Predictors of Relationship Satisfaction: What's Perfection got to do with it?

Nicholas Phillips, Rachel Carpenter, Erin Mangan, and Lawrence Burns[1]

Abstract

This paper combines two related studies. First, we evaluated general interpersonal issues and perfectionism. Second, we expanded on the first study and Mitchelson and Burns' (1998) findings concerning the consequences of these interpersonal variables and perfectionism upon relationship satisfaction. Results indicated a tendency among positive perfectionists to believe in their ability to succeed and enjoy the intellectual challenge of healthy disagreement. Negative perfectionists reported significant avoidance, need for approval, self-silencing behaviors, and self-monitoring. Furthermore, negative perfectionism, the self-silencing construct, and self-monitoring proved important predictors of decreased relationship satisfaction. Significant differences by gender were observed.

Key Words: Perfectionism, Relationship Satisfaction

Predictors of Relationship Satisfaction: What's Perfection got to do with it?

Perfectionism has long been conceptualized as a pathological personality trait (Pacht, 1984; Flett, Hewitt, & Dyck, 1989; Frost, Marten, Lahart, & Rosenblate, 1990; Hewitt, & Flett, 1991; Flett, Hewitt, & DeRosa, 1996). It positively correlates with personality disorders (Hewitt, Flett, & Turnbull, 1992), eating disorders (Brouwers &Wiggum, 1993), sexual dysfunction (Quadland, 1980), low self-esteem (Ashby & Rice, 2002), and can alter the parasympathetic response (Azam et at., 2015). Dimensions of perfectionism are associated with anger and specific fears concerning failure, losing control, and making mistakes (Blankstein, Flett, Hewitt, & Eng, 1993). Research also suggests perfectionists experience relationship difficulties, anxiety, and procrastination problems (Slaney & Ashby, 1996). Perfectionism has been positively linked with cynicism, higher levels of stress at home and work, and a decreased satisfaction with oneself and one's life (Dueling & Burns, 2017; Mitchelson & Burns, 1998). A wealth of literature has shown perfectionism is directly related to depression and social anxiety, contributing to interpersonal impairment and lowered relational satisfaction and distress (Habke & Flynn, 2002; Hewitt & Flett, 1993). Levels of perfectionism have increased steadily in recent decades and are consistent across gender (Curran and Hill, 2019).

Research using the Perfectionistic Self-Presentation Scale, or PSPS, indicates perfectionistic tendencies toward self-related and interpersonal distress (Hewitt, Flett, Sherry, Ediger, Fairle, & Stein, 2003). In their study, Hewitt et al. (2003) proposed three facets of the PSPS: Perfectionistic Self-Promotion, Non-display of Imperfection, and Nondisclosure of Imperfection. They state, "Perfectionistic self-presentation has two general motivational components: striving to present one's 'perfection' or avoiding revealing any of one's 'imperfections'" (Hewitt et al., 2003, p. 1305). Results confirmed that perfectionistic self-presentation was related to self-monitoring and defensiveness, correlating positively with indices of self-handicapping, self-concealment, self-consciousness, need for others' approval, concern over mistakes, and fear of negative evaluation (Hewitt et al., 2003). Findings also "suggest that perfectionistic self-presentation is associated with self-related constructs including lower general self-esteem and negative affect" (Hewitt et al., 2003, p. 1313). Additionally, all three facets "correlated with defensive and assertive self-presentation tactics" (Hewitt et al., 2003, p. 1319) and trait anxiety, social phobia, and social interaction and performance. However, perfectionistic self-promotion was positively related to general appearance and social self-esteem.

---

[1] All authors are from Grand Valley State University; Corresponding author burnsl@gvsu.edu

After controlling for gender and trait perfectionism, perfection was not a predictor for any anxiety measures, suggesting that it may include more positive behaviors (Hewitt et al., 2003).

While perfectionistic self-promotion does have some adaptive features, Hewitt et al. (2003) conclude that perfectionistic self-presentation may be a harmful strategy, this style may foster problematic social or intimate relationships that arise, in part, from reluctance to engage in mutual self-disclosure, dishonesty in terms of the portrayal of inappropriate personal characteristics and accomplishments, and a perceived lack of authenticity in the eyes of others. In addition, individuals who express their shortcomings, fears, and limitations appear to develop more intimate relationships (Derlega, Metts, Petronio, & Margulis, 1993). In contrast, those concerned about avoiding discussing these issues may be particularly prone to problems in intimate relationships (Meleshko & Alden, 1993).

Research on perfectionism has prompted a lively debate about its types and causes. Two theories may provide a point of convergence: first, perfectionism can positively or negatively affect one's quality of life, and second, high standards are a hallmark of perfectionism (Shea, 2000). Due to the limitations of available measures, previous research has focused on perfectionism's associated pathologies. Using the Positive and Negative Perfectionism Scale (Terry-Short, Owens, Slade, & Dewey, 1995), or the PNP, we hope to shed light on its positive characteristics. The PNP distinguishes between positive perfectionism (PP) and negative perfectionism (NP). A positive perfectionist is driven by positive reinforcement, such as heightened self-esteem and self-satisfaction, whereas negative perfectionists are driven by a fear of failure (Terry-Short et al., 1995; Frost et al., 1990; Hamachek, 1978). Additionally, a positive perfectionist sets realistic expectations that account for both strengths and limitations, while a negative perfectionist sets unrealistic standards, continuously setting themselves up for failure (Terry-Short et al., 1995; Frost et al., 1990; Hamachek, 1978).

Study I

This study investigates the relationships between positive and negative perfectionism and various social and interpersonal variables to explore the social implications of the PNP's dichotomous conceptualization. Differentiation between positive and negative perfectionism in the interpersonal context warrants examination. We hope to clarify how positive perfectionism underlies healthy interpersonal relationships and promote a more nuanced understanding of positive perfectionism.

Existing studies concerning perfectionism and self-efficacy conceptualize perfectionism as pathological (Martin, Flett, Hewitt, Krames, & Szanto, 1996; Hart, Gilner, Handal, & Gfeller, 1998). However, results are mixed: socially prescribed perfectionism, characterized by the belief that others set unrealistically high standards for the individual, was related negatively to self-efficacy in one study (Martin et al., 1996) and positively in another (Hart et al., 1998). Socially prescribed perfectionism is linked to maladjustment and disorders such as anxiety, hostility, obsessive-compulsive disorder, depression, and paranoia (Hewitt & Flett, 1991). Common scale items suggest a relationship between negative perfectionism and socially prescribed perfectionism (Terry-Short et al., 1995). Given the negative relationship between negative perfectionism and perceived professional efficacy in career mothers (Mitchelson & Burns, 1998), we expect a negative relationship between negative perfectionism and self-efficacy. Because positive perfectionism is based on positive reinforcement, we hypothesize that it will relate positively with self-efficacy, as endorsing individuals may receive more positive feedback from others for their achievements. Due to gender differences identified in prior research (Falbo and Belk, 1985), we anticipate that men will report higher levels of self-efficacy.

Across interpersonal interactions, competent and aggressive communicators are rated higher in argumentativeness than noncompetent and submissive communicators (Martin & Anderson, 1996a as cited Myers, 1998). Argumentativeness has been conceptually and empirically differentiated from verbal aggressiveness (Infante & Rancer, 1982). "According to Infante (1987), argumentativeness promotes a discussion of the subject matter without attacking an individual's self-concept" (Myers, 1998, p. 143), including the ability to engage in dissenting discussion and is associated positively with self-esteem, intellectual excitement, and feeling challenged (Infante & Rancer, 1982; Blickle, 1995). Argumentativeness consists of two facets: argument avoidance and argument approach. Schill (1996) found a positive relationship between avoiding arguments and self-defeating personality disorder (in which one seeks out disappointment and endorses learned helplessness). Still, this relationship was significant only in female participants. Blickle (1997) found a positive relationship between avoiding arguments and neuroticism in men. Since the relationship between neuroticism and perfectionism has long been substantiated (Hamachek, 1978; Flett et al., 1989), we expect a positive correlation between negative perfectionism and argument avoidance.

Correspondingly, approaching arguments is associated with openness to experience (Blickle, 1997) and is theorized to result in a sense of accomplishment and satisfaction (Infante & Rancer, 1982). Therefore, positive perfectionism's adaptive orientation prompts our prediction that it will correlate positively with approaching arguments or healthy disagreement (Terry-Short et al., 1995).

Because perfectionists have high standards, these individuals may exhibit high levels of self-righteousness, firmly convinced that their beliefs or behaviors are correct in contrast to others' (Falbo & Belk, 1985). High self-righteousness may also indicate cognitive rigidity, consistent with negative perfectionism's conceptualization. Negative perfectionism is related negatively global constructive thinking and positively to categorical thinking, suggesting that negative perfectionists tend toward rigidity and intolerance (Burns & Fedewa, 2003). Conversely, a low level of self-righteousness may imply that the individual is flexible about their beliefs and behaviors, consistent with the adaptive conceptualization of positive perfectionism. Recent research into intellectual humility – the ability to question one's own opinions and consider others' perspectives – is negatively correlated with maladaptive personalities traits such as narcissism and psychopathy (Cannon et al., 2020) and positively associated with mastery behaviors such as perseverance after initial failure (Porter et al., 2020). Therefore, we hypothesize that self-righteousness will be negatively related to positive perfectionism and positively related to negative perfectionism.

