**Appendix B. Description of included studies**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Questionnaire** | **Original study (Y/N)** | **Factor analysis** | **Study population** | **Age (*M*)** | **Sex ratio (% female)** |
| ***APS-R*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Ashby & Rice (2002) |  | Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) did not support a two-factor model for perfectionism. However, each parceled subscale on the APS-R (i.e., after separating each original subscale into two smaller subscales, one consisting of the even-numbered items, and the other of the odd-numbered items) was found to load onto its parent subscale (e.g., the two parceled Standards subscales loaded onto the original Standards subscale). Factor loadings ranged from .78 to .95. | 262 undergraduate students | 21.7 | 69 |
| Flett et al. (2016) |  | CFA indicated a four-factor model as the best fitting model for the APS-R; standards, discrepancy, dissatisfaction, and order. Factor loadings ranged from .47 to .91. | 1647 participants (sample 1 = 670 undergraduate students, sample 2 = 977 community-dwelling adults) | 21.1 and 32.6 | 67 and 36 |
| Grzegorek et al. (2004) |  |  | 273 undergraduate students | 19.9 | 74 |
| Kim et al. (2015) |  | CFA supported a three-factor model of perfectionism using the APS-R and FMPS; perfectionistic strivings (containing the APS-R standards subscale), order (containing the APS-R order subscale), and perfectionistic concerns (containing the APS-R discrepancy subscale). Factor loadings ranged from .76 to 1.14. | 208 undergraduate students | 19.6 | 73 |
| Pearson & Gleaves (2006) |  | CFA indicated a six-factor model of perfectionism using the APS-R, FMPS, Burns Perfectionism Scale (BPS), and Neurotic Perfectionism Questionnaire (NPQ); neurotic perfectionism (containing the APS-R discrepancy subscale), normal perfectionism (containing the APS-R standards subscale), order (containing the APS-R order subscale), self-esteem, body dissatisfaction, and bulimic behaviour. Factor loadings ranged from .83 to .94. | 304 college students | 18.8 | 100 |
| Rice & Ashby (2007) |  |  | 1537 undergraduate students | 19.4 | 70 |
| Rice et al. (2007) |  |  | Two samples of university students (sample 1 = 178, sample 2 = 208) | 20.1 and 19.4 | 56.2 and 74 |
| Rice et al. (2014) |  | CFA was used to test the two-factor structure of the APS-R and revealed an 8-item Short Almost Perfect Scale (SAPS) as providing good fit for the data. The SAPS consisted of four standards items and four discrepancy items, with factor loadings that ranged from .60 to .86. | Study 1: 749 undergraduate students  Study 2: 340 undergraduate students | 19.6 and 19.4 | 66.8 and 77.6 |
| Slaney et al. (2001) | Y | Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and CFA indicated a three-factor measure for the APS-R; high standards, order, and discrepancy. Structure coefficients ranged from .42 to .84 for the high standards factor, .56 to .87 for discrepancy, and .58 to .82 for order. | Four samples of university students (sample 1 = 173, sample 2 = 174, sample 3 = 258, sample 4 = 204) | 19.2, 20.4, 21, and 20.8 | 51.4, 69.5, 61.6, and 65.2 |
| Suddarth & Slaney (2001) |  | PCA of the APS-R, HMPS, and FMPS yielded a three-factor solution. Factor 1 represented the maladaptive factor and was composed of the discrepancy subscale from the APS-R. Factor 2 represented the adaptive factor and consisted of the high standards subscale from the APS-R. Factor 3 was referred to the order/organisation factor and was composed of the order subscale from the APS-R. Factor loadings ranged from .81 to .88. | 196 undergraduate students | 20.3 | 78.6 |
| ***BDQ*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lee et al. (2011) | Y |  | 59 participants (49 university students and 10 non-students) | 23.7 | 78 |
| ***COPS*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Kim (2010) | Y | EFA produced a two-factor solution for the COPS. Factor 1 represented the positive consequences of perfectionism and Factor 2 represented the negative consequences of perfectionism. Factor loadings ranged from .70 to .81. | 492 college students | 20.1 | 71 |
