

PERFECTIONISM AND PERCEIVED PARENTING STYLE AMONG
UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

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

BY

GİZEM ALVAN

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

JANUARY 2015

Approval of the Graduate School of Social Sciences

Prof. Dr. Meliha Altunışık
Director

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

Prof. Dr. Ayhan Demir
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. Esin Tezer
Supervisor

Examining Committee Members

Prof. Dr. Oya Yerin Güneri

(METU, EDS)

Prof. Dr. Esin Tezer

(METU, EDS)

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Esen Uzuntiryaki Kondakçı (METU, SSME)

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: Gizem Alvan

Signature :

ABSTRACT

PERFECTIONISM AND PERCEIVED PARENTING STYLE AMONG UNIVERSITY STUDENTS

Alvan, Gizem

MSc., Department of Educational Sciences

Supervisor: Prof. Dr. Esin Tezer

January 2015, 85 pages

In this study, the relationship between perceived parenting styles and perfectionism was investigated among male and female university students. Two questionnaires, namely, Almost Perfect Scale-Revised (APS-R) Turkish version and Parenting Styles Scales were administered to 530 (245 males and 285 females) undergraduate students of METU. The results of two separate multivariate analysis of variance conducted for mothers and fathers revealed that those who perceived their mothers and fathers as authoritative and authoritarian had significantly higher maladaptive perfectionism scores than those who perceived them as permissive/indulgent. The results also yielded that those who perceived their fathers as authoritative had significantly higher adaptive perfectionism scores than those who perceived their fathers as authoritarian. No gender differences were found between female and male students.

Keywords: Adaptive Perfectionism, Maladaptive Perfectionism, Parenting Styles.

ÖZ

ÜNİVERSİTE ÖĞRENCİLERİ ARASINDA MÜKEMMELİYETÇİLİK VE ALGILANAN ÇOCUK YETİŞTİRME STİLİ

Alvan, Gizem

Yüksek Lisans, Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü

Tez Yöneticisi: Prof. Dr. Esin Tezer

Ocak 2015, 85 sayfa

Bu çalışmada, algılanan çocuk yetiştirme stilleri ve mükemmeliyetçilik arasındaki ilişkiler incelenmiştir. Olumlu- Olumsuz Mükemmeliyetçilik Ölçeği ve Çocuk Yetiştirme Stilleri Ölçeği 530 (285 kız ve 245 erkek) ODTÜ lisans öğrencilerinden oluşan bir örnekleme uygulanmıştır. Anne ve babalar için yürütülen iki ayrı çok yönlü varyans analizi sonuçları, hem annelerini hem de babalarını otoriter ve açıklayıcı/otoriter algılayan öğrencilerin onları izin verici/şımartan algılayanlardan daha yüksek olumsuz mükemmeliyetçilik puanına sahip olduklarını göstermiştir. Sonuçlar, ayrıca, babalarını açıklayıcı/otoriter olarak algılayan öğrencilerin olumlu mükemmeliyetçilik puanlarının babalarını otoriter olarak algılayanlardan daha yüksek olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır. Kız ve erkek öğrenciler arasında anlamlı bir cinsiyet farkı bulunmamıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Olumlu Mükemmeliyetçilik, Olumsuz Mükemmeliyetçilik, Anne Baba Çocuk Yetiştirme Stilleri

To my family
for always being there for me,
rain or shine..

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committee members, my family, and all my friends . It would have been a far more difficult journey without your guidance, support, and help.

I want to thank my parents and sister, Sanem, for all your support during this process and for believing in me. Without your encouragement it would have been impossible to finish my thesis. There are not enough words to describe my appreciation for having you in my life.

I would like to thank my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Esin Tezer, for her endless support, your guidance throughout this process, and sharing her immense knowledge. I am also thankful to my committee members, Prof. Dr. Oya Yerin Güneri and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Esen Uzuntiryaki Kondakçı, for their constructive feedback and support.

I am forever grateful to my teaching partner and friend, Lori Özmey, for her tireless support and endless patience. I am also thankful to my students for helping me remember to smile. You see the good in all things and in everyone. Your perspectives and joy are very valuable to me.

I am thankful to my dear friends Onur, Gözde, Merve, Ece, and İldem for their feedback, support, patience and creative ideas for keeping me motivated throughout this difficult process. I appreciate all of them for being a part of my life.

I would also like to thank to all METU students who contributed to my thesis by sincerely answering questions, and all instructors who used their teaching hours to make time for data collection.

Last, but not the least, I am thankful to Prof. Dr. Sevda Bekman and Dr. Bruce Johnson Beykont for being true inspirations throughout the pursuit of my higher education. I could never thank you enough for all you have done to encourage me to reach higher, achieve my goals, and never give up.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PLAGIARISM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZ.....	v
DEDICATION.....	vi
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	viii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS.....	xii
CHAPTER	
1.INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Purpose of the Study.....	4
1.2. Significance of the Study.....	5
1.3. Definitions of Terms.....	7
2.REVIEW OF LITERATURE.....	9
2.1. Perfectionism.....	9
2.1.1. Debates in Perfectionism.....	10
2.1.2. Adaptive and Maladaptive Nature of Perfectionism	12
2.2. Parenting Styles.....	15

2.3. Relationship between Perfectionism and Parenting Styles.....	19
2.4. Turkish Literature on Perfectionism and Parenting Styles.....	20
2.4.1. Turkish Literature on Perfectionism.....	20
2.4.2. Turkish Literature on Parenting Styles.....	25
2.4.3. Turkish Literature on Perfectionism and Parenting Styles.....	26
3. METHODOLOGY.....	28
3.1. Participants.....	28
3.2. Instruments.....	29
3.2.1. Almost Perfect Scale-Revised.....	30
3.2.1.1. Factor Structure of Turkish Version of APS-R for Present Study.....	30
3.2.2. Parenting Styles Questionnaire.....	32
3.2.2.1. Factor Structure of Parenting Styles Questionnaire for Present Study.....	33
3.3. Procedure.....	36
3.4. Data Analysis.....	36
3.5. Limitations of the Study.....	37
4. RESULTS.....	38
4.1. Descriptive Statistics of the Study Variables.....	38

4.2. Assumptions of Multivariate Analysis of Variance.....	40
4.3.Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance.....	41
4.3.1.Results of Multivariate Analysis for Mothers	42
4.3.2. Results of Multivariate Analysis of Fathers.....	44
5. CONCLUSIONS.....	47
5.1. Discussion.....	47
5.2. Implications.....	50
5.3.Recommendations.....	52
REFERENCES.....	53
APPENDICES	
A.ALMOST PERFECT SCALE-REVISED.....	70
B. PARENTING STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE.....	71
C. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM.....	72
D. TURKISH SUMMARY.....	73
E. TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU.....	85

LIST OF TABLES

TABLES

Table 3.1. The Distribution of the Students by Gender, Faculties and Grades.....	29
Table 3.2. Factor Analysis Results for Turkish Version of ASPR for the Present Study.....	31
Table 3.3. Factor Loadings of Parenting Styles Questionnaire-Analyze for Fathers.....	34
Table 3.4. Factor Loadings of Parenting Styles Questionnaire-Analyze for Mothers.....	35
Table 4.1. Means and Standard Deviations for the Variables of the Study by Gender.....	39
Table 4.2. Correlations Matrix of All Variables.....	41
Table 4.3. Means and Standard Deviations of Perfectionism Scores According to Gender and Parenting Style for Mother's Scale.....	42
Table 4.4. Standard Deviations and Means of Perfectionism Scores According to Gender and Parenting Styles of Fathers.....	44

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

APS-R	Almost Perfect Scale- Revised
FFP	Five-Factor Personality
FMPS	Frost's Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale
METU	Middle East Technical University
MPS	Flett's Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale
ODTÜ	Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi
OOMÖ	Olumlu Olumsuz Mükemmeliyetçilik Ölçeği

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The construct of perfectionism has increasingly drawn the attention of psychologists in recent years. However, in spite of all the interest, several issues regarding the definition of the construct have been discussed in the literature. For example, Hewitt and Flett (2002) mentioned three issues that should be considered in the conceptualization of perfectionism: 1) whether perfectionism has trait or state characteristics; 2) whether it is unidimensional or multidimensional in nature; and 3) whether it has adaptive or maladaptive outcomes. Regarding trait and state characteristics, studies yielded significant correlations between perfectionism and some personality characteristics such as assertiveness, interpersonal maladjustment and distress (Hill, Zull, & Turlington, 1997); motivation, achievement, and wellbeing (Stoeber & Rambow, 2007); conscientiousness (Stumpf & Parker, 2000), self-efficacy (LoCicero & Ashby, 2000); self-criticism, dependency, and self-esteem (Grzegorek, Slaney, Franze, & Rice, 2004; Stumpf & Parker, 2000).

As for the dimensionality of perfectionism, the results of factor analytic studies stated that the multidimensional nature of the perfectionism construct resulted in adaptive and maladaptive outcomes (Frost, Marten, Lahart, & Rosenblate, 1990; Frost, Heimberg, Holt, Mattia, & Neubauer, 1993; Rice, Ashby, & Slaney, 1998; Slaney, Ashby, & Trippi, 1995; Suddarth & Slaney, 2001). Hamachek (1978) is

among the first researchers who categorized perfectionism as “normal and positive” and “neurotic and dysfunctional”. After Hamachek’s definition, Slaney and Ashby (1996) described perfectionism’s three basic features: setting high standards for performance: experiencing discrepancy between personal standards and self-performance which causes distress: and being organized and neat. Based on these three aspects of perfectionism, the subscales of “High Standards”, “Discrepancy”, and “Order” of the Almost Perfect Scale-Revised were created (APS-R; Slaney, Rice, Mobley, Trippi, & Ashby, 2001). After required reliability and validity studies, researchers (Slaney, et al., 2001) found that High Standards subscale assesses adaptive perfectionism, and Discrepancy subscale measures maladaptive perfectionism. Even though Order subscale was originally established to determine adaptive features of perfectionism , studies (see Slaney, Rice, & Ashby, 2002 for a review) revealed inconsistent results; that is, Order subscale was not a measure either for adaptive or maladaptive perfectionism but instead it measures normal neatness.

Adaptive and maladaptive aspects of perfectionism have also been investigated in respect to their developmental nature. As suggested by the scholars of perfectionism (Flett, Hewitt, Oliver, & McDonald, 2002), one of the best ways to understand the adaptive and maladaptive aspects of perfectionism is to examine the factors contributing to its development. In this line of study, the association between perfectionism and parenting styles was investigated. Results demonstrated that adaptive perfectionism was predicted by parental nurturance (e.g., DiPrima, Ashby, Gnilka, & Noble, 2011) whereas maladaptive perfectionism was found to be associated with harsh, demanding, overly critical and authoritarian parenting (Enns, Cox, & Clara, 2002; Flett, Hewitt, & Singer, 1995; Frost, Lahart, & Rosenblate, 1991; Kawamura, Frost, & Harmatz, 2002; Rice, Ashby, & Preusser, 1996; Soenens, Berzonsky, Vansteenkiste, Beyers, & Goossens, 2005). Although these studies provide knowledge regarding the relationships of parenting with perfectionism, the variables used in these studies are so varied that they make the conclusions limited. Thus, in the present study, we used more commonly used conceptualizations for

parenting styles, as well as more recently developed constructs of adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism, both of which were also adapted to, and widely studied, with Turkish samples (Sümer & Güngör, 1999; Ulu, 2007).

In the literature, Baumrind (1966) was considered as the pioneer who proposed three different types of parenting styles: these are authoritarian, authoritative and permissive. Authoritarian parents create strict rules to child, and they place value on discipline and obedience. Authoritative parents, on the other hand, encourage their children to be independent individuals but set limits and control on their actions. Permissive parents, however, have a tendency to be less demanding on their children and provide an accepting and affirmative environment for the children to regulate their own behavior.

Later, in 1983, Maccoby and Martin identified two forms of permissive parenting styles, neglectful and indulgent. In addition, they described four parenting styles based on the two dimensions: demandingness and responsiveness. Demandingness dimension refers to parental control, expectation of a certain level of maturity and providing close supervision in parenting. Responsiveness refers to parental affection and warmth, acceptance and involvement in the child's life. From the intersecting of two dimensions, four parenting styles were described: authoritative, authoritarian, permissive indulgent and permissive neglecting. Authoritative parents are found to be high in both demandingness and responsiveness. They are controlling in every sense but not restrictive to their children. They show acceptance, responsiveness and demand for maturation. Even if authoritarian parents are very demanding, they are not very responsive. They show rejection and unresponsiveness, but they demand maturation. Although both authoritative and authoritarian parenting styles are characterized by demanding and controlling behaviors, the difference between two exists in them being responsive or nonresponsive. Permissive indulgent parents are less demanding, but they are highly responsive. They are highly involved with their children but hardly demanding or

controlling. In comparison, permissive neglectful parents are defined as being very low in demandingness and responsiveness. They show rejection, unresponsiveness, are undemanding for maturation, and do not control their child's behavior. Both indulgent and permissive parents are low in control and undemanding. Again the difference lies in responsiveness.

In the literature, studies conducted with adolescents consistently yielded that authoritative parenting is associated with "healthy" or "normal" behavior in adolescents (e.g., Milevsky, Schlechter, Netter, & Keehn, 2007). Studies also investigated whether authoritative parenting leads to higher psychosocial competence and maturity and lower psychological and behavioral dysfunction during adolescence (Lamborn, Mounts, Steinberg, & Dornbusch, 1991). Studies also showed that parents who encourage autonomy and psychological maturity, convey a two way communication, high in control but with affection and acceptance (i.e., having authoritative parenting style), allow their children to develop more adaptive behaviors (i.e. Rinaldi & Howe, 2012).

1.1. Purpose of the Study

In light of all these findings, it can be argued that although some studies aimed to investigate the relationship between parenting styles and perfectionism, the relationships of different parenting styles and their associations with adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism which is the focus of this study, are still needed for further examination, particularly in Turkish literature. Besides, based on the more recent suggestions of the researchers (Gfroerer, Kern, Curlette, White, & Jonyniene, 2011; Kawamura et al., 2002; McGillicuddy-De Lisi & De Lisi, 2007), the effects of fathers' and mothers' parenting styles in adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism needed to be examined separately to see gender based differences for male and female participants.

Thus, the present study aimed to investigate the relationships of perceived parenting styles and dimensions of perfectionism. More specifically, the following research question was asked: Are there significant differences between dimensions of perfectionism (high standards, discrepancy, order) scores of male and female students as a function of four perceived types of parenting styles (authoritative, authoritarian, permissive indulgent, permissive neglectful) separately measured for mothers and fathers?

1.2. Significance of the Study

The role of parenting styles in the psycho-social development of individuals has been widely emphasized in psychology literature. This emphasis has been so widespread that it covers various experiences and behaviors from childhood such as school achievement (Paulson, 1994; Spera, 2005; Steinberg, Lamborn, Dornbusch, & Darling, 1992), bullying (Baldry & Farrington, 1998; 2000; Georgiou, 2008), and even some adult related choices and behaviors such as mate selection (Geher, 2000; Zietsch, Verweij, Heath, & Martin, 2011), and marital relationship qualities (i.e. Krishnakumar & Buehler, 2000; Margolin, Gordis, & John, 2001; Webster-Stratton & Hammond, 1999). Especially among university students, parenting style were found to have an effect on academic achievement, intrinsic motivation (Turner, Chandler, & Heffer, 2009), self-efficacy and achievement motivation (Abesha, 2012). All these studies suggested that parenting was the most influential effect on the life of individuals, depending particularly on how the individuals perceived the parental styles of their parents.

Similarly, perfectionism has taken serious attention in psychology literature in relation to many personal characteristics such as self-efficacy (i. e. LoCicero & Ashby, 2000) , achievement (i. e. Stoeber & Rambow, 2007), motivation (i. e., Stoeber & Rambow, 2007), and psychological disorders like obsessive compulsive behaviors (i. e. Ashby & Bruner, 2005), and depression (i.e. Hewitt et al., 2002).

Early investigations in perfectionism focused on it from more of a negative perspective and possible treatments for perfectionism addressed it as a problem (i.e. Shafran & Mansell, 2001). However, with changing understanding due to research findings in the psychology field, it is recognized that perfectionism is a multidimensional construct in nature that leads to different consequences according to perceptions of individuals (i.e. Bieling, Israeli, & Antony, 2004; Terry-Short, Owens, Slade, & Dewey, 1995).

Thus, the current study placed emphasis on the importance in examining the relationship between parenting styles and perfectionism constructs which play an important role in the life of individuals. Besides, in the present study, these relationships were investigated by considering the differences between mothers' and fathers' parenting styles and their effects on their sons' and daughters' psychosocial developments, which might be significant predictors, particularly in Turkish culture. Parents through their parenting styles might differently expect their sons and daughters to be perfect without acknowledging the adaptive/maladaptive outcomes of perfectionism. By examining perceptions of university students, the study results aim to fulfill a gap in the literature concerning the interaction between parenting style and multidimensional perfectionism in Turkish literature.