Approval motivation represents a desire for social approval, positive reinforcements, avoidance of others' disapproval, and negative evaluation (Martin, 1984). Previous research found associations between socially prescribed perfectionism and demand for approval, social desirability, and sensitivity in social situations (Hewitt & Flett, 1991; Flett, Hewitt, Blankstein, & Koledin, 1991; Flett et al., 1996). In addition, Wyatt and Gilbert (1998) found that socially prescribed perfectionism was positively related to shame, "indicating that thinking that others look down on one may be a central feature of socially prescribed perfectionism" (p. 77). Comparatively, negative perfectionism is characterized by avoiding negative consequences, such as displeasure from others significant to the individual. Therefore, we anticipate a positive association between negative perfectionism and approval motivation.

An individual who endorses negative perfectionism and avoids disapproval from others may avoid people altogether, displaying social fear. Juster, Heimburg, Frost, Holt, Mattia, and Feccenda (1996) found that several dimensions of perfectionism were related to social phobia. When people have a perceived influence or importance in an individual's life, the individual is more likely to try to fulfill higher standards. The social fear construct was developed to measure perceived interpersonal aversiveness, characterized by a sense of social inadequacy tied to a dearth of interpersonal relationships (Raulin & Wee, 1984). There is evidence suggesting that social phobia may indicate certain types of perfectionism. In a sample of Indian patients with social phobia, Jain and Sudhir (2010) found that social phobia correlated with PSPS's Non-Display of Imperfection but was unrelated to the other subscales in the measure. They found a relationship between social phobia, concern over mistakes, and the fear of a negative evaluation, indicating a possible causal link between perfectionism and social phobia. We hypothesize that individuals who endorse negative perfectionism, with feelings of inadequacy or lowered self-concept (Mitchelson & Burns, 1998), will endorse higher levels of social fear. Because positive perfectionism appears to buffer self-esteem, positive perfectionists may report greater enjoyment of social interactions and lower levels of social fear.

Filsinger (1981) theorized that the extent to which individuals like people influences whether they approach or avoid social situations. It is thought that negative perfectionists may experience deep concern over whether others view them positively. Because negative perfectionism is related to the individual's perception of others' opinions (Terry-Short et al., 1995), we hypothesize that negative perfectionism will be negatively related to a general liking of people. Conversely, since positive perfectionism correlates with self-esteem that may influence one to approach social interactions, we hypothesize that positive perfectionism will positively relate to people's general liking of others.

In this study, we examine several interpersonal and social variables to aid in defining positive and negative perfectionism and clarify a distinction between them. We hypothesize that self-efficacy will be negatively related to negative perfectionism and positively related to positive perfectionism. We expect negative perfectionism to correlate positively with argument avoidance and positive perfectionism to correlate positively with the argument approach. We expect self-righteousness to be positively related to negative perfectionism and negatively related to positive perfectionism. We also expect a positive relationship between negative perfectionism and the need for approval.

Negative perfectionism will be associated with more self-reported social fear and positive perfectionism with less. Finally, we will investigate the relationships between positive and negative perfectionism and the general liking of people.

Method

Participants

125 male and 163 female undergraduate introductory psychology students from a mid-sized Midwestern university participated in this study for course credit. The mean age of our sample was 18.8 years, with a standard deviation of 1.6 years. Our sample's racial/ethnic composition was reported to be 89.8% Caucasian, 4.5% African American, 1.7% Asian American, 2% Hispanic, 0.6% American Indian, and 1.3% not provided.

Procedure

The distribution of materials was arranged through Introductory Psychology courses. Informed consent was obtained, and participants were offered credit for completing the following measures. Upon completion, all participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation.

Measures

The Positive and Negative Perfectionism Scale (Terry-Short et al., 1995), or PNP, assesses perfectionism from a behaviorist perspective. Its two subscales represent types of reinforcement: positive perfectionism (PP), which results from linking positive reinforcements with antecedent perfectionistic behaviors, and negative perfectionism (NP), which is linked to negative reinforcement. The PNP consists of 40 Likert-scale questions with responses ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5). Scores were obtained by summing the coded set of 18 questions measuring positive perfectionism and 22 questions measuring negative perfectionism.

The Self-Efficacy Scale (Sherer, Maddux, Mercandante, Prentice-Dunn, Jacobs & Rogers, 1982), or SES, contains 23 items arranged into two subscales: general and social self-efficacy. The general subscale contains items in three areas: willingness to initiate behavior, willingness to expend effort in completing the behavior, and persistence in the face of adversity. The social subscale consists of items related to social situations. (Sherer et al., 1982). Cronbach alphas are .86 for general self-efficacy and .71 for social self-efficacy (Sherer et al., 1982).

The Argumentativeness Scale (Infante & Rancer, 1982), or ARG, contains 20 items divided into two subscales: the tendency to approach arguments (ARG-ap) and the tendency to avoid arguments (ARG-av). General argumentativeness is calculated by subtracting the "avoiding arguments" sum from the "approaching arguments" sum. For our purposes, we will focus on the individual subscale scores. Cronbach's alpha was .91 for ARG-ap and .86 for ARG-av; test-retest reliability is .87 for ARG-ap and .86 for ARG-av using a one-week interval (Infante & Rancer, 1982).

The Self-Righteousness Scale (Falbo & Belk, 1985), or SRS, is a 7-item measure assessing the conviction that one's beliefs or behaviors are correct in contrast to alternative thoughts or behaviors. The coefficient alpha for this measure is .60, and test-retest reliability is reported as .53 (Falbo & Belk, 1985).

The Revised Martin-Larsen Approval Motivation (Martin, 1984), or MLAM, is a 20-item measure of the desire to receive positive social reinforcement and avoid negative evaluations and social punishments. Internal consistency of the MLAM was .75, and test-retest reliability is reported as .72 (Martin, 1984).

The Social Fear Scale (Raulin & Wee, 1984), or SFS, consisted of 36 true/false items and was designed to measure participants' social fear represented by interpersonal evasiveness and lack of interpersonal relationships. Internal consistency for this measure has been reported as excellent, with alphas ranging from .85 to .88. (Raulin & Wee, 1984).

The Liking People Scale (Filsinger, 1981), or LPS, is a 15-item scale assessing interpersonal orientation. Liking people is conceptualized as one-dimensional: it assumes that individuals approach or avoid people primarily due to their general affinity for them. Cronbach alphas ranged from .75 to .85 on various samples used to norm the scale (Filsinger, 1981).

Results

All means, standard deviations, coefficient alphas, and correlations are presented in Table I separated by gender. All measures had adequate to excellent internal consistency ranging from .55 to .90.

Gender differences were present in general self-efficacy, argumentativeness, self-righteousness, social fear, and liking people; Table I displays these variables' correlations with perfectionism subscales.

TABLE I   Means, Cronbach Alphas, and Correlations between Positive and Negative Perfectionism, Self-efficacy, Argumentativeness, Self-Righteousness, Approval Motivation, Social Fear, and Liking People by Gender

Criterion	PP	NP	SES	ARG-av	ARG-ap	SRS	LMAM	SFS	LPS
PP	{.87}	.40***	.43***	-.01	.23*	.11	-.16	-.13	.23*
NP	.19*	{.87}	-.04	.27**	.09	.11	.24**	.01	.19*
SES	.23**	-.26***	{.83}	-.29***	.25**	.05	-.45***	-.45***	.38***
ARG-av	-.02	.16*	-.22**	{.80}	-.52***	.12	.46***	.10	.03
ARG-ap	.22**	.01	.16*	-.66***	{.86}	.03	-.34***	-.14	.17
SRS	.18*	-.18*	.18*	-.22**	.16*	{.55}	-.05	-.05	.18*
LMAM	-.01	.46***	-.40***	.41***	-.33***	-.25**	{.69}	.14	-.02
SFS	.02	.38***	-.25**	.11	-.06	.02	.26***	{.90}	-.68***
LPS	.02	-.16*	.31**	.06	-.05	.09	-.09	-.45***	{.85}
Male Means	71.8	62.2	61.7	26.3	33.8	17.2	53.1	4.8	58.4
SD	9.8	12.2	9.8	6.9	7.5	2.4	8.1	5.7	9.0
Female Means	70.2	62.0	58.5	29.3	31.4	18.1	53.6	3.3	61.0
SD	8.1	12.8	10.3	7.1	7.5	2.0	7.8	4.8	8.3

Note: The male sample (N = 125) is above the diagonal, and the female sample (N = 163) is below. PP = Positive Perfectionism; NP = Negative Perfectionism; SES = Self Efficacy; ARG-av = Avoiding Arguments; ARG-ap = Approaching Arguments; SRS = Self Righteousness; LPS = Liking People; Cronbach's alpha in brackets on the diagonal.

*p< .05, **p< .01, ***p< .001

While we hypothesized that NP would be negatively related to SES, we found no significant relationship in the male sample. However, NP was negatively related to SES in the female sample (r = -.26, p < .01). Results confirmed our hypothesis that PP would be positively related to SES in both males (r = .45, p < .001), and females (r = .23, p < .01). As anticipated, males reported more self-efficacy overall (t (268) = 8.53, p < .001).

