

Hill, Andrew P. ORCID logoORCID:

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6370-8901> (2017) Comment on “The Great British Medalists Project: A Review of Current Knowledge on the Development of the World’s Best Sporting Talent”. Sports Medicine.

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/2574/>

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version:

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s40279-017-0804-1>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repository Policy Statement](#)

RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at ray@yorks.ac.uk

Hill, A. (in press). Comment on “The Great British Medalists Project: A Review of Current Knowledge on the Development of the World’s Best Sporting Talent”. To appear in *Sports Medicine*. [Letter to editor] Accepted 15-10-2017.

Comment on “The Great British Medalists Project: A Review of Current Knowledge on the
Development of the World’s Best Sporting Talent”

Andrew P. Hill

York St John University, UK

Andrew P. Hill, PhD

Faculty of Health and Life Sciences

York St. John University

Lord Mayor’s Walk

York, YO31 7EX

UK

e-mail:a.hill@yorksja.ac.uk

This letter concerns the review titled “The Great British Medalists Project: A Review of Current Knowledge on the Development of the World’s Best Sporting Talent” [1]. The aim of the review was to identify “what is known and what is thought likely to be true in relation to understanding the development of the world’s best sporting talent” (p.1042). The review was described by the authors as “authoritative, balanced, [and] comprehensive” (p.1041). However, in at least one regard, I believe the authors have fallen short of their aim and description.

Among the topics covered in the review is the role of personality traits and perfectionism, in particular, in the development of talent in sport. On this matter, the authors conclude that “Super-elite athletes are conscientious, optimistic, hopeful, and perfectionist” (p.1049) [1]. In regards to the specific evidence on which the conclusions about perfectionism were based, the authors state that “There is...evidence at non-elite, elite, and super-elite level that athletes display *adaptive* perfectionism – a tendency to maintain perspective on performances while striving to achieve exceptional standards” (p.1046). This was juxtaposed with maladaptive perfectionism which was described as having “...many negative outcomes (e.g., burnout, preoccupation with mistakes and self-doubts)” (p.1046) for athletes. I have three main concerns regarding the conclusions of the review. These concerns are outlined below.

Firstly, while it is pleasing to see that the authors of the review [1] are mindful of distinguishing between different dimensions of perfectionism, few researchers use the terms “adaptive” and “maladaptive” perfectionism (unless testing a specific model of perfectionism, the tripartite model [2]). Indeed, many researchers who contribute to research examining perfectionism in sport discourage the use of these terms. This is because it is considered poor practice and overly simplistic to label a personality characteristic in a

manner that presumes its consequences. Few personality characteristics are adaptive or maladaptive for everyone, all of the time. This practice also leads to tautological arguments (e.g., adaptive perfectionism is adaptive because it contributes to adaptive things) [3].

Secondly, only one citation [4] in the review [1] accompanies the conclusion that super-elite level athletes display adaptive perfectionism. In the cited study super-elite athletes were interviewed and adaptive perfectionism was identified by the authors as a personality disposition that characterised the accounts of the interviewees [4]. To me, neither this study nor the other perfectionism research studies cited in the review that address tangential issues (e.g. performance and burnout in non-elite athletes [5-7]) are reasonable grounds on which to base the conclusions offered. To my knowledge, there are only three studies that have examined whether levels of perfectionism differ depending on athlete status [8-10]. These studies have produced mixed findings and none are cited in the review.

Thirdly, the broader context in which the conclusions are offered makes them particularly precarious and worrisome [1]. I refer specifically to the results of three recent meta-analyses that evaluated perfectionism [11-13]. These analyses found perfectionism to be positively correlated to general psychopathology, depression and suicide ideation. In some instances, this includes dimensions of perfectionism that have been described as “adaptive.” Super elite athletes participating in research (or, indeed, any athletes included in research on the basis of their success and ability to navigate the trials and tribulations of sport) may misrepresent the actual influence of characteristics such as perfectionism in regard to psychological difficulties. We might describe this as a “super”-healthy participant problem and it is a problem that is likely to be pervasive in research that seeks to identify the characteristics of high performers. Therefore, there is a danger that even with the best intentions, by promoting

any dimensions or forms of perfectionism, researchers, practitioners and policy makers may inadvertently compromise the welfare and development of athletes.