In counseling processes and practices, the results of the present study would provide some important suggestions to the clients. Counselors may help university students to understand the role of perfectionism in their academic life and achievements (Bieling et al., 2004) and psychopathological tendencies such as depression (Rice & Leffert, 1997). It is important to increase awareness about how they are affected by setting high standards for self and how to deal with consequences as a result of their performance in the helping process. Besides that, understanding their perceptions and reactions related to high expectations in their daily life would help young adults increase their self awareness about self and personality.

Moreover, learning about their perceptions of parenting styles in their family would help young adults to recognize the relationship dynamics with their parents. Study results may serve as a guide to university students on how to become aware of various parenting styles, the roles those styles play in the family environment, and help them prepare for their future roles as parents.

1.3. Definitions of Terms

Definition of important terms of the study are presented below.

Perfectionism is defined as a construct with high personal standards for self, being orderly and organized, and experiencing discrepancy between an individual's standards for self and their real performance (Johnson & Slaney, 1996).

Adaptive Perfectionism refers to setting high standards and embrace orderliness for self (Slaney et al., 2001).

Maladaptive Perfectionism refers to a discrepancy between an individual's perception of personal standards and actual performance (Slaney et al., 2001).

Parenting Style is a combination of parental attitudes, child rearing practices and interaction with children that is shaped according to demanding and responsive features of parenting practices (Baumrind, 1966).

Authoritative Parenting Style occurs when parental demandingness and responsiveness is balanced "...to direct child's activities in a rational, issue-oriented manner. She (parent) encourages verbal give and take, shares with the child the reasoning behind her policy..." (Baumrind, 1966, p.891).

Authoritarian Parenting Style ensures high demandingness with low responsiveness "...to shape, control, and evaluate the behavior and attitudes of the child in accordance with a set standard of conduct, usually an absolute standard,...She (parent) does not encourage verbal give and take, believing that the child should accept her word for what is right" (Baumrind, 1966, p.890).

Permissive Indulgent Parenting Style is observed when parents are highly responsive to their child but less demanding in their interaction with their child (Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

Permissive Neglecting Parenting Style occurs when parents are neither demanding from children nor responsive to them (Maccoby & Martin, 1983).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter presents the studies related with parenting styles and perfectionism. The first section is devoted to the presentation of adaptive and maladaptive features of perfectionism and research on related variables. The second section includes the parenting styles and related research. The third section presents the research regarding parenting styles and perfectionism interaction. Finally, the fourth section reviews the Turkish literature on parenting styles and perfectionism.

2.1. Perfectionism

Perfectionism has been the subject of various studies and a number of different issues have been underlined with every definition of perfectionism. For example, Hollender (1965) pointed out the demand for much higher work quality than necessary for self-performance in perfectionism. Later, Hamachek (1978) underlined the need for a difference between striving for better within personal limits and dissatisfaction with personal performance and looking for approval from significant others. In the dictionary definition, from a unidimensional perspective, perfectionism is defined as “a disposition to regard anything short of perfection as unacceptable” (Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary, 2014). In light of most research

in psychology, there are three main debates concerning perfectionism which will be summarized in the following sections.

2.1.1. Debates in Perfectionism

Perfectionism, being a much debated subject in many senses, has been conceptualized according to three different aspects in the field. The first aspect is the trait or state debate on conceptualization of perfectionism. Many researchers in the field of psychology approached perfectionism as a personality trait which would develop and remain constant throughout the years (i. e. Hewitt & Flett, 1991). In many studies, perfectionism was examined as a personality style with negative outcomes in relationship to personality disorders (Hewitt, Flett, & Ediger, 1995). In Saboonchi and Lundh (1999)'s study the trait vs. state case of perfectionism was investigated from a multidimensional perspective. Even if results were found to be unstable in defining perfectionism in interpersonal situations, it was pointed out that a state-approach to perfectionism would be more meaningful in the case of priming of perfectionist thinking and being observed by others. Moreover, results suggested another debate for future studies: that trait-approach would also be explanatory to perfectionistic behaviors when perfectionism is examined from adaptive and maladaptive perspective.

Secondly, the unidimensional and multidimensional debate on perfectionism has been an issue for many years in psychology. In recent years, focus on the conceptualization of perfectionism has been changed to different explanations for multidimensionality (i.e. Frost et al., 1990; Hewitt et al., 1991). Hewitt and Flett (1991) explains perfectionism according to the direction of perfectionistic demands. The types of perfectionism were defined as the demands of an individual by oneself affects the person according to *self-oriented perfectionism*; expectations of an individual from other people causes *other-oriented perfectionism*;

and other people's expectations of an individual is explained as *socially prescribed perfectionism* (Hewitt et al., 1991).

Frost and colleagues (1990) also suggested a multidimensional explanation to the conceptualization of perfectionism. Accordingly, subdimensions of perfectionism were defined according to an individual's self evaluation in respect to concerns with mistakes, doubt about the quality of the work an individual performs, extreme concern with parents' expectations and evaluations, and concern with orderliness and organization. Underlining parental criticism and fulfilling their expectations, considerations of self-doubts and concerns about actions focus asserted new correlations for understanding perfectionism in an individual's life. Frost and his colleagues (1991) developed the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale to measure perfectionism with the following subdimensions: Concern over Mistakes, Personal Standards, Parental Expectations, Parental Criticism, Doubts about Actions, and Organization. Even though Frost's Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (FMPS) brought up a new perspective in multidimensionality of perfectionism and suggested meaningful explanations to perfectionistic behaviors, further studies criticized many concepts in FMPS and its findings (Stöber, 1998). Subdimensions and factorial incongruity in various studies with different samples revealed contradiction in results of investigating perfectionism.

Having only a neurotic and problem-based approach to defining perfectionism was not fulfilling the need to fully conceptualize the term. A quest to develop a positive side as well as a negative point of view of perfectionism has gathered attention in the last decade (Terry-Short et al., 1995). Slaney and Ashby (1996) suggested a different multidimensional perspective to explain perfectionism. Referring to other explanations in multidimensionality, Slaney and Johnson (1992, as cited in Slaney et al., 1995) focused on a positive side to perfectionism in parallel to Hamachek (1978)'s study. Positive and negative perfectionism, and related literature, has been discussed in detail in the following section.

2.1.2. Adaptive and Maladaptive Nature of Perfectionism

Adler presented a theory of perfectionism in psychology literature with his concept of striving for perfection for the first time. Adler (1959) stated that striving for perfectionism and inferiority feelings as a natural drive of human beings to achieve better in his studies (Stoltz & Ashby, 2007). He also argued that normal perfectionism leads to working hard to achieve attainable goals while neurotic or maladaptive perfectionism is closely related to criticism of others and obsessive unattainable goals (Adler, 1956, as stated in Khodarahimi, 2010). Similarly, as it is mentioned in the previous section, Hamachek (1978) was one of the pioneers who made a distinction between maladaptive and adaptive perfectionism in the literature. He underlined the difference for adaptive or normal perfectionism as an individual's satisfaction with the results of his/her own performance from maladaptive or neurotic perfectionism in which individual ends up with harsh self-criticism and is never satisfied with the outcome of their performance.

Studies in literature pointed out the relationship between perfectionism and many negative outcomes such as eating disorders (Boone, Soenens, Vansteenkiste, & Braet, , 2012); body image and appearance self-esteem (Hewitt et al., 1995); excessive responsibility (Bouchard, Rheaume, & Ladouceur, 1999); procrastinatory behaviors (Flett, Blankstein, Hewitt, & Koledin, 1992); negative self-concept (Choy & McInerney, 2005); depression proness (Enns et al., 2002; Hewitt & Dyck, 1986); interpersonal maladjustment and distress (Hill et al., 1997; Hewitt & Dyck, 1986); self-criticism, dependency, and lower self-esteem (Grzegorek et al., 2004) which supported the neurotic point of view for the conceptualization of perfectionism. In recent years, Slaney (Slaney & Ashby, 1996; Slaney et al., 2001) focused more on the differentiation of adaptive and maladaptive nature of perfectionism leaving the neurotic focus on perfectionism aside. Even though different names have been given to these concepts, adaptive and maladaptive conceptualization gained recognition and was supported in the psychology field of study (Stoeber & Otto, 2006; Terry-

Short et al., 1995). Emphasizing both adaptive and maladaptive characteristics of perfectionism, Johnson and Slaney (1996) developed the Almost Perfect Scale to measure perfectionism of college students. They asserted four factors to identify perfectionism based on their practical experiences in counseling, which were interpersonal relationships, personal standards and being orderly, extreme anxiety for performance outcomes, and procrastination. Results of the study revealed that standards and being orderly does not lead to negative outcomes in every individual, but extreme anxiety for expectations from self creates a conflict for some individuals. Later Slaney and his colleagues developed a revised version of the perfectionism scale (Almost Perfect Scale- Revised: APS-R, 2001) which was found to be more valid with three dimensions (high standards, order, and discrepancy) arguing that perfectionism is not an inherent maladaptive personality dimension but multidimensional in nature indeed with maladaptive and adaptive aspects (Rice, Ashby, & Slaney, 2007; Slaney & Ashby, 1996). They stated high standards and orderliness are indicators of adaptive perfectionism while discrepancies experienced between actual performance and personal standards lead to identification of maladaptive perfectionism. Many studies were conducted in the light of adaptive and maladaptive multidimensionality of perfectionism. Rice and Ashby (2007) asserted the interrelatedness of perfectionism dimensions, life satisfaction, and depression in their studies based on classification of perfectionism with adaptive and maladaptive dimensions with a sample of adult men and women. Also the relationship between procrastination, anxiety, interpersonal problems, and perfectionism were researched and a positive relation was found between maladaptive perfectionism and other variables among university students (Johnson & Slaney, 1996). Similarly, a positive association was found between self-esteem and high personal standards which is an indicator of adaptive perfectionism (Ashby & Rice, 2002). Considering the increasing attention in the big five model of personality, it was asserted that five factor personality model would be helpful in understanding perfectionism conceptualization in the process (Ulu, 2007). In their study, Ulu and

Tezer (2010) found a significant relationship between the Big Five Personality traits and perfectionism dimensions among university students. Similarly, Rice and his colleagues (2007) found the relation between neuroticism from the Five-Factor Personality (FFP) model and maladaptive perfectionism while adaptive perfectionism was suggested as an important factor for self-esteem and Conscientiousness of FFP. The interest in personality characteristics and perfectionism relation was also the subject of Stumpf and Parker (2000)'s study. Even if their study variables were examined with intercorrelated factors of Frost's Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (FMPS: Frost et al., 1990) (Concerns and Doubts, Personal Standards, Organization and Parental Pressure) intercorrelations suggested meaningful correlations between healthy or adaptive perfectionism and conscientiousness, and between unhealthy or maladaptive perfectionism and lack of self-confidence (Stumpf & Parker, 2000). Different personality types in relation to dimensions of perfectionism were studied concerning Adlerian lifestyle definitions in a study by Stoltz and Ashby (2007). Results supported multidimensional perfectionism with diversity in scores of Taking Charge, Entitlement, Being Cautious, Liked by All, Wanting Recognition, and Softness scales. Maladaptive perfectionists were found to have higher scores in given subscales than others. As Stoltz and Ashby (2007) asserted, maladaptive perfectionists have a tendency towards competitiveness, are looking for approval by others and predictability in their life. Similarly, when Adler's personality priorities and dimensions of perfectionism were investigated, Outdoing and Achieving characteristics were parallel to high standards of adaptive perfectionism (Ashby, Kottman, & Stoltz, 2006). Also, Outdoing and Detaching were found to be preliminary factors for maladaptive perfectionists in organizing their lifestyles.

Perfectionism has also been widely researched with a focus on gender differences and cultural characteristics (i.e. Hewitt & Flett, 1991; Wang, Slaney, & Rice, 2007). Hill and colleagues (1997) found a meaningful difference between scores of males and females in other-oriented perfectionism, suggesting that males

tend to fulfill other's expectations more than women, with a sample of undergraduate students. In respect to cultural differences and gender, multidimensional perfectionism was examined in relation to life satisfaction in a different study among university students (Gilman et al., 2005). Scores of American and Croatian students were found to be parallel; adaptive perfectionists were more satisfied with their lives than maladaptive perfectionists and non-perfectionists in both cultural settings with no gender difference. However, Castro and Rice (2003) reported a meaningful difference for subscales of Frost's Multidimensional Perfectionism; Concerns Over Mistakes, Parental Criticism and Doubts About Actions for Asian, African and Caucasian Americans. Asian and African Americans were found to be more exposed to high Parental Expectations and Asian students were more exposed to Parental Criticism than others. Besides relational focus on psychological variables and perfectionism, many studies gave emphasis to perfectionism interaction with developmental variables. Even though there are still differences in explanations, it is widely accepted that perfectionism is closely related to parental expectations, and critical attitudes of parents and parental perfectionism (Shafran & Mansell, 2001; Snell Jr., Overbey, & Brewer, 2005), which will be reviewed in detail in the following section.

2.2. Parenting Styles

Starting from childhood, the family environment influences the personality development of a child by providing a setting where certain assumptions about life and expectations from a child were revealed (Dinkmeyer & McKay, 1973; as cited in Olander, 1989). In this family environment, children are exposed to different parental styles which determines how children develop their personality characteristics and interact with their primary social environment. According to Olander, parents' personality priorities and goals determines their parenting style which had a direct effect on "family atmosphere and child characteristics" (1989, p.18). Being one of

the pioneers in the psychology field, Baumrind suggested three different parenting styles based on commitment and balance between demandingness and responsiveness (Baumrind, 1966, 1967). She called these parenting styles are named as permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative. The permissive parenting style embraces a nonpunitive, affirmative attitude toward the child, where parents share the responsibility with the child about rule making and policy decisions in the home. Permissive parents act as a reference guide whenever child asks for something, without trying to shape or change the child's behavior (Baumrind, 1966, 1967). In the authoritarian style, the parent has more control because they attempt to change and evaluate the child's behaviour. Parental demands are high with an expectation of obedience and when rules are not obeyed, there are required consequences. On the other hand, the authoritative parenting style suggests a controlled environment with rational, issue-oriented style. The child's autonomy is supported by valuing the child's present qualities besides using reasoning, power, reinforcement, and shaping for setting standards of future achievements (Baumrind, 1966, 1967). Studies based on parenting groups with three different styles revealed expected results. Dornbusch, Ritter, Leiderman, Roberts, and Fraleigh (1987) investigated adolescent school performance and their parents' child rearing styles. Results suggested a meaningful relation between higher grades and authoritative parenting while authoritarian and permissive parenting styles showed a negative association with grades. Similarly, using Baumrind's three parenting prototypes correlations where obsessive compulsive behaviors were investigated (Timpano, Keough, Mahaffey, Schmidt, & Abramowitz, 2010), it was found that authoritarian parenting characteristics related to obsessive compulsive tendencies while authoritative style was negatively related with obsessive symptoms. It was underlined that under high control and demandingness, parental responsiveness and care creates differences in affecting behaviors.

After Baumrind's initiation in defining parenting styles, Maccoby and Martin (1983) characterized two forms of permissive parenting style, as neglectful

and indulgent parenting based on a differentiation within responsiveness dimension. Parents who are high in responsiveness but low in demandingness in their interaction with their child are referred to as indulgent parents. Parents who are neither demanding or responsive to their children are referred to as neglecting parenting style.

Researchers have conducted numerous studies while building on the two basic dimensions, responsiveness and demandingness. Responsiveness in parenting refers to being present with providing sufficient warmth, love, support, and nurturance. Parental responsiveness was found to be related to children's emotion knowledge, emotion understanding and emotion regulation (Alegre, 2011) which are accepted as dimensions of emotional intelligence. Also, parental responsiveness was identified with positive outcomes in children with higher self-esteem and independence (Rohner, 1990, as cited in Alegre, 2011), more self-regulation, less externalizing behaviors (Eiden, Edwards, & Leonard, 2007), and a healthy balance between individuation and connectedness in development (Baumrind, 1991). Parental demandingness is a more complex issue than responsiveness which can be grouped as negative and positive according to its outcomes (Alegre, 2011). Some demanding parental practices (i.e. monitoring and supervision, inductive discipline, behavioral control) were found to be correlated with positive outcomes such as higher prosocial behavior (Krevans & Gibbs, 1996), increased self-confidence (Baumrind, 1991), and higher academic success (Aunola, Stattin, & Nurmi, 2000; Steinberg, Elmen, & Mounts, 1989). Other parental practices like inconsistent and punitive discipline, psychological control, harsh rule settings, and over protection are negatively demanding practices. These were associated with undesirable outcomes and developmental problems such as difficulties with emotional well-being (Driscoll, Russell, & Crockett, 2008), personality disorders (Johnson, Cohen, Chen, Kasen, & Brook, 2006), problems in prosocial behaviors and psychosocial maturity (Steinberg et al., 1989), and cognitive anxiety and lower self-esteem (Herz & Gullone, 1999).

