

TITLE PAGE

Imposter Phenomenon in licensed physical therapists: prevalence, predictors, and impact

Alexandra R. Anderson PT, DPT^{1,4}

Jamie LaPenna PT, DPT²

Dustin Willis PT, DPT³

Alison H. Chang PT, DPT, MS⁴

¹Physical Therapy Department University of Illinois Health, Chicago, IL, 60607 United States

²Physical Therapy Department, Loyola University Medical Center, Burr Ridge, IL, 60527, United States

³West Coast University, Center for Graduate Studies, Department of Physical Therapy, Los Angeles, CA 90004, United States

⁴Northwestern University Feinberg School of Medicine, Department of Physical Therapy and Human Movement Sciences, Chicago, IL, 60611, United States.

Corresponding Author: Dr. Alexandra Anderson

The Physical Therapy Academy

524 N Marshfield Ave

Chicago, IL 60622

Phone: (301) 821-113

E-mail: alex@thephysicaltherapyacademy.com

ABSTRACT

Objective

Determine the prevalence and predictors of Imposter Phenomenon (IP) among licensed physical therapists (PTs) in the United States.

Methods

This cross-sectional observational study utilized an online survey to assess the levels of IP, emotional exhaustion, and job satisfaction among licensed PTs in the United States and collect their professional and demographic information. Participants were recruited from various physical therapy specialty groups representing a range of professional memberships and certifications. A multivariable logistic regression model examined factors associated with IP presence.

Results

The study sample consisted of 514 PTs [women (66.1%), ≤ 40 years of age (73.2%), White (77.0%)]. The mean IP score was 60.3 (SD: 15.1, range: 19 to 95). 55 respondents (10.7%) had low IP, 196 (38.1%) moderate IP, 215 (41.8%) frequent IP, and 48 (9.3%) intense IP. The prevalence of IP, defined as frequent or intense IP, was 51.2% in our study sample. Having Manager/supervisor experience (OR=0.55, 95% CI=0.34-0.90) was associated with a reduced odds of IP presence. Holding a bachelor's or master's degree (vs. Doctor of Physical Therapy (DPT) degree; OR=2.31, 95% CI=1.07-5.00), a history of or current mental health diagnosis (OR=2.77, 95% CI=1.69-4.54), and emotional exhaustion (moderate vs. low: OR=5.37, 95% CI=2.11-13.69; high

vs. low: OR=14.13, 95%CI=5.56-35.89) were each associated with an increased odds of IP presence.

Conclusions

IP is highly prevalent among licensed PTs, with more than half reporting frequent or intense IP. Seasoned clinicians with managerial roles seemed to be less susceptible to IP, whereas those with mental health diagnoses, emotional exhaustion, and those without a DPT degree may be more likely to experience IP.

Impact Statement

Given the high prevalence of IP and its potential negative impact on burnout and career advancement, it is crucial to increase IP awareness and provide education on strategies and resources to manage it for licensed PTs.

Key words: Imposter phenomenon, burnout, job satisfaction, career advancement

Manuscript word count: 2,770

INTRODUCTION

Imposter Phenomenon (IP), or perceived fraudulence, describes an ongoing fear of exposure as a fraud or imposter, despite objective successes and accomplishments¹. Those with IP tend to attribute their achievements to luck or good timing and question their professional legitimacy and expertise.

Recent studies have reported high prevalence of IP among physicians and academic faculty, which could have a detrimental effect on psychological well-being and contribute to burnout, ultimately stunting both personal and professional growth^{1, 2, 3}. A 2020 systematic review outlined the prevalence, predictors, and potential treatment of this long-recognized phenomenon that impacts approximately 70% of working professionals at some point in their career¹. IP was strongly correlated with depression and anxiety, poor work performance, job dissatisfaction, and burnout, particularly among ethnic minority groups. Their findings suggested those affected, specifically healthcare providers, may be limited in achieving their full professional potential and are more likely to experience burnout.

Professional burnout and mental health comorbidities are on a steep rise, further fueled by the recent Covid-19 pandemic⁴. While job burnout among physical therapists (PTs) is associated with emotional exhaustion and a decreased sense of personal achievement⁵, no studies have examined the prevalence of IP in licensed PTs. The objectives of the present study were to 1) examine the prevalence of IP among licensed

PTs, 2) determine demographic and professional factors associated with IP, and 3) examine its relationship with burnout and job satisfaction.

METHODS

Study Design and Setting

An observational study using a cross-sectional survey design was utilized. The survey was delivered in English and hosted on Google Forms, a web-based survey tool. Data collection took place from June 10 to July 10, 2022. The study was approved by West Coast University Institutional Research Board and followed the STROBE guidelines.

Role of Funding Source

No funding from agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors played a role in the design, conduct, or reporting of this research.

Participants, Recruitment, and Consent

Eligible participants were licensed PTs in the United States. A recruitment flyer was shared with peers/colleagues, posted on social media, and distributed from professional organizations including Academies of the American Physical Therapy Association (APTA) that allow electronic survey distribution to their members, including orthopedics, neurological, geriatrics, home health, and aquatics. Members of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Manual Physical Therapists and both the Illinois Physical Therapy Association as well as the California Physical Therapy Association were also invited to engage in the survey. Each participant provided informed consent prior to taking the survey and was instructed to only complete the survey once.

