- 2 Short Title: Prevalence of IP in PGME
- 3 Authors: Jessica Cheung MD, Matthew Sibbald MD PhD, Brandon Ruan BHSc, Jonathan
- 4 Sherbino, MD Med
- Jessica Cheung, Department of Emergency Medicine, Mississauga Hospital, Trillium Health 6
- 7 **Partners**

5

12

- 8 Matthew Sibbald, Scientist, McMaster Education Research, Innovation and Theory (MERIT)
- 9 program, Faculty of Health Sciences, McMaster University
- 10 Brandon Ruan, Research Assistant, MERIT, Faculty of Health Sciences, McMaster University
- 11 Jonathan Sherbino, Assistant Dean, MERIT, Faculty of Health Sciences, McMaster University
- 13 Corresponding Author:
- 14 Dr. Jonathan Sherbino
- 15 C/O MERIT Rm 5003/A
- 16 100 Main Street West
- 17 Hamilton, Ontario
- 18 L8P 1H6
- 19 (Ph): (905) 525-9140 x 20061
- 20 Email: sherbino@mcmaster.ca
- 22 Tables: 2

21

23 Supplementary Appendix: 1

25

26

27

28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

40

41

42

43

44

45

46

Phenomenon Imposter phenomenon (IP) is the feeling of inadequacy despite demonstrating external standards of success. Few studies have broadly examined the prevalence of IP in resident-physicians. This study assessed the prevalence of self-reported IP in resident-physicians, exploring the correlation of demographic risk factors and feelings of IP. **Approach** All residents, across all years of training and programs at McMaster University during the 2019-2020 academic year were recruited to complete a self-report survey. Survey items gathered demographic information and measured self-reported feelings of IP and Clance Imposter Phenomenon Scale (CIPS) scores. **Findings** 519 out of 977 (53.1%) individuals completed the survey. Measured by the CIPS, clinically significant IP occurred in 59.2% (n=307) of participants. After completing the CIPS, participants self-reported feelings of low (25.0%, n=130), medium (41.9%, n=218), high (19.0%, n=99), and intense (3.7%, n= 19) IP. 64.9% (n=337) of respondents felt they hid feelings of IP during residency. 62.4% (n=324) of respondents were unaware of resources available to them as they struggled with feelings of IP. Only female gender was associated with IP (p < 0.001). **Insights** IP is highly prevalent across a broad range of residents, independent of clinical discipline and most demographics. Educators and administrators should attend to IP by normalizing the discussion of IP and ensuring adequate access to resources for support. **Keywords** Imposter phenomenon, graduate medical education, professional identity

Phenomenon

47

48

49

50

51

52

53

54

55

56

57

58

59

60

61

62

63

64

65

66

67

68

69

Few studies have broadly examined the prevalence of imposter phenomenon (IP) in resident-physicians. IP is the feeling of inadequacy despite demonstrating external standards of success. Individuals with feelings of IP often fear exposure of being a fraud and attribute their success to external causes such as charm, luck and hard work, rather than internal causes such as demonstrated intelligence, competence, or ability.² Once a task is assigned, individuals with IP either over-prepare or procrastinate. When the task is accomplished, however, any positive feedback is discounted by an individual with IP. Those who achieved the task through overpreparation attribute success to external causes, such as hard work, rather than internal sources, such as ability. Equally, achievement associated with procrastination is attributed to external causes, such as luck.² Subsequently, both approaches lead to worsening feelings of fraudulence, self-doubt, and increased IP. Imposter phenomenon has been studied in various groups, including women,^{2,3} undergraduate students, graduate students, nursing students, and business professionals. 1,4 Studies have shown that individuals experiencing IP are at risk of also experiencing psychological distress from self-oriented perfectionism, 5-7 anxiety, depression, and low selfconfidence.8-9 A review of the literature reveals five studies that examined features of IP in attending physicians. 10-14 Only four small studies, ranging from 48 to 185 participants, have assessed IP in postgraduate medical education: one study of family medicine residents, 15 two studies of internal medicine residents, ¹⁶⁻¹⁷ and one study of general surgery residents. ¹⁴ There have been no studies to date that assess IP in postgraduate medical education across all specialties, in all years of training.

