Est.	YORK
1841	ST JOHN
	UNIVERSITY

# Hill, Andrew P. ORCID logoORCID:

https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6370-8901, Madigan, Daniel J. ORCID logoORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9937-1818 and Olamaie, Malak ORCID logoORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8129-2521 (2021) Combined effects, total unique effects and relative weights of perfectionism. Personality and Individual Differences, 183 (111136).

Downloaded from: https://ray.yorksj.ac.uk/id/eprint/5402/

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/S0191886921005158

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 <u>ray@yorksj.ac.uk</u>

1	Hill, A. P., Madigan, D. J., & Olamaie (in press). Combined Effects, Total Unique Effects
2	and Relative Weights of Perfectionism. Personality and Individual Differences. [Accepted
3	version]. Accepted: 10-07-2021.
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	Combined Effects, Total Unique Effects and Relative Weights of Perfectionism
12	
13	Andrew D. Hill Daniel I. Madigan, & Malak Olamaia
14	Andrew P. Hill, Daniel J. Madigan, & Malak Olamale
15	York St John University, UK
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20	
21	Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Andrew Hill, School of
22	Science Technology and Health, York St. John University, Lord Mayor's Walk, York, YO31
23	7EX, UK. E-mail: <u>a.hill@yorksj.ac.uk</u>
~ ^	

1

# Abstract

It has recently been argued that because the major two dimensions of perfectionism 2 (perfectionistic strivings and perfectionistic concerns, PS and PC) can have opposing effects, 3 4 the "combined effect" should be calculated to understand whether, overall, perfectionism is neutral, adaptive, or maladaptive. In this methodological note we revisit the task of 5 disentangling the overall effects of PS and PC. In doing so, we illustrate a new and alternative 6 7 approach – calculation of the total unique effect and the relative weights of PS and PC. The total unique effect is the simplest way of ascertaining whether perfectionism is neutral, 8 9 adaptive, or maladaptive. However, like the combined effect, it does not convey information regarding the relative importance of PS and PC. Calculating the relative weights of PS and 10 PC does so and provides a fuller account of the overall effect of perfectionism and the precise 11 12 role of each dimension when predicting a given outcome. We close the paper by applying this approach to a range of outcomes reported in recent meta-analyses in this area. In doing so, 13 perfectionism is revealed to be primarily maladaptive and rarely adaptive or neutral, with the 14 relative contribution of perfectionistic concerns being the main reason why this is the case. 15

1

#### **Combined Effects, Total Unique Effects and Relative Weights of Perfectionism**

Perfectionism is multidimensional – at its broadest level including two-higher-order 2 dimensions of perfectionistic strivings (PS) and perfectionistic concerns (PC). PS capture 3 unrealistically or exceedingly high personal standards and striving for perfection and PC 4 capture concern over mistakes, fear of imperfection, feelings of discrepancy from personal 5 standards, and negative reactions to imperfection (Stoeber, Madigan, & Gonidis, 2020). The 6 7 two dimensions are typically positively correlated and, sometimes, highly positively correlated with effects medium-to-large in size most common. However, they can also have 8 9 opposing effects. That is, PS and PC can be related to the same outcomes in the same way (e.g., depression, eating disorders, and workaholism; Harari et al., 2018; Limburg et al., 10 2017) but can also be related to other outcomes in the opposite way (e.g., academic 11 achievement, burnout, procrastination; Hill & Curran, 2016; Madigan, 2019; Sirois, Molnar, 12 & Hirsch, 2017). 13

