

1 **Impostor Phenomenon in the Nutrition and Dietetics Profession: An Online Cross-Sectional**
2 **Survey**

3

4 **Authors:** Matthew J. Landry¹, Dylan A. Bailey², MinJi Lee³, Samuel Van Gundy⁴, Audrey Ervin⁵

5 **Affiliations:**

- 6 1. Stanford Prevention Research Center, School of Medicine, Stanford University, Palo Alto,
7 CA
- 8 2. Well Done Nutrition, LLC. Millburn, NJ
- 9 3. Department of Kinesiology, Nutrition, and Recreation, Southeast Missouri State
10 University, Cape Girardeau, MO
- 11 4. San Diego VA Healthcare System, San Diego, CA
- 12 5. Department of Counseling Psychology, Delaware Valley University, Doylestown, PA

13

14 **Funding/Financial Disclosures:** No funding or financial disclosures to report.

15

16 **Availability of Data and Material:** Data and material are available on request from the authors.

17 The material and data that support the findings of this study are available from the
18 corresponding author, MJL, upon reasonable request.

19

20 **Conflict of Interest Disclosures:** MJL has received speaker honoraria from the California

21 Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics and PepsiCo Health & Nutrition Sciences for talks related to
22 impostor phenomenon. Other authors report no potential conflicts of interest.

23 **Abstract**

24

25 *Background:* Impostor phenomenon (IP) (also known as impostor syndrome) describes high-
26 achieving individuals who, despite their objective successes, fail to internalize their
27 accomplishments and have persistent self-doubt and fear of being exposed as a fraud or
28 impostor. Despite robust literature describing the effects of IP in other health care professions,
29 there is an absence of research within the nutrition and dietetics profession.

30

31 *Objective:* To assess the prevalence and predictors of IP within the nutrition and dietetics
32 students and practitioners.

33

34 *Design:* An online cross-sectional survey was conducted.

35

36 *Participants/setting:* 1,015 students, dietetic interns, and currently practicing and retired
37 nutrition and dietetic technicians registered, and registered dietitian nutritionists provided
38 complete responses.

39

40 *Main outcome measures:* Impostor phenomenon was assessed with the Clance Impostor
41 Phenomenon Scale (CIPS). Self-reported Job satisfaction and well-being were assessed using
42 validated scales.

43

44 *Statistical analyses:* Descriptive statistics were summarized and reported using frequency
45 counts and percentages. Unadjusted logistic regression models were used to assess the
46 relationship between IP and sociodemographic outcomes, job satisfaction, and well-being.

47
48 *Results:* Respondents were primarily female, non-Hispanic White, and practicing dietitians. The
49 average CIPS score was 66.0 ± 16.3 (range 22-99). 64% of survey respondents (n=655)
50 experience intense or frequent IP and 62% (n=628) had a CIPS score ≥ 62 . Older age, educational
51 attainment, professional level, and membership in Academy groups were associated with lower
52 IP scores. Greater Social media use was associated with higher IP scores. Job satisfaction and
53 overall well-being were inversely correlated with impostor phenomenon ($p < 0.001$).

54
55 *Conclusions:* Findings from an online survey suggest that a majority of nutrition and dietetics
56 students and practitioners experience IP. Our results reinforce the need to recognize and
57 address this issue by raising awareness, using early prevention methods, and supporting
58 individuals who are younger and/or new to the profession.

59
60 **Keywords:** impostor phenomenon, impostor syndrome, career advancement, job performance,
61 nutrition and dietetics, mentoring

1 Introduction

2

3 Impostor Phenomenon (IP) was first described over 40 years ago by psychology researchers
4 Pauline Clance and Suzanne Imes as persistent cognitions of intellectual phoniness.¹⁻³ Simply
5 put, it is the notion that otherwise competent and qualified individuals feel that they have
6 secured esteemed roles or professional positions because of an “oversight” or “plain luck.”⁴
7 Therefore, they feel like frauds or “impostors.” Impostor phenomenon (IP) is linked with
8 experiencing psychological distress (e.g., depression, anxiety, stress or burnout), increased self-
9 doubt, persistent feelings of failure, strained relationships, as well as significant detrimental
10 outcomes for career advancement and workforce retention.^{5, 6}

11

12 A recent systemic review of 61 studies and over 14,000 participants found that IP varied widely
13 depending on the screening tool and cutoff used to assess symptoms. Feelings of fraudulence
14 were common across gender, race, age, and a range of occupations though it may be more
15 prevalent and disproportionately impact the experiences of underrepresented or disadvantaged
16 groups.⁶ First-generation college students, academics, marketing managers, chief executive
17 officers, celebrities, and many others report experiencing IP at some time in their life.^{3, 6-9}
18 Psychological characteristics that are associated with increased susceptibility to IP include
19 introversion, trait anxiety, perfectionism, dependence on others for feelings of validation or
20 success, high propensity for shame, high family conflict, generalized anxiety, depressive
21 symptoms, excessive worry, and low self-confidence.⁵

22

23 Impostor phenomenon has been described extensively across a wide range of allied health and
24 medicine professionals, including but not limited to nurses and nursing students, physicians,
25 medical students, physician assistants, pharmacy residents, and dental students.¹⁰⁻¹⁶ Estimates
26 of the prevalence of IP within various healthcare professionals (HCPs) is shown in **Table 1**. HCPs
27 who experience IP report negative psychological outcomes such as increased levels of stress,
28 burnout, as well as decreased job performance and satisfaction over time.⁶ HCPs experiencing
29 IP may overwork and overproduce, which can be counterproductive and lead to burnout.
30 Generally speaking, individuals who experience IP have been found to report less career
31 planning and motivation to lead.^{3, 17} As a result, it is possible HCPs affected by IP may
32 purposefully miss or turn down career advancement opportunities, which could lead to poor
33 career retention.

