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Abstract
The goal of this systematic review was summarized the existing evidence for the relationship between perfectionism and dyadic relationships find the best high-quality studies of perfectionism and dyadic relationships and identify a good and common instrument for evaluation perfectionism in dyadic. Two independent reviewers organized a systematic review of the literature by taking after Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review rules, and inclusion/exclusion criteria from 1995 to 2017. Databases: SCOPUS/ Web of Science/ Google Scholar/ Science Direct / SAGE. After review 2307 articles were recognized in the initial search, then 20 articles satisfied criteria for finish assessment. The result showed that a significant relationship between perfectionism and dyadic relationship. The majority of articles (n=13) had a moderate level of acceptance scoring 3 or 4 of the 5 factors which were set by authors. Only three articles) got grade 5, they used all 5 factors evaluations. In this review two common and acceptable scales (MPS, APS-R) were identified.
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Introduction
Perfectionism is defined by trying for flawlessness and setting extremely high standards and rules for performance followed by tendencies for overly critical self-judgment and worries about negative judgment by other people (Flett & Hewitt, 2002; Frost et al., 1990). Based on Hewitt and Flett’s (1991) model, perfectionism has personal and social aspects, and three forms of perfectionism can be separated: self-oriented (hint to the attribution of compulsiveness qualities to oneself), other-oriented (hint to the attribution of compulsiveness qualities to another), and socially prescribed perfectionism (hint to the attribution of compulsiveness qualities by society).

Perfectionism influences all aspects of life, including romantic communication and marital satisfaction (Stoeber & Stoeber, 2009). The results of the studies demonstrate that the couples who have abnormal (negative) perfectionism indicates less marital satisfaction (Dimitrioski et al., 2002; Martin & Ashby, 2004; DiBarto & Barlow, 2006; Kim, 2011; Safarzadeh et al., 2011; Ehteshamzadeh et al., 2011) and the partner who has normal perfectionism showshigher marital satisfaction (Ashby et al., 2008).

Dyadic Perfectionism (perfectionism in dyadic connections, concentrating on the two individuals from the dyad) is a vital subject in research on perfectionism and sentimental...
connections. The researchers demonstrate that dyadic perfectionism has a significant negative relationship with marital satisfaction. People who have extra expectations and high conflict to their spouse have a tendency to be less fulfilled in their marriage (Arcuri, 2013; Mee et al, 2015).

**Aim**
The aim of this study was a) to summarize all information about the relationship between perfectionism and dyadic relationships b) to find the best high-quality studies of perfectionism and dyadic relationships and c) identify a good and common instrument for evaluation perfectionism in dyadic.

**Methods**
Two independent reviewers (MT & SAH) organized a systematic review of the literature by taking after Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Review rules. A complete survey of the following electronic databases was attempted — SCOPUS, Web of Science, Google Scholar, Science Direct and SAGE — using the search terms ‘perfectionism’, ‘married’, ‘satisfaction’, ‘conflict’ and all related sources.

**Inclusion Criteria**
Just original, published journal articles were incorporated into the analyses. All articles published from 1995 to 2017 in the English language, were involved. Studies should include the sample which has experience about married or dates. At least a measure of perfectionism was used in the assessment of perfectionism.

**Exclusion Criteria**
The studies which have the participants do not have interpersonal relationship were excluded. All articles that may fit the incorporation criteria were controlled. No exclusion criteria were set on appraisal strategies; any type of correspondence and strategy for assessment could be incorporated.

**Criteria for Evaluating the Quality of Articles**
Two reviewers independently (MT and SAH) surveyed each article for inclusion/exclusion criteria. The overall quality of each study was evaluated with five factors (table 1). For instance, the paper which used more than one scale to evaluate perfectionism were appraised greater than the paper used only one scale.
Table 1 Quality rating scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criteria Factors</th>
<th>Point(1/0)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. The aims of the study in connection to perfectionism are obviously expressed.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The information of sample is expressed, such as age distribution</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The duration of the relationship is stated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The validity or reliability of the scale is stated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. More than one scale is utilized to evaluate of perfectionism</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Where deficient factor is accessible, point ‘0’, the highest point is 5.

