

Concept of Perceived Task Difficulty: A Systematic Review

Mudasir Andrabi*, Adam Robinson and Francisco Marques

Abstract

Aim: We conducted a systematic review of the literature related to the perception of the difficulty of treatments and its influence on treatment adherence in various populations.

Method: The literature published between 1970 and 2019 was searched using the databases Scopus, Pubmed, Embase, and Cochrane CENTRAL was conducted. This review has followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review (PRISMA) guidelines. The quality of the evidence was assessed by Using Joanna Briggs Institute's critical appraisal tool. Studies that assessed the perception of task difficulty and were published in English were included. Two reviewers reviewed the literature and any disagreements among these reviewers were resolved by a third reviewer.

Results: Twenty-nine articles were selected for this review. Selected articles described research that utilized a host of different populations such as HIV patients, diabetics, hemophilia patients, and some mental disorders. The participants involved in these studies were diverse. The results of the review suggest that several factors must be considered in health teachings so that it would influence the individuals' perceptions related to the difficulty of their treatments and help them to better engage/adhere with their treatment plans.

Introduction

Perceived task difficulty refers to an individual's beliefs about the level of effort needed to succeed at a particular assignment and how likely they would be to achieve their goals. Task difficulty was originally

Rehabdata, Psycinfo and Web of Science for the date range between 1970 - 2019. The University librarian's assistance was used to search for the articles. Articles were located using keywords: disability therapy; disability and therapy; disability and intervention; disability and treatment; disability and rehabilitation; barriers and treatment; barriers and intervention. These databases produced 294, 48, 261, 309, and 28 articles, respectively. Two reviewers independently vetted each abstract and full article to ensure the validity and suitability of each study for inclusion. Any disagreements among these reviewers were resolved through discussions. If a consensus was not reached, disputed articles were independently reviewed by a third party.

Publication Inclusion

Study Designs and Participants

In order to have a broad and inclusive approach to study designs were included. (1) Experimental methods including using randomized control trials (RCTs), as well as quasi-RCT designs; (2) self-report surveys, observational methods, pre-post interventions, secondary data analysis, case series, and cross sectional experiments were included in

Citation:

Citation: