

The University of Maine

DigitalCommons@UMaine

Honors College

Spring 5-2022

Self-Oriented and Socially-Prescribed Perfectionism and Satisfaction with the Honors College and Major Experience

Ethan Lowell

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.library.umaine.edu/honors>

This Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UMaine. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors College by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UMaine. For more information, please contact um.library.technical.services@maine.edu.

SELF-ORIENTED AND SOCIALLY-PRESCRIBED PERFECTIONISM AND
SATISFACTION WITH THE HONORS COLLEGE AND MAJOR EXPERIENCE

by

Ethan Lowell

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for a Degree with Honors
(Psychology)

The Honors College

University of Maine

April 2022

Advisory Committee:

Jeffrey Hecker, Professor of Psychology, Co-Advisor
Margaret Killinger, Professor of Honors, Co-Advisor
Jordan LaBouff, Associate Professor of Psychology & Honors.
Shannon McCoy, Associate Professor of Psychology
Michael Robbins, Research Associate Professor of Psychology

©2022 Lowell

All Rights Reserved

ABSTRACT

This thesis investigates the relationship between perfectionism and the perceived importance of, and satisfaction with, various components of both the Honors College experience and the experience within majors as rated by University of Maine Honors College students. UMaine Honors College students were recruited to take an online Qualtrics survey. Preliminary descriptive analysis has suggested that, while UMaine Honors College students show average levels of self-oriented perfectionism, they demonstrate exceptionally high levels of socially-prescribed perfectionism, as compared to normative samples. Additionally, UMaine Honors College students exhibit significantly higher ratings of personal importance and satisfaction assigned to components of their major in comparison with the same components of their Honors College experience. Furthermore, correlate analysis has indicated that male Honors College students show a negative correlation between personal importance assigned to major experience, personal satisfaction with major experience and self-oriented and socially-prescribed perfectionism. Further investigation is warranted to develop a better understanding of the extreme mean score of socially-prescribed perfectionism observed in UMaine Honors College students. Future studies might investigate the variables responsible for the lower ratings of importance and satisfaction assigned to the Honors College, relative to their majors.

The Personal Importance & Satisfaction Inventory for the UMaine Honors College & Major Experience provides a novel framework to explore variables unseen in extant literature; this inventory, given further research to establish its reliability and validity, shows promise in evaluating weaknesses in Honors College experiences versus

within-major experiences, which is a much-needed tool for baccalaureate colleges given Curran & Hill's (2019) findings that SOP and SPP are currently increasing at dramatic rates among undergraduates.

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to Troop 47, the Beta Upsilon Chapter of Tau Kappa Epsilon and to my parents. Thank you for your unconditional support.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	1
METHOD.....	9
Hewitt & Flett MDPS.....	9
Personal Importance & Satisfaction Inventory.....	10
Demographic & Descriptive Variable Questions.....	11
RESULTS.....	13
Descriptive Statistics.....	13
Hypothesis Testing.....	14
Descriptive Analyses.....	16
Exploratory Analysis.....	17
DISCUSSION.....	20
LIMITATIONS & FUTURE DIRECTIONS.....	25
CONCLUSION.....	27
REFERENCES.....	28
APPENDICES A-I	34-61
ABOUT THE AUTHOR.....	62

LIST OF FIGURES

Table 1: Age & GPA Information for UMaine Honors College Students.....	13
Table 2: Grade Frequency & Percent of Sample.....	14
Table 3: Preferred Gender Identity Frequency & Percent of Sample.....	14
Table 4: SOP, SPP, HI, HS, MI, MS Variable Information.....	16
Table 5: Paired Sample T-test for HI vs. MI and HS vs. MS.	17
Table 6: Correlation between Demographic Variables and H/M Variables.....	18
Table 7: Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for HI/HS/MI/MS.....	19
Table 8: HI vs. MI Paired Sample T-Test Information.....	35
Table 9: HS vs. MS Paired Sample T-Test Information.....	36
Table 10: Correlation of SOP & SPP w/ significant items from Tables 8 & 9.....	37
Table 11: Correlations between HI, MI, HS & MS.....	38
Table 12: Factor Analysis for HI-HS & MI-MS & HI-HS-MI-MS.....	39

INTRODUCTION

This thesis investigates the relationship between perfectionism and the perceived importance of, and satisfaction with, various components of both the Honors College experience and the experience within majors as rated by University of Maine Honors College students. Perfectionism is defined as the establishment of high personal standards for academic, professional and social achievement that is typically comorbid with high critical self-evaluation (Hewitt & Flett, 1991). It is a complex construct that includes adaptive as well as maladaptive components (Frost, Marten, Lahart & Rosenblate, 1990).

Adaptive perfectionism is characterized by deriving satisfaction from internal feelings of accomplishment, happiness and achievement as a result of intense dedication while also tolerating personal flaws without employing overly critical self-evaluation and doubt (Rice & Dellwo, 2002). Adaptive perfectionism relies on constructive reappraisal and validation, which has been positively correlated with personal well-being and life satisfaction (Richardson, Rice & Devine, 2014). Additionally, adaptive perfectionism is negatively associated with obsessive-compulsive activities (such as persistent self-checking, overt cleanliness and procrastination), as well as being associated with a lower rate of clinically significant pathopsychology in comparison with maladaptive perfectionism (Wu & Cortesi, 2009). Furthermore, adaptive perfectionists characteristically approach tasks with the intent of achieving success and praise, whereas maladaptive perfectionists approach tasks with the intent of avoiding failure and criticism (Slade & Owens, 1998).

Maladaptive perfectionism is characterized by deriving satisfaction from external reward and validation that is typically comorbid with the establishment of unrealistic

standards and expectations which ultimately lead to overly critical self-evaluation and doubt (Rice & Dellwo, 2002). Maladaptive perfectionism is positively associated with perceived stress which mediates its positive association with depression and negative association with life satisfaction. In contrast, adaptive perfectionism is negatively correlated with perceived stress, thus establishing that there is little relationship between low satisfaction with life and high depression scores in adaptive perfectionism (Ashby, Noble, Gnilka, 2010). From this, it can be inferred that perceived stress is a strong predictor of pathological depression and low life satisfaction, which can be further generalized to satisfaction within specific domains (Stoeber & Stoeber, 2009). Lastly, in establishing the construct validity of perfectionism and its relationship to satisfaction, Wang, Yuen and Slaney (2009) evaluated perfectionistic traits in Chinese students in Hong Kong. It was found that adaptive perfectionism was positively associated with general life satisfaction and negatively with depression; maladaptive perfectionism showed the inverse of these relationships, paralleling extant literature. These findings suggest that the relationship between perfectionism subtype and life satisfaction is evident across cultures and is ubiquitous among college students

Maladaptive perfectionism relies more on suppression and validation that are likely to be obsessive in nature, which is negatively associated with well-being and life satisfaction (Richardson, Rice & Devine, 2014). Additionally, maladaptive perfectionism is strongly associated with obsessive-compulsive activities, such as persistent self-checking, overt cleanliness and procrastination (Wu & Cortesi, 2009). Cognitively, both adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism are associated with consistent intrusive, automatic and critical thoughts related to achievement of goals, thought to derive from

extreme sensitivity to personal imperfections and to faults. This sensitivity is more prevalent in maladaptive perfectionism (Hewitt, Flett, Turnbull-Donovan, & Mikail, 1991). As Frost, Marten, Lahart and Rosenblate (1990) found, adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism had a significant degree of trait overlap, which led to concerns of questionable construct validity. This highlighted the need to establish distinct characterizations of perfectionism that show larger delineation between adaptability-dependent traits. From this, the constructs of self-oriented and socially-prescribed perfectionism were created (Hewitt & Flett, 1991); the former is largely characterized by adaptive cognitive, emotional and behavioral patterns, whereas the latter is more volatile and maladaptive in nature (Frost, Marten, Lahart & Rosenblate, 1990).

