

Est.  
1841

YORK  
ST JOHN  
UNIVERSITY

Smith, Martin M. ORCID logoORCID:  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4754-3032>, Sherry, Simon B., Rnic, Katerina, Saklofske, Donald H., Enns, Murray and Gralnick, Tara (2016) Are Perfectionism Dimensions Vulnerability Factors for Depressive Symptoms After Controlling for Neuroticism? A Meta-analysis of 10 Longitudinal Studies. *European Journal of Personality*, 30 (2). pp. 201-212.

Downloaded from: <https://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/2926/>

The version presented here may differ from the published version or version of record. If you intend to cite from the work you are advised to consult the publisher's version:

<https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2053>

Research at York St John (RaY) is an institutional repository. It supports the principles of open access by making the research outputs of the University available in digital form. Copyright of the items stored in RaY reside with the authors and/or other copyright owners. Users may access full text items free of charge, and may download a copy for private study or non-commercial research. For further reuse terms, see licence terms governing individual outputs. [Institutional Repository Policy Statement](#)

# RaY

Research at the University of York St John

For more information please contact RaY at [ray@yorks.ac.uk](mailto:ray@yorks.ac.uk)

Are Perfectionism Dimensions Vulnerability Factors for Depressive Symptoms After Controlling  
for Neuroticism? A Meta-Analysis of 10 Longitudinal Studies

Martin M. Smith<sup>a\*</sup>, Simon B. Sherry<sup>b</sup>, Katerina Rnic<sup>a</sup>, Donald H. Saklofske<sup>a</sup>, Murray W. Enns<sup>c</sup>,  
& Tara M. Gralnick<sup>b</sup>

Accepted February 5, 2016 at *European Journal of Personality*

<sup>a</sup>Department of Psychology, The University of Western Ontario, Social Science Center, London,  
Canada N6A 5C2

<sup>b</sup>Department of Psychology, Dalhousie University, 1355 Oxford Street, PO Box 15000, Halifax,  
Nova Scotia, Canada B3H4R2

<sup>c</sup>Department of Psychiatry, University of Manitoba, 771 Bannatyne Avenue, Winnipeg,  
Manitoba, Canada, R3E 3N4

\*Corresponding author. Tel.: +1 519-661-2111

*E-mail address:* msmit454@uwo.ca (M.M.Smith).

### Abstract

Extensive evidence suggests neuroticism is a higher-order personality trait that overlaps substantially with perfectionism dimensions and depressive symptoms. Such evidence raises an important question: Which perfectionism dimensions are vulnerability factors for depressive symptoms after controlling for neuroticism? To address this, a meta-analysis of research testing whether socially prescribed perfectionism, concern over mistakes, doubts about actions, personal standards, perfectionistic attitudes, self-criticism, and self-oriented perfectionism predict change in depressive symptoms, after controlling for baseline depression and neuroticism, was conducted. A literature search yielded 10 relevant studies ( $N = 1,758$ ). Meta-analysis using random-effects models revealed that all seven perfectionism dimensions had small positive relationships with follow-up depressive symptoms beyond baseline depression and neuroticism. Perfectionism dimensions appear neither redundant with nor captured by neuroticism. Results lend credence and coherence to theoretical accounts and empirical studies suggesting perfectionism dimensions are part of the premorbid personality of people vulnerable to depressive symptoms.

*Keywords:* perfectionism, neuroticism, depression, meta-analysis, longitudinal

## Are Perfectionism Dimensions Vulnerability Factors for Depressive Symptoms After Controlling for Neuroticism? A Meta-Analysis of 10 Longitudinal Studies

Neuroticism is a dispositional tendency to experience negative emotional states. This higher order personality dimension encapsulates several lower order characteristics (e.g., anxiety, hostility, impulsivity, vulnerability) and is robustly predictive of numerous mental-health problems (Lahey, 2009), including depressive symptoms (e.g., sadness, loneliness, anhedonia, apathy, hopelessness, helplessness, suicidal ideation; Békés, Dunkley, et al., 2015; Graham, Sherry, et al., 2010). Given that neuroticism shares substantial variance with depressive symptoms, researchers have legitimately questioned whether lower-order personality traits such as perfectionism predict depressive symptoms beyond higher-order vulnerability factors such as neuroticism (Coyne & Whiffen, 1995; Enns & Cox, 1997; Enns, Cox, & Clara, 2005). The present meta-analysis of 10 longitudinal studies ( $N = 1,758$ ) represents the most comprehensive examination to date of the relationship between perfectionism and depressive symptoms after controlling for baseline neuroticism.

### **Perfectionism Dimensions, Neuroticism, and Depressive Symptoms**

Extensive evidence suggests two higher-order factors underlie and account for the shared variance amongst core perfectionism dimensions: perfectionistic concerns and perfectionistic strivings (see Stoeber & Otto, 2006, for review). Perfectionistic concerns are comprised of a family of traits, including socially prescribed perfectionism (i.e., perceiving others as demanding perfection of oneself; Hewitt & Flett, 1991), concern over mistakes (i.e., adverse reactions to failures; Frost, Marten, Lahart, & Rosenblate, 1990), doubts about actions (i.e., doubts about performance abilities; Frost et al., 1990), and self-criticism (i.e., the tendency to assume blame and feel self-critical towards the self; Blatt, D’Afflitti, & Quinlan, 1976). Perfectionistic strivings

encompass a constellation of traits, including self-oriented perfectionism (i.e., demanding perfection of oneself; Hewitt & Flett, 1991) and personal standards (i.e., setting unreasonably high personal standards and goals; Frost et al., 1990). In the present study, perfectionistic attitudes also receive attention. Beck and associates' (e.g., Imber et al., 1990) treat perfectionism as a unitary cognitive style that we label perfectionistic attitudes. These attitudes include cognitive distortions with perfectionistic themes (e.g., black-and-white, dichotomous thinking) and social difficulties with perfectionistic themes (e.g., social-evaluative concerns). Perfectionistic attitudes align more closely with perfectionistic concerns (versus perfectionistic strivings; Sherry, Hewitt, Flett, & Harvey, 2003).

Accumulated evidence suggests perfectionistic concerns exacerbate the effect of stress on depressive symptoms across clinical (Békés, et al., 2015; Enns & Cox, 2005; Hewitt, Flett, & Ediger, 1996) and non-clinical samples (Flett, Hewitt, Blankstein, & Mosher, 1995; Sherry, Gautreau, Mushquash, Sherry, & Allen, 2014). Likewise, prior research suggests perfectionistic concerns confer vulnerability to depressive symptoms through negative social situations (e.g., hostile interactions), social cognitions (e.g., perceiving others as uncaring), maladaptive coping (e.g., avoidance), negative life events (e.g., romantic breakups), and daily hassles (Dunkley & Blankstein, 2000; Dunkley, Blankstein, Halsall, Williams, & Winkworth, 2000; Dunkley, Sanislow, Grilo, & McGlashan, 2006; Hewitt & Flett, 1993; Sherry, Hewitt, Stewart, Mackinnon, Mushquash, Flett, & Sherry, 2012). In contrast, perfectionistic strivings are inconsistent predictors of depressive symptoms, with some research suggesting they are vulnerability factors (Békés et al., 2015; Hewitt et al., 1996; Joiner & Schmidt, 1995), and other research suggesting they are resiliency factors (Enns, Cox, & Clara, 2005). On the one hand, perfectionistic strivings confer vulnerability to depressive symptoms in the presence of ego-

involving achievement stressors (e.g., failing a test; Békés, et al., 2015; Hewitt et al., 1996). On the other hand, perfectionistic strivings are occasionally associated with positive outcomes (e.g., resourcefulness and task-oriented coping; Dunkley, Zuroff, & Blankstein, 2003; Stoeber & Otto, 2006) and, after controlling for perfectionistic concerns, are sometimes negatively associated with depressive symptoms (Smith, Saklofske, Yan, & Sherry, 2015; see Stoeber & Otto, 2006 for review).

Aside from perfectionistic strivings' status as a vulnerability factor, some investigators also question whether the apparent link between perfectionism dimensions and depressive symptoms stem from overlap with the "third variable" neuroticism (Enns et al., 2005). Indeed, a long-standing debate in psychology centers on whether lower-order characteristics, such as perfectionism dimensions, predict change in outcomes (e.g., depressive symptoms), beyond higher-order traits such as neuroticism (Coyne & Whiffen, 1995; Zuroff, Mongrain, & Santor, 2004). Research on the incremental explanatory power of perfectionism dimensions beyond neuroticism is particularly important given that depression and several perfectionism dimensions have strong positive associations with neuroticism (Dunkley, Sanislow, Grilo, & McGlashan, 2009; Dunkley, Blankstein, & Berg, 2012; Lahey, 2009), and because vulnerability is a fundamental component of neuroticism (Costa & McCrae, 1992). Moreover, neuroticism is a robust predictor of change in depressive symptoms across both clinical and non-clinical samples (Lahey, 2009). However, while many perfectionism dimensions are conceptually and empirically related to neuroticism, perfectionism dimensions also have unique components that distinguish them from neuroticism, such as a profound sense that one is making irreconcilable mistakes, as well as feeling as though others impose unfair demands on the self to be perfect (Flett & Hewitt,

2015). Additionally, Dunkley et al. (2012) found that perfectionistic concerns are distinguishable from neuroticism in terms of lower agreeableness.

