THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTACHMENT STYLES AND
PERFECTIONISM IN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO
THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
OF
MIDDLE EAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

BY

PELİN SAYA

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS
FOR
THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE
IN
THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL SCIENCES

JULY 2006

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

_____

Prof. Dr. Sencer Ayata
Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies all the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Prof. Dr. Ali Yıldırım
Head of Department

This is to certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate, in scope and quality, as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science.

_____

Prof. Dr. Gül Aydın
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Gül Aydın   (METU, EDS)   _____

Prof. Dr. Esin Tezer   (METU, EDS)   _____

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fidan Korkut (HÜ, EBB)   _____

I hereby declare that all information in this document has been obtained and presented in accordance with academic rules and ethical conduct. I also declare that, as required by these rules and conduct, I have fully cited and referenced all material and results that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name : Pelin Saya

Signature   :

ABSTRACT

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTACHMENT STYLES AND
PERFECTIONISM IN HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS

Saya, Pelin

M.S., Department of Educational Sciences

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Gül Aydın

July, 2006, 81 pages

The main purpose of the present study is to investigate the relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism as a function of gender in Turkish high school students. Factor structure of Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale in Turkish high school was also investigated.

Four hundred and ninety five 11th grade high school students from four different state high schools in Ankara participated in the study. Turkish versions of Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS, Oral, 1999) and Relationship Scale Questionnaire (RSQ, Sümer & Güngör, 1999b) were administered to students to collect data in the class settings.

Factor analysis was employed to MPS items to identify the dimensions of perfectionism as perceived by the participants. Factor analysis revealed three factors named self-oriented perfectionism, other-oriented perfectionism and socially prescribed perfectionism. A 2 (gender) x 4 (attachment styles) factorial MANOVA was conducted to examine the possible associations between attachment styles and perfectionism and, whether such a relationship varies as a function of gender. The

results of the MANOVA revealed no significant relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism as a function of gender.

Key words: Perfectionism, Attachment, Attachment Styles.

ÖZ

LİSE ÖĞRENCİLERİNDE BAĞLANMA BİÇİMLERİ VE MÜKEMMELLİYETÇİLİK İLİŞKİSİ

Saya, Pelin

Yüksek Lisans, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Gül Aydın

Bu çalışmanın amacı, bağlanma stilleri ve mükemmeliyetçilik arasındaki ilişkinin Türk lise öğrencilerinde cinsiyete bağlı olarak değişip değişmediğini incelemektir. Bunun yanısıra, Çok Boyutlu Mükemmeliyetçilik Ölçeği (ÇBMÖ)'nin faktör yapısı Türk lise öğrencileri örneklemi üzerinde araştırılmıştır.

Bu çalışmaya Ankara'daki dört farklı devlet lisesinin 11. sınıfında okuyan 495 öğrenci katılmıştır. Bu araştırmada, öğrencilere sınıf ortamında veri toplamak amacıyla daha önce Türkçe'ye uyarlanmış olan Çok Boyutlu Mükemmeliyetçilik Ölçeği (ÇBMÖ, Oral, 1999) ve İlişki Ölçekleri Anketi (İÖA; Sümer & Güngör, 1999b) uygulanmıştır.

Katılımcıların mükemmeliyetçilik boyutlarını algılayışını incelemek için ÇBMÖ üzerinde faktör analizi yapılmıştır. Faktör analizi sonuçları ÇBMÖ'de kendine yönelik mükemmeliyetçilik, başkalarına yönelik mükemmeliyetçilik ve başkalarınca belirlenen mükemmeliyetçilik olmak üzere 3 faktör ortaya çıkarmıştır. Bağlanma stilleri ve mükemmeliyetçilik arasındaki olası bir ilişkinin varlığını ve varsa bu ilişkinin cinsiyete bağlı olarak değişip değişmediğini saptamak amacıyla 2 (cinsiyet) x 4 (bağlanma stilleri) faktörlü Çoklu Varyans Analizi uygulanmıştır.

MANOVA sonuçları bağlanma stilleri ve mükemmeliyetçilik arasında cinsiyete bağlı olarak değişen anlamlı bir ilişkinin olmadığını ortaya koymuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Mükemmeliyetçilik, Bağlanma, Bağlanma Stilleri.

To My Parents,

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Trying to be better in many ways in life was a very common and basic need that humankind has been experiencing for centuries. This attitude was mostly appreciated by other people and gave satisfaction and happiness of approval.

Perfectionism (Flett, Besser, Davis, & Hewitt, 2003; Gosselin, 2003; Kottman, 2002; Makris, 1999; Rice, Ashby, & Slaney, 1998; Rice & Slaney, 2002; Smyth, 2001) and attachment style (Broemer & Blumle, 2003; Buist, Dekoviç, Meeus, & Aken, 2004; Gezer, 2001; Marotta, 2002; McCarthy, Moller, & Fouladi, 2001) concepts have recently been the focus of interest of many researchers as both of these concepts have appeared important for human life in different ways.

Research indicated that perfectionists have unreachable standards; they usually push themselves to reach unrealistic and unattainable goals and evaluate themselves in terms of productivity and success (Burns, 1980; Nugent, 2000; Pacht, 1984). Blatt (1995) claimed that the child can internalize parental attitudes such as neglect or rejection in time and these internalizations can represent self and others. Therefore, parental attitudes towards children, which are connected to attachment theory, might be a very important aspect in the development of perfectionist characteristics of the child.

Research indicated that perfectionism was associated with several psychological characteristics such as unconditional self-acceptance (Flett et al., 2003), depression (Accordino, Accordino, & Slaney, 2000; Cheng, 2001; Dinç, 2001; Enns & Cox, 2005; Hewitt & Flett, 1991a; Minarik & Ahrens, 1996; Rice et al., 1998), anxiety sensitivity (Flett, Greene, & Hewitt, 2004), narcissistic injury (Mann, 2003), suicide ideation (Hamilton & Schweitzer, 2000; Hewitt, Newton, Flett, & Callander, 1997), eating disorders (Ruggiero, Levi, Ciuna, & Sassaroli, 2003; Sherry, Hewitt, Besser,

McGeee, & Flett, 2004), parental authority styles (Flett, Hewitt, & Singer, 1995), psychological maladjustment (Chang, 2002), obsessive-compulsive symptomatology (Yorulmaz, 2002) and social anxiety (Alden, Bieling, & Wallace, 1994).

The main principle of the attachment theory is about the early relationships with caregivers preparing the prototypes of social relations in later life (Bartholomew, 1990). Attachment styles were explained as cognitive representations of the primary caregivers that were later internalized by the development of the child. These internalized representations of attachment relationship which means 'inner working models' were consequently prepared (Bowlby, 1969). The inner working models consist of cognition about self and others, which are related to the primary caregiver's responses and an individual's cumulative experience in past relationships (Bowlby, 1969; Collins & Read, 1990). Therefore, it is very important to learn the improvement of these inner working models for an individual to understand the attachment styles and the development of personality traits like perfectionism that is also associated with parent child relationships.

Similar to perfectionism, attachment styles were found to be associated with several characteristics of human such as relationship satisfaction (Beesley & Stoltenberg, 2002), family environment (Gezer, 2001), global self-esteem (Bylsma, Cozzarelli, & Sümer, 1997), vulnerability to depression (Murphy & Bates, 1997), anger (Mikulincer, 1998), problem coping styles (Lopez, Maurico, Gromley, Simko, & Berger, 2001), personality traits (Konyalıoğlu, 2002), social and emotional loneliness (Löker, 1999) and academic achievement (Güroğlu, 2002).

Research findings in the literature showed that both attachment styles and perfectionism seemed to be correlated with analogous psychological patterns (Accordino et al., 2000; Cheng, 2001; Dinç, 2001; Enns & Cox, 2005; Mikulincer, 1998; Murphy & Bates, 1997) and they are both related to parental behaviors (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991; Bowlby, 1988; Burns, 1980). There may be a possible relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism although this relationship was supported by only a few research in the literature (Andersson & Perris, 2000; Brewer, 2001; Flett, Hewitt, Mosher, Sherry, Macdonald, and

Sawatzky, 2001, as cited in Flett, Hewitt, Oliver, & Macdonald, 2002; Rice, Lopez, & Vergara, 2005; Rice & Mirzadeh, 2000; Snell, Overbey, & Brewer, 2005; Wei, Mallinckrodt, Russell, & Abraham, 2004).

There are some studies about attachment styles (Çelik, 2004; Gezer, 2001; Sümer & Güngör, 1999a, 1999b) and perfectionism (Dinç, 2001; Oral, 1999; Sun-Selışık, 2003) that are carried out separately in Turkey. However, there is no study conducted to examine a possible attachment style and perfectionism relationship with Turkish participants. Thus, the purpose of this study is to investigate the possible relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism in a Turkish context.

In the following sections, first, main advances in research on perfectionism were presented. Second, research regarding attachment styles was documented. Finally, the studies that show the relationship between these two variables were presented.

1.1 Perfectionism

1.1.1 Nature of Perfectionism

Adderholdt and Goldberg (1999) mentioned that perfectionism may bring some problems and the main one would be anxiety about making mistakes. According to these researchers, perfectionists experience a constant need for approval, lack effective coping strategies, question their own judgments, do not take risks because of fear of failure and experience procrastination. They usually place very high standards and perceive high expectations and negative criticism from others as their parents, so the message the child takes from parents would be that his/her love and affection depends on his/her ability to do well.

Though there are many researchers interested in perfectionism (Adler, 1956a; Burns, 1980; Chang & Rand, 2000; Frost, Lahart, & Rosenblate, 1991; Hewitt & Flett, 1991a; Pacht, 1984; Sorotzkin, 1998; Stöber, 1998), they had different perspectives about the development and investigation of this construct.

3

One of the first theorists who mentioned about perfectionism was Adler (1956a). He claimed that we all strive to reach a goal that makes us feel strong, superior and complete. As a result, striving for perfection is a normal phenomenon for every individual and the urge to life is tied to this striving. He viewed striving for superiority that was an innate tendency for all humans in the center of individual psychology. He also claimed that this innate predisposition helps humans to cope with problems and has a better feeling of one's own potential. Striving for perfection was adaptive when moderated by social interest, but lacking social interest cause maladaptive perfectionism that included the unrealistic goals and unrealistically high standards to achieve such goals.

From another perspective, Ellis (1958) reported some major illogical thoughts that lead self-defeating behavior and neurosis one of which was about perfectionism. He explained that

> the idea that one should be thoroughly competent, adequate, intelligent and achieving in all possible respects-instead of the idea that one should *do* rather than always try to do *well* and that one should accept oneself as a quite imperfect creature, who has general human limitations and specific fallibilities (p.41)

was an irrational thought which one can turn to be hostile, inhibited, guilty, defensive, anxious, ineffective, upset, inert and uncontrolled.

Similar to the view of Ellis (1958), Horney (1970) explained perfectionism by one's obsession with superior intellectual and moral standards which was a specific type of neurosis rooted mainly in alienation from self. She explained some characteristics of perfectionists as being friendly with a hidden arrogant attempt because of the forbidden irregular feelings, working methodically, attending to details, being interested in what they should do and how to do it, incapable of giving a chance to spontaneity and originality, being slow and unproductive, overworking for the high demands from themselves which let them look down on others for the feeling of superiority and getting exhausted easily.

Hamachek (1978) classified perfectionism as normal and neurotic and pointed out that normal perfectionists tend to get pleasure from striving to reach challenging but

attainable goals, they have flexible standards for themselves and even if their performance is not good enough to reach their goals they are able to feel satisfied (as cited in Accordino et al., 2000). In contrast, he claimed that neurotic perfectionists have a very high level of anxiety and a fear or failure; additionally, they feel satisfied about their performance very rarely and do not experience pleasure (as cited in Accordino et al., 2000). Consistent with Hamachek's classification about normal and neurotic perfectionism, Sorotzkin (1998) claimed that pathological form of perfectionism differentiates from the nonpathological need for excellence is about the way that person reacts to a less then perfect performance. For example, Sorotzkin (1985, as cited in Sorotzkin, 1998) claimed that perfectionists do not experience satisfaction from any kind of less then perfect performance and feel humiliated but people who strive for excellence are proud of their effort usually, they are pleased of their less than perfect performance because they accept personal and outer limitations (Pacht, 1984).

Burns (1980) defined perfectionists as people, who have unreachable standards, mostly force themselves to achieve unobtainable goals and interpret their own worth with productivity and success. All or nothing thinking (dualistic thinking), overgeneralization and should statements are very common characteristics of perfectionists (Burns, 1980; Pacht, 1984). Because of these thoughts adolescents are more likely to be perfectionists with the encouragement to be idealistic with their role models (Sorotzkin, 1998). Perfectionists also fear and expect rejection if they are judged as imperfect, they are defensive to criticism and they usually expect the same high standards from their friends that they do of themselves (Burns, 1980; Gard, 1999). Hence, their reactions push others away which results in fear; in turn they begin to believe that they must be perfect to be accepted (Burns, 1980). Moreover, many perfectionists feel lonely, unlovable and have poor personal relationships because of the difficulty they had in having friends and keeping them (Burns, 1980; Gard, 1999; Pacht, 1984). They also think that they are unworthy and believe that others are uncaring and unavailable that usually results in fear of intimacy. Burn's description about the characteristics of perfectionism that include loneliness and fear appear to be very similar to the characteristics of insecurely attached people.

5

Researchers have also been interested in the conditions that contribute to the development of perfectionism. Hamachek (1978, as cited in Frost et al., 1991) claimed that the environment in which perfectionism develops includes non-approval, inconsistent approval or conditional approval. In non-approval or inconsistent approval environments, children were not able to develop a sense to perceive the characteristics of a good performance; because perfection is clearly defined as acceptable performance by the parents (Frost et al., 1991). As the parents show their love and approval on good performance conditionally, the child receives a message that means a certain level of performance is required for love (Frost et al., 1991). Hollender (1965) and Hamachek (1978) mentioned that, in that case, the child would continue trying to reach the demands to avoid the criticism of perfectionist parents (as cited in Frost et al., 1991).

Later, Burns (1980) reported that if a child was regularly rewarded for good performance and if the parent gets anxious and disappointed for the child's mistakes and failures; it is very likely for the child to interpret these parent reactions as punishment or rejection which will lead to the belief that mistakes or failures result in loss of acceptance. After a while, child's self-esteem would base on parents' approval and the child will fear from mistakes and failures which will cause avoidance of any risky experience; as a result, this child will get very anxious and upset in any failure because of the perfectionist caregiver (Burns, 1980).

Likewise, Blatt (1995) claimed that parental neglect, rejection, excessive control, criticism and abuse can be internalized by the child in time and these characteristics can be the representations of self and others. Therefore parental attitudes towards children might be a very important source of the development of perfectionism in the child.

As the research interest increased in perfectionism, attempts of developing a scale to accurately measure the construct have also started. Burns (1980) developed a 10-item 'Perfectionism Scale' derived from a scale called Dysfunctional Attitude Scale that was developed by Arlene Weissman. After Burns' study; Pirot (1986) used this scale

and found that perfectionism was correlated negatively with self-acceptance, and positively correlated with depression.

Pacht (1984) explained the concept of being perfect in terms of being imperfect. He claimed that the quality of humanity in each of us derived from our imperfections that make us real people. As a result, without imperfections we are cold, sterile and unlovable. Although he believed the influence of imperfections, he explained perfectionists as people who have only extremes and are not able to realize the middle ground. As a result, perfectionists set inaccessibly high goals and when they do something successfully, it is very rare that they are able to have the fruits of their success. For instance, 95% or 99% success is also a failure because it is not usually interpreted as perfect.

Halgin and Leahy (1989) pointed an important influence on perfectionism different than the early theoreticians (Adler, 1956a; Burns, 1980; Ellis, 1958; Horney, 1970). They mentioned the effect of social systems on perfectionist thinking and proposed that children were protected from the potential harm of the competition in early childhood but in the way of growing up they experience lots of rejection. For instance, they may be unpopular in high school, fail to go to the college they wanted or fail to do anything that can result in public embarrassment. Therefore, at the time they go to college their self-image may be poor, they mainly try to repair their self-esteem and prove their worthiness to the others, because they believe that being perfect would bring acceptance and love. Moreover, they usually might not be able to see that these beliefs worsen their problems and cause more severe rejections.

1.1.2 Dimensions of Perfectionism

Although perfectionism first thought to be a unidimensional phenomenon it is later understood that the concept is multidimensional. Based on the multidimensional viewpoint of perfectionism, two groups of researchers (Frost, Marten, Lahart, & Rosenblate 1990; Hewitt, & Flett, 1991b) developed two different Multidimensional Perfectionism Scales (MPS) independently.

First, Frost et al. (1990) emphasized the dimensions of perfectionism involving 6 main sub-dimensions titled Personal Standards, Concern over Mistakes, Doubts about Actions, Parental Criticism, Parental Expectations and Organization. Along with this study, another study undertaken on twins about the multidimensionality of perfectionism (Tozzi et al., 2004) proved that Concern over Mistakes, which was the most closely related dimension to symptoms of psychopathology, was the central concept and major component of other measures of perfectionism. Additionally, the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS) was highly correlated with Burn's Perfectionism Scale. In 1998, Stöber's study on MPS (Frost et al., 1990) showed that this scale might be better with four subscales named; Concerns over Mistakes and Doubts, Parental Expectations and Criticism, Personal Standards and Organization.