The construct of perfectionism is not evenly applied to all domains of life. Stoeber and Stoeber (2009) found that perfectionists, both self-oriented and socially prescribed, are most perfectionistic within work, study and bodily hygiene domains. Both self-oriented and socially-prescribed perfectionists assign similar personal importance to these salient domains, though the manner in which they establish the importance of these domains to themselves differs. Additionally, as the magnitude of perfectionism increases, the number of domains one is perfectionistic in (and thus the personal relevance and importance assigned to these domains) increases. As scores of perfectionism increase, the perceived necessity for general control of life domains increases. However, self-oriented perfectionism is correlated with significantly higher rates of satisfaction in more domains of life than socially-prescribed perfectionism, which parallels extant literature that self-oriented perfectionism is associated with higher levels of contentment and lower levels of anxiety and stress, both of which are hallmark higher levels of general life satisfaction

(Stoeber & Stoeber, 2009). This further illustrates that socially-prescribed perfectionistic traits, while maintaining general control of perfectionism across domains, sacrifice satisfaction for an increase in the personal importance assigned to these domains.

In a meta-analysis with over 25,000 subjects, Locicero and Ashby (2000) found that self-oriented perfectionism is sustainable and adaptable with intrinsic motivation and reward as the main driving factors behind goal-seeking behavior. Both social self-efficacy and general self-efficacy, defined as one's degree of executive function and ability to self-advocate in order to complete a task, are significantly higher in self-oriented perfectionists than in socially-prescribed perfectionists, which results from lower levels of "road-blocking" constructs (distracting/inhibiting cognitive, emotional and behavioral constructs, such as clinical mental health issues, neuroticism, rumination, fear of failure, all of which are positively associated with procrastination) typically found in socially-prescribed perfectionism (Locicero, & Ashby, 2000). Additionally, self-oriented perfectionism shows significant positive correlations with academic engagement and proficiency, and negative correlations with procrastination, indicating high self-efficacy (Closson & Boutilier, 2017), which is positively correlated with high personal standards and conscientious behavioral traits (Saulsman, Page, 2004). Given that self-oriented perfectionists show a greater ability for introspective maintenance due to higher levels of self-efficacy, it is logical that self-oriented perfectionists show significantly lower rates of comorbid mental health issues as well as sustained feelings of accomplishment and contentment in comparison to socially-prescribed perfectionists (Klibert, Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Saito, 2005).

In perpetuating the themes of efficacy and resilience, self-oriented perfectionism has been found to be positively associated with willpower, motivation, perceived self-control and self-esteem as well as with lower magnitudes of depression, anxiety, suicide proneness, shame, guilt and procrastination (Klibert, Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Saito, 2005). However, excessively high self-oriented perfectionism can be comorbid with traits typically found in maladaptive perfectionism, such as having negative correlations with willpower, motivation, perceived self-control and self-esteem; these correlations were rarely as significant as those negative correlations found in high scoring socially-prescribed perfectionism (Klibert, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Saito, 2005). These findings suggest that excessively high self-oriented perfectionism is not always inherently good and highlights a potential necessity for evaluating how much is too much self-oriented perfectionism.

In the same meta-analysis, socially-prescribed perfectionism was found to be more volatile and less sustainable due to extrinsic motivation and external rewards being the main driving factors in goal-seeking behavior (Locicero & Ashby, 2000). Socially-prescribed perfectionism shows significant negative correlations with academic engagement and proficiency, and positive correlations with procrastination, indicating low self-efficacy. Given these lower rates of self-efficacy, introspective maintenance and psycho-emotional regulation appear to be more difficult for socially-prescribed perfectionists. Thus, socially-prescribed perfectionists show moderately higher rates of comorbid mental health issues relative to self-oriented perfectionists and experience fleeting emotions of satisfaction and volatility of contentment due to lack of consistent external validation and reward (Closson & Boutilier, 2017).

Additionally, socially-prescribed perfectionism was found to be negatively associated with willpower, motivation, perceived self-control and self-esteem as well as higher magnitudes of depression, anxiety, suicide proneness, shame, guilt and procrastination (Klibert, Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Saito, 2005). Socially-prescribed perfectionism was positively correlated with concern over mistakes, doubts about actions and neurotic behavioral traits (low agreeableness and low extraversion) (Smith, Sherry, Vidovic, Saklofske, Stoeber & Benoit, 2018). Rice and Dellwo (2002) found the same aforementioned correlations in addition to higher concern about parental criticism, a lower degree of personal standards and poorer organizational skills and, of note, significantly greater scores of goal instability and poorer academic/social integration outcomes seen within socially-prescribed perfectionists in comparison to self-oriented perfectionists; no differences were found between groups for GPA. Though socially-prescribed perfectionists perform nearly identically to self-oriented perfectionists academically, it is evident that there is a higher degree of maladaptive neuroticism assigned to goal-oriented behavior which ultimately leads to poorer confidence in navigating complex scenarios academically and socially for socially-prescribed perfectionists. These findings suggest that socially-prescribed perfectionists may assign personal importance to subjectively-determined salient domains of life (social life, academia, etc.) out of fear of failure and criticism (Rice & Dellwo, 2002).

Perfectionism's maladaptive traits (more comorbid in socially-prescribed perfectionism) show significantly higher incidence within rigorous academic institutions that uphold high academic and professional standards. Parker and Adkins (1995) found (in parallel to Smith, Sherry, Vidovic, Saklofske, Stoeber & Benoit, 2018 as well as Rice

& Dellwo, 2002)) that honors undergraduate students showed significantly higher scores of personal standards, concern over mistakes, parental expectations as well as higher overall scores of perfectionism compared to non-honors undergraduate students. The scores seen in the honors population were high enough to be considered pathological at the time which led to the conclusion that socially-prescribed perfectionism is likely more dominant in rigorous academic environments than self-oriented perfectionism.

Perfectionism also appears to be increasing among college students. A longitudinal meta-analysis of over 41,000 American, Canadian and British college students across 164 samples found that the magnitude of self-oriented and socially-prescribed perfectionism linearly increased by 10% and 32% from 1989 to 2016 (Curran & Hill, 2019).

The research on self-oriented and socially-prescribed perfectionism in honors students suggests the need to better understand how perfectionism relates to the importance students place on various aspects of their academic experiences, as well as their satisfaction with those experiences. This honors thesis explores the relationship between self-oriented, socially-prescribed perfectionism and the importance UMaine honors students place on various features of the UMaine Honors College experience, as well as their satisfaction with those features. Four hypotheses were tested:

1. Socially-prescribed perfectionism will be positively correlated with rating of importance of the UMaine honors experience.

2. Ratings of satisfaction with the UMaine Honors experience will be more strongly correlated with self-oriented perfectionism than with socially-prescribed perfectionism.
3. University of Maine Honors Students will show higher ratings of personal importance and satisfaction with the UMaine Honors experience compared to major experience.
4. Perfectionism will correlate more strongly with ratings of personal importance and satisfaction for the UMaine Honors College experience compared to major experience.

METHOD

University of Maine Honors College students were recruited to participate at the beginning of Week 3 in the Spring 2022 semester via an initial email (see Appendix H). All enrolled honors students were contacted by the Honors College administration and invited to participate. A follow up email (see Appendix I) was sent one week later after the initial email was sent (during Week 4). All surveys were administered on Qualtrics anonymously. The following inventories were included in the survey:

1. *Hewitt & Flett Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (45 items; see note below)*

(See Appendix D)

The Hewitt and Flett Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MDPS) is a reliable (alpha coefficients of $\alpha = 0.74+$, test-retest reliability $r = 0.75+$). Its validity has been established in correlational studies with hundreds of other psychological constructs (Hewitt, Flett, Turnbull-Donovan, & Mikail, 1991). This 45-item questionnaire evaluates the relative magnitude of self-oriented, socially-prescribed and other-oriented perfectionism. The questions that evaluate other-oriented perfectionism (OOP) (15 items total) were omitted in this study because prior research has raised questions about OOP's construct validity; the total number of items from the MDPS on this survey was 30. Three scores were derived from the MDPS for this study: Self-Oriented Perfectionism (SOP); Socially-Prescribed Perfectionism (SPP), and Total Perfectionism. The latter was created by totaling SOP and SPP.

