

Est.
1841

YORK
ST JOHN
UNIVERSITY

Hill, Andrew P. ORCID:

<https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6370-8901>, Madigan, Daniel J. ORCID:

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9937-1818> and Jowett, Gareth E.

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4004-2857> (2020)

Perfectionism and athlete engagement: A multi-sample test of the 2 × 2 model of perfectionism. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*.

Downloaded from: <http://ray.yorks.ac.uk/id/eprint/4425/>

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://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1469029219306235>

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

1 Perfectionism and athlete engagement: A multi-sample test of the 2×2 model
2 of perfectionism

3

4 Andrew P. Hill¹, Daniel J. Madigan¹, & Gareth E. Jowett²

5 ¹York St John University, UK

6 ²Leeds Beckett University, UK

7

8

9

10

11

Author note

12 Andrew P. Hill, School of Science, Technology, and Health, York St John
13 University; Daniel J. Madigan, School of Science, Technology, and Health, York
14 St John University; Gareth E. Jowett, Carnegie School of Sport, Leeds Beckett
15 University.

16

17 Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to School of Science,
18 Technology, and Health, York St John University, Lord Mayor's Walk, York,
19 YO31 7EX, UK.

20 E-mail: a.hill@yorks.ac.uk

Abstract

Few studies have examined how perfectionism relates to athlete engagement. In addition, the studies that do exist have focused on the main effects of dimensions of perfectionism as opposed to their interactive effects. The first purpose of the study was therefore to examine the interactive effects of dimensions of perfectionism in predicting athlete engagement and, in doing so, test the hypotheses of the 2×2 model of perfectionism. The second purpose of the study was to examine whether support for the 2×2 model depended on the instrument used to measure perfectionism. Three samples of junior and adult athletes from various sports (total $N = 730$) completed a measures of perfectionism indicative of personal standards perfectionism (PSP) and evaluative concerns perfectionism (ECP) (HF-Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale, Cox, Enns, & Clara, 2002; Sport-Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale-2, Gotwals, Dunn, Causgrove Dunn, & Gamache, 2011; Multidimensional Inventory of Perfectionism for Sport, Stoeber et al. 2007), as well as a measure of athlete engagement (Athlete Engagement Questionnaire, Lonsdale, Hodge & Jackson, 2007). Moderated regression analyses provided support for the hypotheses of the 2×2 model for some facets of engagement but not others. Generally, pure PSP (high PSP/low ECP) was associated with the highest levels of athlete engagement and pure ECP (low PSP/high ECP) was associated with the lowest levels of athlete engagement. Support for the 2×2 model also differed depending on the instrument used to measure perfectionism. Overall, the findings suggest that the 2×2 model may explain differences between athletes in levels of engagement. However, these differences will depend on which indicators of PSP and ECP are examined.

Keywords: vigor; dedication; confidence; enthusiasm; sport

1 associated with need satisfaction and the presence of more internalised, optimal, motivation
2 (Lonsdale et al., 2007b).

3 **Perfectionism**

4 Researchers have begun to examine the role of perfectionism in the development of
5 athlete engagement (e.g., Jowett, Hill, Hall, & Curran, 2016). Perfectionism is a personality
6 trait of excessively high standards accompanied by overly critical evaluation (Frost et al.,
7 1990). There are several models and instruments available to measure perfectionism. The
8 three most popular in sport have been developed by Dunn et al. (2006; Gotwals & Dunn,
9 2009), Stoeber, Otto, Pescheck, Becker, and Stoll (2007), and Hewitt and Flett (1991). Dunn
10 et al. (2006) adapted a model from outside of sport by Frost et al (1990) that included high
11 personal standards and an array of other dimensions, notably, “overconcern” for errors and
12 mistakes, doubts about the quality of performance, and perceived pressures from others.
13 Stoeber et al.’s (2007) proposed a model with only two dimensions. Like Dunn et al., the first
14 dimension focused on high personal standards, specifically, striving for perfection. The other
15 dimension focused on extreme negative reactions when perfection is not obtained – feelings
16 of stress, depression, anger, frustration, and dissatisfaction (Stoeber et al., 2007). The final
17 model by Hewitt and Flett (1991) is more distinct from the other two approaches because it
18 focused on sources of perfectionistic standards and critical evaluation that can be imposed by
19 the self (self-oriented perfectionism), imposed by others (socially prescribed perfectionism)
20 or imposed on others (other-oriented perfectionism).

21 In order to integrate these different models and instruments, researchers have also
22 studied perfectionism via two higher-order factors. The first higher-order factor is personal
23 standards perfectionism (PSP), also referred to as perfectionistic strivings, and entails a
24 personal commitment to exacting standards with elements of stringent self and other-
25 evaluation. This factor is measured using a collection of the lower-order dimensions from the

1 different models of perfectionism and can include high personal standards, striving for
2 perfection, and self-oriented perfectionism (Dunn et al., 2009; Hewitt & Flett, 1991; Stoeber
3 et al., 2007). The second higher-order factor is evaluative concerns perfectionism (ECP), also
4 referred to as perfectionistic concerns, and entails beliefs that others are imposing
5 perfectionistic standards on the self and engage in harsh self-evaluation. Like PSP, ECP is
6 measured using a collection of lower-order dimensions that can include concern over
7 mistakes, negative reactions to imperfection, and socially prescribed perfectionism (Dunn et
8 al., 2009; Hewitt & Flett, 1991; Stoeber et al., 2007).

9 Initial research in sport focused on studying the two higher-order dimensions and their
10 subdimensions independently. Studying them in this way involved examining the two
11 dimensions separately and often in a manner that focused on their unique effects (see Hill,
12 Mallinson-Howard, & Jowett, 2018, for a review). More recently researchers have begun to
13 examine the interactive effects of PSP and ECP. That is, how the presence of combinations of
14 high and low levels of the two dimensions may increase or decrease their effects on various
15 outcomes (e.g., self-worth, enjoyment, friendship quality; Mallinson, Hill, Hall, & Gotwals,
16 2014). In doing so, this research has typically adopted the 2×2 model of perfectionism
17 (Gaudreau & Thompson, 2010). The 2×2 model is based on the notion that PSP and ECP
18 coexist to varying degrees within each individual. Moreover, different subtypes or within-
19 person combinations of perfectionism can be differentiated and correspond with different
20 aetiologies, motivational processes, and outcomes.

21 As described by Gaudreau and Thompson (2010), there are four within-person
22 combinations of perfectionism in the 2×2 model. The first within-person combination is
23 non-perfectionism (low PSP/low ECP) and reflects neither perceived social pressure nor
24 personal orientation towards perfectionistic standards. The second within-person combination
25 is pure PSP (high PSP/low ECP) and reflects a uniquely personal and internally regulated

1 orientation towards perfectionistic standards. The third within-person combination is pure
2 ECP (low PSP/high ECP) and reflects a uniquely social orientation and externally regulated
3 pressure towards perfectionistic standards. The final within-person combination is mixed
4 perfectionism (high PSP/high ECP) and reflects both personal and social, internally and
5 externally regulated, orientations towards perfectionistic standards.

6 Four accompanying hypotheses are used to test the 2×2 model. The first hypothesis
7 is multipronged and states that based on a comparison of pure PSP and non-perfectionism,
8 pure PSP is associated with (H1a) better adjustment, (H1b) worse adjustment, or (H1c) the
9 same adjustment. The second hypothesis states that, as pure ECP is the most externally or
10 socially regulated, it should be the most detrimental within-person combination as illustrated
11 via comparison to non-perfectionism (Gaudreau & Verner-Fillon, 2012). The third hypothesis
12 states that, as a partially internalised within-person combination of perfectionism, mixed
13 perfectionism should be associated with better adjustment when compared to pure ECP. This
14 hypothesis also reflects the assumption that the presence of high PSP will buffer the presence
15 of higher ECP. Finally, the fourth hypothesis states that mixed perfectionism is associated
16 with poorer adjustment when compared to pure personal standards perfectionism, which is an
17 internally regulated within-person combination of perfectionism.