Online Survey

The survey was created by the study team of four PTs, each with greater than 5 years of experience in clinical practice. The authors recruited five practicing PTs from various practice settings to pilot test the survey draft. Their feedback was used to refine the survey prior to its distribution. The final survey consisted of 18 demographic and professional questions and 3 sub-surveys to measure the degree of IP, emotional exhaustion/burnout, and job satisfaction.

Demographic questions included age, race, gender, sexuality, years of experience, length at current position, practice setting, practice specialty, terminal degree, credentials (e.g., Orthopedic Certified Specialist, Fellow of the American Academy of Orthopaedic Manual Physical Therapists, etc.), APTA membership, geographical location of practice, manager/supervisor experience, time per week spent on direct patient care, duration of initial evaluations, duration of return visits, and mental health diagnosis. In questions where respondents selected “other” in place of the listed options, a free-text box was provided for more detailed responses.

The 20-item Clance Imposter Phenomenon Scale was used to assess the degree of IP. It is the most widely used instrument known for its good reliability and validity, and ability to distinguish from self-esteem, social anxiety, and self-monitoring^{6, 7, 8}. The scale uses a 5-point Likert scale for each question with a total score ranging from 20 to 100. A score under 40 is considered low, 41-60 is moderate, 61-80 is frequent, and greater than 80 is intense⁹.

Emotional exhaustion is the greatest predictor of burnout¹⁰. To assess this key attribute, the survey utilized a 9-item emotional exhaustion scale, a subscale within the Maslach Burnout Inventory¹¹. The items were answered on a 5-point frequency scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always) with a total score ranging from 9 to 45^{12, 13}. A score of 27 or higher indicates extreme emotional exhaustion level, 19-26 moderate, and under 18 low¹³.

The Job Satisfaction Subscale of the Michigan Organizational Assessment

Questionnaire was used to measure job satisfaction, which includes 3 questions on a 6-point Likert scale¹⁴. The first question was negatively worded, therefore was scored in reverse to align with the remaining two positively worded questions. The final scores range from 3 to 18. Scores were dichotomized into yes (score ≥ 12) versus no (score < 12) job satisfaction. It took approximately 5-10 minutes to complete the survey and there was no financial compensation awarded to participants.

Data Cleaning

Respondents who were not licensed PTs, such as physical therapy assistants and students, were excluded. One participant did not answer the demographic questions, therefore was also excluded.

Data Synthesis and Analysis

Following recommended guidelines^{9, 11, 14}, Clance IP raw scores were converted to IP levels of low (≤ 40), moderate (41-60), frequent (61-80), and intense (> 80); emotional

exhaustion scores to low (<18), moderate (19-26), and high (≥ 27); job satisfaction scores to yes (≥ 12) and no (<12). Descriptive statistics summarized the characteristics for the overall sample and by IP levels. Missing data (i.e., the response was “blank”) were not imputed.

To assess univariate associations between each factor and IP levels, Chi-Squared tests were conducted. Factors with a P value ≤ 0.20 in the univariate comparisons were considered for inclusion in the final multivariable logistic regression model. For ease of interpretation, IP levels were condensed to a binary outcome of no (combining low and moderate IP) versus yes (combining frequent and intense IP). Multicollinearity check was performed.

Purposeful model selection¹⁵ was used to produce the final regression model. Briefly, the iterative process proposed in the purposeful model selection recommends (1) removing predictors with a P value ≤ 0.1 ; (2) adding back a predictor if removing it resulting in $\geq 20\%$ change in any of the remaining predictor’s beta coefficients, because the deleted predictor has provided important adjustment of the effect of the remaining predictors; (3) selecting the model with the highest R^2 ; and (4) including predictors that are clinically meaningful/important based on content expertise and prior literature. The Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test checked the fit of the final model. Results were reported as odds ratios (ORs) and 95% confidence intervals (CIs). ORs > 1.0 indicated increased odds and < 1.0 indicated decreased odds. All analyses were performed using SPSS 28.0.1.1.

RESULTS

A total of 520 survey responses were recorded. After excluding responses from physical therapy students and/or physical therapy assistants ($n = 5$) and the response without any demographic data ($n = 1$), our final analysis sample consisted of 514 records.

Table 1 summarizes the demographic and professional characteristics of the study respondents. The majority of respondents were women (66.1%), at or under 40 years of age (73.2%), and White race (77.0%). The mean IP score was 60.3 (SD: 15.1, range: 19 to 95). As shown in Figure 1, 55 (10.7%) had low IP, 196 (38.1%) had moderate IP, 215 (41.8%) had frequent IP, and 48 (9.3%) had intense IP. When dichotomized, IP was absent in 251 (48.8%) and present in 263 (51.2%) survey respondents. A sensitivity analysis to compare 4-level vs. 2-level IP categories showed immaterial differences in factors with a $P\text{-value} \leq 0.20$ (see Supplemental Table 1).

Age was strongly correlated with years of experience as a PT ($R = 0.85$), therefore was excluded from the model to avoid multicollinearity. The initial logistic regression model included the following 11 predictors: gender, geographic location, time as a licensed PT, time in current position, terminal degree, manager/supervisor experience, time spent on direct patient care, time spent with patients during initial evaluations, history of or current mental health diagnosis, emotional exhaustion, and job satisfaction.

