

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF
RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

1

1

2

An exploratory review of resiliency assessments after brain injury

3

4

5 Janna Griffioen^{1,2}, Nicole Gingrich³, M.OT, Courtney Pollock^{1,4}, PhD PT, Julia Schmidt^{1,5*}, PhD

6

7

1. Rehabilitation Research Program, Centre for Aging SMART, Vancouver Coastal Health
Research Institute, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada

8

9

2. Department of Rehabilitation Sciences, University of British Columbia, Vancouver,
Canada

10

11

3. GF Strong Rehabilitation Centre, Vancouver Coastal Health, Vancouver, British
Columbia, Canada

12

13

4. Department of Physical Therapy, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

14

15

5. Department of Occupational Science and Occupational Therapy, University of British
Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

16

17

18 *Corresponding author

19 E-mail: Julia.schmidt@ubc.ca

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

2

29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

Abstract

Objective: To identify resiliency measures which have been established for use with people after acquired brain injury, using the process-based Traumatic Brain Injury Resiliency Model as the guiding conceptual framework. **Method:** Databases CINAHL, EMBASE, Medline, and PsychINFO were searched. Using COnsensus based Standards for the selection of Health guidelines of health status Measurement INstruments (COSMIN) guidelines for reporting, articles providing data on psychometric properties for measures of resilience for people with brain injury were retrieved. Psychometric properties and clinical utility (number of items, scoring details) were summarized. **Results:** Nine articles were retrieved, including 9 measures of resiliency. **Conclusion:** There are established measures of resiliency in brain injury rehabilitation. Future work may explore use of these measures in a clinical context and implementation of rehabilitation goals for improving resiliency after brain injury.

Keywords: brain injury, resiliency, self-report, patient reported outcome measures, exploratory review.

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

3

50

Introduction

51 Individuals with brain injury (e.g., stroke and traumatic brain injury) often experience
52 long-term impacts in cognitive, physical, and psychosocial functioning [1]. People with brain
53 injury can experience reduced participation in meaningful everyday activities and experience
54 decreased engagement in social roles [2–5]. People with brain injury may have decreased quality
55 of life and mental health [6,7]. For example, the presence of depression during rehabilitation has
56 been associated with greater impairment at long term follow-up [8]. Additionally, related long-
57 term consequences of living with brain injury can result in unemployment and quality of life
58 [9,10]. While the experience of brain injury can initiate adversity in many facets of life,
59 resiliency can facilitate positive processes to meet adversity after brain injury [11]. As such,
60 resiliency may be an important construct to measure in rehabilitation.

61 Resilience may be lower in TBI populations compared to the general population [12].
62 Notably, lower resilience in TBI populations has been related to lower education and pre-injury
63 substance use; as well as psychological distress and low quality of life experienced after a brain
64 injury [13]. Rehabilitation that is focused on improving resiliency has shown to also improve
65 health outcomes such as depression, anxiety, sleep, and post-traumatic stress disorder [14–16].
66 Resiliency also has shown impact on social outcomes like social relationships, participation, and
67 engagement in activities after brain injury.

68 Resiliency is a process to negotiate cognitive, physical, and psychosocial challenges, and
69 facilitate positive perspectives [17]. Resiliency in the context of brain injury can include the
70 ability to appraise, adapt, and meet broad challenges associated with the consequences of brain
71 injury [11]. The Traumatic Brain Injury Resiliency Model (TBIRM) describes processes (e.g.,

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

4

72 response to adversity, self-regulatory processes, environment) that can interact to achieve
73 resiliency outcomes after brain injury [[11]. Resiliency has been defined in the TBIRM as, “the
74 combined interplay among a set of affective, behavioral, and cognitive protective factors and
75 self-regulatory processes that enable individuals to negotiate or bounce back from adversity”
76 [11]. According to the TBIRM, resilience associates with trait or state perspectives of resilience
77 while resiliency associates with many factors contributing to the process of resiliency [11].
78 Resilience and resiliency have not been consistently defined within the literature.

79 Clinical outcomes of brain injury rehabilitation commonly focus on impairments of the
80 injury itself (e.g., cognitive and physical challenges). While these outcomes may indicate
81 reduction of deficits, they do not consider the influence and importance of resiliency on health
82 and social outcomes. It is important to identify and understand measures of resiliency in brain
83 injury in order to guide clinicians and researchers in selecting and implementing resiliency
84 measures in clinical settings and research studies.

85 The purpose of this review was to identify self-report outcome measures of resiliency,
86 validated for use with people with brain injury. The review also aimed to examine the utility of
87 these measures in clinical rehabilitation.

88 **Methods**

89 An exploratory review was conducted using the TBIRM as a conceptual framework, with
90 a specific focus on “resiliency-related outcomes” that are subjective in nature [11]. Specifically,
91 the TBIRM highlights three key elements when considering resiliency-related outcomes
92 including: re-engagement of activities (e.g., participation in normal activities), adjustment of

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

5

93 patterns (e.g., accept and adapt), and reconstruction of identity (e.g., accepting disability and
94 creating new goals) [11].