Recognizing the impact of IP on physician mental health and a lack of research on the prevalence of IP among resident-physicians, the objective of this study was to assess the prevalence of IP in all postgraduate medical education physician-residents at a large Canadian university, and to identify demographic risk factors associated with feelings of IP.

Approach

An online survey was administered to all residents enrolled in a McMaster University residency training program between March 3 and 10, 2020. Thus, the recruitment period began on March 3, 2020 and concluded on March 10, 2020. Participation in this between-subjects study was voluntary and written informed consent was obtained through email. There were no minors recruited in this study.

The survey consisted of questions on participant demographics, self-perceived IP, available resources to combat IP, and self-rating on the Clance Imposter Phenomenon Scale (CIPS). CIPS is a research standard, peer reviewed instrument to measure IP. 18-19 CIPS consists of 20 questions on a 5-point Likert scale from "not at all true" to "very true." The questions self-assess agreement with statements regarding task completion and performance evaluation. No modifications were made to the instrument. Total scores range from 20 to 100. A total score of 40 or less indicates few IP experiences, a score between 41 and 60 indicating moderate IP experiences, a score of 61 to 80 indicating frequent IP experiences, and a score of 81 to 100 indicating intense IP experiences. Clance established a score of 62 or greater to indicate clinically significant IP, meeting criteria to be diagnosed as an imposter. This cut point in the original research on IP ensures no false negatives and minimal false positive determinations of

93

94

95

96

97

98

99

100

101

102

103

104

105

106

107

108

109

110

111

112

113

IP. It is the current standard for using CIPS. Self-perceived IP was measured to determine if a simpler instrument could replace CIPS. Two faculty members and two research assistants piloted tested the survey for clarity and usability. They subsequently participated in cognitive interviews conducted by the senior investigator, who has experience in survey design, to identify necessary modifications to the final version of the survey instrument. See the supplementary appendix (S1-S2) for the survey instrument. A link to the survey was emailed once a week for a total of four weeks. All survey responses were anonymized; data was unavailable to program directors and administrators. Survey data was reported using descriptive statistics. Univariate analysis of variance was performed to compare CIPS scores across categorical variables. Accepting a 5% probability of type I error, the threshold for statistical significance was set at a p<0.006 based on a Bonferonni correction for multiple comparisons.²⁰ Self-report of IP and CIPS scores were compared using a weighted kappa given the ordinal nature of both variables. Statistics were performed using SPSS Software version 26 (IBM, Redmond). Free text responses were aggregated into conceptual categories.²¹ The study was approved by the Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board (protocol number: 4597). **Findings** Of the 977 residents invited to participate in the study, 519 completed the survey (53.1%). Table 1 reports participant demographics. *Table 1: Participant Demographics* Frequency (%)

Gender	
Male	208 (40.1%)
Female	302 (58.2%)
Non-Binary	2 (0.4%)
Prefer not to answer	7 (1.3%)
Age	
20-25	62 (11.9%)
26-30	305 (58.8%)
31-35	119 (22.9%)
20-25	62 (11.9%)
36-40	27 (5.2%)
41-45	6 (1.2%)
PGY Year	
PGY 1	153 (29.5%)
PGY 2	142 (27.4%)
PGY 3	71 (13.7%)
PGY 4	77 (14.8%)
PGY 5	60 (11.6%)
PGY 6	14 (2.7%)
PGY 7 and/or above	2 (0.4%)
Specialty	
Family Medicine	148 (28.5%)
Internal Medicine	84 (16.2%)
Pediatrics	38 (7.3%)
Psychiatry	33 (6.4%)

