

Tan, Jeryl Shawn T. ORCID logoORCID:
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5547-4065>, Hill, Andrew P. ORCID
logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6370-8901> and Madigan,
Daniel J. ORCID logoORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9937-1818> (2025) A Conditional Process Model of Perfectionism,
Compassion, Wellbeing, and Coping in Filipino University Students.
In: 61st Psychological Association of the Philippines (PAP) Annual
Convention and 8th ASEAN Regional Union of Psychological
Societies (ARUPS) Congress, September 25-27, 2025, Cebu City,
Philippines. (Unpublished)

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/13315/>

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

A Conditional Process Model of Perfectionism, Compassion, Wellbeing, and Coping in Filipino University Students

Jeryl Shawn T. Tan, MA, RPsy

*York St John University (United Kingdom)
and University of the Philippines Diliman*

Andrew P. Hill, PhD

*York St John University (United Kingdom)
and University of Toronto (Canada)*

Daniel J. Madigan, PhD

York St John University (United Kingdom)

Est.
1841

YORK
ST JOHN
UNIVERSITY



Perfectionism

- Striving very hard to reach **high unrealistic standards** and being preoccupied with **harsh critical evaluations** (Frost et al., 1990)
- Multidimensional trait with two dimensions (Hewitt & Flett, 1991)
 - **Self-oriented perfectionism (SOP)**: perception that one must meet high unrealistic standards for oneself
 - **Socially prescribed perfectionism (SPP)**: perception that others impose high unrealistic standards on the person

Gaudreau and Thompson's (2010) 2 × 2 Model of Perfectionism

		Socially Prescribed Perfectionism (SPP)	
		Low	High
Self-oriented Perfectionism (SOP)	Low	Non-perfectionism	Pure SPP
	High	Pure SOP	Mixed Perfectionism

Hypothesis	Difference on Psychological Adjustment
1a	Pure SOP > Non-perfectionism
1b	Pure SOP < Non-perfectionism
1c	Pure SOP = Non-perfectionism
2	Non-perfectionism > Pure SPP
3	Mixed perfectionism > Pure SPP
4	Pure SOP > Mixed perfectionism

Gaudreau and Thompson's (2010)

2 × 2 Model of Perfectionism

- Overall, **subtypes with high SPP (pure SPP and mixed perfectionism)** were associated with **poorer wellbeing and unhealthy coping** than subtypes with low SPP (pure SOP and non-perfectionism) among Filipino university students (Tan et al., 2025).
- **Compassion-related variables** have been shown to be influenced by perfectionism and to mediate the relationship between perfectionism and wellbeing.
 - Self-compassion (Stoeber et al., 2020; Tan, 2023)
 - Compassion for others (Stoeber et al., 2020)
 - Fear of self-compassion, fear of compassion from others, and fear of compassion for others (Gilbert et al., 2011).

Study Objective

To test if the relationships between perfectionism subtypes and outcomes related to wellbeing and coping are mediated by compassion-related variables among Filipino university students.

Methodology

- **Sample size:** $N = 701$ Filipino university students
 - Age: $M = 21.22$; $SD = 1.94$; range = 18-32
 - Gender: Male = 211; Female = 477; Nonbinary = 10; Genderless = 1; Transmasculine = 1; Gay = 1
- The questionnaire included measures of perfectionism, wellbeing, coping, and compassion-related variables.
- **Data analysis:** Separate conditional process analyses (moderated mediation) were conducted for each mediator and outcome using the PROCESS macro (Model 59) in SPSS Statistics (Hayes, 2017), with 5,000 bootstrap samples.