Results and Study Findings
A sum of 2307 articles was distinguished over systematic review, 1733 articles were dropped on starting survey due to the majority did not include “satisfaction or conflict”. Following abstract review, 499 articles did not meet inclusion criteria. 75 articles stayed for complete check. After complete check, 55 articles were avoided because of absence the married, partner, dyadic or interpersonal relationship. 20 articles were accessible meeting incorporation and prohibition criteria (figure 1).
Relationship between Perfectionism and Dyadic Relationships

Previous research illustrates that perfectionism is one of the predictors of satisfaction in dyadic relationships (table 2). Based on Hewitt and Fleet model of perfectionism, it was found that one who has high socially prescribed perfectionism is more likely to have low adjustment among dating couples (Fleet, Hewitt, Shapiro, & Rayman, 2001), low marital adjustment (Haring, Hewitt, & Fleet, 2003) and marital satisfaction (Mee, Hassan, Baba,Talib, Zakaria, 2015; Safarzadeh, EsfahansiaL, & Bayat, 2011; Egan, Vinciguerra, & Mazzucchelli, 2013; Dibartolo, & Barlow, 2006; Gol, Rostami, & Gudarzi, 2013; Arjmand, Fallahchait, & Zarei, 2015) among married couples. The Actor-Partner Independence Model Analysis shows that socially prescribed perfectionism predicts not only own marital adjustment, but also predicts partner’s marital adjustment (Haring, et al., 2003). Maladaptive perfectionism decreased the likelihood of higher quality relationships (Ashby, Rice and Kutchins, 2008). In Pup and Rusu (2015) study, there is a significant positive relationship between perfectionism and sexual perfectionism. Partner-prescribed and socially prescribed sexual perfectionism are maladaptive forms of sexual perfectionism associated with the negative aspects of sexuality whereas self-oriented and partner-oriented sexual perfectionism emerged as ambivalent forms associated with positive and negative aspect (Stoeber, Harvey, Almeida, & Lyons, 2013). Habke, Hewitt, & Flett, 1999, in their study found that the interpersonal dimensions of trait perfectionism were negatively related to general sexual satisfaction and sexual satisfaction with the partner for both husbands and wives. Maladaptive perfectionism to be associated with decreased levels of engagement in preventive health behaviours, life satisfaction and well-being and increased levels of self-concealment and psychological distress. Adaptive perfectionism was associated with higher levels of engagement in preventive health behaviours. Self-concealment was identified as a partial mediator in the relationship between maladaptive perfectionism and both engagement in preventive health behaviours and psychological distress (Williams, & Cropley, 2014).

All in all, according to the previous research perfectionism (adaptive & maladaptive) had a significant relationship with dyadic relationships.

Table 2. Summary of Reviewed articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Participant Characteristics</th>
<th>Perfectionism Measure</th>
<th>Other Measures</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Stewart, Sherry, & Hartling (2006). Rejecting interpersonal behaviors, Murray et al., 2003. (Modified)


Participants’ partner-oriented perfectionism had a positive effect on their partner’s partner-prescribed perfectionism and a negative effect on their own relationship satisfaction and long term commitment. Participants’ partner-prescribed perfectionism also had a negative effect on their own relationship satisfaction.

Maladaptive perfectionism decreased the likelihood of higher quality relationships.

---

1. Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale
2. Relationship Assessment Scale
3. Commitment Inventory
4. Almost Perfect Scale—Revised
5. Pre-marital Personal and Relationship Evaluation

---

www.hrmars.com
The students with abnormal perfectionism stated significantly greater fear of closeness than normal perfectionism.

Forgiveness and perfectionism had a significant role in marital conflict.

Socially prescribed perfectionism had a negative effect on marital coping and marital adjustment.