18 Hill and Madigan (2017) recently conducted a review of studies that examined the $2 \times$
19 2 model in sport, exercise and dance. Of the nine studies reviewed, five were in athletes.
20 These studies examined a range of criterion variables including cognitive appraisals, affect,
21 coping, vitality, life satisfaction, burnout, enjoyment, physical self-worth, and friendship
22 quality. Across all nine studies, based on effect size estimates H1a was supported 81% of the
23 time and contradicted 19% of the time (H1b). H2 was supported 91% of the time and
24 unsupported 9% of the time. H3 was supported 77% of the time and unsupported 23% of the
25 time. And, H4 was supported 91% of the time and unsupported 9% of the time. In other

1 words, although not without exception, the hypotheses of the 2×2 model tended to be
2 supported and within-person combinations were identifiable in a manner reflecting the
3 specific configurations of ECP and PSP most of the time. The 2×2 model therefore appears
4 to be a useful framework that can be used to distinguish between perfectionistic athletes in
5 regard to their experiences in sport.

6 **Perfectionism and Athlete Engagement**

7 There are two main reasons to expect within-person combinations of perfectionism to
8 differ in regard to athlete engagement. First, all four within-person combinations of
9 perfectionism have motivational underpinnings that vary in degrees of internalisation and
10 corresponding propensities for functional outcomes (Deci & Ryan, 2008). This notion mirrors
11 current understanding of athlete engagement in a manner that one would expect internally
12 regulated within-person combinations of perfectionism (e.g., pure PSP) to be more likely to
13 promote athlete engagement than externally regulated within-person combinations of
14 perfectionism (e.g., pure ECP). Second, research findings suggest that propensity for different
15 functional outcomes of the four within-person combinations of perfectionism extends to
16 antecedents of athlete engagement, notably, psychological need fulfilment (Mallinson & Hill,
17 2011). Specifically, the presence of high ECP has been found to undermine psychological
18 needs of autonomy, competence and relatedness (possibly because it includes perceptions of
19 external pressure and criticism from others). By contrast, when ECP is controlled for, the
20 presence of high PSP has been found to satisfy psychological needs of autonomy,
21 competence, and relatedness (possibly because of a greater sense of control and agency it
22 encompasses).

23 Researchers have yet to directly examine the 2×2 model in regard to athlete
24 engagement. However, there is indirect evidence that can be drawn upon to hypothesise about
25 the likely relationships. For example, research has examined the 2×2 model in relation to

1 concepts similar to athlete engagement such as vitality (Gaudreau & Verner-Fillion, 2012),
2 positive affect (Crocker et al., 2014), and enjoyment (Mallinson et al., 2014). Research has
3 also examined the conceptual opposite of athlete engagement, athlete burnout (Hill, 2014).
4 The most direct evidence available has been provided by the only study in sport to examine
5 the relationship between perfectionism and athlete engagement (Jowett et al., 2016).
6 Although this study did not test the hypotheses of the 2×2 model, the findings of this study
7 can be interpreted retrospectively using the 2×2 model (see Gaudreau, 2012). When this is
8 done, support is found for hypotheses H1a and H3, but not H2 and H4. That is, pure PSP was
9 associated with higher engagement than non-perfectionism and mixed perfectionism was
10 associated with higher engagement than pure ECP. Building on this research, and testing the
11 hypotheses of the 2×2 model in relation to athlete engagement directly, is the first purpose
12 of the current study.

13 **Different Indicators**

14 A further issue worth investigating is whether different subdimensions or indicators of
15 PSP and ECP influence the relationship between within-person combinations of
16 perfectionism and athlete engagement. This is the case because researchers regularly use
17 different indicators of perfectionism in research and doing so may produce different findings.
18 On one hand, indicators of the same higher-order dimension might be expected to perform
19 similarly. This tendency has been described as functional homogeneity by Gaudreau (2016)
20 and is one of the assumptions of the higher-order model. On the other hand, dimensions of
21 perfectionism can vary widely in their content. This variability is especially evident for ECP
22 that can include dimensions that focus on the self (e.g., concerns of mistakes, “If I fail in
23 competition, I feel like a failure as a person”) or on others (e.g., coach pressure, “Only
24 outstanding performance in competition is good enough for my coach”). As such, when

1 different indicators of ECP and PSP are used, we might expect the within-person
2 combinations of perfectionism to display different relationships with outcome variables.

3 Evidence for this possibility was recently been provided by a meta-analytical study in
4 sport. It was found that the instrument used to measure perfectionism moderated the
5 relationship between perfectionism and variables such as motivation regulation, goal
6 orientation, and performance (Hill et al., 2018). Some indicators of PSP and ECP, then, have
7 different relationships depending on the instrument used and the outcome variable examined.
8 There is also evidence that alludes to similar effects for athlete engagement from research
9 that has tested the 2×2 model in sport. Specifically, comparison of the findings of research
10 that has examined the opposite of athlete engagement, athlete burnout, has indicated that
11 support for the 2×2 model and its four hypotheses may depend, at least partly, on the
12 instrument used to measure perfectionism (see Hill, 2013 vs Madigan, Stoeber, & Passfield,
13 2016).

14 **The Present Study**

15 Researchers have yet to examine the 2×2 model in relation to athlete engagement.
16 Therefore, the first purpose of the present study was to examine the interactive effects of
17 perfectionism on athlete engagement. In doing so, the hypotheses of the 2×2 model of
18 perfectionism were tested. The first hypothesis was that pure PSP would be associated with
19 higher athlete engagement (H1a). The second hypothesis was that pure ECP perfectionism
20 would be associated with the lowest level of athlete engagement (H2). The third hypothesis
21 was that mixed perfectionism would be associated with higher athlete engagement than pure
22 ECP (H3). The fourth hypothesis was that mixed perfectionism would be associated with
23 lower athlete engagement than pure PSP (H4). In addition, as researchers have recently found
24 that the use of different indicators of PSP and ECP can influence the degree of support for the
25 hypotheses of the 2×2 model, the second purpose of the present study was to test whether

1 this was the case in regard to athlete engagement. We offer no hypotheses in this regard as
2 this part of the study was considered exploratory.

3 **Method**

4 **Participants**

5 Sample one were 297 junior swimmers (M age 15.16 yrs, $SD = 1.93$; 127 males and
6 159 females) recruited from recreational clubs. They reported that they trained and competed
7 on average for 5.54 hrs per week ($SD = 2.78$ hrs) and had been competing for 4.14 years (SD
8 $= 2.50$ years).

9 Sample two were 222 junior athletes (M age 16.01 yrs, $SD = 2.68$; 98 males and 124
10 females) recruited from various sports that included football ($n = 61$), rugby ($n = 47$) cricket
11 ($n = 17$), swimming ($n = 62$), synchronised swimming ($n = 20$), diving ($n = 14$), and golf ($n =$
12 1). They reported that they trained and competed on average for 9.51 hrs per week ($SD = 4.54$
13 hrs) and had been competing for 7.21 years ($SD = 3.53$ years). Sample two has been used
14 previously in a published piece of research (Blinded for Peer Review).

15 Sample three were 211 adult athletes (M age 18.9 yrs, $SD = 1.38$; 139 males and 72
16 females) was recruited from university teams and sports clubs in a range of sports that
17 included football ($n = 123$), triathlon ($n = 11$), rugby ($n = 10$), netball ($n = 9$), hockey ($n = 7$),
18 cricket ($n = 6$), and other sports (e.g., basketball, athletics; $n = 45$). They reported that they
19 trained and competed on average for 8.42 hours per week ($SD = 6.23$) and had been
20 competing for 8.79 years ($SD = 4.52$ years).

