

Abstract

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15

In this study we examined the effects of feedback (knowledge of results; KR) after good and poor performances on self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation when learning easy and more difficult motor tasks. Participants were assigned to a KR-good, KR-poor, or KR-neutral (control) condition where they putted a golf ball to a target hole at distances of 2m (easy) and 5m (more difficult). All participants received KR on three trials in each six-trial block. Measures of self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation were taken after each test phase; and learning was inferred from 24-hour and one-week retention tests. The KR-good group showed the highest levels of self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation, relative to the other two feedback groups, and more accurate putting performance. These effects persisted after one week and were more pronounced for the more difficult task. There is evidence for the motivational effects of feedback on motor learning, which has implications for theory and practice.

Keywords: feedback; knowledge of results; motivation; motor learning; self-efficacy.

1. Introduction

Primarily, research into the role of augmented feedback in learning has focussed on its informational properties and been **theoretically driven by the guidance hypothesis** (Salmoni, Schmidt, & Walter, 1984). The central premise of the guidance hypothesis is that augmented feedback has strong guiding properties that directs the learner to the correct response, yet under certain conditions (i.e., if feedback is provided too often or too soon) the learner bypasses important intrinsic processing mechanisms and becomes dependent on the external source. Additionally, frequent KR prompts performers to adjust small response errors that may simply represent inherent variability in the motor system; **thus, leading to an inability to recognise and produce stable behaviour in retention** (Schmidt, 1991).

Recently, researchers have begun to pay attention to the motivational properties of this informational feedback, and how it may influence motor learning. The motivational properties of KR have been long acknowledged (e.g., Thorndike, 1927) but are relatively under researched in comparison to its informational role. It has been found that learners who are allowed to decide when to receive feedback (i.e., self-controlled feedback) show superior performance in delayed retention tests compared to control and yoked groups of participants (Chiviawsky & Wulf, 2002; Chiviawsky, Wulf, Laroque de Medeiros, Kaefer, & Tani, 2008). Post-experiment interviews have shown that learners both prefer and request feedback more often after relatively successful ('good') trials than less successful ('poor') trials (Chiviawsky & Wulf, 2002, 2005; Fairbrother, Laughlin, & Nguyen, 2012; Patterson & Carter, 2010; Patterson, Carter, & Sanli, 2011). Similarly, when experimenter-controlled feedback is provided after relatively good trials, it has resulted in more effective performance in retention tests than when it is provided after relatively poor trials (e.g., Chiviawsky & Wulf, 2007; Chiviawsky, Wulf, Wally, & Borges, 2009).

1 Whilst such findings have been argued to suggest an important role for motivation in
2 skill learning (Lewthwaite & Wulf, 2010), researchers have recently shown that the strategies
3 for requesting KR may vary as a function of the number of practice trials completed (e.g.,
4 Carter & Patterson, 2012; Carter, Rathwell, & Ste-Marie, 2016), with KR being requested
5 only after relatively good trials later in practice. Moreover, researchers have also shown that
6 awareness of KR content (i.e., whether KR is given after the three best or three worst trials)
7 results in superior learning, irrespective of whether the KR reflects good or poor trials
8 (Patterson & Azizieh, 2012). It has been suggested that explicitly grouping KR trials as a
9 function of the participant's performance (regardless of whether it relates to KR-good or KR-
10 poor) may increase the informational value of KR, thus providing a meaningful referent to
11 modulate future responses (Patterson & Azizieh, 2012). Learning, however, is dynamic in
12 nature and as Guadagnoli and Lee (2004) highlight, the relative effectiveness of any practice
13 condition may depend on the interplay of learner characteristics, the characteristics of the
14 motor task, and task complexity, which may account for these equivocal findings.

15 A limitation of much of the motor learning literature investigating the role of
16 motivation is that motivational effects have often only been presumed rather than quantified
17 through validated inventories (see Sanli, Patterson, Bray, & Lee, 2013). Badami,
18 VaezMousavi, Wulf, and Namazizadeh (2011) addressed this issue by using the Intrinsic
19 Motivation Inventory (IMI; McAuley, Duncan, & Tammen, 1989) to measure motivation,
20 and reported that participants who received KR after good trials had higher levels of intrinsic
21 motivation than those receiving KR on their poor trials, particularly on the dimension of
22 perceived competence. Though the findings of Badami et al. (2011) suggest that providing
23 feedback after good trials increases intrinsic motivation by enhancing perceived competence
24 of the practiced task, the authors did not measure performance of the primary task (golf-
25 putting) meaning it is difficult to correlate any beneficial effects of this motivational feedback

1 with motor learning. Saemi, Wulf, Varzaneh, and Zarghami (2011) did report both intrinsic
2 motivation and motor learning to be improved when children practising a throwing task
3 received good-trial feedback compared to poor-trial feedback. However, the extent to which
4 this finding can be generalised from children to adults is an open question given that age has
5 been shown to interact with other feedback variables in defining optimum learning conditions
6 (see Pollock & Lee, 1997; Sullivan, Kantak, & Burtner, 2008). Moreover, given that it is the
7 interest/enjoyment sub-scale of the IMI that is considered the self-report measure of intrinsic
8 motivation (McAuley et al., 1989), in both Badami et al. (2011) and Saemi et al. (2011), the
9 authors were incorrect to sum the different sub-scales into an overall measure of intrinsic
10 motivation and to conclude that their findings on KR-good feedback were due to motivational
11 factors. In both of these studies, scores on the IMI overall, and the perceived competence sub-
12 scale, were found to be significantly higher in the KR-good group than the KR-poor group.
13 Thus, it may have been more accurate to conclude that KR on relatively good trials affected
14 perceived competence rather than intrinsic motivation per se.

