

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

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

Affiliations:

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

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

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

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

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: MJL has received speaker honoraria from the California Academy of Nutrition and Dietetics and PepsiCo Health & Nutrition Sciences for talks related to impostor phenomenon. Other authors report no potential conflicts of interest.

Abstract

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

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

Design: An online cross-sectional survey was conducted.

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

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

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

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

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

Keywords: impostor phenomenon, impostor syndrome, career advancement, job performance, nutrition and dietetics, mentoring

Introduction

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

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

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

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

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

Materials and Methods

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

Survey Development and Design

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

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

Social Media Questions

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

Survey Administration

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

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

Data Management and Statistical Analysis

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

Results

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

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

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

Prevalence of IP

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

Demographic Predictors of Impostor Phenomenon

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

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

Well-Being

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

Job Satisfaction

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

Social Media Use

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

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

Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Strengths & Limitations

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

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

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

Table 3. Prevalence of Impostor Phenomenon Experiences in Nutrition and Dietetics by Professional Level

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
^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.			

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