

January 2007

Trial and error versus errorless learning of functional skills in patients with acute stroke

Julie Mount

Thomas Jefferson University, Julie.Mount@jefferson.edu

Samuel R. Pierce

MossRehab Hospital and Institute for Physical Therapy Education

Janet Parker

MossRehab Hospital

Rebecca DiEgidio

MossRehab Hospital

Russell Woessner

*MossRehab Hospital**See next page for additional authors*

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you](#)

Follow this and additional works at: <http://jdc.jefferson.edu/ptfp> Part of the [Physical Therapy Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Mount, Julie; Pierce, Samuel R.; Parker, Janet; DiEgidio, Rebecca; Woessner, Russell; and Spiegel, Lenore, "Trial and error versus errorless learning of functional skills in patients with acute stroke" (2007). *Department of Physical Therapy Faculty Papers*. Paper 4.
<http://jdc.jefferson.edu/ptfp/4>

Authors

Julie Mount, Samuel R. Pierce, Janet Parker, Rebecca DiEgidio, Russell Woessner, and Lenore Spiegel

1 **Trial and Error versus Errorless Learning of Functional Skills in Patients with Acute**
2 **Stroke**

3 Julie Mount, PhD, PT^a, Samuel R. Pierce, PT, MS, NCS^{b,c}, Janet Parker, MSPT, NCS^b, Rebecca
4 DiEgidio, OTR/L^b, Russell Woessner, PsyD^b, Lenore Spiegel, PhD^b

5 **Abstract**

6 **Objective:** To compare the effectiveness of errorless learning versus trial and error learning for
7 teaching activities of daily living to patients with acute stroke with or without explicit memory
8 impairments. **Design:** Randomized crossover. **Setting:** Rehabilitation hospital. **Participants:** 33
9 adult subjects following an acute stroke. **Intervention:** Subjects were taught to prepare a
10 wheelchair for a transfer and to put on a sock with a sock-donner. Tasks were taught using
11 errorless learning or trial and error learning. Explicit memory was assessed using the
12 Neurobehavioral Cognitive Status Exam. **Main Outcome Measures:** Days until subject was able
13 to demonstrate retention of the task, and success or failure at carry-over to a similar task.
14 **Results:** No significant differences were found in days to retention for either functional task
15 when taught using errorless learning or trial and error learning in subjects with or without explicit
16 memory impairments. Carry-over was significantly better when trial and error learning was used
17 for learning sock donning. **Conclusions:** When choosing the best learning method for patients
18 undergoing rehabilitation for stroke, the nature of the task should be considered. Additional
19 research is needed to identify the best approach for teaching activities of daily living and
20 facilitating carry-over of learning in individuals with acute stroke.
21 **Key words:** Cerebrovascular Accident; Errorless Learning; Activities of Daily Living;
22 Rehabilitation

1 a. Department of Physical Therapy, College of Health Professions, Thomas Jefferson

2 University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

3 b. MossRehab Hospital, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

4 c. Institute for Physical Therapy Education, Chester, Pennsylvania

5

6 Correspondence and reprint requests should be addressed to Julie Mount, PhD, Suite 830 Edison

7 Bldg., 130 South 9th Street, Thomas Jefferson University, Philadelphia, PA 19130, phone#:215

8 503 6017, FAX # 215 503 3499, email: julie.mount@jefferson.edu

9 Supported by a grant from the Albert Einstein Society.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

A major component of rehabilitation for individuals post acute stroke is teaching activities of daily living (ADL). Motor skills such as walking, getting dressed, and wheelchair mobility are often taught during the rehabilitation process in an attempt to maximize a patient's independence. Two methods for teaching ADL's to patients post neurological injury are errorless learning (EL) and trial and error learning (TEL). EL is a method that is structured so that the subject is prevented from making errors while learning a task. TEL is a process in which the subject is encouraged to try to guess or figure out the correct response and learn from any errors made. Evidence suggests that TEL results in better retention of skills than EL for individuals without memory deficits¹⁻³. EL has been reported to be more effective than the TEL for teaching retention of information in people with cognitive disorders such as mental retardation⁴, Alzheimer's disease⁵, schizophrenia⁶, and acquired brain damage^{7,8}. A meta-analysis by Kessels and de Haan⁹ reported a statistically significant effect size for the effectiveness of EL in teaching retention of skills in patients with amnesia. However, the assessment of the effectiveness of TEL and EL in teaching skills to patients post acute stroke has not been investigated.

