

The Effect of the Practice Specificity Principle on the Performance and Retention of a Perceptual-Motor Skill: A Quasi-Experimental Study with Application for Sports and Rehabilitation

Sayed Kavos Salehi¹, Fazaneh Hatami²Sara Kamalvandian³

Original Article

Abstract

Introduction: This study was conducted to determine the effect of the specificity of practice principle on the performance and retention of dart-throwing skills.

Materials and Methods: This study employed a quasi-experimental design with an applied purpose. A pretest-posttest protocol was implemented across two training conditions (normal and specific), consisting of an acquisition period and a retention test for each group. The independent variable was the principle of practice specificity, while the dependent variables were the performance and retention of the perceptual-motor skill of dart throwing. The statistical population comprised students aged 12 to 15 years from 8th district of Tehran City, Iran. The final sample consisted of 30 participants who were selected through convenience sampling and randomly assigned into two groups of 15. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics as well as independent t-test and paired t-test.

Results: The results indicated a significant difference in the performance on the post-test and retention of dart-throwing skills between identical and non-identical conditions in both the normal and specific training groups ($P < 0.001$). Specifically, performance on the post-test and retention phases that matched the training conditions was significantly superior to performance in mismatched conditions. These findings provide empirical support for the principle of specificity of training.

Conclusion: These findings are consistent with the specificity of practice principle, highlighting the significant impact of contextual conditions on subsequent performance. Based on these results, it is recommended that when teaching perceptual-motor skills, the environmental conditions of practice should closely mirror the real-world settings in which the skill is intended to be performed.

Keywords: Specificity principle; Performance; Retention; Dart throwing

Citation: Salehi SK, Hatami F, Kamalvandian S. **The Effect of the Practice Specificity Principle on the Performance and Retention of a Perceptual-Motor Skill: A Quasi-Experimental Study with Application for Sports and Rehabilitation.** J Res Rehabil Sci 2023; 19: 37-45.

Received date: 30.10.2023

Accept date: 10.12.2023

Published: 26.12.2023

Introduction

The Specificity of Practice Hypothesis (Practice Specificity Principle), sometimes referred to in the literature as the Practice Specificity Principle, has been

examined for nearly a century in research on the learning and re-learning of motor tasks and skills. The pioneering studies of Franklin Henry and his colleagues established a fundamental interest in motor

1- Assistant Professor, Department of Motor Behavior, School of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Shahid Rajaee Teacher Training University, Lavizan, Tehran, Iran

2- Associate Professor, Department of Motor Behavior, School of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Shahid Rajaee Teacher Training University, Lavizan, Tehran, Iran

3- MSc, Department of Motor Behavior, School of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Shahid Rajaee Teacher Training University, Lavizan, Tehran, Iran

Corresponding Author: Sayed Kavos Salehi; Assistant Professor, Department of Motor Behavior, School of Physical Education and Sport Sciences, Shahid Rajaee Teacher Training University, Lavizan, Tehran, Iran; Email: sk.salehi@sru.ac.ir

tasks and the concept of practice specificity (1). According to this principle, the learning of motor skills depends on the sensory resources and contextual conditions available during practice. These sensory resources and practice conditions are specific to the Performance of a given skill and lead to optimal Performance. For example, visual afferent information serves as a particularly important sensory source during the learning stages (2). Thus, the extent of learning depends on the similarity between the features in the practice and retention phases. The addition or removal of sensory or contextual resources during the performance or testing phase of a criterion task reduces Performance (3).