In actuality, what is known and what is thought likely regarding perfectionism is complex. For what is currently known, I encourage researchers, practitioners, and policy makers to read reviews of research dedicated to perfectionism. Some reviews are available that provide short and accessible accounts of existing research, e.g., Hill and Madigan [14]. When the requirement of researchers, practitioners, and policy makers stretches beyond current empirical research, the reflections of those leading research in this area should be consulted, e.g., Flett and Hewitt [15]. It is noteworthy that the accounts of some of these individuals directly oppose the notion that perfectionism is likely to provide the basis for long-term talent development, performance, and wellbeing of athletes.

Compliance with Ethical Standards

Funding

No sources of funding were used to assist in the preparation of this letter.

Conflicts of Interest

Andrew Hill declares he has no conflicts of interest relevant to the content of this letter.

References

1. Rees T, Hardy L, Güllich A, Abernethy B, Côté J, Woodman T, Montgomery H, Laing S, Warr C. The great British medalists project: a review of current knowledge on the development of the world's best sporting talent. *Sports Medicine*. 2016; 46(8):1041-58.

2. Parker WD. An empirical typology of perfectionism in academically talented children. *Am Educ Res J.* 1997;34(3):545-62.
3. Gaudreau P, Thompson A. Testing a 2×2 model of dispositional perfectionism. *Pers Individ Dif.* 2010;48(5):532-7.
4. Gould D, Dieffenbach K, Moffett A. Psychological characteristics and their development in Olympic champions. *J Appl Sport Psychol.* 2002;14(3):172–204
5. Stoeber J, Uphill MA, Hotham S. Predicting race performance in triathlon: the role of perfectionism, achievement goals, and personal goal setting. *J Sport Exerc Psychol.* 2009;31(2):211–45.
6. Stoll O, Lau A, Stoeber J. Perfectionism and performance in a new basketball training task: does striving for perfection enhance or undermine performance? *Psychol Sport Exerc.* 2008;9(5):620–9.
7. Jowett GE, Hill AP, Hall HK, et al. Perfectionism and junior athlete burnout: the mediating role of autonomous and controlled motivation. *Sport Exerc Perform Psychol.* 2013;2(1):48–61.
8. Ferrand C, Brunet E. Perfectionism and risk for disordered eating among young French male cyclists of high performance. *Percept Mot Skills.* 2004;99(3):959-67.
9. Anshel MH, Weatherby NL, Kang M, et al. Rasch calibration of a unidimensional perfectionism inventory for sport. *Psychol Sport Exerc.* 2009;10(1):210-6.
10. Rasquinha A, Dunn JG, Dunn JC. Relationships between perfectionistic strivings, perfectionistic concerns, and competitive sport level. *Psychol Sport Exerc.* 2014;15(6):659-67.
11. Limburg K, Watson HJ, Hagger MS, et al. The relationship between perfectionism and psychopathology: a meta-analysis. *J Clin Psychol.* 2016; doi: 10.1002/jclp.22435

12. Smith MM, Sherry SB, Chen S, et al. The perniciousness of perfectionism: a meta-analytic review of the perfectionism-suicide relationship. *J Pers.* 2017; doi: 10.1111/jopy.12333
13. Smith MM, Sherry SB, Rnic K, Saklofske DH, Enns M, Gralnick T. Are perfectionism dimensions vulnerability factors for depressive symptoms after controlling for neuroticism? A meta-analysis of 10 longitudinal studies. *Eur J Pers.* 2016; 30(2):201-12.
14. Hill AP, Madigan DJ. A short review of perfectionism in sport, dance and exercise: Out with the old, in with the 2×2. *Curr Opin Pyschol.* 2017;16; 72-77.
15. Flett GL, Hewitt PL. “The perils of perfectionism in sports” revisited: Toward a broader understanding of the pressure to be perfect and its impact on athletes and dancers. *Int J Sport Psychol.* 2014;45(4):395-407.