34
35 Taken together, there is an accumulating body of work describing the link between impostor
36 feelings and poor job performance, substandard job satisfaction, and burnout among HCPs.
37 Dietetic students and practicing RDNs may display similar types and levels of personality traits,
38 and other psychological characteristics that are associated with increased susceptibility for IP,
39 to the collective body of HCPs reporting IP experiences.^{18, 19} However, studies have not yet
40 evaluated if IP is occurring within dietetic students (e.g., undergraduate or intern), registered
41 dietitian nutritionists (RDN) or nutrition and dietetics technicians, registered (NDTRs).²⁰ Given
42 the potential implications on educational and workforce advancement, retention, satisfaction
43 and performance, it critical to understand the level at which IP is occurring in the nutrition and
44 dietetics profession, as well as any factors linked with increased IP susceptibility. Therefore, the

45 primary aim of this study was to describe the prevalence and predictors of IP in the nutrition
46 and dietetics profession.

47

48 **Materials and Methods**

49

50 This cross-sectional, anonymous online survey was administered to nutrition and dietetics
51 practitioners and students and aimed to measure the prevalence of IP and sociodemographic
52 predictors of IP. Procedures were followed in accordance with the ethical standards from the
53 Helsinki Declaration and were approved by the Delaware Valley University Institutional Review
54 Board (protocol #21010, 3 May 2021). All respondents reviewed an informed consent
55 document and agreed to participate.

56

57 **Survey Development and Design**

58 The survey consisted of 56 possible questions including demographic questions, the Clance
59 Impostor Phenomenon Scale (CIPS), job satisfaction, burnout and well-being, and social media
60 use. The survey utilized conditional branching to skip blocks of questions that were not
61 pertinent to respondents based on prior responses or indicated professional level (e.g.,
62 students, dietetic interns, and retired professionals were not asked questions about job
63 satisfaction). Respondents did not have the option to skip questions that were displayed to
64 them; however, questions that were sensitive in nature had a “prefer not to say” option for
65 respondents to select. It was estimated that respondents would need 15-20 minutes to
66 complete the entire survey.

67

68 *Demographics*

69 Data were collected on participant's age, gender identity, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity,
70 disability status, educational attainment, primary area of practice (for RDNs, NDTRs, and
71 retired)²¹, and membership in the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics Dietetic Practice Groups
72 (DPGs) and Member Interest Groups (MIGs).^{22, 23}

73

74 *Impostor Phenomenon*

75 Data on the impostor phenomenon were assessed with the Clance Impostor Phenomenon Scale
76 (CIPS).² Although a gold standard measure is yet to be established, the CIPS is the most cited
77 and utilized measure by practitioners and IP researchers.²⁴ The tool is a 20-item survey using a
78 5-point Likert scale for each item with 1, not at all true; 2, rarely; 3, sometimes; 4, often; and 5,
79 very true. Scores range from 20 to 100, with scores less than 40 indicating few impostor
80 characteristics, scores between 41 and 60 indicating moderate impostor traits, and scores
81 between 61 and 80 representing frequent impostor feelings, and scores of 81 and higher
82 indicating that the respondent possessed intense impostor behaviors. The higher the score, the
83 more frequently and seriously the IP interferes in a person's life. A CIPS score of ≥ 62 was used
84 as a threshold to determine respondents demonstrating IP and has been shown to minimize
85 false-positives and false-negatives.²⁵ The CIPS has been demonstrated to be reliable with a
86 Cronbach's of 0.96.²⁶ We obtained permission to use the CIPS for this study from the author,
87 Dr. Pauline Rose Clance, via personal communication on January 21, 2021.

88

89 *Job Satisfaction*

90 Job satisfaction was assessed using the short-form Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire
91 (MSQ).²⁷ The MSQ is designed to measure an employee's satisfaction with his or her current job
92 and consists of three scales: intrinsic satisfaction, extrinsic satisfaction, and general satisfaction.
93 The short-form version of the questionnaire is 20-items which use a 5-point Likert scale for each
94 item with 1, very dissatisfied; 2, dissatisfied; 3, neither; 4, satisfied; and 5, very satisfied.
95 Response choices for all items were summed, yielding a range from 20-100. The higher the total
96 score, the more satisfied an individual is with their job. Only survey respondents self-identifying
97 as a practicing RDN or NDTR completed the MSQ. Using conditional branching, the MSQ was
98 not shown for respondents identifying as a student, intern, or retired RDN or NDTR.

99

100 *Burnout and Well-Being*

101 To identify distress in a variety of dimensions (burnout, fatigue, low mental/physical quality of
102 life, depression, anxiety/stress) among all participants the 9-item expanded Well-Being Index
103 (eWBI) was used.²⁸ The first seven items are answered using a simple yes/no format. One point
104 is assigned for each "yes." The expanded index includes one question asking participants to
105 assess their satisfaction with work/internship/school-work life balance and the other on the
106 degree of meaning they derived from work/internship/school-work. Satisfaction with work-life
107 balance was assessed using a 5-point Likert scale (strongly agree; agree; neutral; disagree;
108 strongly disagree). Responses of strongly agree or agree were assigned 1 point, responses of
109 neutral were assigned 0 points, and responses of disagree or strongly disagree are given
110 negative 1 point. Individuals who indicated a low level of meaning in work (response option of a

111 1 or 2 on a 7-point Likert scale) had 1 point added to their score while those who answered
112 favorably (response option of a 6 or 7 on a 7-point Likert scale) had 1 point subtracted from
113 their score. Those who indicated neutral level of meaning in work (response option of 3 to 5 on
114 the 7-point Likert scale) received 0 points. Response choices for all items were summed,
115 yielding a total score for the eWBI ranging from -2 to 9. Higher scores on the eWBI are
116 indicative of greater risk for distress (i.e., poor well-being).