21 **Design and Procedures**

22 A cross-sectional, questionnaire-based, design was employed in the current study
23 using a mix of purposeful (athletes) and convenience sampling (local clubs willing to allow
24 us to distribute questionnaires) was used. Local sports clubs were contacted with information
25 regarding the study. Questionnaires were then distributed to participants in paper-and-pencil

1 format. Participants typically completed questionnaires at training sessions. Some completed
2 the questionnaires at home and returned them via post. Coaches and parents were sometimes
3 present when the questionnaires were distributed but questionnaires were completed
4 independently by the participants. Questionnaires were completed once by participants. Three
5 instruments were included in the questionnaires to measure perfectionism. The brief version
6 of Hewitt and Flett's (1991) Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (HF-MPS, Cox, Enns, &
7 Clara, 2002), Dunn et al.'s Sport-Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale-2 (S-MPS-2;
8 Gotwals et al., 2009) and Stoeber et al.'s (2007) Multidimensional Inventory of Perfectionism
9 in Sport (MIPS). In sample one we compared HF-MPS and MIPS; in sample two we
10 compared HF-MPS and S-MPS-2; and in sample three we compared MIPS and S-MPS-2. In
11 doing so, we were able to examine all possible comparisons of the three most popular
12 instruments used to measure perfectionism in sport across three independent samples: HF-
13 MPS vs MIPS, HF-MPS vs S-MPS-2, and MIPS vs S-MPS-2. Ethical approval was granted
14 for the research from an institutional review board. In all cases, participants provided consent
15 based upon an information sheet/consent form prior to taking part in the study.
16 Parental/guardian consent was gained when participants were under 18 years old.

17 **Instruments**

18 **Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale-Brief (HF-MPS).** The brief version of the
19 Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (Hewitt & Flett, 1991) includes three subscales, two of
20 which were used in the current study to assess self-oriented perfectionism (SOP; 5-items,
21 e.g., "I set very high standards for myself") and socially prescribed perfectionism (SPP; 5-
22 items, e.g., "My family expects me to be perfect"). Athletes respond on a 7-point Likert scale
23 (1 = *strongly disagree* to 7 = *strongly agree*). The instructions of the instrument were adapted
24 to focus athletes on sport when completing the scale as opposed to their general life ("The
25 following items ask you to think about when you are practicing or playing your sport").

1 Evidence for the validity and reliability of the scores of this instrument has been provided by
2 Cox et al. (2002) via assessment of factor structure and internal reliability. The shortened
3 subscales are also strongly related to the original subscales (Cox et al., 2002).

4 **Multidimensional Inventory of Perfectionism in Sport (MIPS).** The MIPS
5 includes two subscales that assess striving for perfection (SP; 5-items, e.g., “I strive to be as
6 perfect as possible”) and negative reactions to imperfection (NRI; 5-items, e.g., “I feel
7 extremely stressed if everything does not go perfectly”). Both were used in the current study.
8 Athletes respond to items on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly*
9 *agree*). Evidence for the validity and reliability of the scores of this instrument has been
10 provided by Madigan (2016) via assessment of factorial structure and internal consistency.

11 **Sport-Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale-2 (S-MPS-2).** The S-MPS-2 is a
12 domain specific adaption of Frost et al.’s (1990) Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale and
13 includes six subscales (Dunn et al., 2006; Gotwals et al., 2009). Two subscales were used in
14 the current study to assess personal standards (PS; 7-items, e.g., “I have extremely high goals
15 for myself in my sport”) and concern over mistakes (COM; 8-items, e.g., “If I fail in
16 competition, I feel like a failure in person”). Athletes respond to items on a 5-point Likert
17 scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). Evidence for the validity and reliability of
18 the scores of this instrument has been provided Dunn and colleagues (Dunn et al., 2006;
19 Gotwals et al., 2009) via assessment of factorial structure and internal consistency.

20 **Athlete Engagement Questionnaire (AEQ).** Athlete engagement was measured
21 using the AEQ (Lonsdale, Hodge & Jackson, 2007b). This instrument includes four subscales
22 that assess confidence (4-items, e.g., “I believe I am capable of accomplishing my goals in
23 sport.”); dedication (4-items, e.g., “I am dedicated to achieving my goals in sport.”); vigour
24 (4-items, e.g., “I feel energised when I participate in my sport.”) and enthusiasm (4-items,
25 e.g., “I am enthusiastic about my sport.”). Items are measured on a 5-point Likert scale (1 =

1 *almost never* to 7 = *almost always*). Evidence for the validity and reliability of this instrument
2 has been provided by Lonsdale et al. (2007b) via assessment of factorial structure and
3 internal consistency.

4 **Analytical strategy**

5 The 2 × 2 model was tested following the guidelines provided by Gaudreau (2012;
6 Gaudreau & Thompson, 2010). Each dimension of athlete engagement was regressed on
7 dimensions of perfectionism (e.g., PS and CM) and their interaction. Dimensions of
8 perfectionism were centered and entered as a predictor block (Step 1) followed by a predictor
9 block that included the two dimensions of perfectionism and their interaction term (Step 2).
10 As per the recommendation of Gaudreau (2012), when the interaction term was not
11 statistically significant, a multiple regression was conducted that included only dimensions of
12 perfectionism (uncentered) and was interpreted. In each case, predicted values of athlete
13 engagement that corresponded with each within-person combinations were calculated. In the
14 absence of a significant interaction term, hypotheses were interpreted using the operational
15 framework provided by Gaudreau (2012). In the presence of a significant interaction term,
16 two sets of simple slopes were calculated to enable comparison of the predicted values and
17 test the hypotheses: PSP and athlete engagement at low (−1 SD; hypothesis 1) and high (+1
18 SD; hypothesis 3) ECP, and ECP and athlete engagement at low (−1 SD; hypothesis 2) and
19 high (+1 SD; hypothesis 4) PSP. Estimates of regression coefficients are accompanied by
20 95% percentile bootstrapped confidence intervals (based on 1000 resamples) as they are
21 considered very robust under various conditions relating to the assumptions of regression
22 analyses (Williams, Grajales, & Kurkiewicz, 2013). All analyses were conducted using SPSS
23 (version 24) and PROCESS macro (version 3.3; Hayes, 2013).

24 **Results**

25 **Preliminary Analysis**

1 All three samples were assessed for missing values. For sample one, three participants
2 were removed due to a large amount of missing data (>5%). Thereafter, 19 participants had
3 missing data for one item (15 unique patterns). Missing values were replaced by the mean of
4 available responses for that individual on the variable (ipsatised item replacement, which is
5 considered a reasonable and practical solution when missing data at item level is low,
6 Graham, Cumsille, & Elek-Fisk, 2003). Two participants were removed as univariate outliers
7 (z-score 3.29) and five as multivariate outliers, $\chi^2(8) = 26.13, p < .001$. For sample two, two
8 participants had missing data larger than 5%. Thereafter, 32 participants had missing data for
9 one item (10 unique patterns) and 3 participants had missing data for 2 items (3 unique
10 patterns). Missing values were replaced by ipsatised item replacement. Six were removed as
11 univariate outliers (z-score 3.29) and two removed as multivariate outliers, $\chi^2(8) = 26.13, p <$
12 $.001$. For sample three, three participants were removed due to a large amount of missing data
13 (>5%). Thereafter, 13 participants had missing data for one item. Again, missing values were
14 replaced by ipsatised item replacement. No participants were removed as univariate outliers
15 and five participants were removed as multivariate outliers, $\chi^2(8) = 24.32, p < .001$.