Secondly, Hewitt and Flett (1991a, 1991b) focused on Self-Oriented, Other-Oriented and Socially Prescribed dimensions of perfectionism within the same period of time as Frost et al. (1990). Self-Oriented, Other-Oriented and Socially Prescribed Dimensions of perfectionism were differentiated by the tendencies and behaviors like motivation to be perfect and these dimensions were also related with the person whom the perfectionist behavior is directed towards or derived from (Hewitt & Flett, 1991b; 2002). Self-Oriented Perfectionism is an intra-individual dimension including perfectionist behaviors that are sourced from the self and directed towards the self. Other-Oriented Perfectionism is an interpersonal dimension including perfectionist behaviors that also derived from the self but directed towards others. Finally Socially Prescribed Perfectionism is an interpersonal dimension involving perfectionist demands that are perceived to derive from others but directed towards the self (Hewitt & Flett, 2002). Hewitt and Flett (1991b) also believed that self-oriented perfectionism included a salient motivational characteristics and this motivation was about trying to reach perfection and trying to avoid failure.

In support of this view, Chang and Rand (2000) described self-oriented perfectionism as an individual tendency to set and seek high self-standards of performance, other-oriented perfectionism as an individual tendency to believe that other people should be perfect in their performance and, socially prescribed perfectionism as an individual tendency to believe that other people expect perfection

8

from them. Although these dimensions were also proven in Oral (1999) and Dinç's (2001) studies with Turkish samples; the result of a study conducted in Turkey by Sun-Selışık (2003) did not confirm the three dimensionality of the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale which was developed by Hewitt and Flett (1991b) and an additional dimension named 'Perfectionistic Expectations' was found in the Turkish sample.

From a categorical perspective, in 1992, Slaney and Johnson mentioned the positive and negative aspects of perfectionism (as cited in Rice, Mobley, Trippi, & Ashby, 2001) and developed another scale called Almost Perfect Scale that was designed to measure four subscales (as cited in Rice et al., 1998). The Standards and Order Subscale measured high personal standards and a need for order, which was interpreted as adaptive perfectionism; and Anxiety, Procrastination and Difficulty in Interpersonal Relationships Subscales measured maladaptive perfectionism (Rice et al., 1998).

Rice et al. (2001) revised the Almost Perfect Scale involving subscales called High Standards, Order and Discrepancy. They reported that High Standards and Order Subscales were related to positive aspects of perfectionism and Discrepancy Subscale was related to negative aspects of perfectionism. In a related vein, in 1998 Slade and Owens (as cited in Kobori & Tanno, 2005) categorized perfectionism as positive and negative perfectionism based on Skinner's behavioral theory. According to them, positive perfectionism was a cognition and behavior connected to approach goals such as success and others' approval, but negative perfectionism was explained as the cognition and behavior related to avoidant goals such as avoidance of failure, and rejection from others (as cited in Kobori & Tanno, 2005). They also mentioned that positive perfectionism results in positive type of emotions such as pleasure, but negative perfectionism leads to negative type of emotions such as displeasure (as cited in Kobori & Tanno, 2005). Similarly, both in the study of Accordino et al. (2000) and the study of Gilman and Ashby (2003) Almost Perfect Scale-Revised was used to measure perfectionism but in the latter study it was used to determine adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism with the combination of the subscales called Standards and Discrepancy. Therefore, approach and avoidant goals result in

different perfectionism cognitions and, emotions are affected by positive and negative perfectionism.

In the light of these findings, Hill et al. (2004) worked on constructing a new measure of perfectionism to prepare a better comprehensive instrument including the important perfectionism constructs taken from the two MPS (Hewitt & Flett, 1991b; Frost et al., 1990) measures into one measure together with additional perfectionism constructs called Planfulness and Rumination. At the end of the study, they prepared Perfectionism Inventory that represents an alternative to other perfectionism measures. The inventory consists of the fundamental components of perfectionism efficiently with minimal redundancy. Perfectionism Inventory was found more efficient, higher in psychometric quality and clarity of interpretation and more powerful as a predictive than the other perfectionism measures. Perfectionism Inventory (PI) have the subscales called Striving for Excellence, Concern over Mistakes, High Standards for Others, Need for Approval, Organization, Perceived Parental Pressure, Rumination and Planfulness.

To conclude, there were many theorists and researchers who had different perspectives in understanding perfectionism who developed different scales to measure this construct; but for a better perception of the mechanism and the affect of perfectionism; research about the relationship between perfectionism and other constructs were needed.

1.1.3 Research in Perfectionism

There are many different studies conducted about perfectionism construct in the literature (Alden et al., 1994; Ashby, LoCicero, & Kenny, 2003; Dinç, 2001; Enns, Cox, & Clara, 2002; Flett et al., 1995; Frost & Marten, 1990; Frost et al., 1991; Gilman & Ashby, 2003; Hewitt & Flett, 1991a; Hill, McIntire, & Bacharach, 1997; Kawamura, Hunt, Frost, & DiBartolo, 2001; Kilbert, 2004; Kyrios, Frost, & Steketee, 2004; LoCicero, Ashby & Kern, 2000; Minarik & Ahrens, 1996; Rice, Ashby, & Preusser, 1996; Rosser, Issakidis & Peters, 2003; Slaney & Ashby, 1996;

Stöber & Joorman, 2001; Sun-Selışık, 2003; Terry-Short, Owens, Slade, & Dewey, 1995).

In the studies that MPS (Hewitt & Flett, 1991b) was used, the positive correlation of self-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism with depression and stress was revealed (Enns & Cox, 2005; Hewitt & Flett, 1991a, 1993). Research suggested that Self-Oriented Perfectionism Subscale was positively associated with high levels of perceived self-control, lower levels of procrastination, high levels of achievement motivation and anxiety, but was unrelated to self-esteem (Kilbert, 2004), psychological symptoms of depression, anxiety and hostility (Chang & Rand, 2000).

Notably, Socially Prescribed Perfectionism Subscale was positively associated with suicide ideation of adolescence (Hewitt et al., 1997) and suicidal behaviors (Dean & Range, 1996), reduced self esteem, lower levels of perceived self control and achievement motivation, maladaptive constructs such as depression, suicide proneness, anxiety, shame, guilt (Kilbert, 2004), the scores on psychological symptoms of depression, anxiety and hostility and hopelessness (Chang & Rand, 2000) and low levels of unconditional self-acceptance which was a good mediator between socially prescribed perfectionism and depression (Flett et al., 2003). Alden et al.'s (1994) study also revealed that dysphoric and socially anxious participants reported high levels of socially prescribed perfectionism.

On the other hand, Other-Oriented Perfectionism Subscale was not found to be associated with psychological symptoms of depression, anxiety and hostility (Chang & Rand, 2000), but associated negatively with unconditional self-acceptance (Flett et al., 2003), agreeableness, lack of compliance and modesty (Hill, McIntire et al., 1997) positively correlated with obsessive-compulsive symptomatology (Yorulmaz, 2002).

Some other studies also reported variations of relationships about self-oriented, other-oriented and socially prescribed dimensions of perfectionism in genders. The results of Hill, Zrull and Turlington's (1997) study revealed that self-oriented perfectionism associated with both adaptive interpersonal characteristics such as self-

11

assurance and assertiveness for both genders and maladaptive interpersonal problems like emotional distance, domineering and mistrust for men and very nurturing tendencies for women. In addition, men had higher scores in other-oriented perfectionism than women. Other-oriented perfectionism was associated with domineering, mistrustful and socially distant and little interpersonal distress for both genders. Like other-oriented perfectionism, socially prescribed perfectionism was also associated with arrogant, socially distant and maladaptive interpersonal characteristics for men; on the other hand it was associated with a lot of interpersonal problems and distress for women.

Similarly, in a study of Hill, McIntire et al. (1997), self-oriented perfectionism was strongly associated with conscientiousness and achievement striving. Other-oriented perfectionism was positively associated with arrogant, dominant and mistrustful interpersonal traits for both genders but little interpersonal distress. Likewise, socially prescribed perfectionism was associated with arrogance, social distance and maladaptive interpersonal characteristics for men and different interpersonal maladjustment and distress for women. Other-oriented perfectionism was inversely associated with agreeableness and socially prescribed perfectionism was positively associated with depression facets of neuroticism.

To summarize, three dimensions of perfectionism were associated with negative and maladaptive constructs for both genders, but only self-oriented perfectionism dimension had positive associations with some positive and adaptive constructs. Findings about the other dimensions of perfectionism revealed some controversial results regarding gender.

The studies conducted with the same dimensions of perfectionism in Turkish culture revealed different results including adaptive and maladaptive constructs (Dinç, 2001; Oral, 1999; Sun-Selışık, 2003; Yorulmaz, 2002).

First, Oral (1999) conducted the adaptation studies of MPS (Hewitt & Flett, 1991b) to Turkish culture and the results supported the reliability and validity of this scale. Other results of the same study revealed that both Self-Oriented and Other-Oriented

Perfectionism Subscales were negatively related to depression, but Socially Prescribed Perfectionism Subscale was positively associated with depression scores.

Dinç's (2001) study revealed that the interaction of negative life events and overall perfectionism score was not significant to predict depressive symptoms. Self-oriented perfectionism and achievement related life events were found as the significant predictors of depressive symptoms but self-oriented perfectionism with social life events was not found significant in predicting depression. Another result showed that both socially prescribed perfectionism and social life events seemed having a main effect in predicting depressive symptoms significantly. Other-oriented perfectionism had no interaction with depressive symptoms but interacted with achievement related life events significantly to predict depression.

In a study conducted by Yorulmaz (2002), responsibility attitudes, self-oriented perfectionism, socially prescribed perfectionism and other-oriented perfectionism were significantly and positively associated with obsessive compulsive symptoms.

Finally, in 2003, another study conducted in Turkey by Sun-Selışık showed that there was not any significant relationship between dimensions of perfectionism and helpless explanatory styles.

In the light of these findings, one may think that self-oriented perfectionism can be a predictor of negative construct such as depression when interacted with another psychological construct. Nevertheless, in some cases both Self-Oriented and Other-Oriented Perfectionism Subscales may be associated with negative constructs such as obsessive compulsive symptoms in Turkish samples. Socially prescribed perfectionism seems to be more related with negative aspects although Sun-Selışık's (2003) study on a Turkish university sample did not confirm this idea.

On the other hand, the positive relationships between subscales of MPS (Frost et al., 1990) and some negative constructs were also found in many studies. For example, concern over mistakes, doubts about actions and low personal standards were found to be related to anxiety symptoms but parental expectations and parental criticism

dimensions of perfectionism were correlated with lack of anxiety symptoms (Frost et al., 1990). In another study, concern over mistakes and doubt about actions were related to eating disturbance and anxiety symptoms which was also related to personal standards (Minarik & Ahrens, 1996). Parental expectations, parental criticism, doubts about actions and concern over mistakes showed a positive association to depressive symptoms in the same study. However, when depressive symptoms were controlled none of the perfectionism scales predicted anxiety symptoms although perfectionism was related to depressive symptoms after controlling anxiety symptoms (Minarik & Ahrens, 1996). Moreover, young adults showed greater perfectionism, stress, worry and negative affects than the old ones and perfectionism was found positively associated with negative psychological outcomes such as negative affect, stress and worry for all adults (Chang, 2000). There was a reliable relationship between worry and Concern over Mistakes and Doubts about Actions Subscales, a lesser degree relationship with Parental Expectations and Criticism with worry but no relationship between Personal Standards and worry (Stöber & Joorman, 2001). Therefore, a person who is worrying too much may not need to lower his standards because they already can not put higher standards because of the fear of making mistakes (Stöber & Joorman, 2001).

Mısırlı-Taşdemir (2003) and Özbay (as cited in Mısırlı-Taşdemir, 2003) conducted the adaptation studies of MPS (Frost et al., 1990) on gifted children who were described as the children studying in Science Lyses. Results showed that Turkish version of the scale had a similar factor structure with the original one. Additionally, concern over mistakes and doubts about actions dimensions of perfectionism, rushing and avoidant type of problem solving, external locus of control, lower level of self-efficacy were found to have predictive value on emotionality type of test anxiety.

As mentioned before, some researchers used the terms of normal and neurotic types of perfectionism as well as adaptive and maladaptive categories. For instance, the study of Smyth (2001) showed that Socially Prescribed Perfectionism and Concern over Mistakes Subscales were related to Neurotic Perfectionism. The other factor called Normal Perfectionism consisting of items mostly from Self-Oriented Perfectionism, Other-Oriented Perfectionism and Personal Standards Subscales.

Third factor called as Meticulousness including the items of Organization Subscale. Fourth factor called as Imposed Perfectionism consisting of items of Parental Criticism and Parental Expectations Subscales. Each factor includes the "ideal" as a goal. Smyth finally categorized perfectionists in four groups as neurotic perfectionists that characterized by an inability to accept any imperfect performance, avoiding imperfection out of a failure of rejection, tendency to have should statements and self belittlement and being perfect to be accepted. Normal perfectionists have strong internal standards to judge performance and strive for excellence without the expectation of negative results. Meticulous perfectionists are the ones who are neat and orderly because of a fear of negative results. They also have obsessive-compulsive tendency that causes stress. The Imposed perfectionists are the people who can not live out of the expectations of other people. They do not strive for ideal, they are not mainly perfectionist and they want to be accepted as they are, not as they were wanted to be. Smyth's study might be a good example for that normal and neurotic categorization about perfectionism including two more types as Meticulousness and Imposed Perfectionism in the literature.

Apart from the correlations of negative constructs and perfectionism scales, it is also important to point out to the relationship between parenting and perfectionism. Frost et al. (1991) theorized development of perfectionism by the interaction with the perfectionist and demanding parents. The results of their study indicated that daughters who had perfectionist mothers were more perfectionists. However, fathers' perfectionism was not associated with perfectionism among daughters. In addition, socially prescribed perfectionism was found associated with high ratings of authoritarian parenting behaviors which was restrictive, punitive and overcontrolling only among males (Flett et al., 1995). On the other hand, self-oriented perfectionism was associated with authoritative parenting style which was characterized by using discipline by reason and warmth (Flett et al., 1995). This study might be a support to show the relationship between negative constructs and socially prescribed perfectionism in a family context. In other words, socially prescribed perfectionism seems to be a maladaptive kind of perfectionism.

Rice and Dellwo (2002) indicated that maladaptive perfectionists and non-perfectionists perceived their parents as having high expectations of them but adaptive perfectionists perceived their parents less critical than the other groups' parents. Rice and Dellwo also claimed that parents who model and encourage high expectations of themselves and others without stressing and criticizing them might be good models to be idealized for adaptive perfectionists. On the other hand, non-emphatic and excessively critical parenting might encourage the maladaptive perfectionism. In that study, maladaptive perfectionists reported less emotional, academic and social well being than adaptive and non perfectionists; but adaptive perfectionists showed higher self esteem, academic integration and social integration compared to non-perfectionists.

Slaney and Ashby (1996), in their research which investigates the source of perfectionism, reported that most participants in thought at least one parent as the source of their perfectionism. To address this issue, a comment of one of the male participants was worth mentioning that he was trying not to be like his mother who was late, unorganized and labeled. This comment seems to be connected with the relationship between perfectionism and attachment styles in terms of the effect of an unorganized caregiver. Enns et al. (2002) and Rice et al.'s (1996) studies showed that the environment where maladaptive perfectionism starts may include parenting including high expectations, excessive demands, criticism, lack of care and poor attachment. These results seem to support the supposition of the present study that postulates an association between insecure attachment style and maladaptive (socially prescribed) perfectionism.

Several other attempts were made to identify and measure the dimensions of perfectionism in the literature. These studies also investigated the characteristics of perfectionist individuals. For instance, Martin (2005) conducted a study using Almost Perfect Scale-Revised and the results of the study showed that adaptive perfectionists reported less stress, less dysfunction, higher life satisfaction and greater stress coping resources than did the maladaptive and non-perfectionists. Additionally, male maladaptive perfectionists showed a higher psychological response to stress than the male adaptive perfectionists. Rice et al. (1998) have

shown that people who had adaptive perfectionism had high personal standards, a need for order and organization, unwillingness to procrastinate, but people who had maladaptive perfectionism had excessive concern about making mistakes, doubts about their actions, more procrastinating, anxious and tense feelings and explained themselves as having highly critical parents who had unrealistic expectations from their children.

Several other studies tried to examine the correlates of perfectionism. Findings of Enns et al.'s (2002) study showed that maladaptive perfectionism associated positively with depression proneness but adaptive perfectionism had an inverse relationship with depression proneness. In addition, Kawamura et al. (2001) found that the maladaptive dimension of perfectionism was related to general and social anxiety that was independent of depression. Some separate aspects of perfectionism like maladaptive evaluative concerns were related to depression, independent of anxiety. Rice et al. (1998) showed that adaptive perfectionism did not play a significant role on depression and self-esteem, high standards and need for organization were not related with depression. In contrast, maladaptive perfectionism was associated with low self-esteem and high depression. Self-esteem was an important buffer of maladaptive perfectionism on depression. The results of this study supported the destructive part of perfectionism but did not show a clear proof for adaptiveness of perfectionism except that adaptive perfectionism did not predict depression.