117

118 *Social Media Questions*

119 Seven questions were used to assess social media use. Respondents were asked if they used
120 social media, the number of platforms used, most utilized social media platform, daily amount
121 of time spent on all social media platforms, whether they promoted themselves as a dietitian or
122 dietetics student on their social media account(s), if they compared themselves to other
123 dietitians or dietetics students on social media, and if they felt intellectual phoniness or a
124 persistent feeling of being a fraud compared to other dietitians, nutrition professionals, or
125 influencers on social media.

126

127 *Survey Administration*

128 This study utilized a nonrandom, convenience sampling approach. The survey was accessible for
129 two months (May 1 – June 30, 2021). Information about the study was shared through social
130 media groups (e.g., Facebook, Instagram, LinkedIn, etc.) targeting dietetics students, interns,
131 and practicing RDNs/NDTRs and shared via communication channels of Academy Dietetic
132 Practice Groups (DPGs) and Member Interest Groups (MIGs). Directors and administrators of

133 didactic program in dietetics, coordinated program in dietetics, and dietetic internships were
134 asked to pass along information to students and interns within their programs. Lastly,
135 respondents who completed they survey were encouraged to pass along information about the
136 survey to colleagues (snowball recruitment). Eligible respondents who consented to participate,
137 were dietetic students, dietetic interns, practicing RDNs and NDTRs, and retired RDNs and
138 NDTRs.

139

140 *Data Management and Statistical Analysis*

141 Survey data were collected and managed using Qualtrics (Qualtrics, Provo, UT, USA). Data from
142 incomplete surveys were not used (N=145, approximately 1% of all collected surveys).
143 Respondents did not have the option to skip questions; therefore, there was no missing data
144 from completed surveys. Categorical variables were described as n (%) and continuous variables
145 were described as mean \pm standard deviation. Unadjusted logistic regression models were used
146 to assess the relationship between IP and sociodemographic outcomes. Unadjusted linear
147 regression models were used to examine the relationship between IP and continuous outcomes
148 (job satisfaction from the MSQ and well-being from the eWBI). Data were analyzed in RStudio
149 (Version 1.2.5042, R Core Team, 2019).

150

151 **Results**

152

153 There were 1,015 eligible responses to the survey. Survey respondents were majority RDNs
154 (65%). Most respondents reported being between 25-34 years of age. The sample was primarily

155 female, non-Hispanic, White, and heterosexual (**Table 2**). Nine participants (<1%) reported a
156 chronic disability condition (blindness, deafness, or a severe vision or hearing impairment) and
157 26 participants (3%) reported a disability condition that substantially limits one or more basic
158 physical activities such as walking, climbing stairs, reaching, lifting, or carrying. Approximately
159 10% of respondents were a member of at least one Academy DPG and 10% were members of at
160 least one Academy MIG.

161
162 Of practicing RDNs and NDTRs, the majority (45%) have been practicing for less than five years,
163 19% have 5-9 years of practice, 20% have 10-19 years, and 16% have been practicing 20 or
164 greater years. Of retired RDNs and NDTRs, the majority (89%) had practiced 20 or greater years
165 prior to retirement. The majority (54%) of practicing RDNs and NDTRs reported practicing in
166 clinical nutrition with 25%, 19% and 10% in acute care/inpatient care, ambulatory care, and
167 long-term care, respectively. The remaining practicing RDNs and NDTRs reported practice areas
168 in community nutrition (18%), education and research (14%), consultation and business (10%),
169 and food and nutrition management (5%). Within retired RDNs and NDTRs, 56% reported
170 working in clinical nutrition prior to retirement with 28%, 17% and 11% in acute care/inpatient
171 care, ambulatory care, and long-term care, respectively. The remaining retired RDNs and NDTRs
172 reported practice areas in community nutrition, 11% in education and research, and 6% in
173 consultation and business prior to their retirement.

174

175 *Prevalence of IP*

176 Across all nutrition and dietetics professional levels, the average Clance Impostor Phenomenon
177 score (CIPS) was 66.0 ± 16.3 (range 22-99) (**Table 3**). Intense IP experiences were reported by
178 21% of respondents and 43%, 28%, and 8% of respondents reported frequent, moderate, and
179 few IP experiences, respectively. Using the CIPS threshold score of 62 out of 100, 628
180 respondents (62%) were identified as having IP. Prevalence of IP experiences stratified by
181 professional level are shown in **Table 3** and displayed in **Figure 1**.

182

183 *Demographic Predictors of Impostor Phenomenon*

184 There were several demographic predictors that were associated with higher CIPS scores (i.e.,
185 more likely to experience impostor experiences). Age was a significant predictor of CIPS scores
186 ($p < 0.001$). Significant differences were found in individuals 35-64 years of age compared to 18-
187 24 years of age respondents ($p < 0.001$). There was a protective effect of age on CIPS scores, as
188 older respondents had lower CIPS scores. Educational attainment was a significant predictor of
189 CIPS scores; however, there was only a between-group difference of those with a bachelor's
190 degree and those with a Doctorate. Professional level was a significant predictor of CIPS scores.
191 Students (undergraduate or graduate) had 6.5 points lower CIPS scores ($p < 0.001$) compared to
192 practicing RDNs and interns had 4.4 points lower CIPS scores ($p = 0.002$) compared to practicing
193 RDNs. However, retired NDTRs and RDNs had 10 points lower CIPS scores compared to
194 practicing RDNs. There was no significant difference in CIPS scores between practicing RDNs
195 and practicing NDTRs. Membership in an Academy DPG or MIG was found to be associated with
196 lower CIPS scores ($p < 0.001$ and $p < 0.028$, respectively). Compared to members, respondents
197 who were not a member of any DPG had 4 points higher CIPS scores. A similar association was

198 found for respondents who were not part of a MIG. Use of social media was significantly
199 associated with higher CIPS scores ($p < 0.001$). There was also stepwise positive relationship
200 between amount of social media use per day and higher CIPS scores ($p < 0.001$). Participants
201 who reported the highest social media use (> 3 hours per day) had 10 points higher CIPS scores
202 compared to those who used social media for < 30 minutes per day. Gender, ethnicity, race, and
203 sexual orientation were not significant predictors of impostor phenomenon within the study.