2. Personal Importance & Satisfaction Inventory for the UMaine Honors College & Major Experience [42 items; 2 ratings (personal importance & personal satisfaction) per item] (See Appendix E)

This survey was created by me for this study. I developed it based upon interviews with several Honors College faculty wherein I asked about the Honors College mission, quintessential and unique Honors College experience components, as well as how faculty ensure that both mission and experience are as enriching as possible for honors students. Four members of the Honors College were interviewed with a standardized set of questions designed to encourage critical thought as to what the Honors College mission is, and which components of the honors experience are vital for this mission. All interviews were recorded, the following seven questions were asked, in no particular order:

- How would you describe the honors experience, and what qualities would you say are the most important/unique to the program?
- What exactly is your definition of the UMaine Honors College mission, and what are some of the goals it has for its students?
- How are these goals met as one progresses through the four-year Honors experience?
- No one person can be everywhere in an institution at any one point in time to make sure that everyone reaps the full benefits of the Honors College experience. We all have a limited reach to the individuals around us. That being said, how do

you best ensure that the goals the Honors College has for its students are met with your students?

- Why the Honors College? What makes it so unique? What is it about the Honors experience that deems it as “Honors”?
- Many others feel as if the word “Honors” in this context implies that there is a higher form of interdisciplinary, intellectual enrichment taking place at the Honors College. Do you think this is true?
- In what ways do you think Honors students differ from non-honors college students once they graduate?

Following completion of the interviews, I reviewed and transcribed the recordings, with special attention paid to the central motifs that recurred throughout the interviews. Twenty-one statements were derived from these themes. The statements (e.g., “Deeply passionate intellectual and academic conversations in honors are frequent and enriching”.) were rated on a seven-point Likert scale (1 = not at all important/satisfied, 7 = extremely important/satisfied) for both personal importance and satisfaction. Four scales in total were created with these statements: personal importance assigned to components of the Honors experience (HI), satisfaction with the honors experience (HS), personal importance assigned to components of major experience (MI) and satisfaction with their major experience (MS).

3. Demographic & Descriptive Variable Questions (See Appendix F)

Survey respondents were asked to provide their age, grade, gender, estimated GPA as well as their major(s).

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

A total of 151 Honors College Students responded to the survey; the data from 97 participants were retained while 54 responses were expunged. Participant's data were removed if any of the following conditions were met: missing demographic information (age, grade, preferred gender identity, GPA), significant GPA outliers (more than four standard deviations from the mean); or more than 10 missing data values for any of the included surveys (Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale, Personal Importance & Satisfaction Inventory for Honors Experience, Personal Importance & Satisfaction Inventory for Major Experience). Demographic information for age, GPA, grade and preferred gender identity are presented in Tables 1, 2, and 3 below.

Table 1

Age & GPA Information for UMaine Honors College Students

	Mean	Median	S.D.	Range
Age	19.43	19.00	1.16	5.00
GPA	3.68	3.80	0.46	3.10

Table 2

Grade Frequency & Percent of Sample

	Frequency	Percent
1st Year	40	41.20
2nd Year	22	22.70
3rd Year	24	24.70
4th year	11	11.30
Total	97	100.00

Table 3

Preferred Gender Identity Frequency & Percent of Sample

	Frequency	Percent
Male	16	16.50
Female	72	74.20
Non-binary	7	7.20
Total	97	100.0

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1: Socially-prescribed perfectionism will be positively correlated with rating of importance of the UMaine honors experience.

A simple correlation between socially-prescribed perfectionism (SPP) and ratings of importance for components of the Honors experience (HI) showed no significant association ($r = 0.01$).

Hypothesis 2: Ratings of satisfaction with the UMaine Honors experience will be more strongly correlated with self-oriented perfectionism than with socially-prescribed perfectionism.

Neither SPP nor self-oriented perfectionism (SOP) were correlated with ratings of satisfaction for components of the Honors experience (HS) ($r = -0.07$ and $r = 0.12$ respectively). Given the lack of significant correlations, no comparison was made between SPP-HS and SOP-HS correlations.

Hypothesis 3: University of Maine Honors Students will show higher ratings of personal importance and satisfaction with the UMaine Honors experience compared to major experience.

Paired sample T tests were used to test hypothesis 3. Participants' mean score on HI ($M = 111.29$, $SD = 24.62$,) were significantly lower than their mean score on the rating of importance of components of major experience (MI; $M = 121.28$, $SD = 18.85$, $t(77) = -4.27$, $p < .001$). However, the mean difference was in the opposite direction to that predicted. The mean score for ratings of satisfaction with the Honor experience (HS; $M = 94.79$, $SD = 2.81$) was significantly lower than ratings of satisfaction with the major experience (MI; $M = 108.31$, $SD = 2.92$; $t(73) = -4.01$, $p < .001$).

Hypothesis 4: Perfectionism will correlate more strongly with ratings of personal importance and satisfaction for the UMaine Honors College experience compared to major experience.

Simple correlation analyses were conducted as a first step in testing test hypothesis 4. The correlations between total perfectionism (TP) and HI ($r = 0.04$), MI ($r = 0.09$), HS ($r = 0.03$), and MS ($r = 0.02$) were all nonsignificant ($p > .05$). Given the lack

of significant correlations, analyses comparing the relative strengths of correlations were not carried out.

Descriptive Analyses

Table 4 includes descriptive statistics for key variables.

Table 4

SOP, SPP, HI, HS, MI, MS Variable Information

	Mean	Median	S.D.	Range
SOP	68.44	71.00	8.27	39.00
SPP	67.58	68.00	8.49	34.00
TP	135.97	139.00	14.740	66.00
HI	110.81	112.50	24.51	117.00
HS	94.11	92.00	24.58	116.00
MI	121.63	124.50	18.85	75.00
MS	108.23	112.00	24.90	116.00

Notes: Ratings of both self-oriented and socially-prescribed perfectionism (SOP, SPP respectively) are out of 105 total possible points. Total perfectionism is the summation of SOP and SPP and is based out of 210 total possible points. Ratings of importance of components of honors experience and ratings of satisfaction of components of honors experience (HI and HS respectively) are each based out of 147 total possible points. Ratings of importance of components of major experience and ratings of satisfaction of components of major experience (MI and MS respectively) are each based out of 147 total possible points.

Table 5

This data table contains data relevant to hypothesis 3.

Paired Sample T-test for HI vs. MI and HS vs. MS.

Item	Honors mean(SD)	Major mean(SD)	t(df)	P (two-tail)
HI vs. MI	111.29(24.62)	121.28(19.62)	-4.27(77)	<0.001
HS vs. MS	94.80(24.16)	108.31(25.10)	-4.03(73)	<0.001

Exploratory Analysis

To explore the relationship between principal variables and age as well as gender, a series of correlation analyses were carried out; these relationships were also examined for male, female and nonbinary gender identities. A relationship was found between age and male participants' ratings of the importance of, as well as their satisfaction with, various aspects of their major. Similarly, there was a relationship between age and the measures of perfectionism for males. All significant correlations were negative.

Table 6

Correlation between Demographic Variables and HI, MI, HS, MS, SOP, SPP & TP

All Genders (n = 97)							
	HI	MI	HS	MS	SOP	SPP	TP
Age	0.06	- 0.05	- 0.01	- 0.04	- 0.10	0.04	- 0.04
GPA	0.17	- 0.14	0.04	- 0.20	0.05	- 0.04	0.01
Non-binary (n = 7)							
	HI	MI	HS	MS	SOP	SPP	TP
Age	N/A	N/A	0.27	N/A	- 0.33	- 0.35	- 0.35
GPA	- 0.77	- 0.54	- 0.01	- 0.16	0.25	- 0.10	0.05
Male (n = 16)							
	HI	MI	HS	MS	SOP	SPP	TP
Age	- 0.05	- 0.34*	- 0.01	- 0.32*	- 0.30*	- 0.33*	- 0.35*
GPA	0.12	0.18	- 0.11	0.16	0.18	- 0.01	0.09
Female (n = 72)							
	HI	MI	HS	MS	SOP	SPP	TP
Age	0.12	- 0.01	0.03	0.07	- 0.03	0.18	0.08
GPA	0.20	- 0.16	0.06	- 0.22	0.06	- 0.03	0.02

Note: Cells indicated with * are significant at the 0.01 level (two-tail), whereas cells indicated with ** are significant at the 0.05 level (two-tail). Cells containing “N/A” could not be calculated due to insufficient statistical power ($n \leq 5$ for any one bivariate correlational analysis).

