Tan, Jeryl Shawn T., 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 (2023) Perfectionism, wellbeing, and coping among Filipino university students: A test of the 2 × 2 model of perfectionism. In: Fifty-ninth Psychological Association of the Philippines Annual Convention, September 21-23 2023, Legazpi City, Albay, Philippines. (Unpublished)

RaY

Research at the University of York St John

Perfectionism, Wellbeing, and Coping Among Filipino University Students:
A Test of the 2 × 2 Model of Perfectionism

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

Trait Perfectionism (Hewitt and Flett, 1991)

- **Self-oriented perfectionism (SOP)**: tendency to set exacting standards for oneself and to evaluate and criticize one's behavior in a stringent manner.

- **Socially prescribed perfectionism (SPP)**: perception that other people are imposing unrealistic standards and if these standards are not met, others are harsh and critical.

- SPP is a consistently debilitating dimension, while SOP is a vulnerability factor (Hewitt & Flett, 1991).

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

Figure 1

*The 2 × 2 Model of
Perfectionism*

**Socially Prescribed Perfectionism
(SPP)**

	Low	High
Low	**Non-perfectionism**	**Pure SPP**
High	**Pure SOP**	**Mixed Perfectionism**

**Self-oriented
Perfectionism (SOP)**

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

Table 1

Hypotheses of the 2 × 2 Model of 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

Table 2

Review of Studies Examining the Hypotheses of the 2 × 2 Model of Perfectionism in University Student Wellbeing

Outcome and Authors	H1a Pure SOP > Non	H1b Pure SOP < Non	H1c Pure SOP = Non	H2 Non > Pure SPP	H3 Mixed > Pure SPP	H4 Pure SOP > Mixed
Academic/school satisfaction						
Gaudreau and Thompson (2010)	✓			✓	✓	✓
Franche et al. (2012)	✓			✓	✓	✓
Franche and Gaudreau (2016)	✓			✓	✓	✓
Gaudreau et al. (2016)	✓			✓	✓	✓
General positive affect						
Gaudreau and Thompson (2010)	✓			✓	✓	✓
Franche and Gaudreau (2016)	✓			✓	✓	✓
General negative affect						
Gaudreau and Thompson (2010)			✓	✓	✓	✓
Franche and Gaudreau (2016)			✓	✓		✓
Stress (Franche & Gaudreau, 2016)			✓	✓		✓

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

Table 3

Review of Studies Examining the Hypotheses of the 2 × 2 Model of Perfectionism in Coping

Crocker et al. (2014) and Jowett et al. (2018) – sports context

Franche (2017) – university students

Outcome and Authors	H1a Pure SOP > Non	H1b Pure SOP < Non	H1c Pure SOP = Non	H2 Non > Pure SPP	H3 Mixed > Pure SPP	H4 Pure SOP > Mixed
Problem-focused coping						
Crocker et al. (2014)			✓			
Jowett et al. (2018)	✓			✓	✓	✓
Emotion-focused coping						
Crocker et al. (2014)			✓			
Jowett et al. (2018)		✓				
Avoidance coping						
Crocker et al. (2014)				✓		✓
Jowett et al. (2018)			✓			
Task-oriented coping (Franche, 2017)	✓				✓	
Disengagement-oriented coping (Franche, 2017)				✓		✓

Testing the 2 × 2 Model of Perfectionism in a Cultural Context

- Yoon and Lau's (2008) proposed cultural models on how students experience perfectionism-related distress
  - **Cultural sensitization model** – experience more distress due to increased pressure to meet cultural obligations
  - **Cultural congruence model** – experience less distress as their perfectionism is consistent with broader cultural embedded themes

Testing the 2 × 2 Model of Perfectionism in a Cultural Context

- Franche et al.'s (2012) proposed alternative hypotheses related to SPP and psychological adjustment
  - **Socially prescribed perfectionism as an aggravating factor hypothesis (SPP-AFH)** – mixed perfectionism is associated with similar outcomes with pure SPP (contradicts H3)
  - **Socially prescribed perfectionism as a cultural makeup hypothesis (SPP-CMH)** – mixed perfectionism is associated with better outcomes than pure SOP (contradicts H4)

Perfectionism in the Filipino Context

- ***Utang ng loob*** for the students' families can be a double-edged sword, especially as the students go through college (Tan, 2022).
  - Some students have difficulties prioritizing their personal goals and aspirations because of their fear of disappointing their parents (SPP-AFH).
  - Some students see the value of their parents' guidance in their college journey (SPP-CMH).

Study Objective

- To test the hypotheses of the 2 × 2 model of perfectionism in predicting wellbeing and coping in Filipino university students
  - Compare the SPP-AFH against the existing Hypothesis 3
  - Compare the SPP-CMH against the existing Hypothesis 4

Participants

- Participants were 294 Filipino university students (male = 76, female = 212, others* = 6, M_{age} = 20.73, SD_{age} = 1.63, range = 18-33) who completed an online survey.

- Participants were recruited from 27 universities and campuses via online advertisement and word of mouth (e.g., student organizations, university staff).