95 **Sources and Search Strategy**

96 The COnsensus based Standards for the selection of Health guidelines of health status
97 Measurement INSTRUMENTS (COSMIN) guidelines were followed as part A of the guideline, the
98 review was conducted using four databases [18][19]. The databases were comprehensively
99 searched since inception: CINAHL (EBSCO) 1982, EMBASE (Ovid) 1974, MEDLINE (Ovid)
100 1946, and PsycINFO (EBSCO) 1967 [18]. Databases were chosen as they relate to intervention
101 by allied health groups that report on brain injury outcome measures and capture a broad
102 interdisciplinary perspective. The last database search took place in in August 2023. Search
103 terms were developed as indicated by COSMIN guidelines within the categories of (a) construct,
104 (b) population, (c) clinical measure, and (d) psychometric properties of interest (see S1 Search
105 Terms) [18]. Supporting information 1 describes the concepts used for each of the four
106 databases. Subject headings and keyword terms that would retrieve papers on resilience and
107 resiliency were used in combination. Combination of subject heading and keywords were
108 combined using Boolean operators (“AND”, “OR”) were used to combine terms. Limiters for
109 English were applied.

110 To obtain studies of resiliency, alternate terms were required in the database searches to
111 broaden and increase the sensitivity of the search as the search term “resiliency” was not
112 identified in most databases until the previous few years.

113 For example, EMBASE created the term resilience in 2017 from the previous term
114 “coping behaviour”. As such, alternate terms were used to maintain a rigorous search throughout

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

6

115 the database history. The search terms self-efficacy, acceptance, and self-confidence were
116 identified through identifying terms used in the TBIRM, previous search terms used in the
117 databases, librarian consultation and clinical judgement. Table 1 outlines the keyword definitions
118 of the search terms. The search included terms for resiliency (e.g., resiliency, resilience, self-
119 efficacy, acceptance, and self-confidence), population (e.g., acquired brain injury), clinical
120 measure (e.g., patient reported outcome measure), and psychometric property (e.g., validity and
121 reliability) (see S1 Search Terms).

122 **Table 1.** Definitions of Key Terms.

Key Term	Definition
Resiliency	“The combined interplay among a set of affective, behavioral, and cognitive protective factors and self-regulatory processes that enable individuals to negotiate or bounce back from adversity” [p. 2709].
Resilience	“A trait or personal quality which allows individuals to rise above or do well in spite of adversity” [11]p. 2709].
Self-confidence	An affective component of resiliency; one’s sense of assuredness in one’s own self and abilities [[11,20].
Self-efficacy	A behavioral component of resiliency; one’s belief in their capacity to manage a situation and achieve their desired outcome [[11,21,22].
Acceptance	A cognitive component of resiliency; patients' acknowledgement that a problem is not likely to disappear, and it is better to adjust goals to accommodate available resources and constraints [[11,23].

123

124 A supplementary search was run with the title of each clinical measure, and the
125 psychometric terms (validity and utility). The secondary search aimed to retrieve additional
126 psychometric information specific to each clinical measure.

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

7

127 **Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria**

128 Article inclusion criteria were as follows: (a) the clinical measure assessed resiliency
129 according to the TBIRM in adults with acquired brain injuries; (b) the article included evaluation
130 of at least one psychometric property of the given measure, even if the measure was not the
131 focus; (c) the measure was a subjective self-report measure; (d) articles were in English, peer-
132 reviewed full-texts. Measures that were used on acquired brain injury population (e.g., TBI
133 stroke) were included given similar experiences with disability after injury [24].

134 Article exclusion criteria were as follows: (a) the measure was only validated for use with
135 children or adolescents under the age of 18 given the different experiences of disability in a
136 younger population [25,26]; (b) the measure was not subjective in nature, and exclusively
137 utilized objective, proxy, or informant report information; (c) the measure does not assess
138 resiliency in accordance to the resiliency-related outcomes in the TBIRM. If the article included
139 collections of clinical measures, then the article was excluded. Collections of measures were
140 further screened for any clinical measures that were missed in the search.

141 **Data Extraction and Analysis**

142 The results were merged into Covidence, a systematic review management platform.
143 Articles were screened by two independent reviewers, based on inclusion and exclusion criteria.
144 Reviewers met to resolve conflicts after title and abstract screening, then again after full-text
145 screening was completed (Figure).

146 **Figure. Study Selection PRISMA.**

147 Data on each measure were extracted by two independent reviewers including population
148 validated for use, time post-injury (i.e., community dwelling or during rehabilitation), clinical

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

8

149 utility (i.e., number of items, size of Likert Scale, availability of clinical measure), and content of
150 questions. Measures were evaluated for construct validity and reliability.

151 To understand how each measure aligns with the TBIRM, two authors independently
152 reviewed the purpose and individual items of each measure. The measure's purpose and items
153 were aligned to one of the three resiliency-related outcomes of the TBIRM: re-engagement of
154 activities, adjustment of patterns, and reconstruction of identity. In the case that some items
155 within each measure also aligned to another resiliency-related outcomes, albeit to a lesser degree,
156 these measures were categorized as having a secondary alignment to another resiliency outcome.