15 In cognitive evaluation theory (CET; Deci, 1975; Deci & Ryan, 1985), a desire for
16 competence is considered a basic psychological need (Deci & Ryan, 2000), with individuals
17 being intrinsically motivated to pursue an activity when they feel competent and self-
18 determined towards it (Ryan & Deci, 2002). Conceptually similar to the construct of self-
19 efficacy (Bandura, 1997), highly self-efficacious individuals have been found to show more
20 persistence in acquiring a skill (Feltz, Short, & Sullivan, 2008), leading to enhanced learning
21 and engagement with the task (Deci & Ryan, 2008; Sheldon & Filak, 2008). Thus, the
22 provision of augmented feedback that positively impacts a learner's perceptions of
23 competence and self-efficacy would be expected to ultimately impact subsequent intrinsic
24 motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000, 2002).

1 Self-efficacy, which refers to the belief a person has in regard to their ability to
2 execute specific actions relative to the achievement of specific outcomes (Bandura, 1997;
3 Feltz, 2007), is both important for motor learning and affected by feedback. Saemi, Porter,
4 Ghotbi-Varzaneh, Zarghami, and Maleki (2012) found participants who received KR on their
5 most successful trials in a tennis ball throwing task were more accurate in a delayed retention
6 test and reported higher levels of self-efficacy than participants who received feedback on
7 their least successful trials. Similarly, by manipulating learners' perceptions of competence
8 and related self-efficacy, Chiviawowsky, Wulf, and Lewthwaite (2012) found the typical
9 learning benefits of self-controlled practice (see Chiviawowsky & Wulf, 2002, 2005) can be
10 reduced by denying learners the opportunity to experience competence through good
11 performance.

12 Perceptions of competence and self-efficacy appear to have an important influence on
13 motor skill learning and, consistent with Wulf and Lewthwaite's (2016) OPTIMAL theory of
14 motor learning, enhancing expectations of future performance success may be beneficial to
15 learning. In a recent study, Palmer, Chiviawowsky, and Wulf (2016) had participants practice
16 a putting task, where different groups were informed that balls coming to rest in a large or
17 small circle, respectively, would be considered 'good' putts. Participants with the large circle
18 criterion (i.e., the relatively easy goal) were found to outperform the group with the small
19 circle criterion (i.e., the relatively difficult goal) on both retention and transfer tests. Though
20 learning was facilitated by enhancing learners' expectation of success, only performance
21 measures were used in this study and, as the authors themselves highlight, measures of self-
22 efficacy or perceived competence would be useful in future studies (Palmer et al., 2016).

23 In the present study we aimed to further investigate the motivational properties of
24 feedback, and how feedback as a learning variable may operate. Specifically, the aim was to
25 investigate how KR after good trials affects self-efficacy, intrinsic motivation, and motor

1 learning relative to KR after poor trials, and whether any observed effects apply for learning
2 both simple and **more** difficult tasks. We used a motor task in which participants were
3 required to putt a golf ball into a target hole at distances of 2m (easy task) and 5m (difficult
4 task) (tasks described as capturing easy and **more** difficult levels by Guadagnoli, Holcomb, &
5 Davis, 2002). To address limitations of previous research (e.g., Badami et al., 2011;
6 Chiviawowsky & Wulf, 2007; Chiviawowsky et al., 2009; Saemi et al., 2012), we also
7 included a control condition to determine whether poor-trial feedback reduces self-efficacy
8 and motivation relative to 'neutral' feedback. Given that learning reflects a relatively long-
9 term change in performance (Schmidt, 1991) but has typically been measured only 24 hours
10 after practice (e.g., Chiviawowsky & Wulf, 2007; Chiviawowsky et al., 2012; Saemi et al.,
11 2011, 2012), we also employed both **24-hour and one-week retention tests**.

12 As providing KR after more accurate (KR-good) compared to less accurate (KR-poor)
13 trials is believed to have **motivational effects** on learning, we predicted that participants in the
14 KR-good group would show increases in self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation compared to
15 the KR-poor group, and KR-neutral (control) condition. We also predicted that golf-putting
16 accuracy would be better for the KR-good group on **24-hour and one-week** retention tests
17 regardless of task difficulty.

18 **2. Method**

19 **2.1 Participants**

20 An opportunity sample of 30 participants (16 males, 14 females) completed the study (M
21 age = 29.67 years, $SD = 9.36$). All participants, except three, were right-hand dominant and
22 all had minimal golfing experience (M number of years playing experience = .28, $SD = .52$;
23 M number of hours per week currently playing = .12, $SD = .41$). All participants provided
24 informed consent and the study was carried out according to institutional ethical guidelines.

25 **2.2 Task and Apparatus**

1 Participants stood behind an opaque curtain (170cm x 140cm) that was attached to a
2 metal frame and positioned one metre (m) from the putting line. Participants were required to
3 putt a standard golf ball (Dunlop 30%) along a flat carpeted putting surface using a TP13
4 RH/LH putter into a target hole (diameter = 10.61 cm) both 2m and 5m from the starting
5 location. The metal frame, which the curtain was attached to, allowed the curtain to be raised
6 from the floor, meaning the golf ball could pass underneath. The task and experimental set-up
7 is illustrated in Figure 1.

