



Autonomy facilitates repeated maximum force productions



Takehiro Iwatsuki^{a,*}, Reza Abdollahipour^b, Rudolf Psotta^b, Rebecca Lewthwaite^{c,d}, Gabriele Wulf^a

^a University of Nevada, Las Vegas, United States

^b Palacký University Olomouc, Czech Republic

^c Rancho Los Amigos National Rehabilitation Center, United States

^d University of Southern California, United States

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Choice
Self-control
Hand-grip dynamometer

ABSTRACT

Performer autonomy (or self-control) has consistently been shown to enhance motor learning, and it can also provide immediate benefits for motor performance. Autonomy is also a key variable in the OPTIMAL theory of motor learning (Wulf & Lewthwaite, 2016). It is assumed to contribute to enhanced expectancies and goal-action coupling, affecting performance effectiveness and efficiency. The purpose of the present study was to examine whether providing autonomy support by giving performers choices would enhance their ability to maintain maximum force levels. Participants were asked to repeatedly produce maximum forces using a hand dynamometer. After 2 initial trials with the dominant and non-dominant hand, stratified randomization was used to assign participants with the same average maximum force to one of two groups, choice or yoked control groups. Choice group participants were able to choose the order of hands (dominant, non-dominant) on the remaining trials (3 per hand). For control group participants, hand order was determined by choice-group counterparts. Maximum forces decreased significantly across trials in the control group, whereas choice group participants were able to maintain the maximum forces produced on the first trial. We interpret these findings as evidence that performer autonomy promotes movement efficiency. The results are in line with the view that autonomy facilitates the coupling of goals and actions (Wulf & Lewthwaite, 2016).

1. Introduction

Autonomy, or being able to make one's own decisions, is considered to be a fundamental psychological need (Deci & Ryan, 2000, 2008) or even biological need (Leotti, Iyengar, & Ochsner, 2010). Like humans, other animals prefer to have choices. Removing opportunities for choice may cause negative responses such as increased stress-related behavior (Owen, Swaisgood, Czekala, & Lindburg, 2005) and cortisol release (Glavin, Paré, Sandbak, Bakke, & Murison, 1994). In contrast, having choices is inherently rewarding (Leotti & Delgado, 2011). Supporting individuals' need for autonomy is critical for performance and well-being in many situations. Autonomy-supportive climates have been associated with persistence in activity engagement and adherence over longer courses of participation (Hagger, Sultan, Hardcastle, & Chatzisarantis, 2015; Yu et al., 2015). It has also been shown to be important for motor performance and learning.

In the motor learning literature, numerous studies have shown that allowing learners to make their own decision about aspects of

* Corresponding author at: Department of Kinesiology and Nutrition Sciences, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, 4505 Maryland Parkway, Las Vegas, NV 89154-3034, United States.

E-mail address: takehiro.iwatsuki@unlv.edu (T. Iwatsuki).

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2017.08.016>

Received 30 January 2017; Received in revised form 26 July 2017; Accepted 21 August 2017
0167-9457/© 2017 Elsevier B.V. All rights reserved.

the practice conditions, so-called self-controlled practice, benefits learning relative to yoked control conditions. For instance, learning advantages have been found when learners were allowed to have control over practice variables, including the amount of practice (Lessa & Chiviawsky, 2015; Post, Fairbrother, & Barros, 2011), timing of performance feedback (Ali, Fawver, Kim, Fairbrother, & Janelle, 2012; Janelle, Barba, Frehlich, Tennant, & Cauraugh, 1997; Lim et al., 2015), or use of assistive devices (Chiviawsky, Wulf, Lewthwaite, & Campos, 2012; Hartman, 2007; Wulf & Toole, 1999).

Furthermore, several studies have shown that even incidental choices, or those not directly related to the task, can enhance learning (e.g., Wulf et al., 2017). For example, choice of golf ball color led to enhanced learning of a golf putting task (Lewthwaite, Chiviawsky, Drews, & Wulf, 2015, Experiment 1). Also, being able to choose the order of balance exercises resulted in more effective balance learning than did an assigned order of the same exercises (Wulf & Adams, 2014). Even choices that are completely unrelated to the task (e.g., choosing a picture to be hung on a wall) have been found to facilitate motor learning (Lewthwaite et al., 2015, Experiment 2). Moreover, in one recent study, involving the learning of a novel motor skill (throwing a lasso), task-relevant (video demonstration) and task-irrelevant (color of mat placed under the target) choices resulted in the same learning benefits relative to a control condition without choice (Wulf et al., 2017). The fact that learning is facilitated when performers are given choices, regardless of the type of choice, suggests that the underlying mechanisms of this effect are motivational in nature (Lewthwaite & Wulf, 2012; Wulf & Lewthwaite, 2016).

