

Patients' and Clinicians' Perceptions of Motivational Factors in Rehabilitation

Authors:

Kazuaki Oyake, PT, PhD,^{1,2} Katsuya Yamauchi, MD, PhD,³ Seigo Inoue, PT, MSc,² Keita Sue, PT, MSc,⁴ Hironobu Ota, PT,⁵ Junichi Ikuta, OT, MSc,⁶ Toshiki Ema, PT,⁷ Tomohiko Ochiai, PT,⁸ Makoto Hasui, MD,⁹ Yuya Hirata, PT, BSc,¹⁰ Ayaka Hida, PT,¹¹ Kenta Yamamoto, PT, BSc,¹² Yoshihiro Kawai, OT,¹³ Kiyoto Shiba, PT,¹⁴ Akihito Atsumi, OT,¹⁵ Tetsuyuki Nagafusa, MD, PhD,³ Satoshi Tanaka, PhD¹⁶

Affiliations:

- ¹ Department of Physical Therapy, School of Health Sciences, Shinshu University, Nagano, Japan
- ² Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Tokyo Bay Rehabilitation Hospital, Chiba, Japan
- ³ Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Hamamatsu University School of Medicine, Shizuoka, Japan
- ⁴ Department of Rehabilitation, Kekeyu-Misayama Rehabilitation Center Kekeyu Hospital, Nagano, Japan
- ⁵ Rehabilitation Center, Aichi Medical University Medical Center, Aichi, Japan
- ⁶ Division of Occupational Therapy, Department of Rehabilitation, Nakaizu Rehabilitation Center, Shizuoka, Japan
- ⁷ Department of Physical Therapy, Suzukake Central Hospital, Shizuoka, Japan
- ⁸ Rehabilitation Center, Juzen Memorial Hospital, Shizuoka, Japan
- ⁹ Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, JA Shizuoka Kohseiren Enshu Hospital, Shizuoka, Japan
- ¹⁰ Department of Rehabilitation, Suzukake Healthcare Hospital, Shizuoka, Japan
- ¹¹ Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Kakegawa Higashi Hospital, Shizuoka, Japan
- ¹² Department of Rehabilitation, Toyoda Eisei Hospital, Shizuoka, Japan
- ¹³ Department of Rehabilitation, Tenryu Suzukake Hospital, Shizuoka, Japan
- ¹⁴ Department of Rehabilitation Medicine, Hamakita Sakuradai Hospital, Shizuoka, Japan
- ¹⁵ Department of Rehabilitation, Hamamatsu-Kita Hospital, Shizuoka, Japan
- ¹⁶ Laboratory of Psychology, Hamamatsu University School of Medicine, Shizuoka, Japan

Corresponding author:

Satoshi Tanaka, PhD

Laboratory of Psychology, Hamamatsu University School of Medicine

1-20-1 Handayama, Higashi-ku, Hamamatsu, Shizuoka, 431-3192, Japan

Tel: +81-53-435-2387 Fax: +81-53-435-2387

E-mail: tanakas@hama-med.ac.jp

Key Points

Question: What are the similarities and differences between patients' and clinicians' perceptions of the relative importance of factors motivating patients for rehabilitation?

Findings: In this multicenter descriptive cross-sectional survey of 479 patients and 401 clinicians, the three most endorsed motivational factors—realization of recovery goal setting, and practice related to the patient's experience and lifestyle—were identical for patients and clinicians. However, patients had more diverse preferences for motivational factors than clinicians.

Meaning: In addition to utilizing the three core motivational factors, rehabilitation clinicians should consider individual patient preferences when determining which motivational strategies to use for enhancing patient-centered care.

Abstract

Importance: Patient motivation is an important determinant of rehabilitation outcomes. Differences in patients' and clinicians' perceptions of motivational factors can potentially hinder patient-centered care.

Objective: To compare patients' and clinicians' perceptions of the most important factors in motivating patients for rehabilitation.

Design: This multicenter descriptive cross-sectional survey was conducted from January to March 2022.

Setting: Thirteen hospitals with a convalescent rehabilitation ward.

Participants: Patients with neurological or orthopedic disorders undergoing inpatient rehabilitation and clinicians, including physicians, physical therapists, occupational therapists, and speech-language-hearing therapists, were selected purposively based on the inclusion criteria.

Main Outcomes and Measures: Patients and clinicians were asked to choose the most important factor from a list of potential motivational factors. The main outcome was patients' and clinicians' perceptions of the relative importance of various motivational factors for rehabilitation.

Results: We obtained data from 479 patients and 401 clinicians. Response rates in the patient and

clinician surveys were 92.1% and 62.2%, respectively. The most common primary reasons for patients' hospitalizations were stroke (45.5%) and fracture (42.2%). Approximately half of the clinicians were physical therapists (49.9%). "Realization of recovery," "goal setting," and "practice related to the patient's experience and lifestyle" were the three factors most frequently selected as most important by both patients and clinicians, chosen by 10.4%–26.5% of patients and 9.5%–36.7% of clinicians. Only five were rated as most important by 5% of clinicians; however, nine factors were selected by 5% of patients. Of these nine motivational factors, "medical information" (odds ratio: 5.19; 95% confidence interval: 2.24–11.60) and "control of task difficulty" (odds ratio: 2.70; 95% confidence interval: 1.32–5.80) were selected by a significantly higher proportion of patients than clinicians.

Conclusions and Relevance: The three most frequently endorsed motivational factors were identical for patients and clinicians. The preferences of patients were more diverse than those of clinicians, and some motivational factors were preferred by patients over clinicians. Therefore, when determining motivational strategies, rehabilitation clinicians should consider individual patient preferences in addition to utilizing the core motivational factors supported by both parties.