Following the principles for purposeful model selection (outlined in the Methods section), we identified the final most parsimonious logistic regression model, shown in Table 2. The Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test had a P value of 0.897,

suggesting that there was no significant difference between observed and predicted values.

Having managerial or supervisory experience reduced the likelihood of IP by 45% [OR=0.55, (95%CI=0.34-0.90)]. Having a terminal bachelor's or master's degree (versus a terminal DPT degree) [OR=2.31, (95%CI=1.07-5.00)]; history of or current mental health diagnosis [OR=2.77 (95%CI: 1.69-4.54)], unsure/undiagnosed mental health diagnosis [OR=3.21 (95%CI: 1.74-5.94)], and moderate or high level of emotional exhaustion [OR=5.37 (95%CI: 2.11-13.69); OR=14.13 (95%CI: 5.56-35.89), respectively] each increased the odds of IP. Having 11 to 20 years of clinical experience (versus ≤ 5 years) and holding their current position > 6 years (versus < 1 year) may reduce the odds of IP [OR=0.55 (95%CI: 0.28-1.08, $P=0.08$); OR=0.50 (95%CI: 0.24-1.04, $P=0.06$), respectively]. It is important to point out that these associations were cross-sectional; no causal inference could be made. For example, the negative association of having managerial or supervisory experience and the presence of IP could be bi-directional. Those with IP might not believe that they could be in a leadership role, therefore may not seek a managerial/supervisory position; or managers/supervisors were less likely to experience IP.

DISCUSSION

IP is highly prevalent among physical therapists in the US. Over half of the survey respondents reported frequent or intense IP. Seasoned clinicians holding managerial positions exhibited a lower susceptibility to IP, whereas individuals with a mental health

diagnosis, emotional exhaustion, and lacking a DPT degree were more prone to this phenomenon. Other factors, such as gender, race, sexuality, geographic location, practice specialty/setting, APTA membership, and job satisfaction did not significantly influence IP. A reduced likelihood of experiencing IP appeared to be associated with a greater length of time held in a professional position. Interestingly, there appeared to be a sweet spot in terms of years as a licensed PT. Specifically, having 11-20 years of clinical practice experience may be linked to reduced IP. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first report investigating the prevalence, predictors, and impact of IP among licensed PTs. Given the high prevalence of IP and its potential negative impacts on mental well-being, it is important to provide education and resources to effectively manage and overcome this phenomenon in the physical therapy community.

The current study findings are in general agreement with previous research conducted in other licensed health care professions. In a literature review of studies involving medical students, residents, and physicians¹⁶, the prevalence of IP ranged from 22.5% to 46.6%. The mean imposter scores within these studies ranged from 47.0 to 61.2. Frequent-to-intense IP was observed in 38.9% of neurosurgeons and neurosurgery residents, with the majority of individuals reporting moderate levels of IP (42.7%)¹⁷. A significant proportion of radiologists (71%) experienced frequent-to-intense IP¹⁸. This finding should be interpreted with caution. The limited number of participants (n = 21) may introduce the possibility of participation bias, which could potentially overestimate the rate of IP.

A noteworthy result emerged from the current study, revealing that over 40% of respondents reported a diagnosed or suspected mental health condition. This finding

underscores the significance of pre-existing mental health comorbidities in PTs. These conditions can be further exacerbated by elevated levels of occupational stress resulting from a number of factors, including demanding physical and mental workloads, significant administrative work (e.g., documentation and billing), high patient expectation and demands, the constant pressure to stay updated in the field and continually learn, and productivity benchmarks within health care settings^{5, 19, 20}. Our data showed that respondents with diagnosed or suspected mental health conditions were approximately 3 times more likely to experience IP. Poor mental health can significantly hinder professional performance, elevate the risk of medical errors, contribute to burnout, and amplify the experience of IP^{16, 21, 22}. Further, individuals with perfectionist tendencies and difficulty internalizing their successes are more susceptible to experiencing IP. These tendencies not only contribute to the development of IP but can also function as precursors to mental health conditions, such as anxiety and depression. This interplay between perfectionism, inadequate self-assessment of achievements, IP, and mental health challenges could have detrimental effects on professional and personal outcomes^{16, 20, 21, 22}.

The majority of PTs (87.7%) in this survey experienced at least moderate levels of emotional exhaustion and approximately half experienced high levels. Emotional exhaustion has been identified as a central measure of burnout^{23, 24}, which could lead to medical errors, reduced productivity, and turnover^{5, 19}. Contrary to a previous study that reported no clear relationship between burnout and IP in 48 internal medicine residents²⁵, we found a dose-response relationship between emotional exhaustion. A higher level of emotional exhaustion was associated with a greater likelihood of IP. PTs

may be more susceptible to burnout, given the prolonged and frequent patient encounters within a typical work week⁵. However, in our study sample, reported job satisfaction was high among PTs (82%). Time spent on direct patient care or time spent with patients during initial evaluation and return visits did not appear to heavily impact IP. Thus, factors beyond workload and time spent with patients must be further explored to better understand the underlying causes for emotional exhaustion in PTs.

Respondents with managerial/supervisory roles or longer time in the current position were less likely to experience IP. Prior research has not consistently demonstrated a clear relationship between job ranks or professional longevity with IP. Among surgeons, IP was more prevalent and worse in trainees and residents than faculty mentors^{17, 26}. On the contrary, non-tenured faculty had lower IP scores than their tenure-track counterparts²⁷ and IP was common in those working in top research institutions²⁸. This is potentially due to the high-pressure research environments and intense competition for funding and recognition. The conflicting observations could be related to differences in job security, workload, and expectations between clinical and academic settings.