The principle of Specificity of practice has demonstrated high levels of motor specificity effects across numerous experiments and has been examined in various domains (4). However, to date, no definitive conclusions have been reached, and research findings in this area have shown considerable variability. The results of most studies indicate that the expected level of Performance during actual competition decreases when individuals are exposed to certain variables. Accordingly, an important question is whether engaging participants in conditions aligned with the principle of Specificity of practice can help preserve the skills they have acquired. Based on analyses by scholars in motor learning and motor control, the principle of Specificity of practice through the concepts of sensory and motor Specificity, context specificity, and transfer-appropriate processing suggests that coaches and movement educators should align practice conditions as closely as possible with test conditions or criterion performance. This alignment enables learners to utilize environmental information more effectively and to engage in more appropriate and beneficial processing that facilitates skill improvement. Through this approach, learners can develop their learning in accordance with testing conditions or real performance demands. Another important consideration for instructors (coaches or therapists) during practice is to expose learners to situations that closely resemble those expected during criterion performance, whether in retention and transfer tests or in real-world performance (1).

In reviewing the research conducted in this area, Proteau and colleagues, by investigating the role of the visual component in motor learning, initiated extensive laboratory-based studies aimed at supporting the Specificity of practice hypothesis through the sensory variable of vision (5). Furthermore, the principle of Specificity of practice has been supported in tasks involving aiming movements (6), gait accuracy (7),

weightlifting (8), golf putting, and rock climbing (9). In addition, this principle has been examined in other studies from various biomechanical, physiological, and information-processing perspectives. These investigations have employed biomechanical components such as movement patterns, joint angles, and velocity; physiological components such as types of muscular contractions and the energy systems involved; and processing components including practice models and practice conditions (1). Researchers have also examined psychological contextual components such as motivational characteristics and psychological states in relation to the Specificity of practice principle. For example, Movahedi and colleagues supported this principle in a real sporting environment by manipulating motivational conditions during the testing phase. In their study, two groups of participants learned a perceptual-motor basketball-throwing task under two motivational conditions (high and low motivation). After the acquisition phase, they were tested under motivational conditions that differed from those during practice. The results of this study demonstrated a decline in Performance when motivational conditions were altered from those present during practice, providing valuable evidence in support of the Specificity of practice hypothesis (3). These findings have been replicated in other studies examining the Specificity of motor skill learning to visual practice conditions (4) and have also been supported by investigations of the effects of sensory manipulations on motor behavior, as well as by providing guidelines for designing rehabilitation interventions and improving patient performance (10). However, although the aforementioned studies have presented strong evidence in support of the principle of Specificity of practice, other research has reported findings that contradict its predictions. In particular, field studies have documented inconsistent results regarding the Specificity of practice hypothesis. For example, one study examined the role of practice in the development of gross motor skills. In this study, participants practiced catching a ball under full-light conditions and in a dark room with an illuminated ball. The results showed that despite the different practice conditions, participants demonstrated equal accuracy during the post-test and transfer conditions. These findings do not support the practice specificity hypothesis (11). In another experiment, squat Performance in novice and expert powerlifters was examined under three visual conditions: full vision, reduced vision, and no vision. The results indicated that 90% of expert lifters who had trained under full-

vision conditions maintained high levels of accuracy across all performance conditions (12). Similarly, within the field of rehabilitation, a study investigating the effects of perceived cutaneous pain on Performance and motor strategies during the practice and testing phases of a motor adaptation task (walking with a robotic orthosis) demonstrated that although motor practice was conducted in the absence of cutaneous pain, when skill-learning tests were performed in the presence of tonic cutaneous pain (experimentally induced), the presence of pain during the test phase did not interfere with overall performance relative to the practice phase. That is, motor performance was comparable to that observed during practice. This finding contradicts the principle of Specificity of practice, as a decline in Performance would have been expected following a change in testing conditions (i.e., the induction of pain) (13).