| Stoeber et al. (2013) |  | CFA demonstrated a two-factor oblique structure as showing good fit for the COPS; positive consequences and negative consequences. | 210 university students | 20.5 | 78.1 |
| ***FMPS*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anshel & Seipel (2006) |  | CFAs used to test the factor structure of the FMPS. Results indicated that the Brief Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS-B) – comprised of 22 of the original 35 items on the FMPS – provided the best fit to the population under study. The MPS-B consists of five subscales; concern over mistakes, doubts about actions, parental perceptions, personal standards, and organization. | 186 undergraduate students | 22.2 | 43 |
| Bieling et al. (2004) |  | CFAs using the FMPS and HMPS to distinguish between the different models of perfectionism. Results demonstrated that a two-factor model of perfectionism; maladaptive evaluative concerns (comprised of the FMPS concern over mistakes, parental expectations, parental criticism, and doubts about actions subscales) and positive striving (comprised of the FMPS personal standards and organization subscales), provided a better fit than a unitary perfectionism model. | 198 undergraduate students | 22.0 | 75.2 |
| Burgess et al. (2016) |  | CFAs supported the two-factor structure of the 8-item Frost Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale – Brief (FMPS-B); evaluative concerns and striving. FMPS-B demonstrated good to excellent fit across both community and clinical samples. | 1376 participants (community sample = 881 college students, clinical sample = 90 adults with clinical diagnoses of obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) and/or hoarding disorder (HD), measurement equivalence sample = 405 undergraduate students) | 21, 51.3, and 22 | 99.2, 82.2, and 86.7 |
| Cox et al. (2002) |  | EFA and CFA generated a five-factor solution for the FMPS and evidence of good fit with a reduced item set (comprised of 22 from the original 35 items on the FMPS) across both clinical and university samples. Further second-order CFAs of the FMPS and HMPS (using both the reduced item sets) revealed a two-factor structure; adaptive perfectionism and maladaptive perfectionism. | 796 participants (clinical sample = 412 adult outpatients from a mood disorders program, college sample 1 = 288 first-year university students, college sample 2 = 96 medical school students) | 40.8, 19.1, and 25.1 | 58.5, 63.2, and 41.7 |
| Flett et al. (1995) |  |  | 261 university students | 23.4 | 67.4 |
| Frost et al. (1990) | Y | Principal factor analysis (PFA) yielded six distinct factors; concern over making mistakes, organization and neatness, high personal standards of performance, parental expectations, parental criticism, and doubts about actions. | Study 1: 232 undergraduate students  Study 2: 84 undergraduate students  Study 3: 72 undergraduate students  Study 4: 106 college students | n/a, n/a, n/a, and n/a | 100, 100, 100, and 100 |
| Frost et al. (1993) |  | PFA of the FMPS and HMPS yielded two distinct factors; maladaptive evaluation concerns (comprised of the FMPS concern over mistakes, parental criticism, parental expectations, and doubts about actions subscales) and positive striving (comprised of the FMPS personal standards and organization subscales). Factor loadings ranged from .54 to .85. | 553 undergraduate students | n/a | 51 |
| Harvey et al. (2004) |  | Principal components analysis (PCA) yielded a four-factor solution for the FMPS; negative projections, achievement expectations, parental influences, and organization. | 255 participants (community-based sample) | 37 | 55.7 |