Both the research of Accordino et al. (2000) on high school students and the study of Gilman and Ashby (2003) on middle school students supported that establishing high standards may result in positive interpersonal, intrapersonal and academic outcomes. It was also found that as the students' personal standards increased, their self-esteem also increased (Accordino et al., 2000). On the other hand, when they experience the difference between their personal standards and their real performance, their depression level increased and their self-esteem level decreased. In the study with middle school students, adaptive perfectionists reported more positive intrapersonal, interpersonal and academic experiences and higher GPA than maladaptive or non perfectionists (Gilman & Ashby, 2003). Martin and Ashby's (2004) study revealed

that maladaptive perfectionists had a significantly greater fear of intimacy than non-perfectionists and although adaptive perfectionists had lower fear of intimacy scores than maladaptive perfectionists, this difference was not significant. In another study adaptive perfectionists had higher scores on positive adjustment measures than did the maladaptive ones and they had lower scores on problematic adjustment measures than did the maladaptive ones (Rice & Slaney, 2002).

According to Kottman (2002), adaptive perfectionists were not extremely anxious about their high standards and they did not feel discouraged when they could not reach their goals, they try to work harder. On the other hand, maladaptive perfectionists were excessively anxious about reaching their goals. Maladaptive perfectionists could easily be discouraged when they were not good enough. Perfectionism and maladjustment are found connected because perfectionism is trying to be the singular best and blemishing fee and maladjustment includes a wide range of problems from the small ones through the most severe psychopathologies (Lombardi, Florentino, & Lombardi, 1998). Further, perfectionism and social problem solving were found to be negatively associated to each other as a result of a study conducted by Chang (2002).

As indicated above, these studies showed that self-oriented perfectionism had associations with more adaptive constructs; other-oriented perfectionism did not show many correlations with adaptive or maladaptive constructs; whereas socially prescribed perfectionism showed associations with more maladaptive constructs. Thus, socially prescribed perfectionism may be considered as maladaptive perfectionism while self-oriented perfectionism appears to indicate adaptive perfectionism.

To conclude, these findings suggest that adaptive perfectionism was mostly associated with positive psychological constructs such as secure attachment, while maladaptive perfectionism was associated with negative psychological ones.

1.2. The Concept of Attachment

1.2.1 Attachment Theory

The idea of attachment might have started with questioning the nature of the mother and child bond. At the beginning scientists believed that a child became emotionally connected to mother because of the feeding function of mother (Bowlby, 1952). It is later understood that a young baby needs to experience a warm, close and continuous relationship with the mother for mental health (Bowlby, 1988). The young child needs to feel being a pleasure object and the mother's pride and, the mother needs to feel expansion of her own personality on the child's personality (Bowlby, 1952). Thus, both mother and the child must find satisfaction and enjoyment in that relationship (Bowlby, 1952). If the mother ignores the child physically or emotionally, there might be problems like a mental defect for the child (Bowlby, 1952). For example, Adler (1956b) explained that a neurotic individual comes from an insecure relationship and the pressure of the feeling of being worthless in the childhood. Bowlby also believed that interaction with parents played a very important role on the later development of a child's personality (as cited in Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). Later the term caregiver was started to use for the person who was caring, helping and looking after the child. The origins of attachment theory were taken from ethology, cybernetics, information processing, developmental psychology and psychoanalysis by Bowlby (as cited in Bretherton, 1995).

From the ethological perspective, the basic component of human nature is emotional bonds to particular individuals (Bowlby, 1988). Infancy and childhood bonds are usually connected to the caregiver because of protection, comfort and assistance role of the caregiver (Bowlby, 1988). In adolescence and adulthood these bonds still exist but complemented by new bonds which are mostly heterosexual (Bowlby, 1988).

From another view called the evolutionary perspective, human attachment behavior was constructed for survival in the environment that was evolved (Bowlby, 1988). Bowlby explained that in that kind of environment it was essential for the child to

find a responsive caregiver that he could go in an emergency to survive, so the attachment bond would be constructed with the child and the caregiver. When the caregiver is absent physically, fail to response affectively or do not response the child, the child will be stressed or has a trauma. Another component is caregiving, which was explained as promoting the survival of offspring, and the individual's own genes by evolution theory.

Bowlby (1969) defined attachment style as a cognitive representation of the primary caregivers and believed that these attachment styles were internalized by the development of the child. Consequently the internalized representations of attachment relationship, which means, 'inner working models' began to take form. Inner working models consist of cognitions about self and others, which are related to the primary caregiver's responses. Bowlby (1988) explained that about the end of the child's first year, he might have knowledge of his immediate world and previous years and organized them as internal working models that explained the models of self and other. They simulate the events in the real world to plan the individual's behavior with all its' advantages of insight and foresight. Overall, early relationship experiences of an individual exert long-term influences on an individual's personality and new relationships through the development of working (or mental) models of self and others (Bowlby, 1969, 1973).

Bowlby (1973) also claimed that if the infant's needs were responded in a comfortable and protective manner and if caregiver was available when needed, the infant would develop an internal model of self-worth and love worthiness. If parental rejection occurred, the infant would develop an internal model consisting of a lack of self-worth and own reliance. If an infant feels an emotional distance from the attachment figure, inaccessibility to this figure or an unexpected separation occurs; infant will experience separation anxiety in forms of attention seeking by crying, reaching out for an attachment figure, and preoccupation with the attachment figure or resistance to others (Bowlby, 1973). Additionally, observing the child's behavior in the presence and absence of the caregiver will open a new door to understand the personality development of the child. For example; when the child was moved by an unfamiliar person, he/she may respond with a great intensity but after reunion with

the caregiver, the child usually shows separation anxiety or unusual detachment (Bowlby, 1969).

It is important to note that attachment behavior continues with new figures chosen for proximity in life (Bowlby, 1969) such as peers (Löker, 1999), siblings (Buist, Dekovic, Meeus, & Aken, 2002) or love partners (Hazan & Shaver, 1987). When individuals reach late adolescence the patterns of interaction with the caregiver from early experiences become organized as generalized interaction styles that are taken from the person's internal working models (Bowlby, 1973). In time, the expectations from the partner's availability in a relationship as a comfort and support source change by experiences.

An additional component is exploring the environment to play and to be in different activities with the peers (Bowlby, 1988). If an individual is feeling secure, they are more likely to explore the environment away from the attachment figure; but if they are anxious, tired and unwell, they more likely want the proximity (Bowlby, 1988). This parent child interaction is called as a secure base for exploration. It was acknowledged that if the caregiver was accessible and responsive, when needed, the healthy child felt secure enough to explore (Bowlby, 1988).

Bowlby (1988) also claimed three attachment components as secure, anxious/resistance and anxious/avoidant. Secure attachments were explained as confidence about the parent's availability, responsiveness and helpfulness in frightening situations. A secure child also feels brave about exploring the world and competent about dealing with it. A parent, who was available if needed, responsive in a loving and caring manner, promotes secure attachment. A securely attached child is a happier and more rewarding to care for and less demanding than the anxious child (Bowlby, 1988). Anxious resistance was explained as feeling uncertainty about the parent's availability, responsiveness and helpfulness when needed because of an inconsistently responsive caregiver. Therefore; the child is anxious about exploring the environment, more likely to experience separation anxiety and being excessively dependent. Anxious/avoidant individuals have no confidence about the availability of the caregiver when they need care. They mostly

expect to be rejected and live their lives without support and love from others. Their caregivers were mostly rejecting them when they needed comfort and protection. Bowlby (1988) believed that once an attachment pattern developed, it tends to continue because of the way that the parent treated the child.

Bartholomew (1990) asserted that individuals might exhibit four different attachment styles. Children who experienced inconsistent and insufficient parenting may have an interpretation that their own unworthiness is the explanation of caregiver's lack of love. Consequently, preoccupied attachment style occurs that is characterized by an endless desire to gain the other's approval and a deep unworthiness feeling (Bartholomew, 1990). Rejected children may think that they are unlovable and others are uncaring and unavailable which results in fearful attachment style (Bartholomew, 1990). Bartholomew believes that these children desire social contact and intimacy with others but they have interpersonal distrust and fear of rejection. They may experience distress, social relations including hypersensitivity to social approval and avoid social situations and close relationships. To have a positive self-image after the rejection of attachment figure some children distance themselves and develop a model of self, which is adequate. They passively avoid close relationships and show that relationships are relatively important because of the higher importance of independence. This type of attachment style is called dismissing attachment style. They attain autonomy and a sense of self worth but fearful ones have difficulties with both autonomy and intimacy (Bartholomew, 1990).

The outcomes of preoccupied and fearful attachment styles are very negative like distrust, distress, feelings of unworthiness etc. and these are similar to the negative effects of perfectionism. Warm and responsive parenting results in secure attachment style and these secure individuals show high self esteem and a lack of serious interpersonal problems (Bartholomew, 1990). Secure attachment seems to be a protective factor and associated with a lot of healthier personality domains but insecure attachment seems to be a risk factor and connected with negative personality characteristics (Eagle, 1995).

Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) defined four attachment styles; Secure Attachment Style represents positive self and other inner working model and characterized by a general comfort with closeness and trust in other people. Preoccupied Attachment Style involves negative self and positive other inner working model and characterized by a feeling of being unloved and a belief that other people are trustworthy and available when needed. Dismissing Avoidant Style reflects a positive self and negative other inner working model and shows a sense of loving one's self but a general distrust of others or expectation of their unreliability and rejection. Finally, Fearful Avoidant Style shows negative self and other inner working models and shows the beliefs that one is unlovable and others are unreliable or rejecting.

Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) conducted two studies regarding attachment styles and related interpersonal problems. The results of the first study showed that each attachment style was associated with a different pattern about interpersonal problems. While fearful individuals were more likely to report interpersonal problems; dismissing ones were more likely to report problems about lack of warmth in social relationships. Preoccupied subjects showed problems that reflected a greater degree of warmth-dominance. At the end of the two studies, it is concluded that the problems of preoccupied subjects were mostly about being warm and dominant but the fearful subjects' problems were centered mostly on being cold and passive in interpersonal relationships. Both dismissing and fearful subjects showed difficulties in being close and relying on others, but they differed on the measures that reflect an internalized sense of self worth. Only the fearful style was associated with social insecurity and lack of assertiveness.

Ainsworth, who is an important theorist for the development of attachment theory, was impressed by Blatz's security theory which explained different kinds of security such as immature dependent security, independent security and mature dependent security (as cited in Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). Ainsworth explained that young children could feel secure only if they believe that their parents would take care of them. However when children start to experience the world around them and explore things that mean insecurity, the parents' availability for the child provides a secure

base for exploration. When the child starts to learn the facts about life and learns how to cope with them, the child also starts to rely on oneself, which prepares a base for independent security. On the other hand, the child may not be secure on the basis of the independency skills and knowledge but to be secure, the child has to supplement with mature dependent security whatever degree he/she can achieve (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). After her observations and studies with babies and their reactions to the movements or absence of their mothers in Uganda, Ainsworth divided the attachment styles of babies into three categories as securely attached, insecurely attached and nonattached (as cited in Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991). Insecurely attached babies cried more when the mother was present but securely attached babies cried less except in the situations their mothers were absent or about to leave. Nonattached babies were the ones who were let alone with unresponsive mothers long periods but they were the youngest ones. Ainsworth thought that these babies cancelled the development of their attachment to mother (Ainsworth & Bowlby, 1991).

In 1992, Ainsworth categorized attachment styles in a different way but similar to Bowlby's (1988) categorization (as cited in Pickover, 2002). She emphasized that secure attachment style means good satisfaction between the child's needs and caregiver's response; anxious-avoidant attachment style means the child's distrust on an attachment figure and expectation of rejection; anxious-ambivalent attachment style occurs as a result of caregiver's aloof manner and; disorganized attachment style occurs when a child does not have a consistent attachment figure and tries to choose attachment figures for his/her own needs (as cited in Pickover, 2002).

Hazan and Shaver (1994) explained the sources of attachment theory with the infant's excessive immaturity at birth and dependency on an adult's protection and care to survive. Attachment is interlocking behavioral systems that include explorations, caregiving, affiliation and sexual mating. Children can easily show attachment behaviors to any available individual around them and mainly being familiar and responsive can affect the preferences and the selection of the attachment figure. Proximity to the attachment figure is more likely to be wanted when the child is fearful or distressed about something, and at these times the caregiver must be the

place of safety, so that the child can feel comfort and a base for exploration. When the caregiver is consistently responsive, inconsistently responsive or consistently unresponsive these may result in secure, anxious/ambivalent and anxious/avoidant attachment styles proposed by Ainsworth (as cited in Hazan & Shaver, 1994). Although these working models are resistant to change they can change in time mostly in the direction from secure to insecure attachment (Hazan & Shaver, 1994).

Hazan and Shaver (1987) suggested that childhood attachment patterns might also be directed to other attachment figures such as love partners in young adolescence and adulthood. Hazan and Shaver (1994) present an intriguing model of how a developing individual transfers his or her attachment behavior from parents to peers. They suggest that the core elements of the infant attachment relationship are successively incorporated into peer relationships across adolescence and young adult life. Proximity-seeking behavior is hypothesized to be the first element to transfer to peers, followed by comfort seeking and support seeking (i.e., seeking a safe heaven), and lastly followed by the use of a specific other as a secure base.

The relationship between early attachment and adult love relationships was first investigated by Hazan and Shaver (1987). They identified people with three major attachment styles but from a love relationship perspective. Secure individuals have trust, happiness and acceptation of their partner's faults, avoidant ones have fear of intimacy to avoid closeness and anxious-ambivalent ones fall in love easily and have reciprocation from their partners. In that study, they transferred the childhood attachment paradigm into terms that are connected to adult relationships. This study showed that the frequencies of three attachment styles in adulthood would be as common as childhood. People with different attachment styles experience three different kinds of love. The results showed that people with different attachment styles show different beliefs about the romantic love, availability, trustworthiness of love partners and their own love worthiness. The anxious-ambivalent ones (insecure) reported greater loneliness than the secure ones.

Leek's (2005) study revealed that most of the participants perceived their interpersonal relationships in adulthood in a secure manner. There was not any

correlation between experienced loss in childhood, the individuals approach to interpersonal relationships in adulthood and adult attachment style in adulthood and interestingly, there was not any significant finding that shows that loss in an individual's life contribute to the any change in the attachment style.

To conclude, John Bowlby (1979) once proclaimed that attachment relationships were important for humans across the life span and that attachment behaviors characterized human interaction "from the cradle to the grave" (p. 129). Bowlby (1973) and other attachment theorists have further asserted that attachment patterns or styles that develop during early experiences with caregivers, contribute to both later interpersonal functioning and emotional development.

1.2.2 Research in Attachment

Various studies were conducted about attachment theory and the relationship between attachment styles and other concepts (Andersson & Perris, 2000; Beesley & Stoltenberg, 2002; Broemer & Blumle, 2003; Bylsma et al., 1997; Collins & Read, 1990; Gezer, 2001; Lopez, 1996; Lopez et al., 2001; Mikulincer, 1998; Murphy & Bates, 1997; Park, Crocker, & Mickelson, 2004; Sümer & Güngör, 1999a, 1999b; Ward & Carlson, 1995). These studies all contributed into a better understanding of the significance of attachment styles.

Collins and Read (1990) have documented that securely attached people showed higher self-esteem than insecurely attached people. Also, Sümer and Güngör (1999a) and Çelik (2004) found a positive relationship between secure attachment style and high self-esteem level using Turkish samples. Bylsma et al. (1997) explored the relationship between adult attachment styles and global self-esteem. Results showed that secure and dismissing subjects reported higher global self-esteem and greater average competence than did either preoccupied or fearful subjects (Bylsma et al., 1997).

Park et al. (2004) examined whether people with different attachment styles derive their self-esteem from different sources of self-worth. The results revealed that

secure individuals derived self-esteem from family support and they were more likely to base self esteem on virtue as their positive model of self. Their results also showed that preoccupied participants had low self-esteem and were highly contingent on others' approval. In addition, fearful individuals had relatively low self-esteem and based their self worth on domains that depend on others' reactions and it was conditional. Finally, dismissing participants were dependent on others' approval, family support or God's love as bases of self-esteem.

Since there appears to be such a consistent relationship between attachment styles and self-esteem, insecurely attached adults may also tend to be perfectionist in their behaviors possibly because of the similar associations of perfectionism with self-esteem.

Murphy and Bates (1997) showed the negative sides of preoccupied and fearful attachment styles in their study. Their results revealed that fearful attachment was consistent with autonomous vulnerability and preoccupied attachment was consistent with sociotropic vulnerability. The component of both fearful and preoccupied attachment called self-criticism that was underlined as a strong depressive vulnerability. Dismissive attachment, without the involvement of self-critical component, did not seem to be associated with depression. The results of a study conducted by Amado (2005) showed that first year students at the university reported more depressive symptoms and hopelessness if they have fearful attachment styles than the ones with preoccupied and secure ones.