Considering the divergent findings of previous studies, the existing research gap in this area, and the presence of both supporting and contradictory evidence regarding the principle of Specificity of practice, it is necessary to conduct further investigations that rigorously examine this principle. Although numerous studies have addressed the Specificity of practice, existing inconsistencies concerning the validity and accuracy of this principle highlight the need for additional research. Moreover, most studies on the principle of Specificity of practice have been conducted in laboratory settings or have employed a limited number of variables associated with this principle. Consequently, fewer studies have examined practice specificity in active environments that include feedback and consider environmental (contextual) components. Therefore, the present study seeks to address these limitations by examining the effects of the Specificity of practice principle on the Performance and learning of a perceptual-motor dart-throwing skill. Specifically, the present research aimed to answer the following question: Does the principle of Specificity of practice influence the Performance and Retention of the dart-throwing skill? Is the Performance of dart throwing, as a real-world skill, dependent on the practice conditions, either general conditions (inactive practice environment without feedback, presence of spectators, and rewards) or specific conditions (active practice environment with feedback, presence of spectators, and rewards)? To address these questions, novice participants, following a training period (acquisition phase), were tested in both a post-test and a retention test. In each test, participants were assessed once under practice conditions identical to those of the acquisition phase

and once under different practice conditions. If participants' Performance declined as a result of changes in testing conditions, this would be interpreted as support for the principle of Specificity of practice. The findings of this study may provide practical implications for movement educators, rehabilitation therapists, and coaches in the domain of motor skill training and practice design. Specifically, the results may contribute to a clearer understanding of the most effective environments for the Performance and learning of motor tasks, thereby facilitating the application of these findings in practical settings.

Materials and Methods

The present study employed a quasi-experimental design and was applied in nature with respect to its objective. The research was conducted in a field setting. A pre-test-post-test design was used across two practice conditions (general and specific), with a practice period and a retention test for each group.

The statistical population of this study consisted of all students aged 12 to 15 years in District 8 of Tehran. Based on a previous study (3) and using G*Power (version 3.1.5, Freeware, University of Düsseldorf, Düsseldorf, Germany), with a significance level of $\alpha = 0.05$ and a statistical power of $\beta = 0.80$, a sample size of 30 participants was estimated. Participants were selected through purposeful and convenience sampling and met the inclusion criteria of right-handedness, neurological health, and no prior familiarity or experience with the experimental task. The selected participants were randomly assigned to two groups of 15 individuals each: a specific-practice condition group and a general-practice condition group. All participants were novices in the target task, aged 12–15, provided informed consent, and were in good overall health.

To evaluate the participants, a demographic information questionnaire was first administered. Subsequently, the Persian version of the General Health Questionnaire (GHQ) was used to assess general health status and the absence of physical disorders; this questionnaire has a reported reliability coefficient of 0.91. In addition, to obtain supplementary information related to students' health, their educational records were reviewed, and relevant information was collected from their coaches and parents. Based on this information, participants' general health status was confirmed, and children with specific medical conditions were excluded from the statistical sample (14). Furthermore, for the assessment of dart-throwing Performance as well as for the practice and testing phases, a standard dartboard and darts were used. The dartboard was

circular, made of compressed paper, with a diameter of 453 mm and a thickness of 12 mm. The throwing distance from the starting line to the dartboard for children was 2.37 m, and the height of the dartboard center from the ground was 1.22 m, respectively (Figure 1). Proper considerations regarding stance and dart grip were observed throughout the task. Each participant was provided with three darts for the throws; all darts were identical in terms of material, design, and weight. During the study, the score for each throw was recorded on a scale of 1 to 10 (equivalent to 10 to 100 points). Participants' throwing scores were recorded from 0 (missed the dartboard) to 10 (dart center).




Figure 1. Schematic view of the dart-throwing target

Data Collection Procedure: Data collection was conducted as follows. First, the necessary permissions for cooperation with the students were obtained. Subsequently, appropriate announcements were made to recruit participants, and volunteer application forms and informed consent forms were completed and reviewed by interested students. After all inclusion criteria were fully verified, eligible participants were enrolled in the study and participated in the research procedures described below.

Preliminary Instruction Phase: During this phase, participants received an explanation of the study's purpose, the importance of the dart-throwing task, and verbal instructions for dart throwing. These instructions included the proper grip on the dart, the correct body position in front of the dartboard, and the appropriate technique for executing the throw. Following this, the examiner demonstrated the criterion skill in a slow, controlled manner, accompanied by verbal explanations. Subsequently, to

ensure task familiarity, each participant was allowed to practice the task by correctly gripping the dart, assuming the proper throwing position, and performing several practice throws.

