

Stoeber, J. (2011). Perfectionism, efficiency, and response bias in proof-reading performance: Extension and replication. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50(3), 426-429. DOI: 10.1016/j.paid.2010.10.021

Perfectionism, Efficiency, and Response Bias in Proof-Reading Performance:

Extension and Replication

Joachim Stoeber

University of Kent

— Short Communication —

Author Note

I thank Julian Childs and Franziska Stoeber for helpful comments on earlier versions of this article. Correspondence should be addressed to Joachim Stoeber, School of Psychology, University of Kent, Canterbury, Kent CT2 7NP, United Kingdom; e-mail: J.Stoeber@kent.ac.uk.

Abstract

In an investigation of perfectionism and proof-reading performance differentiating between perfectionist strivings and perfectionist concerns, Stoeber and Eysenck (2008) found that only perfectionist strivings (but not perfectionist concerns) showed significant correlations with proof-reading performance: a negative correlation with efficiency (accuracy divided by time invested in the task) and a positive correlation with false alarms (incorrectly detected errors). The aim of the present study was to expand on Stoeber and Eysenck's study investigating 156 students using different measures of perfectionism and a different text for proof-reading. Results replicated Stoeber and Eysenck's main findings: Perfectionist strivings showed a negative correlation with efficiency and a positive correlation with false alarms. In addition, they showed a positive correlation with invested time and a negative correlation with response bias against reporting errors. In contrast, perfectionist concerns did not show any significant correlations with proof-reading performance. The findings corroborate the association between perfectionist strivings and reduced efficiency. Moreover, they further confirm the importance of (a) differentiating perfectionist strivings and perfectionist concerns, (b) using signal detection analysis, and (c) considering both absolute performance and relative performance (efficiency) when investigating the relationships of perfectionism with performance.

Keywords: Perfectionism; Performance; Efficiency; Errors; Signal Detection Analysis; Bias

Introduction

Perfectionism is a personality disposition characterized by striving for flawlessness and setting exceedingly high standards for performance accompanied by tendencies for overly critical evaluations (Flett & Hewitt, 2002; Frost, Marten, Lahart, & Rosenblate, 1990). Moreover, perfectionism is a multidimensional characteristic. In particular, two dimensions of perfectionism need to be differentiated: perfectionist strivings and perfectionist concerns (Stoeber & Otto, 2006). The first dimension—perfectionist strivings—captures those aspects of perfectionism associated with striving for perfection and setting exceedingly high standards for performance. The second dimension—perfectionist concerns—captures those aspects associated with concerns over making mistakes, fear of negative evaluations by others, and feelings of discrepancy between one's expectations and performance (see Stoeber & Otto, 2006, for a review).

The differentiation between the two dimensions is crucial because perfectionist concerns have been associated with negative characteristics, processes, and outcomes whereas perfectionist strivings have been associated with positive characteristics, processes, and outcomes (Hill, Huelsman, & Araujo, 2010; Stoeber & Otto, 2006). In particular, perfectionist strivings have been associated with higher levels of performance such as academic performance (see Stoeber & Otto, 2006), aptitude test performance (Stoeber & Kersting, 2007), and task performance (Stoeber, Chesterman, & Tarn, 2010). In contrast, perfectionist concerns have not shown any systematic negative associations with performance (Stoeber & Otto, 2006). Only in studies that measured perfectionist concerns using the Discrepancy scale of the revised Almost Perfect Scale (APS-R; Slaney, Rice, Mobley, Trippi, & Ashby, 2001) did perfectionist concerns show consistent negative relationships with academic performance, indicating that different measures of perfectionism may show different relationships with performance.

Moreover, Stoeber and Eysenck (2008) recently demonstrated that it is important to

consider not only absolute performance, but also relative performance (or *efficiency*) taking into account the effort invested to achieve a certain level of absolute performance. To demonstrate their point, they investigated perfectionism and proof-reading performance taking invested time (time to complete the task) as an indicator of invested effort. To measure the two dimensions of perfectionism, they used two scales from the APS-R: the High Standards scale to measure perfectionist strivings and the Discrepancy scale to measure perfectionist concerns. In terms of proof-reading, overall performance was measured using signal detection analysis, and efficiency was then calculated by dividing performance by time taken to complete the task. Perfectionist strivings showed a negative correlation with efficiency, suggesting that individuals high in perfectionist strivings are less efficient (cf. Ishida, 2005). Moreover, perfectionist strivings showed a positive correlation with false alarms (incorrectly detected errors), suggesting that individuals high in perfectionist strivings have a tendency to report errors even when all is correct. In contrast, perfectionist concerns did not show any significant bivariate correlations with proof-reading performance. However, when partial correlations were computed partialling out the influence of perfectionist strivings, perfectionist concerns showed a significant negative correlation with the number of hits (correctly detected errors) and a significant positive correlation with response bias against reporting errors.