INTRODUCTION

For patients with physical disabilities, rehabilitation programs including physical activity and exercise have beneficial effects on several health outcomes, such as improved physical function and enhanced health-related quality of life.¹ However, physical activity levels are lower among patients with physical disabilities than among those without disabilities.¹⁻³ As a lack of motivation is often the main barrier to physical activity and exercise training,⁴⁻¹⁰ motivation is frequently considered to be a determinant of rehabilitation outcomes.¹¹⁻¹⁵ Thus, various strategies, such as motivational interviewing and behavioral therapies, are used to enhance patient motivation for rehabilitation with positive motor and functional outcomes for individuals with a range of neurological and orthopedic disorders.¹⁶⁻²⁶ Motivation has been defined as the “mental function that produces the incentive to act; the conscious or unconscious driving force for action.”²⁷ Social factors, such as clinicians’ attitudes towards the patient and the patient’s social support networks, in combination with the personality or clinical characteristics of the individual patient have been considered possible determinants of motivation for rehabilitation.^{4-10,28} For example, the opportunities to meet other people who have suffered strokes and group exercise have been reported as perceived motivators of physical activity in individuals with strokes.⁴ Conversely, our previous Delphi study indicated that rehabilitation experts rated “group rehabilitation” as neither effective nor ineffective in motivating patients with strokes.²⁹ Based on these findings, we hypothesized that patients and clinicians would to some extent differ in their perceptions of the relative importance of factors that motivate patients for rehabilitation. The differences in patients’ and

clinicians’ perceptions of motivational factors could potentially hinder patient-centered care.³⁰ Patient-centered care is a core principle of evidence-based medical practice and is more likely to positively affect rehabilitation outcomes, such as improvements in functional performance and quality of life.^{31,32} However, to the best of our knowledge, no studies have directly compared patients’ preferences regarding motivational factors with those of clinicians. Therefore, the current study aims to compare patients’ and clinicians’ perceptions of the most important factors in motivating patients for rehabilitation.

METHODS

Study design

We employed a multicenter descriptive cross-sectional design. This study protocol was approved by the appropriate ethics committee at the Hamamatsu University School of Medicine (approval number: 21-233). Informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Participants

Patients hospitalized in a convalescent rehabilitation ward were recruited through purposive sampling based on the inclusion criteria from 12 hospitals in Japan. In convalescent rehabilitation wards, intensive rehabilitation programs are provided during hospitalization to improve inpatients’ abilities to perform activities of daily living.^{33,34} All rehabilitation inpatients meeting the inclusion criteria were referred to the research team by a researcher at each hospital. Inclusion criteria were as follows: being aged 20–90 years, having an established diagnosis of neurological or orthopedic disorders as the primary reason for hospitalization, having undergone an inpatient rehabilitation program for at least four

weeks at the time of study participation, and adequate communication skills to complete the questionnaire. Demographic and clinical data, such as primary reasons for hospitalization and sex, were obtained from patient medical records. Clinicians were also purposively sampled from 13 hospitals in Japan. They included physicians, physical therapists, occupational therapists, or speech-language-hearing therapists working in a convalescent rehabilitation ward. Patients were recruited as participants from 12 of these hospitals.

The sample size calculation for participants was based on epidemiological data from the Kaifukuki Rehabilitation Ward Association.³⁵ Totally, 38,363 patients with neurological and orthopedic diseases were admitted to convalescent rehabilitation wards. Of them, 18,870 patients had neurological diseases and 19,493 had orthopedic diseases. Similarly, the total number of rehabilitation clinicians working in the convalescent rehabilitation wards was estimated at 66,033, with 30,911 physical therapists, 18,700 occupational therapists, 8,843 physicians, and 7,579 speech-language-hearing therapists. Based on these population sizes and using a margin of error of 5% at a 95% confidence interval (CI), the estimated minimum sample size was 381 patients and 382 clinicians for this study.³⁶

Questionnaire content

The first author initially developed a list of potential factors involved in increasing patient motivation for rehabilitation based on previous findings.^{25,29,37} Two researchers (K.S. and S.T.) reviewed the items for clarity, relevance, and topic coverage.³⁸ We conducted a pilot test with a small sample of patients and clinicians to determine whether participants consistently understood the meaning of each item.³⁹ Based on feedback from

the pilot test, minor grammatical changes were made. Consequently, we prepared a list of 15 potential motivational factors for rehabilitation (Table 1). All survey data were captured anonymously for both patients and clinicians.

We administered the patient questionnaire in an interview style, and patients took part in a face-to-face structured interview with a researcher at each hospital. Patients were presented with a list of 16 items, including “other” in addition to the 15 potential motivational factors. The structured interview included two questions. In the first question, patients were asked to select the three most important factors for facilitating their engagement in rehabilitation from the list. In the second question, they were instructed to choose the most important factor from the three factors they selected in the first question. Participants who selected “other” were asked to respond to an open-ended question in which they proposed additional motivational factors. The interview lasted less than five minutes. The patient survey was available in paper form. In each hospital, one researcher was responsible for administering the survey. Following the end of the recruitment period, all completed questionnaires were mailed to the first author.

Table 1. List of potential factors in motivating patients for rehabilitation

Potential motivational factors	Specific examples
Active listening	Clinicians listen to patients carefully while showing interest, such as conducting motivational interviews to strengthen patients' sense of motivation and commitment to change.
A suitable rehabilitation environment	Clinicians provide a suitable rehabilitation environment so that patients can comfortably engage in rehabilitation practices.
Control of task difficulty	Clinicians gradually increase the difficulty of a task according to the ability of the patient.
Enjoyable rehabilitation programs	Clinicians support patients to enjoy themselves during the rehabilitation process by applying their preferences to the practice tasks, engaging in pleasant conversation with them, and providing a practice task with game-like properties.
Feedback regarding the results of the practice	Clinicians provide verbal and/or visual feedback to their patients regarding their progress and results of the rehabilitation practices.
Goal setting	Clinicians set rehabilitation goals for individual patients and provide practice tasks that are related to each patient's rehabilitation goal.
Group rehabilitation	Clinicians offer a group rehabilitation program.
Medical information	Patients receive medical information regarding topics such as the necessity of practice and the nature of recovery and what patients can expect in their lives at home.
Practice related to the patient's experience and lifestyle	Patients engage in practice tasks that they can complete using their previous experience.
Praise	Clinicians provide patients with positive evaluations and encouragement.
Presence of family members during rehabilitation	The patient's family members are present during rehabilitation.
Realization of recovery	Patients realize their own recovery, for example, (1) by using a diary or graph that helps to track their progress and (2) by acquiring new skills through rehabilitation practices.