Practice Procedure in the Specific Practice Conditions Group: In the specific practice conditions group, following participation in the preliminary instruction phase, specific practice conditions were created based on the approach proposed by Schmidt et al. (1). To establish a task-specific and motivational environment, spectators including active dart athletes, dart coaches, and members of the executive staff were invited to be present at the practice venue. In addition, a competitive selection setting was implemented to identify the best performers, thereby enhancing motivational demands during practice. Furthermore, rewards were given to participants who ranked first through third in Performance. To provide augmented feedback, two dart coaches were asked to offer participants corrective feedback on technical errors and instructional strategies to improve dart-throwing effectiveness (1, 3).

Practice Procedure in the General Practice Conditions Group: The conditions for this group were identical to those of the specific practice group, except that spectators, active dart practitioners, and coaches were not present. Additionally, no rewards were offered to top performers, and no feedback was provided during the practice sessions.

Pre-test: Following the preliminary instruction phase, a pre-test was administered to ensure homogeneity among participants. During this stage, participants performed one block of 10 trials of the criterion task (dart throwing). The score for each throw was calculated and recorded according to the scoring system. Based on their pre-test performance, participants were assigned to either the Specific Practice Conditions group ($n = 15$) or the General Practice Conditions group ($n = 15$) to ensure that both groups were matched on initial skill level.

Criterion Task Practice: During this phase, participants in both the Specific Practice Conditions Group and the General Practice Conditions Group performed the criterion dart-throwing task according to their respective practice conditions. Each participant completed six training sessions and, in each session, executed three blocks of 10 trials of the criterion task, consistent with the designated conditions for their group.

Post-test: Immediately after the final practice session, all participants completed the post-test. In this stage, similar to the pre-test, each group performed one block of 10 trials of the criterion dart-throwing task.

Participants in the General Practice Conditions Group completed the test once under their normal (practice-like) conditions and once under the specific conditions (different from their practice setting). Conversely, participants in the Specific Practice Conditions Group performed the post-test once under their specific (practice-like) conditions and once under the general conditions (different from practice). The resulting data were recorded as post-test performance scores.

Retention Test: Twenty-four hours after the post-test, participants performed an additional 10-trial block to assess Retention of motor learning. Similar to the post-test, both groups completed the task once under the same conditions as their practice phase and once under the alternate condition. The performance results obtained were recorded for subsequent analysis.

After data collection, statistical analysis was performed using SPSS software (version 23, IBM Corporation, Armonk, NY). Descriptive statistics were used to calculate the mean and standard deviation and to generate the relevant charts. The Shapiro–Wilk test was used to assess the normality of the data distribution. To compare Performance between groups, the Independent Samples t-test was used, and to test the Specificity of Practice Hypothesis, the Paired Samples t-test was applied. For this purpose, the mean score of the criterion task in each group during the pre-test phase was compared with the mean score of the same criterion skill obtained in the retention phase for that group. The significance level (alpha) for all statistical analyses was set at $P < 0.05$.

Results

Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of the participants, including age, height, weight, and body mass index (BMI), for the two experimental groups separately. According to the significance column in this table, the Independent Samples t-test results indicated no significant differences between the two groups in their individual characteristics, confirming that the groups were homogeneous.

Based on Table 2, the results of the paired-samples t-test indicated significant changes in the specific practice group from pre-test to post-test under both practice-matched and practice-dimmatched conditions

($p < 0.05$). This indicates that participants in this group achieved significantly higher post-test scores under both conditions than at the pre-test. Furthermore, the results of the paired-samples t-test showed significant changes in the normal practice group from pre-test to post-test under both practice-similar and practice-dissimilar conditions ($p = 0.001$). In other words, this group likewise obtained significantly higher post-test scores in both conditions compared with their pre-test scores.