The mechanism of EL training is unknown but has been attributed to both the use of residual explicit memory¹⁰ and implicit memory⁸. Explicit memory refers to memory that we consciously recall, such as facts and events. Implicit memory refers to improvement in performance that occurs without conscious or intentional recollection. Evans et al¹¹ hypothesized that EL would be optimal for tasks that can be learned implicitly. During the rehabilitation of patients with acute stroke, therapists teach many functional tasks that are primarily motor skills, which may lend themselves well to implicit memory and an EL approach. Orrell et al, for example, demonstrated

1 that balancing tasks, which are commonly taught during rehabilitation, are learned implicitly
2 even among individuals taught using discovery learning and focusing on explicit rules.¹² Pohl
3 and colleagues¹³ reported that implicit memory was preserved in people with chronic stroke as
4 demonstrated by the learning of a perceptual-motor task. Boyd and Winstein¹⁴ found that explicit
5 verbal feedback was detrimental for the learning of a motor sequence in people with chronic
6 stroke, which may suggest that the verbal feedback provided by therapists during TEL may
7 interfere with implicit memory. EL may be effective in patients with poor explicit memory,
8 which is a common impairment in patients with acute stroke¹⁵, because this population may have
9 preservation of implicit memory¹⁶. The identification of explicit memory deficits in patients post
10 acute stroke may be critical in determining whether that patient will benefit from instruction
11 using EL.

12

13 While the studies cited above suggest that EL is successful in teaching specific skills to people
14 with decreased explicit memory, most of the literature reporting the value of EL does not address
15 carry-over of learning to similar skills. Carry-over is defined as the effect of learning one skill on
16 the subject's ability to perform a skill that is similar to but partially different from the learned
17 skill. Carry-over is important in clinical practice because the activities learned in rehabilitation
18 may not be identical to the activities that must be performed after discharge. Multiple
19 investigations have suggested that TEL is superior compared to EL in obtaining carry-over in
20 individuals without neurological impairments¹⁻³. Gollin and Savoy¹⁷ found that children three to
21 ten years of age who learned using EL made a greater number of errors than those who learned
22 using TEL when carry-over to a new situation was tested. On the other hand, Glisky¹⁸
23 demonstrated carry-over of information that was learned through EL in a sample of adults with

1 explicit memory impairments. A comparison of the effectiveness of EL and TEL in facilitating
2 carry-over of skills in patients with acute stroke has not been investigated to date.

3
4 A second factor that limits the application of the research literature on EL and TEL to clinical
5 practice is that the skills typically studied are not the activities of daily living frequently taught in
6 acute stroke rehabilitation. For example, word lists are commonly taught in studies of EL⁷⁻⁸ while
7 functional activities such as getting dressed have not been examined. In addition, only subjects
8 with chronic neurological dysfunction have been studied in the research literature so that the
9 effectiveness of EL and TEL in patients with acute stroke is unknown. Research is needed to
10 compare the effectiveness of EL and TEL of tasks that are typically taught in the rehabilitation of
11 individuals with acute stroke.

12
13 The purpose of this research was to compare the effectiveness of using EL versus TEL when
14 teaching functional skills to patients with an acute stroke with or without explicit memory
15 impairments. The following hypotheses were tested:

- 16 1. Individuals with an acute stroke with intact explicit memory require fewer instructional
17 sessions to learn a functional task using TEL as compared to EL.
- 18 2. Individuals with an acute stroke with impaired explicit memory require fewer instructional
19 sessions to learn a functional task using EL as compared to TEL.
- 20 3. Carry-over to a variation of the learned functional task is greater among individuals with or
21 without impaired explicit memory who succeed in learning the functional task using TEL as
22 compared to EL.