To analyze the internal consistency of the variables HI, HS, MI and MS, an analysis of each variable's Cronbach's alpha coefficient was done. All variables show very high Cronbach's alpha coefficients, indicating that each item within each variable is very closely related to one another.

Table 7

Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for HI, HS, MI and MS

	HI	HS	MI	MS
Cronbach's Alpha	0.957	0.945	0.944	0.951

DISCUSSION

As no significant correlation was found between SPP and HI ($r = 0.01$), hypothesis 1 was not supported; this appears to be in direct contradiction to Rice and Dellwo's (2002) as well as Stoeber and Stoeber's (2009) findings that socially-prescribed perfectionists assign significant personal importance to subjectively-determined salient domains of life (social life, academia, etc.). Additionally, support for hypothesis 2 was not found: no significant correlation was found between SOP and HS ($r = 0.12$), as well as SPP and HS ($r = -0.07$). It is well documented that SOP is positively associated with general life satisfaction (Wang, Yuen, & Slaney, 2009) and domain-specific satisfaction (Stoeber & Stoeber, 2009). The lack of correlation between SOP and HS is thus in direct contradiction with extant literature and calls into question the reliability of the Personal Importance & Satisfaction Inventory for the UMaine Honors College & Major Experience in measuring HS.

Another potential explanation for the lack of an SOP-HS correlation is that UMaine Honors College students, despite having a healthy magnitude of SOP (and thus indicating healthy levels of willpower, motivation and low levels of mental health disturbances) (Klibert, Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Saito, 2005), generally do not have significant satisfaction with the UMaine Honors College experience as a whole. This is potentially the result of a high-cost/low-reward academic structure, redundant course experience (Honors Civilizations sequence is largely identical across all four classes) and a lack of a cohesive Honors College mission statement (which was made adamantly clear by all Honors College faculty interviewed). The latter is of speculative importance; with no cohesive Honors College mission statement, there is no established and ubiquitous

goal that all Honors College instructors have in mind for their students. Thus, it is likely that Honors College students do not experience the satisfaction of working toward an ultimate goal through their progression through the Honors College curriculum. This effect may also explain the lack of an SOP/SPP-HI correlation; as there is no explicit mission and ubiquitous set of goals for UMaine Honors College students, it is likely more difficult for Honors College students to discern which salient components constitute a worthwhile, satisfactory Honors College experience (which in turn would further invalidate ratings of HS), regardless of perfectionism profile.

The lack of a correlation between SPP and HS is not surprising as it has been established that socially-prescribed perfectionists exchange the magnitude of personal satisfaction they assign to salient life domains for an increased magnitude of personal importance assigned to these same domains (Closson & Boutilier, 2017); this effect linearly increases as magnitude of SPP increases (Stoeber & Stoeber, 2009). Curran and Hill's findings (2019) suggest that the magnitude of SPP linearly increased by 32% from 1989 to 2016 ($M = 40.9(SD = 13.5) \rightarrow M = 54(SD = 19.5)$). Given the high validity of Curran and Hill's findings, this linear model was extended to the current year 2022, which yielded a predicted and generalizable 39.11% increase in SPP magnitude between the years of 1989 and 2022 which would be equal to a score of 56.84. The current UMaine Honors College SPP ($M = 67.58(SD = 8.49)$) relative to Curran and Hill's predicted 2022 SPP mean is significantly higher (18.79%). This finding raises questions about why UMaine Honors College students show such high magnitudes of SPP which warrants further investigation. Given the extremely high magnitude of SPP in UMaine Honors College students and its abysmal correlation with HS/MS, it is plausible that

UMaine Honors College students would exchange a significant degree of satisfaction (with both Honors and Major experiences) for a significant degree of importance (for both Honors and Major experiences) during the exploratory data analysis period. However, it was found that there is no correlation between SPP and HI/MI which calls into question the validity of the Personal Importance & Satisfaction Inventory for the UMaine Honors College & Major Experience in measuring personal ratings of importance for different components of the Honors College experience. Another potential explanation for the lack of correlation between SPP-HI/MI is that there is no relationship between these variables (HI/MI are novel variables that have not been explored in extant literature).

The mean score of SOP ($M = 68.44(SD = 8.27)$) for UMaine Honors College students was not significantly different from Curran and Hill's mean score of SOP ($M = 69(SD = 3)$). SOP and SPP show greater magnitudes within undergraduate individuals enrolled in selective academic sub-institutions that uphold high academic and professional standards in comparison to the general student body (Parker & Adkins, 1995; Smith, Sherry, Vidovic, Saklofske, Stoeber & Benoit, 2018; Rice & Dellwo, 2002). Additionally, SOP is positively associated with satisfaction and SOP/SPP is positively associated with importance assigned to salient life domains (Stoeber & Stoeber, 2009). Given this research, one might assume that mean scores of HI and HS would be elevated in comparison to MI ($M = 121.28(SD = 19.62)$) and MS ($M = 108.31(SD = 25.10)$) in UMaine Honors College students. However, ratings of HI, MI, HS and MS indicated that mean scores of MI and MS were significantly greater than their HI and HS counterparts. Parker and Adkins (1995) and Smith, Sherry, Vidovic, Saklofske, Stoeber and Benoit

(2018), and Rice & Dellwo (2002) did not specify if the curricula in which their populations were enrolled were supplemental and mainly exploratory for intellectual development and “soft skills” (for example, UMaine Honors College curriculum) versus being focused on the development of “hard skills” to be used in a specific career (for example, UMaine’s engineering curriculum). Thus, it is difficult to determine if their findings are generalizable to both forms of curricular experiences. However, students may place more emphasis on assigning personal importance to characteristics within their own major as such experiences are more relevant to the establishment of a professional career and future quality of life than experiences that are less relevant to career and quality of life. If students place more importance on salient domains within a curricular experience that is predictive of later career success and shows significant current academic success (as seen in UMaine Honors College students; mean GPA: 3.68(SD = 0.46)), it is logical to assume that these individuals will show significant satisfaction with this curricular experience compared to other curricular experiences that are less relevant to later career success.

Exploratory bivariate correlation analysis yielded significant negative correlation between age and MI and MS for males ($n = 16$) ($r = -0.34, -0.32$). As male UMaine Honors undergraduate students age, they assign less personal importance to different characteristics within their major and grow less satisfied with their within major experience. However, due to the small sample size for males, these findings need to be replicated with a larger sample size to establish validity. The aforementioned effects were not seen in females, which warrants further investigation as to what might account for this gender difference. For males, age was shown to be negatively associated with SOP,

SPP and TP ($r = -0.30, -0.33, -0.35$ respectively). These findings are consistent with Stoeber and Stoeber (2009). However, Stoeber and Stoeber did not find a gender difference.

Lastly, Cronbach' alpha coefficient analysis yielded excellent alpha coefficients ($\alpha \geq 0.944$) for the variables HI, HS, MI and MS, indicating significant internal reliability of the *Personal Importance & Satisfaction Inventory*. From this, it is clear that many items within this survey, when correlated with one another for each variable aforementioned, are significantly and positively correlated with one another. This further indicates that across all 97 participants, the degree to which each participant clearly perceives the construct of importance/satisfaction (for Honors and Major experiences) for each item presented is extremely similar.

Further exploratory analyses can be seen in Appendices A-C below.