| Khawaja & Armstrong (2005) |  | PCA indicated a four-component structure for the FMPS; concern over mistakes and doubts about actions combined (CMDA), parental expectations and parental criticism combined (PEPC), personal standards, and organization. Further analyses also revealed a four-component solution with a reduced item set that consisted of 24 of the original 35 items on the FMPS – referred to as Frost’s Multidimensional scale 24-item (FMPS-24). EFA also demonstrated a two-component solution with 17 items from the original FMPS (referred to as the Frost Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale – Reduced; FMPS-R); dysfunctional perfectionism and functional perfectionism. | 271 university students | 26.0 | 75 |
| Kim et al. (2015) |  | CFA supported a three-factor model of perfectionism using the FMPS and APS-R; perfectionistic strivings (containing the FMPS personal standards subscale), order (containing the FMPS organization subscale), and perfectionistic concerns (containing the FMPS concern over mistakes and doubts about actions subscales). Factor loadings ranged from .73 to .94. | 208 undergraduate students | 19.6 | 73 |
| Parker & Adkins (1995) |  | Factor analysis produced a six-factor solution for the FMPS. | 278 college students | n/a | 61.5 |
| Pearson & Gleaves (2006) |  | CFA indicated a six-factor model of perfectionism using the FMPS, APS-R, BPS, and NPQ; neurotic perfectionism (containing the FMPS concern over mistakes, parental criticism, and doubts about actions subscales), normal perfectionism (containing the FMPS personal standards subscale), order (containing the FMPS organization subscale), self-esteem, body dissatisfaction, and bulimic behavior. Factor loadings ranged from .59 to .92. | 304 college students | 18.8 | 100 |
| Purdon et al. (1999) |  | PFA yielded a three-factor solution for the FMPS (i.e., fear of mistakes, goal/achievement orientation, and perceived parental pressure) and evidence of good fit in a clinical sample. | 322 patients with clinical diagnoses of anxiety disorders | 36.0 | 49.7 |
| Rice et al. (1998) |  | CFA using the FMPS and Almost Perfect Scale (APS) supported a two-factor model of perfectionism; adaptive perfectionism (containing the FMPS personal standards and organization subscales) and maladaptive perfectionism (containing the FMPS parental criticism, parental expectations, concern over mistakes, and doubts about actions subscales). Factor loadings ranged from .34 to .77. | 489 undergraduate students | 23.7 | 71.4 |
| Rice & Ashby (2007) |  |  | 1537 undergraduate students | 19.4 | 70 |
| Rice & Dellwo (2001) |  |  | 119 undergraduate students | 21.5 | 73.9 |
| Slaney et al. (1995) |  | Factor analysis produced a two-factor solution for the FMPS and HMPS; adaptive perfectionism (consisting of the FMPS personal standards and organization subscales) and maladaptive perfectionism (consisting of the FMPS concern over mistakes, parental expectations, parental criticism, and doubts about actions subscales). Factor loadings ranged from .58 to .77. | Study 1: 167 undergraduate students | 25.6 | 74.3 |
| Stallman & Hurst (2011) |  | EFA and CFA yielded a five-factor model for the FMPS and evidence of good fit with a reduction in items (from 35 to 29) – referred to as FMPS-29. Factor 1 = concern over mistakes, Factor 2 = organization, Factor 3 = parenting, Factor 4 = high standards, Factor 5 = doubts about actions. Factor loadings ranged from .56 to .82. | 6449 university students | 24.0 | 64.6 |
| Stoeber (1998) |  | PCA yielded a four-factor solution for the FMPS; aggregate of the concern over mistakes and doubts about actions subscales (CMD), aggregate of the parental expectations and parental criticism subscales (PEC), personal standards, and organization. | 243 university students | 26.3 | 66.3 |
| Suddarth & Slaney (2001) |  | PCA of the FMPS, APS-R, and HMPS yielded a three-factor solution. Factor 1 represented the maladaptive factor and was composed of the concern over mistakes, parental expectations, parental criticism, and doubts about actions from the FMPS. Factor 2 represented the adaptive factor and consisted of the personal standards subscale from the FMPS. Factor 3 was referred to the order/organization factor and was composed of the organization subscale from the FMPS. Factor loadings ranged from .56 to .91. | 196 undergraduate students | 20.3 | 78.6 |
