



Short Communication

Perfectionism and social desirability: Students report increased perfectionism to create a positive impression

Joachim Stoeber*, Sarah Hotham

School of Psychology, University of Kent, United Kingdom

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 9 January 2013

Received in revised form 12 April 2013

Accepted 19 April 2013

Available online 25 May 2013

Keywords:

Positive striving perfectionism
 Maladaptive evaluation concerns
 perfectionism
 Impression management
 Self-enhancement
 Self-depreciation

ABSTRACT

Because previous studies examining correlations between perfectionism and social desirability produced inconclusive findings, this study used an experimental approach examining the perceived social desirability of perfectionism. 117 university students were randomly assigned to three conditions (fake-good, standard, and fake-bad instructions) and then completed measures of self-oriented, other-oriented, and socially prescribed perfectionism. Results showed that all three forms of perfectionism were perceived as socially desirable. Self-oriented perfectionism showed a strong linear trend across the conditions: Students reported significantly higher self-oriented perfectionism in the fake-good condition, and significantly lower self-oriented perfectionism in the fake-bad condition compared to standard instructions. Other-oriented perfectionism showed the same linear trend, albeit weaker, and only fake-good and fake-bad conditions differed significantly. Socially prescribed perfectionism too showed a significant linear trend: Students reported higher levels in the fake-good condition compared to standard instructions and fake-bad condition, with no significant difference between the latter conditions. The findings indicate that, in educational settings, students perceive perfectionism—including maladaptive forms such as socially prescribed perfectionism—as socially desirable.

© 2013 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

1.1. Multidimensional perfectionism

Perfectionism is a personality disposition characterized by striving for flawlessness and setting exceedingly high standards for performance accompanied by tendencies for overly critical evaluations of one's behavior (Flett & Hewitt, 2002; Frost, Marten, Lahart, & Rosenblate, 1990). Research has shown that perfectionism is best conceptualized as a multidimensional characteristic (see Enns & Cox, 2002, for a review). One widely-researched conceptualization of multidimensional perfectionism is Hewitt and Flett's (1991) model, differentiating three forms of perfectionism: self-oriented, other-oriented, and socially prescribed perfectionism. Self-oriented perfectionism comprises a person's beliefs that striving for perfection and being perfect are important; it is characterized by having perfectionistic expectations for oneself. In contrast, other-oriented perfectionism involves beliefs that it is important others meet one's high standards for performance; it is characterized by having perfectionistic expectations of others. Socially prescribed perfectionism comprises beliefs that high stan-

dards are expected by others and acceptance by others is conditional on fulfilling these standards; it is characterized by individuals' perceptions that others have perfectionistic expectations of them that they must fulfill.

Research has shown that when different measures of multidimensional perfectionism are combined in a factor analysis, two superordinate factors emerge: one factor called "positive striving perfectionism" and one called "maladaptive evaluation concerns perfectionism" (Frost, Heimberg, Holt, Mattia, & Neubauer, 1993). The first factor captures "good perfectionism" (Bieling, Israeli, & Antony, 2004) and has shown positive correlations with conscientiousness whereas the second factor captures "bad perfectionism" and has shown positive correlations with neuroticism (see Stoeber & Otto, 2006, for a review). Across studies, self-oriented and other-oriented perfectionism always formed part of the first factor whereas socially prescribed perfectionism always formed part of the second (see again Stoeber & Otto, 2006).

1.2. Multidimensional perfectionism and social desirability

Social desirability is an individual difference variable aiming to capture respondents' tendency to over-report "good" and under-report "bad" behaviors and characteristics so others will view them favorably (e.g., Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). Because positive striving perfectionism is seen as "good" and conscientiousness

* Corresponding author. Address: School of Psychology, University of Kent, Canterbury, Kent CT2 7NP, United Kingdom. Tel.: +44 1227 824196.

E-mail address: J.Stoeber@kent.ac.uk (J. Stoeber).

has shown positive correlations with social desirability whereas maladaptive evaluation concerns perfectionism is seen as “bad” and neuroticism has shown negative correlations with social desirability (e.g., Stöber, 2001), it could be expected that self-oriented and other-oriented perfectionism would show positive correlations with social desirability scores whereas socially prescribed perfectionism would show negative correlations. However, findings so far have been inconclusive. In a study with university students (Hewitt & Flett, 1991), other-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism showed negative correlations with social desirability scores, which suggests that students perceived higher levels of other-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism as less socially desirable than lower levels. This finding, however, failed to replicate in a study with psychiatric patients (Hewitt, Flett, Turnbull-Donovan, & Mikail, 1991) where all three forms of perfectionism showed nonsignificant correlations with social desirability scores.