NP was positively related to ARG-av in males (r = .26, p < .01) and females (r= .16, p < .05). As expected, a positive relationship between PP and ARG-ap was also reported by males and females (r = .23, p < .01 and r = .22, p < .01, respectively).

In females, the SRS was negatively related to PP (r = -.18, p < .05) and positively related to NP (r = .18, p < .05), as hypothesized. In males, the correlations were both slightly positive and not significantly different.

We anticipated a positive relationship between NP and the MLAM. As hypothesized, NP was positively related to the MLAM in both males (r = .24, p < .001) and females (r= .46, p < .001).

Data failed to support the hypothesis that higher levels of PP correspond with lower levels of social fear: PP and the SFS showed no significant relationships in either gender. NP was associated with higher levels of social fear in females (r = .38, p < .001) as expected, but not in males.

Our expectation that PP and NP would be related to the LPS was supported. Interestingly, LPS was positively related to both PP (r =.23, p < .01) and NP (r = .19, p < .05) in males. In the female population, NP was negatively related to the LPS (r = -.16, p < .05); PP and LPS were unrelated.

Discussion

Study 1 further clarified the PNP's conceptualization by examining defining interpersonal and social variables. Results revealed essential interpersonal differences between positive and negative perfectionism, including interesting gender differences. Perfectionism was positively related to general self-efficacy in males and females, and males reported significantly more overall self-efficacy. In females, perfectionism correlated negatively to self-efficacy, supporting Martin et al.'s (1996) findings. Negative perfectionism positively correlated with avoiding arguments in both genders, and positive perfectionism positively correlated with approaching arguments.

An unexpected gender difference emerged in that males were overall more likely to approach arguments (t (286) = 7.30, p < .001) and women were more likely to avoid arguments (t (286) = 9.53, p < .001). Thus, gender may explain the difference in higher levels of self-confidence (Hirshfeld, Klerman, Gough, Barrett, Korchin, & Chodoff, 1977). Additionally, women tend to score higher in measures of warmth (De Bolle et al., 2015), which is related to argument avoidance (Nussbaum & Bendixen, 2003). Self-righteousness correlated negatively with positive perfectionism and positively with negative perfectionism in the female sample. Interestingly, females reported significantly more self-righteousness (t (286) = 5.07, p < .001) than males, who revealed no significant relationships between positive and negative perfectionism and self-righteousness. In line with our predictions, negative perfectionism is significantly related to the need for approval as motivation.

"Adaptive" vs. "Maladaptive" Perfectionism

Our results revealed the perfectionist's willingness to approach or avoid arguments. NP individuals were more likely to avoid arguments, while PP individuals were more likely to approach discussions. Research has generally shown a negative relationship between argument approach and argument avoidance (Nussbaum & Bendixen, 2003; Gronostay, 2019). This relationship suggests positive and negative perfectionism are motivated by different personal needs and social cues. Because this relationship is stable across genders, one's willingness to approach or avoid an argument and individual differences tied to perfectionism appear conceptually congruent. Research investigating the relationship between the Big Five and argument approach/avoidance has found that approaching discussions positively correlates with openness and extraversion and negatively correlated with agreeableness (Gronostay, 2019). Avoiding arguments negatively correlates with extraversion and emotional stability (Gronostay, 2019). Thus, positive and negative perfectionism may be related to different personality traits. Absolutism was positively associated with avoiding arguments (Gronostay, 2019), providing evidence that NP individuals may be prone to rigid thinking (Fedewa & Burns, 2003).

A goal of Study 1 was to consider whether perfectionism can have positive qualities. Our results provide support for such a claim by demonstrating a positive relationship between self-efficacy and positive perfectionism. Self-efficacy is broadly related to numerous positive attributes, including greater life satisfaction (Azizli et al., 2015) and better health outcomes (O'Leary, 1985). In addition, evidence aligns with Bandura's theory of self-efficacy, which postulated performance accomplishments as a significant source of efficacy information (Bandura, 1977), finding that positive perfectionism may be characterized by the ability to set and accomplish goals, providing positive reinforcement influencing mastery behaviors.

Our results also help explain the behavioral pattern of NP. Notably, NP individuals reported being strongly motivated by a desire to gain others' approval while avoiding their disapproval. Thus, in line with Hewitt et al.'s (2003) description of perfectionistic self-presentation, NP individuals may experience difficulties in their relationships brought on by their need to conceal aspects of their identity.

Gender differences

Unexpectedly, associations with negative perfectionism evidenced differences by gender. Females high in negative perfectionism had lower self-efficacy, higher social phobia, and a higher dislike of people. In contrast, males' negative perfectionism was positively related to liking people but unrelated to the other mentioned measures. We propose two possible explanations for the differences found. First, we suggest that men and women may express negative affect differently. When neuroticism is partitioned into volatility and withdrawal, women tend to score higher in withdrawal than men (Weisberg et al., 2011), indicating greater self-consciousness, higher anxiety, higher vulnerability, lower toughness, and higher rates of depression (DeYoung et al., 2007). This may explain why our female NPs scored higher in rates of social phobia and lower in self-efficacy and liking people. These differences may be attributed to women who withdraw from social situations and direct negative affect inward.

Secondly, we propose another explanation, that female NPs may be more receptive to nonverbal social feedback. Several studies have found that females tend to be better at decoding non-verbal communication (Briton & Hall, 1995): they integrate all communication channels, while males attend more to the verbal channel (Ambady, Hallahan, & Rosenthal, 1995). Individuals who were less expressive, less sociable, and lower in self-esteem tended to be more accurate when judging non-verbal cues (Ambady, Hallahan, & Rosenthall, 1995). Individuals often reveal their true negative feelings in the non-verbal channel while providing positive verbal feedback (Swann, Stein-Steroussi, & McNulty, 1992). Socially anxious individuals may also be hypervigilant of specific non-verbal cues (Boll et al., 2016). However, these effects are situation-dependent and not always apparent (Moutinho et al., 2021; Wermes et al., 2018). Thus, these females may be more likely to perceive contradictory verbal and non-verbal feedback or interpret ambiguous feedback negatively.

As a result, they may be more likely to conclude that their performance is inadequate, despite verbal reinforcement to the contrary. Because positive perfectionism is conceptually paired with positive reinforcement, females who endorse positive perfectionism may favor positive, albeit superficial, reinforcement and negative non-verbal feedback. However, additional research would be warranted to examine this premise.

Study II

The ability to experience positive interpersonal relations significantly affects the quality of life. Many variables affect our relationships: our personal and relationship standards, dependence on others, communication style, and level of intimacy are crucial aspects of interpersonal relationships. The ability to form satisfying and positive relations with others starts with our relationship with ourselves. Perfectionists have been frequently singled out in research as having maladaptive tendencies that could be detrimental to building successful interpersonal relationships (Habke & Flynn, 2002; Quadland, 1980; Pacht, 1984; Flett et al., 1989; Frost et al., 1990; Hewitt, & Flett, 1991; Ashby & Rice, 2002; Shea, 1999).

With many negative relational characteristics associated with perfectionism, one may assume that perfectionists build poor-quality relationships. This is not our assumption. Research on perfectionism and relationship satisfaction suggests an association between the two: Hewitt, Flett, and Mikail (1995) found that other-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism was linked with lower relationship satisfaction; other results have indicated "that relationship satisfaction suffers as one becomes increasingly distressed about oneself or one's partner achieving one's standards" (Shea, 1999, p. iii). Socially prescribed perfectionism "was associated with a tendency to display destructive relationship responses (i.e., exit, neglect, and insensitivity), lower dyadic adjustment, and various aspects of limerence, including obsessive preoccupations and emotional dependence on the dating partner" (Flett, Hewitt, Shapiro, & Rayman, 2002, p. 289). Alternatively, one study indicated that self-oriented perfectionists have stronger relationship beliefs in communication, trust, and support; therefore, they have high relationship standards in these areas.

Additionally, self-oriented perfectionism and loving are positively correlated (Flett, Hewitt, Shapiro, & Rayman, 2002). Research on romantic perfectionism and relationship affect has shown that certain aspects of perfectionism may benefit romantic relationships (Haney, 1999). They found that concern over romantic mistakes, partner's romantic criticism and expectations, and doubts about romantic activity damaged relationships. They were indicated by lower relationship satisfaction and relationship esteem and increased relationship depression and relationship anxiety (Haney, 1999). Conversely, high romantic standards and romantic organization benefit relationships related to increased satisfaction, greater relationship esteem, lower relationship depression, and reduced relationship anxiety (Haney, 1999). Consistent with prior research and the PNP conceptualization, we hypothesize that positive perfectionists will report increased satisfaction in their intimate relationships. We also expect that negative perfectionism will relate to decreased satisfaction in interpersonal relationships.