Perfectionism (positive and negative) had a significant effect on

---

6. Fear of intimacy scale
7. Frost perfectionism scale et al
8. Marital conflict questionnaire
9. Marital Happiness Scale
10. Autonomy and Relatedness Inventory
11. Marital Coping Inventory
12. Evaluation and Nurturing Relationship Issues, Communication and Happiness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gudarzi</th>
<th>men and 56 women (30 graduate students)</th>
<th>Inventory</th>
<th>marital satisfaction.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mee et al, 2015</td>
<td>APS-R, DAPS</td>
<td>ENRICH (Olson &amp; Larson, 2008)</td>
<td>Dyadic perfectionism has a significant negative relationship with marital satisfaction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarpoula &amp; Kolahi, 2016</td>
<td>Positive &amp; negative perfectionism (Terry-Short and et al)</td>
<td>Social adjustment Bell. self-efficacy questionnaire of Shrerzhand et al</td>
<td>Perfectionism (positive and negative) had a significant effect on social adjustment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Multidimensional Sexual Perfectionism Questionnaire
14. Sexual Communication Apprehension
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SD = 4.52; women 
M=21.48, SD = 4.13.

50 married 
women M= 
26.12

100 pregnant married 
women M= 27.9

Dimitrovsky, Levy-Shiff, & SchattnerZanany 2010 MPS endorsed in self-defeating interpersonal behaviors.

Self-oriented perfectionism was negatively related to marital satisfaction for non-pregnant women. For the pregnant women there was a negative relationship between socially prescribed perfectionism and marital satisfaction.

All perfectionist dates were seen as less attractive than the non-perfectionist date. Participants high in other-oriented perfectionism found the self-oriented perfectionist date more attractive, and the non-perfectionist date less attractive than participants low in other-oriented perfectionism.

Hoffman, Stoeberr, & Musch 2015 MPS

MPS; German version: Alstött er-Gleich, 1998

422 participants (192 male, 230 female) (SD = 12.4) M= 36.0

MPS; German translation of the attraction to the other scale (Sprecher, 1989)

Partner-prescribed and socially prescribed perfectionism are maladaptive forms of

Stoeber, Harvey, Almeida, & Lyons 2013 MSPQ

Multidimensional Sexual Self-Concept Questionnaire (Snell, 2011b)

272 university students

15. Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale
16. Dyadic Adjustment Scale
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author(s)</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Sample Description</th>
<th>Measures</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Habke, Hewitt, &amp; Flett</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>82 couples; men M = 29.6 (7.41), women M = 27.08 (6.4)</td>
<td>SPS; PSPS; PSSI; MPS</td>
<td>Sexual perfectionism associated with the negative aspects of sexuality whereas self-oriented and partner-oriented sexual perfectionism emerged as ambivalent forms associated with positive and negative aspects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flett, Hewitt, Shapiro, &amp; Rayman</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>69 college students (27 men, 42 women); M = 22.30</td>
<td>MPS</td>
<td>The interpersonal dimensions of trait perfectionism were negatively related to general sexual satisfaction and sexual satisfaction with the partner for both husbands and wives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiBartolo &amp; Barlow</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>32 men (with erectile disorder)</td>
<td>MPS</td>
<td>Perfectionist personality style was associated with particular beliefs and tendencies in interpersonal relationships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. Perfectionistic Self-Presentation Scale
18. The Pinney Sexual Satisfaction Inventory
Maladaptive perfectionism was associated with decreased levels of engagement in preventive health behaviours, life satisfaction and well-being and increased levels of self-concealment and psychological distress. Adaptive perfectionism was associated with higher levels of engagement in preventive health behaviours. Self-concealment was identified as a partial mediator in the relationship between maladaptive perfectionism and both engagement in preventive health behaviours and psychological distress.