204

205 *Well-Being*

206 Average expanded Well-Being Index (eWBI) score was 3.3 ± 2.4 (range -2, 9). Among all
207 participants, there was an inverse relationship observed with IP and eWBI score. For every one-
208 unit increase in IP, risk of poor well-being went up by 0.07 ($p < 0.001$).

209

210 *Job Satisfaction*

211 Within practicing RDNs and NDTRs, average job satisfaction on the short-form Minnesota
212 Satisfaction Questionnaire was 73.3 ± 11.7 (range 33-100). For everyone one-unit increase in IP,
213 job satisfaction was associated with a decrease of 0.16 ($p < 0.001$).

214

215 *Social Media Use*

216 The majority (88%) of survey respondents reported currently using social media (**Table 5**). Of
217 those using social media, more than 61% spend more than one hour on social media per day.
218 Most respondents reported having two to three active social media accounts with Facebook
219 and Instagram as the social media channels respondents were most active on. Less than one-

220 third of respondents use social media as a tool to promote themselves as a dietitian or dietetics
221 student. However, nearly 40% of respondents compare themselves to other dietitians or
222 dietetics students on social media at least half the time, and 44% reported feeling intellectual
223 phoniness or a persistent feeling of being a fraud compared to other dietitians, nutrition
224 professionals, or influencers on social media.

225

226 **Discussion**

227

228 In this online cross-sectional survey of 1,015 nutrition and dietetics professionals, 62% were
229 identified as having IP (CIPS score ≥ 62) and 64% reported experiencing intense or frequent IP.
230 Job satisfaction and overall well-being scores were also found to be inversely associated with IP
231 scores. Older age, educational attainment, professional level, and membership in Academy
232 groups were associated with lower IP scores. Greater Social media use was associated with
233 higher IP scores. Compared to other healthcare professionals with documented IP experiences
234 (Table 1), this study is one of the largest to suggest that nutrition and dietetics professionals
235 present with the highest prevalence of IP across other HCP domains and professional levels.

236

237 In this study, impostor experiences declined with increasing age; however, nutrition and
238 dietetics professionals at all stages of the education pipeline and career ladder reported
239 experiencing impostorism. A protective age effect is not always present within the literature.⁶
240 In this regard, a practitioner's time and familiarity in their current position may be a stronger

241 predictor of fewer impostorism experiences. This is partially corroborated by our findings that
242 greater education, experience in the field, and professional level (i.e., student vs intern vs RDN)
243 have a protective effect on IP symptomology. As dietetic educational programs are the
244 gatekeepers to the profession, it is important to acknowledge that they may simultaneously
245 foster insecurities and limit efforts to recognize and support those struggling with them.
246 Additionally, training educators on the early identification of distress due to IP symptomology
247 and deployment of psychologically appropriate coping strategies, encouragement of more
248 realistic perceptions via modelling, and normalizing performance concerns from students may
249 be warranted.

250

251 Programs and internships can be adapted to incorporate strategies and mentoring networks to
252 allow for students and interns to overcome persistent feelings of self-doubt or overwhelming
253 drive for perfectionism.^{20, 29} For example, students may benefit from openly discussing
254 imposter feelings, context-specific fears or concerns, and perfectionism during orientation
255 and/or peer discussions. For practitioners, professional development programs and mentoring
256 networks can be utilized to mitigate attributing success to external factors or setbacks as
257 evidence of professional inadequacy or lack of competence. Peer-to-peer workshops have been
258 utilized by other health professionals as a means to discuss discipline-specific strategies on how
259 to address IP at the individual, peer, and professional institution levels and could be
260 implemented within the nutrition and dietetics profession.^{30, 31}

261

262 Gender was not found to not be predictive of greater IP experiences. A systematic review of 33
263 articles found mixed results when comparing prevalence of impostor syndrome by gender.⁶ Half
264 of studies found that women reported greater impostor feelings while the other half of studies
265 found that there were no differences in prevalence. Despite the inconclusive evidence of
266 gender effects, both genders experience impostorism. Gender identity is an important
267 consideration when developing strategies to overcome impostor feelings as previous research
268 has found that men and women cope differently with these experiences.^{32, 33} Sexual orientation
269 was also not predictive of greater IP experiences. Interpretation of gender and sexual
270 orientation as non-significant predictors of IP experiences within this sample should be made
271 with caution. Respondents were primarily cis-gender, heterosexual females, and the sample
272 included few respondents who self-identified as part of a gender- or sexual-minority group.

273
274 Race and ethnicity were not predictive of greater IP experiences in this study. However, within
275 the literature racial and ethnic minority groups have been found to have higher rates of IP.^{6, 34-}
276 ³⁶ It should also be noted that the racial and ethnic categorizations used within the study may
277 overlook differences among heterogeneous diverse racial and ethnic groups. Mullangi and Jagsi
278 (2019) have suggested that IP is but a symptom where inequity is the true underlying disease.³⁷
279 The root cause of higher rates within underrepresented groups is likely a result of inequities
280 that exist within the structural and social environments. Acknowledging that the dietetics
281 profession is predominantly able-bodied, cisgender, heterosexual, White, and female,
282 improvements in diversity across the dietetics profession is an important first step, as it
283 provides diverse role models needed to encourage students to enter and remain within the

284 profession.^{38, 39} Considering the important role of the environment in provoking IP feelings
285 among nutrition and dietetics professionals may offer more structural and effective solutions,
286 but requires additional research.⁴

