can help athletes become more aware of key factors involved in their performance, which in turn can lead to self-regulatory strategies (Ravizza & Fifer, 2014). For example, the question "How well did you start and finish today?" allows for a holistic account of the performance experience, and helps athletes uncover explanations for discrepancies between the beginning and end of a competition. On the other hand, the question "What did you learn about yourself today?" helps athletes extrapolate salient lessons learned from the experience, regardless of whether they performed well or not. In team settings, Section 5 includes the following question: "What did you do today to make your teammates better?" Reflecting on this prompt reinforces the notion that each athlete can contribute to team performance through task or social interaction with teammates. In coactive sports (e.g., golf) this question prompts the athlete to consider and enact social support (emotional, informational, instrumental). Lastly, the question "Anything else you want to note" allows athletes to reflect upon aspects of their performance that may have been missed in the structure of the PER. Practitioners may choose to tailor Section 5 to the athlete's unique needs and goals by adding or omitting open-ended questions as needed.

Online version of PER

Travel is a constant feature associated with competitive athletics and can interfere with finding sufficient time to self-reflect. Therefore, we have also developed an online version of the PER. Athletes access it through a web link saved on their browser bookmarks or via email reminders or notifications. This way, the PER can be completed using a computer or handheld device, which in our experience athletes prefer to the pen-and-paper version. Stylistic features such as pictures, colors, and quotes make the online

version of the PER more personalized. Immediately following completion, the athlete automatically receives a printer-friendly copy with their responses via email, facilitating the logbook function of the PER. The practitioner also receives the athlete's completed PER via email, including a timestamp of when it was completed. Having access to the athlete's PER immediately following completion allows the practitioner to plan more efficiently prior to the next session and can facilitate distance consultation if the athlete desires to discuss his/her performance reflection while at an away game. The online PER is available upon request from the first author.

General observations and challenges

We have experience implementing the PER in an applied setting with several athletes ranging in competitive level from high school to collegiate to professional. This has led us to identify particular strengths, challenges, and lessons learned associated with the tool.

In our experience, athlete's adherence to the PER is high, across different competitive levels and sports. Athletes find it useful to set aside time to process their performance, learn from it, and make the necessary changes for continued improvement. That said, self-reflection is a skill that requires systematic practice (Allen et al., 2010), and athletes inexperienced in reflective practice may find it challenging to provide thorough and thoughtful responses such as in Section 2 of the PER. However, athletes tend to improve their self-reflection skills after successive completions. This is typically evidenced by more detailed responses, and clearer distinctions between strengths, weaknesses, adjustments, and plans. We have also noticed how repetitive use of the PER facilitates more difficult self-reflections, such as recognizing positives after a very poor performance or identifying areas for improvement after an excellent performance. Another appealing characteristic of the PER is that engagement with the tool appears to lead to higher engagement during sessions. Practitioners should plan enough time for adequate discussion of the recent performance to avoid feeling short of time (Silva et al., 2011). In our experience, the more athletes become familiar with the PER, the more efficient the discussion of recent performance becomes, thus reducing planning time. Additionally, client engagement and improvements in self-reflective abilities can be gauged by the extent to which the athlete elaborates on mental attributes (Section 3) and arousal levels (Section 4). Such engagement facilitates discussion and understanding of previous performance as the athlete has already spent ample

time processing it alone. Over time, athletes gain deeper insight into their presenting concern and overall sport experience.

Like any intervention, there are some challenges associated with the PER. Although adherence appears to be high, one barrier to initial utilization may be its length and breadth. Practitioners should devote adequate time prior to administering the PER explaining the purpose of each section to create positive expectations regarding use of the tool. Another challenge is getting athletes to complete it within the recommended 24 hours following performance. The PER should not be completed right after the event to allow sufficient time to process the performance and avoid overly emotional or rushed responses, but also not too late to avoid forgetting or being overly influenced by external sources (e.g., coach, teammates). In this regard, the online version of the PER can help with accessibility and timing via scheduled reminders or notifications. Finally, self-reflection can be difficult for those who present with particular personality features such as low conscientiousness, low openness to experience, or emotional instability (Ellis et al., 2014), and we have found this to be accurate in our experience. Practitioners must be aware of such individual differences when considering utilization of the PER. Adapting the PER to address other individual characteristics, such as non-sport performers (e.g., performing artists) and coaches can easily be accomplished through minor modifications to Section 2. For instance, we have removed the strategy domain for dancers and technical domain for coaches.