Nonetheless, there are notable between-study inconsistencies concerning the status of perfectionism as a vulnerability factor that predicts incremental change in depressive symptoms beyond neuroticism (Békés, et al., 2015; Enns et al., 2005; Dunkley et al., 2009; Sherry, Mackinnon, Macneil, & Fitzpatrick, 2013). Given that neuroticism overlaps with many perfectionism constructs (Dunkley et al., 2012; Enns et al., 2005; Graham et al., 2010), it is crucial that researchers determine which, if any, perfectionism dimensions are vulnerability factors for depressive symptoms after controlling for baseline neuroticism. The apparent link between perfectionism and depressive symptoms may otherwise be an artifact arising from shared variance with the “third-variable” neuroticism. By controlling for this covariate, our study represents a rigorous test of the perfectionism-depressive symptoms relationship.

### **Advancing Research on Perfectionism and Depressive Symptoms using Meta-Analysis**

A quantitative synthesis may clarify between-study inconsistencies concerning the status of perfectionism as a vulnerability factor for depressive symptoms (Enns, Cox & Inayatulla, 2003; Sherry et al., 2013), allowing an overall conclusion to be reached. Given that the majority of studies suggest perfectionism has a small to moderate effect on depressive symptoms, it is likely that they are underpowered (Enns, Cox, Sareen, & Freeman, 2001). Advantages of a meta-analysis will help overcome limitations of small sample sizes (Card, 2012), bringing greater clarity to our understanding of the longitudinal effects of perfectionism dimensions on depressive symptoms. The consequences of perfectionistic strivings on depressive symptoms are also contentiously debated, with researchers either arguing they are vulnerability (Békés, et al. 2015) or resiliency (Enns et al., 2005) factors for change in depressive symptoms. Meta-analysis will

provide a more encompassing and generalizable statement about the longitudinal effects of perfectionistic strivings on depressive symptoms, which is difficult to establish through any single longitudinal study.

### **Objectives and Hypotheses**

Are perfectionism dimensions part of a premorbid personality structure that reliably increases the risk of experiencing depressive symptomology above and beyond the effects of baseline neuroticism and baseline depression? Do only certain perfectionism dimensions confer vulnerability to depressive symptoms? This study addressed these contentiously debated questions by comprehensively meta-analyzing extant research.

Based on theory and empirical evidence, we hypothesized that baseline socially prescribed perfectionism would predict follow-up depressive symptoms after controlling for baseline neuroticism and baseline depressive symptoms. A similar hypothesis was made for the other perfectionistic concerns dimensions, including concern over mistakes, doubts about actions, perfectionistic attitudes and self-criticism. We also explored whether perfectionistic striving dimensions (self-oriented perfectionism and personal standards) predict change in follow-up depressive symptoms beyond neuroticism. Additionally, we investigated the effects of perfectionistic strivings on depressive symptoms after controlling for perfectionistic concerns, baseline neuroticism and baseline depression.

### **Method**

#### **Selection of Studies**

A literature search on using PsycINFO was conducted using the keywords and Boolean search terms “perfection\*” OR “self-criticism” AND “longitudinal\*” OR “prospective”. Dissertations and non-English language articles were excluded. This search yielded 241 studies.

The first and third author reviewed the abstract and method of all studies identified from this broad search selecting studies that met inclusion criteria. Journal articles were included if the following criteria were met: (a) the study used a longitudinal design, (b) depressive symptoms were assessed on at least two measurement occasions, (c) perfectionism was assessed alongside depression in one of the measurement occasions preceding the final assessment of depression, and (d) neuroticism was assessed alongside depression and perfectionism at one of the measurement occasions preceding the final assessment of depression.

The literature search yielded a total of 12 articles for inclusion. Interrater agreement on inclusion or exclusion in the meta-analysis was high (100%). Following the literature search, the reference lists of the included articles were examined in an attempt to locate other relevant studies (Card, 2012). If a study did not report information needed to compute effect sizes, the authors were contacted. All authors contacted ( $N = 3$ ) provided the requested information. On October 5, 2015 we terminated all search strategies and instigated data reduction and analysis. We elected to exclude Mushquash and Sherry (2013) as it used the same sample and measure of depression (the Profile of Mood States depression subscale; McNair, Lorr, & Droppleman, 1992) as Sherry et al. (2014). We also excluded Enns et al. (2003) as it was a treatment study. Finally, one study (Mackinnon, Sherry, Antony, Stewart, Sherry, & Hartling, 2012) reported data on couples. In this case, females and males in the dyad were treated as unique studies. Thus, the final sample of selected studies was comprised of 10 articles with 11 samples (see Table 1 for sample characteristics).

### **Coding of Studies**

The first and third author coded each study based on 10 characteristics: sample size at baseline, sample type, mean age of participants at baseline, percent of female participants at

baseline, percent of Caucasian participants at baseline, time lag between assessments, percent attrition, measure used to assess perfectionism, measure used to assess neuroticism, and measure used to assess depressive symptoms.

### **Meta-Analytic Procedure**

Random-effects analyses were performed using Comprehensive Meta-Analysis software (Version 3.3; Borenstein, Hedges, Higgins, & Rothstein, 2005). We chose random-effects models, over fixed-effects models, as the 10 selected studies varied widely in design (see Table 1). Moreover, random-effects models are generally preferable to fixed-effects models, as they allow for generalizations beyond the set of selected studies to future studies (Card, 2012).

Weighted mean effect sizes were computed following the procedure recommended by Hunter and Schmidt (1990). This allowed for estimation of mean effect sizes and the variance in observed scores after considering sampling error (Card, 2012). Effect size estimates were weighted by sample size and aggregated. We chose to weight effects by sample size as studies with larger sample sizes, relative to studies with smaller sample sizes, have greater precision. To examine the relationship between perfectionism dimensions and depressive symptoms after controlling for baseline neuroticism and baseline depression, standardized betas were computed for each of the 11 samples using Mplus 6 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2010). In studies that included more than one measure of depressive symptoms, effect sizes obtained using various measures of depression were averaged such that one effect size was included in the analysis (Card, 2012). This commonly used meta-analytic strategy guards against overrepresentation of studies that include multiple effects. Prior to averaging, correlations were transformed into Fisher's  $Z$  (Card, 2012). When studies included more than two waves of data collection, the time points whereby the necessary measures were administered (depressive symptoms, neuroticism,

perfectionism at one time-point, depressive symptoms at a subsequent time point), and that correspond to the longest time lag between measurement occasions, were selected to compute effect sizes. Selection of the longest possible time lag provided the most conservative test of the perfectionism-depressive symptoms link. To facilitate interpretation, weighted mean effect size correlations, as well as 95% confidence intervals, are reported in Table 2.

For each analysis, the total heterogeneity of weighted mean effect sizes ( $Q_T$ ) was assessed (see Table 3). If  $Q_T$  is significant, it indicates the variance evident in the weighted mean effect sizes is greater than would be expected by sampling error (Card, 2012). A non-significant  $Q_T$  suggests a weak basis for moderation. The inconsistency in observed relationships across studies ( $I^2$ ) was also computed for each analysis.  $I^2$  indicates the percentage of total variation across studies due to heterogeneity: values of 25%, 50%, and 75% correspond to low, medium, and high heterogeneity, respectively (Higgins & Thompson, 2002). Unlike  $Q_T$ ,  $I^2$  is not adversely influenced by the number of included studies. To ensure accuracy, the first and third author computed effect sizes independently. No discrepancies in reported effect sizes were found.

## Results

### Description of Studies

Our literature search identified 10 studies and 11 samples that contained relevant effect size data (Table 1). The total number of participants pooled across studies was 1,758. Studies were published between 2001 and 2015, and the median year of publication was 2012. Studies varied considerably. Sample size varied between 47 and 240, with a median of 152. The average percent of female participants was 65.2%; the average percent of Caucasian participants was 83.9%. The mean age of the participants at baseline was 28.4 years ( $SD = 10.3$ ; range: 18.3-50.1). The time lag between assessments varied between 2 and 192.0 weeks ( $M = 40.04$   $SD =$

68.7). A total of three samples contained undergraduates, one sample contained community members, two samples used psychiatric patients, two samples used medical students, one sample used depressed outpatients, and two samples contained a mix of undergraduates, graduate students, and community members. The average percent attrition was 14.5%. Perfectionism was assessed using four measures (see Table 1). Neuroticism was assessed using four measures (see Table 1). Depressive symptoms were assessed using 11 measures (Table 2).