Similarly as a support for the associations between attachment styles and negative aspects of humans Andersson and Perris's (2000) study showed that there was a negative relationship between measures of secure attachment and dysfunctional assumptions scores while a positive association between measures of insecure attachment and dysfunctional assumptions scores was found. In this study, the measurement called Dysfunctional Attitude Scale (DAS) which had dimensions measuring depressogenic information processing, perfectionist attitudes and self-esteem depending on the approval of others was used. The results found, in one sample, showed that there were moderate correlations between attachment avoidance

scale and perfectionist attitudes and self-esteem. Insecure attachment styles, especially preoccupied and fearful attachment styles have positive correlations with negative personality constructs. Moreover, they may have an association with perfectionism, mainly the socially prescribed perfectionism, because both of them have relationships with negative constructs and may cause problems on individuals in similar ways.

There are also many studies conducted in Turkey that examined the propositions of the attachment theory. For instance, İzmirli (1991) investigated the attachment quality of Turkish infants. The distribution of the attachment styles of the infants indicated that 73% secure, 23% insecure-avoidant and 4% insecure-resistant in her sample. These findings were similar to the distribution of attachment styles in Ainsworth et al.'s (1978) study (as cited in İzmirli, 1991). Additionally, the findings showed that mothers of insecurely attached infants had higher scores on anxiety questionnaire than mothers of securely attached children.

Moreover, institutionalized children who were separated from their parents at an early age were compared in terms of their attachment styles to the children from two parent families in a study conducted by Hortacsu and Cesur (1993). The results showed that the children who were raised in an orphanage found to be more avoidant, anxious and less secure than were the parent reared children. Additionally, orphanage children found to have higher depression scores than did the parent reared children.

Bekiroğlu (1996) investigated attachment styles and their relationship to family environment, anxiety and depression. Insecurely attached individuals reported being more depressed and having higher anxiety than the individuals who were securely attached. There was no difference between securely attached and insecurely attached subjects in terms of perceived cohesion within the family. Findings of another study about the relationship between attachment styles of adolescents and their family environments revealed that students who grew up with low coherent families had fearful, preoccupied or dismissing attachment styles but the students who were

brought up in high coherent family atmosphere had secure attachment style (Gezer, 2001).

In another study conducted by Löker (1999), the effects of parent and peer attachment, perceived self-worth, perceived physical attractiveness on social and emotional loneliness were investigated. Individuals who reported more social and emotional loneliness showed less attachment to parents and friends. Additionally, parent attachment contributed more to the prediction of emotional loneliness but peer attachment contributed more to social loneliness.

In a study conducted by Deniz, Hamarta and Arı (2005) to investigate the social skills and loneliness levels of university students with respect to their attachment styles, results showed that loneliness was positively correlated with dismissing, fearful and preoccupied attachment style but negatively correlated with secure attachment style. Secure attachment style was positively correlated with emotional expressivity, social expressivity and social control but negatively correlated with social sensitivity. Dismissing and fearful attachment styles and emotional expressivity was negatively correlated. Fearful attachment was also negatively correlated with social expressivity and social control; and positively correlated with social sensitivity. Preoccupied attachment style was positively correlated to social sensitivity and negatively correlated with social control.

The results of the study conducted by Sümer and Güngör (1999a) revealed that authoritarian and permissive-indulgent parenting styles were the most commonly used parenting attitudes in Turkish parents. Individuals from authoritative and indulgent families were more likely to have secure attachment, high levels of self-esteem, self-concept clarity and low levels of trait anxiety as compared to individuals from authoritarian and neglectful families. Interestingly, parenting dimensions perceived from mothers were mostly related to attachment variables but parenting dimensions which were perceived from fathers, were primarily related with the self variables. This study may show that attachment system should be explained within the context of mother child interaction more than father child interaction.

Güroğlu (2002) investigated the predictors of adolescents' academic achievement. There were three models: 1. Parenting style of mother, which was perceived by adolescents, would predict their academic achievement. 2. Adolescents attachment style, which was predicted from their mothers' attachment style, would predict academic achievement of adolescents. 3. The attachment style of mother would predict their parenting style, which in turn predicts adolescents' attachment style and adolescents' attachment styles predict academic achievement. The results showed that higher perceived authoritativeness was associated with higher academic achievement for male students. Additionally, preoccupied attachment ratings of mothers were positively correlated with adolescents' preoccupied attachment ratings, which were negatively correlated with academic achievement for girls. There was not any support for other models for both genders.

The results of the studies of Löker (1999), Deniz et al. (2005) and Sümer and Güngör (1999a) supported that loneliness might be the result of low levels of parent and peer attachment of mostly insecure individuals. Moreover, the interaction between mother and child was more connected to the attachment system than the interaction between father and child. Furthermore, parenting styles may effect the academic achievement of a young adult in Turkish culture (Güroğlu, 2002).

The study conducted by Konyalıoğlu (2002) with university students proved that there were significant relationships between attachment styles and personality traits. The results showed that male students had more avoidant, secure and anxious attachment styles than did the female students. The results also revealed that married students showed more secure attachment style than single students. Securely attached individuals showed a positive relationship with judgment and extrovert personality types and individuals with avoidant attachment styles revealed an introvert personality type.

Keskingöz (2002) investigated the relationship between attachment styles, interpersonal schemas and eating patterns in Turkey. The results showed that individuals with dismissing attachment style showed more pathological eating attitudes than did the ones with fearful and secure attachment styles. Additionally,

individuals with preoccupied attachment styles showed more unhealthy eating patterns than individuals with fearful attachment styles. Unhealthy eating patterns and dysfunctional interpersonal schemas were related to insecure attachment styles. This result is consistent with the findings of the earlier studies.

The relationship between attachment styles, interpersonal schemes and anxiety symptomatology was investigated by Tolan-Çakmak (2002). The results revealed that participants with secure attachment style expected more complementary reactions from their fathers in dominant situations than the participants with fearful attachment styles. Participants with dismissed attachment styles expected more complementary reactions from their fathers in submissive situations than the individuals with preoccupied attachment styles. Desirability was negatively correlated with fearful attachment style but positively correlated with secure attachment style. Fearful and preoccupied attachment styles were positively correlated with trait anxiety but secure attachment style was negatively correlated with trait anxiety. Desirability and friendly situations were negatively correlated with fearful attachment style.

Aydın (2002) conducted a study to investigate the relationship between the need for power, need for achievement and higher need for affiliation in an individual's motivational profile. The results revealed that fearful individuals had lower need for affiliation scores and higher need for power scores and higher need for approval levels than the individuals with secure, dismissing and preoccupied attachment styles. Secure individuals had higher need for affiliation scores than dismissing and fearful individuals. Additionally, there was a relationship between attachment styles and need for achievement, but female participants were found to have higher need for achievement than the males.

Pamir-Arıkoğlu (2003) found that secure individuals reported low attachment-related anxiety and low avoidance, low distress, high self-restraint and high negative mood regulation. They also reported higher repressive defensiveness than did the preoccupied and dismissing avoidant ones. Dismissing ones were low in attachment-related anxiety and high in avoidance and low in restraint. Dismissing individuals

31

had high negative mood regulation. Preoccupied group reported high attachment-related anxiety, low avoidance, high distress, low restraint and low negative mood regulation. The fearful avoidant group was high in attachment related anxiety, high in avoidance, high in distress and low in negative mood regulation. Secure group reported higher repressive defensiveness levels than the preoccupied and fearful avoidant ones. There was no significant relationship between attachment style and relationship satisfaction and psychological problems.

These findings point out to the possible negative results of having insecure attachment and positive affects of establishing secure attachment.

Some attachment studies were carried out with couples and focused upon romantic relationships. For instance, Karakurt (2001) conducted a study to test the impact of attachment styles on romantic jealousy. The behavioral jealousy was affected by attachment styles but emotional and cognitive aspects of jealousy were not. The fearful individuals reported higher levels of behavioral jealousy and preoccupied individuals reported higher levels of negative affect and inadequacy feeling than the secure individuals. Secure individuals showed more tendencies to maintain the relationship and less intense negative emotions related with jealousy but dismissing ones had the lowest tendency to do that. Preoccupied ones had higher internalization strategy to cope with jealousy. Fearful ones had the lowest level of self-esteem protection.

Işınsu (2003) investigated the couples in terms of showing differences about the adjustment of their relationships under the view of romantic relationships and attachment styles of loving couples, engaged couples, couples married up to an including 5 years period and couples married for more than 5 years. The results showed that married couples for more than 5 years were more securely attached to their romantic relationship than engaged couples. Women were insecurely attached while men were securely attached to their romantic relationships. Adjustment of the romantic relationship had a positive relationship with secure attachment style but negative relationship with insecure attachment styles. In another study conducted

with doctors (Kart, 2002) showed that doctors with preoccupied attachment style had higher stress and had more conflicts of work versus love.

In 2003, Üretmen investigated the relationships among adult attachment styles, place attachment and exploration orientation. The results revealed that participants with dismissing attachment styles had lower place attachment compared to participants with secure attachment style. Female individuals also showed higher exploration orientation than males.

To conclude, attachment system was internalized in a healthier way in a coherent family in the childhood, but attachment figure may change during the life. As indicated in the above literature, secure attachment style mainly shows positive associations with adaptive aspects of human functioning and insecure attachment styles show positive associations with maladaptive aspects of human functioning.

1.3 The Relationship between Attachment Styles and Perfectionism

Hamachek (1978) suggested that maladaptive perfectionism is the result when a child's need for approval, acceptance and love from parents are responded by the parent's failure to provide needed love, interest and positive regard (as cited in Wei et al., 2004). Similarly, Pacht (1984) claimed that most of the people he has seen believed that their parents would love them only if they are perfect. There are still lots of people at their 20s, 30s or 40s who are still trying to be perfect to gain parental love. Parents want their child's excellence in many ways while they react anxiously to any failure showing it as a poor reflection of them (Halgin & Leahy, 1989). If this is the case, it is very likely that perfectionism might occur among the individuals who established insecure attachment styles.

Wei et al. (2004) explained that children who have attachment anxiety might easily learn to understand if they are perfect children for their parents, it is more likely for them to gain their parents' love and acceptance. This way of having parental acceptance in childhood may result in a maladaptive attachment pattern in adulthood. In attachment avoidance there is negative working model of others but positive

33

working model of self, so trying to be perfect may be a positive coping mechanism for children whose parents are unresponsive or inconsistently responsive to the child's needs (Wei et al., 2004). Hence, one may think that perfectionism may start for parental acceptance in childhood. Stating differently, this idea may be a good base to consider a relationship between attachment style and perfectionism.

According to Rice and Mirzadeh (2000), qualities of attachment to parents or parental role models might prepare a base for the development of different kinds of perfectionism. Harter (1988) claimed that children who are insecurely attached might perceive themselves to be 'perfect' and idealize themselves and other people to cover feelings of unworthiness (as cited in Rice & Mirzadeh, 2000). Insecurely attached children tend to develop either negative views of them as unworthy or positive views of others as perfect (Rice & Mirzadeh, 2000). Thus, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing adults who have insecure attachment styles may be more likely to experience perfectionism with its negative effects like setting unreachable goals or never being satisfied with whatever they do.

Although there seem to be a relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism, there have been only a very few research about this relationship in the literature (Andersson & Perris, 2000; Brewer, 2001; Franze, 2005; Rice et al., 2005; Wei et al., 2004; Wei, Heppner, Russell, & Young, 2006).

The results of Brennan and Shaver (1995)'s study (as cited in Flett et al., 2002) revealed small but significant correlations between EDI perfectionism subscale which is a unidimensional measure and measure of attachment.

In 2000, Andersson and Perris investigated this relationship in two convenience samples of adults without a history of psychiatric disorder and found that perfectionism was positively associated with attachment variables like relationship preoccupation and the need for approval.

Results of two studies conducted by Rice and Mirzadeh (2000) also showed that there were adaptive, maladaptive and non-perfectionist groups of perfectionists.

34

Adaptive perfectionists reported more secure attachments than maladaptive perfectionists so attachment might seem to be a predictor of perfectionism. Second study showed that adaptive perfectionists had higher scores on academic integration than maladaptive perfectionists and maladaptive perfectionists reported depression in a clinically significant range. Additionally, academic and emotional benefits of adaptive perfectionism and adverse emotional effects and no academic advantages of maladaptive perfectionism were shown. This research is one of the basic supports of the possible relationship between these two concepts in the literature.

In 2004, Rice and Lopez conducted another study to extend the findings of Rice and Mirzadeh's (2000) study by using an adult attachment measure. Results revealed that concern over mistakes and doubts about action were associated with lower levels of self-esteem and higher levels of depression. In addition, while self esteem scores increased, depression scores decreased with elevated scores on Concern over Mistakes and Doubts about Action Subscales. Further, high degrees of insecure attachment along with greater maladaptive perfectionism predicted low levels of self-esteem. Overall, results indicated that individuals' attachment security might lessen or intensify the negative effects of maladaptive perfectionism on self-esteem. For students with low levels of attachment security self-doubt was related to low self-esteem, but for students with high levels of attachment security self-doubt had a less adverse impact on self-esteem.

In 2001, Brewer conducted a study to investigate the relationships of parenting perfectionism to perceived parenting style of parent, attachment with parent, parent status and gender. The results of this study provided some evidence of the positive relationship between positive attachment styles with parent and positive perfectionism in parenting. This study also showed the positive relationship between negative attachment styles and negative parenting perfectionist tendencies.

Another support for the relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism were the results of the studies conducted by Flett et al. (2001, as cited in Flett et al., 2002) which showed that preoccupied or fearful subjects had higher levels of socially prescribed perfectionism than those with a secure attachment style. However, self-

oriented and other-oriented perfectionism were not found to be associated with the attachment style measures.

Moreover, Wei et al. (2004) conducted a study to investigate maladaptive perfectionism as both a mediator and a moderator between adult attachment and depressive mood. Results showed that maladaptive perfectionism mediated the relationship between attachment anxiety and depressive mood partially, and the relationship between attachment avoidance and depressive mood fully. In addition, both attachment anxiety and attachment avoidance were associated with maladaptive perfectionism significantly. In another study conducted by Wei et al. (2006), the impact of attachment on future depression was mediated by future maladaptive perfectionism and ineffective coping. They used Discrepancy Subscale of Almost Perfect Scale-Revised to measure maladaptive perfectionism. Ineffective coping also mediated the relation between maladaptive perfectionism and depression. In addition, maladaptive perfectionism and ineffective coping affected each other and contributed to depression. The results also suggested that attachment anxiety and avoidance affect the maladaptive perfectionism tendencies that lead to the use of ineffective coping ways. Moreover, in the same study, the associations between attachment anxiety and maladaptive perfectionism or ineffective coping were stronger than the associations between attachment avoidance and maladaptive perfectionism or ineffective coping.

Rice et al. (2005) investigated the mediating role of perfectionism on relationship between parental social influences and adult attachment, they found that parental criticism and socially prescribed perfectionism significantly interacted in the prediction of attachment avoidance but parental expectations and parental criticism interacted in the prediction of attachment anxiety. The results also revealed that maladaptive perfectionism was connected to greater insecurity in an individual's adult relationship. In addition, adaptive perfectionists were more likely to report less avoidance and anxiety and more security in their adult relationships compared to maladaptive perfectionists. Maladaptive perfectionism mediated the association between parental and other social performance expectations and adult attachment

orientations but adaptive perfectionism associated with adult attachment orientations was not found to mediate this relationship.

Findings of another study about parenting perfectionism showed that participants revealed more secure and less dismissing attachment with their mother, and less preoccupied attachment with their father (Snell et al., 2005). Additionally, individuals with more secure relationship with others also attributed more adaptive aspects of parenting perfectionism to themselves. On the other hand, more maladaptive aspects of parenting perfectionism were systematically related to more fearful and preoccupied attachment tendencies. Hence, secure attachment was directly associated with the more beneficial, positive and adaptive aspects of parenting perfectionism but a fearful/preoccupied attachment were associated with more detrimental, negative and maladaptive aspects of parenting perfectionism (Snell et al., 2005).

Franze (2005) conducted a study to investigate adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism as mediating variables in the relationship between parent child attachment and later adult relationship functioning via adult attachment and satisfaction in romantic relationships. Results revealed that more controlling parenting was associated with more negative perfectionism and this perfectionism was associated with more insecure adult attachment and less relationship satisfaction. Adaptive perfectionism was correlated positively with more secure parent/child interactions. Maladaptive perfectionism was associated with less secure attachment style and less satisfaction in relationships. In conclusion, as parenting styles becomes more controlling adult attachment turn into more insecure and less satisfying.

Another study (Eckerd, 2004) investigating whether perfectionism moderates relations between insecure attachment cognitions and eating disorder symptoms on Caucasian College women showed that insecure attachment and eating disorder symptoms associated positively. Self-oriented perfectionism, socially prescribed perfectionism, concern over mistakes and doubts about actions were all positively correlated with eating disorder symptomatology. Therefore, eating disorder symptoms were related more with maladaptive perfectionism than adaptive

perfectionism. Fearful attachment style might be most relevant to eating and dieting problems.