157 **Results**

158 The search yielded 417 articles, leaving 305 after 112 duplicates were removed (see
159 Figure 1). After title and abstract screening, 65 articles remained for full-text review. There were
160 33 articles excluded based on the inclusion criterion, with a remaining 9 articles included in this
161 review. These articles collectively retrieved 9 clinical measures of resiliency (see Figure, for
162 reasons of exclusion). One clinical measure, the Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale, was found
163 from screening collections of measures such as RAND and Review of Positive Psychology
164 Outcome Measures, but not found in the database search [1,27,28].

165 The measures retrieved differed in the specific clinical population which the measure has
166 been validated for use, the format of the measure, and how the measure relates to resiliency (see
167 Table 2). All measures incorporate a similar format of providing specific statements for
168 participants to rate their identification with or level of agreement or disagreement with the
169 statement. The measures are reasonable in length for ease of use clinically, in a range from 10-35
170 statements.

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

171 **Table 2.** Self-Report Resiliency Measures Summary Table

Clinical Measure	Appropriateness	Clinical Utility	Content of questions
Acceptance and Action Questionnaire – Acquired brain injury	Validated for brain injury population	15 items; 3 Subscales: Reactive Avoidance, Denial, and Active Acceptance; 5-point Likert Scale: (0) “not at all true” to (4) “very true”; higher scores reflect greater psychological inflexibility; Items are listed in article, must submit request for copy of full assessment.[29]	Assessing beliefs explicitly in the context of brain injury. Item: “My brain injury defines me.”
Confidence after Stroke Measure	Validated for stroke population	27 items; 3 factors: Self-Confidence, Positive Attitude and Social Confidence; 4-point Likert scale: (0) low confidence to (3) high confidence; Assessment available as supplemental material to article.[30]	Assessing general beliefs, yet informed by disability experience. Mix of positively and negatively positioned questions. Self-confidence subscale: “I feel robbed of my identity” Positive attitude subscale: “I believe I have inner strength” Social confidence subscale: “I feel scared to go out”
Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale	Validated for acquired brain injury	25 items, 10 item, and 2 item versions; 5-point Guttman-type scale: (0) “not true at all” to (4) “true nearly all of the time”; Total scores range from 0-100, higher scores indicate higher resilience; Must contact copyright holders for copy of clinical measure and instructions for administration. Sample manual available on measure’s website	Assessing general beliefs, not specific to health or disability. Positively positioned questions. Item: “I am able to adapt when changes occur” Item: “I tend to bounce back after illness, injury, or hardship”

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF
RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

Daily Living Self-Efficacy Scale	Validated for stroke population	12 items; 2 subscales: (1) Self-efficacy for psychosocial functioning and (2) self-efficacy for activities of daily living (ADL); 10-point Likert scale with 10-unit intervals from (0) “cannot do at all” to (100) “highly certain can do” referring to statement “I am confident that I can...”; Total scores range from 0-100, higher scores indicating higher self-efficacy; Items are listed in article, must submit request for copy of full clinical measure.[31]	Assessing general beliefs, yet informed by disability experience on aspects of both psychosocial functioning and ADLs. Mix of positively and negatively positioned statements. Psychosocial functioning subscale: “Do something that helps me feel better when feel down” ADL subscale: “Look after my finances”
General Self-Efficacy Scale	Validated for stroke population	10 statements; Scale from (1) “not at all true” to (4) “exactly true”; Total scores range from 10-40, higher scores indicate greater sense of general self-efficacy; Scale is publicly available via the clinical measure website.	Assessing general beliefs, not specific to health or disability. All questions are positively positioned. Item: “I can usually handle whatever comes my way”
Participation Strategies Self-Efficacy Scale	Validated for community-dwelling stroke population	35 items; 10-point Likert scale from (1) “not at all confident” to (10) “totally confident”; Rating confidence/ self-efficacy in 6 participation domains in home, work and community referring to statement “I am confident that I can...”; Items are listed in article, must email to request copy of full clinical measure.[32]	Assessing general beliefs, yet informed by disability experience. Item: “Adapt home activities to do what you want/need to” Item: “Strategize falling or fear of falling in the community” Item: “Access services to help stay in home”
Resilience Questionnaire for Stroke Rehabilitation	Validated for stroke population during rehabilitation	35 items; 5-level Likert scale: completely agree to completely not agree; 3 dimensions: effective rehabilitation training, accessible support system, and appropriate	Assessing rehabilitation-specific beliefs and behaviours. Includes statements that imply compliance with medical