When the two dimensions have opposing effects, is perfectionism adaptive, 14 maladaptive, or neutral? To answer this question, Stoeber et al. (2020) recently argued that 15 the "combined effect" (CE) of perfectionism should be calculated. Couched within the  $2 \times 2$ 16 model of perfectionism (Gaudreau & Thompson, 2010), Stoeber and colleagues (2020) 17 defined the CE as the difference between a mixed subtype of perfectionism (high PS + high 18 PC) and a non-perfectionism subtype of perfectionism (low PS + low PC);  $CE = 2(\beta_{PS} + \beta_{PC})$ . 19 20 Thereafter, they illustrated different ways the CE can be calculated and how it varies as a function of the relationships of PS [r(PS,Y)] and PC [r(PC,Y)] with the outcome variable (Y) 21 and the relationship between PS and PC [r(PC, PS)]. Finally, they provided useful examples 22 23 of neutral, adaptive, and maladaptive combined effects from published research. Stoeber et al. (2020) have provided a novel and innovative way to study perfectionism 24

as a multidimensional characteristic and ascertain its overall effects without having to adopt a

unidimensional approach (i.e., using a total perfectionism score). The CE is particularly 1 useful to those who wish to compare subtypes of perfectionism in the  $2 \times 2$  model, essentially 2 adding a new a priori comparison and hypothesis to the model (Hypothesis 5: mixed 3 perfectionism will be associated with worse outcomes than non-perfectionism). The CE is 4 also useful for those who wish to test the comparative benefits of perfectionism in a 5 standalone manner outside of the  $2 \times 2$  model and simply want to know whether it is typically 6 7 better or worse to be more perfectionistic. In these regards, the CE is a welcome addition to perfectionism research. 8

9 These strengths aside, the CE is only one way to answer the question of whether, perfectionism is, overall, neutral, adaptive, or maladaptive. It will not always be the most 10 appropriate way to answer this question which will depend on the precise research question. 11 12 Notably, too, it relies on a "pick-a-point" approach to creating the two combinations of perfectionism that may not be desirable or optimal when studying perfectionism (see Hill, 13 2021). With this in mind, here, we illustrate an alternative method – calculating the total 14 unique effect (TUE) of PS and PC and their relative weights. In regards to calculating relative 15 weights, we make no claim of originality. Rather, we refer readers to the excellent work of 16 Johnson (2000) and Tonidandel and LeBreton (2011), among others, who helped derive the 17 method and have illustrated its use in other contexts. Here, we aim to demonstrate the value 18 of applying the method to understanding the effects of perfectionism alongside calculating 19 20 the TUE.

# 21 **TUE of Perfectionism**

In addition to calculating the CE, those interested in whether perfectionism is, overall, neutral, adaptive, or maladaptive can also calculate the TUE;  $TUE = \beta_{PS} + \beta_{PC}$ . Note that although Stoeber et al. (2020, p. 2) also defined the combined effect as "PS + PC", when expressed in this way it is more accurately identified as the TUE, rather than the CE. The TUE is statistically and conceptually distinct from the CE. This is evident in the way the two are calculated;  $\beta_{PS} + \beta_{PC}$  versus  $2(\beta_{PS} + \beta_{PC})$ . It is also evident in that the CE is a standardised mean difference (Cohen's *d*) that reflects a comparison of two different combinations of perfectionism (high PS + high PC versus low PS + low PC) whereas the TUE is a standardised change score that reflects the total change in the outcome variable following a one standardised unit increase in *both* PS and PC.

7 The TUE provides a simple and straightforward means of ascertaining whether the overall effect of perfectionism is neutral, adaptive, or maladaptive. When the positive effect 8 9 of PS is larger than the negative effect of PC ( $\beta_{PS} > \beta_{PC}$ ), the TUE will reveal perfectionism to be adaptive. Likewise, when the positive effect of PS is smaller than the negative effect of PC 10  $(\beta_{PS} < \beta_{PC})$ , the TUE will reveal perfectionism to be maladaptive. By way of example, when 11 examining the relationship between perfectionism and life satisfaction, Suh, Gnika, and Rice 12 (2017) found that  $\beta_{PS} = .22$  and  $\beta_{PC} = -.39$ , therefore, TUE = -.17 (.22 + -.39). In this case, 13 while PS is related to higher life satisfaction and PC is related to lower life satisfaction, 14 overall, perfectionism is related to lower life satisfaction. Therefore, perfectionism would be 15 considered maladaptive in regard to life satisfaction. 16