Taken collectively, all these research findings appear to indicate a possible association between insecure attachment styles and perfectionism, specifically maladaptive (i.e. socially prescribed perfectionism), which is the main intention of the study. There is not any study about the relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism conducted with a Turkish sample. Therefore, this study intends to demonstrate this possible association with a Turkish sample.

1.4 Significance of the Study

Attachment styles and perfectionism have their roots in the family environment; as a result, these concepts have importance on young adults' personality and relationships in different ways.

Attachment theory is about the early interactions with caregivers and these interactions prepare the role models in social relations in later life (Bartholomew, 1990). Therefore, it is very crucial to have these models available for the social and emotional development of a child. As these role models develop with the different caregiver responses to the child, informing parents or prospective parents about the possible negative results of inappropriate caregiver responses may be necessary for promoting social and emotional development of the child. School counselors may help parents to understand the role of good modeling.

As mentioned before, Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) classifications revealed that secure attachment style represents positive self and positive perception of others, preoccupied attachment style involves negative self and positive perception of others, dismissing avoidant style reflects a positive self and negative perception of others and fearful avoidant style shows negative self and negative perception of others. Depending on the availability and responsiveness of the caregiver, these perceptions of the child develop and start influencing the development of the later relationships. At the age of 17 or 18 which is the time that young adults are close to go to

university and have a possible separation from the family, it is very critical to understand their attachment styles, specifically inner working models, in their relationships.

Perfectionism that was described in different ways by different theorists such as a normal aspect of human beings (Adler, 1956a) or a specific type of neurosis (Horney, 1970). Perfectionism is also a concept that was connected to the caregiver's responses in the childhood. For instance, the child who was rewarded regularly for good performance observes the parent's disappointment or anxiety for her/his own failures and starts to perceive the failures as the reasons of a loss of acceptance (Burns, 1980). Fear of failure, fear of risky experience (Burns, 1980) and a strong need for good performance may start in the family and continue affecting the later life of the child. As mentioned by Hewitt and Flett (2002), self-oriented perfectionism includes perfectionist behaviors that are sourced from self and directed to self, other-oriented perfectionism is derived from self but directed to other people and socially prescribed perfectionism is derived from others and directed towards the self.

The competitive atmosphere of preparation to university entrance exam at 11th grade in Turkey may be a good example to sustain this perfectionist thinking because this exam may be perceived as risky. Further, the perceptions of self and other may affect the relationships of students because it is important to be more successful than each other to enter the desired branch of a university. Thus, investigating students' perceptions about perfectionism appears important for understanding their difficulties regarding the university entrance examination. There are few studies that were stated in the literature about the relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism (Rice & Mirzadeh, 2000; Wei et al., 2004; Wei et al., 2006). There are many studies about these two constructs separately in Turkey (Aydın, 2002; Çelik, 2004; Gezer, 2001; Güroğlu, 2002; Konyalıoğlu, 2002; Mısırlı-Taşdemir, 2003; Oral, 1999; Sun-Selışık, 2003; Yorulmaz, 2002) however; there appears no study that investigated the relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism in Turkish high school students. The present study aims at filling this gap in Turkish literature.

The importance of conducting this study is to examine the possible relationship of insecure attachment style and socially prescribed perfectionism which was found connected with insecure attachment style in Flett et al.'s (2001) study (as cited in Flett et al., 2002).

To conclude, the results of this study may show the possible interactions of attachment styles and perfectionism in high school students, so it may be meaningful to inform parents or prospective parents about this relationship and the environment that may be prepared for the child's healthy emotional and social development.

Results of this study can give light to further research. It is hoped that this study may encourage other researchers to investigate attachment styles, dimensions of perfectionism and their possible relations with some other self-related variables like self-esteem, global self concept and self-efficacy in high school students.

The purpose of the study, research questions and definitions of terms are explained in the following sections.

1.5 Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of this study is twofold: 1) to investigate the dimensions of perfectionism as perceived by Turkish high school students, 2) to determine whether there is a relationship between attachment styles and the dimensions of perfectionism of Turkish high school students as a function of gender.

1.6 Research Questions

The research questions of this study were formulated as follows:
1. What are the dimensions of perfectionism as perceived by Turkish high school students?
2. Are there any relationships between attachment styles and the dimensions of perfectionism of Turkish high school students as a function of gender?

1.7 Definitions of the Terms

Attachment: It is an emotional bond which is experienced with another individual who is perceived as a security source and who gives a secure base for exploration (Bowlby, 1988)

Attachment Styles: In this study, four attachment categories that were proposed by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) were used. Secure attachment style refers to a sense of worthiness and expectation of accepting and responsive attitude of others; preoccupied attachment style refers to a feeling of unlovability but a belief in other people's trustworthiness and availability; dismissing avoidant style involves a belief in one's lovability but a general distrust in other people or an expectation of other's rejection and unreliability and fearful avoidant style includes a belief in one's unlovability and other people's rejection and unreliability (Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991).

Perfectionism: Perfectionism is striving for unrealistic and unobtainable goals, having unreachable standards and interpreting one's own worth with productivity and success (Burns, 1980; Nugent, 2000). In this study dimensions of perfectionism, which are mentioned by Hewitt and Flett (1991b) were attended. Self-oriented perfectionism includes perfectionist behaviors that are derived from the self and directed toward the self, other-oriented perfectionism includes perfectionist attitudes that are derived from the self but directed toward others and socially prescribed perfectionism involves perfectionist demands that are perceived to stem from others but are directed toward the self (Hewitt & Flett, 2002).

CHAPTER II

METHOD

This chapter includes four sections. The first section presents the participants of the study. Second section displays the psychometric properties of the data collection instruments. Data collection procedure was described in the third section. Finally, data analysis procedures were explained in the last section.

2.1 Participants

The population of the study was all high school students in Ankara. In selecting the participants, convenience sampling method was used. Volunteer participants were recruited from the 11th grade of four randomly chosen state high schools (Çankaya Deneme, Cumhuriyet and Ayrancı) in Ankara. Four hundred ninety four students participated in the study. Two hundred seventy two of the participants (55.1%) were females and 222 (44.9%) were males. Eleventh grade is preferred because it is considered as the critical turning point that adolescents take the last steps before entering into higher adult learning at university.

2.2 Instrumentation

In this study, Turkish version of The Relationship Scale Questionnaire (RSQ) (Sümer & Güngör, 1999b) (Appendix A) were used to measure the attachment styles of students while Turkish version of Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS) (Oral, 1999) (Appendix B) was used to measure the perfectionism of students. The Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale and Relationship Scale Questionnaires were originally developed for the university students. The reliability and the validity studies of the Turkish versions of these inventories were also conducted with Turkish university students (Oral, 1999; Sümer & Güngör, 1999b). Thus, administering these scales on 11th grade high school students who were age wise closer to university

students seemed feasible. However, factor analysis for obtaining validity evidence of MPS for 11th grade students was replicated for the present study. In addition, reliability analyses for both the total and the subscales of MPS were conducted.

2.2.1 Relationship Scale Questionnaire (RSQ)

The Relationship Scale Questionnaire was developed by Griffin and Bartholomew (1994) and consists of 30 items which were taken from Hazan and Shaver's (1987) Attachment Measure Paragraphs, Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) Relationship Questionnaire and Collins and Read's (1990) Adult Attachment Scale (as cited in Sümer & Güngör, 1999b). RSQ was used to evaluate the attachment styles of high school students. It assesses four attachment style prototypes. RSQ's subscales measure Secure Attachment Style, Preoccupied Attachment Style, Dismissing Attachment Style and Fearful Attachment Style (Sümer & Güngör, 1999b).

In administering the scale the students are instructed to think about their close relationships and evaluate themselves on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (not at all like me) to 7 (very much like me). Secure and Dismissing Attachment Style Subscales include five items and Preoccupied and Fearful Attachment Style Subscales consist of four items for each subscale. Four subscale scores are considered by calculating the values of items across subscales and dividing the total subscale score by the number of items of each subscale. Therefore, each subscale's scores range from 1 to 7.

Sümer and Güngör (1999b) translated The Relationship Scale Questionnaire to Turkish and conducted the reliability and validity studies of the scale with a Turkish sample of 123 students. The results of the factor analysis using principle component analysis with varimax rotation showed that the instrument had two identifiable dimensions with eigenvalues over 1. The first factor explained 43 % and the second factor explained the 33 % of the variance. Both factors explained the 76 % of the total variance. In the first factor the secure attachment style was loaded with a factor loading of -.84, Fearful Attachment Style with .80, in the second factor Preoccupied attachment style was loaded with a factor loading of -.84 and Dismissing Attachment

Style was loaded with a factor loading of .76. Test-retest correlation coefficients ranged between .54 and .78.

In another study (Gezer, 2001) RSQ was used with preparatory school students at Middle East Technical University. The researcher was contented with the validity evidence of the RSQ and thus no other validity study was conducted for the present study.

The results of a cross-cultural comparison with a U.S. sample made by Sümer and Güngör (1999b) showed that RSQ had satisfactory level of reliability, stability and convergent validity.

Cronbach alpha reliability of four different subscales of RSQ was also computed for the present study. The results of the present study revealed that Cronbach alpha coefficients for Secure Attachment Style Subscale (5 items) was .12, for Fearful Attachment Style Subscale (4 items) .36, for Dismissing Attachment Style Subscale (5 items) .41 and for Preoccupied Attachment Style Subscale (4 items) .28. These Cronbach alpha results showed satisfactory level of reliability, because there are only a few items for every subscale in RSQ. Griffin and Bartholomew (1994) stated that the Cronbach alpha coefficients of RSQ's subscales ranged between .41 and .71, but test-retest correlation coefficient was satisfactory (as cited in Sümer & Güngör, 1999b). Griffin and Bartholomew (1994) interpreted the low alpha levels of the subscales not because of the small amount of items in every subscale or low psychometric quality of the scales, but with the characteristics of the subscales which measures both the model of self and the model of others at the same time (as cited in Sümer & Güngör, 1999b).

Similarly, in Çelik's (2004) study, Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient was particularly low for the Secure Attachment Subscale. Cronbach alpha coefficient was .17 for Secure Attachment Style Subscale; .54 for Fearful Attachment Style Subscale; .53 for Dismissing Attachment Style Subscale; .32 for Preoccupied Attachment Style Subscale. These values were accepted as the satisfactory evidence for the reliability of the subscales.

2.2.2 Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS)

Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale is a 45-item instrument. It was used to determine the individual differences of students in perfectionism through three different dimensions named as Self-Oriented, Other-Oriented and Socially Prescribed Perfectionism (Hewitt & Flett, 1991b). Each dimension is represented in a subscale consisting of 15 items. Items for Self-Oriented Perfectionism (i.e. 01.When I am working on something, I can not relax until it is perfect) include 1, 6, 8, 12, 14, 15, 17, 20, 23, 28, 32, 34, 36, 40, 42; items for Other-Oriented Perfectionism (i.e. 10. It does not matter that someone close to me does not do their absolute best) are 2, 3, 4, 7, 10, 16, 19, 22, 24, 26, 27, 29, 38, 43, 45 and items for Socially Prescribed Perfectionism (i. e. 11. The better I do, the better I am expected to do) involve 5, 9, 11, 13, 18, 21, 25, 30, 31, 33, 35, 37, 39, 41, and 44. Self-Oriented Perfectionism Subscale measures the self-directed perfectionist behaviors, Other-Oriented Perfectionism Subscale measures the beliefs and expectations about other's capabilities and Socially Prescribed Perfectionism Subscale measures the perceived need to reach standards and expectations prescribed by significant others (Hewitt & Flett, 1991b).

MPS uses a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). Higher scores on three subscales show greater perfectionism. Items 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 12, 19, 21, 24, 30, 34, 36, 37, 38, 43, 44, and 45 are reverse coded, so they were reversed before subscale scores were computed.

There are studies indicating the adequate reliability and validity of the original three MPS subscales (Flett et al., 1991, as cited in Sun-Selışık, 2003; Hewitt & Flett, 1991b) on both normal and clinical samples. For university students item-to-subscale score correlations ranged between .51 and .73 for Self-Oriented items, .43 and .64 for Other-Oriented items, and .45 and .71 for Socially Prescribed items (Hewitt & Flett, 1991b). Coefficient alphas were .86 for Self-Oriented Perfectionism, .82 for Other-Oriented Perfectionism and .87 for Socially Prescribed Perfectionism for the same participants. Flett et al. (1991, as cited in Sun-Selışık, 2003) found high coefficient alphas for each subscales in another study; .89 for Self-Oriented, .79 for Other-

Oriented and .86 for Socially Prescribed Perfectionism with a sample of university students. In the same study of Flett et al. the coefficient alphas for patients were .88 for Self-Oriented, .74 for Other-Oriented, and .81 for Socially Prescribed Perfectionism respectively (as cited in Sun-Selışık, 2003).

Hewitt and Flett (1991b) conducted two factor analyses to test the construct validity for patients sample and for students sample separately. As a result of the factor analyses of the MPS on the students' sample all 15 items of the Self-Oriented Perfectionism Subscale were loaded to the first factor with factor loadings ranging between .45 and .66. Similarly, all items of Socially Prescribed Perfectionism Subscale were converged under the second factor with factor loadings ranging between .39 and .63. Thirteen Other-Oriented Perfectionism items converged under the third factor with factor loadings ranging between .38 and .63. Other two items from Other-Oriented Perfectionism Subscale with factor loadings of .24 and .32 on the third factor had slightly higher loadings on the second factor. In the same study, factor analyses of the MPS on the patient sample revealed that 14 of the 15 items of Self-Oriented Perfectionism Subscale loaded highest on the first factor with the factor loadings ranging between .36 to .77 and the remaining item loaded highest on the first factor. Likewise, 14 items of the Socially Prescribed Perfectionism Subscale loaded highest on the second factor with factor loadings ranging between .32 and .63 and the remaining item loaded higher on the third factor. Finally, 10 Other-Oriented Perfectionism items loaded highest on the third factor with the factor loadings ranging between .33 and .60. The remaining items from Other-Oriented Perfectionism Subscale loaded on the first and third factors. These results regarding the original scale revealed that the factor structures were quite similar for student and patient samples, except for a few items measuring other-oriented perfectionism.

Moreover, Hewitt and Flett (1991b) compared the MPS with personality measures as self and other blame scale, the authoritarianism scale, the general population dominance scale, fear of negative evaluation, irrational beliefs test, locus of control scale and narcissistic personality inventory. The MPS was also examined to see the associations with some psychopathological conditions. The results of these studies

revealed that the MPS had adequate concurrent validity (Flett et al., 1991, as cited in Sun-Selışık, 2003; Hewitt & Flett, 1991b, 1993).

Turkish Version of Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale which was used in this study was translated to Turkish by Oral (1999). The MPS had a similar factor structure to the original scale in Oral's (1999) pilot study. Fourteen items converged under the first factor was the same as the previous studies. On the other hand, 4 items under Other-Oriented Perfectionism (22, 16, 29, and 07) and one item (30) that was under the Socially Prescribed Perfectionism in the original scale converged under the first factor in that study. Most of the items of Socially Prescribed Perfectionism in the original scale were under the second factor except, only one item (27) was loaded under Other-Oriented Perfectionism in the original scale. Consequently, 10 items converged under the Other-Oriented Perfectionism but only one of them (34) was under Self-Oriented Perfectionism in the original one. In addition, Oral reported that item 22 was excluded from the scale because of its low factor loading. Oral also reported reliability analysis of the Turkish version of MPS that revealed a coefficient alpha level of .91. The respective alphas were .91 for Self-Oriented Perfectionism, .73 for Other-Oriented Perfectionism and .80 for Socially Prescribed Perfectionism. Finally, item-total-subscale correlations for each item ranged between .20 and .75 for Self-Oriented Perfectionism, .22 and .60 for Socially Prescribed Perfectionism, and .31 to .52 for Other-Oriented Perfectionism.

Nevertheless, the findings of a study conducted in Turkey by Sun-Selışık (2003) did not confirm the three dimensionality of the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale and an additional dimension named 'Perfectionistic Expectations' appeared.

2.2.2.1 Construct Validity Evidence for the Present Study

Factor analyses were replicated for the present study for the purpose of obtaining new construct validity evidence of the MPS on 11th grade high school students. The results of the factor analytic study are presented in the results section in detail.

2.3 Procedure

The instruments were given to the students in their class hours by the researcher. After excluding the cases with missing values over three, 495 filled instruments were left. One case is excluded because of having outlier value.

A sheet of paper that contains an instruction explaining the aim of the present study (APPENDIX C) and two scales that include an instruction about how the questionnaires (MPS and RSQ) should be filled were attached together for collecting data. Official permissions from Ministry of Education were taken and four high school authorities in Ankara gave permission to administer two questionnaires simultaneously in the class settings of 11th grade students. Students who filled the questionnaires returned them back in one class hour. Anonymity was also guaranteed.