In recent years, in the light of Baumrind (1991) and Maccoby and Martin's (1983) conceptualizations, parenting styles were studied following four different typologies in relation to many variables. Garcia and Garcia (2009) investigated parenting effects on psychosocial maladjustment, self-esteem, personal competence, and problem behaviors of adolescents. In a Hispanic sample, authoritative and indulgent parenting styles were associated with positive outcomes (i.e. higher self-esteem, better personal competence) in comparison with authoritarian and neglecting parenting styles. Specifically, permissive indulgent parenting practices were associated with better outcomes than other types, suggesting that indulgent parenting was ideal within Hispanic families' systems according to a teenager sample (Garcia & Garcia, 2009). Many studies, on the other hand, revealed that children who grew up under an authoritative parenting style are more independent, and have less psychosocial (i.e. depression, anxiety) and behavioral problems (e.g. Baumrind, 1967; Dornbusch et al., 1987; Driscoll et al., 2008; McGillicuddy-De Lisi & De Lisi, 2007) in comparison with those raised under the influence of other parenting styles. Academic success has been a closely related characteristic that was studied in respect to parenting practices and family environment. Lately, the authoritative parenting style and its effect on the academic performance of children was subjected to a study by Turner et al., (2009). Positive association between those factors created a meaningful effect underlining the importance of supportiveness and warmth by parents in every stage of their children's life. Also, the authoritative parenting style was said to create a more positive and nurturing family environment for all family members (McGillicuddy-De Lisi & De Lisi, 2007). Considering relevant research in these areas, authoritative parenting was found to be the optimal parenting style considering overall positive outcomes for children and the family in general as suggested in the literature. It is important to underline that cultural differences may result in variations with best practices in parenting (Garcia & Garcia, 2009) that prove the need for further research in different cultural settings.

2.3. Relationship between Perfectionism and Parenting Style

Even though studies for relational investigation between parenting styles and multidimensional perfectionism were limited in the literature, relevant examples are stated in this section.

When developmental factors are considered, family environment and parental attitudes are found to be indispensable agents contributing to the development of perfectionism. Some researchers have asserted that there is a direct relation between expectations from parents and developing perfectionism (i.e. Frost et. al, 1990; Hamachek, 1978; Hewitt & Flett, 1991), underlying “to fulfill expectations and gain significant others’ approval” aspect of multidimensional perfectionism (i. e. Other-oriented perfectionism). Many studies suggested a direct relationship between maladaptive perfectionism and authoritarian parenting (Frost et. al, 1990; Hewitt & Flett, 1991), and between adaptive perfectionism and authoritative parenting (Cook, 2012). From a multidimensional perspective, Miller and her colleagues (2012) found that the authoritarian parenting style was related to socially prescribed perfectionism where high control, close supervision, and acceptance from others were preliminary characteristics among university students.

Similarly, Kawamura and colleagues (2002) addressed the relationship between parenting style and perfectionism from a multicultural perspective with a sample of undergraduate students. It is suggested that being exposed to harsh parenting practices and parental criticism would result with internalizing harsh criticism and developing maladaptive perfectionism. The authoritarian parenting style was found to be related with Concern Over Mistakes and Doubts about Actions which were addressed as negative perfectionism indicators (Kawamura et al., 2002). Even if gender based differences in respect to cultural differences and perfectionism were discussed, how genders of parents interacted with other variables remained questionable.

2.4. Turkish Literature on Perfectionism and Parenting Styles

Studies that take part in Turkish literature related to parenting styles and perfectionism are examined in this section separately.

2.4.1. Turkish Literature on Perfectionism

There have been many studies conducted about perfectionism and various psychological and demographic variables with Turkish samples. A group of studies used Frost's Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (FMPS) to find out association of perfectionism to variables of anxiety, loneliness, and parental perfectionism. Frost's MPS was translated to Turkish (Mısırlı-Taşdemir & Özbay, 2004) and reliability and validity studies were conducted with high school students. Also, Tuncer and Voltan-Acar (2006) studied the relationship between anxiety and perfectionism and found a significant difference among a sample of university students using Frost's MPS. Erözkan (2008) also investigated perfectionism and depression levels of university students and found that male students had higher perfectionism scores compared to female students. Similarly, an association was found between perfectionism and loneliness with a sample of university students (Arslan, Hamarta, Üre, & Özyeşil, 2010). It was reported that loneliness was positively correlated with Concern Over Mistakes, Parental Criticism, and Doubts about Actions while it was negatively correlated with the organization subscale of perfectionism. Camadan (2010) studied parental perfectionism and how it is related to children's perfectionist tendencies using a sample of secondary school students. A meaningful relationship was found between mothers' and female participants' scores on the following subscales of perfectionism: Organization, Doubts About Actions, and Parental Expectations. Besides, there was a positive relationship between male participants' perfectionism and their parents' perfectionism scores on Parental Expectations of FMPS. However, Concern Over Mistakes and Personal Standards did not have any

meaningful relationship in respect to parental perfectionism in both genders (Camadan, 2010). Most recently, Yıldızbaş and Topuz (2014) investigated demographic variables and achievement as indicators of prospective language teachers' perfectionist tendencies. Findings revealed that demographic variables such as gender and parenting attitudes creates a significant difference in the perfectionism scores of teacher candidates. While male teacher candidates had higher scores on Concern Over Mistakes and Parental Criticism subscales, female teacher candidates had higher scores for Organization subscale. For perceived parental attitudes, participants with authoritarian families were significantly higher than other groups according to the Parental Expectations of FMPS. Also, Organization scores of authoritarian families were found to be higher than protective families.

There are other studies that used Flett's Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS) to measure perfectionism scores with Turkish samples. The relationship of perfectionism with psychological variables such as depression and shyness were examined in the studies. Flett's MPS was translated to Turkish by Oral (1999). Reliability and validity analysis were conducted with a sample of university students. In the study, the relationship between dimensions of perfectionism, depressive symptoms and stressful life events were investigated. While self-oriented and other-oriented perfectionism were found to be negatively correlated with depression, socially-prescribed perfectionism was positively related to depression. Also, results revealed that participants varied according to some demographic variables in relation to perfectionism scores. Sun-Selişik (2003) studied perfectionism and helpless explanatory style as a function of gender in a university sample. Findings showed no significant relation between those variables. Similarly, Saya (2006) studied the relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism as a function of gender among high school students. No significant results were found between perfectionism scores and attachment styles with respect to gender. Koydemir (2006) investigated the relationship between perfectionism and shyness with a sample of university students. Results of the study revealed a significant relation for socially-

prescribed perfectionism and shyness and a positive relationship between socially-prescribed perfectionism and fear of negative evaluation. In Büyükbayraktar and Üre (2014)'s study, relationship between perfectionism and anger was examined among university students and a positive relationship was found. Also, gender differences among subscales of perfectionism was reported in the study.

Another perfectionism scale that has been used in Turkish literature was Kırdök (2004)'s "Olumlu ve Olumsuz Mükemmeliyetçilik Ölçeği" (Positive and Negative Perfectionism Scale) that consist of two factors for positive and negative perfectionism to measure the perfectionism trait of early adolescents. Content and construct validity studies were done based on interviews with teachers and reflections of students. Validity and reliability studies were held with middle school students. It was found that reliability and validity results met expectations (Kırdök, 2004). Altun and Yazıcı (2010) investigated the relation between academic success of primary school students and positive- negative perfectionism. Positive perfectionism was positively related to academic success of primary graders while negative perfectionism was found to be negatively correlated with success.

Lastly, there were four different translations and adaptation studies of APS-R to Turkish literature (Slaney et al., 2001). First, Sapmaz (2006) translated APS-R and investigated the relationship between levels of psychological symptoms for non-perfectionists, adaptive perfectionists, and maladaptive perfectionists. Reliability and validity studies were held among university students and results displayed a four-factor model for Turkish adaptation of APS-R. These factors were High Standards, Order, Discrepancy as parallel to Slaney's study, and Dissatisfaction as an additional one. Researchers defined Standards and Order factors as indicators of adaptive perfectionism, and Discrepancy and Dissatisfaction factors as indicators of maladaptive perfectionism. Study results showed significant differences between perfectionism factors (adaptive, maladaptive, and non-perfectionism) and obsessive-compulsive symptoms, interpersonal sensitivity, depression, anxiety, hostility and

phobic anxiety, while somatic symptoms were not related to any type of perfectionism.

Also, Ulu (2007) translated APS-R by Slaney and colleagues (2001) and investigated multidimensional perfectionism in respect to adult attachment and the Big Five personality traits in her study. Reliability and validity studies of the perfectionism scale revealed parallel results with a sample of university students from preparatory classes. Referring to the initial hypothesis and a two factor structure to identify adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism in the original study (Slaney, 2001), Ulu examined the two factor model excluding Order subscale questions and crossloaded items in the two factor structure, three-factor structure of the original scale, and four-factor structure as suggested by factor loadings according to Varimax Rotations. However, the three-factor model with Standards, Order, and Discrepancy was used for analysis in reference to multiple validity and reliability results of Turkish Almost Perfect Scale-Revised. Ulu (2007) found that adaptive perfectionism (measured by Standards) was related to Conscientiousness, Openness and Extraversion, maladaptive perfectionism (measured by Discrepancy) was related to Neuroticism, Anxiety and Avoidance dimensions of attachment scale. Order subscale scores were found to be related with Neuroticism, Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Openness traits. Later in Ulu, Tezer, and Slaney (2012)'s study was held to re-examine the adaptation of Turkish Almost Perfect Scale-Revised and reliability coefficients for the three-factor structure indicated good internal consistencies.

Besides, Öngen (2009) translated APS-R to Turkish and studied life satisfaction association to multidimensional perfectionism. Reliability and validity studies were executed with a high school student sample and results for reliability coefficients with the three-factor structure (Standards, Order, and Discrepancy) were satisfactory. Findings showed that maladaptive perfectionism had a negative correlation with life satisfaction, while order and high standards as predictors of adaptive perfectionism were positively correlated with life satisfaction. Öngen had similar results in predicting adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism in her later

studies. Maladaptive perfectionism was found to be a predictor of anger while high standards were a positive indicator of verbal aggression and a negative indicator of hostility (Öngen, 2010). In another study, adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism, self criticism, and identity styles were found to be correlated with each other among university students (Öngen, 2011). Results revealed an association between information-orientation identity style, adaptive perfectionism, and internalized self-criticism just as a normative-orientation identity style was related to adaptive perfectionism. While diffusive-avoidant style was found to be negatively related with adaptive perfectionism, it was positively related to comperative self-criticism. In addition, commitment was positively associated with adaptive perfectionism but also negatively related with maladaptive perfectionism scores.

The last and latest crosscultural translation and adaptation of APS-R was conducted by Aydın (2013). Validity and reliability studies were conducted with a sample of university students from America to compare with the original study. With a two-factor structure, omitting Order factor, with 19 item questionnaire, researchers reported satisfactory results. Also, factor analysis was done for a Turkish university student sample excluding Order related questions. Findings of Turkish sample suggested a three-factor structure with High Standards, Discrepancy, and Dissatisfaction subdimensions and revealed satisfactory coefficient reliabilities. The cultural differences among the Turkish and American sample was discussed by Aydın (2013).

It is evident that interest in perfectionism in Turkish literature and adaptation studies of perfectionism scales have been increased in recent years. Research findings support the reliability and validity of Hewit and Flett's, Frost et al.'s Multidimensional Perfectionism Scales and translation variations of Slaney et al.'s Almost Perfect Scale-Revised. Also, Sapmaz's Negative and Positive Perfectionism Scale attracted quite a bit of attention being the first generated multidimensional perfectionism scale in Turkish literature. Study findings showed that there has been a growing body of research about perfectionism in relation to many psychological and

demographic variables within Turkish culture and lots of studies are of interest to many students and people from different age groups.

2.4.2. Turkish Literature on Parenting Styles

Turkish literature related to parenting styles has found associations with culture specific characteristics, psychological variables such as learned resourcefulness, self-esteem, self-perception, and demographic variables such as gender.

The parenting style measure of Lamborn and colleagues (1991) which was translated to Turkish by Yılmaz (2000) was used in some studies in Turkish literature. Reliability and validity studies were conducted with high school and primary school children revealing satisfactory results for a four parenting typology: authoritarian, authoritative, permissive/neglecting, and permissive indulgent. Yılmaz (2007) studied associations between perceived parenting styles, development of autonomy, and academic achievement with an early-adolescent group of students. Authoritative parenting, either perceived from the mother or father, was found to be a predictor of behavioral autonomy, emotional autonomy and academic achievement of members of the early-adolescent group. Türkel (2006) investigated the relationship between learned resourcefulness and parenting style in respect to gender differences among high school students. Findings disclosed that authoritative and indulgent parenting styles led to higher levels of learned resourcefulness compared to neglectful and authoritarian styles. Researchers underlined the importance of high acceptance/involvement to create a difference in learned resourcefulness in an adolescent sample.

Another measurement tool was the Parenting Style Inventory that was developed by Kuzgun (1972, as cited in Yaprak, 2007) and revised by Eldeleklioğlu (1996). While Kuzgun suggested three parenting types according to democratic, authoritarian, and neglecting subdimension, Eldeleklioğlu increased the number of

subscales to five. They are as follows: democratic, authoritarian, protective-demanding, neglecting, and repudiative including demanding, protective and repudiative parenting subdimensions to the scale. Eldeleklioğlu (1996) investigated the association between the parental attitudes and decision making strategies of university students. Findings revealed a positive relation for rational decision making strategies and democratic parental attitude, and a negative correlation between authoritarian parental attitude and rational decision making strategies. Yaprak (2007) studied the relationship between parenting styles and self-esteem within elementary school students. Researchers made a different classification for parenting styles conducting a discriminant analysis with the sample and suggested four parenting typologies as democratic, authoritarian, protective, and uninvolved. Results suggested that higher self-esteem scores were correlated with a democratic parenting style in comparison to other parenting styles.

Sümer and Güngör (1999) developed a parenting style questionnaire based on Maccoby and Martin (1983)'s suggestion based on two dimensions (demandingness and responsiveness) to define four different parenting styles with a university student sample in Turkish culture. Crossing dimensions of perceived parental acceptance/involvement and strict control, Sümer and Güngör (1999) defined authoritarian, authoritative, permissive/indulgent, and permissive/neglecting parenting styles. Findings revealed that authoritative and indulgent parenting styles were related to having secure attachment, higher self-esteem and self-concept clarity, and lower trait anxiety in comparison to authoritarian and neglectful styles among university students.

2.4.3. Turkish Literature on Perfectionism and Parenting Styles

In addition, there were some specific studies focusing on perfectionism and parenting style interaction in Turkish literature. Using Yılmaz (2000)'s Turkish adaptation of Parenting Style Inventory and Kırđök (2004)'s Negative-Positive

Perfectionism Scale, Tire (2011) analysed the relationship between parenting style and perfectionism among elementary school students in relation to some demographic variables. Perceived parenting styles showed a meaningful difference for positive and negative perfectionism scores of students. More specifically, a democratic parenting style for both parents correlated with positive perfectionism with higher scores. On the other hand, a neglecting parenting style for both parents had the lowest scores for positive perfectionism in comparison with other styles. However, results did not disclose any consistent correlations for negative perfectionism in respect to gender and parenting styles. Another study was conducted by Oran-Pamir (2008) on the relationship between high school student's perfectionism and parental attitudes in respect to gender differences. Frost's Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (Frost et al., 1990) and Parents Attitude Scale (Kuzgun & Eldeleklioğlu, 1993; 2005, as cited in Oran-Pamir, 2008) were instruments used to investigate the relationship between variables. Findings suggested significant differences between protective, democratic, and authoritarian parenting styles of mothers and fathers for Personal Standards, Orderliness, Parental Expectations, and Parental Criticism. Meaningful differences were obtained according to various demographic variables including gender, grade, and educational level of parents, as well.

In summary, there were studies in Turkish literature investigating parenting style in respect to many variables including perfectionism. Even if there were inconsistencies among age the groups they were studying using the same scales, the results supported correlations and meaningful differences among the variables.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Methodological details of the study are presented in this chapter. The first section demonstrates the characteristics of the participants. The second section introduces the data collection instruments. The procedure followed in the study is explained in the third section. In the fourth section, the data analyses employed to obtain the data are presented. Finally, the fifth section displays the limitations of the study.