Perfectionists exhibit a paradox: they desire social relationships (sociotrophy and dependency) but simultaneously experience autonomous self-criticism. Perfectionists seem concerned about interpersonal relationships but may experience them as unreliable or conflictual (Habke & Flynn, 2002). Perfectionists seeking social approval may work harder to avoid rejection or withdrawal, experiencing less emotional involvement in their relationships. Both tactics are maladaptive (Habke & Flynn, 2002). In previous research, high scores on the Interpersonal Dependency Inventory (IDI) (Hirshfeld et al., 1977), which measures emotional reliance on others, lack of self-confidence, and the assertion of autonomy, have been consistently related to elevated scores on measures of depression (Hirshfeld et al., 1977; Overholser, 1990; Franche & Dobson, 1992), anxiety (Sterwart, Knize, & Pihl, 1992; Hirshfeld et al., 1977), interpersonal sensitivity (Richman & Flaherty, 1987; Hirshfeld et al., 1977), neuroticism (Hirshfeld et al., 1977), and loneliness (Mahon, 1982). Consistent with previous research on dependency, we expect women to report higher IDI (Hirshfeld et al., 1977; Bornstein, 1997, 1998). We hypothesize that positive perfectionists will report less emotional reliance on others and less assertion of autonomy than negative perfectionists, especially males, and that negative perfectionists will report the opposite. In a study of perfectionism in elite athletes, negative perfectionism was related to lower levels of self-confidence (Koivula, Hassmen, & Fallby, 2002).

Consistent with these findings, we expect that positive perfectionism will be unrelated or negatively related to self-confidence, especially in males. We also hypothesize that negative perfectionists will report lower self-confidence, especially among females.

Positive and negative perfectionism will be explored concerning self-silencing behavior. Jack (1991) initially introduced the self-silencing construct to explain factors of depression in women; however, literature has reported that men self-silence at least as much as women do (Duarte & Thompson, 1999; Jack & Dill, 1992; Thompson, 1995). The Silencing the Self scale assesses the level of communication relating to personal needs in relationships and contains four subscales: Externalized Self-perception (ESP), Care as Self-sacrifice (CSS), Silencing the Self (SS), and the Divided Self (DS) (Duarte & Thompson, 1999). ESP assesses whether the respondent judges by external standards and the CSS measures the belief that caring means putting the needs of others ahead of their own (Duarte & Thompson, 1999). The SS determines whether self-expression is squelched to avoid conflict in relationships, and the DS assesses whether one feels they must remain outwardly compliant when internally angry and resentful (Duarte & Thompson, 1999). Self-silencing is related to depression in both genders (Duarte & Thompson, 1999). Given the relationship between perfectionism and depression, we hypothesized that SS, DS, and ESP would be unrelated or negatively related to positive perfectionism and positively associated with negative perfectionism in both genders since each dimension influences the suppression of one's personal needs to decrease conflict in interpersonal relationships, which leads to poor communication and relationship dissatisfaction.

Self-silencing is also related to relationship satisfaction. In previous research on gender differences in self-silencing, men were found to self-silence more than women. Still, they reported less depression, suggesting a difference in perception of self-silencing between genders, which may significantly affect interpersonal relationships (Duarte & Thompson, 1999). Because no substantial differences among SS, DS, and ESP were found between genders in previous studies, none are expected in this study (Duarte & Thompson, 1999). Instead, we anticipate that SS, DS, and ESP will be strongly related to decreased relationship satisfaction in both genders.

The CSS and DS were correlated positively for women, "suggesting that, when women believe that it is imperative to be subservient to the needs of others, they may experience a loss of self" (Duarte & Thompson, 1999, p. 159). However, no correlation was found for men, "suggesting that the consequences to the self of putting the needs of others first may be different for men" (Duarte & Thompson, 1999, p. 159). Thus, care as self-sacrifice may be a positive aspect of relationships for men unrelated to adverse outcomes as found with women. Considering this evidence, we hypothesize that CSS and satisfaction will positively correlate for males and negatively for females.

We will examine the relationships between positive/negative perfectionism and self-monitoring behavior. Habke and Flynn (2002) suggested: "that perfectionists experience feelings of vulnerability and inferiority" (p. 157), seeking to gain approval and attempting to avoid negative evaluation by others in social interactions (Hewitt & Flett, 1993). Self-monitoring is the degree to which individuals monitor their nonverbal affect, self-presentation, and expressive behavior (Snyder, 1974). High self-monitors are sensitive to interpersonal cues and "regulate their expressive self-presentation for the sake of desired public appearance" (Sullivan & Harnish, 1990, p. 292). Conversely, low self-monitors place more importance on their realities: their expressive self-presentations reflect their attitudes, feelings, and beliefs, not those of their peers (Sullivan & Harnish, 1990). Furnham (1989) found that self-monitoring was related to neuroticism, extraversion, and Type A behavior. "Both A type behavior and self-monitoring tend to be negatively correlated with forgiving, patient, tolerant and unselfish and positively correlated with complaining, cruel, dishonest and selfish" (Furnham, 1989, p. 39). Type A behavior is associated with poor physical and psychological health. High self-monitors experience depression predominantly from failure, whereas low self-monitors experience depression due to cognitive dissonance (Furnham, 1989). Dimensions of perfectionism have also been related to Type A behavior: Flett, Hewitt, Blankstein, and Dynin (1994) "found that at least one component of the Type A construct was associated with each perfectionism dimension, and these relations were present for both males and females" (p. 477). Self-monitoring has also been related to defensive pessimism, which "is a self-handicapping strategy in which individuals set low expectations prior to entering an academic situation to defend against a loss of self-esteem in the event of failure" (Polak & Prokop, 1989, p. 286). These relationships between self-monitoring and variables associated with NP inform our hypothesis that high self-monitors will score high in negative perfectionism. This relationship will be particularly salient for male participants, given that men tend to be high self-monitors (Frazier & Fatis, 1980). The overlap of proposed etiological factors between NP and self-monitoring justifies this hypothesis.

Previous research indicates considerable differences in dating behaviors between high and low self-monitors. High self-monitors are more willing to terminate current relationships in favor of a new one and report a greater number of partners than low self-monitors (Snyder & Simpson, 1984). "The link between the relationship length and intimacy level was more pronounced for low than high self-monitoring individuals. This converging evidence suggests that high self-monitoring individuals adopt an 'uncommitted' and low self-monitoring individuals a 'committed' orientation toward dating relationships" (Snyder & Simpson, 1984, p. 1281).

Considering these presumptions, we hypothesize that self-monitoring will relate to lower relationship satisfaction, especially in males. Since high self-monitors are more concerned with monitoring their self-presentation and emotional affect, we hypothesize that they would also be high in self-silencing behaviors (SS, DS, and ESP) in interpersonal relationships, especially if male.

Perfectionism can significantly affect one's life for better or for worse. Accordingly, we assert that an essential difference between positive and negative perfectionism exists. This study aims to distinguish between positive and negative perfectionism and explore how this distinction relates to interpersonal and social interaction indices. We expect that positive perfectionists will show less emotional reliance on others and that negative perfectionists will show more emotional dependence, with females being more emotionally reliant in general. Positive perfectionists should be less assertive of their autonomy, especially if female and negative perfectionists will likely be more assertive, especially if male. Lack of self-confidence should be unrelated or negatively related to positive perfectionism, especially in males, while negative perfectionists should report lower self-confidence, predominantly if female. Finally, we expect positive perfectionists to be less likely to self-silence than negative perfectionists. We hypothesize that SS, DS, and ESP will be unrelated or negatively related to positive perfectionism and positively associated with negative perfectionism in both genders. We also expect that high self-monitors will report high levels of negative perfectionism.

A fundamental question explored in this study concerns how relationship satisfaction will vary due to positive and negative perfectionism, dependency, self-silencing, and self-monitoring behavior. We hypothesize that positive perfectionists will report higher levels of relationship satisfaction while negative perfectionists will report lower levels. We expect SS, DS, and ESP to be strongly related to decreased relationship satisfaction in both genders. The relation between CSS and relationship satisfaction will be positive in males and negative in females. We hypothesize that self-monitoring will be related to lower satisfaction in relationships overall. One subsidiary hypothesis will also be tested: since self-monitors are highly concerned with monitoring their self-presentation and emotional affect, they will also report self-silencing behaviors (SS, DS, and ESP) in interpersonal relationships.

Method

Participants

Our sample contained 99 male and 122 female undergraduate introductory psychology students from a mid-sized Midwestern university receiving credit for participation. The only requirement for their participation was that they were currently involved in an intimate relationship of at least three months. The mean age of our sample was 19.9 (SD = 3.3) for males and 19.4 (SD = 2.6) for females. The average length of involvement was 22.2 (SD = 32.1) months for males and 20.7 (SD = 27.1) months for females. Our sample's racial/ethnic composition was reported to be 87.4% Caucasian, 6.5% African American, 2.2% Asian American, 2.7% Hispanic, and 1.2% not provided.

Procedure
The same procedure was used as described in Study 1.
Measures

The Positive and Negative Perfectionism Scale (Terry-Short et al., 1995), or PNP, is described in Study 1.

The Interpersonal Dependency Inventory (Hirshfeld et al., 1977), or IDI, measures excess dependency related to behavioral and emotional disorders and is based on psychoanalytic, social learning, and attachment theories (Hirshfeld et al., 1977). It is a 48-item instrument composed of three subscales designed to measure thoughts, behaviors, and feelings following the need to associate with highly valued people closely. The three subscales are Emotional Reliance on others (ER), Lack of Self-confidence (LSC), and Assertion of Autonomy (AA). The IDI has good internal consistency with split-half reliabilities that range from .72 to .91.

No test-retest data were reported. The concurrent validity of the first two subscales is acceptable, and the IDI distinguishes between psychiatric patients and a control group (Hirshfeld et al., 1977).