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

ion	n	self-regulation; Items are listed in article, must email to request copy of full clinical measure.[33]	management. Includes positively positioned statements. Item: “I will actively cooperate with healthcare team” Item: “I will follow physicians’ rehabilitation plan during treatment”
Resilience Scale	Validated for mild traumatic brain injury	25 items; 14 item short version also available (RS14); 7-point Likert Scale from (1) “disagree” to (7) ‘agree’; Higher scores reflecting greater resilience; Must purchase clinical measure via the clinical measure website	Assessing general beliefs, not specific to health or disability. Includes positively positioned statements. Item: “I usually manage one way or another”
Robson Self-Esteem Scale	Validated for brain injury population	30 items; 8-point Likert scale from (0) “completely disagree” to (7) “completely agree”; 4 factors: Self-Worth, Self-Regard, Self-Efficacy, Confidence; Administration time 10 min.; Items are listed in article, must email for copy of full clinical measure [Longworth]; Also made available online under the name “Robson Self-Concept Questionnaire”.[34]	Assessing general beliefs, not specific to health or disability. Mix of positively and negatively positioned statements. Item: “If I really try, I can overcome most of my problems” Item: “I can never seem to achieve anything worthwhile”
Stroke Self-Efficacy Questionnaire	Validated for stroke population	13 items; 0-10 scale from (0) “not at all confident” to (10) “very confident” for a variety of tasks; <15 min.; Clinical measure available at the end of article.[35]	

172 No equipment or special training required for any measure.

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

12

173 The psychometric properties of each clinical measure vary. Clinical measures in this
174 review report psychometric properties to guide clinicians and researchers to choose appropriate
175 measures based on the brain injury sub-population. Supporting Information 2 Psychometrics
176 provides a summary description of the psychometric properties of each clinical outcome
177 measure; this does not constitute an independent evaluation of psychometric properties.

178 **TBIRM Resiliency-Related Outcomes**

179 Measures differed in how they related to resiliency in accordance with resiliency-related
180 outcomes of the TBIRM (see Table 3). After analyzing the purpose and individual items of each
181 measure, we identified four measures that considered the resiliency-related outcome of
182 Reconstructing Identity, three measures that aligned with the outcome of Re-engaging in
183 Activities, and two measures that assessed Adjusting Participation Patterns or Preferences.
184 Below is a description of how each measure identified in this review aligns with the resiliency-
185 related outcomes from the TBIRM.

186 **Table 3.** Checklist of Constructs Assessed by Measures

Measure	Adjusting	Reconstructing	Re-engaging
Acceptance and Action Questionnaire – acquired brain injury	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Confidence after Stroke Measure	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Daily Living Self-Efficacy Scale			<input type="checkbox"/>
General Self-Efficacy Scale	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

13

**Participation Strategies Self-
Efficacy Scale**

**Resilience Scale &
Resilience Scale Brief**

Robson Self-Esteem Scale

Stroke Self-Efficacy Questionnaire

187

188 *Reconstructing Identity*

189 As per the TBIRM, reconstructing identity is understood as the ability to recognize the
190 large change TBI enacts upon identity and the act of reconstructing identity by performance,
191 acceptance, and identification of goals [11]. Three measures assessed the construct of
192 Reconstructing Identity and are described below.

193 The General Self-Efficacy Scale is a component of the Emotional Health section of the
194 National Institute of Health Toolbox and was validated for traumatic brain injury and stroke
195 populations where participants were at least one-year post-injury [36]. The Swedish version has
196 also been validated for the stroke population with good to excellent test-retest reliability and
197 internal consistency [37]. The measure evaluates the reconstruction of identity by assessing
198 perceived ability using questions such as “It is easy for me to stick to my aims and accomplish
199 my goals”.

200 The Resilience Scale was developed for individuals 1, 6, and 12 months after mTBI, and
201 may be limited in its applicability to community-dwelling populations with other brain injury
202 diagnoses such as stroke to TBI [38]. The Resilience Scale evaluates the construct of

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

14

203 reconstructing identity by using positively positioned statements that assess the individual’s
204 identification of priorities using language that probes identity, such as “I feel that I can handle
205 many things at a time”.

206 Lastly, the Robson Self-Esteem Scale, [39] assesses the process of identity reconstruction
207 through factors such as self-deprecation, self-respect, attractiveness, and self-respect/confidence
208 [40]. This measure has been validated for use with adults aged 17-56 who have complex and
209 continued difficulties at least 9 months post-brain injury [39]. The measure aligned with the
210 construct of reconstructing identity by assessing general beliefs in predominantly negatively
211 positioned questions such as, “I can never seem to achieve anything worthwhile”.

212 Measures that had a secondary alignment to this outcome included the Confidence After
213 Stroke Measure (described in full below).

214 *Re-engaging in Activities*

215 The TBIRM defines re-engagement as resuming valued activities at a level equivalent to
216 pre-injury functioning [11]. Outcome measures identified within the construct of Re-engaging
217 Activities include the Acceptance and Action Questionnaire for Acquired Brain Injury, the Daily
218 Self-efficacy Scale, Participation Strategies Self-Efficacy Scale, and the Stroke Self-Efficacy
219 Scale, described below.

220 The Acceptance and Action Questionnaire–Acquired Brain Injury measure included 3
221 subscales, one of which is “Active Acceptance” [41]. In line with the definition from the
222 TBIRM, acceptance is seen as an active process rather than a passive resignation. The measure
223 identifies active acceptance through positive mood and relationship. The AAQ-ABI fits within

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

15

224 the Re-engaging in Activities construct as the measure identifies active acceptance through
225 statements such as “Even with my brain injury, I can do good work” identifying belief in ability
226 to engage in activity with a brain injury.