LIMITATIONS & FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The present study examined a relatively small sample ($n = 97$). Gender distribution was not even with far more females ($n = 72$) than males ($n = 16$). Gender analyses for non-binary students were not reported due to very low sample size numbers ($n = 7$). The incongruence of no correlations between SPP-HI and SOP-HS in the present thesis and the plethora of literature indicating positive relationships in the aforementioned call into question the validity of the Personal Importance & Satisfaction Inventory in measuring importance and satisfaction. Should this experiment be repeated with modified parameters, the following would likely ensure better data outcomes:

1. More effective survey distribution (advertise survey via email, distribute flyers around high-traffic areas on the UMaine campus and student housing, etc.) in addition to higher incentivization to recruit as many people as possible
2. Allow for a longer open period for individuals to take the Qualtrics survey.
3. Omit the descriptive variable “Grade”; the descriptive variable “Age” is a sufficient measure of this type of descriptive variable (If age does not correlate with one variable, then grade will not correlate with the same variable, etc.).
4. Establish the test-retest reliability of the *Personal Importance & Satisfaction Inventory* by administering the survey to UMaine Honors College students once at the beginning of the fall semester, and once more at the beginning of the spring semester.
5. To better understand what UMaine Honors College students believe are the most important aspects of the UMaine Honors College experience, and to increase the validity of the statements presented on the *Personal Importance & Satisfaction*

Inventory, a financially incentivized online survey will be distributed to UMaine Honors College

students and faculty. This survey will ask “What do you believe are the 10 most important aspects of the UMaine Honors College experience?” followed with a fill-in-the-blank prompt.

- Concurrently, interviews with willing UMaine Honors College students and faculty (in addition the Honors College faculty interviewed for this thesis) will be carried out with a standardized set of conversation-prompting questions relating to what one believes are the most important aspects of the UMaine Honors College, in addition the questions seen bulleted in #2 of the Methods section aforementioned.

6. To determine if SOP/SPP differ between Honors and non-Honors College students at UMaine, the MDPS should be administered to both populations. This will hopefully establish whether the extremely high mean SPP is unique to the UMaine Honors College population or if it is generalizable to the entire UMaine undergraduate population.

- To evaluate the replicative validity of Curran and Hill’s findings (2019), the MDPS should be distributed to both aforementioned populations every year to see if SOP and SPP see linear increases (per Curran & Hill (2019), SOP and SPP levels increase by 0.37 and 1.19% every year respectively).

CONCLUSION

This thesis investigates the relationship between perfectionism and the perceived importance of, and satisfaction with, various components of both the Honors College experience and the experience within majors among University of Maine Honors College students. Very high levels of socially-prescribed perfectionism were found. Relatively low levels of assigned importance and satisfaction with components of the UMaine Honors College experience, in comparison to within-major experience, were found. The *Personal Importance & Satisfaction Inventory for the UMaine Honors College & Major Experience* provides a novel framework to explore variables unseen in extant literature; this inventory, given further research to establish its reliability and validity, shows promise in evaluating strengths and weaknesses in Honors College experiences and within-major experiences. This inventory may prove itself to be another valuable tool for baccalaureate colleges to utilize in optimizing the undergraduate college experiences they provide. The findings of the present study extend the trend of increasing levels of socially-prescribed perfectionism identified by Curran and Hill (2019). In turn, attention must be paid to students' personal experiences during their undergraduate years in order to address, in an informed way, the unsatisfying, maladaptive issues that may accompany this rise in perfectionism.

REFERENCES

- Ashby, J. S. N. (2012, June 30). Multidimensional perfectionism, depression, and satisfaction with life: Differences among perfectionists and tests of a stress-mediation model. *Journal of College Counseling*. Retrieved September 29, 2021, from <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ973233>.
- Bieling, P. J., Israeli, A. L., & Antony, M. M. (2004). Is perfectionism good, bad, or both? examining models of the perfectionism construct. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*(6), 1373–1385. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869\(03\)00235-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869(03)00235-6)
- Closson, L. M., & Boutilier, R. R. (2017). Perfectionism, academic engagement, and procrastination among undergraduates: The moderating role of honors student status. *Learning and Individual Differences, 57*, 157–162.
- Cross, T. L., Cross, J. R., Mammadov, S., Ward, T. J., Neumeister, K. S., & Andersen, L. (2018). Psychological heterogeneity among honors college students. *Journal for the Education of the Gifted, 41*(3), 242–272. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0162353218781754>
- Curran, T., & Hill, A. P. (2019). Perfectionism is increasing over time: A meta-analysis of birth cohort differences from 1989 to 2016. *Psychological Bulletin, 145*(4), 410–429. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000138>
- Damian, L. E., Stoeber, J., Negru-Subtirica, O., & Băban, A. (2017). Perfectionism and school engagement: A three-wave longitudinal study. *Personality and Individual Differences, 105*, 179–184. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.09.044>
- Eddington, K. M. (2013). Perfectionism, goal adjustment, AND self-regulation: A SHORT-TERM follow-up study of distress and coping. *Self and Identity, 13*(2), 197–213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2013.781740>
- Enns, M.W., Cox, B..J., Sareen, J., & Freeman, P. (2001). Adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism in medical students: A longitudinal investigation. *Medical Education, 35*, 1034-1042.
- Egan, S. J., Wade, T. D., & Shafran, R. (2011). Perfectionism as a transdiagnostic process: A clinical review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 31*(2), 203–212. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2010.04.009>

- Harvey, B. C., Moore, A. M., & Koestner, R. (2017). Distinguishing self-oriented perfectionism- striving and self-oriented perfectionism-critical in school-aged children: Divergent patterns of perceived parenting, personal affect and school performance. *Personality and Individual Differences, 113*, 136–141. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.02.069>
- Henning, K.R., Ey, S., & Shaw, D. (1998). Perfectionism, the imposter phenomenon, and psychological adjustment in medical, dental, nursing, and pharmacy students. *Medical Education, 32*, 456-464.
- Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1991). Perfectionism in the self and social contexts: Conceptualization, assessment, and association with psychopathology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*(3), 456–470. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.60.3.456>
- Hewitt, P. L., Flett, G. L., Turnbull-Donovan, W., & Mikail, S. F. (1991). The Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale: Reliability, validity, and psychometric properties in psychiatric samples. *Psychological Assessment: A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 3*(3), 464–468. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.3.3.464>
- Iranzo-Tatay, C., Gimeno-Clemente, N., Barberá-Fons, M., Rodriguez-Campayo, M. Á., Rojo- Bofill, L., Livianos-Aldana, L., Beato-Fernandez, L., Vaz-Leal, F., & Rojo-Moreno, L. (2015). Genetic and environmental contributions to perfectionism and its common factors. *Psychiatry Research, 230*(3), 932–939. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2015.11.020>
- Kang, M., Lee, J., & Lee, A.-R. (2019). The effects of college students' perfectionism on career stress and indecision: Self-esteem and coping styles as moderating variables. *Asia Pacific Education Review, 21*(2), 227–243. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-019-09609-w>
- Kim, L. E., Chen, L., MacCann, C., Karlov, L., & Kleitman, S. (2015). Evidence for three factors of perfectionism: Perfectionistic strivings, order, and perfectionistic concerns. *Personality and Individual Differences, 84*, 16–22. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.01.033>
- Klibert, J. J., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Saito, M. (2005). Adaptive and maladaptive aspects of self-oriented versus socially prescribed perfectionism. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*(2), 141–156. <https://doi.org/10.1353/csd.2005.0017>