According to table 3, a significant difference was observed between the post-test and retention-test performances of the specific practice group under practice-matched and practice-mismatched conditions. Comparison of the mean scores showed that participants in the specific practice group performed significantly better on both the post-test and the retention test under practice-matched conditions than under practice-mismatched conditions. Similarly, in the normal practice group, participants demonstrated significantly higher Performance in both the post-test and retention test under practice-matched conditions compared to practice-mismatched conditions. These findings provide support for the Specificity of Practice Hypothesis. In other words, participants in both groups exhibited a decline in Performance when tested under conditions that did not match those experienced during practice, confirming that motor skill performance and learning are optimized when testing conditions closely match practice conditions (Figure 2).




Figure 2. Dart throwing Performance across study phases

Table 1. Mean and standard deviation of participants' demographic characteristics

Variable	Group		P value
	Practice in the specific condition (mean $\pm$ SD)	Practice in the general condition (mean $\pm$ SD)	
Age (years)	13.00 $\pm$ 0.98	13.00 $\pm$ 0.83	0.43
Height (cm)	147.40 $\pm$ 1.87	145.30 $\pm$ 3.93	0.21
Weight (kg)	37.20 $\pm$ 3.83	35.30 $\pm$ 0.97	0.26
BMI (kg/m ²)	19.30 $\pm$ 0.12	19.10 $\pm$ 0.18	0.52

SD: Standard deviation

Table 2. Results of the paired t-test for changes from pre-test to post-test under practice similar and practice dissimilar conditions in the specific and normal practice groups

Group		Pre-test (mean $\pm$ SD)	Post-test (mean $\pm$ SD)	df	t value	P value
Specific Practice	Practice-matched	49.8 $\pm$ 8.78	60.06 $\pm$ 8.81	14	-9.304	0.001
	Practice-mismatched	49.5 $\pm$ 1.71	52.5 $\pm$ 7.52	14	-2.280	0.039
Normal Practice	Practice-matched	48.6 $\pm$ 6.67	61.06 $\pm$ 6.71	14	-18.804	0.001
	Practice-mismatched	48.5 $\pm$ 6.61	55.6 $\pm$ 5.77	14	-10.990	0.001

SD: Standard deviation; df: Degree of freedom

Discussion

The present study was conducted to examine the effect of the principle of Specificity of practice on the Performance and Retention of the perceptual-motor skill of dart throwing. The results showed that both the specific practice and normal practice groups demonstrated better performance on tests similar to the conditions under which they had practiced, and that both practice groups exhibited an upward trend in dart-throwing scores. In the post-test and retention test conducted under practice-matched conditions, both the normal-practice and specific-practice groups showed superior Performance. This finding, along with the observed changes in the rate of performance improvement for both groups, can be explained by the power law of practice. According to this law, initial practice leads to substantial and noticeable improvements in Performance; however, following this rapid early gain, further practice results in improvements at a slower rate. In addition, these findings are consistent with the general characteristics of Performance during the learning of perceptual-motor tasks, which include improvement, consistency, and stability in task performance (15).

The results of the present study indicated that participants' performance in both the specific-practice and normal-practice groups depended on the practice conditions and the contextual setting in which the criterion task was performed. Specifically, in the post-test and retention test, when the testing conditions were altered, and participants were assessed under practice-mismatched conditions, Performance in both groups declined significantly. These findings support the principle (or Specificity) of practice in motor learning. According to this principle, there is a meaningful interaction between practice conditions and the conditions under which the criterion task is tested or evaluated (16). In other words, when task performance during testing does not correspond to the conditions experienced during practice, a specific decrement in Performance is likely to occur. Therefore, practice and testing should be conducted under similar conditions to allow participants to demonstrate their maximum acquired Performance.

These findings are consistent with the results reported by Movahedi et al. (3), Moradi et al. (4), Blandin et al. (17), Mackrout and Proteau (18, 19). These studies examined specific practice conditions across different tasks. They showed that the removal or addition of sensory information during practice facilitates the learning process only when final Performance is executed or tested under the same conditions (i.e., with the same sensory information removed or added). Otherwise, modifying sensory information during the acquisition phase not only fails to facilitate learning or the attainment of an optimal coordination pattern but may also disrupt Performance. In the present study, the superior Performance of the experimental groups practicing under specific conditions in the retention test may be attributed to more precise movement planning and more effective use and processing of feedback during the acquisition phase.