16 **Descriptive Statistics and Bivariate Correlations**

17 Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations are displayed in Table 1. Mean levels
18 of indicators of PSP were typically higher than indicators of ECP. Levels of engagement
19 were similar across samples. In all cases, indicators of PSP and ECP were positively
20 correlated with each other. Indicators of ECP were either unrelated or negatively related to
21 athlete engagement. By contrast, indicators of PSP were typically positively related to athlete
22 engagement. Two notable exceptions in this regard are found in sample one where the
23 relationships for one indicator of PSP (striving for perfection) was mixed (positive and
24 negative relationships) and in sample three where one indicator of ECP (negative reactions to
25 imperfection) was positively related to engagement (dedication).

1 **Moderated Hierarchical Regressions**

2 **Sample one (HF-MPS vs MIPS)**

3 *Confidence.* For HF-MPS, there was no significant interaction term when predicting
4 confidence. Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 283)$
5 $= 27.80, p < .001, R^2 = 16.4\%$. SOP ($B = 0.27, 95\% \text{ CI} = 0.19 \text{ to } 0.35, t = 7.42, p < .001$) and
6 SPP ($B = -0.08, 95\% \text{ CI} = -0.14 \text{ to } -0.02, -t = -2.67, p = .008$) significantly predicted
7 confidence. This pattern of effects provides support for H1a and all other hypotheses.

8 For MIPS, there was no significant interaction term when predicting confidence.
9 Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 283) = 5.08, p =$
10 $.010, R^2 = 3.5\%$. Neither SP ($B = 0.02, 95\% \text{ CI} = -0.11 \text{ to } 0.16, t = 0.31, p = .754$) or NRI (B
11 $= -.11, 95\% \text{ CI} = -0.23 \text{ to } 0.00, t = -1.89, p = .060$) uniquely predicted confidence. This
12 pattern of effects provides support for H1c and none of the other hypotheses.

13 *Dedication.* For HF-MPS, there was no significant interaction term when predicting
14 dedication. Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 283)$
15 $= 32.21, p < .001, R^2 = 18.5\%$. SOP ($B = 0.30, 95\% \text{ CI} = 0.22 \text{ to } 0.39, t = 7.98, p < .001$) and
16 SPP ($B = -0.09, 95\% \text{ CI} = -0.16 \text{ to } -0.02, t = -2.82, p = .005$) significantly predicted
17 dedication. This pattern of effects provides support for H1a and all other hypotheses.

18 For MIPS, there was no significant interaction term when predicting dedication.
19 Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 283) = 3.10, p =$
20 $.047, R^2 = 2.1\%$. Neither SP ($B = 0.04, 95\% \text{ CI} = -0.11 \text{ to } 0.19, t = 0.07, p = .565$) or NRI (B
21 $= -.11, 95\% \text{ CI} = -0.25 \text{ to } 0.04, t = -1.73, p = .085$) uniquely predicted confidence. This
22 pattern of effects provides support for H1c and none of the other hypotheses.

23 *Vigour.* For HF-MPS, there was no significant interaction term when predicting
24 vigour. Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 283) =$
25 $7.10, p = .001, R^2 = 4.8\%$. SOP significantly predicted vigour ($B = 0.17, 95\% \text{ CI} = 0.07 \text{ to}$

1 0.26, $t = 3.65$, $p < .001$) but ECP did not ($B = -0.03$, 95% CI = -0.11 to 0.05, $t = -0.80$, $p =$
2 .426). This pattern of effects provides support for H1a and H3.

3 For MIPS, there was no significant interaction term when predicting vigour.
4 Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 283) = 7.14$, $p =$
5 .001, $R^2 = 4.8\%$. PSP did not significantly predict vigour ($B = 0.07$, 95% CI = -0.07 to 0.22, t
6 = 0.98, $p = .33$) but ECP did ($B = -.19$, 95% CI = -0.32 to -0.06, $t = -2.70$, $p = .007$). This
7 pattern of effects provides support for H1c, H2 and H4.

8 *Enthusiasm.* For HF-MPS, there was no significant interaction term when predicting
9 enthusiasm. Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 283)$
10 = 3.35, $p = .037$, $R^2 = 2.3\%$. SOP ($B = 0.12$, 95% CI = 0.03 to 0.21, $t = 2.50$, $p = .013$)
11 predicted enthusiasm but SPP did not ($B = -0.07$, 95% CI = -0.15 to 0.02, $t = -1.72$, $p = .086$).
12 This pattern of effects provides support for H1a and H3.

13 For MIPS, there was no significant interaction term when predicting enthusiasm.
14 Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 283) = 14.14$, $p <$
15 .001, $R^2 = 9.1\%$. PSP did not significantly predict vigour ($B = 0.06$, 95% CI = -0.09 to 0.23, t
16 = 0.81, $p = .418$) but ECP did ($B = -.25$, 95% CI = -0.37 to -0.11, $t = -3.98$, $p = .001$). This
17 pattern of effects provides support for H1c, H2 and H4.

18 **Sample two (HF-MPS vs S-MPS-2)**

19 *Confidence.* For HF-MPS, there was no significant interaction term when predicting
20 confidence. Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 209)$
21 = 16.49, $p < .001$, $R^2 = 13.6\%$. SOP ($B = 0.31$, 95% CI = 0.20 to 0.42, $t = 5.74$, $p < .001$)
22 predicted confidence but SPP did not ($B = -0.07$, 95% CI = -0.16 to 0.02, $t = -1.49$, $p = .138$).
23 This pattern of effects provides support for H1a and H3.

24 For S-MPS-2, there was no significant interaction term when predicting confidence.
25 Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 209) = 19.63$, $p >$

1 .001, $R^2 = 15.8\%$. Both PS ($B = 0.50$, 95% CI = 0.35 to 0.65, $t = 6.20$, $p > .001$) and CM ($B =$
2 -0.21 , 95% CI = -0.37 to -0.06 , $t = -2.89$, $p = .004$) predicted confidence. This pattern of
3 effects provides support for H1a and all other hypotheses.

4 *Dedication.* For HF-MPS, there was a significant interaction term when predicting
5 dedication, initial $R^2 = .25$, $F(3, 208) = 23.51$, R^2 change = .03, $F(2, 208) = 7.72$, $p = .006$,
6 interaction $B = 0.13$, 95% CI = 0.02 to 0.21, $t = 2.78$, $p = .006$. Examination of simple slopes
7 revealed that SOP at low SPP was significant ($B = .22$, 95% CI = 0.09 to 0.35, $t = 3.34$, p
8 $= .001$; supporting H1a), SOP at high SPP was significant ($B = .47$, 95% CI = 0.35 to 0.59, $t =$
9 7.55 , $p < .001$; supporting H3), SPP at low SOP was significant ($B = -.22$, 95% CI = -0.32 to $-$
10 0.11 , $t = -4.07$, $p < .001$; supporting H2), and SPP at high SPP was not significant ($B = -.003$,
11 95% CI = -0.11 to 0.11 , $t = -0.58$, $p = .954$; rejecting H4).

12 For S-MPS-2, there was no significant interaction term when predicting dedication.
13 Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 209) = 32.39$, $p <$
14 $.001$, $R^2 = 23.7\%$. Both PS ($B = 0.53$, 95% CI = 0.39 to 0.67, $t = 7.80$, $p > .001$) and CM (B
15 $= -0.18$, 95% CI = 0.31 to -0.04 , $t = -2.93$, $p = .004$) predicted confidence. This pattern of
16 effects provides support for H1a and all other hypotheses.

17 *Vigour.* For HF-MPS, there was no significant interaction term when predicting
18 vigour. Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 209) =$
19 7.91 , $p < .001$, $R^2 = 7.0\%$. SOP significantly predicted vigour ($B = 0.23$, 95% CI = 0.11 to
20 0.35 , $t = 3.96$, $p < .001$) but ECP did not ($B = -0.06$, 95% CI = -0.16 to 0.04 , $t = -1.17$, $p =$
21 $.242$). This pattern of effects provides support for H1a and H3.