Stoeber and Eysenck (2008) were the first to investigate perfectionism and efficiency using time to determine effort and employing signal detection analysis to determine overall performance. Consequently, it would be important to replicate their findings, particularly because their sample was not particularly large ($N = 96$) and the significant partial correlations of perfectionist concerns were not predicted. Moreover, it is unclear if their findings would generalize to other measures of perfectionist strivings and perfectionist concerns and to other proof-reading texts. Consequently, the aim of the present study was to expand on Stoeber and

Eysenck's findings using a larger sample, different measures of perfectionism, and a different text.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Participants were 156 first-year undergraduate students (28 male, 128 female) studying psychology at a British university. Mean age was 19.6 years ($SD = 3.9$; range = 18-47 years). Students were tested in groups of 34 to 50 students in the computer lab. First, they completed the perfectionism measures. Then they received written instructions for the proof-reading task and, after reading them, started the task. The task was computer-administered: a computer program recorded students' answers and measured the time students took to complete the task.

Measures

Perfectionism. To measure perfectionism, two scales were used: the 5-item Striving for Perfection scale (Stoeber & Rambow, 2007) to measure perfectionist strivings (e.g., "I strive to be as perfect as possible"), and the 9-item Concern Over Mistakes scale (Frost et al., 1990) to measure perfectionist concerns (e.g., "People will probably think less of me if I make a mistake"). Both scales have been shown to be reliable indicators of the two dimensions of perfectionism (e.g., Stoeber, Stoll, Salmi, & Tiikkaja, 2009), and the scales' scores showed high reliability (Cronbach's alphas): .91 (striving for perfection) and .87 (concern over mistakes).

Proof-reading performance. To measure proof-reading performance, the same task as in Stoeber and Eysenck (2008) was used. Again, the text required students to find three types of errors: spelling, grammar, and APA format errors (see Stoeber & Eysenck, 2008, for details). However, a different and longer text containing more errors was used. Whereas Stoeber and Eysenck used a text from a journal article on taste potentiation in mice (Davis, Bailey, Becker, & Grover, 1990) comprising 107 lines (1126 words, 6073 characters) and containing 30 errors (11 spelling, 9 grammar, 10 APA format errors), the present study used a

text from a journal article on heat and hostility in humans (Dubitsky, Weber, & Rotton, 1993) comprising 182 lines (1979 words, 10388 characters) and containing 50 errors (20 spelling, 14 grammar, 16 APA format errors).

The text was presented on a computer screen as running text with one line of text highlighted. At the end of the highlighted line, students found three tick-boxes labeled “S” for spelling error, “G” for grammar error, and “A” for APA format error. Students were instructed to tick the respective box if they found an error in spelling, grammar, or APA format. Further they were instructed that a line of text could contain more than one type of error (e.g., a spelling error and an APA format error) in which case they had to tick all respective boxes (e.g., “S” and “A”). After finishing proof-reading a line, students clicked on a button labeled “Next” to move to the next line of text. Students were instructed to work at their own pace, and they had 50 minutes to complete the task which was sufficient for all students (see Table 1, Time, Max).

Preliminary Analyses

Following Stoeber and Eysenck (2008), a signal detection analysis was performed to differentiate accuracy and response bias. First, the number of hits (correctly detected errors) and the number of false alarms (incorrectly detected errors) were determined. Second, hit rates and false alarm rates were computed adding 0.5 to the nominator and 1 to the denominator to avoid division by zero: hit rate = $(\text{hits} + 0.5) / (\text{lines with errors} + 1)$; false alarm rate = $(\text{false alarms} + 0.5) / (\text{lines with no error} + 1)$ (see Snodgrass & Corwin, 1988). These rates were then used to compute accuracy and response bias (in SPSS syntax): accuracy = $\text{IDF.NORMAL}(\text{hit rate}, 0, 1) - \text{IDF.NORMAL}(\text{false alarm rate}, 0, 1)$; response bias = $-0.5 \times (\text{IDF.NORMAL}(\text{hit rate}, 0, 1) + \text{IDF.NORMAL}(\text{false alarm rate}, 0, 1))$. (Note that response bias captures conservative responding, that is, bias *against* reporting errors.) Four students with negative accuracy values (indicating they did not understand/follow instructions) were removed from the analyses before efficiency of performance was computed

by dividing students' overall performance (accuracy) by the time they took to complete the proof-reading task. To transform accuracy and time to the same metric, both indicators were subjected to a linear transformation so they had a variance of 1 and a minimum value of 1 following the formula $x' = \frac{x - \text{value of } x + \text{sample's minimum value of } x + 1}{\text{value of } x + \text{sample's minimum value of } x + 1}$ (see Craig & Condon, 1985). Finally, efficiency was computed as accuracy'/time'. Table 1 shows the descriptive statistics.