### **Overall Effect Sizes**

The weighted mean effect sizes between perfectionism at baseline and depressive symptoms at follow-up, while controlling for neuroticism and depressive symptoms at baseline, are reported in Table 2. Following Cohen's (1992) guidelines for small, medium, and large effect sizes ( $r = .10, .30, .50$ , respectively), all longitudinal perfectionism-depression effects were small in magnitude. For socially prescribed perfectionism, a positive effect ( $\beta = .13, p < .001$ ) was observed between socially prescribed perfectionism at baseline and depressive symptoms at follow-up, while controlling for neuroticism and depression at baseline. In this regard, a positive effect ( $\beta = .10, p < .001$ ) was found for concern over mistakes, a positive effect ( $\beta = .13, p < .001$ ) was found for doubts about actions, a positive effect ( $\beta = .12, p = .027$ ) was found for self-criticism, a positive effect ( $\beta = .08, p = .018$ ) was found for self-oriented perfectionism, a positive effect ( $\beta = .10, p = .003$ ) was found for personal standards, and a positive effect ( $\beta = .24, p < .001$ ) was found for perfectionistic attitudes. Results suggest all perfectionism dimensions confer vulnerability to depressive symptoms, even after removal of variance attributable to baseline depressive symptoms and baseline neuroticism.

Additionally, all weighted mean effect sizes corresponding to perfectionism dimensions effects on follow-up depression had non-significant  $Q_T$  values and  $I^2$  estimates of 0.0% (see

Table 3). This suggests the assumption of homogeneity should be retained and indicates common study effects (Card, 2012). The non-significant  $Q$  values also indicate differences in relevant effect sizes were not greater than would be expected on the basis of sample variation alone. This may be an artifact of the small sample sizes of five of the included studies (e.g., Békés et al., 2015). In addition, the percentage of total variance due to true heterogeneity (i.e.,  $I^2$ ) was consistently small, suggesting that variability amongst effect sizes was not due to additional sources and suggests a weak basis for testing the influence of potential moderating factors (Card, 2012).

After controlling for concern over mistakes, doubts about actions, and socially prescribed perfectionism, as well as baseline depressive symptoms and baseline neuroticism, the effect of personal standards on follow-up depressive symptoms was non-significant ( $\beta = .02, p = .504$ ). Likewise, a similar pattern was observed for self-oriented perfectionism ( $\beta = .00, p = .930$ ). Detailed statistics regarding the effects of personal standards and self-oriented perfectionism on follow-up depressive symptoms after controlling for baseline depressive symptoms, baseline neuroticism, baseline concern over mistakes, baseline doubts about actions, and baseline socially prescribed perfectionism are presented in Supplemental Material A. Additionally, while outside the scope of the present paper, the effects of concern over mistakes, personal standards, self-oriented perfectionism and socially prescribed perfectionism on follow up depressive symptoms, after controlling for conscientiousness, are available in Supplemental Material B.

### **Discussion**

Empirical studies and theoretical accounts suggest perfectionism is a vulnerability factor for depressive symptoms (Békés et al., 2015; Graham et al., 2010; Hewitt et al., 1996; Joiner & Schmidt, 1995). It is unclear, however, the extent to which this relationship persists after

controlling for the compelling covariate of neuroticism. Prior studies have shown that when measures of depressive symptoms are highly saturated with items assessing negative emotionality, depressive symptoms' relation with vulnerability factors (e.g., perfectionism) will be largely explained by shared variance with neuroticism (Dunkley, Blankstein, & Flett, 1997; Zuroff et al., 2004). Accordingly, this renders the present meta-analytic review of the extant empirical literature examining if perfectionism dimensions continue to predict change in depressive symptoms after controlling for baseline neuroticism a particularly stringent test of the perfectionism-depressive symptoms link.

In our meta-analysis of ten longitudinal studies comprised of undergraduate, community member, psychiatric patient, outpatient, and medical student samples, neuroticism was the strongest predictor of change in depressive symptoms. Even so, all seven perfectionism dimensions still predicted changes in depressive symptoms beyond neuroticism. Findings lend credence and coherence to research and theories suggesting perfectionism dimensions are part of the premorbid personality of people vulnerable to depressive symptoms (e.g., Békés., 2015; Dunkley et al., 2003; Flett et al., 1995; Hewitt & Flett, 1993; Hewitt et al., 1996).

### **Perfectionistic Concerns**

Consistent with hypotheses, socially prescribed perfectionism, concern over mistakes, doubts about actions, self-criticism, and perfectionistic attitudes add incrementally to understanding change in depressive symptoms beyond neuroticism. Effects were small in magnitude across a wide range of samples, methods, and measures. Results suggest perfectionistic concerns constructs are lower-order personality traits neither redundant with nor captured by neuroticism. As prior research suggests, people high in perfectionistic concerns appear to think, feel, and behave in ways that have depressogenic consequences (Graham et al.,

2010). Such people believe others hold lofty expectations for them, and often feel incapable of living up to the perfection they perceive that others demand. They may agonize about perceived failures and have doubts about performance abilities because they experience their social world as judgmental, pressure-filled, and unyielding. Perfectionistic concerns also appear to be comprised of stable, underlying traits that trigger depressive symptoms by predisposing people to the frequent subjective experience of disappointing others (Sherry et al., 2014). Additionally, consistent with the diathesis-stress model, perfectionistic concerns predict heightened depressive symptoms by predisposing people to perceive interpersonal stressors as more ego-involving and distressing (Békés et al., 2015; Hewitt & Flett, 1993; 2002).

### **Perfectionistic Strivings**

Does personal standards and self-oriented perfectionism protect against depressive symptoms? Our meta-analysis offers a resounding “no” to this question. Findings from our meta-analysis are incongruent with a view of perfectionistic strivings constructs as resiliency factors that protect against increases in depressive symptoms (Enns et al., 2005). An over-reliance on cross-sectional studies may have clouded the nature of the perfectionism-depressive symptoms relationship, resulting in inconsistencies in the literature concerning the consequences of this trait. In particular, according to the diathesis-stress model of perfectionism, perfectionistic strivings only promotes depressive symptoms in the presence of ego-threatening stressors, such as achievement failures (e.g., poor performance on an exam; Békés et al., 2015; Enns & Cox, 2005). This might render the deleterious effects of perfectionistic strivings on depressive symptoms elusive when assessed at only a single time point.

Additionally, our findings dovetail with past theoretical accounts, case histories, and empirical studies. In fact, clinicians have long described perfectionistic strivings as a “Trojan

horse,” whereby self-concealment and perfectionistic self-presentation mask perfectionistic strivings’ depressogenic effects (see Blatt, 1995). Our results complement studies showing that perfectionistic strivings’ rob people of satisfaction and positive affect (Hewitt & Flett, 1991) and amplify the risk of suicide (Blatt, 1995; Flett, Hewitt, & Heisel, 2014) and early mortality (Fry & Debats, 2009). Individuals with high perfectionistic strivings are only satisfied when everything in their lives suggests that they are perfect; when life events inevitably suggest they are not perfect, depressive symptoms follow.

Despite this, our findings also complement research showing perfectionistic strivings confer vulnerability for depressive symptoms through overlap with perfectionistic concerns (Stoeber & Otto, 2006). After controlling for baseline depression, baseline neuroticism, and baseline perfectionistic concerns, personal standards and self-oriented perfectionism ceased to be significant predictors of follow-up depressive symptoms. Nevertheless, we caution against over-interpretation of this finding in light of increasing apprehension that controlling for perfectionistic concerns when examining the effects of perfectionistic strivings may change the conceptual meaning of perfectionistic strivings, and may well undermine its relevance to perfectionism research (e.g., Hill, 2014; Molnar, Sadava, Flett, & Colautti, 2012; Powers, Koestner, Zuroff, Milyavskaya, & Gorin, 2011).

### **Limitations of Overall Literature**

Summarizing limitations within the extant research elucidates further areas requiring examination, thereby providing direction to advance the field of study. While conducting our literature search, it became apparent that the majority of studies on the perfectionism-depressive symptoms link are cross-sectional in nature and do not take neuroticism into account. This is problematic, as cross-sectional studies fail to address temporal precedence, and thus are

incapable of evaluating the extent to which perfectionism dimensions predict change in depressive symptoms. Moreover, studies that neglect to control for neuroticism run the risk of drawing erroneous conclusions due to the substantial overlap between perfectionism dimensions and the “third-variable” neuroticism (Dunkley et al., 2012; Enns et al., 2005). Given the importance of assessing constructs longitudinally, and extensive evidence suggesting perfectionism, neuroticism, and depressive symptoms are highly correlated (Dunkley et al., 2012; Enns et al., 2005; Graham et al., 2010), researchers in the area are advised to move forward by using longitudinal designs that control for neuroticism.