287
288 Membership in Academy DPGs and MIGs were found to be protective against IP experiences.
289 Academy DPGs enable students and practitioners to engage with like-minded colleagues
290 around a specialized area of practice.²² Through active participation within the DPG, it may
291 enable members to seek specific supportive guidance and improve their comfortability and
292 competence with an area of practice. Similarly, Academy MIGs which reflect characteristics of
293 the Academy's membership and the public it serves (i.e., Latinos and Hispanics in Dietetics and
294 Nutrition (LAHIDAN) and Cultures of Gender and Age (COGA)) may play a critical role in
295 providing mentorship and networking opportunities for students and practitioners when local
296 networkers lack diversity.²³

297
298 Respondents who reported greater IP experiences were associated with having poorer well-
299 being and job satisfaction. Nutrition and dietetics professionals who experience IP experiences
300 may not develop their professional potential. Those surveyed had an average well-being score
301 of 3.3 and scores on the eWBI that are ≥ 2 have been associated with greater risk for adverse
302 outcomes including burnout, severe fatigue, suicidal ideation, and poor overall quality of life
303 among employed US adults.²⁸ Job satisfaction ranged in the sample, however, the average was
304 only 73 out of a possible 100. Impaired job performance, job satisfaction, and burnout have all
305 been associated with IP based on findings from a systematic review.⁶ It is unclear whether

306 experiences of impostorism impact practice or the outcomes for clients and patients. It is
307 important to note that the current survey was collected in Spring 2021, a year after the onset of
308 the COVID-19 pandemic. Healthcare providers have felt greater stress and burnout, and
309 increased job dissatisfaction and workload during the pandemic.^{40, 41} The COVID-19 pandemic
310 caused many changes to dietitian job responsibilities and modalities of care.⁴² This may have
311 impacted how survey respondents answered self-reported measures of well-being and job
312 satisfaction than they would have prior to the onset of the pandemic. These findings suggest
313 that greater organizational support be provided to employees by managers and administrators
314 to understand why self-doubt develops, how it is sustained, and how nutrition and dietetics
315 practitioners can develop resilient management strategies to mitigate the negative effects of IP.
316

317 Social media has the potential to be a positive influence on nutrition if reputable sources are
318 successfully used to spread accurate, evidence-based nutrition information, find healthy
319 recipes, and create safe online environments for sharing.⁴³ The ready availability of social
320 networking sites also provide abundant opportunities for social comparisons.⁴⁴ In this study, a
321 majority of those surveyed reported being active on social, in some cases, spending several
322 hours per day on social media sites. During this time, many respondents said that they compare
323 themselves to other RDNs on social media. Further research is needed to elucidate RDN
324 behaviors on social media and how this contributes to their self-esteem and feelings of
325 impostorism.

326

327 *Strengths & Limitations*

328 This study did not aim to test a hypothesis about a population, but rather develop an initial
329 understanding of the prevalence of IP within the nutrition and dietetics profession. The survey
330 relied on self-reported measures of IP, well-being, job satisfaction, and social media usage.
331 Social desirability bias may have impacted responses. In addition, there is the potential for self-
332 selection bias, in that individuals within the nutrition and dietetics profession with a particular
333 interest in IP may have been more likely to respond, and for nonresponse bias. Thus, results
334 should be interpreted accounting for these potential biases.

335
336 Because the survey was widely distributed, it is difficult to determine the response rate of this
337 survey and, thus, generalizability to the greater nutrition and dietetics population. However,
338 compared to prior studies of IP within health-related professionals this study is among the
339 largest to report IP prevalence. Additionally, prior studies in other professions largely survey
340 only students. This study examined individuals across the entire professional continuum which
341 allowed for a greater understanding of prevalence of IP at various career stages. This study
342 provides an initial benchmark for which a more robust and widely circulated survey could be
343 conducted allowing for a more generalizable assessment within the profession.

344

345 **Conclusion**

346 In a non-representative online survey of nutrition and dietetics students and professionals,
347 greater than 60% of respondents reported experiencing IP. Results of this study reinforce the
348 need for recognizing and addressing this issue by raising awareness, normalizing IP discussions,

349 using early prevention methods, and supporting individuals who are younger and/or new to the
350 profession.

351
352 Additional research on preventative strategies and early interventions is needed to understand
353 if it is possible to prevent the initial symptoms of IP across the professional level. Identifying the
354 appropriate tools for promoting self-awareness, self-confidence and critical reflection of work
355 and/or education-based experiences within the nutrition and dietetics profession is required in
356 addition to exploring factors that influence confidence and resilience.

357
358 Impostor phenomenon should be viewed not just as a personal challenge that someone must
359 overcome but a possibly widespread occurrence within nutrition and dietetics practitioners at
360 various stages of their career. An important implication for practice is the need for future
361 research in this area to identify if and how impostorism affects practice and the outcomes for
362 clients/patients.