22 For S-MPS-2, there was no significant interaction term when predicting vigour.
23 Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 283) = 7.63$, $p =$
24 $.001$, $R^2 = 6.8\%$. PS ($B = 0.34$, 95% CI = 0.15 to 0.53, $t = 3.87$, $p > .001$) significantly

1 predicted vigour but CM ($B = -0.15$, 95% CI = -0.31 to 0.03, $t = -1.85$, $p = .066$) did not. This
2 pattern of effects provides support for H1a and H3.

3 *Enthusiasm.* For HF-MPS, there was a significant interaction term when predicting
4 enthusiasm, initial $R^2 = .08$, $F(3, 208) = 5.67$, R^2 change = .02, $F(2, 208) = 4.76$, $p = .030$,
5 interaction $B = 0.12$, 95% CI = 0.01 to 0.21, $t = 2.18$, $p = .030$). Examination of simple slopes
6 revealed that SOP at low SPP was not significant ($B = 0.08$, 95% CI = -0.09 to 0.20, $t = 0.77$,
7 $p = .444$; supporting H1c), SOP at high SPP was significant ($B = 0.28$, 95% CI = 0.14 to 0.42,
8 $t = 3.98$, $p < .001$; supporting H3), SPP at low SOP was significant ($B = -.16$, 95% CI = -0.28
9 to -0.04, $t = -2.55$, $p = .012$; supporting H2), and SPP at high SOP was not significant (B
10 $= -0.04$, 95% CI = -0.09 to 0.16, $t = 0.58$, $p = .560$; rejecting H4).

11 For S-MPS-2, there was no significant interaction term when predicting enthusiasm.
12 Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 209) = 5.51$, $p =$
13 $.005$, $R^2 = 5.0\%$. PS significantly predicted enthusiasm ($B = 0.25$, 95% CI = 0.09 to 0.41, $t =$
14 3.25 , $p = .001$) but CM did not ($B = -0.09$, 95% CI = -0.24 to 0.06, $t = -1.35$, $p = .178$). This
15 pattern of effects provides support for H1a and H3.

16 **Sample three (MIPS vs S-MPS-2)**

17 *Confidence.* For MIPS, there was no significant interaction term when predicting
18 confidence. Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 200)$
19 $= 16.33$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = 14.0\%$. Both SP ($B = 0.32$, 95% CI = 0.21 to 0.44, $t = 5.69$, $p < .001$)
20 and NRI significantly predicted self-confidence ($B = -0.18$, 95% CI = -0.32 to -0.06, $t = -$
21 2.91 , $p = .004$). This pattern of effects provides support for H1a and all other hypotheses.

22 For S-MPS-2, there was no significant interaction term when predicting confidence.
23 Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 200) = 31.97$, $p <$
24 $.001$, $R^2 = 24.2\%$. Both PS ($B = 0.42$, 95% CI = 0.33 to 0.52, $t = 7.99$, $p < .001$) and CM (B

1 = -0.16, 95% CI = -0.28 to -0.06, $t = -3.11$, $p = .002$) significantly predicted confidence. This
2 pattern of effects provides support for H1a and all other hypotheses.

3 *Dedication.* For MIPS, there was no significant interaction term when predicting
4 dedication. Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 200)$
5 = 16.12, $p < .001$, $R^2 = 20.7\%$. SP ($B = 0.37$, 95% CI = 0.27 to 0.48, $t = 6.61$, $p < .001$)
6 significantly predicted dedication but NRI did not ($B = -0.09$, 95% CI = -0.19 to 0.01, $t = -$
7 1.40, $p = .163$). This pattern of effects provides support for H1a and H3.

8 For S-MPS-2, there was no significant interaction term when predicting dedication.
9 Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 200) = 56.33$, $p <$
10 $.001$, $R^2 = 36.0\%$. Both PS ($B = 0.52$, 95% CI = 0.43 to 0.60, $t = 10.45$, $p < .001$) and CM (B
11 = -0.13, 95% CI = -0.23 to -0.05, $t = -2.79$, $p = .006$) significantly predicted dedication. This
12 pattern of effects provides support for H1a and all other hypotheses.

13 *Vigour.* For MIPS, there was no significant interaction term when predicting vigour.
14 Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 200) = 8.63$, $p <$
15 $.001$, $R^2 = 7.0\%$. SP significantly predicted vigour ($B = 0.28$, 95% CI = 0.13 to 0.43, $t = 4.03$,
16 $p < .001$) but NRI did not ($B = -0.11$, 95% CI = -0.25 to 0.05, $t = -1.47$, $p = .142$). This
17 pattern of effects provides support for H1a and H3.

18 For S-MPS-2, there was no significant interaction term when predicting vigour.
19 Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 200) = 22.45$, $p <$
20 $.001$, $R^2 = 18.3\%$. Both PS ($B = 0.42$, 95% CI = 0.29 to 0.55, $t = 6.69$, $p < .001$) and CM ($B =$
21 0.16, 95% CI = -0.28 to -0.04, $t = -2.57$, $p = .011$) significantly predicted vigour. This pattern
22 of effects provides support for H1a and all other hypotheses.

23 *Enthusiasm.* For MIPS, there was no significant interaction term when predicting
24 enthusiasm. Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 200)$
25 = 9.39, $p < .001$, $R^2 = 7.0\%$. SP significantly predicted vigour ($B = 0.22$, 95% CI = 0.11 to

1 0.33, $t = 4.13$, $p < .001$) but NRI did not ($B = -0.08$, 95% CI = -0.19 to 0.04, $t = -1.28$, $p =$
2 .203). This pattern of effects provides support for H1a and H3.

3 For S-MPS-2, there was no significant interaction term when predicting enthusiasm.
4 Excluding the interaction term, the model was statistically significant, $F(2, 200) = 17.97$, $p <$
5 .001, $R^2 = 15.2\%$. PS ($B = 0.30$, 95% CI = 0.20 to 0.40, $t = 5.88$, $p < .001$) significantly
6 predicted enthusiasm but CM did not ($B = -0.07$, 95% CI = -0.17 to 0.15, $t = -1.47$, $p = .114$).
7 This pattern of effects provides support for H1a and H3.

8 Discussion

9 The first purpose of the present study was to examine the interactive effects of
10 perfectionism on athlete engagement and test the hypotheses of the 2×2 model of
11 perfectionism. In regard to the findings, the first hypothesis that pure PSP would be
12 associated with higher athlete engagement than non-perfectionism (H1a) was supported 19
13 times of 24 (79%; H1b was not supported at all and H1c was supported 5 times). The second
14 hypothesis that pure ECP perfectionism would be associated with the lowest level of athlete
15 engagement (H2) was supported 12 times of 24 (50%). The third hypothesis was that mixed
16 perfectionism would be associated with higher athlete engagement than pure ECP (H3) was
17 supported 20 times of 24 (83%). The fourth hypothesis that mixed perfectionism would be
18 associated with lower athlete engagement than pure PSP (H4) was supported 10 times of 24
19 (42%).

20 Perfectionism and Athlete Engagement

21 As evidenced by these findings, overall, there was mixed support across the three
22 samples for the notion that different within-person combinations predict varying degrees of
23 athlete engagement. However, consistent with the 2×2 model, typically, pure PSP was
24 associated with the highest levels of athlete engagement and pure ECP was associated with
25 the lowest level of athlete engagement. As such, the findings suggest that there is merit in

1 differentiating between at least some within-person combinations of perfectionism when
2 considering likely levels of athlete engagement. In this regard, the findings of the current
3 study align with previous examinations of the 2×2 model and outcomes similar to
4 engagement, specifically (vitality, positive affect, and enjoyment; Crocker et al., 2014;
5 Gaudreau & Verner-Filion, 2011; Mallinson et al., 2014).