8 FIGURE 1 NEAR HERE

9 2.3 Measures

10 **2.3.1 Self-Efficacy Scale.** Bandura's (2006) *Guide for Constructing Self-Efficacy Scales*
11 was used to develop the self-efficacy scale. This focussed on learners' ability beliefs when
12 putting to a range of distances (1m, 2m, 3m, 4m, and 5m) and was rated on a 100% scale with
13 a range of 10 equal intervals (i.e., 0 = not confident at all, 100 = completely confident).

14 **2.3.2 Intrinsic Motivation Inventory.** Similar to Badami et al. (2011), a nine-item
15 questionnaire consisting of the interest/enjoyment, perceived competence, and
16 effort/importance sub-scales of the IMI (McAuley et al., 1989) was adapted for use in the
17 study. This assessed participants' subjective experiences related to the target activity. Likert
18 scale responses ranged from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree. Negatively-worded
19 items were re-scored before data analysis. Internal consistency using Cronbach's- α statistic
20 was found to be acceptable for the interest/enjoyment (.78) and effort/importance (.72) sub-
21 scales, and high for the perceived competence sub-scale (.83).

22 2.4 Procedure

23 **2.4.1 Assignment to feedback groups.** Prior to collecting data, participants made ten
24 putts to a target hole at a distance of 3.5m with full vision, all of which were measured and
25 recorded to allow equal assignment to feedback groups (i.e., KR-good, KR-poor, and KR-

1 **neutral**) based on skill level. This distance was chosen to minimise any additional practice
2 effects at the 2m and 5m distances used in the main study.

3 **2.4.2. Distance familiarisation putts.** To familiarise themselves with the task **before the**
4 **subsequent occluded vision conditions**, participants performed ten putts to the target distance;
5 with the 2m and 5m conditions counterbalanced to control for order effects. Thus, **throughout**
6 **the study**, participants either completed all trials at **familiarisation**, pre-test, acquisition, post-
7 test, **and retention** firstly to the 2m distance, and then to the 5m distance, or vice versa.

8 **2.4.3 Pre-test.** Each participant made ten putts to the target distance (either 2m or 5m)
9 from behind the opaque screen. Performance was measured and recorded as the distance (in
10 cm) from the target hole to where the ball stopped. **The direction of the ball from the target**
11 **was also recorded. All putts were completed without augmented feedback.**

12 **2.4.4 Acquisition.** Participants completed five blocks of six trials to the target distance
13 (either 2m or 5m); therefore a total of 60 acquisition trials were completed across the study
14 (30 trials at 2m; 30 trials at 5m). Prior to completing each block of trials, participants were
15 informed that at the end of that block they would receive KR on three of the six trials. 'KR-
16 good' participants received feedback on their three most accurate trials; 'KR-poor' participants
17 received feedback on their three least accurate trials; and 'KR-neutral' participants received
18 feedback on three random trials in each block **using a computer-generated randomisation list.**
19 To avoid the influence of evaluative feedback from the researcher (Horn, 1987), KR was
20 written on a whiteboard and presented to participants for 15 seconds (see Figure 2). The KR
21 informed participants of the specific attempts they were receiving feedback on, the degree of
22 error from the target, as well as the direction of the error.

23 FIGURE 2 NEAR HERE

24 **2.4.5 Post-test and Retention.** Once all acquisition blocks had been completed,
25 participants performed an immediate post-test which consisted of ten trials to the target

1 distance without feedback. Retention tests were then completed 24 hours and one week after
2 acquisition, where participants performed ten more putts at each distance without augmented
3 feedback (see Figure 3 for timeline of experimental task).

4 All participants completed the customised self-efficacy scale and the IMI (McAuley et
5 al., 1989) at the end of each test phase (i.e. pre-test, post-test, and 24-hour and one-week
6 retention).

7 FIGURE 3 NEAR HERE

8 2.5 Analysis

9 A three-way mixed ANOVA was used for the main analysis, with the between-
10 participants factor being feedback (KR-good, KR-poor, KR-neutral), and the within-
11 participants factors being task difficulty (easy; 2m vs. more difficult; 5m), and test phase
12 (pre-test, post-test, 24-hour retention, one-week retention). Radial error (recorded as the
13 distance in cm from the target hole to where the ball stopped on each trial) was used as the
14 dependent variable to measure putting performance in terms of deviation from the target.
15 Measures of self-efficacy, interest/enjoyment, perceived competence, and effort/importance
16 were also recorded and analysed using separate three-way mixed ANOVAs. Differences in
17 pre-test scores for any measures were subsequently adjusted using two-way ANCOVAs
18 across both the 2m and 5m distance, where appropriate. As a manipulation check, mean
19 radial error for KR and no-KR trials was analysed using a three-way mixed ANOVA, with
20 the between-participants factor being feedback (KR-good, KR-poor, KR-neutral), and the
21 within-participants factors being task difficulty (2m, 5m) and trial type (KR, no-KR). This
22 was to determine whether radial error on KR trials was actually significantly lower (i.e., more
23 accurate) for the KR-good group relative to the KR-poor and KR-neutral groups. Partial eta
24 squared values (η_p^2) are provided as a measure of effect size for all main effects and
25 interactions and Cohen's d values are also reported where comparisons are made between

1 two means. Post-hoc analyses used paired-samples t-tests for within-participants and
 2 independent-samples t-tests for between-participants effects (alpha levels adjusted according
 3 to number of comparisons). Exact p -values are given for all analyses, except where $p < .001$.