Conclusion

Self-awareness plays a pivotal role in the improvement of sport and mental performance (Gardner & Moore, 2007; Ravizza & Fifer, 2014). The application of structured and systematic self-reflection can help athletes gain self-awareness with the ultimate goal of self-regulation (Kirschenbaum, 1997), while also promoting intrinsic motivation and desirable attributions. The simplicity, structure, and relevance of the PER increases the likelihood that athletes will become self-sufficient and skilled in their reflective practices (Holder, 1997). Moreover, the PER is conceptually grounded and its flexible nature allows practitioners to personalize the tool according to the athlete's needs. Self-reflection tools, such as the PER, help athletes process and learn from their performances in an improvement-focused manner, identify the mental factors associated with optimal performance, and derive specific action plans to increase the likelihood of future performance success.

Author note

Graig M. Chow, Department of Educational Psychology and Learning Systems, Florida State University; Matteo Luzzeri, Department of Educational Psychology and Learning Systems, Florida State University.

References

Allen, M. S., Jones, M. V., & Sheffield, D. (2010). The influence of positive reflection on attributions, emotions, and self-efficacy. *The Sport Psychologist*, *24*(2), 211–226. doi: 10.1123/tsp.24.2.211

Applegate, J. L., Burke, J. A., Burleson, B. R., Delia, J. G., & Kline, S. L. (1985). Reflection-enhancing parental communication. In I. E. Sigel (Ed.), *Parental belief systems: The psychological consequences for children* (pp. 107–142). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: Freeman.

Brooks, A. W. (2014). Get excited: Reappraising pre-performance anxiety as excitement. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *143*(3), 1144–1158. doi:10.1037/a0035325

Chow, G. M., & Gilson, T. A. (2017). Inventories: Using objective measures. In J. Taylor (Ed.), *Handbook of assessment in sport psychology consulting* (pp. 83–100). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Cotterill, S. (2010). Pre-performance routines in sport: Current understanding and future directions. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *3*(2), 132–153. doi: 10.1080/1750984X.2010.488269

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*(4), 227–268. doi: 10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

Ellis, S., Carette, B., Anseel, F., & Lievens, F. (2014). Systematic reflection: Implications for learning from failures and successes. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *23*(1), 67–72. doi:10.1177/0963721413504106

Gardner, F. L., & Moore, Z. E. (2007). *The psychology of enhancing human performance: The mindfulness-acceptance-commitment (MAC) approach*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.

Glaser, R. (2014). Changing the agency for learning: Acquiring expert performance. in A. Ericsson (Ed.), *The road to excellence: The acquisition of expert performance in the arts and sciences, sports, and games* (pp. 303–312). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Greenlees, I. (2009). Enhancing confidence in a youth golfer. In B. Hemmings & T. Holder (Eds.), *Applied sport psychology: A case based approach* (pp. 89–107). Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Gucciardi, D. F., & Gordon, S. (2009). Revisiting the performance profile technique: Theoretical underpinnings and application. *The Sport Psychologist*, *23*(1), 93–117. doi: 10.1123/tsp.23.1.93

Gucciardi, D. F., & Mallett, C. J. (2010). Mental toughness. In S. Hanrahan and M. Andersen (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of applied sport psychology: A comprehensive guide for students and practitioners* (pp. 547–556). New York, NY: Routledge.