23

1 **Methods**

2

3 **Participants**

4

5 Participants in the study were 33 individuals admitted to a large rehabilitation hospital with a
6 diagnosis of acute stroke confirmed by computerized tomography, magnetic resonance imaging,
7 or clinical examination. The mean age of participants was 63 years (range of 31 to 85, SD = 12).
8 There were 18 males and 15 females, 21 with a right stroke and 12 with a left stroke. The mean
9 time post stroke onset to the start of study participation was 21 days (range = 6 to 89, SD = 19
10 days). Patients were excluded from the study if upon initial evaluation they demonstrated proper
11 technique for wheelchair set up without instruction or if they were previously taught the sock-
12 donning task. Also, patients were excluded if they did not have the physical or perceptual ability
13 to complete either task with verbal instructions due to severe weakness, unilateral neglect,
14 apraxia, or spatial deficits. In addition, subjects were excluded if aphasia was documented in the
15 medical record, if verbal instructions in English were not understood due to English not being the
16 primary language, or if a sock-donning task could not be attempted secondary to obesity or co-
17 morbid lower extremity amputation. If the patient had an expected length of stay in the hospital,
18 which was less than one week from the time of screening, the subject was excluded from the
19 study. Figure 1 demonstrates the results of the recruitment efforts for this study.

20

21 All subjects without suspected memory impairments signed a consent form approved by the
22 facility's institutional review board and their family contact provided verbal and/or written
23 consent for their participation. Subjects with suspected memory impairments signed a consent

1 form approved by the facility's institutional review board in the presence of their approved
2 family contact who also gave signed consent for participation.

3

4 Study Design

5

6 The design was a randomized crossover design. The crossover design was selected so that
7 subjects could serve as their own controls. This was important because of the heterogeneity
8 within the population and the difficulty recruiting and running large samples within an acute
9 rehabilitation setting. Each subject learned two tasks, one using the EL instructional method, and
10 one using the TEL method. Subjects were randomly distributed to groups, which varied the type
11 of instruction for each task and the order of task instruction. The Neurobehavioral Cognitive
12 Status Exam (NCSE)¹⁹ was administered to subjects upon admission to the rehabilitation
13 hospital. The four-word memory component of the NCSE was used as a screening tool to identify
14 the degree of memory impairment of subjects in the study. This test was selected because it is a
15 time-efficient screening tool commonly used in the rehabilitation setting for the assessment of
16 explicit memory. Possible scores on the memory component of the NCSE range from 0 to 12.
17 Subjects with scores of 8 or lower were considered to have impaired memory based on guidelines
18 in the manual for the NCSE¹⁹.

19

20 Task Descriptions

21

22 The functional tasks used for instruction were preparing a wheelchair for a transfer and putting
23 on a sock with a sock-donner^a. These tasks were chosen because they are commonly taught to

1 patients with acute stroke in the inpatient rehabilitation setting, are easily broken down into
2 discrete steps, can be performed even if one side of the body is completely paralyzed, and are
3 unlikely to have been learned prior to the stroke. Subjects who participated in the study were
4 asked to refrain from practicing either task during their regularly scheduled therapy sessions or
5 during their daily routine. Also, the subject's treatment team was informed of their participation
6 in the study and was asked not to teach either task. Prior to instruction in the wheelchair task,
7 patients were transferred into a standard wheelchair with bilateral brake extensions, a footplate,
8 and a button release seatbelt if the wheelchair that they used in the hospital did not have those
9 specifications. The wheelchair was positioned next to an exercise mat with the less involved side
10 adjacent to the mat. Prior to instruction in the sock-donning task, the patient's own sock was
11 removed from his or her less involved foot and the patient was issued a standard white tube sock
12 and the sock-donner. The steps of the wheelchair and sock-donning tasks are listed in Table 1.

13

14 Methods of Instruction

15

16 Detailed protocols were developed for each instructional method for each task, including
17 decision trees indicating how the instructor should respond depending on the subject's behavior.
18 For tasks taught using TEL, the subjects were permitted to make errors during the task sequence
19 but were provided with progressively more specific verbal cues to correct the errors. After the
20 first error was committed during a trial-and-error trial, the researcher told the subject an error was
21 made and asked the subject to try again to complete the step. After the second error on the same
22 step, the researcher provided a multiple-choice cue to the subject. After the third error, the
23 subject was given a directed cue to tell them what part of the body, sock donner, or wheelchair

1 needed to be addressed to complete the step. If the subject was still unable to complete the step
2 after the directed cue, the researcher provided hand-over-hand assistance with verbal cues to
3 teach the subject the correct step of the sequence. If the subject made only a verbal response or
4 did not attempt to complete the next step of the task after a fifteen second period, it was
5 considered an error and the next cue was provided. This rule structure for cueing was followed
6 until the subject completed all five steps of the task.