Autonomy is a key variable in the OPTIMAL theory of motor learning (Wulf & Lewthwaite, 2016). It is assumed to contribute to enhanced expectancies and goal-action coupling, thereby affecting effective and efficient performance. Anticipation to act autonomously has been shown to be related to activation in brain regions associated with a sense of agency (Lee & Reeve, 2013), a state associated with dopamine release (Aarts et al., 2012). Thus, a sense of autonomy would be expected to result not only in longer-term learning benefits but also in immediate enhanced performance. Indeed, in a recent study, letting kickboxers choose the order of different punches led to greater punching velocity and higher impact forces than did an assigned order of punches (Halperin, Chapman, Martin, Lewthwaite, & Wulf, 2016). That is, a relatively incidental choice shortly before task execution produced greater maximal forces compared with those seen in a standard test protocol (with no choice).

Given the potential theoretical and practical implications of those findings, we wanted to replicate them and examine their generalizability. In the present study, participants (non-athletes) were asked to repeatedly produce maximal forces using a hand-grip dynamometer. In one group (choice), participants were able to choose the order of hands (dominant, non-dominant), whereas in another group (control) hand order was determined by the participant's counterpart in the choice group. In contrast to Halperin et al., we used a between-participant design. Thus, participants in one group (choice or control) were not aware of the experimental condition of the other group. We used the perceived choice scale of the Intrinsic Motivation Inventory (IMI; Ryan, 1982) as a manipulation check. We hypothesized that participants in the choice group would have higher ratings of perceived choice and be able to maintain force levels across trials to a greater extent than would control group participants.

2. Method

2.1. Participants

Participants were 30 college students (18 males, 12 females) with an average age of 25.7 years ($SD = 5.78$). Informed consent was obtained from all the participants before the beginning of the experiment. Participants were not aware of the specific purpose of the study, but were informed that maximum forces would be assessed. The university's institutional review board approved the study.

2.2. Apparatus and task

A handgrip dynamometer (MG-4800, Marsden, England) was used to measure the maximum forces produced with the dominant and non-dominant hand. The participant was seated in a chair without armrest. The hand grasping the dynamometer was held in a "hand-shake" position with the elbow flexed at 90 degrees. The display of the dynamometer was turned away from the participant so that they did not receive feedback about the forces produced.

2.3. Procedure

Each participant was first asked to perform a maximum effort trial with the dominant hand, followed by the non-dominant hand. Based on the average force produced on the first 2 trials, a stratified randomization procedure was used to assign participants to one of two groups with similar initial force, the choice or yoked control groups. Participants in the choice group were then asked in which order they wanted to complete the remaining 6 trials. Specifically, they were asked before each trial which hand they wanted to use, with the understanding that they were to perform 3 trials with each hand. Control group participants also understood that they had to perform 3 trials with each hand, but they were informed before each trial which hand to use (determined by their choice-group counterpart). There were 20-s rest periods between trials. Subsequently, participants filled out the perceived choice sub-scale of the IMI (Ryan, 1982). It consisted of 8 statements (e.g., I believe I had some choice regarding this activity) that were rated on a 7-point Likert scale with response options ranging from 1 (*not at all true*) to 7 (*very true*). Participants were then debriefed, provided with performance feedback, and thanked for their time.

2.4. Data analysis

Maximum forces were analyzed in a 2 (group: choice vs. control) \times 2 (hand: dominant vs. non-dominant) \times 4 (trials) analysis of variance with the repeated measures on the last two factors. Mauchly's test was utilized to assess the sphericity assumption, and it showed that the assumption was violated. Therefore, Greenhouse-Geisser epsilon values were used to adjust the degrees of freedom. Bonferroni corrections were performed for all adjustments and pairwise post hoc tests. Estimates of effect size were quantified by two measures. First, partial eta squared (η_p^2) was employed, where $\eta_p^2 = 0.01, 0.06$ and 0.14 were estimates for a small, moderate and large effect, respectively (Larson-Hall, 2009). Cohen's d was utilized as a measure of the difference between group means using the repeated-measures version of Cohen's d that factors in the correlation between time points (Morris & DeShon, 2002). To examine the difference between the choice and control groups with regard to perceived choice, a t -test was used. Cohen's d for t -test was calculated for independent groups. The evaluation of Cohen's d corresponded to a low ($d = 0.2$), medium ($d = 0.5$), and large ($d = 0.8$) effect (Cohen, 1988). The level of significance was set at 0.05.