References

1. Clance PR, Imes SA. The imposter phenomenon in high achieving women: Dynamics and therapeutic intervention. *Psychotherapy: Theory, research & practice*. 1978;15(3):241.
2. Clance PR. *The Impostor Phenomenon: When Success Makes You Feel Like a Fake*. Bantam Books; 1985.
3. Langford J, Clance PR. The imposter phenomenon: Recent research findings regarding dynamics, personality and family patterns and their implications for treatment. *Psychotherapy: theory, research, practice, training*. 1993;30(3):495.
4. Feenstra S, Begeny CT, Ryan MK, Rink FA, Stoker JI, Jordan J. Contextualizing the Impostor "Syndrome". *Front Psychol*. 2020;11:3206.
5. Bernard NS, Dollinger SJ, Ramaniah NV. Applying the big five personality factors to the impostor phenomenon. *J Pers Assess*. 2002;78(2):321-333.
6. Bravata DM, Watts SA, Keefer AL, et al. Prevalence, predictors, and treatment of impostor syndrome: a systematic review. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2020;35(4):1252-1275.
7. Canning EA, LaCosse J, Kroeper KM, Murphy MC. Feeling like an imposter: The effect of perceived classroom competition on the daily psychological experiences of first-generation college students. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*. 2020;11(5):647-657.
8. Vaughn AR, Taasobshirazi G, Johnson ML. Impostor phenomenon and motivation: Women in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*. 2020;45(4):780-795.
9. Cisco J. Exploring the connection between impostor phenomenon and postgraduate students feeling academically-unprepared. *Higher Education Research & Development*. 2020;39(2):200-214.
10. Holliday AM, Gheihman G, Cooper C, et al. High prevalence of imposterism among female Harvard medical and dental students. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2020;35(8):2499-2501.
11. Sullivan JB, Ryba NL. Prevalence of impostor phenomenon and assessment of well-being in pharmacy residents. *American Journal of Health-System Pharmacy*. 2020;77(9):690-696.
12. Prata J, Gietzen J. Impostor Phenomenon in Physician Assistant Education.: 27. *Journal of the American Academy of PAs*. 2007;20(7):32-33.
13. Shreffler J, Weingartner L, Huecker M, et al. Association between characteristics of impostor phenomenon in medical students and step 1 performance. *Teach Learn Med*. 2021;33(1):36-48.
14. Paladugu S, Wasser T, Donato A. Impostor syndrome in hospitalists-a cross-sectional study. *J Community Hosp Intern Med Perspect*. 2021;11(2):212-215.
15. Jacobs MD, Sasser JT. Impostor Phenomenon in Undergraduate Nursing Students: A Pilot Study of Prevalence and Patterns. *J Nurs Educ*. 2021;60(6):329-332.
16. Ares TL. Role transition after clinical nurse specialist education. *Clinical Nurse Specialist*. 2018;32(2):71-80.
17. Neureiter M, Traut-Mattausch E. An inner barrier to career development: preconditions of the impostor phenomenon and consequences for career development. *Front Psychol*. 2016;7:48.
18. Ball L, Eley D, Desbrow B, Lee P, Ferguson M. A cross-sectional exploration of the personality traits of dietitians. *J Hum Nutr Diet*. 2015;28(5):502-509.

19. Eliot KA, Kolasa KM, Cuff PA. Stress and burnout in nutrition and dietetics: strengthening interprofessional ties. *Nutr Today*. 2018;53(2):63-67.
20. Landry MJ, Bailey DA, Ervin A. You Are Not an Impostor: The Registered Dietitian Nutritionist and Impostor Phenomenon. *J Nutr Educ Behav*. 2021;53(7):625-630.
21. Griswold K, Rogers D. Compensation and Benefits Survey 2019. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2020;120(3):448-464.
22. Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics. Dietetic Practice Groups. Accessed November 10, 2021. <https://www.eatrightpro.org/membership/academy-groups/dietetic-practice-groups>
23. Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics. Member Interest Groups. Accessed November 10, 2021. <https://www.eatrightpro.org/membership/academy-groups/member-interest-groups>
24. Mak KK, Kleitman S, Abbott MJ. Impostor phenomenon measurement scales: a systematic review. *Front Psychol*. 2019;10:671.
25. Holmes SW, Kertay L, Adamson LB, Holland C, Clance PR. Measuring the impostor phenomenon: A comparison of Clance's IP Scale and Harvey's IP Scale. *J Pers Assess*. 1993;60(1):48-59.
26. Chrisman SM, Pieper W, Clance PR, Holland C, Glickauf-Hughes C. Validation of the Clance imposter phenomenon scale. *J Pers Assess*. 1995;65(3):456-467.
27. Weiss DJ, Dawis RV, England GW. Manual for the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire. *Minnesota studies in vocational rehabilitation*. 1967;
28. Dyrbye LN, Satele D, Shanafelt T. Ability of a 9-item well-being index to identify distress and stratify quality of life in US workers. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2016;58(8):810-817.
29. Hicks-Roof KK, Beathard K. Development of a sustainable mentorship program: registered dietitian nutritionists mentoring undergraduate dietetics students. *Journal of allied health*. 2018;47(2):49E-51E.
30. Rivera N, Feldman EA, Augustin DA, Caceres W, Gans HA, Blankenburg R. Do I Belong Here? Confronting Imposter Syndrome at an Individual, Peer, and Institutional Level in Health Professionals. *MedEdPORTAL*. 2021;17:11166.
31. Haney TS, Birkholz L, Rutledge C. A workshop for addressing the impact of the imposter syndrome on clinical nurse specialists. *Clinical Nurse Specialist*. 2018;32(4):189-194.
32. Hutchins HM, Rainbolt H. What triggers imposter phenomenon among academic faculty? A critical incident study exploring antecedents, coping, and development opportunities. *Human Resource Development International*. 2017;20(3):194-214.
33. Hutchins HM, Penney LM, Sublett LW. What imposters risk at work: Exploring imposter phenomenon, stress coping, and job outcomes. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*. 2018;29(1):31-48.
34. McClain S, Beasley ST, Jones B, Awosogba O, Jackson S, Cokley K. An examination of the impact of racial and ethnic identity, impostor feelings, and minority status stress on the mental health of Black college students. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*. 2016;44(2):101-117.
35. Graham J, McClain S. A canonical correlational analysis examining the relationship between peer mentorship, belongingness, impostor feelings, and Black collegians' academic and psychosocial outcomes. *American Educational Research Journal*. 2019;56(6):2333-2367.