4 3. Results

5 **3.1 Radial Error.** Main effects of feedback ($F_{(2, 27)} = 4.59, p = .02, \eta_p^2 = .25$), test phase ($F_{(3, 81)} = 17.96, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .40$), and task difficulty ($F_{(1, 27)} = 266.25, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .91$)
 6 were superseded by a significant three-way interaction ($F_{(6, 81)} = 8.20, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .38$).
 7

8 There were no differences at pre-test between the KR-good ($M = 87.34, SD = 24.65$), KR-
 9 poor ($M = 89.18, SD = 18.84$), and KR-neutral groups ($M = 86.21, SD = 29.43$), however, at
 10 one-week retention, the KR-good group ($M = 58.93, SD = 22.96$) was more accurate than
 11 both the KR-poor ($M = 80.85, SD = 37.24$), $d = .71$, and KR-neutral groups ($M = 79.54, SD$
 12 $= 21.57$), $d = .93$, who were no different to one another ($d = .04$). Such differences were
 13 found to vary across task difficulty, as detailed below.

14 **3.1.1 2m distance.** For the 2m putt, post hoc comparisons (adjusted alpha level of
 15 $.004$) revealed that whilst the KR-good and KR-poor groups improved from pre-test ($M =$
 16 $65.96, SD = 7.30$; $M = 77.46, SD = 17.83$) to 24-hour retention ($M = 47.14, SD = 6.97$; $M =$
 17 $52.69, SD = 10.14$) (p 's $< .001, d$'s = 2.64 and 1.71); only the KR-good group improved from
 18 pre-test to one-week retention ($M = 41.90, SD = 5.62$) ($p < .001, d = 3.69$) but the KR-poor
 19 group did not ($M = 52.17, SD = 9.47$) ($p = .01, d = 1.77$). The KR-neutral group showed no
 20 change from pre-test ($M = 61.67, SD = 17.33$) to 24-hour ($M = 51.98, SD = 17.74$) ($p = .23, d$
 21 $= .55$) and to one-week retention ($M = 62.08, SD = 12.88$) ($p = .95, d = .03$) (see Figure 4).

22 **3.1.2 5m distance.** For the 5m putt, post hoc comparisons (adjusted alpha level of
 23 $.004$) revealed that the KR-good group improved significantly from pre-test ($M = 108.71, SD$
 24 $= 14.63$) to 24-hour ($M = 79.38, SD = 11.73$) and to one-week retention ($M = 75.95, SD =$

1 20.90) (p 's $< .001$, d 's = 2.21 and 1.82), whereas the KR-poor group showed no significant
 2 differences from pre-test ($M = 100.89$, $SD = 11.26$) to 24-hour ($M = 121.91$, $SD = 32.89$; $p =$
 3 $.05$, $d = .86$) and to one-week retention ($M = 109.53$, $SD = 31.79$; $p = .32$, $d = .36$). The KR-
 4 neutral group showed a significant improvement from pre-test ($M = 110.75$, $SD = 13.78$) to
 5 24-hour retention ($M = 94.49$, $SD = 17.40$; $p = .001$, $d = 1.04$), but no difference from pre-test
 6 to one-week retention ($M = 96.99$, $SD = 11.82$; $p = .03$, $d = 1.07$) (see Figure 4).

7 FIGURE 4 NEAR HERE

8 **3.1.3. KR vs. no-KR trials manipulation check.** Analysis of mean radial error on KR
 9 versus no-KR trials during acquisition revealed a significant feedback x task difficulty x trial
 10 type interaction ($F_{(2, 27)} = 16.61$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .55$). Post hoc comparisons (adjusted alpha
 11 level of .017) showed that for both the 2m and 5m distance, the KR-good group did in fact
 12 receive KR on relatively more accurate trials, and the KR-poor group received KR on
 13 relatively less accurate trials, in comparison to KR-neutral (p 's $< .001$); while the opposite
 14 was true for no-KR trials (see Figure 5 for an illustration of radial error on KR and no-KR
 15 trials for each feedback group across all practice blocks).

16 FIGURE 5 NEAR HERE

17 **3.2 Self-Efficacy.** Pre-test differences in self-efficacy scores between the KR-neutral group
 18 ($M = 70.00$, $SD = 8.90$) and both the KR-good ($M = 62.00$, $SD = 12.68$) ($p = .01$, $d = .73$) and
 19 KR-poor group ($M = 44.75$, $SD = 10.24$) ($p < .001$, $d = 2.63$) were adjusted using a two-way
 20 ANCOVA across both the 2m and 5m distance. Analyses revealed a significant main effect
 21 of feedback ($F_{(2, 26)} = 6.43$, $p = .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .33$) and a main effect of test phase ($F_{(2, 52)} = 7.10$,
 22 $p = .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .22$), after controlling for pre-test scores. Overall, levels of self-efficacy
 23 increased from pre-test ($M = 58.92$, $SD = 14.89$) to post-test ($M = 62.25$, $SD = 17.95$) ($p =$

1 .01, $d = .20$) and from pre-test to one-day ($M = 63.25$, $SD = 18.03$) ($p = .01$, $d = .26$) and
 2 one-week retention ($M = 65.75$, $SD = 14.01$) ($p < .001$, $d = .47$). Participants in the KR-good
 3 group reported significantly higher levels of self-efficacy ($M = 68.89$, $SD = 5.73$) compared
 4 to the KR-poor group overall ($M = 58.51$, $SD = 7.24$) ($p = .01$, $d = 1.59$). The KR-neutral
 5 group ($M = 63.86$, $SD = 6.67$) did not significantly differ from either KR-good ($p = .21$, $d =$
 6 $.81$) or KR-poor ($p = .45$, $d = .77$) groups (see Table 1). There were no other significant
 7 effects at $p < .05$.