The present findings are also consistent with the results reported by Sugiyama et al. (10), who demonstrated that manipulating sensory information can enhance motor performance. However, sensory manipulations, particularly visual manipulations, are not always beneficial. Increased reliance on visual information may reduce intrinsic learning and, consequently, impair transfer to contexts lacking such information. In this regard, motor learning facilitated by specific sensory manipulations may improve Performance in the trained environment (e.g., a rehabilitation room). At the same time, the effects of practice may diminish in untrained environments (e.g., outside the clinic). This pattern of results further supports the principle of Specificity of practice. The present findings also agree with studies by Craikleson (20) and Toussaint and Blandin (21), who suggested that a greater number of trials and training sessions under specific practice conditions leads to increased Specificity of learning and provides stronger support for the Specificity of practice hypothesis.

Nevertheless, these findings are not consistent with the results reported by Whiting and Savelsbergh (11), Robertson et al. (22), and Bouffard et al. (13). Such discrepancies may be attributed to differences like the tasks, experimental paradigms, and contextual

conditions employed across studies. For example, the findings of Bouffard et al., contrary to the Specificity of practice principle, indicated that cutaneous pain did not interfere with overall Performance during acquisition and Retention. In contrast, similar experimental paradigms (23) have shown that motor skills can still be acquired even when practice of the criterion task is consolidated in the presence of pain within the central nervous system, and because such pain is tonic and unrelated to movement execution, Performance can remain intact even in the absence of the pain variable.

A question that may arise here is why performance scores decline in performance assessments when the testing conditions differ from those experienced during practice. One possible explanation is that the representation of sensory information is specific to the practice conditions. According to the Specificity of practice theory, the extent to which learning transfers depends on the degree of similarity between the characteristics of practice and those of testing (24). That is, based on the principle of Specificity of practice, information available during motor practice becomes associated within the central nervous system with the task goal and the state of the motor system, forming a specific representation of the motor skill that contributes to the specificity effect (5, 25). In other words, through the practice phase, participants become dependent on environmental information and contextual conditions present during training sessions, such as the presence of spectators and encouragement. Consequently, when participants are tested under different conditions, both immediate and delayed, their performance scores decline. In the present study, participants had no prior experience with the task; therefore, they adapted to the practice environment, whether normal or specific. It appears that when practice is insufficient or when skill level is low, full integration between performance conditions and environmental information does not occur. The resulting perceptual-motor representation of the skill is not sufficiently robust. As a result, even a minor change in execution conditions or exposure to a different environment is likely to lead to a decrease in performance scores (13, 26). The findings of the present study are also

consistent with studies that have examined this hypothesis using simple targets in laboratory settings (27, 28). Overall, the results suggest that the principle of Specificity of practice is valid not only for laboratory-based tasks but also for field-based tasks.

Limitations

In addition to individual differences, participants' activities outside the research sessions and their mental states should be considered as limitations of the present study.

Recommendations

In the present study, contextual characteristics were examined as one element of the Specificity of practice principle. It is recommended that future research investigate other forms of Specificity, such as sensory Specificity and information-processing characteristics. Moreover, additional studies examining the effects of the Specificity of practice principle in rehabilitation and clinical settings, particularly during patient-performed rehabilitation exercises, may provide valuable insights into the optimal conditions for improving patient performance.

Conclusion

Overall, the findings of the present study are in line with the principle of Specificity of practice and provide evidence supporting both this principle and the influence of contextual conditions on subsequent Performance. Considering that one of the key issues in learning motor tasks and skills is maintaining conditions that allow learners to achieve the highest level of Performance in the shortest possible time, this goal can be achieved when movement educators and skill instructors make practice conditions as similar as possible to the real conditions of future Performance. Based on the findings, optimal Performance occurs when the conditions of skill practice closely resemble those of actual execution in real-world settings. These results offer important practical implications for coaches, teachers, and movement educators, suggesting that training programs should be planned and designed under conditions that closely match the intended performance environment.