The Relationship Assessment Scale (Hendrick, 1988), or RAS, is a 7-item measure of global relationship satisfaction. It applies to anyone in an intimate relationship, including dating, cohabiting, and engaged couples; it is not limited to married couples. Subjects rate their level of satisfaction based on items using a 5-point Likert-style scale, with responses ranging from low satisfaction (1) to high satisfaction (5). The total or the average score can

be used for interpretation – higher scores mean higher relationship satisfaction. Average scores range from 1 to 5, and the total scores range from 7 to 35.

The Cronbach's alpha obtained from our sample for the RAS was .88, with six of the seven total items. Upon examination, the seventh item seemed to confuse respondents, and removing the item raised our alpha significantly.

The Silencing the Self-Scale (Jack, 1991), or STSS, is a 31-item scale measuring the extent to which an individual endorses self-silencing behaviors and thoughts in relationships. The scale consists of four subscales, including Externalized Self-perception (ESP), Care as Self-sacrifice (CSS), Silencing the Self (SS), and the Divided Self (DS); scores can be derived from each subscale or combined for a measure of global self-silencing (Duarte & Thompson, 1999; Jack & Dill, 1992). According to Duarte and Thompson (1999), ESP measures self-assessment by external standards; CSS measures whether the respondent believes that caring means putting the needs of others in front of their own needs in interpersonal relationships; SS determines whether self-expression is squelched to avoid conflict in relationships; DS "reflects the phenomenology of depression" (Jack & Dill, 1992, p. 98), as it assesses whether one feels they need remain outwardly compliant while feeling angry and resentful on the inside (Duarte & Thompson, 1999).

Results

All means, standard deviations, coefficient alphas, and correlations are presented in Table II, separated by gender. Cronbach's alphas for all measures used were >.70 and found acceptable. As noted in prior research, significant gender differences were observed with all variables (t range = 1.90 to –5.16, p < .05), except NP, PP, RAS, ESP, relationship length, and age. Thus, all analyses were conducted by gender.

TABLE II   Means, Cronbach Alphas, and Correlations between Positive and Negative Perfectionism, Relationship Satisfaction, Interpersonal Dependency, Self-silencing, and Self-monitoring by Gender

Criterion	PP	NP	RAS	ER	LSC	AA	ESP	CSS	SS	DS	SM
PP	{.84}	.21*	.10	.28**	-.20*	-.12	-----	.20*	-.17	-.02	.08
NP	.44***	{.88}	-.32**	.47***	.32**	-.20	.68***	.25*	.21*	.38***	.40***
RAS	.03	-----	{.88}	-.07	-.11	-.14	-.24*	.15	-.29**	-.58***	-.34***
ER	.40***	.51***	-.04	{.80}	.33***	-.20*	.36***	.21*	-----	.14	.31**
LSC	.03	.42***	-----	.42***	{.81}	-.02	.42***	.02	.27**	.27**	.21*
AA	.08	.18	.02	-----	.15	{.77}	-.17	-.13	.12	.06	.15
ESP	.25**	.59***	-.13	.44***	.39***	-.15	{.78}	.31**	.36***	.57***	.50***
CSS	.08	.13	.10	.14	.13	-.16	.29**	{.70}	.11	-.12	.10
SS	.01	.32***	-.19*	.29**	.35***	-.16	.42***	.24**	{.81}	.45***	.30**
DS	.06	.35***	-.56***	.37***	.26**	-----	.49***	.06	.54***	{.82}	.51***
SM	.09	.20*	-.26**	.13	.09	.03	.39***	-.02	.11	.38***	{.72}
Male Means	68.6	58.1	25.2	40.3	31.1	30.0	15.4	27.2	22.4	14.7	13.4
SD	7.8	11.8	4.9	8.5	7.4	6.1	4.7	5.2	5.7	5.8	4.0
Female Means	69.8	59.4	26.3	42.3	33.6	27.0	16.1	25.9	19.6	12.5	10.7
SD	7.7	13.4	3.9	8.1	7.6	6.9	4.9	5.1	6.2	4.7	3.9

Note: The male sample (N = 99) is above the diagonal, and the female sample (N = 122) is below. PP = Positive Perfectionism; NP = Negative Perfectionism; RAS = Relationship Satisfaction; ER = Emotional Reliance; LSC = Lack of Self-confidence; AA = Assertion of Autonomy; ESP = Externalized Self-perception; CSS = Care as Self-sacrifice; SS = Self-silencing; DS = Divided Self; SM = Self-Monitoring. Cronbach's alpha in brackets on the diagonal.
*p<.05, **p<.01, ***p<.001

We expected that PP and NP would correlate differently with RAS. Data failed to support our hypothesis that positively oriented perfectionists would report experiencing increased satisfaction in their intimate relationships. NP correlated negatively with RAS for males only (r = -. 32, p < .01), partially supporting our hypothesis that NP and RAS would be negatively related for both genders.

We hypothesized that positive perfectionists would experience less ER than negative perfectionists. In both males and females, ER correlated positively with PP (males: r = .28, p < .05; females: r = .40, p < .001) and NP (males: r = .47, p < .001; females: r = .51, p < .001). Utilizing a mean-split for PP and NP by gender for ER revealed that males high in NP and low in PP experienced significantly more emotional reliance (t (40) = 2.46, p <

.05) than males high in PP and low in NP. The effect of high NP and low PP compared to high PP and low NP with ER was also significant in females (t (51) = 3.21, p < .01).

We expected that PP would be unrelated or negatively related to AA and that NP would positively correlate with AA in both genders. In contrast, AA was unrelated to both PP and NP in males. In females, AA was also unrelated to PP; however, a positive correlation with NP (r = .18, p < .05) did emerge, as expected. Utilizing a mean split for PP and NP revealed no significant differences between PP and NP for AA levels in males or females.

Results confirmed our hypothesis that PP would be unrelated or negatively related to LSC. In males, PP and LSC correlated negatively (r = -.20, p < .05) and NP and LSC correlated positively (r = .32, p < .05). In females, PP and LSC were unrelated and NP and LSC were positively correlated (r = .41, p < .001), as predicted. Utilizing a mean-split for PP and NP by gender for LSC revealed that males high in NP and low in PP, compared to males high in PP and low in NP, reported significantly lower self-confidence (t (40) = 7.05, p < .001). In females, the effect of high NP and low PP, compared to high PP and low NP, with LSC was also significant (t (51) = 7.24, p < .001).

In alignment with prior research on dependency, females reported significantly more ER (t (219) = 5.41, p < .001) and LSC (t (219) = 6.62, p < .001) than males, while males reported significantly more AA (t (219) = 8.75, p < .001).

Substantial differences between PP and NP were expected regarding self-silencing. We hypothesized that PP would be unrelated or negatively related to SS, DS, and ESP in both genders. Data fully supported this only with males – PP was unrelated to SS, DS, and ESP. In females, PP was unrelated to SS and DS as expected; however, an unpredicted positive correlation between PP and ESP (r = .25, p < .01) was found. Results confirmed our predictions that NP would be positively related to SS, DS, and ESP in both genders. In males, NP correlated positively with SS (r = .25, p < .05), DS (r = .38, p < .001), and ESP (r = .68, p < .001). In females, NP also correlated positively with SS (r = .32, p < .001), DS (r = .35, p < .001), and ESP (r = .59, p < .001).

We expected that SS, DS, and ESP would be strongly related to decreased RAS in both genders. In males, results did reveal significant negative correlations between the RAS and SS (r = -.29, p < .05), DS (r = -.58, p < .001), and ESP (r = -.24, p < .05). In females, results also revealed significant negative correlations between the RAS and SS (r = -.19, p < .05) and DS

(r = -.56, p < .001); however, ESP and RAS were found to be unrelated. CSS was positively related to RAS in males (r = .20, p = .05) as hypothesized. However, our hypothesis that CSS would negatively affect RAS in females was not confirmed.

Negative perfectionism was expected to positively affect self-monitoring behavior, especially in males. Results confirmed this hypothesis: NP and SM were positively correlated in both males (r = .40 p < .001) and females (r = .20, p < .05), with males showing a stronger relationship as expected.

Self-monitoring was also thought to be related to RAS and the SSS. Results confirmed our hypothesis that self-monitoring would relate to decreased RAS in both genders: SM and RAS were negatively correlated in males (r = -.34, p < .001) and females (r = -.26, p < .01). We also hypothesized that SM would positively correlate with the indices of SS, DS, and ESP in both genders. Results supported our hypothesis in males: SM showed significant positive correlations with SS (r = .30, p < .01), DS (r = .51, p < .001), and ESP (r = .50, p < .001). In females, SM showed significant positive correlations with DS (r = .38, p < .001) and ESP (r = .39, p < .001) only, SM and SS were unrelated.

Discussion

One aim of Study 2 was to explore the differentiation between positive and negative perfectionism in romantic interpersonal relationships. Our findings revealed essential differences between positive and negative perfectionism in interpersonal and social interaction. Positive perfectionists showed less emotional reliance and were more confident, while negative perfectionists were more emotionally reliant on others and less self-confident. Assertion of autonomy and negative perfectionism were positively correlated in females but not males. Finally, while positive perfectionism proved to be unrelated to self-silencing behavior, a positive correlation with the externalized self-perception scale emerged with females.

On the other hand, negative perfectionists reported significant increases in self-silencing, feelings of division within the self, and externalized self-perceptions in both genders, as was expected. Negative perfectionists were also more likely to monitor their behavior in social situations, especially if male.