Instruments

Outcome	Measure
SOP and SPP	Short version of the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (Hewitt & Flett, 1991) developed by Cox et al. (2002)
Stress	10-item Perceived Stress Scale (Cohen & Williamson, 1988)
Life satisfaction	Satisfaction with Life Scale (Diener et al., 1985)
Positive affect Negative affect	Scale of Positive and Negative Experience (Diener et al., 2010)
Coping	Brief COPE (Carver, 1997) • The 14 subscales (coping strategies) were categorized based on exploratory factor analysis (EFA)

Instruments

Outcome	Measure and Sample item
Self-compassion	Self-compassion Scale - Short Form (Raes et al., 2011) e.g., “When I’m going through a very hard time, I give myself the caring and tenderness I need.”
Compassion for others	The Compassion Scale (Pommier et al., 2019) e.g., “I like to be there for others in times of difficulty.”
Fear of self-compassion	Fear of Compassion Scales (Gilbert et al., 2011) e.g., “I feel that I don’t deserve to be kind and forgiving to myself.”
Fear of compassion for others	Fear of Compassion Scales (Gilbert et al., 2011) e.g., “People will take advantage of me if they see me as too compassionate.”
Fear of compassion from others	Fear of Compassion Scales (Gilbert et al., 2011) e.g., “When people are kind and compassionate towards me I feel anxious or embarrassed.”

Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities, and Correlations

Outcome	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Cronbach's α	Correlation with SOP (<i>r</i>)	Correlation with SPP (<i>r</i>)
Life satisfaction	3.60	1.31	.85	.04	-.14***
Positive affect	3.31	0.66	.86	.00	-.18***
Negative affect	3.23	0.70	.80	.14***	.34***
Perceived stress	2.41	0.56	.83	.12**	.38***
Social support	2.49	0.85	.89	.00	-.07
Active coping	2.91	0.64	.78	.07	-.14***
Substance use	1.23	0.51	.88	.05	.11**
Avoidance coping	2.45	0.69	.75	.15***	.35***

Note. *N* = 677. SOP = self-oriented perfectionism (*M* = 4.36; *SD* = 1.34). SPP = socially prescribed perfectionism (*M* = 3.57; *SD* = 1.29).

p* < .01. *p* < .001.

Descriptive Statistics, Reliabilities, and Correlations

Outcome	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Cronbach's α	Correlation with SOP (<i>r</i>)	Correlation with SPP (<i>r</i>)
Religion	2.11	1.03	.88	.08*	-.03
Humor	2.75	0.96	.85	.01	.12**
Denial	1.65	0.75	.69	.07	.28***
Positive cognitive restructuring	2.93	0.62	.68	-.01	-.08*
Venting	2.61	0.80	.52	.05	.04
Self-compassion	2.89	0.64	.83	-.21***	-.37***
Compassion for others	4.09	0.45	.83	.01	-.05
Fear of self-compassion	1.41	0.89	.93	.26***	.47***
Fear of compassion for others	2.19	0.74	.84	.08*	.21***
Fear of compassion from others	1.72	0.78	.89	.18***	.43***

Note. *N* = 677. SOP = self-oriented perfectionism (*M* = 4.36; *SD* = 1.34). SPP = socially prescribed perfectionism (*M* = 3.57; *SD* = 1.29).

p* < .05. *p* < .01. ****p* < .001.

Cross-sectional Test Results (Without Mediation)

Outcome	H1a Pure SOP > Non	H1b Pure SOP < Non	H1c Pure SOP = Non	H2 Non > Pure SPP	H3 Mixed > Pure SPP	H4 Pure SOP > Mixed
Self-compassion			✓ $d = -0.01$	✓*** $d = 0.74$	$d = -0.01$	✓*** $d = 0.74$
Compassion for others			✓ $d = 0.11$	$d = 0.16$	$d = 0.11$	$d = 0.16$
Fear of self-compassion			✓ $d = 0.03$	✓*** $d = -0.92$	$d = 0.03$	✓*** $d = -0.92$
Fear of compassion for others			✓ $d = -0.10$	✓*** $d = -0.47$	$d = -0.10$	✓*** $d = -0.47$
Fear of compassion from others			✓ ($p = .0504$) $d = -0.16$	✓*** $d = -0.95$	($p = .0504$) $d = -0.16$	✓*** $d = -0.95$

Note. $N = 677$. ✓ support for the hypothesis. d = Cohen's d , which is calculated by dividing the difference between the predicted values of the perfectionism subtypes by the standard deviation of the dependent variable (Gaudreau, 2012).