227 The Daily Living Self-Efficacy Scale assesses self-efficacy to return to daily life with
228 two subscales: self-efficacy for psychosocial functioning and for activities of daily living [31].
229 The scale has been validated with individuals several years after stroke, and its authors suggest
230 its utility for assessing readiness for community living [31]. The scale has been validated through
231 good to excellent test-retest reliability, convergent validity, and discriminant validity [31]. The
232 scale includes questions like “I am confident that I can: attend a social gathering with friends”
233 and “I am confident that I can: not allow feelings of discouragement to stop me from doing the
234 things I want to do” which identify the process of Re-engaging in Activity as an outcome of
235 resiliency.

236 Participation Strategies Self-Efficacy Scale (PSSSES) assesses self-efficacy for
237 community-level participation, with subscales for home, work, social and community
238 management and participation [32]. The measure was developed for those with mild to moderate
239 stroke and has limited utility in sub-acute or inpatient rehabilitation settings due to its evaluation
240 of self-efficacy for community level participation [32]. Participation levels are measured using a
241 subjective assessment of ability to re-engage in activity, for example “[You can] identify what
242 you need in order to go back to work/volunteer”.

243 The Stroke Self-Efficacy Questionnaire, looks at self-efficacy using “self-management”
244 and “activities” subscales and was validated with individuals 4–24 weeks post-stroke, from acute
245 stroke units and living in the community [35,42]. The recommended utility is to assess

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

16

246 confidence during stroke recovery and influence the approach taken by clinicians during
247 rehabilitation [42]. The measure uses questions assessing the Re-engagement of Activity that
248 subjectively assess capability of participating in activities of daily living, such as “Cope with the
249 frustration of not being able to do some things because of your stroke”.

250 The Confidence After Stroke Measure also had a secondary alignment with the Re-
251 engagement of Activity outcome.

252 *Adjusting Participation Patterns and Preferences*

253 The TBIRM describes Adjusting Participation Patterns and Preferences as both objective
254 adjustment and subjective adjustment [11]. Objective adjustment could be participation in new
255 goals, while subjective adjustment could be changing perception of participation after brain
256 injury. Outcome measures identified in this construct include the Confidence After Stroke
257 Measure, and the Connor Davidson Resilience Scale.

258 The Confidence After Stroke Measure was created to guide treatment, support
259 rehabilitation after stroke, and determine if lack of confidence is a potential barrier to recovery
260 [34]. The measure assesses participation patterns through subjective questions “I feel less
261 capable” and objective questions “I am confident enough to leave the house”.

262 The Connor Davidson Resilience Scale also fit in with Adjusting Participation Patterns
263 and Preferences. The Connor-Davidson Resilience Scale was validated for traumatic brain injury
264 and stroke [43] as part of the National Institute of Health Toolbox [44]. The scale has been used
265 widely with the traumatic brain injury population [12,45–47]. The Connor-Davidson Resilience
266 Scale is unspecific in terms of chronicity post-brain injury. The measure assesses both

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

17

267 subjective and objective assessments of participation using positively positioned questions. The
268 measure uses subjective phrases “I think of myself as a strong person when dealing with life’s
269 challenges and difficulties” and objective phrases “I can deal with whatever comes my way”.

270 Three measures had a secondary alignment with this outcome: Acceptance and Action
271 Questionnaire for Acquired Brain Injury, General Self-efficacy Scale, and Resilience Scale (all
272 discussed above).

273 **Discussion**

274 The present review included nine clinical measures in accordance with the TBIRM
275 outcome measures of resiliency constructs including Reconstructing Identity, Re-engaging in
276 Activities, and Adjusting Participation Patterns and Preferences. Of the nine clinical measures of
277 resiliency available for use with brain injury populations, no singular clinical measure captures
278 all aspects of resiliency-related outcomes as described by the TBIRM. This may reflect the
279 complexity of resiliency as an outcome measure in rehabilitation as well as the need for further
280 establishment of resiliency as important outcomes after brain injury. Further research can explore
281 the processes of developing resiliency after brain injury as well as explore the implementation of
282 resiliency measures in clinical practice.

283 This review highlights resilience as a relatively new term in library databases. As such,
284 our search required use of terms that were related to resilience. For example, CINAHL refers to
285 ‘hardiness’ as an alternate term to resiliency, a term that is not aligned with the TBIRM model of
286 resiliency after TBI. Additionally, EMBASE recently created the subject heading of resilience in
287 2017 after previously using the term “coping behaviour”. Notably, outcome measures identified
288 in the present review were not validated until 2009. The shift the focus from a state or trait

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

289 approach (i.e., resilience) to a process perspective (i.e., resiliency) can greatly impact the field's
290 ability to assess resiliency from a holistic viewpoint. Theories of resiliency and models such as
291 the TBIRM may assist with future clinical intervention and development of assessments
292 methods.

293 There was variability in the applicability of the measures to different adult brain injury
294 populations. For example, some measures were only validated for stroke populations (i.e.,
295 Confidence After Stroke Measure), others were validated for different severities and chronicity
296 across brain injury populations (i.e., Robson Self-Esteem Scale) [39,48]. Future research could
297 consider further development of psychometrics for each population in brain injury.