8 **3.3 Interest/Enjoyment.** There was a significant main effect of feedback ($F_{(2, 27)} = 17.03$, p
 9 $< .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .56$) (see Table 1) and a significant feedback x test phase interaction ($F_{(6, 81)} =$
 10 6.26 , $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .32$). While there were no differences in levels of interest/enjoyment
 11 between the KR-good ($M = 5.63$, $SD = .57$), KR-poor ($M = 5.60$, $SD = .50$), and KR-neutral
 12 groups ($M = 5.13$, $SD = .74$) at pre-test, post-hoc comparisons (adjusted alpha level of .008)
 13 revealed that the KR-good group showed significant increases in interest/enjoyment from
 14 pre-test to 24-hour ($M = 6.37$, $SD = .47$; $p = .004$, $d = 1.42$) and to one-week retention ($M =$
 15 6.48 , $SD = .60$; $p = .001$, $d = 1.45$), while the KR-poor (p 's = .06 and .02, respectively; d 's =
 16 $.62$ and $.65$) and KR-neutral groups (p 's = .81 and .61, respectively; d 's = .08 and .11) showed
 17 no differences from pre-test to both 24-hour and one-week retention. There were no other
 18 significant effects at $p < .05$.

19 **3.4 Perceived Competence.** Pre-test differences in perceived competence between the KR-
 20 good ($M = 4.05$, $SD = .56$) and KR-neutral group ($M = 4.78$, $SD = .47$) ($p = .01$, $d = 1.41$)
 21 were adjusted using a two-way ANCOVA across both the 2m and 5m distance. Analyses
 22 revealed a significant main effect of feedback ($F_{(2, 26)} = 21.92$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .63$) after
 23 controlling for pre-test scores. The KR-good group ($M = 5.76$, $SD = .53$) reported
 24 significantly higher levels of perceived competence overall, compared to the KR-poor ($M =$

1 4.27, $SD = .51$; $p < .001$, $d = 2.86$) and KR-neutral group ($M = 4.61$, $SD = .55$; $p < .001$, $d =$
 2 2.13). There were no differences in perceived competence between the KR-poor and KR-
 3 neutral group ($p = .53$, $d = .64$) (see Table 1). No other significant effects were reported at $p <$
 4 $.05$.

5 **3.5 Effort/Importance.** Pre-test differences in levels of effort/importance between the KR-
 6 good ($M = 6.05$, $SD = .44$) and KR-poor group ($M = 5.40$, $SD = .61$) ($p = .01$, $d = 1.22$) were
 7 adjusted using a two-way ANCOVA across both the 2m and 5m distance. Analyses revealed
 8 a significant main effect of feedback ($F_{(2, 26)} = 10.33$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .44$) after controlling for
 9 pre-test scores. The KR-good group ($M = 6.57$, $SD = .45$) reported significantly higher levels
 10 of effort/importance overall, compared to the KR-poor ($M = 5.73$, $SD = .48$; $p = .01$, $d =$
 11 1.81) and KR-neutral group ($M = 5.80$, $SD = .44$; $p = .01$, $d = 1.73$). There were no
 12 differences in effort/importance between the KR-poor and KR-neutral group ($p = .99$, $d =$
 13 $.15$) (see Table 1). No other significant effects were reported at $p < .05$.

14 TABLE 1 NEAR HERE

15 4. Discussion

16 In this study we aimed to investigate the motivational **properties** of augmented feedback in
 17 learning simple and **more** difficult motor skills. Specifically, we tested whether receiving
 18 feedback after more accurate (KR-good) trials enhanced self-efficacy and intrinsic
 19 motivation, relative to receiving feedback after less accurate (KR-poor) trials and a control
 20 (KR-neutral) condition. We hypothesised that if feedback has a motivational effect on
 21 learning, participants in the KR-good condition would show increases in self-efficacy and
 22 intrinsic motivation, compared to those receiving KR-poor and KR-neutral feedback. We also
 23 predicted that performance on the putting task would be more accurate for the KR-good

1 group at retention in comparison to KR-poor and KR-neutral groups, regardless of task
2 difficulty.

3 As hypothesised, levels of self-efficacy and intrinsic motivation (as measured by the
4 interest/enjoyment sub-scale of the IMI) were found to increase from pre-test to 24-hour and
5 one-week retention, whereby participants receiving feedback after good trials reported higher
6 levels of self-efficacy and interest/enjoyment compared to those receiving feedback after
7 poor trials. Similarly, for the perceived competence and effort/importance sub-scales of the
8 IMI, participants receiving feedback after good trials reported higher levels on these
9 measures relative to the KR-poor and KR-neutral groups, who were found to not differ from
10 one another. Thus, even though participants were not told for which trials they would receive
11 KR and were not explicitly told that their feedback related to good, poor, or neutral
12 performance attempts, the type of feedback given affected, to some extent, their self-efficacy,
13 as well as indicators of intrinsic motivation as measured through the IMI, with such effects
14 generalising across task difficulty.