*** $p < .001$.

Conditional Indirect Effect Results

- Based on the results, there were only two conditional indirect effects that were statistically significant, with Hypotheses 2 and/or 4 being supported.

Conditional indirect effects of X on Y:

INDIRECT EFFECT:

SPP	→	Fearfrom	→	Negative	
SOP		Effect	BootSE	BootLLCI	BootULCI
3.0264		.0523	.0157	.0243	.0858
4.3637		.0742	.0124	.0507	.0994
5.7009		.0963	.0179	.0631	.1319
					H2 supported
					H4 supported

Pairwise contrasts between conditional indirect effects (Effect1 minus Effect2)

Effect1	Effect2	Contrast	BootSE	BootLLCI	BootULCI
.0742	.0523	.0219	.0109	.0002	.0424
.0963	.0523	.0440	.0231	-.0005	.0894
.0963	.0742	.0221	.0124	-.0011	.0472

Conditional indirect effects of X on Y:

INDIRECT EFFECT:

SPP	→	FearSC	→	Religion	
SOP		Effect	BootSE	BootLLCI	BootULCI
3.0264		-.0231	.0210	-.0622	.0191
4.3637		-.0546	.0165	-.0868	-.0226
5.7009		-.0902	.0230	-.1368	-.0455
					H4 supported

Pairwise contrasts between conditional indirect effects (Effect1 minus Effect2)

Effect1	Effect2	Contrast	BootSE	BootLLCI	BootULCI
-.0546	-.0231	-.0315	.0135	-.0588	-.0060
-.0902	-.0231	-.0672	.0289	-.1255	-.0114
-.0902	-.0546	-.0357	.0157	-.0683	-.0056

Note. N = 677. Negative = negative affect. Fear from = fear of compassion from others. Fear SC = fear of self-compassion.

If a confidence interval does not include the value of 0, then it confirms the presence of the moderated mediation (Hayes, 2015; 2018).

Insights from Conditional Indirect Effect Results

- Subtypes with high SPP were associated with more negative affect than subtypes with low SPP because of high fear of compassion from others.
 - Mixed perfectionism was associated with less use of religion than pure SOP because of high fear of self-compassion.
- Due to their **sensitivity to social threats** (Neff, 2023), students high in SPP may fear receiving compassion from others and struggle to show it to themselves, leading to poorer wellbeing and less use of effective coping.

Insights from Conditional Indirect Effect Results

- Irrespective of the significance of the moderated mediation, the simple slopes associated to Hypotheses 2 and 4 for all wellbeing and coping outcomes (except humor and venting for Hypothesis 2) were mediated by at least one compassion-related variable.
 - These give credence to the SPP being an aggravating factor among Filipino university students (Franché et al., 2012).
 - Practitioners can offer compassion-related interventions that promote **social safeness**, allowing students to experience a kind and supportive environment (Best et al., 2021).

Limitations

- Measures used were all self-reported.
- Reliability of venting was lower than desirable (e.g., $\alpha = .52$).
- Looking into alternative statistical approaches (e.g., SEM)
- Student wellbeing was operationalized in a particular way (i.e., focusing on hedonic wellbeing rather than eudemonic wellbeing).

For questions about this presentation,
you can email me at:
jeryl.tan@yorksj.ac.uk or jttan1@up.edu.ph



Visit:

[https://www.yorksj.ac.uk/research/
motivation-performance-and-
wellbeing/](https://www.yorksj.ac.uk/research/motivation-performance-and-wellbeing/)