6 The lower levels of support for hypothesis 2 and hypothesis 4 in comparison to the
7 other two hypotheses is especially noteworthy in regard to the mixed findings. It appears that
8 the presence of high ECP (versus low ECP) is not always sufficient to distinguish between
9 perfectionistic athletes in terms of engagement. However, the presence of high PSP (versus
10 low PSP) is typically sufficient to do so. In other words, the current study is more supportive
11 of the notion that higher PSP may be comparatively more beneficial for athletes in regard to
12 engagement than the notion that higher ECP is comparatively more problematic. Consider the
13 comparison of mixed perfectionism and pure ECP, for example. There was typically no
14 significant difference between the two combinations in athlete engagement despite the
15 discernible levels of ECP. This finding contrasts to the comparison between mixed
16 perfectionism and pure ECP which were typically different in athlete engagement and levels
17 of PSP.

18 In regard to revisiting the proposed motivational underpinnings of athlete
19 engagement, the relationships between within-person combinations of perfectionism and
20 athlete engagement are, at least to some degree, consistent with the idea that the development
21 of engagement may reflect the presence of optimal versus suboptimal motivation.
22 Specifically, using SDT as an explanatory framework, Lonsdale et al. (2007b) proposed that
23 athlete engagement develops when psychological needs are satisfied and more internalised,
24 optimal, forms of motivation are evident. In the current study, comparing mixed
25 perfectionism (a combination of internally and externally regulated) with pure ECP

1 (externally regulated) and comparing pure PSP (internally regulated) with non-perfectionism
2 (relative absence of both internal and external regulation). Specifically, we found that athlete
3 engagement was lower when the presence of internal regulation was lower. Thus, the notion
4 that the development of athlete engagement, and the nuances of the perfectionism-
5 engagement relationship, is reflective of underlying motivational quality remains a strong
6 possibility.

7 **Different Indicators and 2×2 model of perfectionism**

8 The second purpose of the present study was to examine the hypotheses of the 2×2
9 model when using different indicators of PSP and ECP. The findings revealed that when
10 testing the 2×2 model, different indicators of ECP and PSP produce different findings. This
11 trend was evident in all samples – only on three occasions (of 12 sets of comparisons; 25%)
12 were findings replicated exactly within samples using different instruments. One notable
13 example of how findings differed can be found in sample one for H1 and H3. In sample one,
14 H1a and H3 were supported when using HF-MPS on all occasions but not on any occasion
15 when using MIPS. In this regard, the expected buffering effect of high PSP was captured only
16 by SOP but not by SP. In a further example, in sample two, interactions were evident when
17 using HF-MPS but not when using S-MPS-2 (dedication and enthusiasm). Specifically, there
18 were no comparative costs of high ECP vs low ECP for dedication when using HF-MPS but
19 there was when using S-MPS-2 (hypothesis 4; pure PSP vs mixed perfectionism). Similarly,
20 in this sample, some of the proposed benefits of pure PSP were not evident for enthusiasm
21 when using HF-MPS but were evident when using S-MPS-2 (hypothesis 1; pure PSP vs non-
22 perfectionism).

23 These findings have implications for those interested in the 2×2 model. Gaudreau
24 and Verner-Fillion (2012) have encouraged the use of different indicators of perfectionism
25 when testing the 2×2 model. Our findings indicate that researchers will need to be cautious

1 when doing so. Different indicators may not be interchangeable, and findings may not
2 generalise between indicators and studies. When one considers the distinctive features of
3 different dimensions of perfectionism this is understandable. For example, self-oriented
4 perfectionism has long been considered more destructive than other subdimensions of
5 perfectionism and indicators of PSP (Flett & Hewitt, 2007). Similarly, one might expect
6 notably different effects when using indicators focused on personal mistakes or personal
7 reactions to imperfection to assess ECP than when using indicators focused on perceived
8 pressures from others. Again, the latter have typically be found to be more debilitating in
9 research (Hill et al., 2018). With this in mind, we encourage researchers to select the most
10 appropriate model and dimensions of perfectionism (e.g., MIPS, HF-MPS, or S-MPS-2)
11 given the phenomena of interest when deciding upon which approach to take when testing the
12 2×2 model of perfectionism.

13 **Practical Implications**

14 The introduction of the concept of engagement to sport was in part motivated by the
15 desire to provide a framework for the promotion of positive sport experiences, rather than
16 simply attempting to reduce negative experiences (Hodge et al., 2009). Based on the
17 proposed antecedents of athlete engagement, Hodge et al. (2009) suggested that practitioners
18 seeking to promote greater engagement in their athletes will need to provide environments
19 that foster psychological need fulfilment and highlighted practical guidelines to help do so
20 (e.g., Mageau & Vallerand, 2003). Since their suggestion, we are not aware of any
21 interventions that have evaluated the effects of this type of intervention on athlete
22 engagement but other similar SDT intervention work has been effective (e.g., Tessier,
23 Sarrazin, & Ntoumanis, 2010). Our findings suggest that perfectionistic athletes will display
24 engagement to varying degrees. In this regard, those athletes who display higher levels of
25 evaluative concerns perfectionism (concern over mistakes, negative reactions to imperfection,

1 and socially prescribed perfectionism) may display the lowest levels of engagement and
2 therefore benefit most from environments that promote psychological need satisfaction.
3 Moreover, given the focus on establishing an authentic sense of self in a relational context,
4 we speculate that these environments may also be effective in reducing evaluative concerns
5 perfectionism in young athletes directly.

6 **Limitations and Other Future Directions**

7 The study has a number of limitations that require consideration. First, we caution
8 against generalisability to populations outside of the current sample characteristics. There is
9 evidence that the effects of perfectionism may depend on a range of factors including gender,
10 age and sport, for example (Hill et al., 2018). This possibility also means that differences in
11 support for the 2×2 model between samples may be in part due to differences in these
12 factors not the instruments (though this possibility does not account for differences found
13 within each sample). Second, the observed effects may also differ across domains (sport vs
14 education; e.g., Hill & Curran, 2016). This possibility, too, will need to be examined in
15 future research. Third, the degree to which differences in support for the 2×2 model
16 observed here related specifically to athlete engagement is unclear. Similar tests are required
17 for other outcomes variables, burnout being a logical starting point given that it is considered
18 the conceptual opposite of engagement and the availability of existing data. Finally, in terms
19 of furthering our understanding of the perfectionism-engagement relationship, longitudinal
20 studies are required in the same manner as has begun with research on the 2×2 model and
21 athlete burnout (e.g., Madigan et al., 2016).

22 **Conclusion**

23 Evidence continues to emerge that suggests that the 2×2 model of perfectionism can
24 be used to differentiate between athletes in regard to their experiences in sport. Here, we
25 found evidence that this is the case, to some degree, in relation to athlete engagement.

1 However, we also found evidence that support for the 2 × 2 model depended on the indicators
2 of perfectionism examined. Some hypotheses were supported when using some indicators of
3 perfectionism but not supported when using others. Researchers will need to be mindful of
4 this issue when testing the hypotheses of the 2 × 2 model in relation to athlete engagement
5 and other outcomes in future research.

11 **References**

- 12 Cox, B. J., Enns, M. W., & Clara, I. P. (2002). The multidimensional structure of
13 perfectionism in clinically distressed and college student samples. *Psychological*
14 *Assessment, 14*, 365-373.
- 15 Crocker, P. R., Gaudreau, P., Mosewich, A. D., & Kljajic, K. (2014). Perfectionism and the
16 stress process in intercollegiate athletes: Examining the 2× 2 model of perfectionism in
17 sport competition. *International Journal of Sport Psychology, 45*, 61-84.
- 18 Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2002). An overview of self-determination theory: An organismic
19 dialectical perspective. In E. L. Deci & R. M. Ryan (Eds.), *Handbook of self-*
20 *determination research* (pp. 3-36). Rochester, NY: University of Rochester Press.
- 21 Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2008). Facilitating optimal motivation and psychological well-
22 being across life's domains. *Canadian Psychology, 49*, 14-23.
- 23 Diener, E. (2003). What is positive about positive psychology: The curmudgeon and
24 pollyanna. *Psychological Inquiry, 14*, 115–120.