Finally, while positive perfectionists did not report increased satisfaction in their relationships, negative perfectionism showed a significant decrease in satisfaction in our male sample. Possible reasons for these outcomes will be discussed.

Negative perfectionism and self-monitoring correlated positively. Self-monitoring and negative perfectionism indices seem comparable in nature and consequence; a heightened fear of failure, proneness to depression, and need to prove oneself in social atmospheres. In our sample, self-monitoring was also significantly related to feelings of division within the self and externalized self-perception, which suggests detrimental interpersonal consequences for excessive self-monitors. These findings indicate a division within the self-monitoring construct itself.

Factor analytic studies have suggested that self-monitoring is multi-dimensional (Briggs & Cheek, 1986; Lennox, 1988). Lennox argued that the self-monitoring scale measures two distinct latent traits: acquisitive and protective self-monitoring. Acquisitive self-monitoring involves an active self-presentation style geared toward accommodating oneself to the situation to accumulate status and social approval. The acquisitive self-monitor tends to have high self-esteem, be optimistic about social situations, and be preoccupied with "getting ahead" (Lennox, 1988). On the other hand, the protective self-monitor tends to be pessimistic, have low self-esteem, and be concerned with "getting along" (Lennox, 1988) (as cited in Polak & Prokop, 1989, p. 285-286).

This study's second and equally important goal was to evaluate differential associations with positive and negative perfectionism and how dependency, self-silencing behaviors, and self-monitoring relate to relationship satisfaction. Positive perfectionism was unrelated to satisfaction in interpersonal relationships in either gender. Though negative perfectionism indicated decreased satisfaction for males, no relationship was found for females. No relationships were predicted or found between interpersonal dependency measures and reported relationship satisfaction. Indices of self-silencing and divided-self proved to be significant indicators of decreased satisfaction in both genders. These findings confirm the negative impact of self-silencing on both genders. Externalized self-perception was also negatively related to satisfaction with males ($r = -.24$, $p < .01$) but not females ($r = -.13$, $p =$ NS). Further research may confirm this relationship in both genders. Our hypothesis that care as self-sacrifice would positively relate to satisfaction in men and negatively in women was not supported: our data showed no relationship with either gender. Self-monitoring was negatively correlated with relationship satisfaction in both genders, though more so in males, as we expected due to previous findings that men tend to monitor their expressive behavior to a greater extent than women (Frazier & Fatis, 1980).

Gender Differences

The negative correlation between relationship satisfaction and NP in men was unexpected. Other gender differences in our study could explain why our NP female sample did not report lower relationship satisfaction: our female NPs reported high levels of autonomy assertion, dislike of people, and social fear. Evidence suggests that these traits are loosely correlated (Filsinger, 1981). Unlike our male NPs, our female NPs seemed to endorse a level of independence. For several reasons, endorsement of such traits may explain differences in overall relationship satisfaction in our sample. One explanation is that our female NPs benefited from maintaining some control in their relationships by asserting autonomy. Kitayama et al. (2010) found that compared with Japanese individuals, Americans tend to be less negatively affected by low relational harmony and more negatively affected by low levels of perceived control in their relationships.

Thus, Americans' well-being depends heavily on perceived control in their relationships. Another reason autonomy assertion may have helped our female NP sample stave off low relationship satisfaction is that these individuals endorsed self-oriented behaviors via endorsement of autonomy assertion and other-oriented behaviors, such as self-silencing. Mutuality, the relationship style characterized by the endorsement of both self-oriented and other-oriented behavior, leads to the best outcomes in romantic relationships when compared to individuals who only express either other-oriented (other-focused connectedness) or self-oriented behavior (self-focused autonomy) (Neff & Harter, 2003). Another possible explanation involves the differences between men and women in how self-silencing affects relationship satisfaction. Swann et al. (2003) theorize that men who inhibit themselves verbally are particularly at odds with women who are more disinhibited verbally. This interaction could influence the differences found in relationship satisfaction. This interpretation should be taken with caution, as we did not screen information about individuals' partner's personalities. Finally, research suggests that autonomy in relationships correlates positively with support-seeking behaviors, meaning that our female NPs may be more motivated to discuss and fix their relationship problems (Don & Hammond, 2017).

It is unclear why female NPs scored higher on independence issues than male NPs in our sample. Following study 1, we theorized that gender differences in our NP sample might result from differences in how men and women express negative affect or an increased awareness of non-verbal cues in female NPs. Study 2 provides additional insights into the different behavioral patterns between the genders. Another possible explanation for these gender differences is that males may be more tolerant of relational strain among their same-sex peers than females (Benenson et al., 2009). Because self-monitoring and self-silencing behaviors can lead to high-stress relationships, female NPs may be more susceptible to the stress caused by their NP tendencies.

Additionally, how men and women socialize may explain these differences. Men tend to be oriented toward group interactions, while women are more oriented toward dyadic interactions (Markovits, Beneson, & White, 2006; Benenson et al., 2007; Benenson & Heath, 2006). Thus, self-silencing may be more salient and especially harmful in novel or newly etablished social interactions when one is correspondingly less contextually oriented. This interpretation may also account for the differences in relationship satisfaction if men self-silence more often in personal or intimate relationships. However, more research is needed to confirm that such differences are stable across time and situations to account for our results.

General Discussion

Relationships between positive and negative perfectionism and several associated variables display significant gender differences. This was a rather unexpected finding. It is surprising, in part, because the PNP does not evidence of gender differences (Terry-Short et al., 1995). That said, men appear to benefit from positive perfectionism more than women. In Study 1, positive perfectionism in males revealed a significant association with self-efficacy and a decreased need for approval. In Study 2, positive perfectionism was associated with heightened self-confidence in our male sample. Females endorsing positive perfectionism reported less self-efficacy ($z = 2.72$, $p < .003$).

Conversely, negative perfectionism may have more severe consequences for women. Negative perfectionism in men was unrelated to self-efficacy, social fear, liking of people, and self-righteousness. However, females endorsing negative perfectionism reported lowered levels of self-efficacy and more self-righteousness by comparison. Females also endorsed higher levels of social fear and reported less liking of other people. Unexpectedly, positive perfectionism also correlated with externalized self-perception ($r = .25$, $p < .05$) in females. This suggests that positively perfectionistic women still judge themselves by external standards and endorse higher personal standards, typically a characteristic of negative perfectionism. Prior research has shown that females place more importance on their physical appearance than men (Jackson, Sullivan, & Rostker, 1988). They also tend to perceive a greater discrepancy between their actual and ideal figure and are more likely to suffer from eating disorders (Striegel-Moore, Silberstein, & Robin, 1986).

Gender Differences in Reappraisal and Perfectionism

The PNP doesn't evidence gender differences, so associated discrepancies are worth investigating. One possibility is that these gender differences are related to the reappraisal process. While reappraisal is generally considered an emotion-regulation strategy to cope with stressors and increase positive affect, evidence suggests that the reappraisal process can be either adaptive or maladaptive depending on the situation (Troy et al., 2013). Perchtold et al. (2019) investigated the relationship between depressive symptoms and reappraisal capacity.

While a higher capacity for reappraisal was associated with fewer depressive symptoms in men, there was no association in the female sample. The authors cautiously speculated that these differences might result from men's higher self-efficacy regarding emotion regulation. Our results align with this explanation: NP females in our sample scored lower in general self-efficacy and more elevated in areas of negative affect such as social phobia. A theoretical framework for reappraisal authored by Ford and Troy (2019) considers when reappraisal may be ineffective or detrimental. They propose that situational factors such as low social status may prevent successful emotion regulation following reappraisal when a sense of high sense of oppression arises in women who perform well academically may still lack confidence in their ability to achieve career success and impose unrealistic standards on themselves that fail to increase career self-efficacy appropriately. "Because of this lower status and power, women experience more negative events and have less control over important areas of their lives than men" (Nolen-Hoeksema, Grayson, & Larson, 1999, p. 1061). Previous research on perfectionism in career mothers by Mitchelson and Burns (1998) found that positive perfectionism was unrelated to professional efficacy at work for these women, suggesting that they may not feel positively rewarded for their efforts.

These findings prompt serious concerns for females who endorse negative perfectionism. Most detrimentally, ineffective attempts to use reappraisal to regulate emotions can increase depressive symptoms (Ford & Troy, 2019).

Positive and negative perfectionism correlated with cognitive flexibility (operationalized by our inverted self-righteousness scale) in women: positively for PP and negatively for NP. Neither relationship was observed in our male sample. This relationship is unclear, but recent research points to cognitive reappraisal as a moderator between perfectionism and cognitive flexibility (Hayatbini et al., 2021). While perfectionism is unrelated to the ability to consider different perspectives (a type of cognitive flexibility referred to as "alternatives"), it is negatively related to one's perception of control in their life, a kind of cognitive flexibility known as "control." This relationship is weaker among people who habitually use cognitive reappraisal, indicating that perfectionists with high self-efficacy can more effectively employ cognitive reappraisal to reduce cognitive rigidity. Thus, our female PP sample with high self-efficacy may have increased cognitive flexibility, whereas our female NP sample did not. Therefore, successful reappraisal in female PP and unsuccessful reappraisal in female NP may account for many of the gender differences in our sample. However, such a conclusion is speculative: future research should further investigate this relationship to determine the merits of this explanation.