*Three participants identified as nonbinary/genderqueer, while one participant each identified as female-to-male, lesbian, and bisexual.

Instruments

Table 4

Instruments Used in the Study

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)

Procedures

- Participants viewed an online poster with survey link.

- Participants answered the online survey.

- Selected participants received a monetary prize after raffle draw.

Analysis Plan

1. Preliminary analysis prior to exploratory analyses and prior to main analyses – outliers and missing responses (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007)

2. Exploratory analyses (e.g., Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007)
   - Principal component analysis with eigenvalues, scree plot, parallel analysis, and Velicer's (1976) minimum average partial (MAP) test
   - Principal axis factoring extraction with oblique rotation (Promax) - factor structure were assessed based upon interpretability, pattern coefficients, communalities, internal reliabilities, and model fit indices.

Analysis Plan

3. Descriptive statistics, bivariate correlations, and internal reliabilities

4. Procedures described by Gaudreau (2012)
   - Mean centered SOP and SPP were first entered as predictors in the regression model. The interaction of their scores (SOP×SPP) was then added in the model.
   - If SOP×SPP was statistically significant, then four simple slope analyses were performed.
   - If SOP×SPP was not statistically significant, a new regression model was conducted without the interactive term and with uncentered scores for SOP and SPP.

Exploratory Analyses Results

- Data from 284 participants were included in the exploratory analyses.

- Nine factors were identified:

1. social support
2. active coping
3. substance use
4. avoidance coping
5. religion
6. humor
7. denial
8. positive cognitive restructuring
9. venting

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics, Bivariate Correlations, and Internal Reliabilities of Scaled Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. SOP	-														
2. SPP	.53***	-													
3. Perceived stress	.25***	.40***	-												
4. Positive affect	-.14*	-.23***	-.62***	-											
5. Negative affect	.28***	.37***	.71***	-.56***	-										
6. Life satisfaction	-.05	-.22***	-.47***	.59***	-.47***	-									
7. Social support	.10	-.04	-.19**	.35***	-.11	.27***	-								
8. Active coping	.14*	.06	-.28***	.34***	-.26***	.30***	.34***	-							
9. Substance use	.07	.15*	.11	-.16**	.19**	-.07	.08	-.09	-						
10. Avoidance coping	.20***	.32***	.66***	-.47***	.57***	-.42***	-.11	-.22***	.25***	-					
11. Religion	-.05	-.12*	-.24***	.32***	-.23***	.32***	.22***	.32***	-.13*	-.18**	-				
12. Humor	.10	.06	.02	.09	.12*	.08	.17**	.04	.16**	.12*	-.03	-			
13. Denial	.19**	.21***	.25***	-.20***	.21***	-.08	-.03	-.02	.21***	.36***	.01	.12*	-		
14. Positive cognitive	-.07	-.05	-.33***	.49***	-.33***	.37***	.38***	.49***	-.03	-.27***	.35***	.21***	-.12*	-	
15. Venting	.06	.04	.15*	.01	.20***	-.01	.34***	.17**	.13*	.11	-.09	.18**	.04	.18**	-
M	4.78	3.98	2.56	3.29	3.32	3.49	2.54	2.97	1.26	2.49	2.01	2.59	1.51	2.84	2.59
SD	1.30	1.38	0.51	0.68	0.71	1.29	0.86	0.62	0.56	0.67	1.00	1.01	0.69	0.63	0.78
Range	1.20-7.00	1.00-6.80	1.20-3.70	1.50-5.00	1.67-5.00	1.00-6.80	1.00-4.00	1.25-4.00	1.00-3.00	1.00-4.00	1.00-4.00	1.00-3.50	1.50-4.00	1.00-4.00	1.00-4.00
McDonald's ωª	.88	.84	.80	.87	.80	.86	.90	.78	-	.72	-	-	-	.71	-
Cronbach's α	.88	.84	.80	.87	.80	.86	.90	.78	.96	.73	.88	.87	.66	.75	.62

Note. $N = 279$. SOP = self-oriented perfectionism; SPP = socially prescribed perfectionism; Positive cognitive = positive cognitive restructuring.
* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$
ª Values of McDonald's ω for substance use, religion, humor, denial, and venting cannot be estimated as the number of items for these coping dimensions is less than three.

Descriptive Statistics, Bivariate Correlati[

Variable	1	2
1. SOP	-	
2. SPP	.53***	-
3. Perceived stress	.25***	.40***
4. Positive affect	-.14*	-.23***
5. Negative affect	.28***	.37***
6. Life satisfaction	-.05	-.22***
7. Social support	.10	-.04
8. Active coping	.14*	.06
9. Substance use	.07	.15*
10. Avoidance coping	.20***	.32***
11. Religion	-.05	-.12*
12. Humor	.10	.06
13. Denial	.19**	.21***
14. Positive cognitive	-.07	-.05
15. Venting	.06	.04