7

8 During EL training sessions, the subject was first instructed not to attempt to perform the next
9 step of the task unless he was confident that he was correct. The subject was told that if he was
10 uncertain, he should ask the instructing therapist to show him the correct step. The therapist
11 would then provide hand-over-hand instruction with verbal cues to complete the step. If a subject
12 started to make an error during the performance of a step, the therapist would as quickly as
13 possible stop the subject from making the error and provide hand-over-hand instruction with
14 verbal cues to perform the step correctly. This rule structure was followed until the subject
15 completed all five steps of the task.

16

17 Errors were classified as verbal errors, errors of no response, errors of action, or errors of
18 sequence. An error was coded as a verbal error when a subject provided only a verbal response
19 and did not attempt to complete the next step of the task. When a subject did not attempt to
20 complete the next step and did not make a verbal response, it was classified as an error of no
21 response. An error of action was defined as a step that was performed incorrectly while an error
22 of sequence was defined as a step that was performed out of sequence.

23

1 Procedure for Learning Sessions

2

3 At the start of each testing session for each task, the subject was first asked to correctly complete
4 the task without verbal instructions. When a subject was able to correctly complete a task on two
5 consecutive trials without any physical assistance or verbal cues and prior to any instruction on
6 that day, the subject was considered to have achieved retention. If retention was not achieved
7 after seven days of training, training was discontinued for the subject. Training was limited to
8 only seven days due to limitations in subject length of stay and the availability of data collectors
9 for extended periods of time.

10

11 If the subject was unable to successfully complete the task for two consecutive trials, instruction
12 was provided to the subject in the form of verbal and physical guidance. The instructor physically
13 moved the subject's limbs through performance of the task while providing verbal instruction.
14 The subject was then asked to try to perform the task without verbal and physical guidance. It
15 was during the subject's attempt to reproduce the performance that differential instructions and
16 feedback were given according to whether the task was being taught using TEL or EL. This
17 sequence of teaching the entire task followed by the subject being asked to reproduce the task
18 occurred twice each day for each task. A five-minute break was provided for subjects in between
19 the wheelchair and sock donning tasks.

20

21 Carry-over Testing

22

23 The day after retention was achieved, the subject was tested on a carry-over task, which was

1 similar to the original task. Carry-over of the wheelchair task was assessed using a wheelchair
2 with a different type of brakes and seatbelt. Carry-over of the sock-donning task was assessed
3 using a sock donner with a different kind of strap and degree of flexibility. During performance
4 of the carry-over tasks, the number of correct steps completed and the number and nature of
5 errors were recorded. No physical or verbal instructions were provided to subjects while
6 completing the carry-over task. If all the steps were performed correctly in the correct order, the
7 subject was considered to have successfully demonstrated carry-over.

8

9 Training and Reliability of Instructors

10

11 Patients were instructed in the wheelchair and sock donning tasks by physical and occupational
12 therapists that were employed at the rehabilitation hospital or by physical therapy students from a
13 locally affiliated graduate program. Study investigators trained the instructors/raters through the
14 use of role-playing of patient scenarios with each rater individually. Instructors had to complete a
15 competency test in which the investigators acted like different patients who had strokes.

16 Instructors were required to complete all protocols for instruction of both tasks using both
17 methods, and were required to score the “patient” performances during the instruction, retention,
18 and carry-over tasks without any errors.

19

20 After videotaping the instructional and testing sessions for the first 16 subjects, these videotapes
21 were used to assess the reliability of the instructors. Sessions that were easy to see on videotape
22 and that represented both tasks, each with both instructional methods, and included all the
23 possible types of errors during the instruction and included retention and carry-over trials were

1 dubbed onto videotape. Instructors viewed this videotape and independently scored the nature of
2 errors (which determined what follow-up instruction was to be given when teaching the task), the
3 number of steps correctly completed during the retention task, and success or failure in the carry-
4 over trials. Among instructors who had participated in data collection at least once per week at
5 the time of reliability testing, the kappa values indicated excellent reliability for scoring the
6 nature of errors ($k = 0.82$), retention trials ($k = 1.0$), and carry-over trials ($k = 1.0$). For instructors
7 who had participated in data collection less than once per week, kappa values were excellent for
8 scoring of the nature of errors ($k = 0.70$ and 0.86) and retention trials ($k = 1.0$) and excellent to
9 moderate for carry-over trials ($k = 1.0$ and 0.50).