3. Results

3.1. Hand usage

Participants tended to switch hands after the first 2 trials with the dominant (first) and non-dominant hands. The percentage of dominant-hand use was 93.3% on Trial 1, 26.7% on Trial 2, 73.4% on Trial 3, 13.3% on Trial 4, 66.7% on Trial 5, and 26.7% on Trial 6.

3.2. Maximum force production

Maximum forces, averaged across hands, produced by the choice and control groups can be seen in Fig. 1. While maximal force levels were similar for both groups on Trial 1, the control group showed a consistent decrease across trials, whereas the choice group was able to maintain the initial force level. The interaction of group and trial was significant, $F(2.13, 59.74) = 3.28, p = 0.041, \eta_p^2 = 0.105$. Post-hoc tests confirmed that force production in the control group was significantly lower on the last trial ($M = 37.93 \pm 8.97$ kg) relative to the first trial ($M = 40.66 \pm 10.08$ kg), $p = 0.005, d = 0.856$, whereas there was no significant change for the choice group from the first ($M = 40.58 \pm 10.40$ kg) to the last trial ($M = 40.51 \pm 10.06$ kg), $p > 0.05, d = 0.011$. The main effect of hand was significant, $F(1, 28) = 30.77, p < 0.001, \eta_p^2 = 0.524$, as forces produced with the dominant ($M = 41.06, SD = 9.64$ kg) were greater relative to the non-dominant hand ($M = 38.59, SD = 9.56$ kg), $p = 0.000, d = 0.025$. The main effect of trial was significant, $F(2.13, 59.74) = 3.44, p < 0.05, \eta_p^2 = 0.109$. The main effect of group, $F(1, 28) = 0.17, p = 0.678, \eta_p^2 = 0.006$, was not significant. There were no other significant interaction effects.

3.3. Perceived choice

The choice group ($M = 43.67 \pm 4.85$) had significantly higher ratings of perceived choice than the yoked group ($M = 38.60 \pm 6.41$), $p = 0.021, d = 0.892$.

4. Discussion

The present results support our hypothesis that providing performers the opportunity for a small choice (order of hands) would help them sustain forces across repeated maximum effort attempts. Relative to a control group without that choice, but with a yoked




Fig. 1. Maximum forces produced by the choice and control groups across trials (average of right and left hands).

order of hand usage, the choice group's force levels remained unchanged whereas the control group showed a consistent drop in force across trials. The manipulation check confirmed that the degree of perceived choice differed between groups. Thus, it appears that the increased sense of autonomy facilitated sustained force production, consistent with other recent findings from within-participant comparisons (Halperin et al., 2016). The present results complement the findings of Halperin et al. (2016) showing that maximum force production (e.g., impact forces) in kickboxers was increased by giving them an incidental choice (i.e., order of punches). Relative to a prescribed order of punches, the same boxers produced greater forces when they could choose the order. In the present study, a different group of (yoked) participants showed effects of choice in sustained force relative to their no-choice counterparts.

Maximum force production typically decreases somewhat over repeated trials as a result of peripheral and central fatigue (Kennedy, Hug, Sveistrup, & Guével, 2013; Smith, Martin, Gandevia, & Taylor, 2007). In the current study, effects of fatigue were seen in the control group, even though there were only 4 maximum effort trials per hand, and in most cases the rest period between trials with a given hand was at least 40 s (because participants switched hands on successive trials). It is also possible that participants in this more controlled condition felt less compelled to keep effort high. In contrast to the control group, no change in force production was seen in the choice group.

What may explain the benefit of having an opportunity for choice on force production? Anticipation of choice is related to greater activity in brain regions involved in reward, affective, and motivational processes, and is associated with dopamine release (Aarts et al., 2012; Lee & Reeve, 2013; Leotti & Delgado, 2011). Consistent with these activations, kinematic and kinetic advantages in rapid force production movements have been found in Parkinson disease when dopamine agonists are administered (Foreman et al., 2014). Indirect effects of having a sense of autonomy include the opportunity to enhance expectations for performance, which in turn prepare the individual for successful movement (Wulf & Lewthwaite, 2016). Reward expectations, for instance, have been demonstrated to suppress electroencephalographic (EEG) activity in the beta-frequency range, which inhibits spinal motor activity (Meadows, Gable, Lohse, & Miller, 2016). Suppression of beta activity, which is enhanced by dopamine (Jenkinson & Brown, 2011), readies the motor system for action as indicated, for example, by reduced pre-motor reaction times (Meadows et al., 2016).