Moreover, the vast majority of research on the perfectionism-depressive symptom link relies on mono-source designs (cf. Flett, Besser, & Hewitt, 2005; Sherry et al., 2013). Mono-source designs are problematic when studying personality traits such as perfectionism that can involve self-presentational biases (e.g., defensively concealing imperfections from others; Klonsky & Oltmanns, 2002). Future studies can advance the literature by using alternative methods of data collection (e.g., informant reports; Sherry, Nealis et al., 2013). Finally, as five of the ten studies included in our meta-analysis had sample sizes below 150, the present research suggests many longitudinal perfectionism studies are underpowered. Researchers are advised to move forward by using sample sizes large enough to detect small to moderate effects.

### **Limitations of the Present Study and Future Directions**

Certain limitations in extant literature translate into limitations in the present meta-analysis. In this regard, studies from only three research teams met our inclusion criteria, limiting investigator variability. Also, while the effects of five perfectionistic concern dimensions were tested in the current meta-analysis, only two perfectionistic striving dimensions were included (self-oriented perfectionism and personal standards). It is, therefore, likely that perfectionistic

concerns captured a more comprehensive construct, thereby limiting our ability to accurately compare the contributions of perfectionistic concerns and perfectionistic strivings. Furthermore, seven of the ten studies included used a short-form, opposed to a long-form, measure of neuroticism. A richer, more fine-grained analysis of the longitudinal effects of perfectionism on depressive symptoms beyond neuroticism's six lower order facets is needed. Also, findings derived from the current meta-analysis may have limited generalizability beyond the specific set of samples included. Additionally, future research should also explore the extent to which perfectionism dimensions are vulnerability factors for other forms of emotional distress such as anger and anxiety. Finally, the predictive utility of perfectionism in the present meta-analysis was likely understated due to not accounting for life stressors, which consistent with a diathesis-stress model, may need to be present for perfectionism's role as a vulnerability factor to become evident (Hewitt & Flett, 1993; 2002).

### **Concluding Remarks**

The present meta-analysis of 10 longitudinal studies (involving 11 samples and 1,758 participants) represents the most comprehensive test to date of the perfectionism-depressive symptoms relationship. Results add substantively to the perfectionism and depression literature by synthesizing existing research to demonstrate that all perfectionism dimensions predict change in depressive symptoms beyond neuroticism. Findings support past evidence suggesting perfectionistic concerns and perfectionistic strivings comprise lower-order personality traits that place individuals at risk for experiencing depressive symptoms. In sum, our meta-analysis sheds light on the experiences of people with high levels of perfectionism, highlighting the importance of developing ways of intervening when people feel they must meet the perfectionistic expectations of themselves and others.

## References

References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in the meta-analysis.

- Bagby, R. M., Parker, J. D., Joffe, R. T., & Buis, T. (1994). Reconstruction and validation of the Depressive Experiences Questionnaire. *Assessment, 1*, 59-68.
- Beck, A. T., & Beck, R. W. (1972). Screening depressed patients in family practice: A rapid technique. *Postgraduate Medical Journal, 52*, 81-85.
- Beck, A. T., Ward, C., & Mendelson, M. (1961). Beck Depression Inventory (BDI). *Archives of General Psychiatry, 4*, 561-571.
- \*Békés, V., Dunkley, D., Taylor, G., Zuroff, D., Lewkowski, M., Foley, J., ... & Westreich, R. (2015). Chronic stress and attenuated improvement in depression over 1 year: The moderating role of perfectionism. *Behavior Therapy, 46*, 479-492.
- Benet-Martínez, V., & John, O. P. (1998). Los Cinco Grandes across cultures and ethnic groups: Multitrait-multimethod analyses of the Big Five in Spanish and English. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 729-750.
- Blatt, S. J. (1995). The destructiveness of perfectionism: Implications for the treatment of depression. *American Psychologist, 50*, 1003-1020.
- Blatt, S. J., D'Afflitti, J. P., & Quinlan, D. M. (1976). Experiences of depression in normal young adults. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 85*, 383-389.
- Borenstein, M., Hedges, L., Higgins, J., & Rothenstein, H. (2005). *Comprehensive meta-analysis* (Version 3.3). Englewood, NJ: Biostat.
- Card, N. A. (2012). *Applied meta-analysis for social science research*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Chang, E. C., & Rand, K. L. (2000). Perfectionism as a predictor of subsequent adjustment:

- Evidence for a specific diathesis–stress mechanism among college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47, 129.
- Cohen, J. (1992). A power primer. *Psychological Bulletin*, 112, 155-159.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Normal personality assessment in clinical practice: The NEO Personality Inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, 4, 5-13.
- Coyne, J. C., & Whiffen, V. E. (1995). Issues in personality diathesis for depression: The case of sociotropy-dependency and autonomy-self-criticism. *Psychological Bulletin*, 118, 358-378.
- Cox, B. J., Enns, M. W., & Clara, I. P. (2002). The multidimensional structure of perfectionism in clinically distressed and college student samples. *Psychological Assessment*, 14, 365-373.
- Derogatis, L. R., & Lazarus, L. (1994). SCL-90-R, Brief Symptom Inventory, and matching clinical rating scales. In M. Maruish (Ed.), *The use of psychological testing for treatment planning and outcome assessment* (pp. 217-248). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Donnellan, M., Oswald, F. L., Baird, B. M., & Lucas, R. E. (2006). The Mini-IPIP Scales: Tiny-yet-effective measures of the Big Five factors of personality. *Psychological Assessment*, 18, 192-203.
- Dunkley, D. M., & Blankstein, K. R. (2000). Self-critical perfectionism, coping, hassles, and current distress: A structural equation modeling approach. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 24, 713-730.
- Dunkley, D. M., Blankstein, K. R., & Berg, J. L. (2012). Perfectionism dimensions and the five-factor model of personality. *European Journal of Personality*, 26, 233-244.

- Dunkley, D. M., Blankstein, K. R., & Flett, G. L. (1997). Specific cognitive-personality vulnerability styles in depression and the five-factor model of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 23*, 1041-1053.
- Dunkley, D. M., Blankstein, K. R., Halsall, J., Williams, M., & Winkworth, G. (2000). The relation between perfectionism and distress: Hassles, coping, and perceived social support as mediators and moderators. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 437-453.
- \*Dunkley, D. M., Sanislow, C. A., Grilo, C. M., & McGlashan, T. H. (2006). Perfectionism and depressive symptoms 3 years later: Negative social interactions, avoidant coping, and perceived social support as mediators. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 47*, 106-115.
- \*Dunkley, D. M., Sanislow, C. A., Grilo, C. M., & McGlashan, T. H. (2009). Self-criticism versus neuroticism in predicting depression and psychosocial impairment for 4 years in a clinical sample. *Comprehensive Psychiatry, 50*, 335-346.
- Dunkley, D. M., Zuroff, D. C., & Blankstein, K. R. (2003). Self-critical perfectionism and daily affect: Dispositional and situational influences on stress and coping. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 234-252.
- Enns, M. W., & Cox, B. J. (1997). Personality dimensions and depression: Review and commentary. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 42*, 274-284.
- Enns, M. W., & Cox, B. J. (2005). Perfectionism, stressful life events, and the 1-year outcome of depression. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 29*, 541-553.
- \*Enns, M. W., Cox, B. J., & Clara, I. P. (2005). Perfectionism and neuroticism: A longitudinal study of specific vulnerability and diathesis-stress models. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 29*, 463-478.

- Enns, M. W., Cox, B. J., & Inayatulla, M. (2003). Personality predictors of outcome for adolescents hospitalized for suicidal ideation. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 42*, 720-727.
- \*Enns, M. W., Cox, B. J., Sareen, J., & Freeman, P. (2001). Adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism in medical students: A longitudinal investigation. *Medical Education, 35*, 1034-1042.
- Flett, G. L., Besser, A., & Hewitt, P. L. (2005). Perfectionism, ego defense styles, and depression: A comparison of self-reports versus informant ratings. *Journal of Personality, 73*, 1355-1396.
- Flett, G. L., & Hewitt, P. L. (2015). Measures of perfectionism. In G. J. Boyle, D. H. Saklofske, & G. Matthews (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social constructs* (pp. 595-618). London: Academic Press.
- Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., Blankstein, K. R., & Mosher, S. W. (1995). Perfectionism, life events, and depressive symptoms: A test of a diathesis-stress model. *Current Psychology, 14*, 112-137.
- Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., & Heisel, M. (2014). The destructiveness of perfectionism revisited: Implications for the assessment of suicide risk and the prevention of suicide. *Review of General Psychology, 18*, 156-172.
- Frost, R., Marten, P., Lahart, C., & Rosenblate, R. (1990). The dimensions of perfectionism. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 14*, 449-468.
- Fry, P. S., & Debats, D. L. (2009). Perfectionism and the five-factor personality traits as predictors of mortality in older adults. *Journal of Health Psychology, 14*, 513-524.