3.1. Participants

A convenient sampling procedure was used in the present study. Data were collected from 613 volunteered students of five faculties at Middle East Technical University (METU). After completing data cleaning and assumption checking procedures, analyses were carried out with a sample of 530 (285 female and 245 male) students. Age of the students ranged between 15 and 29 with the mean of 20.40 (SD = 1.89). The distribution of the students in terms of gender, departments and grades is presented in *Table 3.1*.

Table 3.1.

The distribution of the students by gender, faculties and grades according to number and percentages

	Female (n = 285) %		Male (n = 245) %		Total (N = 530) %	
Faculty						
Architecture	57	11	22	4	79	15
Arts and Sciences	70	13	53	10	123	23
Economics and Administrative Sciences	25	5	26	5	51	10
Education	69	13	21	4	90	17
Engineering	64	12	123	23	187	35
Grade Level						
Preparatory school	34	6	39	7	73	14
Freshmen	109	21	93	18	202	38
Sophomores	76	14	56	11	132	25
Juniors	47	9	29	6	76	14
Seniors	19	4	28	6	47	9

As can be seen from the table, in the sample, there were 79 (15%) students from Faculty of Architecture, 123 (23%) students from Faculty of Arts and Sciences, 51 (10%) students from Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, 90 (17%) students from Faculty of Education, and 187(35%) students from Faculty of Engineering. There were 73 (14%) preparatory, 202 (38%) freshmen, 132 (25%) sophomore, 76 (14%) junior, and 47 (9%) senior students.

3.2. Instruments

In the present study, two instruments were administered to the participants, the Almost Perfect Scale to measure perfectionism (Appendix A) and the Parenting Style Questionnaire to measure parenting styles separately for mother and father (Appendix B).

3.2.1. Almost Perfect Scale-Revised

The Almost Perfect Scale-Revised (APS-R) is a self-report instrument which was developed by Johnson and Slaney (1996) and revised to measure adaptive and maladaptive dimensions of perfectionism by Slaney and colleagues (2001). The APS-R contains 23 items with 7 point rating scale 1 referring “strongly disagree” to 7 referring “strongly agree”. The APS-R has three subscales; Standards (7 item referring to personal standards for performance), Discrepancy (12 items referring to distress as a result of a perceived discrepancy between real performance and standards), and Order (4 items referring to being organized and need for orderliness) (Ulu, 2007; Ashby et al., 2005). Standards and Order scores were used as indicators of adaptive perfectionism while Discrepancy scores were related to maladaptive perfectionism.

APS-R was translated into Turkish by Ulu (2007). It was reported that the Turkish version of APS-R also yielded three subscales as in the original scale which are high standards, discrepancy, and order. The results of confirmatory factor analysis yielded a GFI of .90. Factor loadings of the items ranged from .80 to .87. Cronbach alphas were .80 for the high standards subscale, .87 for the discrepancy subscale, and .87 for the order subscale (Ulu, Tezer, & Slaney, 2012).

3.2.1.1. Factor Structure of Turkish Version of APS-R for Present Study

Factor analysis was done using varimax rotation for APSR to examine the dimensions with data from the present study. Preliminary factor analysis revealed that the scale had four factor loadings with eigenvalues greater than 1. Following primary study by Ulu (2007), factor structure was forced to three components. The initial eigenvalues for three factor structure were as follow 7.48, 3.65, and 2.20. First factor explores 32.53% of variance, 15.89% of variance for the second factor, and 9.58% of variance for the third factor were explained and factor loadings including

some items being distributed among first and second factors. Results are shown in *Table 3.2.*

Table 3.2.
Factor Analysis Results for Turkish Version of ASP-R for the Present Study
Rotated Component Matrix^a

	Component		
	1	2	3
P21	.81		
P16	.77		
P19	.76		
P20	.75		
P23	.75		
P13	.73	.34	
P17	.71	.32	
P15	.67		
P11	.66	.37	
P9	.63		
P6	.61	.44	
P3	.40		
P14		.77	
P8		.75	
P12	.33	.73	
P1		.66	
P18		.56	
P22	.40	.55	
P5		.51	
P4			.92
P2			.88
P7			.85
P10			.80

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

As seen in *Table 3.2.*, factor loadings and items grouped under subscales were found parallel to Ulu (2007)'s findings. Although 6 items showed double

loadings on the components, three groups were attained in line with the original study (Ulu, 2007; Ulu & Tezer, 2010; Ulu et al., 2012) and matrix loadings for expected groups were higher than others and satisfactory.

In the present study Cronbach alpha coefficient reliability of the Standards subscale was found as .81, .91 for Discrepancy subscale, and .90 for Order subscale.

3.2.2. Parenting Styles Questionnaire

The Parenting Style Questionnaire is a self-report instrument which was developed by Sümer and Güngör (1999) based on dimensions suggested by Maccoby and Martin (1983) and classification system suggested by Steinberg et al. (1992). It is a 22 item questionnaire with 5 point rating scale 1 referring “not at all true” to 5 referring “completely true”. Participants were expected to fill out questionnaires for their mothers and fathers separately. Close supervision/control and acceptance/love are the dimensions that were used to define four different parenting styles: authoritative, authoritarian, permissive/indulgent, and permissive/neglecting.

Accordingly, those whose scores are above the median on both dimensions were grouped as “authoritative”; those scores which are above the median on acceptance/love and below the median on close supervision/control dimensions are grouped as “permissive/indulgent”; scores which are above the median on close supervision/control dimension and below the median on acceptance/love dimension are grouped as “authoritarian”; and finally, scores which are below the median on both dimensions are labeled as “permissive/neglecting”. Sümer and Güngör (1999) reported Cronbach alpha reliabilities of acceptance/love dimension for mothers and fathers as .94, while close supervision/control was reported for mothers as .80 and for fathers as .70.

3.2.2.1. Factor Structure of Parenting Style Questionnaire for Present Study

To investigate the dimensions data were factor analyzed using varimax rotation for Parenting Style Inventory separately for fathers and mothers. The first factor analysis for fathers' parenting style suggested that the scale consisted of three factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. Some of the items were found to be distributed among other factors. Component factor analysis was run for the second time with limiting the factor numbers to two as it was suggested in the original study (Sümer & Güngör, 1999). The findings supported factor loading (See *Table 3.3.*) and commonalities in two components with explaining 32.60% of variance for first factor and 20.21% of variance for second factor. The eigenvalues were 7.17 for the first and 4.44 for the second factor.

Table 3.3.
Factor Loadings of Parenting Styles Questionnaire-Analyze for Fathers

Rotated Component Matrix ^a		
	Component	
	1	2
F7	.84	
F5	.82	
F15	.80	
F1	.80	
F3	.77	
F19	.77	
F9	.75	
F11	-.74	
F21	-.73	
F13	-.72	
F17	.46	-.33
F6		.78
F2		.76
F18		.72
F12		.72
F4		.67
F22		.64
F16		.62
F8	-.35	.61
F14		.59
F10		.56
F20	.34	.52

Similar to the factor analysis for fathers' parenting style, the first factor analysis for data collected for mothers suggested that the scale consisted of four factors with eigenvalues greater than 1. Some of the items had loadings for more than one factor without any meaningful cluster. Component factor analysis was run for one more time with limiting the factor numbers to two in accordance with original study. The factor analysis results indicated commonalities in two components with

explaining 31.15% of variance for first factor and 15.40% of variance for second factor. The eigenvalues of factors were 6.85 for the first one and 3.38 for the second one and factor loadings are stated in *Table 3.4*.

Table 3.4.

Factor Loadings of Parenting Styles Questionnaire-Analyze for Mothers

	Rotated Component Matrix ^a	
	Component 1	Component 2
M7	,80	
M5	,79	
M15	,77	
M1	,76	
M3	,72	
M9	,69	
M11	-,68	
M19	,68	
M13	-,66	
M21	-,50	,43
M4		,71
M6		,70
M12		,66
M2		,66
M8		,64
M22		,62
M18		,62
M10		,61
M16		,61
M14		,58
M17		-,46
M20		,41

In the present study, for mothers, Cronbach reliabilities were found for acceptance/love dimension as .89, for close supervision/control dimension as .84. For fathers, reliabilities were .92 for acceptance/love dimension, and .86 for close supervision/control dimension.

3.3. Procedure

Before implementing the instruments, required permissions were gathered from METU Human Research Ethics Committee. Appointments were arranged with instructors of various departments before administering the questionnaires. Data were collected in November-December 2013. All participants volunteered to take part in the study. Anonymity of participant responses and confidentiality of data were guaranteed. Questionnaires were administered to the students in the classrooms during class hours. Completion of all instruments took approximately 15 to 20 minutes.

3.4. Data Analysis

The statistical tests used to analyze the data were exploratory factor analysis, Cronbach alpha coefficients for internal consistency estimates of reliability, Pearson product moment correlations, and multivariate analysis of variance. As for the main analyses, two separate, i.e., one for mother and one for father, 2 (gender) X 4 (parenting styles) MANOVA was employed to three perfectionism scores (Standards, Discrepancy, Order) of the participants. Before conducting MANOVA, participants were assigned to four parenting style categories based on their scores obtained from each of the two dimensions: demandingness (supervision/control) and responsiveness (acceptance/love). As it was previously explained, participants whose scores were above the median on both dimensions (close supervision/control and

acceptance/love) were assigned to the group of authoritative parenting style. Participants with scores below the median on both dimensions (close supervision/control and acceptance/love dimensions) were assigned the permissive/neglecting parenting style type. Participants with scores below the median on acceptance/love and above the median on close supervision/control dimensions were assigned to the group of authoritarian parenting style. Finally, those whose scores were above the median on acceptance/love and below the median on close supervision/control dimensions were considered as permissive indulgent parenting style. IBM SPSS 22.0 program was used to analyze data.

3.5. Limitations of the Study

There were some limitations to the current study. First, via convenient sampling procedure the data was collected from only one campus university in Ankara. Therefore the sample may not be generalized to all university students. Second, the sample included university students which may display certain developmental characteristics, therefore it should be remembered they may differ from other age groups of individuals in terms of the variables. Third, all measures of the study were self-reported in nature which may be a threat to internal validity. Lastly, the correlational design of the current study does not allow us to verify causal link among variables.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

In the first section of this chapter, descriptive statistics of the study variables are presented. The second section includes the presentations of the assumptions of multivariate analysis of variance. Finally, the third and the fourth section present the results of multivariate analysis of variance for mothers and fathers, respectively.

4.1. Descriptive Statistics of the Study Variables

The means and standard deviations of the variables used in the present study were presented in *Table 4.1*. These variables were Standards, Discrepancy and Order subscale scores of Almost Perfect Scale-Revised and acceptance/love (responsiveness) and close supervision/control (demandingness) dimensions of Parenting Style Inventory.

Table 4.1.

Means and Standard Deviations for the Variables of the Study by Gender

Variables	Female (<i>n</i> = 285)			Male (<i>n</i> = 245)			Total		
	n	M	SD	N	M	SD	N	M	SD
Perfectionism									
Standards	285	5.08	1.07	245	5.16	1.16	530	5.12	1.11
Discrepancy	285	3.67	1.34	245	3.71	1.30	530	3.69	1.32
Order	285	4.52	1.65	245	4.33	1.66	530	4.43	1.66
Parenting Style Dimensions									
<i>Mother</i>									
Close supervision/control	285	2.43	.74	244	2.42	.68	529	2.42	.71
Acceptance/love	285	4.00	.73	244	3.84	.66	529	3.93	.70
<i>Father</i>									
Close supervision/control	282	2.26	.79	239	2.35	.75	521	2.30	.77
Acceptance/love	282	3.56	.91	239	3.44	.86	521	3.50	.89

As can be seen from the table, female participants' mean scores for perfectionism subscales were ranged from 3.67 to 5.08 while male participants' perfectionism subscale scores were between 3.71 and 5.16. In parenting style dimensions mothers' close supervision/control scores were 2.42 in all groups in respect to gender and mean scores of mothers' acceptance/love dimension were between 3.84 and 4.00. Similarly father parenting style scores for acceptance/love

were ranged from 3.44 to 3.56 and for close supervision/control participants' mean scores were ranged from 2.26 to 2.35 for fathers.

4.2. Assumptions of Multivariate Analysis of Variance

Before conducting analysis for this study, all assumptions for multivariate analysis were checked. All dependent variables were expected to be distributed normally. In order to test normality assumption, Skewness, Kurtosis values, visual inspection of histograms and Q-Q plots were checked. Skewness and Kurtosis values for standards variable (-.428 and -.196), discrepancy variable (.213 and -.536), and order variable (-.249 and -.799) were within normal values. Besides, Standards variable with $M = 5.12$ ($SD = 1.11$), Discrepancy variable with $M = 3.68$ ($SD = 1.32$), and Order variable with $M = 4.43$ ($SD = 1.65$) values suggested normal distribution.

Pearson correlations were implemented for all dependent variables to test MANOVA assumption which requires a moderate correlation between all dependent variables (Meyer, Gamst, & Guarino, 2006). The results have shown that a meaningful correlation was observed among all variables (See *Table 4.2.*) and linearity assumption was not violated with all variables. In addition, a moderate correlation between all dependent variables revealed that absence of multicollinearity assumption was not violated. Moreover, the Box's M values were 40,480 for mothers' parenting style ($p = .576$) and 53,583 for fathers' parenting style ($p = .128$) suggesting a non-significance according to $p < .05$ which indicates that homoscedasticity assumption was not violated (Meyer, Gamst, & Guarino, 2006). Bearing in mind that Turkish version of APS-R is a self-reported questionnaire administered to participants individually: independence of observation assumption was not violated. However, fulfilling same questions for both parents in Parenting Style Scale could be a treat to independent observation assumption for the scale. Considering all the findings besides large sample size ($n = 530$), the covariance

matrix between groups were assumed to be equal for the purposes of multivariate analysis of variance.

Table 4.2.
Correlations Matrix of All Variables

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1.Gender	1							
2.Standards	.038	1						
3.Discrepancy	.013	.413**	1					
4.Order	-.055	.343**	.190**	1				
5.MothersCS/C	-.118**	.099	-.153**	.134**	1			
6.MotherL/A	-.069	.059	-.164**	.119**	.542**	1		
7.FathersCS/C	-.002	.099	.244**	.067	-.366**	-.141**	1	
8. FathersL/A	.058	.035	.171**	.051	-.203**	-.215**	.540**	1

**p<0.01

4.3. Results of Multivariate Analysis of Variance

Before MANOVA, as it was explained in the Method Chapter, four groups of parenting styles, namely, authoritative, authoritarian, permissive/indulgent, and permissive/neglecting, were identified separately for mothers and fathers. Accordingly, those whose scores are above the median on both acceptance/love and close supervision/control dimensions were grouped as “authoritative”; those scores which are above the median on acceptance/love and below the median on close supervision/control dimensions are grouped as “permissive/indulgent”; scores which are above the median on close supervision/control dimension and below the median on acceptance/love dimension are grouped as “authoritarian”; and finally, scores which are below the median on both dimensions are labeled as “permissive/neglecting”.

For the purpose of investigating the differences between three perfectionism scores of male and female students as a function of authoritative, authoritarian, permissive/indulgent, and permissive/neglecting parenting styles, a 2 (gender) X 4 (parenting style groups) MANOVA was employed to the three perfectionism scores (Standard, Discrepancy, Order) of the participants, separately for mothers and for fathers.

4.3.1. Results of Multivariate Analysis for Mothers

The means and standard deviation of perfectionism scores of female and male students in terms of four groups of parenting styles of mothers are presented in *Table 4.3*.

Table 4.3.
Means and Standard Deviations of Perfectionism Scores According to Gender and Parenting Style for Mother's Scale

Perfectionism Dimensions	Gender	Parenting Style of Mother	n	M	SD
Standards	Female	Authoritative	54	5.17	1.02
		Authoritarian	76	5.09	1.09
		Permissive Indulgent	108	5.10	1.08
		Permissive Neglecting	47	4.90	1.08
	Male	Authoritative	37	5.57	1.05
		Authoritarian	97	5.03	1.07
		Permissive Indulgent	61	5.25	1.32
		Permissive Neglecting	49	5.06	1.14
	Total	Authoritative	91	5.33	1.05
		Authoritarian	173	5.06	1.08
		Permissive Indulgent	169	5.16	1.17
		Permissive Neglecting	96	4.98	1.11
Discrepancy	Female	Authoritative	54	3.85	1.22
		Authoritarian	76	4.14	1.34
		Permissive Indulgent	108	3.24	1.32
		Permissive Neglecting	47	3.71	1.24
	Male	Authoritative	37	3.96	1.15

		Authoritarian	97	3.90	1.19
		Permissive Indulgent	61	3.36	1.43
		Permissive Neglecting	49	3.57	1.35
	Total	Authoritative	91	3.89	1.19
		Authoritarian	173	4.01	1.26
		Permissive Indulgent	169	3.28	1.36
		Permissive Neglecting	96	3.64	1.29
Order	Female	Authoritative	54	4.75	1.54
		Authoritarian	76	4.34	1.79
		Permissive Indulgent	108	4.66	1.65
		Permissive Neglecting	47	4.20	1.50
	Male	Authoritative	37	4.76	1.51
		Authoritarian	97	4.47	1.55
		Permissive Indulgent	61	4.10	1.88
		Permissive Neglecting	49	4.07	1.66
	Total	Authoritative	91	4.75	1.52
		Authoritarian	173	4.41	1.66
		Permissive Indulgent	169	4.46	1.75
		Permissive Neglecting	96	4.13	1.58

The results of MANOVA yielded significant multivariate effects for mothers' parenting style groups (Wilk's Lambda = .915, partial eta squared = .998). No significant main effects for gender and gender X mothers' parenting style groups' interaction effect were found.