10

11 Data Analysis

12

13 Survival analysis was used to compare the incident rate (IR) of retention for errorless versus trial-
14 and-error method in subjects with impaired memory and intact memory. The incidence rate (IR)
15 is the number of subjects who succeeded in learning the task expressed as a proportion of the
16 number of subject-days, which is the number of subjects times the number of days that subjects
17 participated in the study. A higher IR indicates a more effective method. Survival analysis was
18 selected in order to take into account subjects who did not achieve retention during the seven-day
19 testing period. An analysis that could not take these subjects into account would systematically
20 eliminate data from the least successful subjects and provide misleading results. The non-
21 parametric log-rank test for survival analysis was used due to a non-normal distribution of the
22 data.

23

1 There were imbalances in proportions of males vs. females and right versus left stroke among the
2 subgroups. While none of these variables had a significant effect by itself, the lack of
3 significance may have been due to the small sample sizes, and therefore logistic regression was
4 used to adjust for these imbalances when analyzing both the retention and the carry-over data.
5 When adjusted vs. unadjusted results were compared, the adjustments made no difference in the
6 trends seen in the data. A Wald test adjusted by logistical regression was used to compare the
7 odds ratios for success during the carry-over task for both the sock and wheelchair skills for
8 subjects trained with EL versus TEL and for subjects with intact versus impaired memory. Chi-
9 square was used to analyze the types of errors committed during learning trials in order to see if
10 there were differences between the tasks. SPSS 13 for Windows was used to do the statistical
11 analysis^b. Alpha was set at <0.05 for all analyses.

12

13 **Results**

14

15 The median number of days required to learn the wheelchair task was 2.5 days when using EL
16 and 3 days when using TEL. The median number of days required to learn the sock-donning task
17 was 3 days when using EL and 2 days when using TEL. The median memory score for all
18 subjects on the Neurobehavioral Cognitive Status Examination was 9 with a range from 3 to 12.
19 Fourteen subjects were classified as having impaired memory while 19 subjects were classified
20 as having intact memory.

21

22 Eighty two percent of subjects (27/33) were able to learn the sock donning task while 91% of
23 subjects (30/33) were able to learn the wheelchair task. Table 2 presents the incidence rates (IR)

1 of the errorless vs. trial-and-error method for subjects who had impaired vs. intact memory. No
2 significant differences were found in the effectiveness of the two instructional methods for
3 enabling patients with different levels of memory to achieve retention of these functional skills.
4 However, Figure 2 illustrates differences in the trends in the effectiveness of the two learning
5 methods for the two tasks across memory status.

6

7 The sock-donning carry-over task was successfully completed by 41% of subjects who attempted
8 it (11/27). For the sock-donning task, the method of instruction significantly affected the
9 likelihood of a subject successfully achieving carry-over (OR = 19.92, $p = 0.03$, 95% CI 1.34 to
10 296) with TEL significantly improving the odds of carry-over. The memory status of the subjects
11 (intact vs. impaired) did not significantly affect the likelihood of a subject successfully achieving
12 carry-over on the sock-donning task (OR = 0.59, $p = 0.62$, 95% CI 0.07 to 4.69). The wheelchair
13 carry-over task was successfully completed by 47% of subjects who attempted it (14/30). The
14 method of instruction (EL vs. TEL) did not significantly affect the likelihood of a subject
15 successfully achieving carry-over on the wheelchair task (OR = 0.86, $p = 0.89$, 95% CI 0.12 to
16 5.98). Subjects with intact memory tended to be more likely to achieve carry-over than subjects
17 with impaired memory (OR = 0.21, $p = 0.09$, 95% CI 0.03 to 1.30). See Figure 3.

18

19 During retention trials, there was no significant difference between the wheelchair task and the
20 sock-donning task in the proportion of verbal errors (17 errors and 15 errors respectively; $(.05)X^2$
21 $(1) = 0.101$; $p = 0.750$) or errors of sequence (117 errors and 108 errors respectively; $(.05)X^2$ $(1) =$
22 0.284 ; $p = 0.594$) that occurred. However, there were significant differences between the
23 wheelchair task and the sock-donning task in the proportion of errors of action (79 errors and 256

1 errors respectively; $(.05)X^2_{(1)} = 103.35$; $p < 0.001$) and errors of no response (184 errors and 42
2 errors respectively; $(.05)X^2_{(1)} = 86.73$; $p < 0.001$).