- 1 Dunn, J. G. H., Causgrove Dunn, J., Gotwals, J. K., Vallance, J. K. H., Craft, J. M., &
2 Syrotuik, D. G. (2006). Establishing construct validity evidence for the Sport
3 Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 7, 57–79.
- 4 Flett, G. L., & Hewitt, P. L. (2007). When does conscientiousness become perfectionism.
5 *Current Psychiatry*, 6, 49-64.
- 6 Frost, R. O., Marten, P., Lahart, C., & Rosenblate, R. (1990). The dimensions of
7 perfectionism. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 5, 449-468.
- 8 Gaudreau, P. (2012). A methodological note on the interactive and main effects of dualistic
9 personality dimensions: An example using the 2 × 2 model of perfectionism.
10 *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52, 26-31.
- 11 Gaudreau, P. (2016). The 2× 2 model of perfectionism in sport, dance, and exercise. In A. P.
12 Hill (Ed.), *The psychology of perfectionism in sport, dance and exercise* (pp. 190-216).
13 London, Routledge. Gaudreau, P., & Thompson, A. (2010). Testing a 2 × 2 model of
14 dispositional perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48, 532-537.
- 15 Gaudreau, P. & Verner-Filion, J. (2012) Dispositional perfectionism and well-being: A test of
16 the 2 × 2 model of perfectionism in the sport domain. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance*
17 *Psychology*, 1, 29-43.
- 18 Gotwals, J. K., Dunn, J. G. H., Causgrove Dunn, J., & Gamache, V. (2011). Establishing
19 validity evidence for the Sports Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale-2 in
20 intercollegiate sport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 11, 423-432.
- 21 Gould, D. (2002). Sport psychology in the new millennium: The psychology of athletic
22 excellence and beyond. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 14, 137–139.
- 23 Graham, J. W., Cumsille, P. E., & Elek-Fisk, E. (2003). Methods for handling missing data.
24 In J. A. Schinka & W. F. Velicer (Eds.), *Research methods in psychology* (pp. 87-112).
25 New York, NY: Wiley.

- 1 Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process*
2 *analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford Publications.
- 3 Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1991). Perfectionism in the self and social contexts:
4 Conceptualization, assessment and association with psychopathology. *Journal of*
5 *Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*, 456-470.
- 6 Hill, A. P. (2013). Perfectionism and athlete burnout: A test of the 2 × 2 model of
7 dispositional perfectionism. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, *35*, 18-29.
- 8 Hill, A. P., & Curran, T. (2016). Multidimensional perfectionism and burnout: A meta-
9 analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *20*, 269-288.
- 10 Hill, A. P., & Madigan, D. J. (2017). A short review of perfectionism in sport, dance and
11 exercise: Out with the old, in with the 2 × 2. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *16*, 72-77.
- 12 Hill, A. P., Mallinson-Howard, S. H., & Jowett, G. E. (2018). Multidimensional
13 perfectionism in sport: A meta-analytical review. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance*
14 *Psychology*, *7*, 235-270.
- 15 Jowett, G. E., Hill, A. P., Hall, H. K., & Curran, T. (2016). Perfectionism, burnout and
16 engagement in youth sport: The mediating role of basic psychological
17 needs. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *24*, 18-26.
- 18 Hodge, K., Lonsdale, C., & Jackson, S. A. (2009). Athlete engagement in elite sport: An
19 exploratory investigation of antecedents and consequences. *The Sport Psychologist*, *23*,
20 186-202.
- 21 Lonsdale, C., Hodge, K., & Raedeke, T. (2007a). Athlete engagement: I. A qualitative
22 investigation of relevance and dimensions. *International Journal of Sport Psychology*,
23 *38*, 451-470.

- 1 Lonsdale, C., Hodge, K., & Jackson, S. A. (2007b). Athlete engagement: II. Developmental
2 and initial validation of the Athlete Engagement Questionnaire. *International Journal*
3 *of Sport Psychology*, 38, 471-492.
- 4 Madigan, D. J. (2016). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Multidimensional Inventory of
5 Perfectionism in Sport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 26, 48-51.
- 6 Madigan, D. J., Stoeber, J., & Passfield, L. (2016). Perfectionism and changes in athlete
7 burnout over three months: Interactive effects of personal standards and evaluative
8 concerns perfectionism. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 26, 32-39.
- 9 Mallinson, S. H., & Hill, A. P. (2011). The relationship between multidimensional
10 perfectionism and psychological need thwarting in junior sports participants.
11 *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 12, 676-684.
- 12 Mallinson, S. H., Hill, A. P., Hall, H. K., & Gotwals, J. K. (2014). The 2× 2 model of
13 perfectionism and school- and community-based sport participation. *Psychology in*
14 *the Schools*, 51(9), 972-985.
- 15 Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in*
16 *motivation, development, and wellness*. New York: Guilford Publications.
- 17 Stoeber, J., Otto, K., Pescheck, E., Becker, C., & Stoll, O. (2007). Perfectionism and
18 competitive anxiety in athletes: Differentiating striving for perfection and negative
19 reactions to imperfection. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42, 959-969.
- 20 Tessier, D., Sarrazin, P., & Ntoumanis, N. (2010). The effect of an intervention to improve
21 newly qualified teachers' interpersonal style, students motivation and psychological
22 need satisfaction in sport-based physical education. *Contemporary Educational*
23 *Psychology*, 35, 242-253.

- 1 Williams, M. N., Grajales, C. A. G., & Kurkiewicz, D. (2013). Assumptions of multiple
2 regression: Correcting two misconceptions. *Practical Assessment, Research &*
3 *Evaluation, 18*, 1-14.

4

Journal Pre-proof

Running head: PERFECTIONISM AND ENGAGEMENT

1 Table 1 – Descriptive statistics and bivariate correlation coefficients

| | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | α | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
|---------------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|--------|--------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| Sample 1 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Striving for perfection | 4.53 | 1.01 | .93 | | | | | | | |
| 2. Negative reactions to imperfection | 4.44 | 1.07 | .91 | .86** | | | | | | |
| 3. Self-oriented perfectionism | 5.32 | 0.97 | .83 | -.01 | -.06 | | | | | |
| 4. Socially prescribed perfectionism | 4.68 | 1.13 | .81 | .08 | .07 | .44** | | | | |
| 5. Confidence | 4.10 | 0.57 | .70 | -.15* | -.19** | .37** | .04 | | | |
| 6. Dedication | 4.18 | 0.60 | .77 | -.11 | -.14** | .39** | .05 | .79** | | |
| 7. Vigor | 3.89 | 0.67 | .79 | .15** | -.21** | .20** | .05 | .68** | .63** | |
| 8. Enthusiasm | 3.85 | 0.70 | .80 | -.23** | -.30** | .10 | -.04 | .61** | .48** | .81** |
| Sample 2 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Personal standards | 3.43 | 0.67 | .81 | | | | | | | |
| 2. Concern over mistakes | 2.85 | 0.75 | .83 | .58** | | | | | | |
| 3. Self-oriented perfectionism | 5.15 | 0.84 | .56 | .65** | .40** | | | | | |
| 4. Socially prescribed perfectionism | 3.29 | 0.98 | .66 | .27** | .54** | .21** | | | | |
| 5. Confidence | 3.92 | 0.69 | .83 | .35** | .06 | .36** | -.02 | | | |