- \*Graham, A. R., Sherry, S. B., Stewart, S. H., Sherry, D. L., McGrath, D. S., Fossum, K. M., & Allen, S. L. (2010). The existential model of perfectionism and depressive symptoms: A short-term, four-wave longitudinal study. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 57*, 423-438.
- Hamilton, M. (1960). A rating scale for depression. *Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery, and Psychiatry, 23*, 56-62.
- Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1991). Perfectionism in the self and social contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 456-470.
- Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1993). Dimensions of perfectionism, daily stress, and depression: A test of the specific vulnerability hypothesis. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 102*, 58-65.
- Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (2002). Perfectionism and stress processes in psychopathology. In G. L. Flett & P. L. Hewitt (Eds.), *Perfectionism: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 255-284). Washington: American Psychological Association.
- Hewitt, P. L., Flett, G. L., & Ediger, E. (1996). Perfectionism and depression: Longitudinal assessment of a specific vulnerability hypothesis. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 105*, 276-280.
- Hewitt, P. L., Habke, A., Lee-Baggeley, D., Sherry, S. B., & Flett, G. L. (2008). The impact of perfectionistic self-presentation on the cognitive, affective, and physiological experience of a clinical interview. *Psychiatry, 71*, 93-122.
- Higgins, J., & Thompson, S. G. (2002). Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Statistics in Medicine, 21*, 1539-1558.

- Hill, A. P. (2014). Perfectionistic strivings and the perils of partialling. *International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 12*, 302-315.
- Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (1990). Dichotomization of continuous variables: The implications for meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 334-349.
- Imber, S. D., Pilkonis, P. A., Sotsky, S. M., Elkin, I., Watkins, J. T., Collins, J. F., & ... Glass, D. R. (1990). Mode-specific effects among three treatments for depression. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 58*, 352-359.
- Joiner, T. E., & Schmidt, N. B. (1995). Dimensions of perfectionism, life stress, and depressed and anxious symptoms: Prospective support for diathesis-stress but not specific vulnerability among male undergraduates. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 14*, 165-183.
- Keller, M. B., Lavori, P. W., Friedman, B., Nielsen, E., Endicott, J., McDonald-Scott, P., & Andreasen, N. C. (1987). The longitudinal interval follow-up evaluation: A comprehensive method for assessing outcome in prospective longitudinal studies. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 44*, 540-548.
- Klonsky, E. D., & Oltmanns, T. F. (2002). Informant-reports of personality disorder: Relation to self-reports and future research directions. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 9*, 300-311.
- Lahey, B. B. (2009). Public health significance of neuroticism. *American Psychologist, 64*, 241-256.
- Lovibond, P., & Lovibond, S. (1995). The structure of negative emotional states. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 33*, 335-343.

- Lubin, B. (1965). Adjective checklists for measurement of depression. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 12*, 57-62.
- \*Mackinnon, S. P., & Sherry, S. B. (2012). Perfectionistic self-presentation mediates the relationship between perfectionistic concerns and subjective well-being: A three-wave longitudinal study. *Personality and Individual Differences, 53*, 22-28.
- \*Mackinnon, S. P., Sherry, S. B., Antony, M. M., Stewart, S. H., Sherry, D. L., & Hartling, N. (2012). Caught in a bad romance: Perfectionism, conflict, and depression in romantic relationships. *Journal of Family Psychology, 26*, 215-225.
- McNair, D. M., Lorr, M., & Droppleman, L. F. (1992). *Profile of Mood States manual*. San Diego, CA: Educational and Industrial Testing Service.
- Molnar, D. S., Sadava, S. W., Flett, G. L., & Colautti, J. (2012). Perfectionism and health: A mediational analysis of the roles of stress, social support and health-related behaviours. *Psychology & Health, 27*, 846-864.
- Morey, L. C. (1991). *Personality Assessment Inventory - Professional Manual*. Lutz, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Mushquash, A. R., & Sherry, S. B. (2013). Testing the perfectionism model of binge eating in mother-daughter dyads: A mixed longitudinal and daily diary study. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 14*, 171-179.
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (1998-2011). *Mplus user's guide*. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- Powers, T. A., Koestner, R., Zuroff, D. C., Milyavskaya, M., & Gorin, A. (2011). The effects of self-criticism and self-oriented perfectionism on goal pursuit. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*, 964-975.

Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D Scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement, 1*, 385-401.

\*Sherry, S. B., Gautreau, C. M., Mushquash, A. R., Sherry, D. L., & Allen, S. L. (2014). Self-critical perfectionism confers vulnerability to depression after controlling for neuroticism: A longitudinal study of middle-aged community-dwelling women. *Personality and Individual Differences, 69*, 1-4.

Sherry, S. B., Hewitt, P. L., Flett, G. L., & Harvey, M. (2003). Perfectionism dimensions, perfectionistic attitudes, dependent attitudes, and depression in psychiatric patients and university students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 50*, 373-386.

Sherry, S. B., Hewitt, P. L., Stewart, S. H., Mackinnon, A. L., Mushquash, A. R., Flett, G. L., & Sherry, D. L. (2012). Social disconnection and hazardous drinking mediate the link between perfectionistic attitudes and depressive symptoms. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioural Assessment, 26*, 193-201.

Sherry, S. B., Mackinnon, S. P., Macneil, M. A., & Fitzpatrick, S. (2013). Discrepancies confer vulnerability to depressive symptoms: A three-wave longitudinal study. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 60*, 112-126.

\*Sherry, S. B., Nealis, L. J., Macneil, M. A., Stewart, S. H., Sherry, D. L., & Smith, M. M. (2013). Informant reports add incrementally to the understanding of the perfectionism-depression connection: Evidence from a prospective longitudinal study. *Personality and Individual Differences, 54*, 957-960.

Stoeber, J., & Otto, K. (2006). Positive conceptions of perfectionism: Approaches, evidence, challenges. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*, 295-319.

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 1063–1070.

Weissman, A. N., & Beck, A. T. (1978). *Development and validation of the Dysfunctional Attitude Scale: A preliminary investigation*. Paper presented at the 86th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Zuroff, D. C., Mongrain, M., & Santor, D. A. (2004). Conceptualizing and measuring personality vulnerability to depression: Comment on Coyne and Whiffen (1995). *Psychological Bulletin*, *130*, 489-511.

Table 1

*Characteristics of longitudinal studies included in the meta-analysis*

	Sample							Measurement		
	<i>N</i>	Sample type	Mean age	Time lag	Attrition %	Female %	Caucasian %	Neuroticism	Perfectionistic concerns	Perfectionistic strivings
Békés et al. (2015)	47	Psychiatric <sup>a</sup>	45.5	50.9	–	70.2	75.0	NEOPIR-N	DAS-P DEQ-SC FMPS-COM HFMP-SPP	FMPS-PS HFMP-SOP
Dunkley et al. (2006)	96	Psychiatric <sup>a</sup>	34.3	158.6	–	62.5	84.0	NEOPIR-N	DAS-P	–
Dunkley et al. (2009)	107	Psychiatric <sup>a</sup>	34.4	192.0	–	60.7	82.0	NEOPIR-N	DAS-P	–
Enns et al. (2001)	96	Medical <sup>b</sup>	25.1	24.0	39.6	41.7	–	NEOFFI-N	FMPS-COM FMPS-DAA HFMP-SPP	FMPS-PS HFMP-SOP
Enns et al. (2005)	206	Medical <sup>b</sup>	24.0	20.0	32.5	44.2	–	NEOFFI-N	FMPS-COM FMPS-DAA HFMP-SPP	FMPS-PS HFMP-SOP
Graham et al. (2010)	240	Undergrad <sup>c</sup>	20.0	3.0	3.3	83.3	86.7	BFI-N	FMPS-SF-COM FMPS-DAA HFMP-SF-SPP	FMPS-SF-PS HFMP-SF-SOP
Mackinnon & Sherry (2012)	127	Undergrad <sup>c</sup>	18.3	19.0	9.4	77.9	81.1	BFI-N	FMPS-SF-COM FMPS-DAA HFMP-SF-SPP	FMPS-SF-PS HFMP-SF-SOP
Mackinnon et al. (2012)	226	Mixed <sup>d</sup>	22.4	4.0	2.7	0.0	88.5	BFI-N	DEQ-SF-SC FMPS-SF-COM HFMP-SF-SPP	–
Mackinnon et al. (2012)	226	Mixed <sup>d</sup>	21.5	4.0	2.2	100.0	88.5	BFI-N	DEQ-SF-SC FMPS-SF-COM HFMP-SF-SPP	–
Sherry et al. (2013)	155	Undergrad <sup>c</sup>	20.7	4.3	1.9	76.8	70.3	BFI-N	DEQ-SF-SC HFMP-SF-SPP FMPS-SF-COM FMPS-DAA	–