Table 3. Results of the paired t-test comparing posttest performance under practice matched and practice mismatched conditions in the specific and normal practice groups

Group	Retention-similar (mean $\pm$ SD)	Retention-dissimilar (mean $\pm$ SD)	df	t value	P value
Specific Practice	59.06 $\pm$ 7.98	54.3 $\pm$ 7.18	14	7.92	0.001
Normal Practice	58.3 $\pm$ 5.57	54.3 $\pm$ 5.88	14	3.16	0.007

SD: Standard deviation; df: Degree of freedom

Furthermore, in the field of rehabilitation, applying the principle of Specificity of practice may facilitate more effective re-learning of lost motor-functional skills in individuals with neurological disorders and physical injuries, thereby enhancing functional recovery.

Acknowledgments

On this occasion, we would like to express our gratitude to the participants in this research.

Authors' Contribution

Study design and ideation: Sayed Kavos Salehi
Getting financial resources for the study: Sara Kamalvandian
Scientific and executive support of the study: Sayed Kavos Salehi
Data collection: Sara Kamalvandian
Analysis and interpretation of the results: Farzaneh Hatami
Specialized statistics services: Farzaneh Hatami
Manuscript preparation: Sayed Kavos Salehi, Farzaneh Hatami, Sara Kamalvandian
Specialized scientific evaluation of the manuscript: Farzaneh Hatami, Sayed Kavos Salehi, Sara Kamalvandian

Confirm the final manuscript to be submitted to the journal website: Sayed Kavos Salehi, Farzaneh Hatami, Sara Kamalvandian

Maintaining the integrity of the study process from the beginning to the publication, and responding to the referees' comments: Sayed Kavos Salehi, Farzaneh Hatami, Sara Kamalvandian

Funding

This study was prepared from the master's thesis of Shahid Rajaei Teacher Training University in motor behavior with code 26116 and with the financial support of the authors was conducted. Shahid Rajaei Teacher Training University did not comment on data collection, analysis and reporting, manuscript preparation and final approval of the article for publication. Also, this research has a code of ethics registered in the Institute of Physical Education and Sports Sciences and the National committee for Ethics in Biomedical Research under the number IR.SSRC.REC.1402.040.

Conflict of Interest

The authors did not have a conflict of interest.