Future studies might seek more direct evidence for optimized mechanisms for motor activity, such as motor unit recruitment and greater neuromuscular efficiency resulting from being autonomous – similar to what is seen when performers' expectancies are directly enhanced (Hutchinson, Sherman, Martinovic, & Tenenbaum, 2008) or their attentional focus is directed to the movement goal (e.g., Lohse, Sherwood, & Healy, 2011; Vance, Wulf, Töllner, McNevin, & Mercer, 2004). Future studies should follow up on these findings by including measures of movement efficiency, such as electromyographic measures in force production tasks or oxygen consumption in endurance tasks. In addition, brain imaging studies examining functional connectivity as a result of performer autonomy are desirable as they might yield more direct evidence for the role of autonomy in goal-action coupling (Wulf & Lewthwaite, 2016).

The present findings add to increasing evidence that small or even incidental choices can be sufficient to enhance motor performance and learning. In fact, in their meta-analysis, Patall, Cooper, and Robinson (2008) found that incidental choices, or those that are not directly task-relevant, seem to be particularly motivating. Thus, the range of beneficial choices that practitioners can take advantage of to facilitate skill learning and immediate performance appears to be greater than clearly task-relevant ones.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the Czech Science Foundation [GA16-17945S] and the Internal Grant Agency of the Palacký University Olomouc [IGA_FTK_2017_008].

References

- Aarts, H., Bijleveld, E., Custers, R., Dogge, M., Deelder, M., Schutter, D., & Haren, N. E. (2012). Positive priming and intentional binding: Eye-blink rate predicts reward information effects on the sense of agency. *Social Neuroscience*, *7*, 105–112. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17470919.2011.590602>.
- Ali, A., Fawver, B., Kim, J., Fairbrother, J., & Janelle, C. M. (2012). Too much of a good thing: Random practice scheduling and self-control of feedback lead to unique but not additive learning benefits. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *3*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2012.00503> Article 503.
- Chiviawosky, S., Wulf, G., Lewthwaite, R., & Campos, T. (2012). Motor learning benefits of self-controlled practice in persons with Parkinson's disease. *Gait and Posture*, *35*, 601–605. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2011.12.003>.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: L. Erlbaum Associates.
- 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*, 227–268. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104>.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Self-determination theory: A macrotheory of human motivation, development, and health. *Canadian Psychology*, *49*, 182–185. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0012801>.
- Foreman, K. B., Singer, M. L., Addison, O., Marcus, R. L., LaStayo, P. C., & Dibble, L. E. (2014). Effects of dopamine replacement therapy on lower extremity kinetics and kinematics during a rapid force production task in persons with Parkinson disease. *Gait & Posture*, *39*, 638–640. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.gaitpost.2013.07.114>.
- Glavin, G. B., Paré, W. P., Sandbak, T., Bakke, H.-K., & Murison, R. (1994). Restraint stress in biomedical research: An update. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, *18*, 223–249. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0149-7634\(94\)90027-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0149-7634(94)90027-2).
- Hagger, M. S., Sultan, S., Hardcastle, S. J., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. D. (2015). Perceived autonomy support and autonomous motivation toward mathematics activities in educational and out-of-school contexts is related to mathematics homework behavior and attainment. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, *41*, 111–123. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2014.12.002>.
- Halperin, I., Chapman, D. W., Martin, D. T., Lewthwaite, R., & Wulf, G. (2016). Choices enhance punching performance of competitive kickboxers. *Psychological Research Psychologische Forschung*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00426-016-0790-1>.
- Hartman, J. M. (2007). Self-controlled use of a perceived physical assistance device during a balancing task. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, *104*, 1005–1016. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2466/PMS.104.3.1005-1016>.
- Hutchinson, J. C., Sherman, T., Martinovic, N., & Tenenbaum, G. (2008). The effect of manipulated self-efficacy on perceived and sustained effort. *Journal of Applied*