Given the significance of the overall test, the univariate main effect results for mothers' parenting style groups for each perfectionism dimension were examined. The significant univariate main effect of mothers' parenting style groups were obtained for Discrepancy $F(3, 521) = 9.394, p < .05$, partial eta squared = .051. However, there were no significant main effect for Standards ($F(3, 521) = 2.3, p = .076$, partial eta squared = .013) and for Order ($F(3, 521) = 2.205, p = .087$, partial eta squared = .013) dimensions.

The results of post hoc analyses to the MANOVA by using the Benferroni method revealed only one significant difference in Discrepancy scores ($F(3, 528) =$

9.394, $p = .000$, partial eta squared = .997). The results of Tukey test showed that, the Discrepancy scores of those who perceived their mothers as permissive/indulgent ($M = 3.28$) significantly different from those who perceived their mothers as authoritative ($M = 3.89$) and who perceived their mothers as authoritarian ($M = 4.01$). Differences between other groups were not found as significant.

4.3.2. Results of Multivariate Analysis for Fathers

The means and standard deviation of perfectionism scores in respect to gender of students and four parenting styles of fathers were presented in *Table 4.4*

Table 4.4.

Standard Deviations and Means of Perfectionism Scores According to Gender and Parenting Styles of Fathers

Perfectionism Dimensions	Gender	Parenting Style of Father	<i>n</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Standards	Female	Authoritative	75	5.28	1.09
		Authoritarian	66	4.88	1.02
		Permissive/Indulgent	82	5.05	1.03
		Permissive/Neglecting	59	5.06	1.14
	Male	Authoritative	54	5.36	.88
		Authoritarian	84	5.02	1.18
		Permissive/Indulgent	58	5.08	1.39
		Permissive/Neglecting	43	5.27	1.09
	Total	Authoritative	129	5.31	1.01
		Authoritarian	150	4.96	1.11
		Permissive/Indulgent	140	5.06	1.18
		Permissive/Neglecting	102	5.15	1.12
Discrepancy	Female	Authoritative	75	3.60	1.10
		Authoritarian	66	4.01	1.30
		Permissive/Indulgent	82	3.31	1.37
		Permissive/Neglecting	59	3.84	1.49
	Male	Authoritative	54	3.85	1.02
		Authoritarian	84	3.93	1.27

		Permissive/Indulgent	58	3.28	1.35
		Permissive/Neglecting	43	3.82	1.42
	Total	Authoritative	129	3.70	1.07
		Authoritarian	150	3.96	1.28
		Permissive/Indulgent	140	3.30	1.36
		Permissive/Neglecting	102	3.83	1.45
Order	Female	Authoritative	75	4.66	1.52
		Authoritarian	66	4.44	1.63
		Permissive/Indulgent	82	4.70	1.66
		Permissive/Neglecting	59	4.10	1.78
	Male	Authoritative	54	4.39	1.71
		Authoritarian	84	4.41	1.60
		Permissive/Indulgent	58	4.29	1.81
		Permissive/Neglecting	43	4.19	1.56
	Total	Authoritative	129	4.55	1.60
		Authoritarian	150	4.42	1.61
		Permissive/Indulgent	140	4.53	1.73
		Permissive/Neglecting	102	4.14	1.68

The results of MANOVA yielded significant multivariate effects for fathers' parenting style groups (Wilk's Lambda = .923, partial eta squared = .993). No significant main effects for gender and gender X fathers' parenting style groups' interaction effect were found.

Univariate main effect results for fathers' parenting style groups for each perfectionism dimension were examined in light of multivariate results. Significant univariate main effect of fathers' parenting style groups were obtained for Discrepancy ($F(3, 513) = 6.830, p < .05$, partial eta squared = .038) and Standards ($F(3, 513) = 2.629, p = .05$, partial eta squared = .015). However, there was no significant main effect for Order dimension, $F(3, 513) = 1.171, p = .320$, partial eta squared = .007.

The results of post hoc analyses to the MANOVA by using the Benferroni method elicited significant differences both in Standards scores $F(3, 520) = 2.629, p$

= .05, partial eta squared = .643) and Discrepancy scores ($F(3,520) = 6.830, p = .000$, partial eta squared = .977). The results of Tukey test showed that Standard scores of those who perceived their fathers as authoritative ($M = 5.31$) significantly differed from those who perceived their fathers as authoritarian ($M = 4.96$). The results of Tukey test also indicated that Discrepancy scores of those who perceived that their fathers as permissive/indulgent ($M = 3.30$) significantly differed from authoritative ($M = 3.71$) and authoritarian ($M = 3.97$). Differences between other groups were not found to be significant.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

This chapter is devoted to conclusions acquired from the findings of the current study. In the first section, the relationship between dimensions of perfectionism and parenting styles of mothers and fathers are discussed in light of findings; in the second, and third sections the implications and recommendations for future studies are presented respectively.

5.1. Discussion

Research results revealed that those who perceived their mothers as authoritative and authoritarian had significantly higher Discrepancy scores than those who perceived their mothers as permissive/indulgent. A similar pattern obtained for fathers, indicating that Discrepancy scores of those who perceived their fathers as authoritative and authoritarian were significantly higher than those who perceived their fathers as permissive/indulgent. The results also yielded that those who perceived their fathers as authoritative had significantly higher Standards scores than those who perceived their fathers as authoritarian.

Overall, the findings of the study seemed to suggest one common pattern for mothers and fathers indicating that, as compared to permissive/indulgent parenting, authoritative and authoritarian parenting led participants to experience more maladaptive perfectionism, i.e., sense of distress as a result of a perceived

discrepancy between real performance and standards set or imposed by their parents or society at large. That is, parental expectations and demandingness function as indicators for developing maladaptive perfectionism. When dimensions defining parenting were taken into account, close supervision and control determine the difference between authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive/indulgent parenting characteristics. Similar results were obtained with earlier studies in the literature. As Frost and his colleagues (1991) indicated demanding parents and perceived parental harshness suggested direct a relation with developing perfectionism. Similarly, Kawamura and colleagues (2002) asserted a direct connection between harsh, authoritarian parenting and maladaptive perfectionism in children. Considering difference between perceptions of children and parents' self-reflections for parenting styles, further research is needed for explanation of maladaptive perfectionism in connection with parenting styles among different age groups of children.

The differences in fathers' authoritative parenting style leading to higher Standards scores of perfectionism than authoritarian style seemed worthy of emphasis. That is, participants who perceive their fathers as embracing an authoritative style (giving verbal reasoning with higher acceptance, expressing attention and love) develop more adaptive perfectionism than authoritarian style (obedience demanding and controlling). Since fathers, in comparison to mothers, were found to be more dominant and leave little authority to children in the Turkish family system (Schönplflug, 2001), current research supported the idea of an authoritative family system and giving fathers a role with control dimension besides showing their love and acceptance to support adaptive perspective of perfectionistic tendency. Considering the adaptive nature of Standards scores of perfectionism, these results needed further examination.

When Order dimension of perfectionism is considered, no significant result was found for either parenting style of fathers or mothers with the sample in this study. As it was suggested by Slaney and colleagues (2006), Order dimension

measures only normal orderliness but is not related to adaptive perfectionism as it was originally designed. In the present study, results did not reveal any meaningful explanation for being neat and orderly in relation to parenting styles.

The gender of participants was not a determining factor on perfectionism or the interaction of perfectionism and parenting styles. In the present study, we expected to find significant gender difference both in participants and on their perceptions regarding their mothers and fathers. A study by Flett and colleagues (1995) suggested a meaningful gender difference for males reporting higher perceived authoritarian parenting from their mother. Similarly, Kawamura and colleagues (2002) suggested a difference between female and male college students for adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism scores in respect to their cultural backgrounds. While Asian females but not males, Caucasian male and females showed a difference in maladaptive perfectionism scores in relation to authoritative parenting, no meaningful gender based difference was found for adaptive perfectionism. Moreover, supporting a gender difference, Brand and colleagues (2011) found meaningful difference between perceptions of female athletes and male athletes regarding parenting styles. Female athletes were asserted to report on more positive and supportive parenting characteristics and less in negative ones. Different from all related previous research findings, the current study revealed no significant difference in respect to gender.

When nature of study and implementation of scales are considered, acquiring similar results for mothers' and fathers' parenting styles in relation to perfectionism was questionable. Implementing a parenting style scale that requires evaluating fathers and mothers separately was intentional to elicit gender differences in parent-child relationships. As it was suggested in studies that were held among university students, significant gender difference was found in the ways parents interact with their daughters and sons (Stephens, 2009). However, answering same scale for both parents, one after another, might have jeopardized the independence of observation in students' reflections for parents. Also, without emphasizing differences in their

relations with each parent may have resulted in a generalization of perceptions for mothers' and fathers' parental attitudes. It is suggested that for future studies, emphasis should be placed on gender differences for participants and parents, with additional means of obtaining information.

5.2. Implications

The current study fulfills the expectations of possible interaction between perceived parenting styles and perfectionism tendencies of individuals. Significant findings among different parenting styles to perfectionism underlines an important factor: child-parent relationship. Working with families and parents to increase their awareness about how their parenting styles have an effect on their child's healthy development would be best preventive practice. Results of the study serve as a guide for young adults, and future parents to understand their parenting styles. Moreover, it would be helpful for university students to make sense out of relationship with their parents and understand how they are affected

Also, practitioners and counselors working with young adults may benefit from the study results. Understanding university students' developmental milestones and their interactions with family would be assistance in working on perfectionism related outcomes in students' life. It is crucial to underline the multidimensional nature of perfectionism, as supported with the study results. Evaluating perfectionism as a trait characteristics to shape perceptions and attitudes toward every day experiences would make a difference in individuals' lives. Understanding the perfectionism concept would help practitioners and university students work on their perceptions and experienced discrepancies in counseling process. Also, underlying perfectionism as an adaptive concept which is defined with personal high standards would lead both young adults and professionals working with them to obtain a more positive focus on setting high self expectations.

However, the sample of university students with a convenient sampling comes up as a restriction to a generalization of the study. First, participants are from one of the high achieving universities of Ankara and Turkey in general. An ideal random sampling method was not possible to have an actual representation of all university students and from different universities considering applicability of the study with present conditions. Therefore volunteer students from various departments were provided to take part in the study. For future studies, paying attention to student characteristics and choosing a sample from universities randomly would provide support for literature in related area.

It should be noted that working with a high achieving group of university students had its own consequences in the study. Naturally, the sample group consisted of university students who are achievement-oriented based on their preferences in university choice. Therefore, setting high standards for themselves is one of the characteristics of current sample that cannot be ignored which is also a defining factor of perfectionism. Parallel to sample features, study results revealed higher mean scores of High Standards dimension in comparison to other dimensions of perfectionism.

Moreover, working with university students for evaluating self in terms of perfectionism and their parents to find out their perceived parenting styles had both positive and negative aspects. The university education process and being in the young adult period of their life was a defining factor in choosing university students as a sample. As explained before, perfectionism is still a compelling issue in the literature with various perspectives in definitions, in respect to abstract nature of concepts, evaluating self requires a certain frame of mind to reflect properly. Also, considering their relations with their parents and how they are effected from their attitudes throughout their lives demands a certain level of maturity and critical approach. A sample consisting of university students was fulfilling those requirements for the benefit of the study. As a suggestion for future research

addressing same subject, parental reflections about their parenting styles besides students' evaluation of their parents may be collected as additional data.

5.3. Recommendations

This study functions as a base to study in detail perfectionism and parenting styles in different age groups and with sample of university students. To look for indepth information for reasons of perfectionism trait, a qualitative research style would be more effective in exploring interaction between perfectionism and other related factors. Since the current study only reveals the interaction between perfectionism, gender, and parenting style, further research is needed to obtain causation from a wider perspective. Based on their academic success and achievement oriented characteristics, a convenient sample of a campus university students' perceptions for parenting styles had been examined. However, variations in results are more likely to be obtained with university students from other universities all over Turkey. Last but not the least, drawing students' attention to differences between interactions with mothers and fathers would be helpful in identifying gender based differences among a new sample for future research.

REFERENCES

- Abesha, A. G. (2012). *Effects of parenting styles, academic self-efficacy, and achievement motivation on the academic achievement of university students in Ethiopia* (Unpublished dissertation). School of Psychology and Sical Science, Edith Cowan University.
- Adler, A. (1959). *The practice and theory of individual psychology*. NJ: Littlefield, Adams & Paterson.
- Alegre, A. (2011). Parenting styles and children's emotional intelligence: What do we know? *The Family Journal*, 19(1), 56-62.
- Altun, F. & Yazıcı, H. (2010). Öğrencilerin olumlu ve olumsuz mükemmeliyetçilik özellikleri ile akademik başarıları arasındaki ilişkiler. *International Conference on New Trends in Education and Their Implications*. 11-13 November 2010 Antalya Turkey. ISBN:9786053641049.
- Arslan, C., Hamarta, E., Üre, Ö., & Özyeşil, Z. (2010). An investigation of loneliness and perfectionism in university students. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2, 814-818.
- Ashby, J. S. & Bruner, L. P. (2005). Multidimensional perfectionism and obsessive-compulsive behaviors. *Journal of College Counseling*, 8, 31-40.
- Ashby, J. S. & Rice, K. G. (2002). Perfectionism, dysfunctional attitudes, and self-esteem: A structural equation analysis. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 80(2), 197-203.
- Ashby, J. S., Kottman, T., & Stoltz, K. B. (2006). Multidimensional perfectionism and personality profiles. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, 62(3), 312-323.

- Aunola, K., Stattin, H., & Nurmi, J. E. (2000). Parenting styles and adolescents' achievement strategies. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23(2), 205-222.
- Aydin, K. B. (2013). Cross-cultural validity of the almost perfect scale-revised on the college students in the United States and Turkey. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 8(14), 1150-1157.
- Baldry, A. C. & Farrington, D. P. (2000). Bullies and delinquents: personal characteristics and parental styles. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 10(1), 17-31.
- Baldry, A. C. & Farrington, D. P. (1998). Parenting influences on bullying and victimization. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*, 3(2), 237-254.
- Barnhart, C. M., Raval, V. V., Jansari, A., & Raval, P. H. (In press). Perceptions of parenting style among college students in india and the united states. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 1-24.
- Baumrind, D. (1966). Effects of authoritative parental control on child behavior. *Child Development*, 37(4), 887-907.
- Baumrind, D. (1967). Child care practices anteceding three patterns of preschool behavior. *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, 75(1), 43-88.
- Baumrind, D. (1991). The influence of parenting style on adolescent competence and substance use. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 11(1), 56-95.
- Bieling, P. J., Israeli, A. L., & Antony, M. M. (2004). Is perfectionism good, bad, or both? Examining models of the perfectionism construct. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36(6), 1373-1385.

- Boone, L., Soenens, B., Vansteenkiste, M., & Braet, C. (2012). Is there a perfectionist in each of us? An experimental study on perfectionism and eating disorder symptoms. *Appetite*, 59, 531-540.
- Bouchard, C., Rheaume, J., & Ladouceur, R. (1999). Responsibility and perfectionism in OCD: an experimental study. *Behavior Research and Therapy*, 37(3), 239-248.
- Brand, S., Gerber, M., Beck, J., Kalak, N. , Hatzinger, M., Pühse, U., & Holsboer-Trachsler, E. (2011). Perceived parenting styles differ between genders but not between elite athletes and controls. *Adolescent Health, Medicine and Therapeutics*, 2, 9-14.
- Büyükbayraktar, C. G. & Üre, Ö. (2014). The relationship between perfectionism and anger. *Anthropologist*, 18(3), 835-846.
- Camadan, F. (2010). Predicting the students' perfectionism from their parents' perfectionism. *Procedia- Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 2 (2), 4260-4265.
- 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(1), 64-78.
- Choy, G. & McInerney, V. (2005). *Perfectionism, self-concept and self-evaluative emotions in Australian primary school students*. AARE Annual Conference, Parramatta.