References

- Schmidt RA, Lee TD, Winstein C, Wulf G, Zelaznik HN. Motor control and learning: A behavioral emphasis (6th Ed). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics. 2019.
- Harris DJ, Buckingham G, Wilson MR, Brookes J, Mushtaq F, Mon-Williams M, Vine SJ. The effect of a virtual reality environment on gaze behavior and motor skill learning. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*. 2020; 50: 101721.
- Movahedi A, Sheikh M, Bagherzadeh F, Hemayatlab R, Ashayeri H. A practice-specificity-based model of arousal for achieving peak performance. *Journal of motor behavior*. 2007; 39(6): 457-62.
- Moradi J, Movahedi A, Salehi H. Specificity of learning a sport skill to the visual condition of acquisition. *Journal of motor behavior*. 2014; 46(1): 17-23.
- Proteau L. On the specificity of learning and the role of visual information for movement control. *Advances in psychology*. 1992; 85: 67-103.
- Elliott DJ, Jaeger ME. Practice and the visual control of manual aiming movements. *Journal of Human Movement Studies*. 1988; 14(6): 279-91.
- Proteau L, Tremblay L, Dejaeger D. Practice does not diminish the role of visual information in on-line control of a precision walking task: Support for the specificity of practice hypothesis. *Journal of Motor Behavior*. 1998; 30(2): 143-50.
- Tremblay L, Proteau L. Specificity of practice: The case of powerlifting. *Research quarterly for exercise and sport*. 1998; 69(3): 284-9.
- Lawrence GP, Cassell VE, Beattie S, Woodman T, Khan MA, Hardy L, Gottwald VM. Practice with anxiety improves performance, but only when anxious: evidence for the specificity of practice hypothesis. *Psychological research*. 2014; 78: 634-50.
- Sugiyama T, Liew SL. The effects of sensory manipulations on motor behavior: from basic science to clinical rehabilitation. *Journal of motor behavior*. 2017; 49(1): 67-77.
- Whiting HT, Savelsbergh GJ, and Pijpers JR. Specificity of motor learning does not deny flexibility. *Applied Psychology*. 1995; 44(4): 315-32.
- Bennett S, Davids K. The manipulation of vision during the powerlift squat: Exploring the boundaries of the specificity of learning hypothesis. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and sport*. 1995; 66(3): 210-8.
- Bouffard J, Bouyer LJ, Roy JS, Mercier C. Pain induced during both the acquisition and retention phases of locomotor adaptation does not interfere with improvements in motor performance. *Neural plasticity*. 2016; 2016.
- Salehi SK, Sheikh M, Hemayatlab R, Humaneyan D. The Effect of Age-Related Changes and Explicit and Implicit Awareness on Mixed Motor Sequence Learning and its Consolidation. *Journal of Research in Rehabilitation Sciences*. 2016; 12(1): 1-9.
- Newell A, Rosenbloom PS. Mechanisms of skill acquisition and the law of practice. In *Cognitive skills and their acquisition*

- 2013 Oct 28 (pp. 1-55). Psychology Press.
16. De Camargo Barros JA, Tani G, Corrêa UC. Effects of practice schedule and task specificity on the adaptive process of motor learning. *Human movement science*. 2017; 55: 196-210.
 17. Blandin Y, Toussaint L, Shea CH. Specificity of practice hypothesis: The relation between sensory information and extrinsic feedback. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*. 2007; 29.
 18. Mackrout I, Proteau L. Specificity of practice results from differences in movement planning strategies. *Experimental brain research*. 2007; 183: 181-93.
 19. Yoshida M, Cauraugh JH, Chow JW. Specificity of practice, visual information, and intersegmental dynamics in rapid-aiming limb movements. *Journal of Motor Behavior*. 2004; 36(3): 281-90.
 20. Krigolson OE, Tremblay L. The amount of practice really matters: specificity of practice may be valid only after sufficient practice. *Research quarterly for exercise and sport*. 2009; 80(2): 197-204.
 21. Toussaint L, Robin N, Blandin Y. On the content of sensorimotor representations after actual and motor imagery practice. *Motor Control*. 2010; 14(2): 159-75.
 22. Robertson S, Collins J, Elliott D, Starkes J. The influence of skill and intermittent vision on dynamic balance. *Journal of Motor Behavior*. 1994; 26(4): 333-9.
 23. Bouffard J, Bouyer LJ, Roy JS, Mercier C. Tonic pain experienced during locomotor training impairs retention despite normal performance during acquisition. *Journal of Neuroscience*. 2014; 34(28): 9190-5.
 24. Harris DJ, Bird JM, Smart PA, Wilson MR, Vine SJ. A framework for the testing and validation of simulated environments in experimentation and training. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2020; 11: 605.
 25. Howard IS, Wolpert DM, Franklin DW. The effect of contextual cues on the encoding of motor memories. *Journal of neurophysiology*. 2013; 109(10): 2632-44.
 26. Proteau L, Carnahan H. What causes specificity of practice in a manual aiming movement: Vision dominance or transformation errors? *Journal of Motor Behavior*. 2001; 33(3): 226-34.
 27. Proteau L, Isabelle G. On the role of visual afferent information for the control of aiming movements toward targets of different sizes. *Journal of Motor Behavior*. 2002; 34(4): 367-84.
 28. Proteau L. Visual afferent information dominates other sources of afferent information during mixed practice of a video-aiming task. *Experimental Brain Research*. 2005; 161: 441-56.