Gender was not linked to IP when accounting for other demographic, professional, and mental health factors. While early studies primarily focused on the prevalence of IP in females in various occupational settings, updated research revealed that IP is common in both men and women¹. Notably, the univariable association between gender and IP attenuated to non-significance after adjusting for other variables. This finding highlights

that gender alone may not be a significant predictor of IP and caution against drawing conclusions solely on gender when seeking to understand the risk profile of IP.

The present study has significant strengths. This is the first study that comprehensively examined IP and its predictors among licensed PTs, using a validated outcome measure to categorize IP. Compared to previous research of IP in health care professionals, the present study included the largest sample to date and employed a more rigorous analytic approach of multivariable regression modeling. Our study sample was representative of the demographics of licensed PTs in the United States, as reported by the U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, 2022²⁹. This alignment with the broader PT community enhances the generalizability of our findings and allows for meaningful comparisons and inferences regarding IP in PTs. Additionally, a focus group was utilized prior to survey distribution to ensure inclusivity and ease with the survey experience.

Limitations

Our study also has limitations. The cross-sectional study design precludes us from establishing causal relationships. We cannot definitively determine whether the identified demographic and professional factors were predictors for or consequences of IP. Nonetheless, this study provides a valuable groundwork for future investigations aimed at mitigating potential risk factors associated with IP. Although this survey was peer reviewed by a focus group of PTs from diverse clinical settings to ensure clarity and comprehensibility prior to its dissemination, some variability in the interpretation of

the survey questions may have occurred. Due to the multiple channels of survey distribution and de-identified collection of information, individuals may have accessed and responded to the survey more than once, despite being informed to avoid repeated attempts.

Conclusions

IP is highly prevalent among licensed PTs, with more than half reporting frequent or intense IP. Seasoned clinicians with managerial roles seemed to be less susceptible to IP, whereas those with mental health diagnoses, emotional exhaustion, and those without a DPT degree may be more likely to experience IP. Given the high prevalence of IP and its negative impacts, it is important to prioritize education and awareness about this phenomenon. PT clinicians and students need to be equipped with information, strategies, and resources to effectively manage and mitigate IP, ensuring their long-term professional success and personal well-being.

References:

1. Bravata DM, Watts SA, Keefer AL, et al. Prevalence, Predictors, and Treatment of Impostor Syndrome: a Systematic Review. *J GEN INTERN MED*. 2020;35(4):1252-1275. doi:10.1007/s11606-019-05364-1
2. Mak KKL, Kleitman S, Abbott MJ. Impostor Phenomenon Measurement Scales: A Systematic Review. *Front Psychol*. 2019; 10:671. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2019.00671
3. Hutchins HM, Rainbolt H. What triggers imposter phenomenon among academic faculty? A critical incident study exploring antecedents, coping, and development opportunities. *Human Resource Development International*. 2017;20(3):194-214. doi:10.1080/13678868.2016.1248205
4. Sexton JB, Adair KC, Proulx J, et al. Emotional Exhaustion Among US Health Care Workers Before and During the COVID-19 Pandemic, 2019-2021. *JAMA Netw Open*. 2022;5(9): e2232748. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.32748
5. Pustułka-Piwnik U, Ryn ZJ, Krzywoszański Ł, Stożek J. Burnout syndrome in physical therapists - demographic and organizational factors. *Med Pr*. 2014;65(4):453-462. doi:10.13075/mp.5893.00038
6. Freeman KJ, Houghton S, Carr SE, Nestel D. Measuring impostor phenomenon in healthcare simulation educators: a validation of the Clance Impostor Phenomenon Scale and Leary Imposterism Scale. *BMC Med Educ*. 2022;22(1):139. doi:10.1186/s12909-022-03190-4
7. Chrisman SM, Pieper WA, Clance PR, Holland CL, Glickauf-Hughes C. Validation of the Clance Impostor Phenomenon Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 1995;65(3):456-467. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa6503_6
8. Holmes SW, Kertay L, Adamson LB, Holland CL, Clance PR. Measuring the Impostor Phenomenon: A Comparison of Clance's IP Scale and Harvey's I-P Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*. 1993;60(1):48-59. doi:10.1207/s15327752jpa6001_3
9. Clance PR. *The Impostor Phenomenon: Overcoming the Fear That Haunts Your Success*. Peachtree; 1985.
10. Slabšinskienė E, Gorelik A, Kavaliauskienė A, Zaborskis A. Burnout and Its Relationship with Demographic and Job-Related Variables among Dentists in Lithuania: A Cross-Sectional Study. *IJERPH*. 2021;18(8):3968. doi:10.3390/ijerph18083968
11. Maslach C, Jackson S, Leiter M. In: *Evaluating Stress: A Book of Resources*. third. Scarecrow Education; 1997.
12. Wall M, Schenck-Gustafsson K, Minucci D, Sendén MG, Løvseth LT, Fridner A. Suicidal ideation among surgeons in Italy and Sweden – a cross-sectional study. *BMC Psychol*. 2014;2(1):53. doi:10.1186/s40359-014-0053-0