298 When considering clinical relevance, some measure identified hold more clinical utility
299 than others. Clinicians should consider aspects of the measure such as population for which the
300 measure has been validated and the stage of the person's recovery when implementing these
301 measures into clinical practice. While some important factors and experiences overlap among
302 subpopulations within brain injury (e.g., stroke versus traumatic brain injury), the clinical
303 measures included in this review have been validated for specific use. Clinicians should consider
304 the accessibility of measures to implement in clinical practice (e.g., cost of the measure) and
305 training required (e.g., length of training, cost of training).

306 Many clinical measures examine task-level domains (e.g., physical, cognitive, and
307 emotional outcomes) important for discharge to the community and community reintegration
308 [36,49]. Such measures may not include important patient-oriented constructs, and how
309 resiliency influences and shapes quality of life over time [50]. The inclusion of patient-oriented
310 constructs are important, as qualitative findings suggest that people with brain injury have

311 alternate outcome priorities for rehabilitation after brain injury, including regaining their sense of
312 self, improving self-efficacy, and regaining confidence in their ability to enjoy a meaningful life
313 [35,39,42,51]. This gap in assessing patient-orientated outcomes may represent an important
314 omission to address more explicitly during rehabilitation and community integration. Further
315 development of patient-oriented resiliency measures could translate into clinical practice and
316 may support clinicians and researchers to better understand the needs of people with brain injury
317 in rehabilitation and community care [52].

318 The current review presents the clinical measures that have been validated in brain injury
319 to date. The clinical measures identified in this review do not provide an exhaustive list of all
320 resiliency measures, as the goal of this review was to consider only those validated for brain
321 injury. The perspective of each measure focuses on the state/trait view of resilience, as opposed
322 to the assessment of the process of resiliency. It is possible that resilience measures for other
323 population groups (e.g., paediatrics) may be considered for further validation studies for
324 individuals with brain injury.

325 **Limitations**

326 This review had three main limitations. First, due to the small number of measures
327 identified and associated articles, measures could not be divided into type of injury (e.g., TBI
328 versus stroke) and time of use post injury (e.g., acute versus chronic stage of injury). However,
329 this review provides an overview of all measures of resiliency for a brain injury population,
330 which may have broader generalizability. However, understanding the assessments in this review
331 may provide critical knowledge for the development of an assessment of the process of
332 resiliency. Finally, only studies in English were included in our review which may have limited

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

20

333 the scope of the findings, as resiliency could vary across languages and non-English speaking
334 regions.

335 **Conclusion**

336 Resiliency is an important construct to measure in brain injury rehabilitation, with many
337 promising measures to use in this area. Further research is needed to explore how
338 implementation of these measures in clinical practice could contribute to the development of
339 patient goals and treatment plans directed towards the important global construct of resiliency.

340

341

342

343

344

345

346

347

348

349

350

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF
RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

21

- 351 [1] Stoner CR, Orrell M, Spector A. Review of positive psychology outcome measures for
352 chronic illness, traumatic brain injury and older adults: Adaptability in dementia? *Dement*
353 *Geriatr Cogn Disord*. S. Karger AG; 2015. p. 340–357.
- 354 [2] O'Connor C, Colantonio A, Polatajko H. LONG TERM SYMPTOMS AND
355 LIMITATIONS OF ACTIVITY OF PEOPLE WITH TRAUMATIC BRAIN INJURY: A
356 TEN-YEAR FOLLOW-UP “,.” *O Psychological Reports*. 2005.
- 357 [3] Sander AM, Clark A, Pappadis MR. What Is Community Integration Anyway?: Defining
358 Meaning Following Traumatic Brain Injury [Internet]. *J Head Trauma Rehabil*. 2010.
359 Available from: www.headtraumarehab.com.
- 360 [4] Williams MW, Rapport LJ, Millis SR, et al. Psychosocial outcomes after traumatic brain
361 injury: Life satisfaction, community integration, and distress. *Rehabil Psychol*.
362 2014;59:298–305.
- 363 [5] Woodman P, Riazi A, Pereira C, et al. Social participation post stroke: A meta-
364 ethnographic review of the experiences and views of community-dwelling stroke
365 survivors. *Disabil Rehabil*. Informa Healthcare; 2014. p. 2031–2043.
- 366 [6] Soberg HL, Røe C, Anke A, et al. Health-related quality of life 12 months after severe
367 traumatic brain injury: A prospective nationwide cohort study. *J Rehabil Med*.
368 2013;45:785–791.
- 369 [7] Gould KR, Ponsford JL, Johnston L, et al. Predictive and associated factors of psychiatric
370 disorders after traumatic brain injury: A prospective study. *J Neurotrauma*. 2011;28:1155–
371 1163.
- 372 [8] Levack WMM, Kayes NM, Fadyl JK. Experience of recovery and outcome following
373 traumatic brain injury: A metasynthesis of qualitative research. *Disabil Rehabil*.
374 2010;32:986–999.
- 375 [9] Goverover Y, Johnston M V, Toglia J, et al. Treatment to improve self-awareness in
376 persons with acquired brain injury. *Brain Inj* [Internet]. 2007;21:913–923. Available from:
377 <https://go.exlibris.link/9PxXPkdq>.
- 378 [10] Haarbauer-Krupa J, Pugh MJ, Prager EM, et al. Epidemiology of Chronic Effects of
379 Traumatic Brain Injury. *J Neurotrauma*. 2021;38:3235–3247.
- 380 [11] Nalder E, Hartman L, Hunt A, et al. Traumatic brain injury resiliency model: a conceptual
381 model to guide rehabilitation research and practice. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2019;41:2708–2717.
- 382 [12] Kreutzer JS, Marwitz JH, Sima AP, et al. Resilience Following Traumatic Brain Injury: A
383 Traumatic Brain Injury Model Systems Study. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2016;97:708–713.
- 384 [13] Hanks RA, Rapport LJ, Waldron Perrine B, et al. Correlates of resilience in the first 5
385 years after traumatic brain injury. *Rehabil Psychol*. 2016;61:269–276.