Descriptive Statistics, Bivariate Correlatio

Variable	1	2
1. SOP	-	
2. SPP	.53***	-
3. Perceived stress	.25***	.40***
4. Positive affect	-.14*	-.23***
5. Negative affect	.28***	.37***
6. Life satisfaction	-.05	-.22***
7. Social support	.10	-.04
8. Active coping	.14*	.06
9. Substance use	.07	.15*
10. Avoidance coping	.20***	.32***
11. Religion	-.05	-.12*
12. Humor	.10	.06
13. Denial	.19**	.21***
14. Positive cognitive	-.07	-.05
15. Venting	.06	.04

Descriptive Statistics, Bivariate Correlatic

Variable	1	2
1. SOP	-	
2. SPP	.53***	-
3. Perceived stress	.25***	.40***
4. Positive affect	-.14*	-.23***
5. Negative affect	.28***	.37***
6. Life satisfaction	-.05	-.22***
7. Social support	.10	-.04
8. Active coping	.14*	.06
9. Substance use	.07	.15*
10. Avoidance coping	.20***	.32***
11. Religion	-.05	-.12*
12. Humor	.10	.06
13. Denial	.19**	.21***
14. Positive cognitive	-.07	-.05
15. Venting	.06	.04

Results

Table 5

Examination of the Hypotheses of the 2 × 2 Model of Perfectionism in Wellbeing Among Filipino University Students

Note. N = 279.
✓ support for the hypothesis
** *p* < .01; *** *p* < .001

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
Perceived Stress			✓ *d* = 0.11	✓*** *d* = -0.74	*d* = 0.11	✓*** *d* = -0.74
Positive affect			✓ *d* = -0.03	✓** *d* = 0.45	*d* = -0.03	✓** *d* = 0.45
Negative affect			✓ *d* = 0.23	✓*** *d* = -0.62	*d* = 0.23	✓*** *d* = -0.62
Life satisfaction			✓ *d* = 0.18	✓*** *d* = 0.53	*d* = 0.18	✓*** *d* = 0.53

Results

Table 6

Examination of the Hypotheses of the 2 × 2 Model of Perfectionism in Coping Among Filipino University Students

Note. N = 279.
✓ support for the hypothesis
* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$
† significant difference between two perfectionism subtypes in the opposite direction (not predicted in the 2 × 2 model)

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
Social support	✓* $d = 0.34$			$d = 0.26$	✓* $d = 0.34$	$d = 0.26$
Active coping	✓* $d = 0.30$			$d = 0.04$	✓* $d = 0.30$	$d = 0.04$
Substance use			✓ $d = -0.02$	✓* $d = -0.32$	$d = -0.02$	✓* $d = -0.32$
Avoidance coping			✓ $d = 0.08$	✓*** $d = -0.60$	$d = 0.08$	✓*** $d = -0.60$
Religion			✓ $d = 0.03$	$d = 0.26$	$d = 0.03$	$d = 0.26$
Humor			✓ $d = 0.19$	$d = -0.02$	$d = -0.19$	$d = -0.02$
Denial			✓ $d = 0.05$	$d = -0.03$	†** $d = 0.55$	✓** $d = -0.53$
Positive cognitive restructuring			✓ $d = -0.13$	$d = -0.02$	$d = -0.13$	$d = -0.02$
Venting			✓ $d = -0.07$	$d = 0.23$	†* $d = 0.42$	$d = -0.26$

Discussion: 2 × 2 Model of Perfectionism for Student Wellbeing

- H2 and H4 were supported for all wellbeing outcomes.
  - Psychological maladjustment was triggered by the presence of high SPP.

- H1a and H3 were not supported for all wellbeing outcomes.
  - SOP had significant positive correlations with stress and negative affect, and a significant negative correlation with positive affect
  - Supports the notion that SOP is problematic and is a vulnerability factor for wellbeing (Hewitt & Flett, 1991).

Discussion: 2 × 2 Model of Perfectionism for Student Coping

- H1a and H3 were supported for social support and active coping.
- H2 and H4 were supported for substance use and avoidance coping.
  - Students with high SOP typically used more problem-focused coping → better wellbeing
  - Students with high SPP typically used more avoidance coping → worse wellbeing

Discussion: Aggravating Factor Hypothesis and Cultural Makeup Hypothesis

- As H3 was not supported for all wellbeing outcomes and most coping strategies, there was clearer support for the SPP-AFH than the SPP-CMH in this study.
  - Students experienced personal distress and parental relationship struggles because of their fear of parental punishments (Maramba, 2008; Tan, 2022).
- SPP-CMH can still be applicable to Filipino students (Paz, 2011; Tan, 2022)
  - Consider moderating factors when testing the 2 × 2 model (e.g., parental support; Yoon & Lau, 2008)

Limitations

- The study adopted a cross-sectional design.
- Measures used were all self-reported.
- Caution must be placed in generalizability (e.g., most participants came from a single university campus).
- Reliabilities of some variables were lower than desirable (e.g., venting α = .62).
- 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

EST. 1841 | YORK ST JOHN UNIVERSITY

Motivation, Performance and Wellbeing (MPaW) Research Group

Visit:
https://www.yorksj.ac.uk/research/motivation-performance-and-wellbeing/

Perfectionism, Wellbeing, and Coping Among Filipino University Students:
A Test of the 2 × 2 Model of Perfectionism

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