13. de Paiva LC, Canário ACG, de Paiva China ELC, Gonçalves AK. Burnout syndrome in health-care professionals in a university hospital. *Clinics (Sao Paulo)*. 2017;72(5):305-309. doi:10.6061/clinics/2017(05)08
14. Bowling NA, Hammond GD. A meta-analytic examination of the construct validity of the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire Job Satisfaction Subscale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 2008;73(1):63-77. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2008.01.004
15. Bursac Z, Gauss CH, Williams DK, Hosmer DW. Purposeful selection of variables in logistic regression. *Source Code Biol Med*. 2008;3(1):17. doi:10.1186/1751-0473-3-17
16. Thomas M, Bigatti S. Perfectionism, impostor phenomenon, and mental health in medicine: a literature review. *Int J Med Educ*. 2020; 11:201-213. doi:10.5116/ijme.5f54.c8f8
17. Zaed I, Bongetta D, Della Pepa GM, et al. The prevalence of imposter syndrome among young neurosurgeons and residents in neurosurgery: a multicentric study. *Neurosurgical Focus*. 2022;53(2):E9. doi:10.3171/2022.4.FOCUS2216
18. Deshmukh S, Shmelev K, Vassiliades L, Kurumety S, Agarwal G, Horowitz JM. Imposter phenomenon in radiology: incidence, intervention, and impact on wellness. *Clinical Imaging*. 2022;82:94-99. doi:10.1016/j.clinimag.2021.11.009
19. Meredith LS, Bouskill K, Chang J, Larkin J, Motala A, Hempel S. Predictors of burnout among US healthcare providers: a systematic review. *BMJ Open*. 2022;12(8):e054243. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2021-054243
20. Cawcutt KA, Clance P, Jain S. Bias, Burnout, and Imposter Phenomenon: The Negative Impact of Under-Recognized Intersectionality. *Womens Health Rep (New Rochelle)*. 2021;2(1):643-647. doi:10.1089/whr.2021.0138
21. Shanafelt TD, Dyrbye LN, Sinsky C, et al. Imposter Phenomenon in US Physicians Relative to the US Working Population. *Mayo Clin Proc*. 2022;97(11):1981-1993. doi:10.1016/j.mayocp.2022.06.021
22. Neureiter M, Traut-Mattausch E. An Inner Barrier to Career Development: Preconditions of the Impostor Phenomenon and Consequences for Career Development. *Front Psychol*. 2016;7:48. doi:10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00048
23. Halbesleben JRB, Buckley MR. Burnout in Organizational Life. *Journal of Management*. 2004;30(6):859-879. doi:10.1016/j.jm.2004.06.004
24. Ito JK, Brotheridge CM. Resources, coping strategies, and emotional exhaustion: A conservation of resources perspective. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*. 2003;63(3):490-509. doi:10.1016/S0001-8791(02)00033-7
25. Legassie J, Zibrowski EM, Goldszmidt MA. Measuring Resident Well-Being: Imposterism and Burnout Syndrome in Residency. *J GEN INTERN MED*. 2008;23(7):1090-1094. doi:10.1007/s11606-008-0536-x

26. Leach PK, Nygaard RM, Chipman JG, Brunsvold ME, Marek AP. Impostor Phenomenon and Burnout in General Surgeons and General Surgery Residents. *Journal of Surgical Education*. 2019;76(1):99-106. doi:10.1016/j.jsurg.2018.06.025
27. Clark M, Vardeman K, Barba S. Perceived Inadequacy: A Study of the Imposter Phenomenon among College and Research Librarians. *CRL*. 2014;75(3):255-271. doi:10.5860/crl12-423
28. Woolston C. Faking it. *Nature*. 2016;529(7587):555-557. doi:10.1038/nj7587-555a
29. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. Labor Force Statistics from the Current Population Survey. <https://www.bls.gov/cps/cpsaat11.htm> 2022. January 25, 2023. June 19, 2023.

TABLE 1. Descriptive Summary of Demographic and Professional Factors related to 4 IP Categories (Univariate Comparisons)