- Kljajic, K., Gaudreau, P., & Franche, V. (2017). An investigation of the 2 × 2 model of perfectionism with burnout, engagement, self-regulation, and academic achievement. *Learning and Individual Differences, 57*, 103–113. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2017.06.004>
- Lee, Y. J., & Anderman, E. M. (2020). Profiles of perfectionism and their relations to educational outcomes in college students: The moderating role of achievement goals. *Learning and Individual Differences, 77*, 101813. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2019.101813>
- Levine, S. L., & Milyavskaya, M. (2018). Domain-specific perfectionism: An examination of perfectionism beyond the trait-level and its link to well-being. *Journal of Research in Personality, 74*, 56–65.
- Locicero, K. A., & Ashby, J. S. (2000). Multidimensional perfectionism and self-reported self-efficacy in college students. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 15*(2), 47–56. https://doi.org/10.1300/j035v15n02_06
- Mackinnon, S. P., & Sherry, S. B. (2012). Perfectionistic self-presentation mediates the relationship between perfectionistic concerns and subjective well-being: A three-wave longitudinal study. *Personality and Individual Differences, 53*(1), 22–28. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.02.010>
- Newman, B. N., Strickler, J. G., O'Brien, C., Lui, T., & Lynch, M. (2019). Deconstructing perfectionism in college students: Patterns of behavior, emotion, and cognition. *Personality and Individual Differences, 145*, 106–111. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.03.030>
- Ocampo, A. C., Wang, L., Kiazad, K., Restubog, S. L., & Ashkanasy, N. M. (2019). The relentless pursuit of perfectionism: A review of perfectionism in the workplace and an agenda for future research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 41*(2), 144–168. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2400>
- Parker, W. D., & Adkins, K. K. (1995). The incidence of perfectionism in honors and regular college students. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 7*(1), 303–309. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1932202x9500700103>
- P. Sederlund, A., R. Burns, L., & Rogers, W. (2020). Multidimensional models of perfectionism and procrastination: Seeking determinants of both. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(14), 5099. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17145099>

- Rice, K. G., & Dellwo, J. P. (2002). Perfectionism and self-development: Implications for college adjustment. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 80*(2), 188–196. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6678.2002.tb00182.x>
- Rice, K. G., Lopez, F. G., Richardson, C. M., & Stinson, J. M. (2013). Perfectionism moderates stereotype threat effects on STEM majors' academic performance. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 60*(2), 287–293. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032052>
- Saulsman, L. M., & Page, A. C. (2004). The five-factor model and personality Disorder empirical literature: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 23*(8), 1055–1085. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2002.09.001>
- Shim, S. S., Rubenstein, L. D. V., & Drapeau, C. W. (2016). When perfectionism is coupled with low achievement: The effects on academic engagement and help seeking in Middle School. *Learning and Individual Differences, 45*, 237–244. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lindif.2015.12.016>
- Sirois, F. M., & Molnar, D. S. (2017). Perfectionistic strivings and concerns are differentially associated with self-rated health beyond negative affect. *Journal of Research in Personality, 70*, 73–83. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2017.06.003>
- Smith, M. M., Sherry, S. B., Vidovic, V., Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (2020). Why does perfectionism confer risk for depressive symptoms? A meta-analytic test of the mediating role of stress and social disconnection. *Journal of Research in Personality, 86*, 103954. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2020.103954>
- Smith, M. M., Speth, T. A., Sherry, S. B., Saklofske, D. H., Stewart, S. H., & Glowacka, M. (2017). Is socially prescribed perfectionism veridical? A new take on the stressfulness of perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 110*, 115–118. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.01.031>
- Stoeber, J. (2015). How other-oriented perfectionism differs from self-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism: Further findings. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 37*(4), 611–623. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10862-015-9485-y>
- Stoeber, J., Haskew, A. E., & Scott, C. (2015). Perfectionism and exam performance: The mediating effect of task-approach goals. *Personality and Individual Differences, 74*, 171–176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.10.016>

- Stoeber, J., & Kersting, M. (2007). Perfectionism and aptitude test performance: Testees who strive for perfection achieve better test results. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*(6), 1093–1103. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.09.012>
- Stoeber, J., Noland, A. B., Mawenu, T. W. N., Henderson, T. M., & Kent, D. N. P. (2017). Perfectionism, social disconnection, and interpersonal hostility: Not all perfectionists don't play nicely with others. *Personality and Individual Differences, 119*, 112–117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.07.008>
- Stoeber, J., & Stoeber, F. S. (2009). Domains of perfectionism: Prevalence and relationships with perfectionism, gender, age, and satisfaction with life. *Personality and Individual Differences, 46*(4), 530–535. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.12.006>
- Suh, H., Gnilka, P. B., & Rice, K. G. (2017). Perfectionism and well-being: A positive psychology framework. *Personality and Individual Differences, 111*, 25–30. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.01.041>
- Wang, K. T., Yuen, M., & Slaney, R. B. (2008). Perfectionism, depression, loneliness, and life satisfaction. *The Counseling Psychologist, 37*(2), 249–274. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011000008315975>
- Wimberley, T. E., & Stasio, M. J. (2012). Perfectionistic thoughts, personal standards, and Evaluative concerns: Further investigating relationships to psychological distress. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 37*(2), 277–283. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-012-9462-7>

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

To further investigate the significant findings relating to hypothesis 3, a paired sample T-test was carried out to evaluate for significant differences between paired items for evaluation of HI vs. MI as well as HS vs. MS. Out of the 42 paired items below (21 for HI vs. MI; 21 for HS vs. MS), 20 item pairs showed significant within-pair differences ($p < 0.001$ (two-tail)); 10 pairs were significant for HI vs. MI and 10 pairs were significant for HS vs MS. Rating of importance and satisfaction were higher for MI and MS vs. HI and HS for every significant difference. Only 5 item pairs out of 42 showed $HI > MI$ and $HS > MS$ values, though these differences were not significant.

Table 8

HI vs. MI Paired Sample T-Test Information

Item	HI mean(SD)	MI mean(SD)	t(df)	P (two-tail)
1	5.52 (1.19)	5.18(1.68)	2.12(90)	0.038
2	5.41(1.54)	5.59(1.46)	-1.12(94)	0.266
3	5.20 (1.76)	6.01(1.12)	-4.60(93)	<0.001*
4	5.99(1.29)	6.19(1.13)	-1.33(95)	0.188
5	5.00(1.72)	5.80(1.40)	-4.68(93)	<0.001*
6	4.82(1.93)	5.53(1.65)	-3.41(92)	<0.001*
7	5.19(1.59)	5.14(1.60)	0.25(94)	0.806
8	5.32(1.48)	6.19(1.08)	-5.43(92)	<0.001*
9	5.85(1.20)	6.07(1.04)	-1.54(95)	0.128
10	5.24(1.68)	5.70(1.49)	-2.79(91)	0.006
11	4.48(1.89)	6.11(1.20)	-8.11(92)	<0.001*
12	4.93(1.76)	5.66(1.27)	-4.46(96)	<0.001*
13	5.13(1.68)	5.64(1.35)	-2.73(94)	0.008
14	4.92(1.78)	5.67(1.23)	-3.92(91)	<0.001*
15	5.02(1.81)	5.94(1.16)	-4.70(92)	<0.001*
16	5.15(1.72)	5.53(1.47)	-1.91(91)	0.060
17	5.13(1.68)	5.80(1.26)	-3.96(91)	<0.001*
18	4.96(1.70)	5.39(1.59)	-2.41(93)	0.018
19	5.38(1.57)	5.86(1.38)	-2.85(93)	0.006
20	4.84(1.95)	5.96(1.14)	-5.75(93)	<0.001*
21	5.51(1.50)	5.47(1.59)	0.18(90)	0.856

Note: mean values for both HI and MI are based out of 7 total possible points. Cells indicated with * are significant ($p < 0.001$)

Table 9

HS vs. MS Paired Sample T-Test Information

Item	HS mean(SD)	MS mean(SD)	t(df)	P (two-tail)
1	4.47(1.37)	4.46(1.83)	0.06(92)	0.956
2	4.43(1.51)	4.46(1.91)	-0.15(94)	0.884
3	4.29(1.77)	5.26(1.67)	-4.56(95)	<0.001*
4	5.53(1.48)	5.74(1.46)	-1.22(96)	0.224
5	4.35(1.75)	5.00(1.86)	-2.80(93)	0.006
6	4.33(1.90)	5.04(1.89)	-3.06(93)	0.002
7	4.36(1.58)	4.69(1.70)	-1.50(94)	0.138
8	4.29(1.61)	5.71(1.40)	-7.37(94)	<0.001*
9	5.42(1.42)	5.34(1.58)	0.38(95)	0.706
10	4.01(1.82)	4.93(1.73)	-4.65(91)	<0.001*
11	3.49(1.82)	5.37(1.65)	-8.69(91)	<0.001*
12	3.61(1.64)	4.64(1.69)	-4.95(95)	<0.001*
13	4.30(1.84)	4.97(1.76)	-2.71(95)	0.008
14	4.29(1.87)	5.14(1.60)	-3.90(90)	<0.001*
15	3.88(1.86)	5.00(1.66)	-4.49(92)	<0.001*
16	4.40(1.80)	4.92(1.86)	-2.12(91)	0.036
17	4.55(1.91)	5.28(1.60)	-3.43(93)	<0.001*
18	4.64(1.69)	5.29(1.57)	-3.82(92)	<0.001*
19	4.62(1.84)	5.31(1.55)	-3.17(92)	0.002
20	3.66(1.84)	5.34(1.59)	-7.52(92)	<0.001*
21	4.97(1.58)	5.08(1.89)	-0.42(89)	0.670

Note: mean values for both HS and MS are based out of 7 total possible points. All rows highlighted in yellow contain statistically significant differences in mean HS vs. MS.