One additional piece of information we would be interested in is whether TUE is 17 statistically significant. This can be ascertained by calculating the standard error (SE) of the 18 TUE. The TUE is then divided by the SE and the result looked up in a normal probability 19 20 table to identify the probability that the TUE is different from zero (TUE  $\neq 0$ ). Note that the critical value that must be exceeded to denote statistically significance depends on degrees of 21 freedom (n – number of variables – 1). Confidence intervals (e.g., 95%) can also be created 22 23 for the TUE; TUE -  $1.96(SE) \le TUE \le TUE + 1.96$  (SE). Revisiting the life satisfaction example, we find that the TUE of perfectionism on life satisfaction is statistically significant 24 and produces 95% Confidence internals of -.32 to -.03. 25

1 Here we provide a worked example of the full method to derive the TUE, its standard error, and confidence intervals is provided. The information required is the bivariate 2 correlations between PS, PC, and the outcome variable, along with the sample size. The 3 method uses equations provided by Cohen and Cohen (2003) to calculate standardised betas 4 for PS and PC (EQ 3.2.4, p.68) and multiple R (EQ 3.3.1, p.70). We provide an equation for 5 the standard error of TUE. The information required for this equation comes from the inverse 6 7 correlation matrix (illustrated by Cohen & Cohen, 2003, p.636-638). Using this method and information routinely provided in most studies allows the TUE and its statistical significance 8 9 to be calculated for any study and outcome variable. The data used in the example below comes from Burcas and Cretu (2020) meta-analysis of perfectionism and test anxiety 10 (reported in Table 1). 11 The method includes three steps. In step 1 we calculate standardised beta values ( $\beta$ ) 12 from the bivariate correlation coefficients between PS, PC, and the outcome variable: 13 14  $\beta_{YPS,PC} = \frac{r_{YPS} - r_{YPC} r_{PSPC}}{1 - r_{PSPC}^2}$ 15 16  $\beta_{YPC.PS} = \frac{r_{YPC} - r_{YPS} r_{PSPC}}{1 - r_{PSPC}^2}$ 17 18 19  $r_{YPS} = 0.04$ 

20  $r_{YPC} = 0.42$ 

21 
$$r_{PSPC} = 0.32$$

22 
$$n = 4521$$
  
23  $k = 2$ 

23 
$$k =$$

24

- 25  $\beta_{YPS.PC} = -0.11$
- $26 \qquad \beta_{YPC.PS} = 0.45$

27

1 In step 2, we calculate multiple R and multiple  $R^2$ :

 $R_{Y,PSPC}^{2} = \frac{r_{YPS}^{2} + r_{YPC}^{2} - 2r_{YPS}r_{YPC}r_{PSPC}}{1 - r_{PSPC}^{2}}$  $R_{Y,PSPC} = \sqrt{\frac{r_{YPS}^{2} + r_{YPC}^{2} - 2r_{YPS}r_{YPC}r_{PSPC}}{1 - r_{PSPC}^{2}}}$  $R_{y_{PSPC}}^2 = 0.19$  $R_{Y,PSPC} = 0.44$ In step 3 and final step, we calculate the standard error of TUE, TUE and 95% confidence intervals using the information from step 1 and step 2: Correlation matrix  $r = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & r_{PSPC} \\ r_{PCPS} & 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0.32 \\ 0.32 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$ Inverse correlation matrix  $r^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{1 - r_{PSPC}^2} & \frac{r_{PSPC}}{1 - r_{PSPC}^2} \\ \frac{r_{PCPS}}{1 - r_{PCPS}^2} & \frac{1}{1 - r_{PSPC}^2} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1.11 & -0.36 \\ -0.36 & 1.11 \end{pmatrix}$ Standard error of TUE (SETUE)  $SE_{TUE} = \sqrt{\frac{1 - R_{Y.PSPC}^2}{n - k - 1} (r_{11}^{-1} + r_{22}^{-1} + r_{12}^{-1})}$  $r_{11}^{-1} = r_{22}^{-1} = 1.11$  $r_{12}^{-1} = -0.36$  $SE_{TUE} = 0.02$ 