Factor	Total N (N = 514)	Low IP (N = 55)	Moderate IP (N = 196)	Frequent IP (N = 215)	Intense IP (N = 48)	P value*
Age groups (years)						< 0.001
20-30	172	9 (5.2%)	60 (34.9%)	83 (48.3%)	20 (11.6%)	
31-40	204	19 (9.3%)	79 (38.7%)	85 (41.7%)	21 (10.3%)	
41-50	67	10 (14.9%)	28 (41.8%)	26 (38.8%)	3 (4.5%)	
51-60	41	5 (12.2%)	18 (43.9%)	14 (34.1%)	4 (9.8%)	
> 60	30	12 (40.0%)	11 (36.7%)	7 (23.3%)	0 (0.0%)	
Race						0.523
White alone, non-Hispanic	396	43 (10.9%)	154 (38.9%)	166 (41.9%)	33 (8.3%)	
Asian alone, non-Hispanic	36	5 (13.9%)	9 (25.0%)	18 (50.0%)	4 (11.1%)	
Hispanic	25	1 (4.0%)	10 (40.0%)	12 (48.0%)	2 (8.0%)	
Other	57	6 (10.5%)	23 (40.4%)	19 (33.3%)	9 (15.8%)	
Gender						0.002
Cisgender woman	340	27 (7.9%)	117 (34.4%)	161 (47.4%)	35 (10.3%)	
Cisgender man	128	22 (17.2%)	55 (43.0%)	40 (31.3%)	11 (8.6%)	
Other/Prefer not to answer	46	6 (13.0%)	24 (52.2%)	14 (30.4%)	2 (4.3%)	
Sexuality						0.670
Heterosexual	446	45 (10.1%)	169 (37.9%)	189 (42.4%)	43 (9.6%)	
LGBTQ plus	38	4 (10.5%)	16 (42.1%)	16 (42.1%)	2 (5.3%)	
Prefer not to answer	30	6 (20.0%)	11 (36.7%)	10 (33.3%)	3 (10.0%)	
Geographic location^a						0.035
Midwest	172	20 (11.6%)	69 (40.1%)	70 (40.7%)	13 (7.6%)	
Northeast	86	15 (17.4%)	28 (32.6%)	35 (40.7%)	8 (9.3%)	
Other (e.g., abroad)	11	0 (0.0%)	1 (9.1%)	6 (54.5%)	4 (36.4%)	
Southeast	57	8 (14.0%)	22 (38.6%)	24 (42.1%)	3 (5.3%)	
Southwest	34	4 (11.8%)	15 (44.1%)	10 (29.4%)	5 (14.7%)	
West	135	8 (5.9%)	50 (37.0%)	65 (48.1%)	12 (8.9%)	
Time as a licensed PT (years)						< 0.001
≤ 5	198	11 (5.6%)	66 (33.3%)	95 (48.0%)	26 (13.1%)	
6-10	128	8 (6.3%)	48 (37.5%)	65 (50.8%)	7 (5.5%)	
11-20	95	13 (13.7%)	43 (45.3%)	29 (30.5%)	10 (10.5%)	
> 20	93	23 (24.7%)	39 (41.9%)	26 (28.0%)	5 (5.4%)	
Time in current position (years)^b						< 0.001
< 1	152	5 (3.3%)	51 (33.6%)	76 (50.0%)	20 (13.2%)	
1-3	169	19 (11.2%)	65 (38.5%)	71 (42.0%)	14 (8.3%)	
4-6	86	9 (10.5%)	29 (33.7%)	38 (44.2%)	10 (11.6%)	
> 6	106	22 (20.8%)	50 (47.2%)	30 (28.3%)	4 (3.8%)	
Practice setting^c						0.895
Private practice	229	27 (11.8%)	78 (34.1%)	101 (44.1%)	23 (10.0%)	
Hospital	190	16 (8.4%)	81 (42.6%)	77 (40.5%)	16 (8.4%)	
Academic	32	4 (12.5%)	13 (40.6%)	12 (37.5%)	3 (9.4%)	
Military	12	2 (16.7%)	5 (41.7%)	3 (25.0%)	2 (16.7%)	

Other non-for-profit	12	1 (8.3%)	5 (41.5%)	6 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0.861
Other	31	5 (16.1%)	11 (35.5%)	13 (41.9%)	2 (6.5%)	
Practice specialty^d						
Orthopedics	374	42 (11.2%)	138 (36.9%)	157 (42.0%)	37 (9.9%)	0.015
Geriatrics	31	2 (6.5%)	17 (54.8%)	12 (38.7%)	0 (0.0%)	
Neurology	28	5 (17.9%)	8 (28.6%)	13 (46.4%)	2 (7.1%)	
Pelvic Health	25	2 (8.0%)	9 (36.0%)	10 (40.0%)	4 (16.0%)	
Pediatrics	17	0 (0.0%)	6 (35.3%)	9 (52.9%)	2 (11.8%)	
Sports	4	0 (0.0%)	1 (25.0%)	2 (50.0%)	1 (25.0%)	
Cardiopulmonary	2	0 (0.0%)	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Oncology	1	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (100.0%)	0 (0.0%)	
Other	8	1 (12.5%)	4 (50.0%)	2 (25.0%)	1 (12.5%)	
Terminal degree^b						
DPT	425	40 (9.4%)	158 (37.2%)	190 (44.7%)	37 (8.7%)	0.546
Bachelor's degrees	16	5 (31.3%)	4 (25.0%)	4 (25.0%)	3 (18.8%)	
Master's degrees	38	3 (7.9%)	16 (41.2%)	15 (39.5%)	4 (10.5%)	
EdD, DSc, DHS, or PhD	34	6 (17.6%)	18 (52.9%)	6 (17.6%)	4 (11.8%)	
APTA membership^e						0.295
Yes	312	37 (11.9%)	114 (36.5%)	129 (41.3%)	32 (10.3%)	
No	200	18 (9.0%)	81 (40.5%)	85 (42.5%)	16 (8.0%)	< 0.001
Credentials						
Board certified specialties	103	11 (10.7%)	40 (38.8%)	43 (41.7%)	9 (8.7%)	
Fellow (FAAOMPT)	88	16 (18.2%)	37 (42.0%)	29 (33.0%)	6 (6.8%)	
Other	61	3 (4.9%)	25 (41.0%)	27 (44.3%)	6 (9.8%)	
None	262	25 (9.5%)	94 (35.9%)	116 (44.3%)	27 (10.3%)	0.101
Manager/supervisor experience^f						
Yes	204	35 (17.2%)	90 (44.1%)	66 (32.4%)	13 (6.4%)	
No	305	20 (6.6%)	104 (34.1%)	147 (48.2%)	34 (11.1%)	0.094
Time per week spent on direct patient care (hours/week)^e						
< 10	66	14 (21.2%)	26 (39.4%)	23 (34.8%)	3 (4.5%)	
11-20	61	6 (9.8%)	24 (39.3%)	24 (39.3%)	7 (11.5%)	
21-30	103	11 (10.7%)	42 (40.8%)	37 (35.9%)	13 (12.6%)	
> 30	282	24 (8.5%)	103 (36.5%)	130 (46.1%)	25 (8.9%)	0.504
Time spent with patients during initial evaluations (minutes)^g						
< 44	147	15 (10.2%)	64 (43.5%)	58 (39.5%)	10 (6.8%)	
45-59	234	24 (10.3%)	75 (32.1%)	106 (45.3%)	29 (12.4%)	
≥ 60	118	14 (11.9%)	53 (44.9%)	43 (36.4%)	8 (6.8%)	< 0.001
Time spent with patients during return visits (minutes)^h						
< 30	95	8 (8.4%)	34 (35.8%)	43 (45.3%)	10 (10.5%)	
30-44	192	22 (11.5%)	71 (37.0%)	87 (45.3%)	12 (6.3%)	
45-59	154	17 (11.0%)	62 (40.3%)	55 (35.7%)	20 (13.0%)	
≥ 60	59	6 (10.2%)	26 (44.1%)	22 (37.3%)	5 (8.5%)	
History of or current mental health diagnosis						< 0.001