Significant negative relationship between perfectionism and

19. Self-Concealment Scale
20. Hopkins Symptom Checklist–21
21. Satisfaction with Life Scale
22. World Health Organization’s WHO-5 Well-Being Index
23. Ahvaz Perfection Scale
24. Family Forgiveness Scale
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>marital</td>
<td>satisfaction</td>
<td>Moreover</td>
<td>multiple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relationships</td>
<td>between</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>forgiveness</td>
<td>perfectionism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>intimacy</td>
<td>and marital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Perfectionism Scale Used**

In total, 9 of the 20 articles used The Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS), 4 articles used Almost Perfect Scale–Revised (APS-R), and the other scales that used in these articles were Multidimensional Perfectionism Cognitions Inventory – English (Stoeber et al., 2010), MPSQ (Snell, 1997), Frost perfectionism scale FMPS, Hill Perfectionism Inventory, Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale (DAPS), Positive & negative perfectionism (Terry-Short and et al), Multidimensional Sexual Perfectionism Questionnaire MSPQ (Snell & Rigdon, 2001), Perfectionistic Self-Presentation Scale (PSPS) Hewitt, Flett, Fehr, Habke, & Fairlie, 1996, Ahvaz Perfection Scale (APS) and SPP scale from Hewitt and Flett (1991) Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (table 2).

The two measures used mostly for perfectionism are 1) The Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS; Hewitt & Flett, 1989, 1991a, 1991b) consists of three 15-item subscales measuring other-oriented, Self-oriented, and socially prescribed perfectionism. Participants rate their agreement with these items on a scale ranging from 1 to 7. Hewitt and Flett have reported satisfactory reliability, validity and dimensionality for the MPS for both clinical and nonclinical samples (Hewitt & Flett, 1989, 1991b; Hewitt, Flett, Turnbull-Donovan. & Mikail, 1991) and 2) Almost Perfect Scale–Revised (APS; Slaney et al., 2001). This scale is a self-report inventory containing 23 items designed to measure adaptive and maladaptive components of perfectionism. Participants respond to items utilizing a 7-point Likert-type (from 1 = strongly disagree to 7 = strongly agree). The scale has 3 subscales: (a) High Standards, (b) Discrepancy, and (c) Order.

**Evaluation of Articles**

---

25. International Personality Item Pool (IPIP), 2001
26. Depression Anxiety Stress Scale
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The quality of the papers was different, however the majority of them (n=13) was scored 3 or 4 as graded by the 5 factors quality degree (table 3). Three articles (studies 1, 10 and 15) got grade 5, they used all 5 factors evaluations. Six articles got grade 4 because they used only one perfectionism scale and the other articles got grade 3 or under it, they used valid scale and state all information about samples. In four studies that get grade 2 (Gol et al; Stoeber et al; Williams & Cropley; Safarzadeh et al) did not report any information about the sample or validation questioner. The aim factor was clearly stated in all 20 studies.

Table 3. Evaluation of articles by 5 factors (quality degree 0-5)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Factor 1 (Aim)</th>
<th>Factor 2 (Sample)</th>
<th>Factor 3 (Duration)</th>
<th>Factor 4 or 5 (Validity Reliability</th>
<th>Quality degree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mackinnon et al</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry et al</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arjmand et al</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin et al</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gol et al</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop &amp; Rusu.</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherry et al</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimitrovsky et al</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hoffmann et al</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoeber et al</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haring et al</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mee et al</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarpoulaki &amp; Kolahi</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DiBartolo &amp; Barlow</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams &amp; Cropley</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safarzadeh et al</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egan et al</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion
This systematic review included 20 studies which are investigated perfectionism and dyadic relationships. Based on previous research, there was a significant relationship between perfectionism and dyadic relationships, the spouses with normal perfectionism have a higher degree of marital satisfaction and spouses with negative perfectionism have a lower degree of marital satisfaction and higher degree of dyadic conflict. The goal of this systematic review was to find the best high-quality studies of perfectionism and dyadic relationships and identify a good and common instrument for evaluation perfectionism in dyadic. In this review, the related articles were described and evaluated based on five factors to assess the complete information for researchers in the future. This systematic review will be helpful to develop intervention strategies in counselling to promote marital wellness.
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