

Alejandro Latorre

Criticisms of the Field of Imposter Phenomenon Research

Abstract:

In this literature review of texts on Impostor Phenomenon, which I will be referring to as IP for the duration of this review, I intend to bring to light three issues with the current literature on IP brought up by Daniel Gullifor (2024). The first is the wealth of inaccuracies and inconsistencies caused by Clance and Imes' (1978) description of IP as a trait rather than an experience and the unwillingness of the Psychology community to fully adjust to the new corrected classification as a trait. Even though Clance herself called IP an experience in her original study, the way she described it seemed more like a trait. The second criticism is the ambiguous reasoning researchers use when explaining the results of their IP studies, the assumptions regarding the effects of IP on work performance, mental state, and many other correlations. The last is that a sizable portion of IP research is reliant on cross-sectional survey designs which comes with some disadvantages that have hindered IP research. Specifically, I will discuss the shortcomings of the Clance Impostor Phenomenon scale, which has been the primary method for quantifying IP tendencies since it was created in 1978.