- Sport Psychology*, 20, 457–472. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10413200802351151>.
- Janelle, C. M., Barba, D. A., Frehlich, S. G., Tennant, L. K., & Cauraugh, J. H. (1997). Maximizing performance feedback effectiveness through videotape replay and a self-controlled learning environment. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 68, 269–279. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02701367.1997.10608008>.
- Jenkinson, N., & Brown, P. (2011). New insights into the relationship between dopamine, beta oscillations and motor function. *Trends in Neuroscience*, 34, 611–618. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2011.09.003>.
- Kennedy, A., Hug, F., Sveistrup, H., & Guével, A. (2013). Fatiguing handgrip exercise alters maximal force-generating capacity of plantar-flexors. *European Journal of Applied Physiology*, 113, 559–566. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00421-012-2462-1>.
- Larson-Hall, J. (2009). *A guide to doing statistics in second language research using SPSS*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Lee, W., & Reeve, J. (2013). Self-determined, but not non-self-determined, motivation predicts activations in the anterior insular cortex: An fMRI study of personal agency. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 8, 538–545. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/scan/nss029>.
- Leotti, L. A., & Delgado, M. R. (2011). The inherent reward of choice. *Psychological Science*, 22, 1310–1318. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0956797611417005>.
- Leotti, L. A., Iyengar, S. S., & Ochsner, K. N. (2010). Born to choose: The origins and value of the need for control. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 14, 457–463. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2010.08.001>.
- Lessa, H. T., & Chiviawosky, S. (2015). Self-controlled practice benefits motor learning in older adults. *Human Movement Science*, 40, 372–380. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2015.01.013>.
- Lewthwaite, R., Chiviawosky, S., Drews, R., & Wulf, G. (2015). Choose to move: The motivational impact of autonomy support on motor learning. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 22, 1383–1388. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/s13423-015-0814-7>.
- Lewthwaite, R., & Wulf, G. (2012). Motor learning through a motivational lens. In N. J. Hodges, & A. M. Williams (Eds.). *Skill acquisition in sport: Research, theory & practice* (pp. 173–191). (2nd ed.). London: Routledge.
- Lim, S., Ali, A., Kim, W., Kim, J., Choi, S., & Radlo, S. J. (2015). Influence of self-controlled feedback on learning a serial motor skill. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 120, 462–474. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2466/23.PMS.120v13x3>.
- Lohse, K. R., Sherwood, D. E., & Healy, A. F. (2011). Neuromuscular effects of shifting the focus of attention in a simple force production task. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, 43, 173–184. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00222895.2011.555436>.
- Meadows, C. C., Gable, P. A., Lohse, K. R., & Miller, M. W. (2016). Motivation and motor cortical activity can independently affect motor performance. *Neuroscience*, 339, 174–179. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroscience.2016.09.049>.
- Morris, S. B., & DeShon, R. P. (2002). Combining effect size estimates in meta-analysis with repeated measures and independent-groups designs. *Psychological Methods*, 7, 105–125.
- Owen, M. A., Swaisgood, R. R., Czekala, N. M., & Lindburg, D. G. (2005). Enclosure choice and well-being in Giant Pandas: Is it all about control? *Zoo Biology*, 24, 475–481. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/zoo.20064>.
- Patall, E. A., Cooper, H., & Robinson, J. C. (2008). The effects of choice on intrinsic motivation and related outcomes: A meta-analysis of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, 134, 270–300. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.134.2.270>.
- Post, P. G., Fairbrother, J. T., & Barros, J. A. C. (2011). Self-controlled amount of practice benefits learning of a motor skill. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 82, 474–481. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02701367.2011.10599780>.
- Ryan, R. M. (1982). Control and information in the intrapersonal sphere: An extension of cognitive evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43, 450–461.
- Smith, J. L., Martin, P. G., Gandevia, S. C., & Taylor, J. L. (2007). Sustained contraction at very low forces produces prominent supraspinal fatigue in human elbow flexor muscles. *Journal of Applied Physiology*, 103, 560–568. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1152/jappphysiol.00220.2007>.
- Vance, J., Wulf, G., Töllner, T., McNeven, N. H., & Mercer, J. (2004). EMG activity as a function of the performers' focus of attention. *Journal of Motor Behavior*, 36, 450–459. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/JMBR.36.4.450-459>.
- Wulf, G., & Adams, N. (2014). Small choices can enhance balance learning. *Human Movement Science*, 38, 235–240. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.humov.2014.10.007>.
- Wulf, G., Iwatsuki, T., Machin, B., Kellogg, J., Copeland, C., & Lewthwaite, R. (2017). Lassoing skill through learner choice. *Journal of Motor Behavior*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00222895.2017.1341378>.
- Wulf, G., & Lewthwaite, R. (2016). Optimizing performance through intrinsic motivation and attention for learning: The OPTIMAL theory of motor learning. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 23, 1382–1414. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/s13423-015-0999-9>.
- Wulf, G., & Toole, T. (1999). Physical assistance devices in complex motor skill learning: Benefits of a self-controlled practice schedule. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 70, 265–272. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02701367.1999.10608045>.
- Yu, C., Rouse, P. C., Veldhuijzen, J., Van Zanten, J. C. S., Metsios, G. S., Ntoumanis, N., ... Duda, J. L. (2015). Motivation-related predictors of physical activity engagement and vitality in rheumatoid arthritis patients. *Health Psychology Open*, 1–9. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/2055102915600359>.