Sherry et al. (2014)	232	Community	50.1	3.3	9.2	100.0	90.4	IPIP-N	DEQ-SF-SC FMPS-SF-COM FMPS-DAA HFMP-SF-SPP	FMPS-SF-PS HFMP-SF-SOP
----------------------	-----	-----------	------	-----	-----	-------	------	--------	---	---------------------------

*Note.* Time lag in weeks; COM = concern over mistakes; DAA = doubts about actions; PS = personal standards; SC = self-criticism, SOP = self-oriented perfectionism; SPP = socially prescribed perfectionism; D = depression; P = perfectionism; N = neuroticism; NA = negative affect; DAS = Weissman and Beck's (1978) Dysfunctional Attitude Scale; DEQ-SC = Blatt, D'Afflitti, & Quinlan's (1976) Depressive Experiences Questionnaire Self-Criticism; DEQ-SF-SC = Depressive Experiences Questionnaire Self-Criticism Short Form (see Bagby, Parker, Joffe, & Buis, 1994); FMPS = Frost et al.'s (1990) Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale; FMPS-SF = Frost's Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale Short Form (see Cox, Enns, & Clara, 2002); HFMP-SF = Hewitt and Flett's (1991) Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale; HFMP-SF = Hewitt and Flett's Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale Short Form (see Hewitt, Habke, Lee-Baggely, Sherry, & Flett, 2008); BFI = Benet-Martínez and John's (1998) Big Five Inventory; IPIP = Donnellan, Oswald, Baird, and Lucas' (2006) Mini International Personality Item Pool; NEOFFI = Costa and McCrae's (1992a) NEO Five-Factor Inventory; NEOPIR = Costa and McCrae's (1992b) Revised NEO Personality Inventory;

<sup>a</sup>Psychiatric patients  
<sup>b</sup>Medical students  
<sup>c</sup>Undergraduates  
<sup>d</sup>Undergraduates, graduate students, and community members

Table 2

*Relationships between perfectionism dimensions, neuroticism, and depressive symptoms*

	Outcome	Concern over mistakes					
		$r_{COM_1, N_1}$	$r_{COM_1, DEP_1}$	$r_{N_1, DEP_1}$	$COM_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$	$N_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$	$DEP_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$
Békés et al. (2015)	BDI	.43	.20	.32	.08	-.07	.50
	HAM-D	.43	.08	.24	.26	.05	.24
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.43</b>	<b>.14</b>	<b>.28</b>	<b>.17</b>	<b>-.01</b>	<b>.38</b>
Enns et al. (2001)	BDI-SF	.52	.33	.57	-.07	.40	.22
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.52</b>	<b>.33</b>	<b>.57</b>	<b>-.07</b>	<b>.40</b>	<b>.22</b>
Enns et al. (2005)	BDI	.54	.48	.60	.09	.03	.57
	PANAS-NA	.54	.42	.55	.21	.20	.28
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.54</b>	<b>.45</b>	<b>.58</b>	<b>.15</b>	<b>.12</b>	<b>.44</b>
Graham et al. (2010)	CES-D-SF	.48	.43	.55	.06	.08	.65
	DASS-D	.48	.41	.48	.10	.08	.49
	SCLR-D	.48	.44	.52	.09	.06	.65
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.48</b>	<b>.43</b>	<b>.52</b>	<b>.08</b>	<b>.07</b>	<b>.60</b>
Mackinnon & Sherry (2012)	CES-D	.42	.55	.63	.17	.00	.45
	PANAS-NA	.42	.30	.61	.25	.02	.41
	POMS-D	.42	.52	.53	.21	-.12	.54
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.42</b>	<b>.46</b>	<b>.59</b>	<b>.21</b>	<b>-.03</b>	<b>.47</b>
Mackinnon et al.(2012) men	CES-D	.18	.28	.54	.04	.19	.57
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.28</b>	<b>.54</b>	<b>.04</b>	<b>.19</b>	<b>.57</b>
Mackinnon et al.(2012) women	CES-D	.16	.15	.54	.08	.11	.60
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.16</b>	<b>.15</b>	<b>.54</b>	<b>.08</b>	<b>.11</b>	<b>.60</b>
Sherry et al. (2013)	CES-D	.30	.14	.50	.17	.12	.41
	DASS-D	.30	.42	.46	.12	.04	.38
	SCL90R-D	.30	.48	.52	.10	.19	.40
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.30</b>	<b>.35</b>	<b>.49</b>	<b>.13</b>	<b>.12</b>	<b>.40</b>
Sherry et al. (2014)	DACLE	.37	.54	.48	.11	.20	.51
	DACLG	.37	.50	.47	.14	.20	.47
	POMS-D	.37	.52	.47	.11	.15	.57
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.37</b>	<b>.52</b>	<b>.47</b>	<b>.12</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.52</b>
Doubts about actions							
	Outcome	$r_{DAA_1, N_1}$	$r_{DAA_1, DEP_1}$	$r_{N_1, DEP_1}$	$DAA_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$	$N_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$	$DEP_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$
Enns et al. (2001)	BDI-SF	.62	.39	.57	.16	.24	.21
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.62</b>	<b>.39</b>	<b>.57</b>	<b>.16</b>	<b>.24</b>	<b>.21</b>
Enns et al. (2005)	BDI	.65	.51	.60	.04	.04	.58
	PANAS-NA	.65	.42	.55	.10	.24	.31
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.65</b>	<b>.47</b>	<b>.58</b>	<b>.07</b>	<b>.14</b>	<b>.45</b>
Graham et al. (2010)	CES-D-SF	.50	.57	.55	.07	.08	.63
	DASS-D	.50	.47	.48	.13	.07	.48

	SCLR-D	.50	.54	.52	.11	.05	.63
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.50</b>	<b>.53</b>	<b>.52</b>	<b>.10</b>	<b>.07</b>	<b>.58</b>
Mackinnon & Sherry (2012)	CES-D	.53	.57	.63	.29	-.06	.42
	PANAS-NA	.53	.45	.61	.31	-.01	.37
	POMS-D	.53	.49	.53	.28	-.18	.55
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.53</b>	<b>.50</b>	<b>.59</b>	<b>.29</b>	<b>-.08</b>	<b>.45</b>
Sherry et al. (2013)	CES-D	.36	.35	.50	.16	.10	.43
	DASS-D	.36	.32	.46	.10	.03	.40
	SCL90R-D	.36	.48	.52	.11	.18	.40
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.36</b>	<b>.38</b>	<b>.49</b>	<b>.12</b>	<b>.10</b>	<b>.41</b>
Sherry et al. (2014)	DACLE	.43	.56	.48	.08	.20	.52
	DACLG	.43	.47	.47	.16	.18	.47
	POMS-D	.43	.53	.47	.09	.15	.58
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.43</b>	<b>.52</b>	<b>.47</b>	<b>.11</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.52</b>
Perfectionistic attitudes							
	Measure	$r_{PA_1, N_1}$	$r_{PA_1, DEP_1}$	$r_{N_1, DEP_1}$	$PA_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$	$N_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$	$DEP_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$
Békés et al. (2015)	BDI	.49	.24	.32	-.08	.00	.51
	HAM-D	.49	.02	.24	.18	.07	.26
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.49</b>	<b>.13</b>	<b>.28</b>	<b>.05</b>	<b>.04</b>	<b>.39</b>
Dunkley et al. (2006)	BDI	.63	.24	.41	.27	.26	.20
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.63</b>	<b>.24</b>	<b>.41</b>	<b>.27</b>	<b>.26</b>	<b>.20</b>
Dunkley et al. (2009)	LIFEPSPSR-D	.59	.18	.38	.24	-.06	.27
	PAI-D	.59	.18	.38	.31	.24	.15
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.59</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.38</b>	<b>.28</b>	<b>.09</b>	<b>.21</b>
Personal standards							
	Measure	$r_{PS_1, N_1}$	$r_{PS_1, DEP_1}$	$r_{N_1, DEP_1}$	$PS_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$	$N_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$	$DEP_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$
Békés et al. (2015)	BDI	.23	.20	.32	.00	-.04	.51
	HAM-D	.23	-.06	.24	.16	.13	.26
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.23</b>	<b>.07</b>	<b>.27</b>	<b>.08</b>	<b>.09</b>	<b>.39</b>
Enns et al. (2001)	BDI-SF	.21	.11	.57	.00	.35	.22
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.21</b>	<b>.11</b>	<b>.57</b>	<b>.00</b>	<b>.35</b>	<b>.22</b>
Enns et al. (2005)	BDI	.18	.24	.60	.03	.06	.59
	PANAS-NA	.18	.19	.55	.19	.27	.30
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.22</b>	<b>.58</b>	<b>.11</b>	<b>.17</b>	<b>.45</b>
Graham et al. (2010)	CES-D-SF	.15	.17	.55	.05	.10	.65
	DASS-D	.15	.12	.48	.06	.11	.51
	SCL-R-D	.15	.21	.52	.04	.08	.66
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.15</b>	<b>.17</b>	<b>.52</b>	<b>.05</b>	<b>.10</b>	<b>.61</b>
Mackinnon & Sherry (2012)	CES-D	.25	.23	.63	.14	.00	.52
	PANAS-NA	.25	.21	.61	.20	.08	.41
	POMS-D	.25	.17	.53	.19	-.12	.62
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.25</b>	<b>.20</b>	<b>.59</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>-.01</b>	<b>.52</b>