Rehabilitation programs with variations	Clinicians provide variations of rehabilitation programs.
Respect for self-determination	Clinicians respect patients' self-determination and encourage them to consider how they could successfully perform the provided practice tasks.
Rewards for effort	Clinicians propose conditions for exchange to their patients. For example, clinicians promise that patients can do their favorite practice task after completing their least favorite practice task.

Note. Potential motivational factors are arranged in alphabetical order.

We used a cloud-based questionnaire and survey software (Google Forms tool, Google LLC, Mountain View, CA, USA) to develop the clinician survey and to collect data. To publicize the study, the researcher at each hospital distributed leaflets to clinicians who met the inclusion criteria. The leaflets contained a brief description of the study and a hyperlink to the survey. Clinicians could voluntarily access the survey website using their own laptops, tablets, or smartphones. The survey included two questions and a few demographic characteristics. In the first question, clinicians were asked to select the three most important factors for increasing patient adherence to rehabilitation programs from the list. In the second question, they were also instructed to choose the most important factor out of the three they selected in the first question. Clinicians who completed the survey were reimbursed for their participation with a 500-yen gift card (approximately USD \$3.50).

Statistical analysis

The primary outcome of the study was patients' and clinicians' top choice for the most important motivational factor. The secondary outcome included the three factors that they selected in the first question. We used descriptive statistics to summarize the demographic characteristics of patients and clinicians and their

responses to the two survey questions. Because we used a margin of error of 5% to determine the sample size of this study, motivational factors selected by more than 5% of participants in each of the patient and clinician groups were considered to constitute their preferences. We compared patients' responses with those of clinicians by calculating odds ratios (ORs) with 95% CIs. When there was a null value in one of the four cells, we added 0.5 to all cells.⁴⁰ In addition, a multiple logistic regression analysis was used to examine the association between patients' choices regarding the most important motivational factor with their demographic characteristics, including the primary reason for hospitalization, sex, age ≥ 65 years or not,⁴¹ and the length of hospital stay. Statistical analyses were performed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software version 27.0 (International Business Machines Corp., NY, USA).

RESULTS

Participants' characteristics

The survey was conducted from January to March 2022. Of the total of 520 patients who met the inclusion criteria, 23 refused to participate in this study. Consequently, we obtained data from 479 patients. In addition, of the 645 clinicians who met the inclusion criteria, 401 responded. Thus, the response rates of the patient and clinician surveys were 92.1% and 62.2%, respectively. The demographic characteristics of patients and clinicians are presented in Table 2. The primary reason for hospitalization of most patients was either stroke (45.5%) or fracture (42.2%). Approximately half of the clinicians were physical therapists (49.9%).

Comparison of patients' and clinicians' perceptions of the most important factors for motivating patients to engage in rehabilitation

The distribution of patients' and clinicians' answers, when asked to report their top choice regarding the most important motivational factor, is shown in Figure 1. The three most frequently selected motivational factors were identical for patients and clinicians: "realization of recovery," "goal setting," and "practice related to the patient's experience and lifestyle," chosen by 10.4%–26.5% of patients and 9.5%–36.7% of clinicians.

Although nine motivational factors were selected by more than 5% of the patients, only five were chosen by more than 5% of the clinicians, indicating that patients exhibited more varied preferences for motivational factors than clinicians (Figure 1). The ORs comparing patients' top choices with those of clinicians are shown in Figure 2. Of the nine motivational factors selected by more than 5% of patients, "medical information" (OR: 5.19; 95% CI: 2.24–11.60) and "control of task difficulty" (OR: 2.70; 95% CI: 1.32–5.80) were chosen by a significantly higher proportion of patients than clinicians.

Comparison of patients' and clinicians' perceptions of the three most important motivational factors

The distribution of patients' and clinicians' answers, when asked to choose the three most important factors among 15 potential motivational factors, is shown in Figure 3. Twelve patients (2.5%) selected "other" as one of the three most important motivational factors. Additional motivational factors proposed by patients are shown in Table 3. Similar to the results on the motivational factors perceived as the most important, the three most frequently endorsed motivational factors were identical for patients and clinicians: "realization of recovery," "goal setting," and "practice related to the patient's experience and lifestyle." These factors were chosen by 32.4%–47.4% of the patients and 38.2%–59.4% of the clinicians.

The ORs comparing patients' choices with those of clinicians for the first question of the survey are shown in Figure 4. A significantly higher proportion of patients than clinicians rated "a suitable rehabilitation environment" (OR: 6.24; 95% CI: 3.14–12.42), "rehabilitation programs with variations" (OR: 5.55; 95% CI: 2.51–12.77), "respect for self-determination" (OR: 3.56; 95% CI: 1.93–6.58), "control of task difficulty" (OR: 2.22; 95% CI: 1.57–3.15), and "medical information" (OR: 2.05; 95% CI: 1.45–2.95), as important.

Table 2. Characteristics of participants

Variable	Value
Patients (n = 479)	
Primary reason for hospitalization	
Stroke	218 (45.5)
Fracture	202 (42.2)
Spinal cord injury	24 (5.0)
Amputation	8 (1.7)
Arthritic disorders	8 (1.7)
Traumatic brain injury	8 (1.7)
Neuromuscular disorders	5 (1.0)
Brain and spinal cord tumors	4 (0.8)
Others	2 (0.4)
Sex	
Female	266 (55.5)
Male	213 (44.5)
Age	79 [70–84]
Time since the onset of primary disease, days	70.50 [57.00–97.25]
Length of hospital stay, days	42.00 [33.00–63.00]
Clinicians (n = 401)	
Professional category	
Physical therapist	200 (49.9)
Occupational therapist	142 (35.4)
Speech-language-hearing therapist	37 (9.2)
Physician	22 (5.5)
Sex	
Male	214 (53.4)
Female	187 (46.6)
Years of clinical experience	5 [3–11]

Values are presented as number (%) and median [interquartile range].