1	TUE
2	$TUE = \beta_{YPS.PC} + \beta_{YPC.PS}$
3	TUE = 0.34
4	
5	95% confidence internals (two-tailed, critical value +/-1.96)
6	$TUE - (1.96 \times SE_{TUE}) \leq TUE \leq TUE + (1.96 \times SE_{TUE})$
7	$0.30 \leq TUE \leq 0.38$
8 9	In using these steps and the data from Burcas and Cretu 2020) we have determined
10	that the TUE of perfectionism on test anxiety in 0.34 [.30, .38] and that this effect is
11	statistically significant (the confidence intervals do not include zero).
12	Relative weights of perfectionism
13	As useful as the TUE is, one of its limitations is that it does not always account for the
14	variance shared between PS and PC. It accounts only for the unique variance between PS and
15	the outcome variable and PC and the outcome variable. When the two predictors are
16	orthogonal (i.e., uncorrelated) this is not problematic as there is no shared variance to account
17	for. However, when predictors are correlated, as is very often the case for perfectionism, it is
18	problematic as it becomes unclear which variable is making the largest contribution to the
19	outcome variable. In addition, as noted by Johnson (2000), when predictors are correlated, it
20	is more likely for standardised regression coefficients to be (1) inflated for predictors that are
21	more highly correlated with the dependent variable at bivariate level, (2) deflated for
22	predictors that are less correlated with the dependent variable at bivariate level, and (3)
23	reversed so that positive bivariate correlations become negative standardised regression
24	coefficients, or vice versa (viz. suppression).
25	This latter issue, suppression, is commonly observed in perfectionism research (see
26	Stoeber & Otto, 2006). In multiple regression, suppressor variables increase the magnitude of

1	regression coefficients associated with other independent variables (Conger, 1974). In the
2	context of multidimensional perfectionism, this happens because the two dimensions act to
3	suppress criterion-irrelevant variance in each other (mutual, reciprocal or cooperative
4	suppression; Paulhus, Robins, Trzesniewski, & Tracy, 2004). Suppression can be detected by
5	comparing the bivariate correlation coefficient between the predictor and the criterion
6	variable with the corresponding regression coefficient. Suppression is evident when the
7	regression coefficient is larger than the bivariate correlation coefficient or is in the opposite
8	direction (Cohen, Cohen, Aiken & West, 2003). When the latter is the case it can create
9	interpretational difficulties at a conceptual level if seeking to draw conclusions regarding the
10	effects of the original predictor variable (Lynam et al., 2006).
11	One way of avoiding these issues is to calculate relative importance indices. As
12	described by Tonidandel and LeBreton (2011), relative importance indices estimate the
13	contribution a variable makes by itself and in combination with other variables to an outcome
14	variable. Here we focus on one relative importance index – the relative weight of each
15	predictor (Johnson, 2000). That is, the proportionate contribution each predictor makes to the
16	total squared multiple correlation for the model (Johnson, 2000). In the context of
17	perfectionism, critically, the relative weights of PS and PC indicate which one matters more
18	in predicting outcome variables. Unlike squared standardised regression coefficients, relative
19	weights sum to the model $R^2$ and account for all variance. They can therefore be interpreted
20	as the percentage of variance explained in the criterion that can be attributed to each predictor
21	and as a relative effect size (LeBreton et al. 2007).
22	Relative weights are calculated by transforming the original variables into new
23	variables that are orthogonal. In this way, no issues arise associated with partitioning shared

transformed variables are used for the purpose of calculating relative weights before then