Obstetrics and Gynecology	27 (5.2%)
Emergency Medicine	27 (5.2%)
*Other Surgical Programs (Cardiac Surgery, Neurosurgery, Otolaryngology, Opthalmology, Plastic Surgery, Urology, Vascular Surgery)	25 (4.8%)
General Surgery	23 (4.4%)
*Other (Dermatology, Medical Microbiology, Public Health, Radiation Oncology)	23 (4.4%)
Anesthesiology	20 (3.9%)
Orthopedic Surgery	17 (3.3%)
Diagnostic Radiology	17 (3.3%)
Neurology	13 (2.5%)
Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation	13 (2.5%)
*Anatomic and General Pathology	11 (2.1%)
Residency Status	
	438 (84.4%)
Canadian medical school graduate	730 (07.770)
Non-Canadian medical school graduate Non-Canadian medical school graduate	64 (12.3%)
	` ` `
Non-Canadian medical school graduate	` ` `
Non-Canadian medical school graduate Marital Status	64 (12.3%)
Non-Canadian medical school graduate Marital Status Single	64 (12.3%) 259 (49.9%)
Non-Canadian medical school graduate Marital Status Single Married/Common Law	64 (12.3%) 259 (49.9%)
Non-Canadian medical school graduate Marital Status Single Married/Common Law Status of Dependant	64 (12.3%) 259 (49.9%) 239 (46.1%)
Non-Canadian medical school graduate Marital Status Single Married/Common Law Status of Dependant Yes	64 (12.3%) 259 (49.9%) 239 (46.1%) 73 (14.1%)
Non-Canadian medical school graduate Marital Status Single Married/Common Law Status of Dependant Yes No	64 (12.3%) 259 (49.9%) 239 (46.1%) 73 (14.1%)

Monthly	72 (13.9%)
Every 2 weeks	43 (8.3%)
Less often than once per month	28 (5.4%)
Not sure/prefer not to report	9 (1.7%)
Academic Remediation	
Yes	23 (4.4%)
No	489 (94.2%)

^{*}Aggregated to protect anonymity of respondents from small residency programs.

Clinically significant IP, as measured by a CIPS score greater than 61, occurred in 59.2% (n=307) of participants. CIPS scores of high (score of 60-79) or intense (80-100) IP occurred in 46.8% (n=243) and 14.6% (n=76) participants, respectively. Participants self-report of whether they have IP and their degree of IP demonstrated low (25.0%, n=130), medium (41.9%, n=218), high (19.0%, n=99), and intense (3.7%, n= 19) IP. 10.4% of participants (n = 54) reported no feelings of IP. Self-reported feelings of IP correlated moderately with CIPS (weighted kappa = 0.58).

Female gender was the only demographic factor that contributed to variance in CIPS scores. Participants identifying as female (n=302) had a mean CIPS score of 66, compared to mean CIPS score of 61 in respondents who identified as male (n=208) and a mean CIPS score of 59 in respondents who identified as nonbinary/preferred not to report (n=9) (p <0.001). Older age, marital status, being a parent, postgraduate year training level, clinical specialty, international medical graduate status, frequency of assessments in residency, and previous academic remediation did not predict IP. (See the supplementary appendix, S3, for all comparisons.)

Approximately two-thirds (64.9%, n=337) of respondents hid their feelings of inadequacy during residency. Similarly, nearly two-thirds (62.4%, n=324) of respondents were previously unaware of resources to help them address IP. Table 2 includes resources that participants identified as potentially helpful for addressing IP.

Table 2: List of support networks that residents consult for feelings of imposter phenomenon

Category	Frequency
University-approved Counsellor/Social worker/Wellness Team	126
Private Counsellor/Social Worker/Psychologist/Psychiatrist	119
Program Director or Program Admin	117
University Administration	66
Friends & Family	15
Resident Network	10
Mindfulness Resources	6
Colleagues	5

Insights

This study suggests a high prevalence of imposter phenomenon in residents, across a diversity of clinical disciplines. A majority of participants (59.2%) met the standard of clinically significant IP as measured by the CIPS.

This study demonstrates a greater pervasiveness of IP in residents across a diversity of disciplines as compared to smaller, single-specialty studies (33% in family medicine residents¹⁵ and approximately 40% in internal medicine residents.¹⁶) The majority of respondents hid their feelings of inadequacy. Fear of discrimination, remediation, impact on academic and employment opportunities may play a role in preventing a resident from identifying their IP and

seeking formal support from educators and program administrators. Most respondents were unaware of available resources.