36. Cokley K, Smith L, Bernard D, et al. Impostor feelings as a moderator and mediator of the relationship between perceived discrimination and mental health among racial/ethnic minority college students. *J Couns Psychol*. 2017;64(2):141.
37. Mullangi S, Jaggi R. Imposter syndrome: treat the cause, not the symptom. *JAMA*. 2019;322(5):403-404.
38. Burt KG, Delgado K, Chen M, Paul R. Strategies and Recommendations to Increase Diversity in Dietetics. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2019;119(5):737-738.
39. Baxter SD, Gordon B, Cochran N. Enhancing Diversity and the Role of Individuals with Disabilities in the Dietetics Profession. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2020;120(5):764-765.
40. Morgantini LA, Naha U, Wang H, et al. Factors contributing to healthcare professional burnout during the COVID-19 pandemic: a rapid turnaround global survey. *PLoS One*. 2020;15(9):e0238217.
41. del Carmen Giménez-Espert M, Prado-Gascó V, Soto-Rubio A. Psychosocial risks, work engagement, and job satisfaction of nurses during COVID-19 pandemic. *Front Public Health*. 2020;8
42. May R, Sehgal AR, Hand RK. Changes in US Dialysis Dietitian Responsibilities and Patient Needs During the COVID-19 Pandemic. *Journal of Renal Nutrition*. 2021;
43. Helm J, Jones RM. Practice paper of the Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics: social media and the dietetics practitioner: opportunities, challenges, and best practices. *J Acad Nutr Diet*. 2016;116(11):1825-1835.
44. Vogel EA, Rose JP, Roberts LR, Eckles K. Social comparison, social media, and self-esteem. *Psychology of popular media culture*. 2014;3(4):206.
45. Barr-Walker J, Bass MB, Werner DA, Kellermeyer L. Measuring impostor phenomenon among health sciences librarians. *J Med Libr Assoc*. 2019;107(3):323.
46. Kimball KA, Roecker CB, Hoyt K. Impostor phenomenon among US chiropractic students. *J Chiropr Educ*. 2020;
47. Levant B, Villwock JA, Manzardo AM. Impostorism in third-year medical students: an item analysis using the clance impostor phenomenon scale. *Perspect Med Educ*. 2020;9(2):83-91.
48. Schmulian D, Redgen W, Fleming J. Impostor syndrome and compassion fatigue among graduate allied health students: A pilot study. *Focus on Health Professional Education: A Multi-disciplinary Journal*. 2020;21(3):1-14.

Table 1. Examples of Prevalence of Impostor Phenomenon within Various Health-Related Professions				
Reference	Type of Professional (e.g., Nurses, Pharmacists, Medical Students)	Sample Size	Survey Used	Prevalence of IP and Cutoff Used
Ares (2018) ¹⁶	Clinical nurse specialists	68	CIPS ^a	20.5% (CIPS Score ≥62)
Barr-Walker et al (2019) ⁴⁵	Health science librarians	703	HIPS ^b	14.5% (HIPS Score ≥42)
Holliday et al (2020) ¹⁰	Medical and dental students	485	CIPS	18% (CIPS Score ≥80)
Jacobs and Sasser (2021) ¹⁵	Nursing students	150	CIPS	48.7% (CIPS Score ≥61)
Kimball et al (2020) ⁴⁶	Chiropractic students	406	CIPS	39% (CIPS Score ≥62)
Levant et al (2020) ⁴⁷	Third year medical students	112	CIPS	51% (CIPS Score ≥62)
Paladugu et al (2021) ¹⁴	Hospitalists	71	CIPS	33.8% (CIPS Score ≥60)
Schmulian et al (2020) ⁴⁸	Graduate allied health students	72	YIS ^c	37.5% (YIS Score ≥5)
Shreffler et al (2021) ¹³	Medical students	233	CIPS	42.1% (CIPS Score ≥61)
Sullivan and Ryba (2020) ¹¹	Pharmacy residents	720	CIPS	57.5% (CIPS Score ≥62)
^a CIPS, Clance Impostor Phenomenon Scale ^b HIPS, Harvey Impostor Phenomenon Scale ^c YIS, Young Impostor Scale				

Table 2. Demographics of Cohort of 1,015 Dietetics Students, Dietetic Interns, and Currently Practicing and Retired Nutrition and Dietetic Technicians Registered and Registered Dietitian Nutritionists Participating in an Online Survey on Impostor Phenomenon

Characteristics	n (%)
Age (years)	
18-24	195 (19.2)
25-34	440 (43.3)
35-44	194 (19.1)
45-54	97 (9.6)
55-64	64 (6.3)
65-74	24 (2.4)
75+	1 (0.1)
Gender	
Male	34 (3.3)
Female	972 (95.8)
Non-binary/Nonconforming/Expansive	5 (0.5)
Prefer not to say	4 (0.4)
Ethnicity	
Hispanic/Latino	87 (8.6)
Non-Hispanic/Latino	928 (91.4)
Race	
American Indian or Alaska Native	8 (0.8)
Asian	48 (4.7)
Black or African American	39 (3.8)
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	2 (0.2)
White or Caucasian	853 (84.0)
Bi/Multiracial	65 (6.4)
Sexual Orientation	
Heterosexual or straight	905 (89.1)
Gay or lesbian	17 (1.7)
Bisexual	68 (6.7)
Different identity	12 (1.2)
Prefer not to say	13 (1.3)
Educational Attainment	
Some College	32 (3.2)
Associates	27 (2.7)
Bachelors	453 (44.6)
Masters	442 (43.5)
Doctorate	61 (6.0)
Professional Level	
Student (Undergraduate or Graduate)	170 (16.7)
Dietetic Intern	151 (14.9)

Practicing NDTR ^a	18 (1.8)
Practicing RDN ^b	658 (64.8)
Retired NDTR or RDN	18 (1.8)
Chronic Disability Condition ^c	9 (0.9)
Disability Substantially Limiting Basic Physical Activities ^d	26 (2.6)
Member of an Academy ^e Dietetic Practice Group	105 (10.3)
Member of an Academy ^e Member Interest Group	105 (10.3)
^a NDTR, Nutrition and Dietetics Technician Registered ^b RDN, Registered Dietitian Nutritionist ^c Blindness, deafness, or a severe vision or hearing impairment ^d Disability condition that substantially limits one or more basic physical activities such as walking, climbing stairs, reaching, lifting, or carrying. ^e Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics	