24

variance as there is no shared variance. The standardized regression coefficients for the new

transforming them back to the metric of the original variables. Tonidandel and LeBreton 1 (2011) illustrate how this is done via a series of four steps; (1) derive a set of orthogonal 2 weights maximally related to the original predictors, (2) obtain a set of standardised 3 regression coefficients by regressing Y on the orthogonal predictors, (3) obtain a set of 4 standardised regression coefficients by regressing the set of original predictors on the set of 5 orthogonal predictors, and (4) calculate relative weights by summing the products of squared 6 7 standardised coefficients from steps 2 and 3 for each variable. These steps can be completed easily using an R-based Web Tool: https://relativeimportance.davidson.edu/ (Tonidandel & 8 9 LeBreton, 2014). **Total Recall: An Illustration of the TUE using Previous Research** 10

To illustrate the usefulness of what we are proposing, we have provided the combined 11 effects, TUEs, standardised regression coefficients, and relative weights of PS and PC for a 12 number of recent published meta-analyses (Table 1). We included studies when all 13 information required to calculate these effects were available in the published article 14 (notably, the correlations between PS, PC, Y). These include studies that have examined 15 academic achievement (Madigan, 2019), burnout (Hill & Curran, 2016), various 16 psychopathologies (Limberg et al., 2017), procrastination (Sirois, Molnar, & Hirsch, 2017), 17 test anxiety (Burcaş & Crețu, 2020), work engagement (Harari et al., 2018), and workaholism 18 (Harari et al., 2018). These studies are illustrative, rather than exhaustive. 19 20 The effects displayed show a number of the aforementioned qualities of these statistics: 21 First, it is evident that TUE is different from the CE with the two effects conveying 22 23 different information. The TUE conveys standardised change as PS and PC increase whereas the CE conveys a standardised difference between subtypes of perfectionism (mixed 24 perfectionism versus non-perfectionism). 25

Second, the problems with partitioning variance and signalling of importance in
 regression are evident across studies, most clearly in regards to evidence of suppression.
 Specifically, suppression is evident in the comparison between the bivariate correlations and
 standardised regression coefficients in 14 of 24 instances with all but one indicating mutual
 suppression.

6 Third, in most cases the use of standardised regression coefficients would be 7 misleading in regards to ascertaining the relative importance of PS and PC. As examples, based on squared regression coefficients, the contribution of PC is nearly three times larger 8 9 than PS when predicting burnout, 16 times larger when predicting depression and just over three times larger when predicting bulimia nervosa. In actuality, the relative weights reveal 10 that the contribution of PC is four times larger for burnout, nine times larger for depression, 11 12 and nearly two times larger for Bulimia. As such, relative weights are required to more accurately ascertain the contribution of PS and PC and are a useful addition to calculating the 13 TUE. 14

# 15 Is Perfectionism Neutral, Adaptive, or Maladaptive?

There is no easy answer to this question. Perfectionism is complex and its effects will 16 be determined by an array of factors. However, the TUE (and CE) can help ascertain whether, 17 typically, research has found perfectionism to be, overall, neutral, adaptive, or maladaptive. 18 19 Based on recent meta-analytical studies, calculation of TUEs indicated that perfectionism was 20 adaptive for academic achievement and was neutral for procrastination. However, all other effects revealed perfectionism to be maladaptive, with the largest TUEs evident for anorexia 21 nervosa, bulimia nervosa, and workaholism. As such, focusing on TUE indicates that 22 23 perfectionism is primarily maladaptive. In addition, based on relative weights, PC is principally responsible for these effects. In other words, PC is the major contributing factor to 24 the maladaptive effects of perfectionism observed in research so far. 25