3

4 **Discussion**

5

6 The purpose of this study was to compare the effectiveness of EL and TEL for teaching ADL's
7 during acute stroke rehabilitation to subjects with or without explicit memory impairments. To
8 our knowledge, no studies have examined the effectiveness of EL and TEL in patients with acute
9 stroke using functional tasks commonly taught in rehabilitation. The first two hypotheses of our
10 investigation were that subjects with intact explicit memory would be able to learn a functional
11 task faster using TEL while subjects with impaired explicit memory would be able to learn a task
12 faster using EL. The present study did not find significant differences in the effectiveness of TEL
13 compared to EL for teaching functional tasks to subjects with an acute stroke with intact or
14 impaired explicit memory. An unexpected finding was the apparent interaction effect between
15 the tasks and the instructional method. Further research is needed to determine whether different
16 functional skills lend themselves better to different instructional methods.

17

18 The third hypothesis was that successful carry-over to a variation of the learned functional task
19 would be greater among individuals who learned the functional task using a trial-and-error
20 approach as compared to an errorless approach. The present investigation found that subjects
21 who were taught sock-donning using TEL were significantly more likely to successfully
22 complete a carry-over task as compared to subjects trained using EL, when differences in explicit
23 memory were controlled for using logistic regression. While improved carry-over of new skills

1 after training with TEL compared to EL has been reported in subjects without neurological
2 dysfunction¹⁻³, there has been little research addressing the issue of carry-over for populations
3 with memory impairment⁹. We believe that this is the first investigation to report a significant
4 advantage in carry-over in subjects with acute stroke learning a functional task using TEL rather
5 than EL.

6

7 No significant difference was found in carry-over of the wheelchair task for subjects who learned
8 using TEL versus EL. For the wheelchair task, carry-over appeared more dependent on whether
9 the subject had impaired memory than on the method of instruction (see figure 3), although the
10 effect of memory impairment did not achieve significance ($p=.09$). Further research is needed to
11 explore the relationships between method of instruction and memory ability for individuals with
12 acute stroke learning different types of tasks.

13

14 The patterns that emerged in both learning and carry-over for these subjects with acute stroke
15 were different for the two tasks (see figures 2 and 3), although the nonparametric statistics
16 required for this study did not allow us to test for a significant interaction effect. In designing this
17 study, an attempt was made to select equivalent functional tasks taught in acute rehabilitation so
18 that each subject could use a different method for each task and serve as his or her own control.
19 Setting up for a wheelchair transfer and using a sock-donner were selected due to similarities in
20 the tasks with respect to the number of steps involved, the novelty of the task for subjects, and
21 the ability of the tasks to be performed in subjects with motor impairments. So what differences
22 between these two tasks might account for the different relationships between explicit memory
23 ability and optimal learning methods?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

The nature of the errors committed by subjects while learning the different tasks was analyzed with the hope of gaining insight into whether there were in fact differences in how the two tasks were learned. It was found that when learning the wheelchair task, subjects were more likely not to attempt a response. However while learning sock-donning, subjects were more likely to commit errors of action. It may be that errors of action occurred more frequently during sock-donning because perceptual judgment was required to perform some of the steps correctly, such as judging how far to pull the sock down, and how to position the sock-donner on the floor. Evans et al¹¹ suggested that EL helps people with memory impairments when the task they are performing lends itself to the use of implicit memory. Perhaps the sock-donning task did not lend itself as well to implicit memory, and that is why EL did not seem to benefit subjects with impaired explicit memory as they tried to learn the sock-donning task. If the nature of the task is an important factor determining which learning method will be more effective in achieving retention and carry-over, then additional research is required to identify what features of tasks are critical to know when choosing the optimal learning method.