Running head: PERFECTIONISM AND ENGAGEMENT

| | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|------|------|-----|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|
| 6. Dedication | 4.24 | 0.61 | .80 | .45** | .12 | .44** | -.08 | .72** | | |
| 7. Vigor | 3.92 | 0.72 | .87 | .23** | .03 | .25** | -.02 | .69** | .70** | |
| 8. Enthusiasm | 4.25 | 0.63 | .80 | .20** | .05 | .21** | -.05 | .66** | .69** | .74** |
| Sample 3 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1. Striving for perfection | 3.25 | 0.91 | .88 | | | | | | | |
| 2. Negative reactions to imperfection | 2.71 | 0.82 | .80 | .57** | | | | | | |
| 3. Personal standards | 3.31 | 0.84 | .87 | .73** | .49** | | | | | |
| 4. Concern over mistakes | 2.71 | 0.87 | .86 | .47** | .75** | .43** | | | | |
| 5. Confidence | 4.23 | 0.64 | .88 | .32** | .03 | .45** | .02 | | | |
| 6. Dedication | 4.32 | 0.66 | .91 | .45** | .18** | .58** | .11 | .77** | | |
| 7. Vigor | 4.03 | 0.75 | .88 | .26** | .07 | .40** | .02 | .70** | .71** | |
| 8. Enthusiasm | 4.35 | 0.59 | .83 | .28** | .09 | .38** | .08 | .71** | .78** | .81** |

1 Notes. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Running head: PERFECTIONISM AND ENGAGEMENT

1 *Table 2* – Final main and interaction models for multiple samples and instruments

| | Indicator of PS | | | Indicator of ECP | | | Interaction effect | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------|-----------|---------|------------------|-----------|---------|--------------------|-----------|---------|
| | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | β | <i>B</i> | <i>SE</i> | β |
| Sample 1: HF-MPS | | | | | | | | | |
| Confidence | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.27** | 0.04 | .45 | -0.08* | 0.03 | -.16 | | | |
| Dedication | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.30** | 0.03 | .48 | -0.09* | 0.04 | -.17 | | | |
| Vigour | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.17** | 0.05 | .24 | -0.03 | 0.04 | -.05 | | | |
| Enthusiasm | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.12* | 0.05 | .16 | -0.07 | 0.04 | -.11 | | | |
| Sample 1: MIPS | | | | | | | | | |
| Confidence | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.02 | 0.07 | .04 | -0.11 | 0.06 | -.22 | | | |
| Dedication | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.04 | 0.07 | .07 | -0.11 | 0.07 | -.20 | | | |
| Vigour | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.07 | 0.08 | .11 | -0.19** | 0.07 | -.31 | | | |
| Enthusiasm | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.06 | 0.08 | .09 | -0.25** | 0.07 | -.38 | | | |
| Sample 2: HF-MPS | | | | | | | | | |
| Confidence | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.31** | 0.05 | .38 | -0.07 | 0.05 | -.10 | | | |
| Dedication | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 2 | 0.34** | 0.05 | .47 | -0.11 | 0.04 | -.18 | .12* | .05 | .17 |
| Vigour | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.23** | 0.06 | .27 | -0.06 | 0.05 | -.08 | | | |
| Enthusiasm | | | | | | | | | |

Running head: PERFECTIONISM AND ENGAGEMENT

| | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--------|------|-----|---------|------|------|------|-----|-----|
| Step 2 | 0.17** | 0.05 | .23 | -0.06 | 0.04 | -.10 | .12* | .05 | .15 |
| Sample 2: S-MPS-2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Confidence | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.50** | 0.08 | .48 | -0.21** | 0.07 | -.23 | | | |
| Dedication | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.53** | 0.07 | .58 | -0.18** | 0.06 | -.22 | | | |
| Vigour | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.34** | 0.09 | .32 | -0.15 | 0.08 | -.15 | | | |
| Enthusiasm | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.09** | 0.07 | .27 | -0.09 | 0.07 | -.11 | | | |
| Sample 3: MIPS | | | | | | | | | |
| Confidence | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.32** | 0.06 | .46 | -0.18** | 0.06 | -.22 | | | |
| Dedication | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.37** | 0.06 | .51 | -0.09 | 0.06 | -.11 | | | |
| Vigour | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.28** | 0.07 | .33 | -0.11 | 0.08 | -.12 | | | |
| Enthusiasm | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.22** | 0.05 | .34 | -0.08 | 0.06 | -.11 | | | |
| Sample 3: S-MPS-2 | | | | | | | | | |
| Confidence | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.42** | 0.05 | .54 | -0.16** | 0.05 | -.21 | | | |
| Dedication | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.51** | 0.05 | .65 | -0.13** | 0.05 | -.17 | | | |
| Vigour | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.42** | 0.06 | .47 | -0.16* | 0.06 | -.18 | | | |
| Enthusiasm | | | | | | | | | |
| Step 1 | 0.30** | 0.05 | .42 | -0.07 | 0.05 | -.11 | | | |

Running head: PERFECTIONISM AND ENGAGEMENT

- 1 Notes. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. PSP = Personal standards perfectionism. ECP = Evaluative concerns
- 2 perfectionism. Step 1 = predictor block of PSP and ECP, Step 2 = predictor block of PSP, ECP, and interaction
- 3 term. When interaction term was not significant ($p < .05$), Step 1 is displayed.

Journal Pre-proof

Table 3. Summary of supported for hypotheses of the 2 × 2 model of perfectionism

| | Hypothesis 1 Pure PSP vs. non-perfectionism | Hypothesis 2 Non-perfectionism vs. Pure ECP | Hypothesis 3 Mixed perfectionism vs. Pure ECP | Hypothesis 4 Pure PSP vs. Mixed perfectionism |
|----------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| Sample 1: HF-MPS / MIPS | | | | |
| Confidence | H1a / H1c | * / ns | * / ns | * / ns |
| Dedication | H1a / H1c | * / ns | * / ns | * / ns |
| Vigour | H1a / H1c | ns / * | * / ns | ns / * |
| Enthusiasm | H1a / H1c | ns / * | * / ns | ns / * |
| Sample 2: HF-MPS / S-MPS-2 | | | | |
| Confidence | H1a / H1a | ns / * | * / * | ns / * |
| Dedication | H1a / H1a | * / * | * / * | ns / * |
| Vigour | H1a / H1a | ns / ns | * / * | ns / ns |
| Enthusiasm | H1c / H1a | * / ns | * / * | ns / ns |
| Sample 3: MIPS / S-MPS-2 | | | | |
| Confidence | H1a / H1a | * / * | * / * | * / * |
| Dedication | H1a / H1a | ns / * | * / * | ns / * |
| Vigour | H1a / H1a | ns / * | * / * | ns / * |
| Enthusiasm | H1a / H1a | ns / ns | * / * | ns / ns |

Note. * denotes a significant difference between two subtypes in the predicted direction ($p < .05$) and so the hypothesis is supported; ns denotes a non-significant difference between two subtypes ($p > .05$) and so the hypothesis is unsupported; PSP = personal standards perfectionism; ECP = evaluative concerns perfectionism




Figure 1. Graphical representation of differences between perfectionism subtypes for Sample 1 (HF-MPS and MIPS).




Figure 2. Graphical representation of differences between perfectionism subtypes for Sample 2 (HF-MPS and S-MPS-2).




Figure 3. Graphical representation of differences between perfectionism subtypes for Sample 1 (MIPS and S-MPS-2).

Highlights

- Perfectionism subtypes are related to different levels of athlete engagement.
- The relationships depend on the dimension of athlete engagement examined.
- The relationships depend on the instrument used to measure perfectionism.

Journal Pre-proof

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Journal Pre-proof