Yes	134	7 (5.2%)	33 (24.6%)	73 (54.5%)	21 (15.7%)	
Unsure/not diagnosed by a professional	76	5 (6.6%)	17 (22.4%)	40 (52.6%)	14 (18.4%)	
No	304	43 (14.1%)	146 (48.0%)	102 (33.6%)	13 (4.3%)	
Emotional exhaustion						< 0.001
Low	63	23 (36.5%)	34 (54.0%)	5 (7.9%)	1 (1.6%)	
Moderate	192	21 (10.9%)	91 (47.4%)	70 (36.5%)	10 (5.2%)	
High	259	11 (4.2%)	71 (27.4%)	140 (54.1%)	37 (14.3%)	
Job satisfactionⁱ						0.023
Low	89	6 (6.7%)	25 (28.1%)	50 (56.2%)	8 (9.0%)	
High	423	49 (11.6%)	169 (40.0%)	165 (39.0%)	40 (9.5%)	

**P* values comparing across 4 IP categories ≤ 0.20 are marked in bold.

^adid not answer (n=19)

^bdid not answer (n=1)

^cdid not answer (n=8)

^ddid not answer (n=24)

^edid not answer (n=2)

^fdid not answer (n=5)

^gdid not answer (n=15)

^hdid not answer (n=14)

ⁱdid not answer (n=2)

TABLE 2. Factors Associated with IP: Multivariable Logistic Regression (n = 507)

Factor	Odds Ratio	95% CI Upper bound	95% CI Lower bound	P value*
Gender				
Cisgender man (Reference group)				
Cisgender woman	1.30	0.79	2.15	0.308
Other/Prefer not to answer	0.58	0.25	1.33	0.197
Time as a licensed PT (years)				
≤ 5 (Reference group)				
6-10	1.25	0.70	2.23	0.451
11-20	0.55	0.28	1.08	0.081 [#]
> 20	0.98	0.43	2.26	0.962
Time in current position (years)				
< 1 (Reference group)				
1-3	0.94	0.56	1.60	0.821
4-6	1.03	0.53	2.03	0.925
> 6	0.50	0.24	1.04	0.064 [#]
Manager/supervisor experience				
No (Reference group)				
Yes	0.55	0.34	0.90	0.017
Terminal degree				
DPT (Reference group)				
Bachelor's or Master's degrees	2.31	1.07	5.00	0.034
EdD, DSc, DHS, or PhD	0.71	0.28	1.81	0.469
History of or current mental health diagnosis				
No (Reference group)				
Yes	2.77	1.69	4.54	< 0.001
Unsure/not diagnosed by a professional	3.21	1.74	5.94	< 0.001
Emotional exhaustion				
Low (Reference group)				
Moderate	5.37	2.11	13.69	< 0.001
High	14.13	5.56	35.89	< 0.001

*P values ≤ 0.05 are marked in bold.

[#]P values < 0.10

Supplemental TABLE 1. Descriptive Summary of Demographic and Professional Factors related to IP (yes vs. no) (Univariate Comparisons)