- Cook, L. C. (2012). *The influence of parent factors on child perfectionism: A crosssectional study*. (Unpublished dissertation). University of Nevada, Las Vegas, United States.
- DiPrima, A. J., Ashby, J. S., Gnilka, P. B., & Noble, C. L. (2011). Family relations and perfectionism in middle-school students. *Psychology in the Schools*, 48(8), 815-827.
- Dornbusch, S. M., Ritter, P.L., Leiderman, P. H., Roberts, D.F., & Fraleigh, M. J. (1987). The relation of parenting style to adolescents school performance. *Child Development*, 58(5), 1244-1257.
- Driscoll, A. K., Russell, S. T., & Crockett, L. J. (2008). Parenting styles and youth well-being across immigrant generations. *Journal of Family Issues*, 29(2), 185-209.
- Eiden, R. D., Edwards, E. P., & Leonard, K. E. (2007). A conceptual model for the development of externalizing behavior problems among kindergarten children of alcoholic families: Role of parenting and children's self-regulation. *Developmental Psychology*, 43, 1187-1201.
- Eldeleklioğlu, J. (1996). *Karar stratejileri ile ana baba tutumları arasındaki ilişki* (Unpublished dissertation). Gazi University, Social Sciences Institute, Ankara.
- Enns, M. W., Cox, B. J., & Clara, I. P. (2002). The multidimensional structure of perfectionism in clinically distressed and college student samples. *Psychological Assessment*, 14(3), 365-373.

- Erözkan, A. (2008). Perfectionism tendencies and depression levels of university students. *Cypriot Journal of Educational Sciences*, 3, 76-88.
- Flett, G. L., Blankstein, K. R., Hewitt, P.L., & Koledin, S.(1992). Components of perfectionism and procrastination in college students. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 20(2), 85-94.
- Flett, G.L., Hewitt, P.L., & Singer, A. (1995). Perfectionism and parental authority styles: Individual psychology. *Journal of Adlerian Theory, Research and Practice*, 5, 50-60.
- Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., Oliver, J. M., & McDonald, S. (2002). Perfectionism in children and their parents: A developmental analysis. Flett, G. L. & Hewitt, P. L. (Eds.). *Perfectionism: Theory, research, and treatment*, 89-132 Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association, xiv, 435, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10458-004>.
- Frost, R. O., Marten,P., Lahart, C., & Rosenblate, R. (1990). The dimensions of perfectionism. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 14(5), 449-468.
- 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, 469-490.
- Frost, R.O., Heimberg, R.G., Holt, C.S., Mattia, J.I., & Neubauer, A.L. (1993). A comparison of two measures of perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 14, 119-126.

- Garcia, F. & Garcia, E. (2009). Is always authoritative the optimum parenting style? Evidence from Spanish families. *Adolescence*, 44(173), 101-131.
- Geher, G. (2000) Perceived and actual characteristics of parents and partners: a test of a freudian model of mate selection. *Current Psychology*, 19(3), 194-214.
- Gilman, R., Ashby, J. S., Sverko, D., Florell, D., & Varjas, K. (2005). The relationship between perfectionism and multidimensional life satisfaction among Croatian and American youth. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 39(1), 155-166.
- Gfroerer, K. P., Kern, R. M., Curlette, W. L., White, J., & Jonyniene, J. (2011). Parenting style and personality: Perceptions of mothers, fathers, and adolescents. *The Journal of Invidual Psychology*, 67(1), 57-73.
- Georgiou, S. N. (2008). Parental style and child bullying and victimization experiences at school. *Social Psychology of Education*, 11, 213- 227.
- Grzegorek, J. L., Slaney, R. B., Franze, S., & Rice, K. G. (2004). Self-criticism, dependency, self-esteem, and grade point average satisfaction among clusters of perfectionists and nonperfectionists. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 51(2), 192-200.
- Hamachek, D. E. (1978). Psychodynamics of normal and neurotic perfectionism. *Psychology*, 15, 27-33.
- Herz, L. & Gullone, E. (1999). The relationship between self-esteem and parenting styles: A cross-cultural comparison of Australian and Vietnamese

Australian Adolescents. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 30(6), 742-761.

Hewitt, P. L. & Dyck, D. G. (1986). Perfectionism, stress, and vulnerability to depression. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 10(1), 137-142.

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

Hewitt, P. L., Flett, G. L., Turnbull-Donovan, W., & Mikail, S. F. (1991). The multidimensional perfectionism scale: Reliability, validity, and psychometric properties in psychiatric samples. *Psychological Assessment*, 3(3), 464-468.

Hewitt, P. L., Flett, G. L., & Ediger, E. (1995). Perfectionism traits and perfectionistic self-presentation in eating disorder attitudes, characteristics, and symptoms. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 18(4), 317-326.

Hewitt, P. L., Caelian, C. F., Flett, G. L., Sherry, S. B., Collins, L., & Flynn, C.A. (2002). Perfectionism in children: associations with depression, anxiety, and anger. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32, 1049-1061.

Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (2002). Perfectionism and stress processes in psychopathology. In G. L. Flett, P. L. Hewitt (Eds.), *Perfectionism: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 255-284). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/10458-011.

Hill, R. W., Zrull, M. C., & Turlington, S. (1997). Perfectionism and interpersonal problems. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 69(1), 81-103.

Hollender, M.H. (1965). Perfectionism. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 6(2), 94-103.

Johnson, J. G., Cohen, P., Chen, H., Kasen, S., & Brook, J. S. (2006). Parenting behaviors associated with risk for offspring personality disorder during adulthood. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 63, 579-587.

Johnson, D. P. & Slaney, R. B. (1996). Perfectionism: Scale development and a study of perfectionistic clients in counseling. *Journal of College Student Development*, 37(1), 29-41.

Kawamura, K. Y., Frost, R. O., & Harmatz, M. G. (2002). The relationship of perceived parenting styles to perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 32(2), 317-327.

Kırdök, O. (2004). *Olumlu ve Olumsuz Mükemmeliyetçilik Ölçeği Geliştirme Çalışması* (Yayımlanmamış doktora tezi). Çukurova Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Adana.

Koydemir, S. (2006). *Predictors of shyness among university students: Testing a self-presentational model* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Middle East Technical University, Ankara, Turkey.

Khodarahimi, S. (2010). Perfectionism and five-big model of personality in an Iranian sample. *International Journal of Psychology and Counseling*, 2(4), 72-79.

- Krevans, J. & Gibbs, J.C. (1996). Parents' use of inductive discipline: Relations to children's empathy and prosocial behavior. *Child Development, 67*, 3263-3277.
- Krishnakumar, A. & Buehler, C. (2000). Interparental conflict and parenting behaviors: A meta-analytic review. *Family Relations, 49*(1), 25-44.
- Lamborn, S. D., Mounts, N. S., Steinberg, L., & Dornbusch, S.M. (1991). Patterns of competence and adjustment among adolescents from authoritative, authoritarian, indulgent, and neglectful families. *Child Development, 62*(5), 1049-1065.
- LoCicero, K. A. & Ashby, J. S. (2000). Multidimensional perfectionism and self-reported self-efficacy in college students. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 15*(2), 47-55.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Martin, J. A. (1983). Socialization in the context of the family: Parent-child interaction. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.) & E. M. Hetherington (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 4. Socialization, Personality, and Social Development* (4th ed., pp. 1-101). New York: Wiley.
- Margolin, G., Gordis, E. B., & John, R. S. (2001). Coparenting: A link between marital conflict and parenting in two-parent families. *Journal of Family Psychology, 15*(1), 3-21.
- McGillicuddy-De Lisi, A. V., & De Lisi, R. (2007). Perceptions of family relations when mothers and fathers are depicted with different parenting styles. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 168*, 425-442.

- Meyers, L.S., Gamst, G., & Guarino, A. (2006). *Applied multivariate research: Design and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Milevsky, A., Schlechter, M., Netter, S., & Keehn, D. (2007). Maternal and paternal parenting styles in adolescents: Associations with self-esteem, depression and life satisfaction. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 16(1), 39-47.
- Miller, A. L., Lambert, A.D., & Speirs-Nuemeister, K. L. (2012). Parenting style, perfectionism, and creativity in high-ability and high-achieving young adults. *Journal for Education of Gifted*, 35(4), 344-365.
- Mısırlı-Taşdemir, Ö. & Özbay, Y. (2004). *Üstün yetenekli çocuklarda mükemmeliyetçilik, sınav kaygısı, benlik saygısı, kontrol odağı, öz-yeterlilik ve problem çözme becerileri arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi*, 301-318, *Üstün Yetenekli Çocuklar Bildiriler Kitabı*. İstanbul: Çocuk Vakfı Yayınları.
- Olander, S. M. F. (1989). *Relationships between parents' Adlerian personality priorities and dimensions of family environment* (Unpublished masters thesis). University of Arizona, Arizona, United States.
- 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, the Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.
- Oran-Pamir, Ç. (2008). *Lise öğrencilerinin mükemmeliyetçilik düzeyleri ile anne baba tutumları arasındaki ilişki* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Muğla Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Anabilim Dalı, Muğla.

- Öngen, D. E. (2009). The relationship between perfectionism and multidimensional life satisfaction among high school adolescents in Turkey. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development, 37*, 52-64.
- Öngen, D. E. (2010). The relationship between adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism and aggression among Turkish adolescents. *Australian Journal of Guidance & Counseling, 20*(1), 99-108.
- Öngen, D. E. (2011). The relationship among perfectionism, self criticism and identity styles in Turkish university students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 30*, 565-572.
- Paulson, S. E. (1994). Relations of parenting style and parental involvement with ninth-grade students' achievement. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 14*(2), 250-267.
- Perfectionism. 2014. In *Merriam-Webster.com*. Retrieved November 8, 2014, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/perfectionism>.
- Rice, K.G., Ashby, J.S., & Preusser, K.J. (1996). Perfectionism, relationships with parents, and self-esteem. *Individual Psychology, 52* (3), 246-260.
- Rice, K. G. & Leffert, N. (1997). Depression in adolescence: Implications for school counsellors. *Canadian Journal of Counselling, 31*(1), 18-34.
- Rice, K.G., Ashby, J.S., & Slaney, R. (1998). Self-esteem as a mediator between perfectionism and depression: A structural equations analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45*, 393-398.

- Rice, K. G. & Ashby, J. S. (2007). An efficient method for classifying perfectionists. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 54*(1), 72-85.
- Rice, K. G., Ashby, J. S., & Slaney, R. B. (2007). Perfectionism and the five-factor model of personality. *Assessment, 14*(4), 385-398.
- Rinaldi, C. M. & Howe, N. (2012). Mothers' and fathers' parenting styles and associations with toddlers' externalizing, internalizing, and adaptive behaviors. *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 27*(2), 266-273.
- Saboonchi, F. & Lundh, L.G. (1999). State perfectionism and its relation to trait perfectionism, type of situation, priming, and being observed. *Scandinavian Journal of Behavior Therapy, 28*(4), 154-166.
- Sapmaz, F. (2006). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin uyumlu ve uyumsuz mükemmeliyetçilik özelliklerinin psikolojik belirti düzeyleri açısından incelenmesi* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Sakarya Üniversitesi, Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Sakarya.
- Saya, P. (2006). *The relationship between attachment styles and perfectionism in high school students* (Unpublished masters thesis). Middle East Technical University, Ankara.
- Schönplflug, U. (2001). Decision-making influence in the family: A comparison of Turkish families in Germany and in Turkey. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 32*(2), 219-230.

- Shafran, R. & Mansell, W. (2001). Perfectionism and psychopathology. *Clinical Psychology Review, 21*(6), 879-906.
- Slaney, R. B., Ashby, J. S., & Trippi, J. (1995). Perfectionism: Its measurement and career relevance. *Journal of Career Assessment, 3*, 279-297.
- Slaney, R. B., & Ashby, J. S. (1996). Perfectionists: Study of a criterion group. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 74*, 393-398.
- Slaney, R. B., Rice, K. G., Mobley, M., Trippi, J., & Ashby, J. S. (2001). The revised Almost Perfect Scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 34*, 130-145.
- Slaney, R. B., Rice, K. G., & Ashby, J. S. (2002). A programmatic approach to measuring perfectionism: The almost perfect scales. Flett, G. L. & Hewitt, P. L. (Eds.). *Perfectionism: Theory, Research, and Treatment*. 63-88. Washington, DC: American Psychology Association.
- Soenens, B., Berzonsky, M. D., Vansteenkiste, M., Beyers, W., & Goossens, L. (2005). Identity styles and causality orientations: In search of the motivational underpinnings of the identity exploration process. *European Journal of Personality, 19*, 427-442.
- Snell, W. E. Jr., Overbey, G. A., & Brewer, A. L. (2005). Parenting perfectionism and the parenting role. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*, 613-624.

- Spera, C. (2005). A review of the relationship among parenting practices, parenting styles, and adolescent school achievement. *Educational Psychology Review, 17*(2), 125-146.
- Steinberg, L., Elmen, J.D., & Mounts, N. S. (1989). Authoritative parenting, psychological maturity, and academic success among adolescents. *Child Development, 60*(6), 1424-1436.
- Steinberg, L., Lamborn, S. D., Dornbusch, S. M., & Darling, N. (1992). Impact of parenting practices on adolescent achievement: authoritative parenting, school involvement, and encouragement to succeed. *Child Development, 63*(5), 1266-1281.
- Stephens, M. A. (2009). *Gender differences in parenting styles and effects on the parent child relations* (Unpublished Honors Thesis). Texas State University, Texas.
- Stoeber, J. & Otto, K. (2006). Positive conceptions of perfectionism: approaches, evidence, challenges. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*(4), 295- 319.
- Stoeber, J. & Rambow, A. (2007). Perfectionism in adolescent school students: Relations with motivation, achievement, and well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences, 42*(7), 1379-1389.
- Stöber, J. (1998). The Frost multidimensional perfectionism scale revisited: More perfect with four (instead of six) dimensions. *Personality and Individual Differences, 24*(4), 481-491.

Stoltz, K. & Ashby, J. S. (2007). Perfectionism and lifestyle: Personality differences among adaptive perfectionists, maladaptive perfectionists, and nonperfectionists. *The Journal of Individual Psychology*, 63(4), 414-423.

Stumpf, H. & Parker, W. D. (2000). A hierarchical structural analysis of perfectionism and its relation to other personality characteristics. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28, 837- 852.

Suddart, B. H. & Slaney, R. B. (2001). An investigation of the dimensions of perfectionism in college students. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 34(3), 157-165.

Sun-Selişik, Z. E. (2003). *The dimensions of perfectionism and their relationship to helpless explanatory style* (Unpublished Master's Thesis). Middle East Technical University, the Institute of Social Sciences, Ankara.

Sümer, N. & Güngör, D. (1999). Çocuk yetiştirme stillerinin bağlanma stilleri, benlik değerlendirmeleri ve yakın ilişkiler üzerindeki etkisi. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 14, 35-38.

Terry-Short, L.A., Owens, R. G., Slade, P.D., & Dewey, M. E. (1995). Positive and negative perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 18(5), 663-668.

Timpano, K. R., Keough, M.E., Mahaffey, B., Schmidt, N. B., & Abramowitz, J. (2010). Parenting and obsessive compulsive symptoms: Implications of authoritarian parenting. *Journal of Cognitive Psychotherapy: An International Quarterly*, 24(3), 151-164.

- Tuncer, B. & Voltan-Acar, N. (2006). Kaygı düzeyleri farklı üniversite hazırlık sınıfı öğrencilerinin mükemmeliyetçilik özelliklerinin incelenmesi. *Kriz Dergisi*, 14(2), 1-17.
- Turner, E. A., Chandler, M., & Heffer, R. W. (2009). The influence of parenting styles, achievement motivation, and self-efficacy on academic performance in college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 50(3), 337-346.
- Türkel, Y. D. (2006). *The relationship between parenting styles and learned resourcefulness* (Unpublished master's thesis). Middle East Technical University, Social Sciences Institute, Ankara.
- Ulu, İ. P. (2007). *An investigation of adaptive and maladaptive dimensions of perfectionism in relation to adult attachment and big five personality traits* (Unpublished dissertation). Middle East Technical University, Educational Sciences Institute, Ankara, Turkey.
- Ulu, İ. P. & Tezer, E. (2010). Adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism, adult attachment and Big Five personality traits. *The Journal of Psychology*, 144(4), 327- 340.
- Ulu, İ. P., Tezer, E., & Slaney, R. B. (2012). Investigation of adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism with turkish almost perfect scale-revised. *Psychological Reports*, 110(3), 1007-1020.
- Wang, K. T., Slaney, R. B., & Rice, K. G. (2007). Perfectionism in Chinese university students from Taiwan: A study of psychological well-being and achievement motivation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(7), 1279-1290.