Results

First, bivariate correlations were analyzed (Table 1). Replicating Stoeber and Eysenck's (2008) findings, perfectionist strivings showed a negative correlation with efficiency. Moreover, they showed a positive correlation with false alarms (incorrectly detected errors) and a negative correlation with response bias, indicating that students high in perfectionist strivings had a stronger tendency to mark correct text as incorrect than students low in perfectionist strivings. Finally, perfectionist strivings showed a positive correlation with time, indicating that students high in perfectionist strivings invested more time to complete the task than students low in perfectionist strivings.

In contrast, all bivariate correlations of perfectionist concerns with the indicators of proof-reading performance were nonsignificant (Table 1). Therefore, following Stoeber and Eysenck (2008), partial correlations were computed to examine if perfectionist concerns showed significant correlations with the indicators proof-reading performance when controlling for perfectionist strivings. However, the resulting partial correlations were all nonsignificant too, $-.04 \leq \text{partial } r_s \leq .04, p_s > .610$.

Discussion

The aim of the present study was to expand on Stoeber and Eysenck's (2008) findings on perfectionism, efficiency, and response bias in proof-reading performance using a larger sample, different measures of perfectionism, and a different text. Results demonstrated that individuals high in perfectionist strivings showed lower efficiency in proof-reading

performance than those low in perfectionist strivings, replicating Stoeber and Eysenck's findings. Moreover, perfectionist strivings showed a positive correlation with false alarms (incorrectly detected errors) and a negative correlation with response bias against reporting errors, indicating that individuals high in perfectionist strivings preferred to report errors (even when everything was correct) rather than miss potential errors. Finally, further confirming previous findings that individuals high in perfectionist strivings invest more effort (Stoeber et al., 2010; Stoeber & Eismann, 2007), perfectionist strivings showed a positive correlation with time invested to complete the proof-reading task.

In contrast, the present study did not replicate Stoeber and Eysenck's (2008) findings that perfectionist concerns showed a negative partial correlation with the number of hits (correctly detected errors) and a positive partial correlation with response bias against reporting errors, when the influence of perfectionist strivings was partialled out. Note, however, that Stoeber and Eysenck measured perfectionist concerns with the Discrepancy scale of the APS-R (Slaney et al., 2001), a scale capturing concerns over discrepancies between high expectations and actual results that has shown small, but significant, negative correlations with academic performance (e.g., Rice & Ashby, 2007). In comparison, the present study measured perfectionist concerns with the Concern over Mistakes scale of the FMPS (Frost et al., 1990), a scale capturing concerns over making mistakes and not living up to others' expectations that usually does not show significant negative correlations with academic performance (e.g., Castro & Rice, 2003). Consequently, future studies on perfectionism and proof-reading performance may profit from including both measures of perfectionist concerns and investigating their differential relationships with indicators of performance, efficiency, and response bias.

The present study has further limitations. Because the study used the same task as Stoeber and Eysenck (2008), it remains unclear whether the findings are specific to proof-reading performance. Future studies investigating perfectionism and efficiency should use

other tasks to demonstrate that perfectionist strivings predict lower efficiency also in tasks other than proof-reading. Moreover, like Stoeber and Eysenck's study, the present study investigated undergraduate students. Consequently, future studies should investigate whether the finding of a negative relationship between perfectionist strivings and efficiency also holds outside the academic context, for example, in the workplace by investigating whether perfectionist strivings, while associated with higher job engagement (Childs & Stoeber, in press), may also be associated with lower efficiency in job performance.

Despite these limitations, the present findings have important implications. First, they replicate and expand on Stoeber and Eysenck's (2008) central findings corroborating that perfectionist strivings are associated with lower efficiency and more false alarms in proof-reading performance and demonstrating that the findings hold for different measures of perfectionist strivings and different proof-reading texts. With this, they further underscore the importance of considering not only absolute performance and correct responses, but also relative performance (efficiency) and incorrect responses when investigating the perfectionism-performance relationship. Second, the present findings substantiate previous findings that individuals high in perfectionist strivings invest more effort in their performance compared to individuals low in perfectionist strivings (e.g., Stoeber et al., 2010). Finally, the findings demonstrate the significance to regard perfectionism as a multidimensional personality characteristic and to differentiate two main dimensions—perfectionist strivings and perfectionist concerns—because the two dimensions not only show differential relationships with positive and negative life outcomes (e.g., Hill et al., 2010), but also with performance.