Factor	Total N (N = 514)	IP (-) (N = 251)	IP (+) (N = 263)	P value*
Age groups (years)				0.002
20-30	172	69 (40.1%)	103 (59.9%)	
31-40	204	98 (48.0%)	106 (52.0%)	
41-50	67	38 (56.7%)	29 (43.3%)	
51-60	41	23 (56.1%)	18 (43.9%)	
> 60	30	23 (76.7%)	7 (23.3%)	
Race				0.596
White alone, non-Hispanic	396	197 (49.7%)	199 (50.3%)	
Asian alone, non-Hispanic	36	14 (39.9%)	22 (61.1%)	
Hispanic	25	11 (44.0%)	14 (56.0%)	
Other	57	29 (50.9%)	28 (49.1%)	
Gender				< 0.001
Cisgender woman	340	144 (42.2%)	196 (57.6%)	
Cisgender man	128	77 (60.2%)	51 (39.8%)	
Other/Prefer not to answer	46	30 (65.2%)	16 (34.8%)	
Sexuality				0.581
Heterosexual	446	214 (48.0%)	232 (52.0%)	
LGBTQ plus	38	20 (52.6%)	18 (47.4%)	
Prefer not to answer	30	17 (56.7%)	13 (43.3%)	
Geographic location^a				0.064
Midwest	172	89 (51.7%)	83 (48.3%)	
Northeast	86	43 (50.0%)	43 (50.0%)	
Other (e.g., abroad)	11	1 (9.1%)	10 (90.9%)	
Southeast	57	30 (52.6%)	27 (47.4%)	
Southwest	34	19 (55.9%)	15 (44.1%)	
West	135	58 (43.0%)	77 (57.0%)	
Time as a licensed PT (years)				< 0.001
≤ 5	198	77 (38.9%)	121 (61.1%)	
6-10	128	56 (43.8%)	72 (56.3%)	
11-20	95	56 (58.9%)	39 (41.1%)	
> 20	93	62 (66.7%)	31 (33.3%)	
Time in current position (years)^b				< 0.001
< 1	152	56 (36.8%)	96 (63.2%)	
1-3	169	84 (49.7%)	85 (50.3%)	
4-6	86	38 (44.2%)	48 (55.8%)	
> 6	106	72 (67.9%)	34 (32.1%)	
Practice specialty^c				0.656
Orthopedics	374	180 (48.1%)	194 (51.9%)	
Geriatrics	31	19 (61.3%)	12 (38.7%)	
Neurology	28	13 (46.4%)	15 (53.6%)	
Pelvic Health	25	11 (44.0%)	14 (56.0%)	
Pediatrics	17	6 (35.3%)	11 (64.7%)	

Sports	4	1 (25.0%)	3 (75.0%)	
Cardiopulmonary	2	1 (50.0%)	1 (50.0%)	
Oncology	1	0 (0.0%)	1 (100.0%)	
Other	8	5 (62.5%)	3 (37.5%)	
Terminal degree^b				0.053
DPT	425	198 (46.6%)	227 (53.4%)	
Bachelor's degrees	16	9 (56.3%)	7 (43.8%)	
Master's degrees	38	19 (50.0%)	19 (50.0%)	
EdD, DSc, DHS, or PhD	34	24 (70.6%)	10 (29.4%)	
APTA membership^d				0.808
Yes	312	151 (48.4%)	161 (51.6%)	
No	200	99 (49.5%)	101 (50.5%)	
Credentials				0.110
Board certified specialties	103	51 (49.5%)	52 (50.5%)	
Fellow (FAAOMPT)	88	53 (60.2%)	35 (39.8%)	
Other	61	28 (45.9%)	33 (54.1%)	
None	262	119 (45.4%)	143 (54.6%)	
Manager/supervisor experience^e				< 0.001
Yes	204	125 (61.3%)	79 (38.7%)	
No	305	124 (40.7%)	181 (59.3%)	
Time per week spent on direct patient care (hours/week)^d				0.134
< 10	66	40 (60.6%)	26 (39.4%)	
11-20	61	30 (49.2%)	31 (50.8%)	
21-30	103	53 (51.5%)	50 (48.5%)	
> 30	282	127 (45.0%)	155 (55.0%)	
Time spent with patients during initial evaluations (minutes)^f				0.015
< 44	147	79 (53.7%)	68 (46.3%)	
45-59	234	99 (42.3%)	135 (57.7%)	
≥ 60	118	67 (56.8%)	51 (43.2%)	
Time spent with patients during return visits (minutes)^g				0.602
< 30	95	42 (44.2%)	53 (55.8%)	
30-44	192	93 (48.4%)	99 (51.6%)	
45-59	154	79 (51.3%)	75 (48.7%)	
≥ 60	59	32 (54.2%)	27 (45.8%)	
History of or current mental health diagnosis				< 0.001
Yes	134	40 (29.9%)	94 (70.1%)	
Unsure/not diagnosed by a professional	76	22 (28.9%)	54 (71.1%)	
No	304	189 (62.2%)	115 (37.8%)	
Emotional exhaustion				< 0.001
Low	63	57 (90.5%)	6 (9.5%)	
Moderate	192	112 (58.3%)	80 (41.7%)	
High	259	82 (31.7%)	177 (68.3%)	
Job satisfaction^h				0.004
Low	89	31 (34.8%)	58 (65.2%)	

High	423	218 (51.5%)	205 (48.5%)
------	-----	-------------	-------------

*P values comparing between IP yes vs. no ≤ 0.20 are marked in bold.

^adid not answer (n=19)

^bdid not answer (n=1)

^cdid not answer (n=24)

^ddid not answer (n=2)

^edid not answer (n=5)

^fdid not answer (n=15)

^gdid not answer (n=14)

^hdid not answer (n=2)




Figure 1. Imposter Phenomenon (IP) prevalence among US physical therapists

Funding: No funding from agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors played a role in the design, conduct, or reporting of this research.

Declarations of Interest: None

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to acknowledge and thank the Orthopedics, Geriatrics, Neurology, and Home Health academies of the American Physical Therapy Association and the American Academy of Orthopaedic Manual Physical Therapists for their assistance and contribution to this study.