1.3. The present study

Whereas the interpretation of high social desirability scores as “faking” is debated (e.g., McCrae & Costa, 1983), it is unquestionable that responses to personality questionnaires can be faked if respondents intend, or are instructed, to do so. For example, when Furnham (1997) asked students to fake good and bad responses to a questionnaire measuring the Big Five personality traits, students reported higher conscientiousness and lower neuroticism in the fake-good condition, and lower conscientiousness and higher neuroticism in the fake-bad condition, compared to standard instructions. This suggests that students perceived higher levels of conscientiousness and lower levels of neuroticism as more socially desirable. Consequently, the aim of the present study was to examine the perceived social desirability of self-oriented, other-oriented, and socially prescribed perfectionism using the same experimental approach Furnham and others used investigating how students react to instructions to create a good (“fake good”) or bad (“fake bad”) impression compared to standard instructions. Because previous studies using a correlational approach (Hewitt & Flett, 1991; Hewitt et al., 1991) produced inconclusive findings that partly contradicted expectations one may have based on the three forms’ associations with “good” versus “bad” perfectionism (Bieling et al., 2004), the study was largely exploratory.

2. Method

2.1. Participants

117 students (26 male, 91 female) were recruited at our university using the School of Psychology’s Research Participation Scheme (RPS). Mean age of students was 20.1 years ($SD = 3.7$; range: 18–44 years). Students volunteered to participate in the study for RPS credits or a raffle for £50 (~US \$80) and completed all measures online using the School’s Qualtrics® system.

2.2. Procedure

Stratified by gender, students were randomly allocated to three conditions: fake-good, standard, and fake-bad. Adapting the instructions Darnon, Dompnier, Delmas, Pulfrey, and Butera (2009) used to investigate social desirability of achievement goals in university students, students in the fake-good condition received the following instructions:

Create a good image of yourself—as judged by your lecturers. As you fill in the following questionnaires, we would like you to try

and generate a good image of yourself, that is, to answer in such a way as to be judged in a positive way by your lecturers. More specifically, as you indicate your level of agreement with each of the following propositions, you should try and generate a good image of yourself.

Students in the standard condition received the instructions that they should respond honestly how they personally see themselves: “We would like you to indicate your level of agreement with each of the following statements. We are interested in how you personally see yourself, so please answer honestly.” Students in the fake-bad condition received the same instructions as students in the fake-good condition, except that the words “good” and “positive” were replaced with the words “bad” and “negative.”

Afterwards, students completed the measures of perfectionism and social desirability (see Section 2.3). Two students, who gave uniform answers (showing zero variance in their answers to the perfectionism and/or impression management items) were removed from the analyses. With this, our final sample comprised 115 students: 38 (8 male, 30 female) in the fake-good, 39 (9 male, 30 female) in the standard, and 38 (8 male, 30 female) in the fake-bad condition.

2.3. Measures

2.3.1. Perfectionism

To measure perfectionism we used the short form of the Multi-dimensional Perfectionism Scale (Hewitt & Flett, 1991; short form: Cox, Enns, & Clara, 2002) capturing self-oriented (5 items; e.g., “I am perfectionistic in setting my goals”), other-oriented (5 items; e.g., “I do not have very high standards for those around me,” reverse-scored), and socially prescribed perfectionism (5 items; e.g., “People expect nothing less than perfection from me”). Students responded to the items on a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Scale scores were computed by averaging responses across items. All scores showed satisfactory reliability: self-oriented perfectionism (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .97$), other-oriented perfectionism ($\alpha = .82$), and socially prescribed perfectionism ($\alpha = .71$).

2.3.2. Impression management

To measure social desirability, we used the 10-item short form of the impression management scale from the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (Paulhus, 1994; short form: Musch, Brockhaus, & Bröder, 2002) capturing positive impression management (e.g., “I never take things that don’t belong to me”). Students responded on a scale from 1 (*not true*) to 7 (*very true*). Scores were computed by averaging responses across items using continuous scoring (Stöber, Dette, & Musch, 2002) and showed satisfactory reliability ($\alpha = .89$).

3. Results

3.1. Impression management

First, we checked if the experimental manipulation was successful by computing an ANOVA on impression management with condition (fake good, standard, fake bad) as between-subjects factor which showed a significant main effect and linear trend (Table 1). As intended, participants in the fake-good condition had higher, and participants in the fake-bad condition lower impression management scores than participants in the standard condition, indicating that the manipulation was successful.

Download English Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/en/article/890622>

Download Persian Version:

<https://daneshyari.com/article/890622>

[Daneshyari.com](https://daneshyari.com)