2.4 Analysis of Data

At first, to determine the applicability of the MPS for 11th grade high school students a separate factor analysis was carried out for the present study which also revealed further validity evidence for the MPS along with the perceptions of high school students regarding the dimensions of perfectionism.

Second, to investigate the relationship between independent variables that are gender and secure, preoccupied, dismissing and fearful attachment style scores of RSQ with the dependent variables, which are self-oriented, other-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism scores, a 2 (gender) x 4 (attachment styles) factorial MANOVA was employed to the Self-Oriented, Other-Oriented and Socially Prescribed Subscales scores of the MPS. As suggested by Griffin and Bartholomew (1994, as cited in Sümer & Güngör, 1999b) after computing the means for every attachment style subscale scores, the highest mean point of four subscale scores were used to determine the attachment style of every student. Although employing such a procedure limited the sample size, it was regarded as the most appropriate way to identify the attachment styles of students. For instance, 25 subjects were excluded as

they scored equally high in more than one attachment style. However, the number of remaining participants was enough to run a MANOVA without violating the assumptions.

The statistical analyses were carried out by using related subprograms of SPSS program, version 11.0 and 13.0.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

This chapter presents the results of the statistical analyses. First, the results of the factor analysis of the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS) were introduced. Second, the results regarding the possible relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism as a function of gender were presented.

3.1 The Results Regarding the Dimensions of Perfectionism As Perceived by Turkish High School Students

Factor analysis was employed to understand the perceptions of high school students about the dimensions of perfectionism through examining the factor structure of the MPS. The factor analysis was conducted with 495 students. The dimensionality of the 45 items from the MPS was analyzed using maximum likelihood analysis. An initial principal component analysis revealed 13 factors with eigenvalues over 1. These factors explained 56.7 % of the variance.

The number of factors was rotated based on three criteria: a priori hypothesis from previous studies that revealed that MPS was three-dimensional, the scree-test (APPENDIX D) together with the eigenvalues and the interpretability of the factor solution. Three factors were rotated using a varimax rotation procedure. The rotated solution, as shown in Table 3.1., provided three interpretable factors with eigenvalues of 7.1; 3.3; and 2.4 for self-oriented, socially prescribed and other-oriented perfectionism dimensions, respectively. These three factors explained the 28.7 % of the total variance. The first factor explained 12.8 %, second factor explained 8 % and the third factor explained 7.8 % of the total variance. Seventeen items converged under the first factor named self-oriented perfectionism with factor loadings ranging between .32 and .69. Twelve items converged under the second factor named socially prescribed perfectionism with factor loadings ranged from .34

to .60. Thirteen items converged under the third factor entitled other-oriented perfectionism with factor loading ranging between .30 and .59. Items 4, 7 and 22 which were under the third factor of other-oriented perfectionism in the original scale had loadings lower than .30 in the present study. These items were excluded from the scale.

This factor structure was similar to the factor structure observed in the previous studies with some differences observed in the items loadings in factors. When we examined the first factor; items 44, 30 and 21 were loaded on the socially prescribed perfectionism dimension (factor II) and items 29 and 26 were loaded on the other-oriented perfectionism (factor III) in the original scale. In the present study these items were loaded on the self-oriented perfectionism (factor I). Item 8 which was loaded on the self-oriented perfectionism (factor I) in the original scale, converged under both first and the third factors with similar loadings. This item was placed in the first factor as it was theoretically more meaningful when considered within this factor. Similarly, item 16 which was loaded on the other-oriented perfectionism (factor III) and item 18 which was loaded on the socially prescribed perfectionism (factor II) in the original scale; converged under both first and second factors in the present study. Both of these items were included in the second factor because placing the items in that way would be theoretically more meaningful.

Furthermore, although item 27 converged under other-oriented perfectionism (factor III) in the original scale; it converged under socially prescribed perfectionism (factor II) in the present study. Similarly, items 34, 12 and 36 which were loaded on self-oriented perfectionism (factor I) in the original scale were loaded on the other-oriented perfectionism (factor III) in the present study. In addition, items 9 and 37 were converged under socially prescribed perfectionism (factor II) in the original scale; in the present study they converged under other-oriented perfectionism (factor III). The results of the present study revealed a three-dimensional factor structure. Different from the findings of Sun-Selışık's (2003) study no additional fourth factor appeared in the present study. Thus, the three dimensional nature of MPS was supported by the findings.

Factor loadings of the MPS were presented in Table 3.1.
Table 3.1 Factor Loadings of the MPS Subscales

		Factors		
Items		1	2	3
1. Self-Oriented Items				
17.	I strive to be the best in everything I do.	.69		
15.	It is very important that I am perfect in everything I attempt.	.67		
32.	I must work to my all potential all the time.	.66		
06.	One of my goals is to be perfect in everything I do.	.65		
14.	I strive to be as perfect as I can be.	.65		
01.	When I am working on something, I can not relax until it is perfect.	.58		
28.	I am perfectionist in setting my goals.	.52		
20.	I demand nothing less than perfection of myself.	.51		
42.	I must always be successful at school or at work.	.51		
44.	People around me think I am still competent even if I make a mistake.	.48		
23.	It makes me uneasy to see an error in my work.	.45		
30.	Other think I am okay, even when I don't succeed.	.42		
40.	I set very high standards for myself.	.41		
29.	The people who matter to me should never let me down.	.35		
26.	If I ask someone to do something, I expect it to be done flawlessly.	.33		
21.	Others will like me even if I do not excel at everything.	.32		
08.	I never aim for perfection in my life.	.44		.50
2. Socially Prescribed Items				
13.	Anything I do that is less than those will see excellent is poor work around me.		.60	
41.	People expect more from me than I am capable of giving.		.59	
35.	My family expects me to be perfect.		.57	
39.	People expect nothing less than perfection from me.		.57	
33.	Although, they may not show it, other people get very upset with me when I slip up.		.52	
31.	I feel that people are too demanding of me.		.52	
11.	The better I do, the better I am expected to do.		.47	
25.	Success means that I must work even harder to please others.		.41	
27.	I can not stand to see people close to me make mistakes.		.40	
05.	I find it difficult to meet others' expectations of me.		.37	
16.	I have high expectations for the people who are important to me.	.34	.34	
18.	The people around me expect me to succeed at everything I do.	.46	.44	

(Table 3.1 continued)

Items	Factors		
	1	2	3
3. Other-Oriented Items			
10. It does not matter that someone close to me does not do their absolute best.			**.59**
34. I do not have to be best at whatever I am doing.			**.51**
12. I seldom feel the need to be perfect.			**.49**
24. I do not expect a lot from my friends.			**.46**
03. It is not important that the people I am close to are successful.			**.45**
09. Those around me readily accept that I can make mistakes too.			**.43**
19. I do not have very high standards for those around me.			**.37**
36. I do not have very high goals for myself.			**.37**
02. I am not likely to criticize someone for giving up too easily.			**.37**
37. My parents rarely expected me to excel in at all aspects of my life.			**.36**
38. I respect people who are average.			**.36**
43. It does not matter to me when a close friend does not try their hardest.			**.35**
45. I seldom expect others to excel at whatever they do.			**.30**

For the reliability analysis of the scale, Cronbach alpha coefficients were computed for each subscale twice; before and after excluding the items lower than .30 and placing the items within meaningful factors. In the first analysis the alpha reliability was .81 for overall MPS, .77 for self-oriented perfectionism, .70 for other-oriented perfectionism, and .70 for socially prescribed perfectionism. In the second analysis; coefficient alpha was .82 for overall MPS and .77 for self-oriented perfectionism, .77 for other-oriented perfectionism, and .58 for socially prescribed perfectionism.

3.2 The Results Regarding the Relationship between Attachment Styles and Dimensions of Perfectionism as a Function of Gender

To evaluate a possible relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism and to assess whether this relationship varies as a function of gender, a 2 (gender) x 4 (secure, fearful, dismissed and preoccupied attachment styles) factorial MANOVA was employed to the Self-Oriented, Socially Prescribed and Other-Oriented Perfectionism Subscale scores of the MPS.

53

Before the analysis; all the data were examined for data entry accuracy, missing values, fit between their distributions and meeting the assumptions of multivariate analysis of variance. For improving pairwise linearity and reducing extreme skewnesses and curtosis, z scores for all subscales were computed. Only one case which was observed as an outlier on data was omitted. In assigning the students to an attachment style category the highest score that a particular student had among the four attachment styles categories was used. Thus, data obtained from twenty five students which had the same scores on at least two different attachment style subscales were omitted. Consequently, MANOVA was conducted with 469 students. Means and standard deviations of the MPS subscale scores of the male and female secure, fearful, dismissed and preoccupied high school students were presented in Table 3.2.

Table 3.2 Means and Standard Deviations of the MPS Subscale Scores of the Male and Female Secure, Fearful, Preoccupied and Dismissing Students

	Attachment Styles	Gender	M	SD	N
	Secure	Female	4.84	0. 79	66
		Male	4.87	0.86	70
		Total	4.86	0.83	136
	Fearful	Female	4.99	0.86	52
		Male	4.95	0.86	12
		Total	4.98	0.86	64
	Preoccupied	Female	4.94	0.86	45
Self-Oriented		Male	5.00	0.84	46
		Total	4.97	0.85	91
	Dismissing	Female	5.04	0.82	95
		Male	5.05	0.81	83
		Total	5.04	0.81	178
	Total	Female	4.96	0.83	258
		Male	4.98	0.84	211
		Total	4.97	0.83	469

(Table 3.2 continued)

	Attachment Styles	Gender	M	SD	N
	Secure	Female	4.04	1.11	66
		Male	4.36	0.98	70
		Total	4.21	1.06	136
	Fearful	Female	4.34	1.15	52
		Male	4.30	1.41	12
		Total	4.33	1.19	64
	Preoccupied	Female	4.38	1.30	45
Socially Prescribed		Male	4.72	0.88	46
		Total	4.55	1.12	91
	Dismissing	Female	4.44	1.11	95
		Male	4.68	0.92	83
		Total	4.55	1.03	178
	Total	Female	4.31	1.16	258
		Male	4.56	0.97	211
		Total	4.42	1.09	469
	Secure	Female	4.27	0.98	66
		Male	4.29	0.84	70
		Total	4.28	0.91	136
	Fearful	Female	4.19	0.69	52
		Male	3.96	1.19	12
		Total	4.15	0.80	64
	Preoccupied	Female	4.19	0.95	45
Other-Oriented		Male	4.33	0.92	46
		Total	4.26	0.94	91
	Dismissing	Female	4.15	0.79	95
		Male	4.32	0.73	83
		Total	4.23	0.77	178
	Total	Female	4.20	0.85	258
		Male	4.29	0.84	211
		Total	4.24	0.85	469

The results of the MANOVA showed no significant main effect of attachment styles (Wilks' λ=.96; $\underline{F}$ (9, 1117.24) = 1.59; η^2 = .010 p>.05) or gender (Wilks'λ=.99; $\underline{F}$ (3, 459) = 1.25; η^2 = .008 p>.05). The results of the MANOVA analysis also revealed no interaction effect of attachment styles and gender (Wilks'λ=.99; $\underline{F}$ (9, 1117.24) = .38; η^2 = .002 p>.05). As Wilks' λ values were nonsignificant no further

univariate analyses were carried out.

Overall, the results of the present study indicated that MPS was perceived as three dimensional by Turkish high school students and no relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism that varies as a function of gender was found.

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

This chapter presents the discussion of the overall study investigating the relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism in high school students. First, discussion regarding the dimensions of perfectionism as perceived by Turkish high school students was presented. Second, discussion regarding the relationship between attachment styles and dimensions of perfectionism as a function of gender was documented. Third, limitations of the study were identified. Finally, implications and recommendations for future research were specified.

4.1 Dimensions of Perfectionism As Perceived by Turkish High School Students

For the purpose of investigating the dimensions of perfectionism as perceived by high school students in Turkey, the factor structure of MPS was examined. The results supported the three dimensional factor structure of MPS. This result was consistent with the findings of most of the studies in the literature (Dinç, 2001; Hewitt & Flett, 1991b; Oral, 1999) although some differences in the item loadings were observed in the present study.

In the development process of the original version of the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale, Hewitt and Flett (1991b) examined the factor structure of MPS using both student and patient samples. On both of these samples Self-Oriented Perfectionism Subscale, Other-Oriented Perfectionism Subscale and Socially Prescribed Perfectionism Subscale had different item loadings. The original study has been a reference showing the possible different factor structure of MPS that emerged in other studies such as Cox, Enns and Clara's (2002) study. Cox et al. (2002) tested the three factors solution of MPS on clinically distressed, college and medical school students' samples. The results supported three dimensionality of the scale only for empirically derived 15 item subset (Cox et al., 2002). These findings

57

were generally confirmed by the results of the present study that the instrument had a three factor structure.

The studies which were conducted on Turkish samples also revealed different factor structures (Dinç, 2001; Oral, 1999; Sun-Selışık, 2003; Yorulmaz, 2002). For instance, the items converged under the different subscales of MPS in Oral's study displayed a similarity with the findings of the present study. In addition, the findings of factor analysis in Yorulmaz's (2002) study mainly supported the three dimensional structure of MPS, as did the results of the present study.

Another similarity emerged about the excluded items, for example, items 4, 7 and 22 with factor loadings under .30 were excluded in this study and item 22 which loaded under .30 was excluded in Oral's (1999) study. Likewise, in Dinç's (2001) study items 20, 24, 30, 34 with factor loadings under .30 were excluded and items 45 and 7, which caused an increase in the coefficient alpha level of the scale when they were not included, were excluded from the scale.

With the knowledge of all the complexity of the item loadings for three different factors, it is not surprising that in Sun-Selışık's (2003) study; there emerged another subscale named 'perfectionistic expectations' involving 5 items. These studies may show that different factor structures of MPS were obtained with Turkish samples.

The results of the present study also demonstrated that MPS was a reliable measure. As mentioned in the results section, the result of the reliability analysis of MPS in this study was consistent with the findings of Dinç's (2001) study. The overall reliability coefficients of MPS and the reliability coefficients of the subscales in Oral's study were higher than the reliability coefficients of MPS and its subscales found in the present study. In the light of these findings, it is obvious that reliability coefficients of the overall MPS and the subscales found in the present study were lower than the coefficients obtained in the other studies conducted in Turkey. This might have stemmed from the sample characteristics, specifically the different age level of the participants in the present study.

It is also important to mention that some problems occurred during the administration of the scales that might have led to faking on the part of the participants. First of all, the participants of this study were chosen from four state high school students in Ankara and they filled out the instruments in their class hour. Although the researcher explained the purpose of the study and the importance of filling out the forms correctly, some faking behaviors might have occurred while filling out the inventories. In every classroom, the teacher of their course was not inside the class while the students were filling out the instruments. When the researcher was alone in the classrooms some discipline problems occurred and the researcher had difficulty to control the class. For instance, some students did not cooperate to pay attention to the items of the instruments. It was voluntary to fill out the forms but there were many students who volunteered to participate in the study first but soon lost their interest while filling out the instruments. For that reason, the items might not be filled out carefully by some participants that, in turn, might have led the participants to give false answers to the items.

To conclude, although the reliability coefficients were lower, the results of the study revealed a similar factor structure to the ones found in the previous studies. These results indicated that students perceived perfectionism in three different dimensions namely self-oriented, other-oriented and socially prescribed. These findings indicated that the results of the present study were generally confirmed the previous research findings.

The results regarding the relationship between attachment styles and dimensions of perfectionism as a function of gender was discussed in the following subsection.

4.2 The Relationship between Attachment Styles and Dimensions of Perfectionism as a Function of Gender

The result of the MANOVA analysis revealed no significant relationship between attachment styles and dimensions of perfectionism in terms of gender. This result was unexpected and inconsistent with the findings of Flett et al. (2001) that showed a positive relationship between the two constructs (as cited in Flett et al., 2002).

As aforementioned, studies generally use perfectionism dimensions as mediators or moderators in the relationship between attachment styles and other constructs (Eckerd, 2004; Franze, 2005, Rice et al., 2005; Wei et al., 2004; Wei et al., 2006). There are also some studies that show the relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism in terms of parenting styles (Andersson & Perris, 2000; Brewer, 2001; Rice & Lopez, 2004; Rice & Mirzadeh, 2000; Snell et al., 2005). The only direct relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism with the use of MPS and RSQ was conducted by Flett et al. (2001, as cited in Flett et al., 2002). The results of this study showed that preoccupied and fearful participants had higher levels of socially prescribed perfectionism than secure ones and socially prescribed perfectionism was associated with fearful and preoccupied attachment dimensions while self and other-oriented perfectionism dimensions were not found associated with attachment style measures. Additionally, in a study of Suddarth and Slaney (2001), Socially Prescribed Perfectionism Subscale was conceptualized as a maladaptive factor, Self-Oriented and Other-Oriented Subscales were conceptualized under the adaptive factor. In this case one may easily assume a possible connection between socially prescribed perfectionism and insecure attachment style. However, such an association has not been confirmed by the results of the present study possibly because of the age level of the participants, or some cultural differences. It is difficult to relatively discuss this finding obtained in the present study as there were no other comparable studies found in the literature.