Sherry et al. (2014)	DACLG	.18	.34	.48	.13	.21	.51
	DACLE	.18	.34	.47	.19	.22	.47
	POMS-D	.18	.36	.48	.12	.17	.58
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.35</b>	<b>.48</b>	<b>.15</b>	<b>.20</b>	<b>.52</b>
Self-criticism							
	Measure	$r_{SC_1, N_1}$	$r_{SC_1, DEP_1}$	$r_{N_1, DEP_1}$	$SC_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$	$N_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$	$DEP_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$
Békés et al. (2015)	BDI	.44	.25	.32	-.07	-.01	.51
	HAM-D	.44	.02	.24	.18	.12	.25
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.44</b>	<b>.14</b>	<b>.28</b>	<b>.06</b>	<b>.06</b>	<b>.38</b>
Mackinnon et al. (2012) women	CES-D	.32	.37	.54	.15	.09	.57
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.32</b>	<b>.37</b>	<b>.54</b>	<b>.15</b>	<b>.09</b>	<b>.57</b>
Mackinnon et al. (2012) men	CES-D	.30	.43	.54	.06	.18	.55
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.30</b>	<b>.43</b>	<b>.54</b>	<b>.06</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.55</b>
Sherry et al. (2013)	CES-D	.23	.18	.50	.17	.11	.45
	DASS-D	.23	.14	.46	.17	.02	.42
	SCL90R-D	.23	.17	.52	.19	.16	.43
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.23</b>	<b>.16</b>	<b>.49</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.10</b>	<b>.43</b>
Sherry et al. (2014)	DACLE	.46	.43	.47	.20	.16	.44
	DACLG	.46	.48	.47	.20	.16	.49
	POMS-D	.46	.51	.47	.17	.12	.54
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.46</b>	<b>.47</b>	<b>.47</b>	<b>.19</b>	<b>.15</b>	<b>.49</b>
Self-oriented perfectionism							
	Measure	$r_{SOP_1, N_1}$	$r_{SOP_1, DEP_1}$	$r_{N_1, DEP_1}$	$SOP_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$	$N_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$	$DEP_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$
Békés et al. (2015)	BDI	.13	.29	.32	.12	-.04	.47
	HAM-D	.13	.10	.24	.26	.14	.21
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.13</b>	<b>.20</b>	<b>.28</b>	<b>.19</b>	<b>.05</b>	<b>.34</b>
Enns et al. (2001)	BDI-SF	.39	.18	.57	-.03	.37	.22
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.39</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.57</b>	<b>-.03</b>	<b>.37</b>	<b>.22</b>
Enns et al. (2005)	BDI	.18	.22	.60	.07	.06	.58
	PANAS-NA	.18	.18	.55	.19	.27	.30
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.20</b>	<b>.58</b>	<b>.13</b>	<b>.17</b>	<b>.44</b>
Graham et al. (2010)	CES-D-SF	.14	.11	.55	-.03	.10	.66
	DASS-D	.14	.14	.48	.02	.11	.52
	SCL-R-D	.14	.16	.52	.00	.09	.67
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.14</b>	<b>.14</b>	<b>.52</b>	<b>.00</b>	<b>.10</b>	<b>.62</b>
Mackinnon & Sherry (2012)	CES-D	.17	.13	.63	.17	.00	.52
	PANAS-NA	.17	.09	.61	.19	.09	.43
	POMS-D	.17	.09	.53	.13	-.10	.63
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.17</b>	<b>.10</b>	<b>.59</b>	<b>.16</b>	<b>.00</b>	<b>.53</b>
Sherry et al. (2014)	DACLE	.18	.24	.47	.15	.21	.50
	DACLG	.18	.24	.48	.11	.21	.54

	POMS-D	.18	.21	.47	.07	.16	.61
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.23</b>	<b>.47</b>	<b>.11</b>	<b>.19</b>	<b>.55</b>
Socially prescribed perfectionism							
	Measure	$r_{SPP_1, N_1}$	$r_{SPP_1, DEP_1}$	$r_{N_1, DEP_1}$	$SPP_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$	$N_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$	$DEP_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$
Békés et al. (2015)	BDI	.32	.35	.32	.08	-.06	.49
	HAM-D	.32	.23	.24	.32	.08	.17
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.32</b>	<b>.29</b>	<b>.28</b>	<b>.20</b>	<b>.01</b>	<b>.34</b>
Enns et al. (2001)	BDI-SF	.47	.25	.57	.06	.31	.21
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.47</b>	<b>.25</b>	<b>.57</b>	<b>.06</b>	<b>.31</b>	<b>.21</b>
Enns et al. (2005)	BDI	.46	.39	.60	.14	.01	.57
	PANAS-NA	.46	.36	.55	.19	.23	.29
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.46</b>	<b>.38</b>	<b>.58</b>	<b>.17</b>	<b>.12</b>	<b>.44</b>
Graham et al. (2010)	CES-D-SF	.24	.24	.55	.13	.08	.64
	DASS-D	.24	.14	.48	.15	.08	.51
	SCLR-D	.24	.22	.52	.13	.06	.65
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.24</b>	<b>.20</b>	<b>.52</b>	<b>.14</b>	<b>.07</b>	<b>.60</b>
Mackinnon & Sherry (2012)	CES-D	.33	.37	.63	.09	.01	.51
	PANAS-NA	.33	.34	.61	.10	.10	.41
	POMS-D	.33	.32	.53	.08	-.10	.62
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.33</b>	<b>.34</b>	<b>.59</b>	<b>.09</b>	<b>.00</b>	<b>.52</b>
Mackinnon et al. (2012) men	CES-D	.18	.27	.54	.07	.19	.56
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.27</b>	<b>.54</b>	<b>.07</b>	<b>.19</b>	<b>.56</b>
Mackinnon et al. (2012) women	CES-D	.12	.18	.54	.04	.11	.60
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.12</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.54</b>	<b>.04</b>	<b>.11</b>	<b>.60</b>
Sherry et al. (2013)	CES-D	.12	.24	.50	.19	.14	.42
	DASS-D	.12	.28	.46	.20	.06	.36
	SCL90R-D	.12	.31	.52	.16	.21	.39
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.12</b>	<b>.28</b>	<b>.49</b>	<b>.18</b>	<b>.14</b>	<b>.39</b>
Sherry et al. (2014)	DACLG	.35	.44	.48	.20	.18	.48
	DACLE	.35	.40	.47	.28	.16	.44
	POMS-D	.35	.38	.47	.16	.13	.58
	<b>Overall</b>	<b>.35</b>	<b>.41</b>	<b>.47</b>	<b>.21</b>	<b>.16</b>	<b>.50</b>

*Note.* COM = concern over mistakes; DAA = doubts about actions; PA = perfectionistic attitudes; PS = personal standards; SC = self-criticism; SOP = self-oriented perfectionism; SPP = socially prescribed perfectionism; N = neuroticism;  $x_1$  = baseline variable;  $x_2$  = follow-up variable;  $r_{x_1, y_1}$  = bivariate correlation between baseline variables;  $COM_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$  = standardized beta for concern over mistakes predicting follow-up depressive symptoms (controlling for baseline depressive symptoms, neuroticism);  $N_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$  = standardized beta for neuroticism predicting follow-up depressive symptoms (controlling for baseline depressive symptoms, concern over mistakes);  $DEP_1 \rightarrow DEP_2$  = standardized beta for depressive symptoms predicting follow-up depressive symptoms (controlling for baseline neuroticism, concern over mistakes). D = depression; NA = negative affect; BDI = Beck, Ward, & Mendelson's (1961) Beck Depression Inventory; BDI-SF = Beck and Beck's (1972) short form of Beck et al.'s (1961) Beck Depression Inventory; CES = Radloff's (1977) Center for Epidemiological Studies Scale; CES-SF = Radloff's (1977) Center for Epidemiological Studies Scale Short Form; DACLG = Lubin's (1965) Depression Adjective Checklist Form G; DACLE = Lubin's (1965) Depression Adjective Checklist Form E. DASS = Lovibond and Lovibond's (1995) Depression, Anxiety, and Stress Scales; HAM-D = Hamilton's (1960) Hamilton Depression Rating Scale; LIFEPCR = Keller et al.'s (1987) Longitudinal Interval Follow-up Evaluation; PAI = Morey's (1991) Personality Assessment Inventory; PANAS = Watson et al.'s (1988) Positive and Depressive Affect Scale; POMS = McNair et al.'s (1992) Profile of Mood States; SCL90R = Derogatis and Lazarus' (1994) Symptom Checklist-Revised