| ***HMPS*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Bieling et al. (2004) |  | CFAs using the HMPS and FMPS to distinguish between the different models of perfectionism. Results demonstrated that a two-factor model of perfectionism; maladaptive evaluative concerns (comprised of the HMPS socially-prescribed perfectionism subscale) and positive striving (comprised of the HMPS self-oriented perfectionism and other-oriented perfectionism subscales), provided a better fit than a unitary perfectionism model. | 198 undergraduate students | 22.0 | 75.2 |
| Cox et al. (2002) |  | CFA and EFAs supported a three-factor model for the HMPS and evidence of good fit with a reduced item set (comprised of 15 from the original 45 items on the HMPS) across both clinical and university samples. Further second-order CFAs of the HMPS and FMPS (using both the reduced item sets) revealed a two-factor structure; adaptive perfectionism and maladaptive perfectionism. | 796 participants (clinical sample = 412 adult outpatients from a mood disorders program, college sample 1 = 288 first-year university students, college sample 2 = 96 medical school students) | 40.8, 19.1, and 25.1 | 58.5, 63.2, and 41.7 |
| Flett et al. (1995) |  |  | 261 university students | 23.4 | 67.4 |
| Frost et al. (1993) |  | PFA of the HMPS and FMPS yielded two distinct factors; maladaptive evaluation concerns (comprised of the HMPS socially-prescribed perfectionism subscale) and positive striving (comprised of the HMPS self-oriented perfectionism and other-oriented perfectionism subscales). Factor loadings ranged from .54 to .82. | 553 undergraduate students | n/a | 51 |
| Hewitt & Flett (1991a) | Y | PCA indicated a three-factor solution for the HMPS; self-oriented items (factor loadings ranging between .45 and .66), socially-prescribed items (factor loadings ranging between .39 and .63), and other-oriented items (factor loadings ranging between .24 and .32). | Study 1: 156 university students  Study 2: 1369 participants (sample 1 = 1106 university students, sample 2 = 263 psychiatric patients)  Study 3: 197 participants (sample 1 = 104 university students, sample 2 = 93 university students, 45 university students)  Study 4: 91 undergraduate students  Study 5: 77 adult psychiatric patients | Study 1: 21.0  Study 2: n/a and n/a  Study 3: 22.1, n/a, and n/a  Study 4: 25.4  Study 5: 35.9 | Study 1:  66.7  Study 2: 63.9 and 54.0  Study 3: 68.3, 68.8, and 100  Study 4: 62.6  Study 5: 49.4 |
| Hewitt & Flett (1991b) |  |  | Study 1: 1068 participants (sample 1 = 387 patients from psychiatric hospital, sample 2 = 49 psychiatric outpatients, sample 3 = 34 male spouse abusers undergoing group treatment, sample 4 = 399 chronic pain outpatients, sample 5 = 199 adults from the general community)  Study 2: 60 psychiatric patients | Study 1: n/a, 35.4, 30.5, 44.5, and 31.7  Study 2: 38.1 | Study 1: 49.9, 61.2, 0, 46.6, and 49.7  Study 2: 41.7 |
| Rice & Ashby (2007) |  |  | 1537 undergraduate students | 19.4 | 70 |
| Slaney et al. (1995) |  | Factor analysis produced a two-factor solution for the HMPS and FMPS; adaptive perfectionism (consisting of the HMPS self-oriented perfectionism and other-oriented perfectionism subscales) and maladaptive perfectionism (consisting of the HMPS socially-prescribed perfectionism subscale). Factor loadings ranged from .56 to .81. | Study 1: 167 undergraduate students | 25.6 | 74.3 |
| Suddarth & Slaney (2001) |  | PCA of the HMPS, APS-R, and FMPS yielded a three-factor solution. Factor 1 represented the maladaptive factor and was composed of the socially-prescribed perfectionism subscale from the HMPS. Factor 2 represented the adaptive factor and consisted of the self-oriented and other-oriented perfectionism subscales from the HMPS. Factor 3 was referred to the order/organization factor and did not consist of any significant loadings from the subscales on the HMPS. Factor loadings ranged from .82 to .86. | 196 undergraduate students | 20.3 | 78.6 |