Gender differences in the research of these constructs were a good support to add gender as an independent variable to the present study. For instance, Konyalıoğlu (2002) found that male students had more avoidant, secure and anxious attachment styles than the female ones in her study with university students. In another study, male participants were found to have higher scores in other-oriented perfectionism than the female ones (Hill, Zrull et al., 1997). Nevertheless the results of the present study regarding gender were not congruent with the earlier findings.

In addition, one might claim that perfectionism construct might have been perceived differently in diverse cultures. Research showed that perfectionist tendencies might

have been varied from one culture to the other (Castro & Rice, 2003; Chang, 1998; Mobley, Slaney, & Rice, 2005). As indicated before, the different results of factor analysis of MPS (Hewitt & Flett, 1991b) in different studies in Turkey might also be connected with the cultural perspectives of the participants in the sample.

4.3 Limitations

It is important to note that the generalizability of the present study is limited to 11th grade high school students in Ankara. As explained in the method section, sample included students from four state high schools in Ankara but a larger sample size that consists of students from different kinds of high schools from other cities of Turkey might result in a superior generalizability of the study.

Additionally, although they are used in several studies in Turkey MPS (Hewitt & Flett, 1991b) and RSQ might not be psychometrically sound scales for Turkish students. Indeed, different results obtained for the factor structure of MPS in Turkish sample (Dinç, 2001; Oral, 1999; Sun-Selışık, 2003; Yorulmaz, 2002) support this view. Relationship Scale Questionnaire was also used with samples consisting of university students in Turkish culture, yet, it might not be very appropriate to use with high school students. It is also important to mention that this scale has few items for every subscale which reduces the reliability of the scale; therefore it would be more meaningful to use an instrument with higher reliability with adolescents. It was also observed by the researcher that understanding the items of the scales was rather problematic for the participants.

Under the light of these limitations some implications and recommendations for future research were explained in the following subsection.

4.4 Implications and Recommendations

Based on the findings of the present study, some implications and recommendations must be asserted for future research about perfectionism and attachment styles in Turkey.

To begin with, new studies about the factor structure of MPS are needed because of the different factor structures revealed in different studies in Turkey (Dinç, 2001; Oral, 1999; Sun -Selışık, 2003; Yorulmaz, 2002).

Notably, reinvestigating the relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism may provide useful findings for counseling profession. For instance, counselors may inform the prospective parents about a possible relationship between these two concepts in order to allow them to take necessary precautions to prevent their children from the negative effects of perfectionism. Although no relationship was indicated between perfectionism and attachment styles in the present study, when a counselor finds out high socially prescribed perfectionism tendencies in the client during the counseling sessions it may still be important to explore the possible insecure attachment characteristic of the client.

In following research of this kind, using other scales for measuring perfectionism and attachment styles might be more convenient about this relationship in Turkey. For example, Mısırlı-Taşdemir (2003) used the Turkish version of MPS (Frost et al., 1990) which was adapted to Turkish culture by Mısırlı-Taşdemir (2003) and Özbay (as cited in Mısırlı-Taşdemir, 2003) for 14-19 years old students. This study revealed a six factor structure as the original of MPS. The results of the adaptation study of this instrument also showed that the scale was a more valid and reliable measure to use in Turkish culture. Nevertheless, it was not used for the present study because researcher managed to reach Mısırlı-Taşdemir's study just after conducting the research. If this scale would have been used in the present study the results might have been different because of having the higher number of subscales of MPS (Frost et al., 1990). This scale has 6 subscales which measures Organization, Personal Standards, Concern over Mistakes, Doubts about Actions, Parental Expectations and Parental Criticism. Thus, this scale might have measured perfectionism more broadly than MPS (Hewitt & Flett, 1991b).

Another alternative would have been the Perfectionism Inventory (Hill et al., 2004) which combined both of MPS (Frost et al., 1990; Hewitt & Flett, 1991b) scales in

one measure with two additional constructs called Planfulness and Rumination. As claimed before, this scale was found more efficient, higher in psychometric quality and clarity of interpretation and more powerful as a predictor than the other perfectionism measures (Hill et al., 2004). Adaptation of this scale for the future studies might lead to a better measurement.

Additionally, Relationship Questionnaire (RQ) which was developed by Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) and adapted to Turkish culture by Sümer and Güngör (1999b) may be an alternative scale for measuring attachment in future studies. This scale has four paragraphs that represent four attachment styles and was tested on university students and older aged samples and may be tested in younger samples. This self-classification measure of adult attachment style asks respondents to indicate which of the four descriptive paragraphs best describes how they feel about close relationships. The four paragraphs respectively characterize secure, avoidant, preoccupied, and fearful attachment styles (Sümer & Güngör, 1999b).

Regarding the sample size, a larger and more representative sample would be more beneficial for future research. The best would be carrying out a nationwide study involving different kinds of high schools such as Anatolian High Schools, Vocational Schools and so on.

Specifically, it is central to once more mention the difficulties of researcher in controlling the participants in the class settings because of the absence of the teachers during the administration of the inventories; therefore in the following studies giving inventories to students in a class environment where class teachers are also present is very important. Reliable results might be better assured in that way.

Overall, reinvestigating the factor structure of MPS and the relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism in Turkish high school students may be arranged with alternative measurement scales, procedures, larger and diverse samples. Additionally, it may be beneficial to investigate predictor power of attachment styles on the dimensions of perfectionism in the future research.

REFERENCES

Accordino, D. B., Accordino, M. P., & Slaney, R. B. (2000). An investigation of perfectionism, mental health, achievement, and achievement motivation in adolescents. *Psychology in the Schools, 37*, 535-545.

Adderholdt, M., & Goldberg, J. (1999). *Perfectionism: What's bad about being too good?* (Rev. ed.). Minneapolis: Free Spirit Pub.

Adler, A. (1956a). Striving for superiority. In H. L. Ansbacher & R. R. Ansbacher (Eds.), *The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler* (pp.101-125). New York: Basic Books.

Adler, A. (1956b). The neurotic disposition. In H. L. Ansbacher & R. R. Ansbacher (Eds.), *The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler* (pp.239-262). New York: Basic Books.

Ainsworth, M. D. S., & Bowlby, J. (1991). An ethological approach to personality development. *American Psychologist, 46*, 333-341.

Alden, L. E., Bieling P. J., & Wallace S. T. (1994). Perfectionism in an interpersonal context: A self-regulation analyses of dysphoria and social anxiety. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 18*, 297-316.

Amado, S. (2005). *Emotional well-being of first-year university students: Family functioning and attachment styles.* Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara., Turkey.

Andersson, P., & Perris, C. (2000). Attachment styles and dysfunctional assumptions in adults. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, 7*, 47-53.

Ashby, J. S., LoCicero, K. A., & Kenny, M. C. (2003). The relationship of multidimensional perfectionism to psychological birth order. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 59*, 42-51.

Aydın, S. (2002). *Attachment style and motivational profile.* Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Bartholomew, K. (1990). Avoidance of intimacy: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 7*, 147-178.

Bartholomew, K., & Horowitz, M. (1991). Attachment styles among young adults: A test of a four-category model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 226-244.

Beesley, D., & Stoltenberg, C. D. (2002). Control, attachment style, and relationship satisfaction among adult children of alcoholics. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 24*, 281-299.

Bekiroğlu, C. B. (1996). *Attachment style, family environment depression and anxiety.* Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, İsanbul, Turkey.

Blatt, S. J. (1995). The destructiveness of perfectionism: Implications for the treatment of depression. *American Psychologist, 50*, 1003-1020.

Bowlby, J. (1952). *Maternal care and mental health.* Switzerland: Monograph Series of the World Health Organization.

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol, 1. Attachment.* New York: Basic Books

Bowlby, J. (1973). *Attachment and loss: Vol, 2. Separation: Anxiety and anger.* New York: Basic Books

Bowlby, J. (1979). Psychoanalysis as art and science. *Int. Rev. Psychoanal.* 6, 3-14.

Bowlby, J. (1988). Developmental psychiatry comes of age. *The American Journal of Psychiatry, 145*, 1-10.

Bretherton, I. (1995). The origins of attachment theory: John Bowlby and Mary Ainsworth In S. Goldberg, R. Muir, & J. Kerr (Eds.), *Attachment theory: Social, developmental, and clinical perspectives* (pp. 45-84). Hillsdale NC: The Analytic Press.

Brewer, A. L. (2001). *Perfectionism and parenting: The relationships of perceived parenting style of parent, attachment, parent status, and gender to parental perfectionism* Unpublished doctorate dissertation, University of Missouri-Columbia.

Broemer, P., & Blumle, M. (2003). Self-views in close relationships: The influence of attachment styles. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 42*, 445-461.

Buist, K. L., Deković, M., Meeus, W., & Aken, A. G. (2002). Developmental patterns in adolescent attachment to mother, father and sibling. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 31*, 167-176.

Buist, K. L., Deković, M., Meeus, W., & Aken, A. G. (2004). Attachment in adolescence: A social relations model analysis. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 19*, 826-850.

Burns, D. D. (1980). The perfectionists script for self-defeat. *Psychology Today,* 34-52.

Bylsma, W. H., Cozzarelli, C., & Sümer, N. (1997). Relation between adult attachment styles and global self-esteem. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 19*, 1-16.

Castro, J. R., & Rice, K. G. (2003). Perfectionism and ethnicity: Implications for depressive symptoms and self-reported academic achievement. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 9*, 64-78.

Chang, E. C. (1998). Cultural differences, perfectionism, and suicidal risk in a college population: Does social problem solving still matter? *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 22*, 237-254.

Chang, E. C. (2000). Perfectionism as a predictor of positive and negative psychological outcomes: Examining a mediation model in younger and older adults. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 18-26.

Chang, E. C. (2002). Examining the link between perfectionism and psychological maladjustment: Social problem solving as a buffer. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 26*, 581-595.

Chang, E. C., & Rand, K. L. (2000). Perfectionism as a predictor of subsequent adjustment: Evidence for a specific diathesis-stress mechanism among college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 129-137.

Cheng, S. K. (2001). Life stress, problem solving, perfectionism, and depressive symptoms in Chinese. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 25*, 303-310.

Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58,* 644-663.

Cox, B. J., Enns, M. W., & Clara, I. P. (2002). The multidimensional structure of perfectionism in clinically distressed and college student samples. *Psychological Assessment, 14*, 365-373.

Çelik, Ş. (2004). *The effects of an attachment-oriented-psychoeducational-group-training on improving the preoccupied attachment styles of university students.* Unpublished doctorate dissertation, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Dean, P. J., & Range, L. M. (1996). The escape theory of suicide and perfectionism in college students. *Death Studies, 20*, 415-424.

Deniz, M. E., Hamarta, E., & Arı, R. (2005). An investigation of social skills and loneliness levels of university students with respect to their attachment styles in a sample of Turkish students. *Social Behavior and Personality, 33*, 19-32.

Dinç, Y. (2001). *Predictive role of perfectionism on depressive symptoms and anger: Negative life events as the moderator.* Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Eagle, M. (1995). The developmental perspectives of attachment and psychoanalytic theory. In S. Goldberg, R. Muir, & J. Kerr (Eds.), *Attachment theory: Social, developmental, and clinical perspectives* (pp. 123-150). Hillsdale NC: The Analytic Press.

Eckerd, L. M. (2004). *The relation of attachment style and perfectionism in women with eating disorder symptomatology.* Unpublished doctorate dissertation, University of Kentucky.

Ellis, A. (1958). Rational psychotherapy. *Journal of General Psychology, 59,* 35-49.

Enns, M. W., & Cox, B. J. (2005). Perfectionism, stressful life events, and the 1-year outcome of depression. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 29*, 541-553.

Enns, M. W., Cox, B. J., & Clara, I. (2002). Adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism: Developmental origins and association with depression proneness. *Personality and Individual Differences, 33*, 921-935.

Flett, G. L., Besser, A., Davis, R.A., & Hewitt, P. L. (2003). Dimensions of perfectionism, unconditional self-acceptance, and depression. *Journal of Rational-Emotive & Cognitive-Behavior Therapy, 21*, 119-138.

Flett, G. L., Greene, A., & Hewitt, P.L. (2004). Dimensions of perfectionism and anxiety sensitivity. *Journal of Rational-Emotive & Cognitive-Behavior Therapy, 22*, 39-57.

Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., Oliver, J. M., & Macdonald, S. (2002). Perfectionism in children and their parents: A developmental analysis. In G. L. Flett & P. L. Hewitt (Eds.), *Perfectionism: Theory, Research and Treatment* (pp. 89-132). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., & Singer, A. (1995). Perfectionism and parental authority styles. *Individual Psychology, 51*, 50-60.

Franze, S. E. (2005). *Perfectionism as a mediator between parent-child interactions and attachment style in adult romantic relationships.* Unpublished doctorate dissertation, The Pennsylvania State University.

Frost, R. O., Lahart, C. M., & Rosenblate, R. (1991). The development of perfectionism: A study of daughters and their parents. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 15*, 469-489.

Frost, R. O., & Marten, P. (1990). Perfectionism and evaluative threat. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 14*, 559-572.

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

Gard, C. (1999). Perfectionism. *Current Health 2, 26*, 30-31.

Gezer, Z. Ü. (2001). *The relationship between attachment styles of adolescents and their family environments.* Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Gilman, R., & Ashby, J. S. (2003). Multidimensional perfectionism in a sample of middle school students: An exploratory investigation. *Psychology in the Schools, 40*, 677-689.

Gosselin, J. T. (2003). *Perfectionism: Examination from a self-regulation framework.* Unpublished doctorate dissertation, George Mason University, Fairfax, VA.

Güroğlu, B. (2002). *Prediction of academic achievement in Turkish adolescents from attachment style and mother's parenting style variables.* Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Halgin, R. P., & Leahy, P. M. (1989). Understanding and treating perfectionistic college students. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 68*, 222-225.

Hamilton, T. K., & Schweitzer, R. D. (2000). The cost of being perfect: perfectionism and suicide ideation in university students. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry, 34*, 829-835.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 511-524.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1994). Attachment as an organizational framework for research on close relationships. *Psychological Inquiry, 5*, 1-22.

Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1991a). Dimensions of perfectionism in unipolar depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 100*, 98-101.

Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1991b). 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 specific vulnerability hypothesis. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 102*, 58-65.

Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (2002). Perfectionism, stress, and coping in maladjustment. In G. L. Flett & P. L. Hewitt (Eds.), *Perfectionism: Theory, Research and Treatment* (pp. 253-285). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.

Hewitt, P. L., Newton, J., Flett, G., L., & Callander, L. (1997). Perfectionism and suicide ideation in adolescent psychiatric patients. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 25*, 95-101.

Hill, R. W., Huelsman, T. J., Furr, R. M., Kibler, J., Vicente, B. B., & Kennedy, C. (2004). A new measure of perfectionism: The perfectionism inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 82*, 80-91.

Hill, R. W., McIntire, K., & Bacharach, V. R. (1997). Perfectionism and the big five factors. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 12*, 257-270.

Hill, R. W., Zrull, M. C., & Turlington, S. (1997). Perfectionism and interpersonal problems. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 69*, 81-103.

Horney, K. (1970). *Neurosis and human growth: The Struggle toward self-realization.* New York: W.W. Norton & Company Inc.

69

Hortacsu, N., & Cesur, S. (1993). Relationship between depression and attachment styles in parent-and institution-reared Turkish children. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 154*, 329-338.

Işınsu, M. (2003). *İkili ilişki biçimi ve süresi ile bağlanma stilleri arasındaki bağlantılar.* Unpublished master's thesis, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey.

İzmirli, M. (1991). *An application of Ainsworth's strange situation procedure in assessing the quality of attachment in Turkish infants.* Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Karakurt, G. (2001). *The impact of adult attachment styles on romantic jealousy.* Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Kart, N. M. (2002). *Yetişkin bağlanma stillerinin bazı bilişsel süreçlerle bağlantısı: Sağlık personeli ile yapılan bir çalışma.* Unpublished doctorate dissertation, Ankara University, Ankara, Turkey.

Kawamura, K. Y., Hunt, S. L., Frost, R. O., & DiBartolo, P. M. (2001). Perfectionism, anxiety, and depression: Are the relationships independent? *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 25*, 291-301.

Keskingöz, B. (2002). *Üniversite öğrencileri ile anoreksiya nevroza tanısı alan ve almayan bireylerde bağlanma biçimleri, kişilerarası şemalar ve yeme örüntüleri arasındaki ilişkiler.* Unpublished master's thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.

Kilbert, J. J. (2004). *Self-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism: Are they differentiated by adaptive and maladaptive psychological symptoms?* Unpublished master's thesis, University of South Alabama.

Kobori, O., & Tanno, Y. (2005). Self-oriented perfectionism and its relationship to positive and negative affect: The mediation of positive and negative perfectionism cognitions. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 29*, 555-567.

Konyalıoğlu, A. P. (2002). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin duygusal ilişki bağlanma tarzları ile kişilik tipleri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi.* Unpublished master's thesis, Marmara University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Kottman, T. (2002). Perfectionistic children and adolescents: Implications for school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 3*, 182-189.