## **1** Limitations and other approaches

In calculating the TUE of perfectionism researchers should be mindful of a number of 2 3 limitations. First, TUE is based on regression analysis that has a number of statistical requirements (e.g., homoscedasticity, adequate sample size). Bias and precision of estimates 4 of the TUE will be affected if these requirements are not met in the same way that other 5 estimates would be in regression. Second, similarly, reliability of measurement is equally 6 7 important to TUE as other techniques (e.g., attenuating correlations, reducing statistical power). One way to improve estimates of TUE in this regard is to use a latent variable (error-8 9 free) correlation matrix rather than the bivariate correlation matrix as the starting point. Third, other analyses are available to researchers to partition variance in multiple regression 10 and aid interpretation of unique, common, and total effects (e.g., commonality analysis; see 11 12 Kraha et al., 2012). These analyses should be considered alongside the approach we propose here (TUE and relative weights). Readers may find that in some cases alternative approaches 13 will better suit their aims. In addition, these other analyses may offer further insight into the 14 overall effect of perfectionism. 15

# 16 Closing Remarks

By introducing the TUE of perfectionism, we have illustrated a new way to determine 17 whether perfectionism is neutral, adaptive, or maladaptive. In addition, by combining the 18 TUE with relative weights analyses, we have provided a means to determine which of the two 19 20 higher order dimensions of perfectionism contributes most in explaining variance in any given outcome. Research seeking to gain a fuller understanding of the consequences of 21 perfectionism would benefit from adopting this approach. Such work has the potential to 22 significantly progress our understanding of perfectionism as a multidimensional construct 23 that includes two related, but sometimes opposing, dimensions of perfectionism. The use of 24

- 1 this approach when examining recent meta-analytical research here shows that, overall,
- 2 perfectionism is typically maladaptive and rarely adaptive or neutral.

# References

- Burcaş, S., Creţu, R.Z. (2020). Multidimensional perfectionism and test anxiety: A metaanalytic review of two decades of research. *Educational Psychology Review*, *33*, 249-273.
- Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2003). Applied Multiple
   Regression/Correlation Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). New Jersey:
   Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Conger, A. J. (1974). A revised definition for suppressor variables: A guide to their identification and interpretation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 34, 35-46.
- Harari, D., Swider, B. W., Steed, L. B., & Breidenthal, A. P. (2018). Is perfect good? A metaanalysis of perfectionism in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 103, 1121-1144.
- Hill, A. P. (2021). Perfectionistic tipping points: Re-probing interactive effects of perfectionism. Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology, 10, 177-190.
- Hill, A. P., & Curran, T. (2016). Multidimensional perfectionism and burnout: A metaanalysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 20, 269-288.
- Johnson, J. W. (2000). A heuristic method for estimating the relative weight of predictor variables in multiple regression. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *35*, 1-19.
- Kraha, A., Turner, H., Nimon, K., Zientek, L. R., & Henson, R. K. (2012). Tools to support interpreting multiple regression in the face of multicollinearity. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 3., 44.
- Limburg, K., Watson, H. J., Hagger, M. S., & Egan, S. J. (2017). The relationship between perfectionism and psychopathology: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 73, 1301-1326.

- Madigan, D. J. (2019). A meta-analysis of perfectionism and academic achievement. *Educational Psychology Review*, *31*, 967–989.
- Paulhus, D. L., Robins, R. W., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Tracy, J. L. (2004). Two replicable suppressor situations in personality research. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 39, 303-328.
- Sirois, F. M., Molnar, D. S., & Hirsch, J. K. (2017). A meta-analytic and conceptual update on the associations between procrastination and multidimensional perfectionism. *European Journal of Personality*, 31, 137-159.
- Tonidandel, S., & LeBreton, J. M. (2011). Relative importance analysis: A useful supplement to regression analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *26*, 1-9.
- Tonidandel, S. & LeBreton, J. M. (2014). RWA-Web -- A free, comprehensive, web-based, and user-friendly tool for relative weight analysis. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *30*, 207-216.
- Stoeber, J., & Otto, K. (2006). Positive conceptions of perfectionism: Approaches, evidence, challenges. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 295-319.
- Stoeber, J., Madigan, D. J., & Gonidis, L. (2020). Perfectionism is adaptive and maladaptive, but what's the combined effect? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 161, 109846.
- Suh, H., Gnilka, P. B., & Rice, K. G. (2017). Perfectionism and well-being: A positive psychology framework. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 111, 25-30.