Educators and administrators should attend to IP by normalizing the discussion of IP and ensuring adequate access to resources for support. Several studies have looked at successful implementation of low-cost resiliency curricula, which may help address root causes of IP.²²⁻²³ Resiliency curricula have incorporated strategies including meditation, behavioral skills, setting realistic goals, managing expectations, and gratitude exercises in both didactic and group-based delivery.²⁴⁻²⁶ A systematic review identified resiliency workshops and cognitive behavioral training as the strongest interventions for developing healthcare worker resilience.²⁷ The impact of all of these interventions at ameliorating physician IP is modest. The study by Gottlieb et al., found that social supports, validation of success, and personal as well as shared reflections were protective against IP.⁴ Education curricula that include peer-to-peer support, endorse sharing of failures and celebrating success may ameliorate the impact of IP on individuals.

An alternative interpretation of the high prevalence of IP is that signals a fundamental dysfunction of residency education. The rate of burnout in residents has remained unchanged over the past two decades despite substantive world-wide increases in policies and educational interventions targeting resident needs.²⁸ Like burnout, IP may be correlated to the system of education, where interventions targeting the resident may be inefficient or ineffective.²⁹ Future research should address system changes to ameliorate IP, rather than focusing exclusively on the learner.

This study suggests a difference in CIPS stratified by gender. While females had a mean CIP score consistent with clinically significant IP, males had a mean CIP score just below the cutoff for clinically significant IP. A systematic review by Bravata et al. examined IP and

171

172

173

174

175

176

177

178

179

180

181

182

183

184

185

186

187

188

189

190

191

192

gender.³ Sixteen studies found IP to be higher in females than in males, while 17 studies found no difference. A review by Gottlieb et al.⁴, focused on physicians, found 5 studies where IP was more prevalent in women in both undergraduate^{5,30,31} and postgraduate training, ^{15,16} while a similar number of studies found no gender differences. 14,17, 32-34 Within medicine, there remains significant gender inequality in leadership roles, remuneration, and career trajectories.³⁵ Tackling these inequities represents a potential systematic approach to reducing IP which has been highlighted in recent reviews. Suggested interventions include: tackling persistent institutional stereotypes, educational interventions to address microaggressions, increasing diversity via recruitment and enacting systematic process for equitable treatment of all groups. 36,37 While contributing elements are multifactorial and systems are complex, future research about IP should assess the association of IP, gender, and other inequities in medicine. Participants were asked "do you think you have features of imposter phenomenon?" and "... how strong are your feelings...?" The prevalence of self-perceived IP was similar to CIPS scores. However, self-determination of IP is insufficiently correlated to the 20-question CIPS to justify adoption of a simpler instrument. As a Canadian, single-center study, the generalizability of these findings to other centers or jurisdictions is limited. However, it is the largest and only multi-specialty resident study to date, improving on previous much smaller and discipline-specific studies. The study is also limited by a design that relies on self-reported data. However, this is a feature notable in all the IP literature. Women and non-surgical specialties are over-represented among respondents. Nonresponders may reflect different perceptions about IP. In theory, non-responders could counter the strong signal from participants, mitigating the study conclusions. While self-report data is readily influenced by social desirability bias, we believe the strong endorsement for a negative

attribute suggests this may not be a substantive limitation of this study.

Conclusions

In a large, single-centre study, there is a high prevalence of imposter phenomenon in residents, independent of clinical discipline and most demographic factors. Educators and administrators should normalize the discussion of IP and provide resources so that residents and residency programs can address feelings of inadequacy.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank Drs. Mark Crowther (Chair, Department of Medicine, McMaster University) and Parveen Wasi (Associate Dean, Postgraduate Medical Education, McMaster University) for support in completing this study. The authors also thank Heba Khan (MERIT research assistant) for help in manuscript preparation.

Disclosures

The authors report no conflicts of interest.

Ethical Approval

This study was approved by the Hamilton Integrated Research Ethics Board (protocol number: 4597).