Kyrios, M., Frost, R. O., & Steketee, G. (2004). Cognitions in compulsive buying and acquisition. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 28*, 241-258.

Leek, E. M. (2005). *Attachment and loss: Two life experiences and their impact on interpersonal relationships.* Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Long Beach.

LoCicero, K. A., Ashby, J. S., & Kern, R. M. (2000). Multidimensional perfectionism and lifestyle approaches in middle school students. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 56*, 449-461.

Lombardi, D. N., Florentino, M. C., & Lombardi, A. J. (1998). Perfectionism and abnormal behavior. *The Journal of Individual Psychology, 54*, 61-71.

Lopez, F. G. (1996). Attachment-related predictors of constructive thinking among college students. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 75*, 58-64.

Lopez, F. G., Mauricio, A. M., Gormley, B., Simko, T., & Berger, E. (2001). Adult attachment orientations and college student distress: The mediating role of problem coping styles. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 79*, 459-464.

Löker, Ö. (1999). *Differential effects of parent and peer attachment on social and emotional loneliness among.* Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Makris, G. S. (1999). *The interplay among perfectionism, relationship standards, and relationship satisfaction.* Unpublished doctorate dissertation, State University of New York, Albany.

Mann, M. P. (2003). The adverse influence of narcissistic injury and perfectionism on college students' institutional attachment. *Journal of Personality and Individual Differences*, *36*, 1797-1807.

Marotta, S. A. (2002). An ecological view of attachment theory: Implications for counseling. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 80*, 507-511.

Martin, J. L. (2005). *Relations between adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism, stress, and psychological adjustment.* Unpublished doctorate dissertation, Georgia State University.

Martin, J. L., & Ashby, J. S. (2004). Perfectionism and fear of intimacy: Implications for relationships. *The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families, 12*, 368-374.

McCarthy, C. J., Moller, N. P., & Fouladi, R. T. (2001). Continued attachment to parents: It's relationship to affect regulation and perceived stress among college students. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 33*, 198-214.

Mısırlı-Taşdemir, Ö. (2003). *Üstün yetenekli çocuklarda mükemmelliyetçilik, sınav kaygısı, benlik saygısı, kontrol odağı, öz yeterlilik ve problem çözme becerileri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi.* Unpublished master's thesis, Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon, Turkey.

Mikulincer, M. (1998). Adult attachment style and individual differences in function versus dysfunctional experiences of anger. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 513-524.

Minarik, M. L., & Ahrens A. H. (1996). Relations of eating behavior and symptoms of depression and anxiety to the dimensions of perfectionism among undergraduate women. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 20*, 155-169.

Mobley, M., Slaney, R. B., & Rice, K. G. (2005). Cultural validity of the almost perfect scale-revised for African American college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 52*, 629-639.

Murphy, B., & Bates, G. (1997). Adult attachment style and vulnerability to depression. *Personality and Individual Differences, 22*, 835-844.

Nugent, S. A. (2000). Perfectionism: It's manifestations and classroom-based interventions. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education 11*, 215-222.

Oral, M. (1999). *The relationship between dimensions of perfectionism, stressful life events and depressive symptoms in university students ' a test of diathesis-stress model of depression'.* Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Pacht, A. R. (1984). Reflections on perfection. *American Psychologist, 39*, 386-390.

Pamir-Arıkoğlu, A. A. (2003). *Attachment styles and social-emotional adjustment in Turkish college students.* Unpublished master's thesis, Boğaziçi University, İstanbul, Turkey.

Park, L. E., Crocker, J., & Mickelson, K. D. (2004). Attachment styles and contingencies of self-worth. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 1243-1254.

Pickover, S. (2002). Breaking the cycle: A clinical example of disrupting an insecure attachment system. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling, 24*, 358-367.

Pirot, M. (1986). The pathological thought and dynamics of the perfectionist. *Individual Psychology, 42,* 51-58.

Rice, K. G., Ashby, J. S., & Preusser, K. J. (1996). Perfectionism, relationship with parents, and self-esteem. *Individual Psychology, 52*, 246-260.

Rice, K. G., Ashby, J. S., & Slaney, R. B. (1998). Self-esteem as a mediator between perfectionism and depression: A structural equations analyses. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45*, 304-314.

Rice, K. G., & Dellwo J. P. (2002). Perfectionism and self-development: Implications for college adjustment. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 80*, 188-197.

Rice, K. G., & Lopez, F. G. (2004). Maladaptive perfectionism, adult attachment, and self esteem in college students. *Journal of College Counseling, 7,* 118-128.

Rice, K. G., Lopez, F. G., & Vergara, D. (2005). Parental/social influences on perfectionism and adult attachment orientations. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 24*, 580-605.

Rice, K. G., & Mirzadeh, S.A. (2000). Perfectionism, attachment and adjustment. *Journal of Counselling Psychology, 47*, 238-250.

Rice, K. G., Mobley, M., Trippi, J., & Ashby, J. S. (2001). The revised almost perfect scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 34*, 130-146.

Rice, K. G., & Slaney, R. B. (2002). Clusters of perfectionists: Two Studies of emotional adjustment and academic achievement. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 35*, 35-48.

Rosser, S., Issakidis, C., & Peters, L. (2003). Perfectionism and social phobia: Relationship between the constructs and impact on cognitive behavior therapy. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 27*, 143-151.

Ruggiero, G. M., Levi, D., Ciuna, A., & Sassaroli, S. (2003). Stress situation reveals an association between perfectionism and drive for thinness. *International Journal of Eating Disorders, 34*, 220-226.

Sherry, S. B., Hewitt, P. L., Besser, A., McGee, B. J., & Flett, G. L. (2004). Self-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism in the eating disorder inventory perfectionism subscale. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, *35*, 69-79.

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

Smyth, B. C. (2001). *Teasing out normal and neurotic perfectionism from multidimensional perfectionism scales.* Unpublished doctorate dissertation, Marquette University, Milwaukee.

Snell Jr., W. E., Overbey, G. A., & Brewer, A. L. (2005). Parenting perfectionism and parenting role. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*, 613-624.

Sorotzkin B. (1998). Understanding and treating perfectionism in religious adolescents. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training, 35*, 87-95.

Stöber, J. (1998). The Frost multidimensional perfectionism scale revisited: More perfect with four (instead of six) dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences, 24*, 481-491.

Stöber, J., & Joorman, J. (2001). Worry, procrastination, and perfectionism: Differentiating amount of worry, pathological worry, anxiety, and depression. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 25*, 49-60.

Suddarth, B. H., & Slaney, R. B. (2001). An investigation of the dimensions of perfectionism in college students. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 34*, 157-165.

Sun-Selışık, Z. E. (2003). *The dimensions of perfectionism and their relations to helpless explanatory style.* Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Sümer, N., & Güngör, D. (1999a). Çocuk yetiştirme stillerinin bağlanma stilleri, benlik değerlendirmeleri ve yakın ilişkiler üzerindeki etkisi [The impact of perceived parenting styles on attachment styles, self-evaluations and close relationships]. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 14*, 35-58.

Sümer, N., & Güngör, D. (1999b). Yetişkin bağlanma stilleri ölçeklerinin Türk örneklemi üzerinde psikometrik değerlendirmesi ve kültürlerarası bir karşılaştırma [Psychometric evaluation of adult attachment measures on Turkish samples and a cross-cultural comparison]. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi, 14,* 71-106.

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.

Tolan-Çakmak, Ö. (2002). *Üniversite öğrencilerinde kaygı belirtileri ve bağlanma biçimleri ile kişilerarası şemalar arasındaki ilişkiler.* Unpublished master's thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.

Tozzi, F., Aggen, S. H., Neale, B. M., Anderson, C. B., Mazzeo, S. E., Neale, M. C., et al. (2004). The structure of perfectionism: A twin study. *Behavior Genetics, 34*, 483-494.

Üretmen, S. (2003). *Yetişkin bağlanma stilleri, mekana bağlanma eğilimi ve keşfetme yönelimi arasındaki ilişkiler.* Unpublished master's thesis, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey.

Yorulmaz, O. (2002). *Responsibility and perfectionism as predictors of obsessive-compulsive symptomatology: A test of cognitive model.* Unpublished master's thesis, Middle East technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Ward, M. J., & Carlson, E. A. (1995). Associations among adult attachment representations, maternal sensitivity, and infant-mother attachment in a sample of adolescent mothers. *Child Development, 66*, 69-79.

Wei, M., Heppner, P. P., Russell, D. W., & Young, S. K. (2006). Maladaptive perfectionism and ineffective coping as mediators between attachment and future depression: A prospective analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*, 67-79.

Wei, M., Mallinckrodt, B., Russell, D. W., & Abraham, W. T. (2004). Maladaptive perfectionism as a mediator and moderator between adult attachment and depressive mood. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51*, 201-212.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

İLİŞKİ ÖLÇEKLERİ ANKETİ (RELATIONSHIP SCALE QUESTIONNAIRE)

K ☐　　　　**E** ☐

Aşağıda yakın duygusal ilişkilerinizde kendinizi nasıl hissettiğinize ilişkin çeşitli ifadeler yer almaktadır. Yakın duygusal ilişkilerden kastedilen arkadaşlık, dostluk, romantik ilişkiler ve benzerleridir. Lütfen her bir ifadeyi bu tür ilişkilerinizi düşünerek okuyun ve her bir ifadenin sizi ne ölçüde <u>tanımladığını</u> aşağıdaki 7 aralıklı ölçek üzerinde değerlendiriniz.

```
1----------------2-----------------3----------------4------------------5-------------------6---------------7
Beni hiç                            Beni kısmen                           Tamamıyla
tanımlamıyor                        tanımlıyor                            beni tanımlıyor
```

İfade							
1. Başkalarına kolaylıkla güvenemem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Kendimi bağımsız hissetmem benim için çok önemli.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Başkalarıyla kolaylıkla duygusal yakınlık kurarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Bir başka kişiyle tam anlamıyla kaynaşıp bütünleşmek isterim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Başkalarıyla çok yakınlaşırsam incitileceğimden korkarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Başkalarıyla yakın duygusal ilişkilerim olmadığı sürece oldukça rahatım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. İhtiyacım olduğunda yardıma koşacakları konusunda başkalarına her zaman güvenebileceğimden emin değilim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Başkalarıyla tam anlamıyla duygusal yakınlık kurmak istiyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Yalnız kalmaktan korkarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Başkalarına rahatlıkla güvenip bağlanabilirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Çoğu zaman romantik ilişkide olduğum insanların beni gerçekten sevmediği konusunda endişelenirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Başkalarına tamamen güvenmekte zorlanırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. Başkalarının bana çok yakınlaşması beni endişelendirir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. Duygusal yönden yakın ilişkilerim olsun isterim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. Başkalarının bana dayanıp bel bağlaması konusunda oldukça rahatımdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. Başkalarının bana, benim onlara verdiğim kadar değer vermediğinden kaygılanırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17. İhtiyacınız olduğunda hiç kimseyi yanınızda bulamazsınız.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. Başkalarıyla tam olarak kaynaşıp bütünleşme arzum bazen onları ürkütüp benden uzaklaştırıyor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19. Kendi kendime yettiğimi hissetmem benim için çok önemli.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20. Birisi bana çok fazla yakınlaştığında rahatsızlık duyarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21. Romantik ilişkide olduğum insanların benimle kalmak istemeyeceklerinden korkarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22. başkalarının bana bağlanmamalarını tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23. Terk edilmekten korkarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

24. Başkalarıyla yakın olmak beni rahatsız eder.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25. Başkalarının bana, benim istediğim kadar yakınlaşmakta gönülsüz olduklarını düşünüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26. Başkalarına bağlanmamayı tercih ederim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27. İhtiyacım olduğunda insanları yanımda bulacağımı biliyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28. Başkaları beni kabul etmeyecek diye korkarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29. Romantik ilişkide olduğum insanlar, genellikle onlarla, benim kendimi rahat hissettiğimden daha yakın olmamı isterler.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30. Başkalarıyla yakınlaşmayı nispeten kolay bulurum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX B

ÇOK BOYUTLU MÜKEMMELLİYETÇİLİK ÖLÇEĞİ (MULTIDIMENSIONAL PERFECTIONISM SCALE)

K ☐   E ☐

Aşağıda kişilik özellik ve davranışlarına ilişkin bir dizi ifade bulunmaktadır. Her ifadeyi okuduktan sonra o maddede belirtilen fikre katılma derecenizi 7 (kesinlikle katılıyorum) ve 1 (kesinlikle katılmıyorum) arasında değişen rakamlardan size uygun olanını işaretleyerek belirtiniz. (Örneğin; kesinlikle katılıyorsanız 7'yi, katılıyorsanız 6'yı, Biraz katılıyorsanız 5'i, kararsızsanız 4'ü, bir miktar katılmıyorsanız 3'ü, katılmıyorsanız 2'yi ve kesinlikle katılmıyorsanız 1 rakamını işaretleyiniz). Bu ölçek kişisel görüşlerinizle ilgilidir, bunun için "doğru" ya da " yanlış" cevap vermek söz konusu değildir. Önemli olan işaretlediğiniz rakamın sizin gerçek düşüncenizi yansıtmasıdır.

1)	Bir iş üzerinde çalıştığımda iş kusursuz olana kadar rahatlayamam.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2)	Genelde kişileri kolay pes ettikleri için eleştirmem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3)	Yakınlarımın başarılı olmaları gerekmez.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4)	En iyisinden aşağısına razı oldukları için arkadaşlarımı nadiren eleştiririm.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5)	Başkalarının benden beklentilerini karşılamakta güçlük çekerim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6)	Amaçlarımdan bir tanesi yaptığım her işte mükemmel olmaktır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7)	Başkalarının yaptığı her şey en iyi kalitede olmalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8)	İşlerimde asla mükemmelliği hedeflemem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9)	Çevremdekiler benim de hata yapabileceğimi kolaylıkla kabullenirler.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10)	Bir yakınımın yapabileceğinin en iyisini yapmamış olmasını önemli görmem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11)	Bir işi ne kadar iyi yaparsam çevremdekiler daha da iyisini yapmamı beklerler.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12)	Nadiren mükemmel olma ihtiyacı duyarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13)	Yaptığım bir şey kusursuz değilse çevremdekiler tarafından yetersiz bulunur.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14)	Olabildiğim kadar mükemmel olmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15)	Giriştiğim er işte mükemmel olmam çok önemlidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16)	Benim için önemli olan insanlardan beklentilerim yüksektir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17)	Yaptığım her şeyde en iyi olmaya çalışırım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18)	Çevremdekiler yaptığım her şeyde başarılı olmamı beklerler.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19)	Çevremdeki insanlar için çok yüksek standartlarım yoktur.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20)	Kendim için mükemmelden daha azını kabul edemem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21)	Her konuda üstün başarı göstermesem de başkaları benden hoşlanacaktır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22)	Kendilerini geliştirmek için uğraşmayan kişilerle ilgilenmem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23)	Yaptığım işte hata bulmak beni huzursuz eder.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

24)	Arkadaşlarımdan çok şey beklemem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25)	Başarı, başkalarını memnun etmek için daha da çok çalışmam gerektiği anlamına gelir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26)	Birisinden bir şey yapmasını istersem, işim yapılmasını beklerim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27)	Yakınlarımın hata yapmasını görmeye tahammül edemem.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28)	Hedeflerimi belirlemede mükemmeliyetçiyimdir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29)	Değer verdiğim insanlar beni hiçbir zaman hayal kırıklığına uğratmamalıdır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30)	Başarısız olduğum zamanlar bile başkaları yeterli olduğumu düşünürler.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31)	Başkalarının benden çok şey beklediğini düşünüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32)	Her zaman yapabileceğimin en iyisini yapmaya çalışmalıyım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33)	Bana göstermeseler bile, hata yaptığım zaman diğer insanlar çok bozulurlar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34)	Yaptığım her şeyde en iyi olmak zorunda değilim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35)	Ailem benden mükemmel olmamı bekler.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
36)	Kendim için yüksek hedeflerim yoktur.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37)	Annem ve babam nadiren hayatımın her alanında en başarılı olmamı beklerler.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38)	Sıradan insanlara saygı duyarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39)	İnsanlar benden mükemmelden aşağısını kabul etmezler.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40)	Kendim için yüksek standartlar koyarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
41)	İnsanlar benden verebileceğimden fazlasını beklerler.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
42)	Okulda veya işte her zaman başarılı olmalıyım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
43)	Bir arkadaşımın elinden gelenin en iyisini yapmaya çalışmaması benim için önemli değildir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
44)	Hata yapsam bile, etrafımdaki insanlar yeterli ve becerikli olduğumu düşünürler.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
45)	Başkalarının yaptığı her şeyden üstün başarı göstermelerini nadiren beklerim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

APPENDIX C

YÖNERGE

Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi

Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü

Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Anabilim Dalı yüksek lisans programında yapılacak bir tezde kullanılmak üzere size verilmiş olan ölçekleri doldurmanızı rica ediyoruz. Bu araştırmada kullanılacak olan bütün bilgiler yalnızca araştırma amacıyla kullanılacak, bireylere ait bilgiler gizli tutulacaktır. İlginize teşekkür ederiz.

PELİN SAYA

Scree Plot