Figure 1. Distributions of patients' (A) and clinicians' (B) answers when asked to report their top choice for the most important motivational factor. Motivational factors are arranged in descending order by the percentage of participants who selected each factor as the most important. The vertical dashed line represents 5% of participants.




Figure 2. Comparison of patients' and clinicians' perceptions of the most important factors motivating patients for rehabilitation. Motivational factors are arranged in ascending order regarding the value of the odds ratio. Filled diamonds and horizontal bars represent the odds ratio and 95% confidence intervals, respectively.

Associations between patients' choices regarding the most important motivational factors and their demographic characteristics

In patients with stroke and those with fracture (n = 420), who made up the majority of patient participants (87.7%), we evaluated the associations between patients' choices regarding the most important motivational factor and their demographic characteristics. Most patients were those with stroke (51.9%), female (57.1%), and aged ≥ 65 years (84.3%). The median length of hospital stay was 43 days (interquartile range, 34–

64 days). The results of the multiple logistic regression analysis are shown in Table 4. A significantly higher proportion of patients aged < 65 years old, compared with those aged ≥ 65 years old, rated “goal setting” (OR: 0.46; 95% CI: 0.22–0.93) and “realization of recovery” (OR: 0.53; 95% CI: 0.29–0.97) as the most important factor. Additionally, patients with shorter hospital stay lengths were significantly more likely to choose “medical information” as the most important factor (OR: 0.97; 95% CI: 0.94–1.00).




Figure 3. Distribution of patients' (A) and clinicians' (B) answers when asked to choose the three most important items among 15 potential motivational factors. Motivational factors are arranged in descending order by the percentage of patients who selected each item as one of the three most important factors. The vertical dashed line represents 5% of participants.

Table 3. Additional factors motivating patients to engage in rehabilitation proposed by patients

Motivational factors	N
A good relationship with therapists	2
Clinician's efforts to help me	2
Encouragement from therapists	1
Explanation of my expected length of hospitalization	1
Good blood pressure in the morning	1
Improvement in my abilities	1
My willingness	1
Nothing in particular	2
Pleasant massage	1

The reported motivational factors are arranged in alphabetical order. The N column denotes the number of participants.




Figure 4. Comparison of patients' and clinicians' perceptions of the three most important factors motivating patients for rehabilitation. Motivational factors are arranged in ascending order regarding the value of the odds ratio. Filled diamonds and horizontal bars represent the odds ratio and 95% confidence intervals, respectively.

Table 4. Associations between patients' choices regarding the most important motivational factor and their demographic characteristics in patients with stroke and in those with fracture

Potential motivational factors	N	Stroke*	Male†	≥ 65 years of age‡	Length of hospital stay
Realization of recovery	108	0.80 (0.47–1.34)	1.09 (0.67–1.78)	0.53 (0.29–0.97)	1.01 (1.00–1.01)
Goal setting	65	0.66 (0.35–1.25)	0.79 (0.43–1.44)	0.46 (0.22–0.93)	1.01 (1.00–1.01)
Practice related to the patient's experience and lifestyle	44	1.21 (0.59–2.51)	1.06 (0.54–2.10)	3.50 (1.00–12.27)	1.01 (1.00–1.02)
Feedback regarding the results of the practice	35	0.82 (0.36–1.85)	0.87 (0.40–1.91)	0.60 (0.23–1.55)	0.99 (0.97–1.01)
Medical information	27	0.85 (0.34–2.12)	0.79 (0.32–1.94)	1.90 (0.41–8.87)	0.97 (0.94–1.00)
Praise	27	1.21 (0.48–3.01)	0.54 (0.22–1.34)	1.01 (0.97–1.05)	1.00 (0.98–1.01)
Control of task difficulty	23	1.42 (0.55–3.63)	1.10 (0.44–2.76)	4.87 (0.62–38.24)	0.99 (0.97–1.01)
Enjoyable rehabilitation programs	20	1.17 (0.41–3.30)	0.66 (0.24–1.83)	1.09 (0.29–4.15)	1.01 (0.99–1.02)
Active listening	18	1.38 (0.46–4.16)	1.67 (0.60–4.65)	2.00 (0.43–9.35)	1.00 (0.98–1.02)
Presence of family members during rehabilitation	10	0.69 (0.16–2.94)	2.52 (0.63–9.99)	1.99 (0.23–17.20)	1.00 (0.98–1.03)

Respect for self-determination	9	7.40 (0.82–66.80)	2.76 (0.52–14.70)	1.39 (0.27–7.23)	0.97 (0.93–1.01)
A suitable rehabilitation environment	9	1.10 (0.25–4.85)	0.80 (0.18–3.55)	<i>Not estimable</i>	1.00 (0.97–1.03)
Group rehabilitation	9	1.07 (0.23–4.97)	0.30 (0.05–1.70)	0.41 (0.07–2.40)	0.98 (0.95–1.02)
Rehabilitation programs with variations	7	0.66 (0.11–3.85)	1.35 (0.27–6.74)	<i>Not estimable</i>	1.01 (0.98–1.04)
Rewards for effort	7	<i>Not estimable</i>	<i>Not estimable</i>	3.08 (0.36–26.63)	0.99 (0.96–1.02)

The potential motivational factors are arranged in descending order by the number of participants who selected each factor. The N column denotes the number of participants who selected the relevant item. Values are presented as odds ratio (95% confidence interval). The odds ratio values marked in bold show a significant association between patients' choice and demographic characteristics. *Not estimable* indicates that odds ratio was not estimated because there were no patients who corresponded to the reference group.

* Reference group is patients with fracture.

† Reference group is female patients.

‡ Reference group is patients < 65 years of age.

DISCUSSION

To the best of our knowledge, the present study is the first to investigate the similarities and differences between patients' and clinicians' perceptions of the most important factors for motivating patients to engage in rehabilitation. The three motivational factors most frequently endorsed by patients were identical to those endorsed by clinicians. Furthermore, patients had more diverse preferences for motivational factors than clinicians. These findings broaden our understanding of motivation in patients-centered rehabilitation and may provide clinicians with helpful information for effectively motivating patients to engage in rehabilitation.

