

Media Exposure and Perfectionism: The Mediating Role of Fear of Missing Out


Intan. Sari¹  Elena. Radu^{2*} 

¹ Department of Child and Family Studies, Universitas Padjadjaran, Bandung, Indonesia



² Department of Counseling and Human Development, West University of Timișoara, Timișoara, Romania

* Corresponding author email address: elena.radu@e-uvr.ro

Editor

Trevor Archer 
Professor Department of
Psychology University of
Gothenburg, Sweden
trevorcsarcher49@gmail.com

Reviewers

Reviewer 1: Sara Nejatifar 
Department of Psychology and Education of People with Special Needs, Faculty of
Educational Sciences and Psychology, University of Isfahan, Isfahan, Iran.
Email: s.nejatifar@edu.ui.ac.ir
Reviewer 2: Kamdin. Parsakia 
Department of Psychology and Counseling, KMAN Research Institute, Richmond
Hill, Ontario, Canada. Email: kamdinarsakia@kmanresce.ca

1. Round 1

1.1. Reviewer 1

Reviewer:

In the first paragraph of the Introduction, the sentence “Perfectionism is broadly defined as the tendency to set excessively high standards for oneself, coupled with overly critical self-evaluations” could benefit from a citation to a foundational source on perfectionism, such as Frost et al. (1990), to ground the definition in empirical literature.

In the last paragraph of the Introduction, the authors state: “...strategic posting, and self-censorship to align with social expectations.” This claim is critical to understanding behavioral adaptation on social media and should be supported by an empirical citation.

The Methods and Materials section, under “Study Design and Participants,” mentions the use of the Morgan and Krejcie (1970) table, but no citation is provided in the reference list. Please include a complete reference.

In the Social Media Exposure subsection, the sentence “The SMUIS consists of 10 items designed to evaluate the degree to which social media is integrated into an individual's social routines and emotional experiences” would benefit from more detail about the two subscales, such as sample items or scoring direction.

The Data Analysis section notes: “Scatterplots and residual plots indicated linear and homoscedastic relationships between variables.” While this suggests due diligence, visual evidence or a brief description of these plots would substantiate the claim.

In Table 3, the model fit indices are all within acceptable ranges, but the text following the table does not comment on the implication of “excellent fit.” Consider explicitly stating that these indices collectively confirm the model's suitability and adequacy.

In the Discussion section, the sentence “These findings align with the theoretical framework that positions FoMO as a psychological bridge...” is theoretically rich but vague. Consider elaborating on which theoretical framework is being referenced—social comparison theory, self-determination theory, etc.

In the Discussion paragraph beginning with “The mediating effect of FoMO is a crucial contribution...”, the sentence “which in turn motivates perfectionistic behaviors aimed at gaining inclusion and approval” should cite a specific study showing behavioral evidence of this compensation mechanism.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

1.2. Reviewer 2

Reviewer:

In the paragraph beginning with “A key mechanism that may explain...” the sentence “This perceived inadequacy may then push individuals to engage in perfectionistic behaviors...” could be expanded with more empirical evidence or citations that specifically examine this motivational pathway.

In the paragraph starting with “A growing body of research suggests...”, while the authors highlight platforms like Instagram and TikTok, they do not differentiate the impact of visual-based vs. text-based platforms. Consider adding nuance to this discussion by citing research on platform-specific effects on self-presentation.

The authors mention “the digital double bind” in the fourth paragraph of the Introduction. This term is conceptually rich but not defined or cited. A clearer definition and source would help readers unfamiliar with this terminology.

In the description of the FMPS under “Measures,” the authors state, “Participants respond to items on a 5-point Likert scale...” However, the scoring range (i.e., minimum and maximum possible scores) is not specified. Including this would provide better context for interpreting the mean score of 108.53.

In the Fear of Missing Out subsection, the authors state, “The FoMOs is unidimensional and has been validated across different age groups and cultural settings...” It would strengthen the section to mention which specific cultures or populations have been used for validation studies.

In Table 1, the perfectionism mean of 108.53 appears high, yet there is no commentary on whether this is above clinical thresholds or normative expectations. Including a brief benchmark discussion in the text would help contextualize this finding.

The repetition of correlation coefficients in both Table 2 and in-text (e.g., “social media exposure was significantly and positively correlated with FoMO ($r = .51$, $p < .001$)”) is redundant. Instead, focus the in-text commentary on interpreting the significance of these relationships.

Authors uploaded the revised manuscript.

2. Revised

Editor's decision after revisions: Accepted.

Editor in Chief's decision: Accepted.