Conclusion

Our study's college sample and correlational design limit the generalization and interpretation of our results. Though no gender differences in positive and negative perfectionism were found, further research is warranted to understand the differential consequences that indicate women may not experience social and relational reinforcement to the same extent as men. A different measure of relationship satisfaction may help explore gender differences in dependency and care as self-sacrifice in interpersonal relationships. It would also be interesting to see how divided self-monitoring would relate to positive and negative perfectionism – positive perfectionism may be connected with acquisitive self-monitoring, and negative perfectionism may indicate a relationship between protective self-monitoring and defensive pessimism. Further research of the relationships between reappraisal and perfectionism and its correlates would also provide valuable insight.

This study attempted to clarify the relationships between positive/negative perfectionism and its interpersonal behavioral consequences. Negative consequences were markedly salient for negative perfectionism: in females, significant associations were found between NP and decreased self-efficacy, increased self-righteousness, social fear, and a decrease in liking people; in males, NP corresponded with decreased relationship satisfaction. In both genders, negative perfectionism was related to argument avoidance, increased approval motivation, substantially lowered self-confidence and elevated emotional reliance, self-silencing and divisions within the self, externalized self-perception, and heightened self-monitoring in social situations. In males, positive perfectionism was associated with the increased liking of people, boosted self-confidence, and increased caring behaviors toward their significant others. Positive perfectionism proved to be more adaptive, revealing superior levels of self-efficacy, argument approach behaviors, and healthier levels of dependency. In females, positive perfectionism showed no significant relationships with self-silencing and divided self; in males, slight negative correlates were revealed.

The second question evaluated in this study was how relationship satisfaction related to positive and negative perfectionism, dependency, self-silencing, and self-monitoring. Negative perfectionism proved to predict diminished satisfaction in males, while self-silencing, divided self, externalized self-perception, and self-monitoring all predicted decreased satisfaction.

Overall, positive perfectionism was conducive to healthier interpersonal relationships – though it may not always lead to positive consequences, as with its positive correlation with externalized self-perception and negative correlation with self-righteousness found in women. On the other hand, negative perfectionism proved to hinder successful interpersonal relationships. In conclusion, it is not perfectionism that fails love but rather in failing to appreciate and express oneself, even if imperfectly.

References

Ambady, N., Hallahan, M., & Rosenthal, R. (1995). On judging and being judged accurately in zero-acquaintance situations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69*, 518-529.

Ashby, J. S., & Rice K. G. (2002). Perfectionism, dysfunctional attitudes, and self-esteem: A structural equations analysis. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 80(2)*, 197-203.

Azam, M. A., Katz, J., Fashler, S. R., Changoor, T., Azargive, S., Ritvo, P. (2015). Heart rate variability is enhanced in controls but not maladaptive perfectionists during brief mindfulness meditation following stress-induction: A stratified-randomized trial. *International Journal of Psychophysiology, 98(1)*. 27-34.

Azizli, N., Atkinson, B. E., Baughman H. M., Giammarco, E. A. (2015). Relationships between general self-efficacy, planning for the future, and life satisfaction. *Personality and individual differences, 82,* 58-60.

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84,* 191–215.

Blankstein, K. R., Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., & Eng, A. (1993). Dimensions of perfectionism and irrational fears: An examination with the fear survey schedule. *Personality and Individual Differences, 15*, 323-328.

Benenson, J. F., & Heath, A. (2006). Boys withdraw more in one-on-one interactions, whereas girls withdraw more in groups. *Developmental Psychology, 42*(2), 272-282.

Benenson, J. F., Markovits, H., Muller, I., Challen, A., & Carder, H. P. (2007). Explaining sex differences in infants' preferences for groups. *Infant Behavior & Development, 30(4),* 587-595.

Benenson, J. F., Markovits, H., Fitzgerald, C., Geoffroy, D., Flemming, J., Kahlenberg, S. M., & Wrangham, R. W. (2009). Males' greater tolerance of same-sex peers. *Psychological Science, 20(2),* 184-190.

Blickle, G. (1995). Conceptualization and measurement of argumentativeness: A decade later. *Psychological Reports 77*, 99-110.

Blickle, G. (1997). Argumentativeness and the facets of the big five. *Psychological Reports, 81*, 1379-1385.

Boll, S., Bartholomaeus, M., Peter, U., Lupke, U., Gamer, M. (2016). Attentional mechanisms of social perception are biased in social phobia. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 40,* 83-93.

Bornstein, R. F. (1997). Long-term retest reliability of Interpersonal Dependency Inventory scores in college students. *Assessment, 4(4),* 359-364.

Bornstein, R. F. (1998). Implicit and self-attributed dependency needs in dependent and histrionic personality disorders. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 71*, 1-14.

Briggs, S. R., & Cheek, J. M. (1986). The role of factor analysis in the development and evaluation of Personality Scales. *Journal of Personality*, *54*(1), 106–148. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1986.tb00391.x

Briton, N. J., & Hall, J. A. (1995). Beliefs about female and male nonverbal communication. *Sex Roles, 32*, 79-90.

Brouwers, M., & Wiggum, C. D. (1993). Bulimia and perfectionism: Developing the courage to be imperfect. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 15*, 141-159.

Burns, L. R., & Fedewa, B. A. (2005). Cognitive styles; Links with perfectionistic thinking. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38,* 103-113.

Cannon, M., Vedel, A., Jonason, P. K. (2020). The dark and not so humble: School-type effects on the Dark Triad traits and intellectual humility. *Personality and Individual Differences, 163, 110068.*

Curran, T., & Hill., A. P. (2017). Perfectionism is increasing over time: A meta-analysis of birth cohort differences from 1989 to 2016. *Psychological Bulletin, 145(4),* 410-429.

De Bolle, M., De Fruyt, F., McCrae, R. R., Löckenhoff, C. E., Costa, P. T., Aguilar-Vafaie, M. E., Ahn, C. K., Ahn, H. N., Alcalay, L., Allik, J., Avdeyeva, T. V., Bratko, D., Brunner-Sciarra, M., Cain, T. R., Chan, W., Chittcharat, N., Crawford, J. T., Fehr, R., Ficková, E., Gelfand, M. J., … Terracciano, A. (2015). The emergence of sex differences in personality traits in early adolescence: A cross-sectional, cross-cultural study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *108*(1), 171–185. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038497

Derlega, V. J., Metts, S., Petronio, S., & Margulis, S. T. (1993). *Self-disclosure.* Sage Publications, Inc.

DeYoung, C. G., Quilty, L. C., & Peterson, J. B. (2007). Between facets and domains: 10 aspects of the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93(5),* 880–896.

Don, B. P., & Hammond, M. D. (2017). Social support in intimate relationships: The role of relationship autonomy. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 43(8),* 1112-1124.

Duarte, L. M., & Thompson, J. M. (1999). Sex differences in self-silencing. *Psychological Reports, 85,* 146-161.

Dueling, J. K., & Burns, L. R. (2017). Perfectionism and work-family conflict: Self-esteem and self-efficacy as mediator. *Personality and Individual Differences, 116,* 326-330.

Falbo, T., & Belk, S. S. (1985). A short scale to measure self-righteousness. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 49*, 72-77.

Ford, B. Q., & Troy, A. S. (2019). Reappraisal reconsidered: A closer look at the costs of an acclaimed emotion-regulation strategy. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 28*, 195–203.

Filsinger, E. E. (1981). A measure of interpersonal orientation: The Liking People Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 45*, 295-300.

Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., Blankstein, K. R., & Dynin, C. B. (1994). Dimensions of perfectionism and Type A behavior. *Personality and Individual Differences, 16*, 477-485.

Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., Blankstein, K. R., & Koliden, S. (1991). Dimensions of perfectionism and irrational thinking. *Journal of Rational-Emotive and Cognitive Behavior Therapy, 9(3)*, 185-201.

Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., & DeRosa, T. (1996). Dimensions of perfectionism, psychological adjustment, and social skills. *Personality and Individual Differences, 20(2)*, 143-150.

Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., & Dyck, D. G. (1989). Self-oriented perfectionism, neuroticism, and anxiety. *Personality and Individual Differences, 10*, 731-735.

Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., Shapiro, B., & Rayman, J. (Winter 2001-02) Perfectionism, beliefs, and adjustment in dating relationships. *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality, Social, 20(4)*, 289-311.

Franche, R. L., & Dobson, K. (1992). Self-criticism and interpersonal dependency as vulnerability factors to depression. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 16(4)*, 419-435.

Frazier, R. B., & Fatis, M. (1980). Sex differences in self-monitoring. *Psychological Reports, 47*, 597-598.

Frost, R. O., Marten, P., Lahart, C., & Rosenblate, R. (1990). The dimensions of perfectionism. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 14*, 449-468.

Furnham, A. (1989). Personality correlates of self-monitoring: The relationship between extraversion, neuroticism, type a behavior and Snyder's self-monitoring construct. *Personality and Individual Differences, 10*, 32-42.

Gronostay, D. (2019) To argue or not to argue? The role of personality traits, argumentativeness, epistemological beliefs and assigned positions for students' participation in controversial political classroom discussions. *Unterrichtswiss*, 47, 117-135.