15 Importantly, when considering the link between perceptions of competence and
16 intrinsic motivation with motor learning, participants in the KR-good group also
17 demonstrated more accurate performance in the golf putting task at 24-hour and one-week
18 retention, indicative of enhanced learning. These findings are consistent with previous
19 research showing a motivational role of augmented feedback (e.g., Badami et al., 2011;
20 Chiviawosky et al., 2009, 2012; Chiviawosky & Wulf, 2007; Saemi et al., 2012) when
21 feedback is provided after good rather than poor performance attempts. However, these cited
22 examples only measured retention performance 24 hours following acquisition. Here, we
23 have demonstrated these observed effects to be maintained, and even become more
24 pronounced, at one-week compared to 24-hour retention. The observed effects at 24-hour
25 retention did not subside despite a relatively small number of acquisition trials, highlighting

1 the beneficial effects of providing feedback after positive performances on learning, and the
2 way some motivational constructs can impact this.

3 It has been suggested that individuals are intrinsically motivated to pursue an activity
4 when they feel competent and self-determined with regard to that activity and as such,
5 feedback that influences learners' perceptions of competence can ultimately impact intrinsic
6 motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000, 2002). Feelings of competence, in the form of self-efficacy
7 beliefs, have been suggested to be integral for motivation (Bandura, 1986) and important for
8 facilitating motor skill learning (Feltz & Lirgg, 2001; Moritz, Feltz, Fahrback, & Mach,
9 2000) whereby mastery experiences are one of the strongest predictors of enhanced self-
10 efficacy (Bandura, 1997). Here, although participants in the KR-good group reported higher
11 levels of self-efficacy overall, those receiving KR-neutral feedback did not significantly
12 differ from either the KR-good or KR-poor groups, and thus, it is not possible to attribute
13 motivational effects of feedback to self-efficacy alone. Interestingly, though conceptually
14 similar to self-efficacy, levels of perceived competence were found to be higher for the KR-
15 good group compared to both KR-poor and KR-neutral, who did not significantly differ from
16 one another. Though these constructs share common conceptual ground, there are theoretical
17 differences suggested to make the two distinct from one another (Bandura, 1997), as reflected
18 in the measures used. Whilst the perceived competence sub-scale of the IMI focuses on how
19 well the learner felt they performed the practiced task (i.e., an experiential judgment), the
20 self-efficacy scale focuses on a task-relevant prediction of ability (i.e., a future judgment). It
21 seems that the type of feedback given to learners impacted to a greater extent their perceived
22 competence of the practiced task, more so than their efficacy for executing a future behaviour
23 (Bandura, 1997). The perceived competence measure may have been more sensitive to this
24 due to it being considered within the context of the practiced task, which in turn had personal
25 relevance to the learner in the situation at that given time (e.g., see White, 1959). Given this

1 is one of the first studies to look at the combined effects of self-efficacy and intrinsic
2 motivation within the good- vs. poor-trial feedback paradigm, it would be of interest for
3 future research to explore these effects further as there appears to be evidence for a role of at
4 least some motivational properties in the feedback given to learners, though it is not entirely
5 clear which mechanisms may account for this. Future research may also benefit from
6 analysing a range of distances when measuring self-efficacy, rather than just the 2m and 5m
7 distances reported here, as this may provide greater sensitivity in measures of self-efficacy
8 for similar studies going forward.

9 Overall, the findings presented here are consistent with some of the assertions of the
10 OPTIMAL theory of motor learning (Wulf & Lewthwaite, 2016), which suggests conditions
11 that enhance expectations of success may be beneficial to learning and motivation. While the
12 findings in the present study offer support for these proposals, it is important to note that
13 when putting to the 2m distance, participants in the KR-poor group did show some
14 improvement in putting performance at 24-hour retention; but unlike the KR-good group, this
15 was not maintained at one-week retention. It has been suggested that explicitly grouping KR
16 trials as a function of the participant's performance (regardless of whether it relates to KR-
17 good or KR-poor) may increase the informational value of KR (Patterson & Azizieh, 2012);
18 suggesting that whilst there may be some role of motivational feedback on learning, this is
19 not always the key contributor to effective performance. In addition, it is worth noting that
20 consistency has been argued to be a better indicator of learning than performance accuracy
21 (e.g., Fischman, 2015; Schmidt & Lee, 2011), and this is an important consideration for
22 future motor learning research as our radial error findings limit the conclusions that can be
23 drawn here. However, given that learning is said to reflect a relatively long-term change in
24 performance (Schmidt, 1991), the inclusion of a one-week retention test in the present study

1 seems to at least be a more sensitive measure of long-term learning, and may account for the
2 lack of effects for the KR-poor group under extended retention periods.

3 A novel aspect of our research, and an area relatively under researched to-date, was
4 the comparison between an easier and more difficult task. We replicated findings from
5 previous research that had reported positive effects of good-trial feedback on motor learning
6 in simple tasks (e.g., Chiviawowsky & Wulf, 2007; Chiviawowsky et al., 2009) and found
7 these effects transferred to learning more difficult tasks too. In fact these effects became more
8 pronounced for the more difficult (5m) compared to the easy (2m) task, suggesting the
9 motivational properties of feedback may be more beneficial to learners as task difficulty
10 increases. The learning of more difficult or complex tasks has received very little attention
11 compared to simple skills (Sigrist, Rauter, Riener, & Wolf, 2013), and thus our findings add
12 to the growing body of literature on the motivational role of feedback in motor learning by
13 highlighting its generalisability to learning more difficult skills.