Study	DV	k	Ν	r(ps y)	<i>r</i> (PC Y)	r(PS PC)	$\beta_{PS}$	$\beta_{PC}$	TUE [95% CI]	CE	$\beta^2_{PS}$	$\beta^2_{PC}$	$RW_{PS}$ (%)	$\mathrm{RW}_{\mathrm{PC}}\left(\% ight)$	$R^2_{MODEL}$
Burcaș & Crețu (2020)	Test anxiety	22	4521	.04	.42	.32	11	.45	.35 [.32, .38]	.70	.01	.20	.01 (3.09)	.18 (96.91)	.19
Harari et al. (2018)	Workaholism	15	3728	.14	.47	.29	.00	.47	.47 [.44, .51]	.94	.00	.22	.01 (4.44)	.21 (95.56)	.22
Harari et al. (2018)	Work engagement	9	1376	.29	16	.29	.37	27	.10 [.04, .16]	.20	.14	.07	.10 (69.61)	.05 (30.39)	.15
Hill & Curran (2016)	Burnout	34	8244	14	.41	.32	30	.51	.20 [.18, .23]	.40	.09	.26	.05 (20.30)	.20 (79.70)	.25
Limberg et al. (2017)	Depression	12	2412	.18	.40	.44	.00	.40	.40 [.36, .45]	.82	.00	.17	.02 (10.14)	.14 (89.86)	.16
Limberg et al. (2017)	Bulimia nervosa	9	1809	.36	.45	.44	.20	.36	.56 [.51, .61]	1.12	.04	.13	.08 (34.89)	.16 (65.41)	.24
Limberg et al. (2017)	Anxiety disorders	49	9849	.07	.30	.44	08	.33	.26 [.23, .28]	.52	.01	.11	.00 (5.10)	.09 (94.90)	.09
Limberg et al. (2017)	OCD	32	6432	.11	.35	.44	05	.37	.32 [.29, .35]	.64	.00	.14	.01 (5.80)	.12 (94.20)	.13
Limberg et al. (2017)	Anorexia nervosa	8	1608	.56	.81	.44	.25	.70	.95 [.92, .98]	1.90	.06	.49	.18 (25.80)	.53 (74.20)	.71
Limberg et al. (2017)	Suicidal ideation	22	4422	.09	.31	.44	06	.34	.28 [.24, .31]	.56	.00	.12	.01 (5.45)	.09 (94.55)	.10
Madigan (2019)	Achievement	48	8608	.24	08	.32	.30	17	.12 [.10, .15]	.24	.09	.03	.07 (80.12)	.02 (19.88)	.09
Sirois, Molnar, & Hirsch (2017)	Procrastination	43	10000	22	.23	.10	25	.25	.01 [02, .03]	.02	.06	.06	.05 (48.00)	.06 (52.00)	.11

Bivariate correlations, standardised regression coefficients, total unique effects, combined effects, and relative weights from meta-analyses

*Note*: k = Number of effect sizes. N = Number of participants; N was not reported in Limberg et al (2017) so an estimate is used (total sample size divided by total number of studies [57200/284]\*number of effects). DV = Dependent variable.  $\beta$  = Standardised regression coefficient. TUE = Total unique effect ( $\beta_{PS} + \beta_{PC}$ ; units of standard deviations of DV per standard deviation of PS + PC). CE = Combined effect (Cohen's *d*). RW = Relative weight. PS = Perfectionistic strivings. PC = Perfectionistic concerns. Rounding to two decimal places accounts for any differences between  $\beta_{PS} + \beta_{PC}$  and TUE. If 95% CI (confidence intervals) do not include zero, the TUE is statistically significant (p < .05).