Participants in this study were recruited from more than 10 hospitals. Moreover, the sample size per group was determined using a priori sample size calculation. Consequently, this study had a large sample size and sufficient response rates (> 60%),⁴² which can potentially reduce nonresponse bias.³⁸ Furthermore, we prepared the survey according to existing guidelines and conducted pretesting procedures, such as expert reviews and pilot testing, to establish content and response process validity.^{38,39,43} Therefore, we expected that these procedures would strengthen the reliability and generalizability of our findings.

Comparison of patients' and clinicians' perceptions of important factors for motivating patients to engage in rehabilitation: similarities

The first novel finding regarding similarity in perceptions is that not only clinicians, but also patients consider "goal setting" and "practice related to the patient's experience and lifestyle" as most important. Previous theoretical, experimental, and observational studies have reported that these two factors are essential

components of motivation.^{25,29,37,44-47} Thus, many clinicians use them as the key-motivational strategies in convalescent rehabilitation wards. During rehabilitation, patients may share the intentions of clinicians and recognize them as valuable to overcome difficulties. Our study suggests that these strategies can be the core-motivators supported not only by medical evidence but also subjective perceptions of patients and clinicians. Another novel finding is that "realization of recovery" is considered the most important by both patients and clinicians. "Realization of recovery" would be associated with positive achievement emotions that follows success in rehabilitation.⁴⁸ Several studies indicate that patients' emotions at the initial stage of rehabilitation predict their subsequent motor performance and recovery after brain injury.⁴⁹⁻⁵¹ However, it remains unclear if success at rehabilitation influences the development of positive emotions and motivation in a real rehabilitation setting. Along with previous qualitative studies,^{52,53} our result suggests that the reverse direction may be effective as a core motivator of rehabilitation, and the relationship between achievement emotions and outcomes might be reciprocal rather than one directional in rehabilitation. This hypothesis should be investigated in future studies.

Comparison of patients' and clinicians' perceptions of factors important for motivating patients to engage in rehabilitation: differences

Of nine motivational factors endorsed by more than 5% of patients as the most important, "medical information" and "control of task difficulty" were preferred more by patients over clinicians. Previous qualitative studies of individuals with physical disabilities have reported that information regarding the benefits of

rehabilitation programs is an important factor in increasing patients' motivation.^{6,9,52,54-56} Additionally, rehabilitation programs that combine exercise therapy with information provision and therapeutic patient education have shown positive outcomes in patients with a range of neurological and orthopedic disorders.⁵⁷⁻⁶⁴ Regarding the influence of the level of task difficulty on motivation, an experimental study has reported that participants exert less effort in difficult trials compared to easy trials.⁶⁵ Failure feedback has been reported to undermine learning motivation, because it decreases people's confidence in their overall ability to pursue their goals and their general expectations of success.⁶⁶

Thus, strategies, such as explaining the rehabilitation process and providing a practice task that is achievable with little effort, may be more effective in motivating patients than clinicians think. Therefore, when determining which motivational strategies to use, clinicians should consider individual patient preferences regarding motivational factors. Patient information, such as demographic characteristics and personality attributes, and the patient's reactions to a presented motivational strategy, may help clinicians better understand patient preferences.

Associations between patients' choices regarding the most important motivational factors and their demographic characteristics

The results of this study indicate that preferences for motivational factors vary depending on the patient's age and hospital stay length. We found that "goal setting" and "realization of recovery" were preferred by relatively younger patients (under 65 years of age) than older patients. Relatively young patients who were hospitalized in convalescent rehabilitation wards often aim not

only to improve their ability to perform activities of daily living but also to engage in social participation, such as returning to work. Therefore, setting goals that are valuable to these patients and helping them experience positive achievement emotions may be especially important for enhancing active participation in rehabilitation.

Additionally, patients with shorter hospital stays were more likely to consider "medical information" to be the most important motivational factor. This result suggests that interventions such as information provision⁵⁷⁻⁵⁹ and therapeutic patient education⁶⁰⁻⁶⁴ are effective for increasing the motivation of patients in the early period after admission to the convalescent rehabilitation ward. These findings may help clinicians use different motivational strategies tailored to the patients' conditions.

Limitations

A primary limitation of this study is that all of the participants were recruited in Japan, potentially limiting the international generalizability of our findings. Nevertheless, the present results support the results of previous studies from different countries.^{4-6,9,52,54,55,67-73} An international survey would improve the external validity of our findings. Another potential limitation is that the opinions of patients with stroke and patients with fracture might have been overstated in the current sample. Similarly, the responses of physical therapists may have been overstated in clinicians' perceptions. However, patients with stroke and patients with fracture account for approximately 80% of inpatients in convalescent rehabilitation wards in Japan.³⁵ Additionally, rehabilitation clinicians working in the convalescent rehabilitation wards consist of 45.7% physical therapists, 28.6% occupational

therapists, 14.3% physicians, and 11.4% speech-language-hearing therapists.³⁵ Thus, the percentage of patients with stroke, patients with fracture, and physical therapists in our sample may be consistent with the actual situation.

CONCLUSIONS

The three motivational factors most frequently selected as the most important by patients were identical to those selected by clinicians, suggesting the existence of the core motivational strategies considered by both patients and clinicians. Additionally, patients exhibited more diverse preferences regarding motivational factors compared with clinicians, as there were motivational factors preferred by patients over clinicians. Therefore, clinicians are required to consider individual patient preferences to promote patient-centered care in rehabilitation when determining the most appropriate strategies.

Acknowledgments

Author Contributions: Dr Tanaka has full access to all of the data in the study and takes responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Concept and design: Oyake, Tanaka.

Acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data: All authors.

Drafting of the manuscript: Oyake, Tanaka.

Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: Oyake, Tanaka.

Statistical analysis: Oyake.

Funding: Tanaka.