Hanin, Y. L. (2000). *Emotions in sport*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Hogg, J. M. (1998). The post performance debriefing process: getting your capable track and field athletes to the next level of performance. *New Studies in Athletics*, *13*, 49–57.

Hogg, J. M. (2002). Debriefing: A means to increasing recovery and subsequent performance. In M. Kellmann (Ed.), *Enhancing recovery: Preventing underperformance in athletes* (pp 181–198). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Holder, T. (1997). A theoretical perspective of performance evaluation with a practical application. In R. J. Butler (Ed.), *Sports psychology in performance* (pp. 68–86). Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Kirschenbaum, D. (1997). *Mind matters: 7 steps to smarter sport performance*. Carmel, IN: Cooper Publishing.

MacNamara, A., Button, A., & Collins, D. (2010). The role of psychological characteristics in facilitating the pathway to elite performance. Part 1: Identifying mental skills and behaviors. *The Sport Psychologist*, *24*(1), 52–73. doi:10.1123/tsp.24.1.52

McArdle, S., Martin, D., Lennon, A., & Moore, P. (2010). Exploring debriefing in sports: A qualitative perspective. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *22*(3), 320–332. doi:10.1080/10413200.2010.481566

Miller, W. R., & Rollnick, S. (2013). *Motivational interviewing: Helping people change*. (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Orlick, T. (1986). *Psyching for sport: Mental training for athletes*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.

Orlick, T., & Partington, J. (1988). Mental links to excellence. *The Sport Psychologist*, *2*(2), 105–130. doi:10.1123/tsp.2.2.105

Pain, M. A., & Harwood, C. G. (2008). The performance environment of the England youth soccer teams: A quantitative investigation. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, *26*(11), 1157–1169. doi:10.1080/02640410802101835

Ravizza, K., & Fifer, A. (2014). Increasing awareness for sport performance. In J. M. Williams & V. Krane (Eds.), *Applied sport psychology: Personal growth to peak performance* (7th ed., pp. 176–287). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Ravizza, K., & Hanson, T. (2017). *Heads-up baseball 2.0: 5 skills for competing one pitch at a time*. Tampa, FL: Hanson House.

Silva, J., Metzler, J., & Lerner, B. (2011). *Training professionals in the practice of sport psychology*. (2nd ed.). Morgantown, WV: Fitness Information Technology.

Thelwell, R. C., Such, B. A., Weston, N. J., Such, J. D., & Greenlees, I. A. (2010). Developing mental toughness: Perceptions of elite female gymnasts. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *8*(2), 170–188. doi:10.1080/1612197X.2010.9671941

Weiner, B. (1986). *An attributional theory of motivation and emotion*. New York: Springer.

Appendix: The Post-Event Reflection

Name:
Practice or Competition (indicate opponent or event):
Date:
Performance Statistics:

1. HOW WOULD YOU RATE YOUR PERFORMANCE TODAY?

0–––––––––5–––––––––10
Poor Acceptable Excellent

2. REINFORCING STRENGTHS & MAKING ADJUSTMENTS

	Technically	Strategically	Mentally
What worked well for you today?			
What did not work so well for you today?			
What adjustments do you need to make?			
How will you make the adjustments?			

3. RATE YOUR MENTAL ATTRIBUTES TODAY

	0–––––––––5–––––––––10 Low OK High	Describe
Concentration		
Confidence		
Composure		
Commitment		
Resiliency		
Mindfulness		
Self-Talk		
Imagery		
Attitude		
Body Language		

4. HOW WAS YOUR LEVEL OF ACTIVATION/AROUSAL TODAY?

	0–––––––––5–––––––––10 Low Moderate High	Describe
a. During warm-up		
b. Just before practice/competition		
c. During practice/competition		

5. HOW WELL DID YOU START AND FINISH?
6. WHAT DID YOU LEARN ABOUT YOURSELF TODAY?
7. WHAT DID YOU DO TODAY TO MAKE YOUR TEAMMATES BETTER?
8. ANYTHING ELSE YOU WANT TO NOTE?