14 In conclusion, our results add to the converging evidence concerning the motivational
15 role of feedback in facilitating motor skill learning. Research to-date has not looked at self-
16 efficacy and intrinsic motivation in combination and thus, this is the first study to
17 demonstrate the way some of these motivational constructs may impact learning as a result of
18 augmented feedback after good performances. Moreover, we have highlighted that such
19 effects apply to learning more difficult versions of a skill. Given the benefits of engaging in
20 activities for more intrinsic reasons, identifying factors related to the development and
21 facilitation of intrinsically-motivating behaviours is important for enhancing learning; and
22 suggests that simple changes in the feedback given to learners may help create the conditions
23 necessary for optimal learning by enhancing some of its motivational properties.

References

- 1
- 2 Badami, R., VaezMousavi, M., Wulf, G., & Namazizadeh, M. (2011). Feedback after good
3 versus poor trials affects intrinsic motivation. *Research Quarterly for Exercise &*
4 *Sport, 82*, 360-364.
- 5 Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. New
6 York: Prentice-Hall.
- 7 Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York: W. H. Freeman and
8 Company.
- 9 Bandura, A. (2006). Guide for constructing self-efficacy scales. In F. Pajares, & T. Urdan
10 (Eds.). *Self-efficacy beliefs of adolescents* (pp. 307-337). Greenwich, CT: Information
11 Age Publishing.
- 12 Carter, M. J., & Patterson, J. T. (2012). Self-controlled knowledge of results: Age-related
13 differences in motor learning strategies, and error detection. *Human Movement*
14 *Science, 31*, 1459-1472.
- 15 Carter, M. J., Rathwell, S., & Ste-Marie, D. M. (2016). Motor skill retention is modulated by
16 strategy choice during self-controlled knowledge of results schedules. *Journal of*
17 *Motor Learning & Development, 4*, 100-115.
- 18 Chiviawosky, S., & Wulf, G. (2002). Self-controlled feedback: Does it enhance learning
19 because performers get feedback when they need it? *Research Quarterly for Exercise*
20 *& Sport, 73*, 408-415.
- 21 Chiviawosky, S., & Wulf, G. (2005). Self-controlled feedback is effective if it is based on
22 the learner's performance. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport, 76*, 42-48.
- 23 Chiviawosky, S., & Wulf, G. (2007). Feedback after good trials enhances learning. *Research*
24 *Quarterly for Exercise & Sport, 78*, 40-47.

- 1 Chiviakowsky, S., Wulf, G., Laroque de Medeiros, F., Kaefer, A., & Tani, G. (2008).
2 Learning benefits of self-controlled knowledge of results in 10-year-old children.
3 *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport*, 79, 405-410.
- 4 Chiviakowsky, S., Wulf, G., & Lewthwaite, R. (2012). Self-controlled learning: The
5 importance of protecting perceptions of competence. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 3,
6 Article 458.
- 7 Chiviakowsky, S., Wulf, G., Wally, R., & Borges, T. (2009). KR after good trials enhances
8 learning in older adults. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport*, 80, 663-668.
- 9 Deci, E. L. (1975). *Intrinsic motivation*. New York: Plenum.
- 10 Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human*
11 *behavior*. New York: Plenum.
- 12 Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and
13 the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227-268.
- 14 Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well-
15 being across life's domains. *Canadian Psychology*, 49, 14-23.
- 16 Fairbrother, J. T., Laughlin, D. D., & Nguyen, T. V. (2012). Self-controlled feedback
17 facilitates motor learning in both high and low activity individuals. *Frontiers in*
18 *Psychology*, 3, Article 323.
- 19 Feltz, D. L. (2007). Self-confidence and sport performance. In D. Smith, & M. Bar-Eli (Eds.),
20 *Essential readings in sport and exercise psychology* (pp. 278-294). Champaign, IL:
21 Human Kinetics.
- 22 Feltz, D. L., & Lirgg, C. D. (2001). Self-efficacy beliefs of athletes, teams and coaches. In R.
23 N. Singer, H. A. Hausenblas, & C. M. Janelle (Eds.), *Handbook of sport psychology*
24 (pp. 340-361). New York: Wiley.

- 1 Feltz, D. L., Short, S., & Sullivan, P. (2008). *Self-efficacy in sport: Research and strategies*
2 *for working with athletes, teams, and coaches*. Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- 3 Fischman, M. (2015). On the continuing problem of inappropriate learning measures:
4 Comment on Wulf et al. (2014) and Wulf et al. (2015). *Human Movement Science*,
5 42, 225-231.
- 6 Guadagnoli, M. A., Holcomb, W., & Davis, M. (2002). The efficacy of video feedback for
7 learning the golf swing. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 20, 615-622.
- 8 Guadagnoli, M. A., & Lee, T. D. (2004). Challenge Point: A framework for conceptualizing
9 the effects of various practice conditions in motor learning. *Journal of Motor*
10 *Behavior*, 36, 212-224.
- 11 Horn, T. S. (1987). The influence of teacher-coach behavior on the psychological
12 development of children. In D. Gould, & M. R. Weiss (Eds.), *Advances in pediatric*
13 *sport sciences, Vol. 2: Behavioral issues* (pp. 121-142). Champaign, IL: Human
14 Kinetics.
- 15 Lewthwaite, R., & Wulf, G. (2010). Social-comparative feedback affects motor skill learning.
16 *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 63, 738-749.
- 17 McAuley, E., Duncan, T., & Tammen, V. (1989). Psychometric properties of the intrinsic
18 motivation inventory in a competitive sport setting: A confirmatory factor analysis.
19 *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport*, 60, 48-58.
- 20 Moritz, S. E., Feltz, D. L., Fahrbach, K. R., & Mach, D. E. (2000). The relation of self-
21 efficacy measures to sport performance: A meta-analytic review. *Research Quarterly*
22 *for Exercise & Sport*, 71, 280-294.
- 23 Palmer, K., Chiviacowsky, S., & Wulf, G. (2016). Enhanced expectancies facilitate golf
24 putting. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*, 22, 229-232.