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF
RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

22

- 386 [14] Hanks RA, Rapport LJ, Wertheimer J, et al. Randomized Controlled Trial of Peer
387 Mentoring for Individuals With Traumatic Brain Injury and Their Significant Others. *Arch*
388 *Phys Med Rehabil.* 2012;93:1297–1304.
- 389 [15] Lukow HR, Godwin EE, Marwitz JH, et al. Relationship Between Resilience, Adjustment,
390 and Psychological Functioning After Traumatic Brain Injury. *Journal of Head Trauma*
391 *Rehabilitation.* 2015;30:241–248.
- 392 [16] Marwitz JH, Sima AP, Kreutzer JS, et al. Longitudinal Examination of Resilience After
393 Traumatic Brain Injury: A Traumatic Brain Injury Model Systems Study. *Arch Phys Med*
394 *Rehabil.* 2018;99:264–271.
- 395 [17] Neils-Strunjas J, Paul D, Clark AN, et al. Role of resilience in the rehabilitation of adults
396 with acquired brain injury. *Brain Inj.* 2017;31:131–139.
- 397 [18] Prinsen CAC, Mokkink LB, Bouter LM, et al. COSMIN guideline for systematic reviews
398 of patient-reported outcome measures. *Quality of Life Research.* 2018;27:1147–1157.
- 399 [19] Prinsen CAC, Mokkink LB, Bouter LM, et al. COSMIN guideline for systematic reviews
400 of patient-reported outcome measures. *Quality of Life Research.* 2018;27:1147–1157.
- 401 [20] Self-confidence. *Oxford Online Dictionary.* 2021.
- 402 [21] Montgomery GK, Kern T, Lund D, et al. Confidence and mood: Critical treatment goals
403 for brain injury rehabilitation. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology.* 1999;14:794–794.
- 404 [22] Cicerone KD, Azulay J. Perceived Self-Efficacy and Life Satisfaction After Traumatic
405 Brain Injury. *Journal of Head Trauma Rehabilitation.* 2007;22:257–266.
- 406 [23] Van Bost G, Van Damme S, Crombez G. Goal reengagement is related to mental well-
407 being, life satisfaction and acceptance in people with an acquired brain injury.
408 *Neuropsychol Rehabil.* 2020;30:1814–1828.
- 409 [24] Castor N, El Massioui F. Traumatic brain injury and stroke: does recovery differ? *Brain*
410 *Inj.* 2018;32:1803–1810.
- 411 [25] Andruszkow H, Deniz E, Uner J, et al. Physical and psychological long-term outcome
412 after traumatic brain injury in children and adult patients. *Health Qual Life Outcomes.*
413 2014;12.
- 414 [26] Niedzwecki CM, Marwitz JH, Ketchum JM, et al. Traumatic brain injury: a comparison of
415 inpatient functional outcomes between children and adults. *J Head Trauma Rehabil*
416 [Internet]. 2008;23:209–219. Available from: <https://go.exlibris.link/TM33KL0M>.
- 417 [27] Acosta JD, Reynolds K, Gillen EM, et al. The RAND Online Measure Repository for
418 Evaluating Psychological Health and Traumatic Brain Injury Programs: The RAND
419 Toolkit, Volume 2. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation; 2014.

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF
RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