- Webster-Stratton, C. & Hammond, M. (1999). Marital conflict management skills, parenting skills, and early-onset conduct problems: Processes and path ways. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 40(6), 917-927.
- Yıldızbaş, F. & Topuz, C. (2014). The study of teacher candidates' perfectionism in relation with achievement and demographics. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 152, 121-126.
- Yaprak, B. (2007). *İlköğretim öğrencilerinin algıladıkları anne-baba tutumunun diskriminant analiziyle belirlenmesi ve benlik sayısı ile olan ilişkisinin değerlendirilmesi üzerine bir uygulama* (Yayımlanmamış yüksek lisans tezi). Eskişehir Osmangazi Üniversitesi, Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- Yılmaz, A. (2000). Anne-baba tutum ölçeğinin güvenirlik ve geçerlilik çalışması. *Çocuk Ruh Sağlığı Dergisi*, 7(3), 160-172.
- Yilmazer, Y. (2007). *Assessment of the relation between parenting styles and academic success and autonomy development for 6th, 7th, and 8th grade students* (Unpublished masters thesis). Hacettepe University Institute of Health Sciences, Department of Child Development, Ankara.
- Zietsch, B. P., Verweij, K. J. H., Heath, A.C., & Martin, N.G. (2011). Variation in human mate choice: simultaneously investigating heritability, parental influence, sexual imprinting, and assortive mating. *The American Naturalist*, 177(5), 605-616.

APPENDIX A

TURKISH VERSION OF ALMOST PERFECT SCALE- REVISED (OLUMLU-OLUMSUZ MÜKEMMELİYETÇİLİK ÖLÇEĞİ)

Lütfen her bir ifadenin size ne kadar uyduğunu, size uygun rakama (X) işareti koyarak belirtiniz.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç Katılmıyorum						Tamamen Katılıyorum

1. İşte veya okuldaki performansıyla ilgili standartlarım yüksektir.*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Derli toplu olmak benim için önemlidir.*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Elimden gelenin en iyisi bana asla yeterince iyi gibi gelmez.*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

*Example items were given for each dimension of APS-R.

APPENDIX B

PARENTING STYLE QUESTIONNAIRE (ÇOCUK YETİŞTİRME STİLLERİ ÖLÇEĞİ)

Aşağıda, anneniz ve babanızla olan ilişkileriniz hakkında cümleler verilmiştir. Sizden istenen, **çocukluğunuzu ve genel olarak anne-babanızla ilişkinizi düşünerek** her bir cümlenin **sizin için** ne derece doğru olduğunu ilgili yeri işaretleyerek belirtmenizdir. Bunu anne ve babanız için ayrı ayrı yapmanızı istemekteyiz. Hiçbir maddenin doğru veya yanlış cevabı yoktur. Önemli olan her cümle ile ilgili olarak kendi durumunuzu doğru bir şekilde yansıtmmanızdır. **Anne ve/veya babanızı kaybetmişseniz yetişmenizde en çok katkısı olan kişiyi göz önüne alınız.**

Hiç doğru değil **Doğru değil** **Kısmen doğru** **Doğru** **Çok doğru**
1 **2** **3** **4** **5**

	A N N E M / B A B A M				
Her davranışımı sıkı sıkıya kontrol etmek isterdi *	1	2	3	4	5
Nasıl davranacağım ya da ne yapacağım konusunda bana hep yararlı fikirler vermiştir *	1	2	3	4	5

*Example items are given for each dimension

APPENDIX C
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION FORM
(DEMOGRAFİK BİLGİ FORMU)

Değerli Katılımcı,

Bu çalışmada kişilerin kendileriyle ilgili düşüncelerini ve anne-babaları ile ilişkilerini tanımlamaya yönelik sorular yer almaktadır. Lütfen anketi bireysel düşüncelerinizi ve deneyimlerinizi dikkate alarak cevaplayınız. Soruların doğru veya yanlış cevabı yoktur. Vereceğiniz her türlü bilgi gizli tutulacak ve sadece araştırma için kullanılacaktır.

Yardıminız ve katılımınız için şimdiden çok teşekkür ederiz.

Gizem Alvan
ODTÜ Eğitim Bilimleri Bölümü

Demografik Bilgiler

1. Cinsiyet: ()Kadın ()Erkek
2. Yaşınız:
3. Bölümünüz:
4. Sınıfınız:
5. Anne-babanız hayatta mı? () Evet () Hayır (Hangisini kaybettiğinizi belirtiniz):

APPENDIX D
TURKISH SUMMARY
(TÜRKÇE ÖZET)

ÜNİVERSİTE ÖĞRENCİLERİ ARASINDA MÜKEMMELİYETÇİLİK VE
ALGILANAN ÇOCUK YETİŞTİRME STİLİ

Mükemmeliyetçilik psikoloji alanyazınında son yıllarda çok rağbet gören bir konu olmuştur. Çok çalışılan bir konu başlığı olmasına rağmen mükemmeliyetçiliğin tanımına ilişkin değişiklik görüşler mevcuttur. Örneğin, Flett ve Hewitt (2002) bu farklılıkları üç başlık altında toplamışlardır. Bunlar; mükemmeliyetçiliğin değişmez bir özellik mi yoksa bir durum mu olduğu, tek boyutlu ya da çok boyutlu bir yapıya sahip olması ve olumlu veya olumsuz sonuçlar doğurduğudur. Özellik ve durum karşılaştırmasını göz önünde bulundurduğumuzda kaynaklarda mükemmeliyetçilik ile motivasyon, başarı, iyilik hali (Stoeber & Rambow, 2007); özsaygı (Stumpf & Parker, 2000); özeleştirme, bağlılık (Grzegorek ve diğerleri, 2004) gibi kişilik özellikleri ilişkisini inceleyen bir çok araştırmaya rastlanır. Boyutlar açısından incelendiğinde ise çok boyutlu mükemmeliyetçiliğin olumlu ve olumsuz sonuçlar doğuran yapısıyla birbirinden ayrıldığı görülmektedir (Frost ve diğerleri, 1990; Rice, Slaney ve Ashby, 1998; Suddarth ve Slaney, 2001). Hamachek (1978) mükemmeliyetçiliği “normal ve olumlu” ya da “nevrotik ve işlevsiz” olarak gruplandıran araştırmacıların başında gelir. Bu gruplamaya dayanarak Slaney ve Ashby (1996) mükemmeliyetçiliği açıklayan üç önemli özelliği ortaya koymuşlardır; kişisel performans için yüksek standartlar belirlemek, gerçek performans ve beklenen performans arasındaki farklılıktan kaynaklanan çelişkiyi ve stresi yaşamak ve son olarak düzenli ve tertipli olmak. Bu ayırıcı tanımlamaları kullanarak Slaney ve arkadaşları (2001) “Yüksek Standartlar”, “Çelişki” ve “Düzen” alt gruplarıyla

Olumlu- Olumsuz Mükemmeliyetçilik Ölçeğini (Almost Perfect Scale- Revised) oluşturmuşlardır. “Yüksek Standartlar” alt ölçeği olumlu mükemmeliyetçilik değerlerine işaret ederken “Çelişki” alt ölçeği olumsuz mükemmeliyetçiliği belirlemektedir. Temelde “Düzen” alt ölçeğinin de olumlu mükemmeliyetçilik ölçmesi beklense de daha sonraki araştırmalar (örneğin Slaney, Rice ve Ashby, 2002) Düzen alt ölçeğinin normal seviyede bir düzenlilik ölçtüğünü, olumlu-olumsuz mükemmeliyetçilik arasında ayırt edici bir rol üstlenmediğini göstermiştir.

Frost ve arkadaşları (1990) mükemmeliyetçiliği açıklarken çok boyutlu bir yaklaşım benimsemiştir. Alt boyutlar bireyin kendini değerlendirmesi, yaptığı işteki performans kaygısı ve şüphe, ebeveynlerin beklentileri konusunda kaygı duyma ve düzenli, tertipli olma endişesi gibi özellikleri kapsamaktadır. Belirtilen özelliklere dayanarak Frost’un Çokboyutlu Mükemmeliyetçilik Ölçeği (Frost’s Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale, 1991) oluşturulmuştur. Alt boyutlar “Hata yapma kaygısı”, “Kişisel standartlar”, “Ebeveyn beklentileri”, “Ebeveynden gelen eleştiriler”, “Yaptıkları konusunda kuşkuya düşme” ve “Düzenlilik” olarak belirlenmiştir. Anne baba ile olan etkileşimi dikkate alan bu yaklaşımda sadece olumsuza odaklanılmaktadır. Sonra yapılan araştırmalarda Frost’un mükemmeliyetçilik ölçeği kullanılarak çelişkili sonuçlar elde edilmiştir ve ölçeğin yapısal özellikleri tartışılmıştır (Stöber, 1998).

Mükemmeliyetçiliğe başka bir çok boyutlu bakış açısı Hewitt ve Flett (1991) tarafından getirilmiştir. Beklentilerin yönelimine göre çok boyutlu bir kişilik özelliği olarak kabul edilen mükemmeliyetçilik için üç farklı çeşit belirlenmiştir; kendine yönelik (self-oriented), başkalarına yönelik (other-oriented) ve başkalarınca belirlenen (socially prescribed) mükemmeliyetçilik. Kendine yönelik mükemmeliyetçilikte, kişi kendine gerçekçi olmayan standartlar koyarak fazla eleştirel bir bakış açısıyla kendini değerlendirmektedir ve her zaman mükemmel olmaya çalışmaktadır. Başkalarına yönelik mükemmeliyetçilik, kişinin belirlediği yüksek beklentilerin çevresindekiler tarafından karşılanmasını istemesi, aşırı eleştirel

tutumu çevresindekilere yöneltmesi ve başkalarının mükemmel olmalarını beklemesi olarak tanımlanmıştır. Başkalarınca belirlenen mükemmeliyetçilik, kişinin algısına göre başkalarının kendisine karşılanması güç standartlar koyduğunu ve kendisini aşırı miktarda eleştirdiğini varsaydığı ve buna algıya göre davrandığı mükemmeliyetçilik tipidir. Depresyon eğilimi, kaygı, erteleme davranışları, sosyal problemler gibi bir çok kişisel sorunla mükemmeliyetçiliğin boyutları arasında olumlu ilişki bulunmuştur (Flett, Blankstein, Hewitt ve Koledin, 1992; Hewitt ve Flett, 1991; Hill ve ark., 1997). Yalnızca olumsuz odaklı olan mükemmeliyetçiliği anlamlandırma ve açıklama çabası alanda yeterli olmamıştır.

Slaney ve arkadaşlarının (2001) ortaya koyduğu olumlu-olumsuz yaklaşımda çok boyutlu mükemmeliyetçilik gelişimsel faktörler açısından da incelenmiştir. Mükemmeliyetçiliğin oluşmasına katkıda bulunan etkenlerden biri de anne babaların çocuk yetiştirirken benimsedikleri tutumlar olarak belirlenmiştir. Alanyazında olumlu mükemmeliyetçilikle ebeveynlerden gelen ilgi ve yakınlık arasında bir bağlantı bulunurken (örneğin, DiPrima ve ark., 2011) olumsuz mükemmeliyetçilik ile de katı, eleştirel, yüksek beklentili ebeveyn tutumları arasında anlamlı bir ilişki ortaya konmuştur (örnek olarak, Enns, Cox ve Clara, 2002; Frost, Lahart ve Rosenblate, 1991). Farklı değişkenler de hesaba katılarak yapılan bu araştırmalar çocuk yetiştirme stilleri ve mükemmeliyetçilik arasındaki ilişkiye ışık tutsa da alanda yetersiz kalmaktadır. Bu amaçla, bu çalışmada yaygın olarak kullanılan anne baba stilleri ile son zamanlarda geliştirilen ve kabul gören olumlu olumsuz mükemmeliyetçilik tanımlamaları temel alınmış ve aradaki ilişki Türk örneklemine uygun bir biçimde araştırılmıştır (Sümer ve Güngör, 1999; Ulu, 2007). Baumrind (1966) anne babaların çocuk yetiştirme stillerine bir açıklama getiren ve bunların çocuk üzerindeki etkisini göz önünde bulundurarak üç temel çocuk yetiştirme stili tanımlayan öncü kişilerden biri olarak kabul edilir. Tanımlanan bu stiller; otoriter (authoritarian), açıklayıcı/otoriter (authoritative) ve izin verici (permissive) çocuk yetiştirme biçimleridir. Daha sonra Maccoby ve Martin (1983) izin verici çocuk yetiştirme stilini ihmalkar (neglecting) ve şımartan (indulgent)

olarak iki gruba ayırınca ileri sürdükleri talepkarlık(demandingness) ve karşılık verme (responsiveness) boyutlarına dayanarak dört farklı stil kabul görmüştür. Baumrind'in sonraki yıllarda yaptığı çalışmalar da bu ayrımı desteklemektedir (1991). Talepkarlık boyutunun yüksek olduğu stillerden otoriter stilde ebeveynler katı kurallar koyarak çocuktan koşulsuz itaat beklemektedirler. Açıklayıcı/otoriter anne babalar ise kurallar koyup bunlara uyulmasını beklerken çocukların bağımsızlığını kazanmalarını desteklemektedirler. Çocukların davranışlarını kontrol altında tutarken açıklamalar yaparak çocuklar için anlamlı bir süreç oluştururlar. Açıklayıcı/otoriter stili, otoriter stilden ayıran özellik karşılık verme boyutunda açıklayıcı/otoriter ebeveynlerin daha yüksek ilgi ve sevgi göstermesidir. İzin verici/şımartan ve izin verici/ihmkar anne babalarda kontrol ve talepkarlık boyutu düşüktür. Fakat izin verici/şımartan ebeveynler ihmkar tipten farklı olarak yüksek ilgi ve sevgi gösterip çocukların hayatıyla yakından ilgilidirler. İzin verici/ihmkar ebeveynlerde ise ne çocuktan olan beklentileri, çocuğa sağladıkları kontrol seviyesi yüksektir ne de ilgilenme, kabul etme ve sevgi gösterme düzeyleri yüksektir.

Kaynaklarda gençlerle yapılan çalışmalar, açıklayıcı/otoriter ebeveynlerin çocuklarında olumlu mükemmeliyetçiliği desteklediği (Milevsky ve ark., 2007), ergenlerin olgunluk düzeylerinin daha yüksek olduğunu ve psikolojik veya davranışsal sorunlarının daha az olduğunu (Lamborn ve ark., 1991) göstermiştir. Açıklayıcı/otoriter stilin aile yapısını olumlu etkilediği, daha olumlu ve destekleyici bir aile ortamı yarattığı ortaya koyulmuştur (McGillicuddy-De Lisi & De Lisi, 2007). Farklı kültürlerde yapılan bazı çalışmalar da izin verici/şımartan stilin diğerlerine oranla en yüksek değerlerle yüksek özgüven, kişisel beceri gibi özelliklerle ilişkili olduğunu göstermiştir (Garcia ve Garcia, 2009). Kültürel farklılıklar göz önünde bulundurularak alanda daha fazla çalışmaya ihtiyaç olduğu anlaşılmaktadır.

Türk alanyazınında da ilgi çeken konular olarak çocuk yetiştirme stilleri de mükemmeliyetçilik değişik yaklaşımlarla incelenmiştir. Frost'un çok boyutlu

mükemmeliyetçilik ölçeği kullanılarak mükemmeliyetçilik ile endişe (Tuncer ve Voltan-Acar, 2006), yalnızlık (Arslan ve ark., 2010), başarı (Yıldızbaş ve Topuz, 2014), annelerdeki ve çocuklardaki mükemmeliyetçilik (Camadan, 2010) ilişkileri araştırılmıştır. Flett'in çok boyutlu mükemmeliyetçilik ölçeği ile bağlanma stilleri (Saya, 2006), utangaçlık (Koydemir, 2006), öfke (Büyükbayraktar ve Üre, 2014) ve mükemmeliyetçilik ilişkisi yapılan araştırmalar arasındadır. Bunlardan başka, alanyazındaki örneklerden esinlenerek Türkçe olarak hazırlanmış Olumlu-Olumsuz Mükemmeliyetçilik Ölçeği çalışmaları da bulunmaktadır (Kırdök, 2004). Geçerlilik ve güvenilirlik çalışmaları yapılan ilk ve orta öğretim öğrencilerine yönelik hazırlanan ölçek, başarı ve mükemmeliyetçilik ilişkisini inceleyen çalışmalarda kullanılmıştır (örneğin, Altun ve Yazıcı, 2010). Slaney ve arkadaşlarının ürettiği Olumlu ve Olumsuz Mükemmeliyetçilik Ölçeği bir çok araştırmacı tarafından değişik çalışmalarda Türkçe'ye uyarlanmıştır (bkz. Aydın, 2013; Öngen, 2009; Sapmaz, 2006; Ulu, 2007). Farklı yaklaşımlarla uyarlaması alanyazına sokulan ölçeğin Ulu tarafından yapılan çalışmada bağlanma stilleri, beş faktör kişilik özellikleri ile olumlu ve olumsuz mükemmeliyetçilik ilişkisi araştırılmıştır. Olumlu mükemmeliyetçilik ile özdisiplin, deneyime açıklık, dışadönüklük arasında pozitif bir ilişki varken nevroitiklik, bağlanma kaygısı ve kaçınmanın olumsuz mükemmeliyetçiliği tanımlayan özellikler olduğu bulunmuştur (Ulu, 2007).