References

- Castro, J. R., & Rice, K. G. (2003). Perfectionism and ethnicity: Implications for depressive symptoms and self-reported academic achievement. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 9*, 64-78.
- Childs, J. H., & Stoeber, J. (in press). Self-oriented, other-oriented, and socially prescribed perfectionism in employees: Relationships with burnout and engagement. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*.
- Craig, A., & Condon, R. (1985). Speed-accuracy trade-off and time of day. *Acta Psychologica, 58*, 115-122.
- Davis, S. F., Bailey, S. A., Becker, A. H., & Grover, C. A. (1990). Taste/taste potentiation as a function of age and stimulus intensity. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 28*, 201-203.
- Dubitsky, S., Weber, R., & Rotton, J. (1993). Heat, hostility, and immune function: The moderating effects of gender and demand characteristics. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society, 31*, 534-536.
- Flett, G. L., & Hewitt, P. L. (2002). Perfectionism and maladjustment: An overview of theoretical, definitional, and treatment issues. In P. L. Hewitt & G. L. Flett (Eds.), *Perfectionism* (pp. 5-31). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Frost, R. O., Marten, P., Lahart, C., & Rosenblate, R. (1990). The dimensions of perfectionism. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 14*, 449-468.
- Hill, R. W., Huelsman, T. J., & Araujo, G. (2010). Perfectionistic concerns suppress associations between perfectionistic strivings and positive life outcomes. *Personality and Individual Differences, 48*, 584-589.
- Ishida, H. (2005). College students' perfectionism and task-strategy inefficiency: Why their efforts go unrewarded? *Japanese Journal of Social Psychology, 20*, 208-215.
- Rice, K. G., & Ashby, J. S. (2007). An efficient method for classifying perfectionists. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*, 72-85.

- Slaney, R. B., Rice, K. G., Mobley, M., Trippi, J., & Ashby, J. S. (2001). The revised Almost Perfect Scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 34*, 130-145.
- Snodgrass, J. G., & Corwin, J. (1988). Pragmatics of measuring recognition memory: Applications to dementia and amnesia. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 117*, 34-50.
- Stoeber, J., Chesterman, D., & Tarn, T.-A. (2010). Perfectionism and task performance: Time on task mediates the perfectionistic strivings–performance relationship. *Personality and Individual Differences, 48*, 458-462.
- Stoeber, J., & Eismann, U. (2007). Perfectionism in young musicians: Relations with motivation, effort, achievement, and distress. *Personality and Individual Differences, 43*, 2182-2192.
- Stoeber, J., & Eysenck, M. W. (2008). Perfectionism and efficiency: Accuracy, response bias, and invested time in proof-reading performance. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42*, 1673-1678.
- Stoeber, J., & Kersting, M. (2007). Perfectionism and aptitude test performance: Testees who strive for perfection achieve better results. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*, 1093-1103.
- Stoeber, J., & Otto, K. (2006). Positive conceptions of perfectionism: Approaches, evidence, challenges. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*, 295-319.
- Stoeber, J., & Rambow, A. (2007). Perfectionism in adolescent school students: Relations with motivation, achievement, and well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*, 1379-1389.
- Stoeber, J., Stoll, O., Salmi, O., & Tiikkaja, J. (2009). Perfectionism and achievement goals in young Finnish ice-hockey players aspiring to make the Under-16 national team. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 27*, 85-94.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics and Bivariate Correlations

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Min	Max	Correlation							
					1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Perfectionism												
1. Perfectionist strivings	4.28	1.32	1.00	7.00								
2. Perfectionist concerns	3.27	1.05	1.11	6.22	.56***							
Proof-reading performance												
3. Time	21.52	5.35	11.42	40.21	.23**	.14						
4. Hits	23.37	7.22	5	41	.12	.04	.42***					
5. False alarms ^a	25.78	29.26	0	251	.21**	.14	.25**	-.02				
6. Accuracy	1.66	0.58	0.03	3.09	-.04	-.03	.11	.73***	-.61***			
7. Response bias	0.92	0.26	-0.03	1.64	-.21**	-.08	-.49***	-.66***	-.64***	.03		
8. Efficiency	1.47	0.61	0.19	3.80	-.21**	-.15	-.71***	.07	-.50***	.48***	.42***	

Note. $N = 152$. Perfectionism scores are mean scores (see *Measures*). Time = time (in minutes) taken to complete the proof-reading task. Response bias = bias against reporting errors. Efficiency = accuracy²/time² (see *Preliminary Analyses*). Min = minimum, Max = maximum.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$, two-tailed.

^aNote that, because each of the 182 lines of text may contain three errors (a spelling, a grammar, and an APA format error), the theoretical maximum for false alarms is $3 \times 182 = 546$.