| Trumpeter et al. (2006) |  | PCAs produced two distinct components for each of the HMPS subscales; adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism. | 531 undergraduate students | 19.3 | 64.6 |
| ***PANPS*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Egan et al. (2011) |  | CFA and EFAs supported the two-factor structure of the PANPS; positive perfectionism and negative perfectionism. | 252 participants (athletes = 111, students = 101, clinical sample = 40) | 38.9, 26.0, and 39.2 | 34, 76, and 72 |
| Haase & Prapavessis (2004) |  | CFA and EFAs indicated a more parsimonious 19-item two-factor structure for the PANPS; positive perfectionism and negative perfectionism. Factor loadings ranged from .51 to .68 for the positive perfectionism factor and from .41 to .69 for the negative perfectionism factor. | Study 1: 540 elite athletes  Study 2: 496 national level heavyweight and lightweight rowers | 19.8 and 20.5 | n/a and n/a |
| Terry-Short et al. (1995) | Y | PCA demonstrated two distinct components for the PANPS; positive perfectionism (P +) and negative perfectionism (P –). | 311 participants (control sample = 255 adults, clinical sample 1 = 21 outpatients/inpatients diagnosed with an eating disorder, clinical sample 2 = 15 outpatients/inpatients diagnosed with depression, athlete sample = 20) | n/a, 30.0, 41.0, and 24.0 | 100, 100, 100, and n/a |
| ***PI*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cruce et al. (2012) |  | CFA supported a two-factor structure for the PI; conscientious perfectionism (comprised of the PI striving for excellence, planfulness, organization, and high standards for others subscales) and self-evaluative perfectionism (comprised of the PI concern over mistakes, need for approval, rumination, and perceived parental pressure subscales). Factor loadings ranged from .55 to 1.40. | 390 undergraduate students | 19.5 | 56.9 |
| Hill et al. (2004) | Y | Exploratory PCA and CFAs supported a two-factor, higher order structure for the PI, with evidence of better fix when compared to a one-factor model. Factor 1 (labelled conscientious perfectionism) was comprised of the organization, striving for excellence, planfulness, and high standards for others subscales from the PI, with factor loadings that ranged from .60 to .79. Factor 2 (labelled self-evaluative perfectionism) consisted of the concern over mistakes, need for approval, rumination, and perceived parental pressure subscales from the PI, with factor loadings that ranged from .34 to .91. | Study 1: 250 undergraduate students  Study 2: 366 undergraduate students  Study 3: 616 undergraduate students | 18.9, 20.2, and 18.9 | 63, 62, and 62 |
| ***PSPS*** |  |  |  |  |  |
| Hewitt et al. (2003) | Y | Principal-components factor analysis yielded a three-factor solution for the PSPS; perfectionistic self-promotion, nondisplay of imperfection, and nondisclosure of imperfection. Factor loadings ranged from .54 to .77 for the perfectionistic self-promotion factor, .44 to .70 for the nondisplay of imperfection factor, and from .50 to .82 for the nondisclosure of imperfection factor. | Study 1: 2666 participants (sample 1 = 661 university students, sample 2 = 501 community members, sample 3 = 1041 psychiatric patients, sample 4 = 222 psychology students, sample 5 = 90 psychiatric patients, sample 6 = 47 second- and third-year university students, sample 7 = 104 individuals from a depression self-help organization)  Study 2: 220 participants (sample 1 = 130 undergraduate students, sample 2 = sample 5 from Study 1)  Study 3: 1022 participants (sample 1 = 169 undergraduate students, sample 2 = 468 psychiatric patients, sample 3 = 163 university students, sample 4 = sample 4 from Study 1)  Study 4: 303 participants (sample 1 = 152 university students, sample 2 = 151 university students) | Study 1: n/a, 29.1, 38.9, 19.2, 36.2, 23.1, and 46.6  Study 2: 23.6 and 36.2  Study 3: 21.2, 39.0, 19.8, and 19.2  Study 4: 20.2 and 18.9 | Study 1: 65.1, 57.1, 57.5, 77.0, 50.0, 78.7, and 74.0  Study 2: 50.8 and 50.0  Study 3: 67.5, 52.4, 76.1, and 77.0  Study 4: 68.4 and 71.5 |