23

- 420 [28] Connor KM, Davidson JRT. Development of a new Resilience scale: The Connor-
421 Davidson Resilience scale (CD-RISC). *Depress Anxiety*. 2003;18:76–82.
- 422 [29] Kortte KB, Veiel L, Batten S V., et al. Measuring avoidance in medical rehabilitation.
423 *Rehabil Psychol*. 2009;54:91–98.
- 424 [30] Horne JC, Lincoln NB, Logan PA. Measurement of confidence: the development and
425 psychometric evaluation of a stroke-specific, measure of confidence. *Clin Rehabil*.
426 2017;31:1529–1537.
- 427 [31] Maujean A, Davis P, Kendall E, et al. The daily living self-efficacy scale: A new measure
428 for assessing self-efficacy in stroke survivors. *Disabil Rehabil*. 2014;36:504–511.
- 429 [32] Lee D, Fogg L, Baum CM, et al. Validation of the Participation Strategies Self-Efficacy
430 Scale (PS-SES). *Disabil Rehabil*. 2018;40:110–115.
- 431 [33] Cai LH, Zhang Q, Pang SQ, et al. Development and Validation of a Resilience
432 Questionnaire for Patients during Stroke Rehabilitation in China. *Rehabilitation Nursing*.
433 2021;46:214–221.
- 434 [34] Westbrook D. Robson Self-Esteem Scale. *Octc.co.uk*. . 1997.
- 435 [35] Jones F, Partridge C, Reid F. The Stroke Self-Efficacy Questionnaire: Measuring
436 individual confidence in functional performance after stroke. *J Clin Nurs*. 2008;17:244–
437 252.
- 438 [36] Carlozzi NE, Tulsy DS, Kisala PA. Traumatic brain injury patient-reported outcome
439 measure: Identification of health-related quality-of-life issues relevant to individuals with
440 traumatic brain injury. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 2011;92.
- 441 [37] Carlstedt E, Lexell EM, Pessah-Rasmussen H, et al. Psychometric properties of the
442 Swedish version of the General Self-Efficacy Scale in stroke survivors. *International
443 Journal of Rehabilitation Research*. 2015;38:333–337.
- 444 [38] Losoi H, Silverberg ND, Wäljas M, et al. Resilience Is Associated with Outcome from
445 Mild Traumatic Brain Injury. *J Neurotrauma*. 2015;32:942–949.
- 446 [39] Longworth C, Deakins J, Rose D, et al. The nature of self-esteem and its relationship to
447 anxiety and depression in adult acquired brain injury. *Neuropsychol Rehabil*.
448 2018;28:1078–1094.
- 449 [40] Addeo RR, Greene AF, Geisser ME. Construct Validity of the Robson Self-Esteem
450 Questionnaire in a College Sample. *Educ Psychol Meas*. 1994;54:439–446.
- 451 [41] Whiting DL, Deane FP, Ciarrochi J, et al. Validating measures of psychological flexibility
452 in a population with acquired brain injury. *Psychol Assess*. 2015;27:415–423.

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF
RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

24

- 453 [42] Riazi A, Aspden T, Jones F. Stroke self-efficacy questionnaire: A Rasch-refined measure
454 of confidence post stroke. *J Rehabil Med.* 2014;46:406–412.
- 455 [43] Campbell-Sills L, Stein MB. Psychometric analysis and refinement of the Connor-
456 Davidson Resilience Scale (CD-RISC): Validation of a 10-item measure of resilience. *J*
457 *Trauma Stress.* 2007;20:1019–1028.
- 458 [44] Carlozzi NE, Goodnight S, Casaletto KB, et al. Validation of the NIH Toolbox in
459 Individuals with Neurologic Disorders. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology.*
460 2017;32:555–573.
- 461 [45] Laird V, Elliott TR, Brossart DF, et al. Trajectories of Affective Balance 1 Year After
462 Traumatic Injury: Associations with Resilience, Social Support, and Mild Traumatic Brain
463 Injury. *J Happiness Stud.* 2019;20:1419–1437.
- 464 [46] Rapport LJ, Wong CG, Hanks RA. Resilience and well-being after traumatic brain injury.
465 *Disabil Rehabil.* 2020;42:2049–2055.
- 466 [47] White B, Driver S, Warren AM. Considering Resilience in the Rehabilitation of People
467 With Traumatic Disabilities. *Rehabil Psychol.* 2008;53:9–17.
- 468 [48] Horne JC, Lincoln NB, Logan PA. Measurement of confidence: The development and
469 psychometric evaluation of a stroke-specific, measure of confidence. *Clin Rehabil.*
470 2017;31:1529–1537.
- 471 [49] Askew RL, Capo-Lugo CE, Sangha R, et al. Trade-Offs in Quality-of-Life Assessment
472 Between the Modified Rankin Scale and Neuro-QoL Measures. *Value in Health.*
473 2020;23:1366–1372.
- 474 [50] Robinson RG, Spalletta G. Poststroke Depression: A Review. *The Canadian Journal of*
475 *Psychiatry.* 2010.
- 476 [51] Cicerone KD, Azulay J. Perceived Self-Efficacy and Life Satisfaction After Traumatic
477 Brain Injury [Internet]. *J Head Trauma Rehabil.* 2007. Available from:
478 www.headtraumarehab.com.
- 479 [52] Van Bost G, Van Damme S, Crombez G. Goal reengagement is related to mental well-
480 being, life satisfaction and acceptance in people with an acquired brain injury.
481 *Neuropsychol Rehabil.* 2020;30:1814–1828.

482

483

484

AN EXPLORATORY REVIEW OF ASSESSMENTS OF
RESILIENCY AFTER BRAIN INJURY

25

485

486 **Supporting Information Captions**

487 S1 Appendix. Search Terms.

488 S2. Appendix. Psychometrics

Figure 1

Study selection PRISMA