One of the strengths of this study is its external validity for health professionals working in rehabilitation settings. Kessels and deHaan⁹ conducted a meta-analysis concluding that errorless learning is effective for amnesic patients, however, they identified as a limitation of the meta-analysis that few studies looked at the effectiveness of errorless learning in “real-world” settings. Many of the studies included in the meta-analysis used artificial tasks such as word lists or recognition of pictures of faces. Our study used tasks that are actually taught in acute rehabilitation and these tasks were taught to patients during their acute rehabilitation stay. We

1 narrowed the population to people with stroke, and consequently, our subjects had less severe
2 deficits in explicit memory than the subjects typically examined in studies of EL. While Tailby
3 and Haslam²⁰ found that EL was superior to TEL for training word lists in subjects with various
4 degrees of memory impairment, many EL studies involve only patients with severe explicit
5 memory deficits and its effectiveness with less severely impaired individuals is less established.

6

7 Testing the effectiveness of EL versus TEL in a natural acute rehabilitation setting was a strength
8 with respect to external validity, but it resulted in a number of limitations. Because our subjects
9 were enrolled during their acute rehabilitation stage, results may have been affected by
10 improvement in our subjects' cognitive status over the course of training due to rehabilitation and
11 natural recovery occurring in individuals with acute stroke. In addition, by studying subjects
12 undergoing acute stroke rehabilitation, our investigation was limited in the duration of training
13 sessions due to subject fatigue and time commitments due to therapy. Patients were only
14 available to participate in the research between four and five PM, after a full day of
15 rehabilitation. Patients and staff are very busy during acute rehabilitation, and a number of
16 subjects were lost because there was not time to complete their NCSE testing or because subjects
17 found they were too tired to participate and they dropped out. Subjects were also lost due to early
18 discharge for medical complications. The limit of seven days of training for each subject required
19 due to anticipated hospital length of stay limited our ability to measure potential learning that
20 could have occurred with more than seven days of training. While these factors were limitations
21 in determining the efficacy of EL versus TEL, they represent the reality that patients experience
22 when learning skills during acute rehabilitation.

23

1 **Conclusion**

2 The present investigation suggests that for individuals with acute stroke, the effectiveness of EL
3 compared to TEL may be dependent on the nature of the task to be learned. The TEL approach
4 significantly improved carry-over of learning of the sock-donning task compared to EL, while
5 there was no difference in carry-over of the wheelchair task between learning methods.

6 Additional research is needed to identify the best approach for teaching different activities of
7 daily living and facilitating carry-over of learning for individuals with acute stroke.

8

9 **Acknowledgments**

10 We would like to thank the subjects of this investigation who were generous with their time
11 while undergoing acute inpatient stroke rehabilitation. Also, we would like to acknowledge the
12 physical and occupational therapists from MossRehab and the physical therapy students from
13 Thomas Jefferson University who participated as data collectors throughout the study.

14

15

16 **References**

17 [1] D.C.Prather, Trial and error learning versus errorless learning: training, transfer, and stress,
18 *Am J Psych* **84** (1971), 377-86.

19 [2] R. Singer and L. Gaines, Effect of prompted and trial and error learning on transfer
20 performance of a serial motor task, *Am Ed Res J* **12** (1975), 395-404.

21 [3] R.N. Singer and D. Pease, A comparison of discovery learning and guided instructional
22 strategies on motor skill learning, retention, and transfer, *Res Quart* **47** (1976), 788-796.

- 1 [4] P.G. Walsh, Teaching colour discrimination to the mentally handicapped, *Irish J Psychol* **7**
2 (1985), 36-49.
- 3 [5] L. Clare, B.A. Wilson, G. Carter, K. Breen, A. Gosses, and J.R. Hodges, Intervening with
4 everyday memory problems in dementia of Alzheimer type: An errorless learning approach, *J*
5 *Clin & Exp Neuropsychology* **22** (2000),132-146.
- 6 [6] R.E. O'Carroll, H.H.Russell, S.M. Lawrie, and E.C. Johnstone. Errorless learning and the
7 cognitive rehabilitation of memory impaired schizophrenic patients, *Psycholog Med* **29** (1999),
8 105-112.
- 9 [7] A. Baddeley, and B.A. Wilson, When implicit learning fails: amnesia and the problem of
10 error elimination, *Neuropsychologia* **32** (1994), 53-68.
- 11 [8] B.A. Wilson, A. Baddeley, and J. Evans, Errorless learning in the rehabilitation of memory
12 impaired people, *Neuropsych Rehab* **4** (1994), 307-326.
- 13 [9] R.P.C. Kessels, and E.H.F. de Haan, Implicit learning in memory rehabilitation: a meta-
14 analysis on errorless learning and vanishing cues methods, *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol* **25** (2003),
15 805-14.
- 16 [10] N.M. Hunkin, E.J. Squires, A.J. Parkin, and J.A. Tidy, Are the benefits of errorless learning
17 dependent on implicit memory? *Neuropsychologia* **36** (1998), 25-36.
- 18 [11] J.J. Evans, B.A. Wilson, U. Schuri, J. Andrade, A. Baddeley, and O. Bruna O, T. Canavan,
19 S. Della Sala, R. Green, R. Laaksonen, L. Lorenzi, and I. Taussik, A comparison of “errorless”
20 and “trial-and-error” learning methods for teaching individuals with acquired memory deficits.
21 *Neuropsych Rehab* **10** (2000), 67-101.
- 22 [12] A.J. Orrell, F.F. Eves, and R.S.W. Masters, Implicit motor learning of a balancing task, *Gait*
23 *and Posture*. **23** (2006), 9-16.

