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| **Project Title**  Personalized Positive Competence-Enhancing Feedback to Improve Performance.  **Significance**  The purpose of this study is to determine the effect that intrinsic motivation has on performance.  Performance can be separated between being defined as quality versus quantity (Cerasoli, Nicklin, & Ford, 2014).  Brown and Schmidt indicated that positive competence-enhancing feedback (Hagger, Koch, & Chatzisarantis, 2015), a form of feedback whereby individuals are provided acknowledgment for task completion, was shown to have a positive association with intrinsic motivation (Hagger, Koch, & Chatzisarantis, 2015; Cerasoli, Nicklin, & Ford, 2014; Deci & Ryan, 2000). Thus we expect that participants who receive positive competence-enhancing feedback would increase the amount of time that they spend on a task.  This study tests this hypothesis using a common word game Boggle.  Additionally, this study will test whether personalizing positive competence enhancing feedback will have a stronger effect on increasing task performance or motivation. Personalized positive competence enhancing feedback (PPCEF) involves acknowledging a personal characteristic of the participant in the feedback. Generalized positive competence enhancing feedback (GPCEF) is characterized by acknowledging merely the performance without a personalized characteristic.  As other work demonstrated increased performance outcomes with personalized feedback (Martens, Arterberry, Takamatsu, Masters, & Dude, 2015), we predict that the group receiving PPCEF will demonstrate an increase in performance. Additionally, we predict that the group receiving PPCEF will demonstrate an increase in motivation.  **Proposed Design and Procedures**  There will be three groups for this study. All Participants will be discreetly asked what their favorite subject was in school to gain information for the personalized condition. All participants will receive instructions for the Boggle game task.  They will then be given the first Boggle task which is comprised of a 2 minute time period to find as many words as they can.  Half of the participants will receive one boggle sheet for this orientation phase and the other half of the participants will receive the other sheet (see below for the materials). During the test phase, participants will receive the alternative sheet to avoid ordering effects. Participants in the no feedback condition will be given no feedback after completing the first sheet.  Participants in the GPCEF condition will be given GPCEF “wow, good job.”  Participants in the PPCEF condition will be given PPCEF in regard to their response about their favorite subject in school such as “wow, your [scholastic interest] skills must really have paid off, good job.” To further detail how this scholastic interest would identified with the Boggle task a list has been prepared for the experiment.  The scholastic interest with an explanation: math: problem solving, physical education: competitive nature, art: creativity, English: knowledge of words, history: avoiding old the same patterns, health: a healthy mind, computer programing: understanding patterns, Science: logical conclusions, writing: word knowledge, philosophy: depth of communication, music: creativity with words.  Next, they will be given the alternate sheet and asked to write down as many word combinations as they can on a sheet of paper. They will be able to spend up to 20 minutes to identify as many words as they can.  The time they spend on the task and the number of words they accurately identify will be recorded.  To avoid expectancy effects, all participants will be given the cover story that this experiment is designed to assess Boggle performance after practice (see Informed Consent).  **Number Required Participants**  It is anticipated that 80 participants would be required to conduct the study (Hagger & Chatzisarantis, 2010).  **Participant Recruitment**  Participants will be recruited from a convenience sample of friends, family in the area, and nearby public areas and community colleges in Baker City, Oregon and Walla Walla, WA.  Additionally, participants will be recruited using email and/or social media.  **Exclusion Criteria**  Individuals who are younger than 18 years of age will not be included in this study.  In addition,  participants who have a documented case of dyslexia or other reading disability will be excluded from the  experiment.  **Potential Risks**  The risks for participating are fairly minimal and could include minor frustration, boredom, and or amusement as they identify words. Depending on determination of the individual participants, we expect that the experiment should be completed within 10-30 minutes.  **Compensation**  Depending on what classes the participants are taking, if any, their instructors may provide them with extra  credit for participation. This will be at the discretion of the individual class instructors. No compensation  will be provided directly for participation in this study.  **Protecting Anonymity/Confidentiality**  Except for the consent forms, which will be stored separately from the Boggle answer sheets, participants will not be required to give out any personally identifying information.  **Use of Results**  The results will be used to create a poster in partial completion of Eastern Oregon University’s Bachelor's degree in psychology.  No other uses are anticipated. However, if the results are significant, they may be published in a peer-reviewed journal.  **Debriefing**  Subjects will be given a debriefing form explaining the details of the experiment.  The debriefing paper will also contain contact information for the primary author should any participant want more information about the study.  Finally, the debriefing form  will contain information about how to contact the Chair of Eastern Oregon  University’s Institutional IRB should they feel any of their rights were violated.  References  Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M., & Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic  incentives jointly predict performance: A 40-year meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*,  *140*, 980-1008. doi:10.1037/a0035661  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.  doi:10.1207/S15327965PLI1104\_01  Hagger, M. S., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. (2010). Causality orientations moderate the undermining  effect of rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *47*,  485-489. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2010.10.010  Hagger, M. S., Koch, S., & Chatzisarantis, N. L. (2015). The effect of causality orientations and  positive competence-enhancing feedback on intrinsic motivation: A test of additive and  interactive effects. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *72*, 107-111.  doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.08.012  Martens, M. P., Arterberry, B. J., Takamatsu, S. K., Masters, J., & Dude, K. (2015).  The efficacy of  a personalized feedback-only intervention for at-risk college gamblers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *1-6.* doi:10.1037/a003      Training Sheet:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **S** | **R** | **S** | **S** | | **T** | **R** | **O** | **J** | | **A** | **M** | **A** | **L** | | **I** | **D** | **E** | **F** |   Words identified:  LOSS 1 STRAFE \_\_ SOAR \_\_ MAT \_\_ FLAM \_\_  RAM 1 ~~TAIM~~  MALE \_\_ ROAM\_\_ LAME \_\_  JAR 1 IDE \_\_ JADE \_\_ MAID \_\_ MORTAR \_\_  DAME 1 TAME \_\_ MADE \_\_ RAID \_\_ MORTARS \_\_  ~~FEMALE~~ 0 FED \_\_ TRADE\_\_ JAM \_\_ MATS \_\_  Sheet A:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **I** | **C** | **A** | **E** | | **N** | **N** | **O** | **H** | | **E** | **D** | **T** | **D** | | **C** | **E** | **S** | **S** |   Words identified:  Sheet B:   |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | --- | | **E** | **A** | **M** | **J** | | **S** | **A** | **C** | **L** | | **H** | **N** | **I** | **P** | | **E** | **D** | **N** | **A** |   Words identified: |
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