References

212

- 213 1. Bravata DM, Watts SA, Keefer AL et al. Prevalence, predictors, and treatment of impostor
- 214 syndrome: a systematic review. *J. Gen. Intern. Med.* 2020;35(4):1252-1275.
- 2. Clance PR, Imes SA. The imposter phenomenon in high achieving women: Dynamics and
- therapeutic interventions. *Psychol. Psychother.* 1978; 15(3):241-247.
- 3. Clance PR, Dingman D, Reviere SL, Stober DR. Impostor phenomenon in an
- interpersonal/social context: Origins and treatment. WOTHDJ. 1995;16(4):79-96.
- 4. Gottlieb M, Chung A, Battaglioli N, Sebok-Syer SS, Kalantari A. Impostor syndrome among
- physicians and physicians in training: A scoping review. *Med Educ*. 2020; 54(2):116-124.
- 5. Henning K, Ey S, Shaw D. Perfectionism, the impostor phenomenon and psychological
- adjustment in medical, dental, nursing and pharmacy students. *Med Educ*. 1998;32(5):456-464.
- 223 6. Dudău DP. The relation between perfectionism and impostor phenomenon. *Procedia Soc.*
- 224 2014;127:129-133
- 7 Pannhausen S, Klug K, Rohrmann S. Never good enough: The relation between the impostor
- phenomenon and multidimensional perfectionism. Curr Psychol. 2020:1-14
- 8. Bernard NS, Dollinger SJ, Ramaniah NV. Applying the big five personality factors to the
- 228 impostor phenomenon. *J. Pers. Assess*. 2002;78(2):321-333
- 9 Cusack CE, Hughes JL, Nuhu N. Connecting gender and mental health to imposter
- 230 phenomenon feelings. *Psi Chi J. Psychol. Res.* 2013; 18(2): 74-81
- 231 10. LaDonna KA, Ginsburg S, Watling C. Rising to the level of your incompetence: Exploring
- 232 what physicians' self-assessment of their performance reveals about the impact of the imposter
- 233 syndrome in medicine. *Acad Med*.2018; 93(5):763-768.
- 11. Kamarzarrin H, Khaledian M, Shooshtari M, Yousefi E, Ahrami R. A study of the

- relationship between self-esteem and the imposter phenomenon in the physicians of Rasht city.
- 236 Eur J Exp Biol. 2013;3(2):363-366.
- 237 12. Hutchins HM, Rainbolt H. What triggers imposter phenomenon among academic faculty? A
- 238 critical incident study exploring antecedents, coping, and development opportunities. Hum
- 239 Resource Dev Int. 2017;20(3):194-214.
- 240 13. Hutchins HM, Penney LM, Sublett LW. What imposters risk at work: exploring imposter
- phenomenon, stress coping, and job outcomes. Hum Res Dev Q. 2018;29(1):31-48.
- 242 14. Leach PK, Nygaard RM, Chipman JG, Brunsvold ME, Marek AP. Impostor phenomenon
- and burnout in general surgeons and general surgery residents. J Surg Educ. 2019;76(1):99-106.
- 244 15. Oriel, K. Family medicine residents and the impostor phenomenon. Fam Med. 2004,
- 245 36(4):248-252.
- 246 16. Legassie J, Zibrowski EM, Goldszmidt MA. Measuring resident well-being: impostorism and
- burnout syndrome in residency. J Gen Intern Med. 2008; 23(7):1090-1094.
- 248 17. Mascarenhas VR, D'Souza D, Bicholkar A. Prevalence of impostor phenomenon and its
- association with self-esteem among medical interns in Goa, India. Int J Community Med Public
- 250 *Health*. 2019;6(1):355-359.
- 251 18. Chrisman SM, Pieper WA, Clance PR, Holland CL, Glicakuf-Hughes C. Validation of the
- 252 Clance imposter phenomenon scale. J. Pers. Assess. 1995;65(3):456-467.
- 253 19. Holmes SW, Kertay L, Adamson LB, Holland CL, Clance PR. Measuring the impostor
- phenomenon: A comparison of Clance's IP Scale and Harvey's IP Scale. J. Pers. Assess. 1993;
- 255 60(1): 48-59.
- 256 20. Hochberg Y, Tamhane AC. Multiple comparison procedures. JWS. 1987;52(1):21-37
- 257 21. Jackson KM, Trochim WM. Concept mapping as an alternative approach for the analysis of