- 1 [13] P.S. Pohl, J.M. McDowd, D.L. Filion, L.G. Richards, and W. Stiers, Implicit learning of a
2 perceptual-motor skill after stroke, *Phys Ther.* **81** (2001),1780-9.
- 3 [14] L.A. Boyd and C.J. Winstein, Impact of explicit information on implicit motor-sequence
4 learning following middle cerebral artery stroke, *Phys Ther.* **83** (2003), 976-89.
- 5 [15] T. Pohjasvaara, T. Erkinjuntti, R. Vataja and M. Kaste M, Dementia three months after
6 stroke, *Stroke* **28** (1997), 785-792.
- 7 [16] K.J. Sullivan and C.J. Winstein, Actions speak louder than words: a case study
8 demonstrating declarative but not procedural memory deficits, *Neurology Report.* **21** (1997),49.
- 9 [17] E.S. Gollin and P. Savoy, Fading procedures and conditional discrimination in children, *J*
10 *Exp Analysis Beh* **11** (1968), 43-51.
- 11 [18] E.L.Glisky, Acquisition and transfer of declarative and procedural knowledge by memory-
12 impaired patients: a computer data-entry task, *Neuropsychologia* **30** (1992), 899-910.
- 13 [19] The Northern California Neurobehavioral Group, Cognistat: The Neurobehavioral Cognitive
14 Status Examination. Fairfax, CA.: The Northern California Neurobehavioral Group. 1995.
- 15 [20] R. Tailby and C. Haslam, An investigation of errorless learning in memory-impaired
16 patients: improving the technique and clarifying theory, *Neuropsychologia* **41** (2003),1230-40.

17

18

Suppliers

19

- a. North Coast Medical, 18305 Sutter Boulevard, Morgan Hill, CA 95037-2845, U.S.A.

20

21

- b. SPSS 11.5 for Windows. SPSS, Inc. Headquarters, 233 S. Wacker Drive, 11th floor,

22

Chicago, Illinois, 60606.

23

1

<i>Step Number</i>	Wheelchair Task	Sock-Donning Task
1	Lock brakes on stronger side	Place sock-donner between legs
2	Lock brakes on weaker side	Pull sock just to edge of sock-donner with toe of sock tight
3	Remove weaker foot from footplate	Use straps to lower sock-donner to floor with open side facing up
4	Lift up footplate	Slip foot into sock-donner and pull straps until the sock is on foot
5	Release seatbelt	Using the straps, remove the sock-donner from the foot

2

3 Table 1: Steps of the wheelchair and sock-donning tasks.

1

Task	Impaired or Intact	Errorless		Trial & Error		P value
		N	IR	N	IR	
Wheelchair Preparation	Impaired	6	.462	8	.207	.21
	Intact	10	.250	9	.429	.11
Sock-Donning	Impaired	8	.259	6	.333	.39
	Intact	9	.318	10	.267	.74

2

3 Table 2: Incidence Rates (IR), numbers of subjects in subgroups (N), and p values when
4 effectiveness of EL is compared to effectiveness of TEL for each task for subjects with impaired
5 and intact memory.

1 **Figure Captions**

2 Figure 1: Study recruitment.

3 Figure 2: Effectiveness of the two learning methods for different levels of memory for the two
4 different tasks.

5 Figure 3: Percentages of subjects who achieved carry over for the two learning methods for
6 different levels of memory for the two tasks.