APPENDIX B

To see if SOP/SPP account for the significant differences seen in Tables 8 and 9 above, correlate analyses were done between all significant item pairs seen in Table 8 and 9 and SOP/SPP. SOP showed significant positive correlations with item 6 of HI and items 14, 17 and 18 of HS. SPP showed significant negative correlations with item 12 of HS, item 12 of MS and a significant positive correlation with item 18 of MS.

Table 10

Correlation of SOP & SPP w/ significant items from Tables 8 & 9

	HI		MI		HS		MS	
Item	SOP	SPP	SOP	SPP	SOP	SPP	SOP	SPP
3	< -0.01	0.02	0.06	0.07	0.09	- 0.05	0.12	0.17
5	0.13	0.04	0.19	0.06				
6	0.28**	0.18	0.14	0.16				
8	0.01	0.03	0.06	0.07	0.09	- 0.08	0.08	< 0.01
10					0.09	- 0.11	< 0.01	0.03
11	0.16	0.12	- 0.10	0.02	0.14	- 0.05	< 0.01	< -0.01
12	0.12	0.07	0.02	- 0.14	- 0.09	- 0.30**	- 0.12	- 0.36**
14	0.14	0.08	0.10	0.09	0.23*	0.04	0.08	0.06
15	0.06	- 0.10	- 0.01	- 0.10	0.10	- 0.16	- 0.04	0.03
17	0.08	- 0.03	0.13	- 0.02	0.26*	0.02	0.03	- 0.05
18					0.25*	- 0.01	0.16	0.21*
20	0.08	0.04	- 0.02	- 0.11	0.02	- 0.03	- 0.03	- 0.14

Note: Item column corresponds to item number for the *Personal Importance & Satisfaction Inventory for the UMaine Honors College & Major Experience*. Cells indicated with * are significant at the 0.01 level (two-tail), whereas cells indicated with ** are significant at the 0.05 level (two-tail). Rows filled in black did not have the corresponding item pair be significant, as indicated in tables 8 and 9.

APPENDIX C

To evaluate the internal reliability of how well the Personal Importance & Satisfaction Inventory measures the variables of HI, MI, HS and MS, a simple correlation was done between the variables of HI, MI, HS, MS. All possible correlations are significant and positively associated at the 0.01 level (two-tail); this indicates that an individual's pattern of scoring (very strongly or very weakly, for example) for one variable will show similarly paralleled scoring for any other different variable.

Table 11

Correlations between HI, MI, HS & MS

Variables	Correlation		
	1	2	3
1. HI			
2. MI	0.59**		
3. HS	0.69**	0.40**	
4. MS	0.17**	0.62**	0.32**

Note: Cells indicated with ** are significant at the 0.01 level (two-tail).

To evaluate whether or not importance and satisfaction statistically represent two different variables, a factor analysis was performed for HI and HS, as well as MI and MS. Additionally, all four variables aforementioned were analyzed together to determine the number of salient factors. HI-HS yielded one salient factor, MI-MS yielded one salient factor and HI-HS-MI-MS yielded two salient factors; these results potentially indicate

that the salient factors relate to the type of experience (Honors vs. Major) rather than importance vs. satisfaction.

Table 12

Factor Analysis for HI-HS & MI-MS & HI-HS-MI-MS

Component	Total Eigenvalues	Percent of Variance
1	1.69*	84.51
2	0.31	15.49
3	1.62*	81.15
4	0.38	18.85
5	2.41*	60.14
6	0.98*	24.50
7	0.47	11.79
8	0.14	3.58

Note: Cells indicated with * indicate significant (≥ 1 ; if equal to 1 Eigenvalue, then ∓ 0.02) Eigenvalues. Components 1-2 relate to factors seen in HI-HS, components 3-4 relate to factors seen in MI-MS and components 5-8 relate to factors seen in HI, HS, MI, MS.

APPENDIX D

Hewitt & Flett Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal characteristics and traits. Read each item and decide whether you agree or disagree & to what extent.

1. When I am working on something, I cannot relax until it is perfect

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. I find it difficult to meet others' expectations of me

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. One of my goals is to be perfect in everything I do

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. I never aim for perfection on my work

Disagree						Agree
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

5. Those around me readily accept that I can make mistakes too

Disagree						Agree
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

6. The better I do, the better I am expected to do

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7. I seldom feel the need to be perfect

Disagree						Agree
----------	--	--	--	--	--	-------

7	6	5	4	3	2	1
---	---	---	---	---	---	---

8. Anything that I do that is less than excellent will be seen as poor work by those around me

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9. I strive to be as perfect as I can be

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

10. It is very important that I am perfect in everything I attempt

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

11. I strive to be the best at everything I do

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

12. The people around me expect me to succeed at everything I do

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

13. I demand nothing less than perfection of myself

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

14. Others will like me even if I don't excel at everything

Disagree						Agree
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

15. It makes me uneasy to see an error in my work

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

16. Success means that I must work even harder to please others

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

17. I am perfectionistic in setting my goals

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

18. Others think I am okay, even when I do not succeed

Disagree						Agree
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

19. I feel that people are too demanding of me

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

20. I must work to my full potential at all times

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

21. Although they may not say it, other people get very upset with me when I slip up

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

22. I do not have to be the best at whatever I am doing

Disagree						Agree
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

23. My family expects me to be perfect

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

24. I do not have very high goals for myself

Disagree						Agree
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

25. My parent rarely expected me to excel in all aspects of my life

Disagree						Agree
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

26. People expect nothing less than perfection from me

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

27. I set very high standards for myself

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

28. People expect more from me than I am capable of giving

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

29. I must always be successful at school or work

Disagree						Agree
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

30. People around me think I am still competent even if I make a mistake

Disagree						Agree
7	6	5	4	3	2	1

APPENDIX E

UMaine Honors College Personal Importance & Satisfaction Inventory

The following statements describe aspirational features of the University of Maine Honors College experience. For each statement, please rate how important it is for you and how satisfied you are with that feature of your experience.

1. The honors classroom environment encourages openness to difficult and taboo topics.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. Deeply passionate intellectual and academic conversations in honors are frequent and enriching.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. My experience in honors has given me the intellectual scaffolding necessary to further my academic and social growth.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. The honors instructors are genuinely interested in my academic success.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5. Being part of this academic community is gratifying and fulfilling.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. My identity as an honors student instills in me a sense of accomplishment and worth.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7. The honors class's primary sources represent many different foci and fields.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8. My experience in honors allows me the opportunity to explore and develop topics of interest to me.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9. The honors instructors give me constructive criticism and feedback

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

10. There is a clearly outlined honors mission and an end goal to the honors experience.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

11. My experience in honors has contributed to the establishment of long-term social and career goals for me.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

12. The honors classroom environment and the community instill a sense of confidence and contentment, not stress and anxiety.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

13. My experience in honors encourages a collaborative, altruistic environment, not a self-centered and competitive one.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

14. My experience in honors has strengthened my academic resolve and bolstered work ethic.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

15. Honors assignments and the work I complete feel meaningful and intellectually enriching.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

16. My social immersion in honors has encouraged me to develop a more selfless and compassionate attitude toward my wider community.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

17. My experience in honors incentivizes me to produce the best quality work that I can.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

18. Social standards in honors encourage me to display my best self to my honors colleagues.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

19. My skills in critical thinking, scholarly investigation and deductive reasoning have improved through honors.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

20. My experience in honors has given me the necessary tools to foster my passions.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

21. My experience in honors has elevated my self-awareness, helping me to better understand my beliefs, values and morals.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

The following statements describe aspirational features of your major. For each statement, please rate how important it is for you and how satisfied you are with that feature of your experience within your major.