Administrative, technical, or material support: Yamauchi, Inoue, Sue, Ota, Ikuta, Ema, Ochiai, Hasui, Hirata, Hida, Yamamoto, Kawai, Shiba, Atsumi, Nagafusa.

Supervision: Oyake, Yamauchi, Tanaka.

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: None reported.

Funding/Support: This work was supported by a JSPS KAKENHI grant to Satoshi Tanaka (JP20K21752).

Role of the Funder/Sponsor: The funders had no role in the design and conduct of the study; collection, management, analysis, and interpretation of the data; preparation, review, or approval of the manuscript; and decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

Additional Contributors: The authors thank Masafumi Sugawara, Tsuyoshi Tatemoto, Yuto Goto, and Ayumi Mochida at the Tokyo Bay Rehabilitation Hospital for their help and support. They were not compensated for these contributions.

References

1. World Health Organization. WHO guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour: web annex: evidence profiles. <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/336657>. Accessed June 29, 2022.
2. de Hollander EL, Proper KI. Physical activity levels of adults with various physical disabilities. *Prev Med Rep.* 2018;10:370-376. doi:10.1016/j.pmedr.2018.04.017
3. Rimmer JH, Marques AC. Physical activity for people with disabilities. *The Lancet.* 2012;380(9838):193-195. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(12)61028-9
4. Nicholson S, Sniehotta FF, van Wijck F, et al. A systematic review of perceived barriers and motivators to physical activity after stroke. *Int J Stroke.* 2013;8(5):357-364. doi:10.1111/j.1747-4949.2012.00880.x
5. Gorman E, Chudyk AM, Hoppmann CA, et al. Exploring older adults' patterns and perceptions of exercise after hip fracture. *Physiother Can.* 2013;65(1):86-93. doi:10.3138/ptc.2012-01BH

6. Kanavaki AM, Rushton A, Efstathiou N, et al. Barriers and facilitators of physical activity in knee and hip osteoarthritis: a systematic review of qualitative evidence. *BMJ Open*. 2017;7(12):e017042. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2017-017042
7. Boutevillain L, Dupeyron A, Rouch C, Richard E, Coudeyre E. Facilitators and barriers to physical activity in people with chronic low back pain: a qualitative study. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(7):e0179826. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0179826
8. Justine M, Azizan A, Hassan V, Salleh Z, Manaf H. Barriers to participation in physical activity and exercise among middle-aged and elderly individuals. *Singapore Med J*. 2013;54(10):581-586. doi:10.11622/smedj.2013203
9. Kehn M, Kroll T. Staying physically active after spinal cord injury: a qualitative exploration of barriers and facilitators to exercise participation. *BMC Public Health*. 2009;9:168. doi:10.1186/1471-2458-9-168
10. Neate SL, Donald A, Jelinek GA, Nag N. Experiences of and attitudes to lifestyle modification for the management of multiple sclerosis: a qualitative analysis of free-text survey data. *Health Expect*. 2022;25(1):214-222. doi:10.1111/hex.13364
11. Rapoliene J, Endzelyte E, Jaseviciene I, Savickas R. Stroke patients motivation influence on the effectiveness of occupational therapy. *Rehabil Res Pract*. 2018;2018:9367942. doi:10.1155/2018/9367942
12. Wang YH, Yang YR, Pan PJ, Wang RY. Modeling factors predictive of functional improvement following acute stroke. *J Chin Med Assoc*. 2014;77(9):469-476. doi:10.1016/j.jcma.2014.03.006
13. Grahn B, Ekdahl C, Borgquist L. Motivation as a predictor of changes in quality of life and working ability in multidisciplinary rehabilitation. A two-year follow-up of a prospective controlled study in patients with prolonged musculoskeletal disorders. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2000;22(15):639-654. doi:10.1080/096382800445443
14. Sawada M, Kato K, Kunieda T, et al. Function of the nucleus accumbens in motor control during recovery after spinal cord injury. *Science*. 2015;350(6256):98-101. doi:10.1126/science.aab3825
15. Brophy S, Cooksey R, Davies H, Dennis MS, Zhou SM, Siebert S. The effect of physical activity and motivation on function in ankylosing spondylitis: a cohort study. *Semin Arthritis Rheum*. 2013;42(6):619-626. doi:10.1016/j.semarthrit.2012.09.007
16. Dobkin BH, Plummer-D'Amato P, Elashoff R, Lee J, SIRROWS Group. International randomized clinical trial, stroke inpatient rehabilitation with reinforcement of walking speed (SIRROWS), improves outcomes. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair*. 2010;24(3):235-242. doi:10.1177/1545968309357558
17. Laver KE, Lange B, George S, Deutsch JE, Saposnik G, Crotty M. Virtual reality for stroke rehabilitation. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2017;11:CD008349. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD008349.pub4
18. Cheng D, Qu Z, Huang J, Xiao Y, Luo H, Wang J. Motivational interviewing for improving recovery after stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2015; 2015(6):CD011398. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD011398.pub2
19. Popović MD, Kostić MD, Rodić SZ, Konstantinović LM. Feedback-mediated upper extremities exercise: increasing patient motivation in poststroke rehabilitation. *Biomed Res Int*. 2014;2014:520374. doi:10.1155/2014/520374