Habke A. M., & Flynn A. F. (2002). Interpersonal Aspects of Trait Perfectionism. In G. L. Flett & P. L. Hewitt (Eds.), *Perfectionism; Theory, Research and Treatment* (pg. 151-181). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Hamachek, D. E. (1978). Psychodynamics of normal and neurotic perfectionism. *Psychology, 15,* 27-33.

Haney, D. R. (1999, April). *Romantic perfectionism, relationship affect, and attachment in university students.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.

Hart, B. A., Gilner, F. H., Handal, P. J., & Gfeller, J. D. (1998). The relationship between perfectionism and self-efficacy. *Personality and Individual Differences, 24*, 109-113.

Hayatbini, N., Knauft, K., & Kalia, V. (2021). Cognitive reappraisal moderates the relationship between perfectionism and cognitive flexibility. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 77,* 1685–1699.

Hendrick, Susan S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction, *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50*, 93-98.

Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1991). Perfectionism in the self and social contexts: conceptualization, assessment, and association with psychopathology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 456-470.

Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1993). Dimensions of perfectionism, daily stress, and depression: a test of the specific vulnerability hypothesis. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 102,* 58-65.

Hewitt, P. L., Flett, G. L., Sherry, S. B., Ediger, E., Fairle, P., & Stein, M. B. (2003). The interpersonal expression of perfection: Perfectionistic self-presentation and psychological distress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 1303-1325.

Hewitt, P. L., Flett, G. L., & Turnbull, W. (1992). Perfectionism and Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) indices of personality disorder. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 14*, 323-335.

Hewitt, P. L., Flett, G. L., & Mikail, S. (1995). Perfectionism and family adjustment in pain patients and their spouses. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *9,* 335-347.

Hirshfeld, R. M., Klerman, G. L., Gough, H. G., Barrett, J., Korchin, S. J., & Chodoff, P. (1977). A measure of interpersonal dependency, *Journal of Personality Assessment, 41*, 610-618.

Infante, D. A., & Rancer, A. S. (1982). A conceptualization and measure of argumentativeness. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 46*, 72-80.

Jack, D. C. (1991). *Silencing the self: Women and depression.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Jack D. C., & Dill, D. (1992). The Silencing the Self Scale: Schemas of intimacy associated with depression in women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 16,* 97-106.

Jackson, L. A., Sullivan, L. A., & Rostker, R. (1988). Gender, gender role, and body image. *Sex Roles, 19*, 429-443.

Jain M., Sudhir P. M. (2010). Dimensions of perfectionism and perfectionistic self-presentation in social phobia. *Asian Journal of Psychiatry, 3,* 216-221.

Juster, H. R., Heimburg, R. G., Frost, R. O., Holt, C. S., Mattia, J. I., & Feccenda, K. (1996). Social phobia and perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 21*, 403-410.

Kitayama, S., Karasawa, M., Curhan, K. B., Ryff, C. D., & Markus, H. R. (2010). Independence and interdependence predict health and well-being: Divergent patterns in the united states and japan. *Frontiers in Psychology, 1*, 163-163

Koivula, N., Hassmen, P., & Fallby, J. (2002). Self-esteem and perfectionism in elite athletes: Effects on competitive anxiety and self-confidence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *32,* 865-875.

Lennox, R. (1988). The problem with self-monitoring: A two-sided scale and a one-sided theory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *52(1),* 58–73. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5201_5

Mahon, N. E. (1982). The relationship of self-disclosure, interpersonal dependency, and life changes to loneliness in young adults. *Nursing Research, 31*, 343-347.

Markovits, H., Benenson, J., & White, S. (2006). Gender and priming differences in speed of processing of information relating to social structure. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 42(5),* 662-667.

Martin, H. J. (1984). A revised measure of approval motivation and its relationship to social desirability. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 48*, 508-519.

Martin, T. R., Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., Krames, L. & Szanto, G. (1996). Personality correlates of depression and health symptoms: A test of a self-regulation model. *Journal of Research in Personality, 31*, 264-277.

Meleshko, K. G., & Alden, L. (1993). Anxiety and self-disclosure: Toward a motivational model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 64(6),* 1000-9. DOI: 10.1037//0022-3514.64.6.1000

Mitchelson, J. K., & Burns, L. R. (1998). Career mothers and perfectionism: Stress at work and at home. *Personality and Individual Differences, 25*, 477-485.

Moutinho, R., Castro., S. L., Silva. S. (2021). Look at me: The relation between empathy and fixation on the emotional eye-region in low vs. high social anxiety. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 70,* 101610.

Myers, S. A. (1998). Instructor socio-communicative style, argumentativeness, and verbal aggressiveness in the college classroom. *Communication Research Reports, 15(2),* 141-150.

Neff, K. D., & Harter, S. (2003). Relationship styles of self-focused autonomy, other-focused connectedness, and mutuality across multiple relationship contexts. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 20(1)*, 81-99.

Nolen-Hoeksema, S., Grayson, C., & Larson, J. (1999). Explaining the gender difference in depressive symptoms. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*, 1061-1072.

Nussbaum, E. M., & Bendixen, L. D., (2003). Approaching and avoiding argument: The role of epistemological beliefs, need for cognition, and extraverted personality traits. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 28(4),* 573-595.

O'Leary, A. (1985). Self-efficacy and Health. *Behavior Research and Therapy, 23(4),* 437-451.

Overholser, J. C. (1990). Emotional reliance and social loss: Effects on depressive symptomology. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 55*, 618-629.

Pacht, A. (1984). Reflections on perfection. *American Psychologist, 34*, 386-390.

Perchtold, C. M., Papousek I., Fink A., Weber H., Rominger C., & Weiss E. M. (2019). Gender differences in generating cognitive reappraisals for threatening situations: Reappraisal capacity shields against depressive symptoms in men, but not women. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10,* 553.

Porter, T., Schumann, K., Selmeczy, D., & Trzesniewski K. (2020). Intellectual humility predicts mastery behaviors when learning. *Learning and Individual Differences, 80, 101888.*

Polak, R. L., & Prokop, C. K. (1989). Defensive pessimism: A protective self-monitoring strategy? *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 4(3)*, 285-289.

Quadland, M. C. (1980). Private self-consciousness, attribution or responsibility, and perfectionistic thinking in secondary erectile dysfunction. *Journal of Sexual and Marital Therapy, 6*, 47-55.

Raulin, M. L., & Wee, J. L. (1984). The development and validation of a scale to measure social fear. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 40*, 780-784.

Richman, J. A., & Flaherty, J. A. (1987). Adult psychosocial assets and depressed mood over time: Effects of internalized childhood attachments. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 175*, 703-712.

Schill, T. (1996). Self-defeating personality, argumentativeness, and assertive self-statements. *Psychological Reports, 79*, 1103-1106.

Shea, A. J. (1999). Associations between perfectionism and relationship satisfaction. [Unpublished doctoral thesis]. Pennsylvania State University.

Shea, A. J. (2000). Associations between perfectionism and relationship satisfaction. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 60 (7-B)*, 3579.

Sherer, M., Maddux, J. E., Mercandante, B., Prentice-Dunn, S., Jacobs, B., & Rogers, R. W. (1982). The self-efficacy scale: Construction and validation. *Psychological Reports, 51*, 663-671.

Slaney, R. B., & Ashby, J. S. (1996). Perfectionists: Study of a criterion group. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 74*, 393-398.

Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 30(4)*, 526-537.

Snyder, M., & Simpson, J. A. (1984). Self-monitoring and dating relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 47(6)*, 1281-1291.

Sterwart, S. H., Knize, K., & Pihl, R. O. (1992). Anxiety sensitivity and dependency in clinical and non-clinical panickers and controls. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 6*, 119-131.

Striegel-Moore, R. H., Silberstein, L. R., & Rodin, J. (1986). Toward an understanding of risk factors for bulimia. *American Psychologist, 41*, 246-263.

Sullivan, L. A., & Harnish, R. J. (1990). Body Image: differences between high and low self-monitoring males and females. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *24,* 291-147.

Swann, W., Stein-Seroussi, A., & McNulty, S. (1992). Outcasts in a white-lie society: the enigmatic worlds of people with negative self-conceptions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*, 618-624.

Swann, W. B., Rentfrow, P. J., & Gosling, S. D. (2003). The precarious couple effect: Verbally inhibited men + critical, disinhibited women = bad chemistry. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85(6),* 1095-1106.

Terry-Short, L. A., Owens, R. G., Slade, P. D., & Dewey, M. E. (1995). Positive and negative perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 18*, 663-668.

Thompson, J. M. (1995). Silencing the self: depressive symptomatology and close relationships. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 19,* 337-353.

Troy, A. S., Shallcross, A. J., & Mauss, I. B. (2013). A person-by-situation approach to emotion regulation: Cognitive reappraisal can either help or hurt, depending on the context. *Psychological Science, 24,* 2505–2514. DOI: 10.1177/0956797613496434

Weisberg, Y. J., DeYoung, C. G., & Hirsh, J. B. (2011). Gender differences in personality across the ten aspects of the Big Five. *Frontiers in Psychology, 2,* 178.

Wermes, R., Lincoln, T. M., & Helbig-Lang, S. (2018). Anxious and alert? Hypervigilance in social anxiety disorder. *Psychiatry Research, 269,* 740-745.

Wyatt, R., & Gilbert, P. (1998). Dimensions of Perfectionism: A study exploring their relationship with perceived social rank and status. *Personality and Individual Differences, 24*, 71-79.