Table 3

*Summary of effect sizes for the relationship between perfectionism dimensions, neuroticism, and depressive symptoms*

Variable	<i>k</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>r</i> <sup>+</sup>	95% CI	<i>Q<sub>T</sub></i>	<i>F</i> <sup>2</sup> (%)
Neuroticism						
<sup>+</sup> N <sub>1</sub> ,DEP <sub>1</sub>	11	1758	.51 <sup>***</sup>	[.47, .55]	13.43	25.55
Concern over mistakes						
<sup>+</sup> COM <sub>1</sub> ,N <sub>1</sub>	9	1555	.38 <sup>***</sup>	[.28, .47]	39.61 <sup>***</sup>	79.80
<sup>+</sup> COM <sub>1</sub> ,DEP <sub>1</sub>	9	1555	.36 <sup>***</sup>	[.27, .45]	30.44 <sup>***</sup>	73.72
N <sub>1</sub> →DEP <sub>2</sub>	9	1402	.13 <sup>***</sup>	[.08, .19]	9.07	11.83
DEP <sub>1</sub> →DEP <sub>2</sub>	9	1402	.50 <sup>***</sup>	[.42, .56]	21.38 <sup>**</sup>	62.58
<b>COM<sub>1</sub>→DEP<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1402</b>	<b>.10<sup>***</sup></b>	<b> [.05, .15]</b>	<b>4.82</b>	<b>0.00</b>
Doubts about actions						
<sup>+</sup> DAA <sub>1</sub> ,N <sub>1</sub>	6	1056	.52 <sup>***</sup>	[.43, .60]	19.39 <sup>**</sup>	74.21
<sup>+</sup> DAA <sub>1</sub> ,DEP <sub>1</sub>	6	1056	.48 <sup>***</sup>	[.43, .53]	5.29	5.43
N <sub>1</sub> →DEP <sub>2</sub>	6	914	.10 <sup>***</sup>	[.03, .18]	6.65	6.65
DEP <sub>1</sub> →DEP <sub>2</sub>	6	914	.46 <sup>***</sup>	[.38, .54]	11.83 <sup>*</sup>	57.74
<b>DAA<sub>1</sub>→DEP<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>6</b>	<b>914</b>	<b>.13<sup>***</sup></b>	<b> [.07, .19]</b>	<b>4.02</b>	<b>0.00</b>
Perfectionistic attitudes						
<sup>+</sup> PA <sub>1</sub> ,N <sub>1</sub>	3	250	.59 <sup>***</sup>	[.50, .67]	1.26	0.00
<sup>+</sup> PA <sub>1</sub> ,DEP <sub>1</sub>	3	250	.19 <sup>***</sup>	[.07, .31]	0.43	0.00
N <sub>1</sub> →DEP <sub>2</sub>	3	250	.15 <sup>***</sup>	[.02, .27]	2.16	7.28
DEP <sub>1</sub> →DEP <sub>2</sub>	3	250	.24 <sup>***</sup>	[.12, .36]	1.50	0.00
<b>PA<sub>1</sub>→DEP<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>3</b>	<b>250</b>	<b>.24<sup>***</sup></b>	<b> [.11, .35]</b>	<b>1.95</b>	<b>0.00</b>
Personal standards						
<sup>+</sup> PS <sub>1</sub> ,N <sub>1</sub>	6	948	.19 <sup>***</sup>	[.13, .25]	1.05	0.00
<sup>+</sup> PS <sub>1</sub> ,DEP <sub>1</sub>	6	948	.21 <sup>***</sup>	[.13, .29]	5.53	33.58
N <sub>1</sub> →DEP <sub>2</sub>	6	809	.14 <sup>***</sup>	[.06, .22]	6.76	26.05
DEP <sub>1</sub> →DEP <sub>2</sub>	6	809	.48 <sup>***</sup>	[.39, .57]	7.84 <sup>*</sup>	61.84
<b>PS<sub>1</sub>→DEP<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>6</b>	<b>809</b>	<b>.10<sup>**</sup></b>	<b> [.04, .17]</b>	<b>2.45</b>	<b>0.00</b>
Self-criticism						
<sup>+</sup> SC <sub>1</sub> ,N <sub>1</sub>	5	883	.39 <sup>***</sup>	[.33, .44]	7.90	49.38
<sup>+</sup> SC <sub>1</sub> ,DEP <sub>1</sub>	5	883	.34 <sup>***</sup>	[.22, .46]	14.90 <sup>**</sup>	73.16
N <sub>1</sub> →DEP <sub>2</sub>	5	861	.14 <sup>***</sup>	[.06, .21]	2.12	0.00

DEP <sub>1</sub> →DEP <sub>2</sub>	5	861	.51 <sup>***</sup>	[.46, .56]	5.16	22.47
<b>SC<sub>1</sub>→DEP<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>5</b>	<b>861</b>	<b>.14<sup>***</sup></b>	<b> [.07, .20]</b>	<b>2.59</b>	<b>0.00</b>
Self-oriented perfectionism						
<sup>r</sup> SOP <sub>1</sub> ,N <sub>1</sub>	6	948	.19 <sup>***</sup>	[.12, .25]	5.37	6.88
<sup>r</sup> SOP <sub>1</sub> ,DEP <sub>1</sub>	6	948	.18 <sup>***</sup>	[.11, .24]	1.95	0.00
N <sub>1</sub> →DEP <sub>2</sub>	6	809	.09 <sup>*</sup>	[.02, .16]	4.45	0.00
DEP <sub>1</sub> →DEP <sub>2</sub>	6	809	.49 <sup>***</sup>	[.38, .58]	15.95 <sup>**</sup>	68.65
<b>SOP<sub>1</sub>→DEP<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>6</b>	<b>809</b>	<b>.08<sup>*</sup></b>	<b> [.01, .15]</b>	<b>3.97</b>	<b>0.00</b>
Socially prescribed perfectionism						
<sup>r</sup> SPP <sub>1</sub> ,N <sub>1</sub>	9	1555	.28 <sup>***</sup>	[.19, .36]	25.73 <sup>***</sup>	68.91
<sup>r</sup> SPP <sub>1</sub> ,DEP <sub>1</sub>	9	1555	.26 <sup>***</sup>	[.20, .32]	13.40	40.28
N <sub>1</sub> →DEP <sub>2</sub>	9	1402	.11 <sup>***</sup>	[.06, .17]	8.12	1.42
DEP <sub>1</sub> →DEP <sub>2</sub>	9	1402	.49 <sup>***</sup>	[.42, .56]	22.37 <sup>**</sup>	64.24
<b>SPP<sub>1</sub>→DEP<sub>2</sub></b>	<b>9</b>	<b>1402</b>	<b>.13<sup>***</sup></b>	<b> [.07, .18]</b>	<b>5.36</b>	<b>0.00</b>

Note.  $k$  = number of studies;  $N$  = total number of participants in the  $k$  samples;  $r^+$  = weighted mean  $r$ ;  $CI$  = confident interval;  $Q_T$  = measure of heterogeneity of effect sizes;  $I^2$  = percentage of heterogeneity; COM = concern over mistakes; DAA = doubts about actions; PA = perfectionistic attitudes; PS = personal standards; SC = self-criticism; SOP = self-oriented perfectionism; SPP = socially prescribed perfectionism; N = neuroticism; DEP = Depressive symptoms;  $x_1$  = baseline variable;  $x_2$  = follow-up variable;  $r_{x_1}, r_{y_1}$  = bivariate correlation between baseline variables; COM<sub>1</sub>→DEP<sub>2</sub> = standardized beta for concern over mistakes predicting follow-up depressive symptoms (controlling for baseline depressive symptoms, neuroticism); N<sub>1</sub>→DEP<sub>2</sub> = standardized beta for neuroticism predicting follow-up depressive symptoms (controlling for baseline depressive symptoms, concern over mistakes); <sup>r</sup>DEP<sub>1</sub>→DEP<sub>2</sub> = standardized beta for depressive symptoms predicting follow-up depressive symptoms (controlling for baseline neuroticism, concern over mistakes).  
<sup>\*</sup> $p < .05$ ; <sup>\*\*</sup> $p < .01$ ; <sup>\*\*\*</sup> $p < .001$ .