20. Jamil A, Javed A, Iqbal MA. Effects of motivational interviewing with conventional physical therapy on rehabilitation of chronic musculoskeletal disorders: a quasi-experimental study. *J Pak Med Assoc.* 2021;71(4):1123-1127. doi:10.47391/jpma.873
21. de Araujo AVL, Neiva JFO, Monteiro CBM, Magalhaes FH. Efficacy of virtual reality rehabilitation after spinal cord injury: a systematic review. *Biomed Res Int.* 2019;2019:7106951. doi:10.1155/2019/7106951
22. Tatla SK, Sauve K, Virji-Babul N, Holsti L, Butler C, Van Der Loos HF. Evidence for outcomes of motivational rehabilitation interventions for children and adolescents with cerebral palsy: an American Academy for Cerebral Palsy and Developmental Medicine systematic review. *Dev Med Child Neurol.* 2013;55(7):593-601. doi:10.1111/dmcn.12147
23. Palmisano S, Fasotti L, Bertens D. Neurobehavioral initiation and motivation problems after acquired brain injury. *Front Neurol.* 2020;11:23. doi:10.3389/fneur.2020.00023
24. Dorstyn DS, Mathias JL, Bombardier CH, Osborn AJ. Motivational interviewing to promote health outcomes and behaviour change in multiple sclerosis: a systematic review. *Clin Rehabil.* 2020;34(3):299-309. doi:10.1177/0269215519895790
25. Oyake K, Suzuki M, Otaka Y, Tanaka S. Motivational strategies for stroke rehabilitation: a descriptive cross-sectional study. *Front Neurol.* 2020;11:553. doi:10.3389/fneur.2020.00553
26. Holden J, Davidson M, O'Halloran P. Motivational strategies for returning patients with low back pain to usual activities: a survey of physiotherapists working in Australia. *Man Ther.* 2015;20(6):842-849. doi:10.1016/j.math.2015.04.005
27. World Health Organization. *International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health: ICF.* World Health Organization, 2001.
28. Maclean N, Pound P. A critical review of the concept of patient motivation in the literature on physical rehabilitation. *Soc Sci Med.* 2000;50(4):495-506.
29. Oyake K, Suzuki M, Otaka Y, Momose K, Tanaka S. Motivational strategies for stroke rehabilitation: a Delphi study. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil.* 2020;101(11):1929-1936. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2020.06.007
30. Plant SE, Tyson SF, Kirk S, Parsons J. What are the barriers and facilitators to goal-setting during rehabilitation for stroke and other acquired brain injuries? A systematic review and meta-synthesis. *Clin Rehabil.* 2016;30(9):921-930. doi:10.1177/0269215516655856
31. Sackett DL, Rosenberg WM, Gray JA, Haynes RB, Richardson WS. Evidence based medicine: what it is and what it isn't. *BMJ.* 1996;312(7023):71-72. doi:10.1136/bmj.312.7023.71
32. Yun D, Choi J. Person-centered rehabilitation care and outcomes: a systematic literature review. *Int J Nurs Stud.* 2019;93:74-83. doi:10.1016/j.ijnurstu.2019.02.012
33. Miyai I, Sonoda S, Nagai S, et al. Results of new policies for inpatient rehabilitation coverage in Japan. *Neurorehabil Neural Repair.* 2011;25(6):540-547. doi:10.1177/1545968311402696
34. Okamoto T, Ando S, Sonoda S, Miyai I, Ishikawa M. "Kaifukuki Rehabilitation Ward" in Japan. *Jpn J Rehabil Med.* 2014;51(10):629-633. doi:10.2490/jjrmc.51.629
35. Kaifukuki Rehabilitation Ward Association. http://www.rehabili.jp/eng/eng_page.html#2. Accessed June 14, 2022.

36. Bartlett JE, Kotrlik JW, Higgins CC. Determining appropriate sample size in survey research. *ITLPPJ*. 2001;19(1):43-50.
37. Oyake K, Sue K, Sumiya M, Tanaka S. Physiotherapists use different motivational strategies tailored to an individual's condition: a qualitative study [published online April 21, 2022]. *medRxiv*. doi:10.1101/2022.04.20.22274114
38. Artino AR Jr, Durning SJ, Sklar DP. Guidelines for reporting survey-based research submitted to academic medicine. *Acad Med*. 2018;93(3):337-340. doi:10.1097/acm.0000000000002094
39. Kelley K, Clark B, Brown V, Sitzia J. Good practice in the conduct and reporting of survey research. *Int J Qual Health Care*. 2003;15(3):261-266.
40. Glas AS, Lijmer JG, Prins MH, Bossel GJ, Bossuyt PM. The diagnostic odds ratio: a single indicator of test performance. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2003;56(11):1129-1135. doi:10.1016/s0895-4356(03)00177-x
41. Orimo H, Ito H, Suzuki T, Araki A, Hosoi T, Sawabe M. Reviewing the definition of "elderly". *Geriatr Gerontol Int*. 2006;6(3):149-158.
42. Instructions for authors: JAMA network. <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/pages/instructions-for-authors>. Accessed May 16, 2022.
43. Gehlbach H, Artino AR Jr. The Survey Checklist (Manifesto). *Acad Med*. 2018;93(3):360-366. doi:10.1097/acm.0000000000002083
44. Siegert RJ, Taylor WJ. Theoretical aspects of goal-setting and motivation in rehabilitation. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2004;26(1):1-8. doi:10.1080/09638280410001644932
45. Bovend'Eerd TJH, Botell RE, Wade DT. Writing SMART rehabilitation goals and achieving goal attainment scaling: a practical guide. *Clin Rehabil*. 2009;23(4):352-361. doi:10.1177/0269215508101741
46. Gauggel S, Leinberger R, Richardt M. Goal setting and reaction time performance in brain-damaged patients. *J Clin Exp Neuropsychol*. 2001;23(3):351-361. doi:10.1076/jcen.23.3.351.1178
47. Wade DT. Goal setting in rehabilitation: an overview of what, why and how. *Clin Rehabil*. 2009;23(4):291-295. doi:10.1177/0269215509103551
48. Pekrun R, Frenzel AC, Goetz T, Perry RP. The control-value theory of achievement emotions: An integrative approach to emotions in education. In P. A. Schutz & R. Pekrun eds. *Emotion in education*. Elsevier Academic Press; 2007:13-36.
49. Mayo NE, Fellows LK, Scott SC, Cameron J, Wood-Dauphinee S. A longitudinal view of apathy and its impact after stroke. *Stroke*. 2009;40(10):3299-3307. doi:10.1161/strokeaha.109.554410
50. Gainotti G, Antonucci G, Marra C, Paolucci S. Relation between depression after stroke, antidepressant therapy, and functional recovery. *J Neurol Neurosurg Psychiatry*. 2001;71(2):258-261. doi:10.1136/jnnp.71.2.258
51. Paolucci S, Antonucci G, Pratesi L, Trabalesi M, Grasso MG, Lubich S. Poststroke depression and its role in rehabilitation of inpatients. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 1999;80(9):985-990. doi:10.1016/s0003-9993(99)90048-5
52. Luker J, Lynch E, Bernhardsson S, Bennett L, Bernhardt J. Stroke survivors' experiences of physical rehabilitation: a systematic review of qualitative studies. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2015;96(9):1698-1708.e10. doi:10.1016/j.apmr.2015.03.017
53. Yoshida T, Otaka Y, Osu R, Kumagai M, Kitamura S, Yaeda J. Motivation for rehabilitation