Impostor Phenomenon Experiences	Student (n=170)	Dietetic Intern (n=151)	NDTR ^a (n=18)	RDN ^b (n=658)	Retired NDTR/RDN (n=18)	Total (n=1,015)
Few	7 (4.1%)	7 (4.6%)	0 (0.0%)	58 (8.8%)	6 (33.3%)	78 (7.7%)
Moderate	31 (18.2%)	36 (23.8%)	4 (22.2%)	206 (31.3%)	5 (27.8%)	282 (27.8%)
Frequent	80 (47.1%)	69 (45.7%)	11 (61.1%)	276 (41.9%)	4 (22.2%)	440 (43.3%)
Intense	52 (30.6%)	39 (25.8%)	3 (16.7%)	118 (17.9%)	3 (16.7%)	215 (21.2%)

^a NDTR, Nutrition and Dietetics Technician Registered
^b RDN, Registered Dietitian Nutritionist

Table 4. Demographic Predictors of Impostor Phenomenon in the Nutrition and Dietetics Profession (n=1,015)			
	Beta	Std. Error	p-value
Age (years)			<0.001
18-24	Referent	----	---
25-34	-1.64	1.32	0.214
35-44	-3.16	1.56	0.043
45-54	-11.19	1.91	<0.001
55-64	-18.59	2.21	<0.001
65-74	-19.56	3.33	<0.001
75+	-27.06	15.41	0.079
Gender			0.780
Female	Referent	----	---
Male	-2.91	2.84	0.307
Non-binary/Nonconforming/Expansive	-1.51	7.31	0.836
Prefer not to say	0.39	8.16	0.962
Ethnicity			0.051
Non-Hispanic/Latino	Referent	----	---
Hispanic/Latino	3.56	1.83	0.051
Race			0.145
White or Caucasian	Referent	----	---
American Indian or Alaska Native	-9.76	5.77	0.091
Asian	3.18	2.41	0.186
Black or African American	-3.47	2.66	0.193
Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	-15.13	11.50	0.189
Bi/Multiracial	-0.52	2.09	0.805
Sexual Orientation			0.073
Heterosexual or straight	Referent	----	---
Gay or lesbian	6.66	4.10	0.104
Bisexual	3.98	2.04	0.052
Different identity	5.26	4.71	0.265
Prefer not to say	-4.73	4.54	0.297
Educational Attainment			<0.001
Bachelors	Referent	----	---
Some College	5.55	2.93	0.059
Associates	1.54	3.17	0.628
Masters	-1.98	1.07	0.065
Doctorate	-12.23	2.18	<0.001
Professional Level			<0.001
Practicing RDN ^a	Referent	----	---
Student (Undergraduate or Graduate)	6.53	1.38	<0.001
Dietetic Intern	4.47	1.45	0.002

Practicing NDTR ^b	2.84	3.82	0.457
Retired NDTR or RDN	-9.82	3.83	0.010
Academy ^c Dietetic Practice Group Membership			<0.001
Yes	Referent	----	---
No	3.99	1.01	<0.001
Academy ^c Member Interest Group Membership			0.028
Yes	Referent	----	---
No	3.68	1.68	0.028
Social Media Use			<0.001
Yes	Referent	----	---
No	-5.10	1.57	<0.001
Social Media Use Per Day (n=894) ^d			<0.001
<30 minutes	Referent	----	---
30-60 minutes	5.27	1.90	0.006
1-3 hours	6.92	1.80	<0.001
>3 hours	10.19	2.17	<0.001
<p>^a RDN, Registered Dietitian Nutritionist ^b NDTR, Nutrition and Dietetics Technician Registered ^c Academy, Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics ^d Only participants who reported using social media were asked this item. Therefore, there was a smaller sample size for this item. Bolded p-values represent statistical significance of p<0.05.</p>			

Table 5. Social Media Use Among Dietetics Students, Dietetic Interns, and Currently Practicing and Retired Nutrition and Dietetic Technicians Registered and Registered Dietitian Nutritionists^a	
	% of sample
Do you currently use or are you active on social media platform(s)? (n=1,015)	
Yes	88.1%
No	11.9%
How many social media sites do you have accounts with?	
1	3.8%
2-3	45.6%
4-5	33.8%
6 or more	16.8%
How much time do you collectively spend on social media per day?	
<30 minutes	10.3%
30-60 minutes	28.6%
1-3 hours	47.7%
>3 hours	13.4%
Which social media channel are you most active on	
Facebook	37.6%
Twitter	2.6%
Instagram	45.4%
LinkedIn	2.5%
Pinterest	0.7%
YouTube	5.4%
TikTok	5.9%
Do you use social media to promote yourself as a dietitian or dietetics student?	
Yes	30.9%
No	69.1%
Do you compare yourself to other dietitians or students on social media?	
Always	15.8%
Most of the time	12.1%
About half the time	11.2%
Sometimes	41.8%
Never	19.1%
Do you feel intellectual phoniness or a persistent feeling of being a fraud compared to other dietitians, nutrition professionals, or influencers on social media?	
Always	13.7%
Most of the time	16.5%
About half the time	14.2%
Sometimes	29.0%
Never	26.7%
^a n=894 unless otherwise denoted	

Figure 1. Impostor Phenomenon by Professional Level (n=1,015). Data on the impostor phenomenon were assessed with the Clance Impostor Phenomenon Scale. Abbreviations: NDTR, Nutrition and Dietetics Technician Registered; RDN, Registered Dietitian Nutritionist




Figure 1. Impostor Phenomenon by Professional Level (n=1,015). Data on the impostor phenomenon were assessed with the Clance Impostor Phenomenon Scale. Abbreviations: NDTR, Nutrition and Dietetics Technician Registered; RDN, Registered Dietitian Nutritionist