If you are a double or poly major, please reflect on your experience in your preferred major as you respond to the following items.

1. The classroom environment in my major's courses encourages openness to difficult and taboo topics.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

2. Deeply passionate intellectual and academic conversations in my major are frequent and enriching.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. My experience in my major has given me the intellectual scaffolding necessary to further my academic and social growth.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. The instructors within my major are genuinely interested in my academic success.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5. Being part of my major's academic community is gratifying and fulfilling.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. My identity as a student within my major instills in me a sense of accomplishment and worth.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7. My major's primary sources represent many different foci and fields.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8. My experience in my major allows me the opportunity to explore and develop topics of interest to me.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

9. The instructors within my major give me constructive criticism and feedback

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

10. There is a clearly outlined mission and an end goal to my major's experience.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

11. My experience in my major has contributed to the establishment of long-term social and career goals for me.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

12. The classroom environment in my major's courses and the community instill a sense of confidence and contentment, not stress and anxiety.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

13. My experience in my major encourages a collaborative, altruistic environment, not a self-centered and competitive one.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

14. My experience in my major has strengthened my academic resolve and bolstered my work ethic.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

15. Assignments and the work I complete within my major feel meaningful and intellectually enriching.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

16. My social immersion within my major has encouraged me to develop a more selfless and compassionate attitude toward my wider community.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

17. My experience in my major incentivizes me to produce the best quality work that I can.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

18. Social standards within my major encourage me to display my best self to my colleagues within my major.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

19. My skills in critical thinking, scholarly investigation and deductive reasoning have been improved through study in my major.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

20. My experience in my major has given me the necessary tools to foster my passions.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

21. My experience in my major has elevated my self-awareness, helping me to better understand my beliefs, values and morals.

Not at all Important						Very Important
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Not at all Satisfied						Very Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX F

Demographic & Descriptive Variable Questions (These will be presented as fill-in-the-blank questions on Qualtrics)

1. What is your age?
2. What is your year in college (first year, sophomore, junior, senior)?
3. What is your gender?
4. What is your cumulative college GPA? (If you don't know exactly, a best estimate is fine.)
5. What is your major? (Please list all majors. If you are a double/poly major, please first list the major you were thinking of when you responded to the survey items regarding your major).

APPENDIX G

Informed Consent

Informed Consent

You will be asked to respond to an anonymous study being conducted by Ethan Lowell, a fourth-year psychology major in the Honors College. The study will form the basis for Ethan's honors thesis. Professors Margaret Killinger (Honors) and Jeffrey Hecker (Psychology) are the faculty advisors on this project. The purpose of this research is to measure perfectionism in honors students and to assess how important features of the UMaine Honors College experience are to students and how satisfied they are with their experience. You must be at least 18 years of age to participate.

What Will You Be Asked to Do?

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to respond to a set of questions regarding perfectionism, as well as rate the importance of and your satisfaction with various features of your Honors College experience and with your major. It should take you about fifteen minutes to complete the survey.

Risks

The survey items ask about perfectionism as well as yours and others' expectations regarding behavior. There is a possibility that you may become uncomfortable responding to the survey items. You may skip any item that makes you uncomfortable. If you find yourself feeling uncomfortable you may consider contacting UMaine's Counseling Center (581-1392; <https://umaine.edu/counseling/>).

Benefits

While this study will have no direct benefit to you, this research may help us learn more about unhealthy perfectionistic attitudes and behaviors and their relationship to different components of the Honors College experience.

Compensation

At the conclusion of the survey, you will have the opportunity to enter a raffle to win one of four \$50 UMaine Bookstore gift cards; you will be directed to a separate survey following completion of the primary survey where you will be asked for contact

information. Completion of the contact information survey will make you eligible to participate in the raffle.

The odds of winning a gift card will be between 1/30 and 1/40. Should you be randomly selected to receive a gift card, the gift card will be emailed to you.

Confidentiality

This study is anonymous. Please do not indicate your name anywhere in your responses. There will be no records linking you to the data. Data will be kept on a password-protected computer indefinitely.

Voluntary

Participation is voluntary. If you choose to take part in this study, you may stop at any time. You may skip any questions you do not wish to answer, but you must reach the end of the survey in order to enter the raffle.

Submission of the survey implies consent to participate.

Contact Information

If you have any questions about this study, please contact Professor Killinger (margraet.killinger@maine.edu and 207-581-3342), Professor Hecker (hecker@maine.edu and 207-581-2035) or Ethan Lowell (primary investigator; ethan.lowell@maine.edu and 207-219-2119). If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, please contact the Office of Research Compliance, University of Maine, 207-581-2657 (or e-mail umric@maine.edu).

APPENDIX H

Initial Email

Honors Colleagues,

My name is Ethan Lowell, and I am an undergraduate researcher in the Honors College here at the University of Maine. The UMaine Honors College is emailing you this on my behalf to maintain anonymity; I am conducting a research project for my honors thesis to evaluate the relationship between perfectionism and the importance and satisfaction that Honors College students have with various components of the UMaine Honors College experience.

I have asked the UMaine Honors College to contact you to see if you would be willing to participate. Participation would involve you taking a brief anonymous survey that would take 12-15 minutes to complete that you can access on Qualtrics via the link attached below. You must be 18 years or older to participate in this survey. For more information about the study, and to access the survey, click here [Survey Link]. Once you complete the first survey, you will be taken to a second survey where you can enter in your contact information to enter a raffle where you have a chance to win a \$50 gift card to the UMaine Bookstore.

If you have any questions or concerns, or would like to know more about this project, please contact me at ethan.lowell@maine.edu or at 207-219-2119; alternatively, you can contact Professor Killinger (margaret.killinger@maine.edu and 207-581-3342) or Professor Hecker (hecker@maine.edu and 207-581-2035).

Thank you so much for your time!

Ethan Lowell
Fourth-Year Honors Student

APPENDIX I

Second, Reminder Email

Honors Colleagues,

You were recently sent an invitation to participate in a research study concerning perfectionism and the UMaine Honors College experience in Honors students at the University of Maine; you must be 18 years or older to participate in the survey. [Survey Link] Again, we would very much appreciate your joining us in furthering our research and knowledge surrounding this important topic.

The survey will take about fifteen minutes to complete, and if you are able to take that time, you will have the chance to win one of four \$50 gift cards to the University bookstore. Your participation and involvement in our research would be very helpful.

If you've already completed the survey, thank you very much for your time!

If you have any questions, you are welcome to contact Professor Killinger (margaret.killinger@maine.edu and 207-581-3342), Professor Hecker (hecker@maine.edu and 207-581-2035), or Ethan Lowell (primary investigator; ethan.lowell@maine.edu and 207-219-2119).

Thank you!

Ethan Lowell
Fourth-Year Honors Student

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Ethan Lowell is a graduate of the University of Maine Honors College, with a degree in psychology and minors in neuroscience and pre-medicine. He was born and raised in Scarborough, Maine, where he became an Eagle Scout in Troop 47 after graduating from Scarborough High School. At the University of Maine, he became a brother of the Beta Upsilon Chapter of Tau Kappa Epsilon fraternity, where he served as their philanthropy chair for two years. He is currently a pharmacy tech at Walgreens and is applying to become an allopathic medical student, hoping eventually to be board certified in neurology with a specialization in neurodegenerative disorders.