- open-ended survey responses. Organ. Res. Methods. 2002;5(4):307-336
- 259 22. Seo C, Corrado M. Fournier K, Bailey T, Haykal KA. Addressing the physician burnout
- 260 epidemic with resilience curricula in medical education: a systematic review. BMC Med.
- 261 Educ. 2021;21(1):1-25.
- 262 23. Fox S, Lydon S, Byrne D, Madden C, Connolly F, O'Connor P. A systematic review of
- interventions to foster physician resilience. *Postgrad. Med. J.* 2018;94(1109):162-170.
- 24. Chaukos D, Chad-Friedman E, Mehta DH, et al. Risk and resilience factors associated with
- 265 resident burnout. *Acad Psychiatry*. 2017;41(2)189-194
- 266 25. Aggarwal R, Deutsch JK, Medina Jm Kothari N. Resident wellness: an intervention to
- decrease burnout and increase resiliency and happiness. *MedEdPORTAL*: 2017;13:10651
- 268 26. Bird AN, Martinchek M, Pincavage AT. A curriculum to enhance resilience in internal
- 269 medicine interns. J. Grad. Med. Educ. 2017;9(5):600-604.
- 27. Rogers D. Which educational interventions improve healthcare professionals' resilience?
- 271 *Med Teach.* 2016;38(12):1236-1241.
- 272 28. Naji L, Singh B, Shah A, et al. Global prevalence of burnout among postgraduate medical
- trainees: a systematic review and meta-regression. CMAJ. 2021 Jan 1;9(1):E189-200
- 29. Vercio C, Loo LK, Green M, et al. Shifting Focus from Burnout and Wellness toward
- 275 Individual and Organizational Resilience. *Teach Learn Med* 2021; 33(5):568-576.
- 276 30. Villwock JA, Sobin LB, Koester LA, Harris TM. Imposter syndrome and burnout among
- American medical students: a pilot stud. Int. J. Med. Educ. 2016;7:364-369
- 278 31. Qureshi MA, Taj J, Latif MZ, Rafique S, Ahmed R, Chaudhry MA. Imposter syndrome
- among Pakistani medical students. Ann King Edw Med Univ. 2017;23(2):107-111.
- 280 32. Swope K, Thompson BM, Haidet P. Imposter phenomenon across the span of medical

- 281 training. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2017;32(Suppl 2):S223.
- 282 33. Egwuruwu JN, Ugwuezumba PC, Ohamaeme MC, et al. Relationship between self-esteem
- and impostor syndrome among undergraduate medical students in a Nigerian University. *Int. J*
- 284 Brain Cogn Sci. 2018; 7(1):9-16.
- 285 34. Ikbaal MY. Prevalence of impostor phenomenon among medical students in a Malaysian
- private medical school. *Int. J. Med Stud*.2018;6(2):66-70.
- 287 35. Canadian Medical Association, The Federation of Medical Women of Canada. *Addressing*
- 288 gender equity and diversity in Canada's medical profession: a review. Ottawa, ON: Canadian
- Medical Association; 2019. Available from: www.cma.ca/sites/default/files/pdf/Ethics/report-
- 290 <u>2018-equity-diversity-medicine-e.pdf</u> Accessed May 9, 2022.
- 36. Nadal KL, King R, Sissoko DG, Floyd N, Hines D. The legacies of systemic and internalized
- oppression: Experiences of microaggressions, imposter phenomenon, and stereotype threat on
- 293 historically marginalized groups. *New Ideas in Psych.* 2021;1(63):100895.
- 37. Feenstra S, Begeny CT, Ryan MK, Rink FA, Stoker JI, Jordan J. Contextualizing the
- 295 impostor "syndrome". Frontiers in psych. 2020; 13(11):3206.