- in patients with subacute stroke: a qualitative study. *Front Rehabil Sci.* 2021;2: 664758. doi:10.3389/fresc.2021.664758
54. Abrahamsen C, Nørgaard B. Elderly patients' perspectives on treatment, care and rehabilitation after hip fracture: a qualitative systematic review. *Int J Orthop Trauma Nurs.* 2021;41:100811. doi:10.1016/j.ijotn.2020.100811
 55. Kayes NM, McPherson KM, Taylor D, Schlüter PJ, Kolt GS. Facilitators and barriers to engagement in physical activity for people with multiple sclerosis: a qualitative investigation. *Disabil Rehabil.* 2011;33(8):625-642. doi:10.3109/09638288.2010.505992
 56. Palazzo C, Klinger E, Dorner V, et al. Barriers to home-based exercise program adherence with chronic low back pain: Patient expectations regarding new technologies. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med.* 2016;59(2):107-113. doi:10.1016/j.rehab.2016.01.009
 57. Crocker TF, Brown L, Lam N, Wray F, Knapp P, Forster A. Information provision for stroke survivors and their carers. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2021;11(11):CD001919. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD001919.pub4
 58. Amatya B, Khan F, Galea M. Rehabilitation for people with multiple sclerosis: an overview of Cochrane Reviews. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2019;1(1):CD012732. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD012732.pub2
 59. Walsh TS, Salisbury LG, Merriweather JL, et al. Increased hospital-based physical rehabilitation and information provision after intensive care unit discharge: the RECOVER randomized clinical trial. *JAMA Intern Med.* 2015;175(6):901-910. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2015.0822
 60. Engers A, Jellema P, Wensing M, van der Windt DA, Grol R, van Tulder MW. Individual patient education for low back pain. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2008;2008(1):CD004057. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD004057.pub3
 61. Oral A, Arman S, Tarakci E, et al. A systematic review of clinical practice guidelines for persons with osteoarthritis. A "Best Evidence for Rehabilitation" (be4rehab) paper to develop the WHO's Package of Interventions for Rehabilitation: A systematic review of Clinical Practice Guidelines for persons with osteoarthritis for the identification of best evidence for rehabilitation. *Int J Rheum Dis.* 2022;25(4):383-393. doi:10.1111/1756-185x.14292
 62. Abu Mostafa M, Plastow NA, Savin-Baden M. The effectiveness of spinal cord injury ADL inpatient education on rehabilitation outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Brit J Occup Ther.* 2019;83(1):15-28. doi:10.1177/0308022619879019
 63. Goff AJ, De Oliveira Silva D, Merolli M, Bell EC, Crossley KM, Barton CJ. Patient education improves pain and function in people with knee osteoarthritis with better effects when combined with exercise therapy: a systematic review. *J Physiother.* 2021;67(3):177-189. doi:10.1016/j.jphys.2021.06.011
 64. Daviet JC, Bonan I, Caire JM, et al. Therapeutic patient education for stroke survivors: non-pharmacological management. A literature review. *Ann Phys Rehabil Med.* 2012;55(9-10):641-656. doi:10.1016/j.rehab.2012.08.011
 65. Bonnelle V, Veromann KR, Burnett Heyes S, Lo Sterzo E, Manohar S, Husain M. Characterization of reward and effort mechanisms in apathy. *J Physiol Paris.* 2015;109(1-3):16-26. doi:10.1016/j.jphysparis.2014.04.002
 66. Eskreis-Winkler L, Fishbach A. Not learning from failure-the greatest failure of all. *Psychol Sci.* 2019;30(12):1733-1744. doi:10.1177/0956797619881133

67. Eng XW, Brauer SG, Kuys SS, Lord M, Hayward KS. Factors affecting the ability of the stroke survivor to drive their own recovery outside of therapy during inpatient stroke rehabilitation. *Stroke Res Treat.* 2014;2014:626538. doi:10.1155/2014/626538
68. Törnbohm K, Sunnerhagen KS, Danielsson A. Perceptions of physical activity and walking in an early stage after stroke or acquired brain injury. *PLoS One.* 2017;12(3):e0173463. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0173463
69. Nicholson SL, Donaghy M, Johnston M, et al. A qualitative theory guided analysis of stroke survivors' perceived barriers and facilitators to physical activity. *Disabil Rehabil.* 2014;36(22):1857-1868. doi:10.3109/09638288.2013.874506
70. Moraes SA, Furlanetto EC, Ricci NA, Perracini MR. Sedentary behavior: barriers and facilitators among older adults after hip fracture surgery. A qualitative study. *Braz J Phys Ther.* 2020;24(5):407-414. doi:10.1016/j.bjpt.2019.07.001
71. Karlsson Å, Olofsson B, Stenvall M, Lindelöf N. Older adults' perspectives on rehabilitation and recovery one year after a hip fracture - a qualitative study. *BMC Geriatr.* 2022;22(1):423. doi:10.1186/s12877-022-03119-y
72. Sims-Gould J, Stott-Eveneshen S, Fleig L, McAllister M, Ashe MC. Patient perspectives on engagement in recovery after hip fracture: a qualitative study. *J Aging Res.* 2017;2017:2171865. doi:10.1155/2017/2171865
73. Lequerica AH, Donnell CS, Tate DG. Patient engagement in rehabilitation therapy: physical and occupational therapist impressions. *Disabil Rehabil.* 2009;31(9):753-760. doi:10.1080/09638280802309095