- 1 Patterson, J. T., & Azizieh, J. (2012). Knowing the good from the bad: Does being aware of
2 KR content matter? *Human Movement Science, 31*, 1449-1458.
- 3 Patterson, J. T., & Carter, M. (2010). Learner regulated knowledge of results during the
4 acquisition of multiple timing goals. *Human Movement Science, 29*, 214-227.
- 5 Patterson, J. T., Carter, M., & Sanli, E. (2011). Decreasing the proportion of self-control trials
6 during the acquisition period does not compromise the learning advantages in a self-
7 controlled context. *Research Quarterly for Exercise & Sport, 82*, 624-633.
- 8 Pollock, B. J., & Lee, T. D. (1997). Dissociated contextual interference effects in children
9 and adults. *Perceptual & Motor Skills, 84*, 851-858.
- 10 Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic
11 motivation, social development, and well-being. *American Psychologist, 55*, 68-78.
- 12 Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2002). An overview of self-determination theory: An organismic
13 dialectical perspective. In E. L. Deci, & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-
14 determination research* (pp. 3-33). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester.
- 15 Saemi, E., Porter, J. M., Ghotbi-Varzaneh, A., Zarghami, M., & Maleki, F. (2012).
16 Knowledge of results after relatively good trials enhances self-efficacy and motor
17 learning. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise, 13*, 378-382.
- 18 Saemi, E., Wulf, G., Varzaneh, A. G., & Zarghami, M. (2011). Feedback after good versus
19 poor trials enhances motor learning in children. *Revista Brasileira de Educação
20 Física e Esporte, 25*, 673-681.
- 21 Salmoni, A. W., Schmidt, R. A., & Walter, C. B. (1984). Knowledge of results and motor
22 learning: A review and critical reappraisal. *Psychological Bulletin, 95*, 355-386.
- 23 Sanli, E. A., Patterson, J. T., Bray, S. R., & Lee, T. D. (2013). Understanding self-controlled
24 motor learning protocols through self-determination theory. *Frontiers in
25 Psychology: Movement Science & Sport Psychology, 3*, 1-17.

- 1 Schmidt, R. A. (1991). Frequent augmented feedback can degrade learning: Evidence and
2 interpretations. In J. Requin, & G. E. Stelmach (Eds.), *Tutorials in motor*
3 *neuroscience* (pp. 59-75). Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic.
- 4 Schmidt, R. A., & Lee, T. D. (2011). *Motor control and learning: A behavioral emphasis*.
5 Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- 6 Sheldon, K. M., & Filak, V. (2008). Manipulating autonomy, competence, and relatedness in
7 a game-learning context: New evidence that all three needs matter. *British Journal of*
8 *Social Psychology*, 47, 267-283.
- 9 Sigrist, R., Rauter, G., Riener, R., & Wolf, P. (2013). Terminal feedback outperforms
10 concurrent visual, auditory, and haptic feedback in learning a complex rowing-type
11 task. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, 45, 455-472.
- 12 Sullivan, K. J., Kantak, S. S., & Burtner, P. A. (2008). Motor learning in children: Feedback
13 effects on skill acquisition. *Physical Therapy*, 88, 720-732.
- 14 Thorndike, E. L. (1927). The law of effect. *American Journal of Psychology*, 39, 212-222.
- 15 White, R. W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. *Psychological*
16 *Review*, 66, 297-333.
- 17 Wulf, G., & Lewthwaite, R. (2016). Optimizing performance through intrinsic motivation
18 and attention for learning: The OPTIMAL theory of motor learning. *Psychonomic*
19 *Bulletin & Review*, 23, 1382-1414.

Tables and Table Captions

	2m Distance			5m Distance		
	KR- Good	KR- Poor	KR- Neutral	KR- Good	KR- Poor	KR- Neutral
Self-Efficacy	81.95 (SD = 8.89)	62.14 (SD = 9.15)	68.24 (SD = 10.06)	66.04 (SD = 8.57)	41.70 (SD = 9.27)	62.43 (SD = 9.22)
Interest/Enjoyment	6.17 (SD = .80)	5.47 (SD = .64)	5.28 (SD = .59)	6.13 (SD = .52)	5.19 (SD = .52)	5.11 (SD = .65)
Perceived Competence	5.65 (SD = .70)	4.50 (SD = .67)	4.69 (SD = .71)	5.79 (SD = .56)	4.02 (SD = .55)	4.62 (SD = .57)
Effort/Importance	6.58 (SD = .63)	5.71 (SD = .65)	5.90 (SD = .61)	6.70 (SD = .45)	5.55 (SD = .48)	5.78 (SD = .45)

Table 1. Mean scores on the self-efficacy, interest/enjoyment, perceived competence, and effort/importance measures for the KR-good, KR-poor, and KR-neutral group at both the 2m and 5m distance.¹

¹ Values represent adjusted scores to account for any pre-test differences between the groups.