Çocuk yetiştirme stilleri konusunda en çok rastlanan, biri uyarlama üç farklı ölçek kullanılmaktadır. İlki, Lamborn ve arkadaşları (1991) tarafından geliştirilen ve Yılmaz (2000) tarafından Türkçe'ye uyarlanan anne baba stilleri ölçeğidir. Yılmaz (2007) algılanan çocuk yetiştirme stilleri, bağımsızlık kazanma ve akademik başarı arasındaki ilişkiyi araştırdığında açıklayıcı/otoriter çocuk yetiştirme stiline davranışsal bağımsızlık kazanmada, duygusal bağımsızlık geliştirmede ve yüksek akademik başarıda açıklayıcı bir rolü olduğunu bulmuştur. Diğer ölçek, Kuzgun tarafından geliştirilen Eldeleklioğlu (1996) tarafından revize edilen Çocuk Yetiştirme Stilleri Envanteridir. Anne baba tutumları ve karar verme stratejileri arasındaki ilişki çalışılmış ve mantıklı karar verme ile açıklayıcı/otoriter stil arasında

olumlu ilişki varken mantıklı karar verme ile otoriter stil arasında olumsuz ilişki olduğu saptanmıştır (Eldeleklioğlu, 1996). Sonuncusu, Maccoby ve Martin (1983)'in talepkarlık ve karşılık verme iki boyutu üzerine kurulu yaklaşımından yola çıkarak kabul/ilgi ve sıkı denetim/kontrol boyutlarından oluşturulmuş Çocuk Yetiştirme Stilleri Ölçeğidir (Sümer ve Güngör, 1999). Kabul/ilgi ve sıkı/denetim kontrol boyutları çaprazlanarak açıklayıcı/otoriter, otoriter, izin verici/şımartan ve izin verici/ihmalkar stiller tanımlanmıştır. Yaptıkları çalışmada güvenli bağlanma, yüksek özgüven ve belirgin benlik algısına sahip olma açıklayıcı/otoriter ve izin verici/şımartan çocuk yetiştirme stilleriyle açıklanırken bu özellikler otoriter ve izin verici/ihmalkar stillerle olumsuz ilişkisi ortaya konmuştur.

Türk alanyazında mükemmeliyetçilik ve çocuk yetiştirme stilleri baz alınarak ilişkisel araştırmalar yapılmıştır. Oran-Pamir (2008) çalışmasında kişisel standartlar, düzenlilik, anne baba beklentileri ve ebeveynlerin eleştirmesi alt başlıklarıyla koruyucu, demokratik, otoriter çocuk yetiştirme stilleri arasında anlamlı ilişkiler olduğunu göstermiştir. Tire (2011)'nin araştırması da demokratik stil ile olumlu mükemmeliyetçilik arasında olumlu yüksek bir skor elde etmişken ihmalkar stil ile olumlu mükemmeliyetçilik arasında düşük değerler elde etmiştir.

Özetlemek gerekirse gerek mükemmeliyetçilik gerek çocuk yetiştirme stilleri alanında çok çalışılmış konular olmasına karşın tanımlamalarda farklı bakış açılarının yer alması araştırmaların çok farklı yönlerden sonuçlar elde etmelerine neden olmuştur. Son yıllarda kabul gören çalışmaları örnek alarak ve sıklıkla kullanılan ölçeklerden faydalanılarak (Sümer ve Güngör, 1999; Ulu, 2007) bu çalışmada çocuk yetiştirme stilleri ve olumlu olumsuz çok boyutlu mükemmeliyetçilik arasındaki ilişki incelenmektedir. Bu nedenle şu araştırma sorusu cevaplandırılmaya çalışılmıştır: Mükemmeliyetçiliğin boyutları olan Yüksek Standartlar, Çelişki, Düzen ile erkek ve kız öğrencilere göre algılanan çocuk yetiştirme stilleri olan otoriter, açıklayıcı/otoriter, izin verici/şımartan, izin verici/ihmalkar arasında anlamlı bir farklılık var mıdır?

Yöntem

Örnekleme

Bu araştırmaya 530 (285 kız ve 245 erkek) Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi lisans öğrencisi gönüllü olarak katılımda bulunmuştur. Öğrencilerin yaşları 15 ile 29 arasında değişirken yaş ortalamaları 20.40'tır (SS=1.89).

Kullanılan Ölçme Araçları

1. Olumlu Olumsuz Mükemmeliyetçilik Ölçeği (OOMÖ)

Johnson ve Slaney (1996) tarafından geliştirilen Olumlu Olumsuz Mükemmeliyetçilik Ölçeği 2001 yılında Slaney ve arkadaşları tarafından revize edilmiştir. 23 maddeden oluşan ölçekte Standartlar, Uyuşmazlık ve Düzen alt ölçekleri bulunmaktadır. Standartlar alt ölçeği kişinin kendi belirlediği yüksek standartları açıklarken olumlu mükemmeliyetçiliği ölçmek için tasarlanmıştır. Uyuşmazlık alt ölçeği kişinin performansı ve hedeflenen standartlar arasındaki farktan kaynaklanan huzursuzluğu açıklar ve olumsuz mükemmeliyetçiliği ölçmektedir. Düzen alt ölçeği ise kişinin tertipli ve düzenli olmaya verilen dikkati, önemi ölçmektedir. Geçerlilik güvenirlik çalışmaları bir çok çalışma ile kanıtlanmıştır (örnek olarak Suddarth ve Slaney, 2001). Türkçe'ye çevirisi ve geçerlik, güvenirlik çalışmaları Ulu (2007) tarafından yapılmıştır. Cronbach alfa katsayıları ölçeğin toplamı için .83 iken sırasıyla alt ölçekler için .78 .85 ve .86 olarak bulunmuştur. Yapılan çalışmalar OOMÖ'nun Türkçe versiyonunun, amaçlandığı gibi, olumlu ve olumsuz mükemmeliyetçiliği ölçen güvenilir bir araç olduğunu ortaya koymuştur (Ulu, 2007). Benzer şekilde şimdiki çalışma için alt gruplar aynı şekilde ayrılmış ve Cronbach alfa katsayıları alt ölçekler için sırasıyla .81, .91 ve .90 olarak bulunmuştur.

2. Çocuk Yetiştirme Stilleri Ölçeği

Kişinin kendi kendine uygulayacağı bir ölçek olan Çocuk Yetiştirme Stilleri Ölçeği Sümer ve Güngör (1999) tarafından geliştirilmiştir. Temel aldıkları yaklaşım Maccoby ve Martin (1983) tarafından önerilen iki boyutlu talepkarlık ve karşılık vermeye benzer olarak kabul/ilgi ve sıkı denetim/kontrol olarak belirlenmiştir. Bu iki boyutun çaprazlanmasından elde edilen dört çocuk yetiştirme stili sıkı denetim/kontrolün yüksek veya düşük iken kabul/ilgi boyutunun yüksek veya düşük olmasına bağlıdır. Diğer bir deyimle her iki boyutta da aldıkları skorlar medyandan yüksek olan kişiler “açıklayıcı/otoriter” gruba dahil edilirken sıkı denetim/kontrol boyutunda medyanın üzerinde puan alıp kabul/ilgi boyutunda medyanın altında olanlar “otoriter” olarak gruplanmıştır. Her iki boyutta da puanları medyanın altında olan kişiler “izin verici/ihmalkar” grubunda yer alırken sıkı denetim/kontrol boyutunda medyandan düşük, kabul/ilgi boyutunda medyanın üzerinde puan alanlar “izin verici/şımartan” grubunda tanımlanmışlardır. Orjinal çalışmada Cronbach alfa değerleri kabul/ilgi boyutu için hem annelerde hem babalarda .94, sıkı denetim/kontrol boyutu için annelerde .80 ve babalarda .70 olarak rapor edilmiştir (Sümer ve Güngör, 1999). Şimdiki çalışmada bu bulgulara paralel olarak Cronbach alfa katsayıları kabul/ilgi boyutunda babalar için .92 ve anneler için .89 iken, sıkı denetim/kontrol boyutunda babalar için .86 ve anneler için .84 olarak bulunmuştur.

Demografik Bilgi Formu

Demografik bilgi formu ile katılımcıların cinsiyeti, yaşı, bölümü, sınıfı ve anne babalarının hayatta olma durumları ile ilgili bilgiler alınmıştır.

İşlem

Uygulama yapılmadan önce ODTÜ İnsan Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu’ndan gerekli izinler alınmıştır. Gönüllülük esasına dayanan katılımı da değişik

departmanlardaki ğretim yeleri ve grevlileriyle iletiřime geilmiř ve dersten nce/ sonra anket uygulamak iin izin alınmıřtır. Tm soruları cevaplamak 15-20 dakika srmektedir.

Verilerin Analizi

Toplanan verileri analiz etmek iin oklu varyasyon analizi yntemi kullanılmıřtır. 2 (cinsiyet) X 4 (ocuk yetiřtirme stilleri) oklu analizi  farklı mkemmeliyetilik puanlarıyla karřılařtırılmıřtır. oklu varyans analizinden nce katılımcılar sıkı denetim/kontrol ve kabul/ilgi alt boyutlarında aldıkları puanlara gre drt ocuk yetiřtirme stilinden birine atanmıřtır. Analizi yapmak iin IBM SPSS 22.0 programı kullanılmıřtır.

alıřmanın Sınırlamaları

Bu alıřmada bir takım sınırlamalar bulunmaktadır. ncelikle kolaylık rneklemini kullanarak Ankara'daki tek bir kamps niversitesinden veri toplanmıřtır. rneklemden alınan sonuların tm niversite ğrencilerine genellenmesi mmkn olmayacaktır. İkinci olarak rneklemini belirli geliřim zelliklerine sahip niversite seviyesindeki bir grup oluřturmaktadır. Bunun bir sonucu olarak, deėiřkenlere baėlı olarak yař grubu zellikleri yznden farklı bir sonu iřaret etmiř olabilirler. Ayrıca, tm lekler katılımcıların kendi bařına uyguladıkları aralar oldukları iin i geerlilik iin bir tehlike oluřturabilir. Son olarak da alıřmada korelasyon dizaynı tercih edildiėi iin deėiřkenler arasında nedensellik gsterilemez.

Bulgular

1.Betimleyici İstatistik Analizi Bulguları

Ortalama ve standart sapma deėerleri alıřmada kullanılan mkemmeliyetilik alt boyutları (standartlar, uyumazlık, dzen) ve ocuk yetiřtirme

stili boyutları (hem anne hem baba için sıkı denetim/kontrol ve kabul/ilgi) olan değişkenler için hesaplanmış ve Tablo 4. 1.'de gösterilmiştir. Bulgulara göre kız öğrencilerin mükemmeliyetçilik ortalama puanları 3.67 ile 5.08 arasında değişirken erkek öğrencilerin ortalama puanları 3.71 ile 5.16 arasında değişir. Çocuk yetiştirme stillerinin sıkı denetim/kontrol boyutunda anne ölçeği için kızların ortalaması 2.43, erkeklerin ortalaması 2.42; baba ölçeği için kızların ortalaması 2.26, erkeklerin ortalaması 2.35 olarak bulunmuştur. Kabul/ilgi boyutunda anne ölçeği için kızlarda ortalama 4.00, erkeklerde ise 3.84; baba ölçeği için kızlarda ortalama 3.56 ve erkeklerde ortalama 3.44 olarak saptanmıştır.

2. Korelasyon Analizi Bulguları

Tablo 4. 2 'de görüldüğü gibi mükemmeliyetçilik alt ölçekleri birbirileriyle .19 ve .41 arasında değişen değerlerde ilişkili bulunmuştur. Cinsiyet değişkeninin sadece annelerin sıkı denetim/kontrol boyutuyla negatif yönde ilişkisi saptanmıştır ($r=-.12$, $p<0.01$). Standartlar alt ölçeğinin hiç bir çocuk yetiştirme boyutuyla ilişkisi olmadığı görülmüştür. Uyuşmazlık alt ölçeği ise, annelerin sıkı denetim/kontrol ($r=-.15$, $p<0.01$) ve kabul/ilgi ($r=-.16$, $p<0.01$) boyutlarıyla negatif yönde ilişkili babaların sıkı denetim/kontrol ($r=.24$, $p<0.01$) ve kabul/ilgi ($r=.17$, $p<0.01$) boyutlarıyla pozitif yönde ilişkili olduğu görülmüştür. Düzen alt ölçeği annelerin sıkı denetim/kontrol ($r=.13$, $p<0.01$) ve kabul/ilgi ($r=.12$, $p<0.01$) boyutlarıyla pozitif ve anlamlı ilişkiliyken babalar için verilen değerlerde ilişkisiz olduğu görülmüştür. Çocuk yetiştirme stilleri anneler için olan boyutlardaki değişkenler kendi aralarında pozitif yönde ilişkiliyken babalarla ilgili değişkenlerle negatif yönde ilişkili oldukları saptanmıştır (*Tablo 4.2.*).

3. Anneler için Çoklu Varyans Analizi Bulguları

Tablo 4.3. 'te kız ve erkek öğrencilerin annelerinin çocuk yetiştirme stilleriyle ilgili olarak mükemmeliyetçilik alt ölçeklerindeki ortalamaları ve standart sapmaları verilmiştir.

Çoklu varyans analizi annelerin çocuk yetiştirme stilleri arasında anlamlı farklılıklar ortaya koymuştur (Wilk's Lambda=.92, $p=.99$). Cinsiyet ile ilişkili veya cinsiyet ve annenin çocuk yetiştirme stilleriyle etkileşimli bir etki bulunmamıştır. Benferroni post hoc analizleri sadece Uyumsuzluk alt ölçeği için anlamlı bir farklılık ortaya koymuştur ($F(3,528) = 9.394, p=.000, \text{partial eta squared}=.997$). Annelerini izin verici/şımartan ($M=3.28$) olarak değerlendiren öğrencilerle annelerini açıklayıcı/otoriter ($M=3.89$) ve otoriter ($M=4.01$) olarak değerlendiren öğrenciler arasında Uyumsuzluk ölçeğinde anlamlı bir fark ortaya koyulmuştur. Diğer gruplamalar arasında anlamlı farklar bulunamamıştır.

4. Babalar için Çoklu Varyans Analizi Bulguları

Kız ve erkek öğrencilerin babalarının çocuk yetiştirme stilleriyle ilgili olarak mükemmeliyetçilik alt ölçeklerindeki ortalamaları ve standart sapmaları *Tablo 4.4.*'te verilmiştir.

Babaların çocuk yetiştirme stilleri arasında çoklu varyans analizine göre anlamlı farklılıklar bulunmuştur (Wilk's Lambda=.923, $p=.993$). Anne ölçeğinde olduğu gibi, cinsiyet ile ilişkili veya cinsiyet ve babanın çocuk yetiştirme stilleriyle etkileşimli anlamlı bir fark bulunmamıştır. Benferroni post hoc analizleri hem Standartlar ($F(3,520) = 2.629, p=.05, \text{partial eta squared}=.643$) hem de Uyumsuzluk ($F(3,520) = 6.830, p=.000, \text{partial eta squared}=.997$) alt ölçeği için anlamlı farklılıklar ortaya koymuştur. Tukey test sonuçları Standartlar alt ölçeğinde babalarını açıklayıcı/otoriter ($M=5.31$) olarak görenlerle babalarını otoriter ($M=4.96$) bulanlar arasında anlamlı bir fark olduğunu göstermiştir. Ayrıca, Uyumsuzluk alt

ölçeğinde babalarını izin verici/şımartan ($M=3.30$) olarak algılayan öğrencilerle babalarını açıklayıcı/otoriter ($M=3.71$) ve otoriter ($M=3.97$) olarak algılayan öğrenciler arasında anlamlı bir fark ortaya koyulmuştur. Diğer gruplamalar arasında hiç bir anlamlı fark bulunamamıştır.

Tartışma

Anneler ve babalar için yapılan değerlendirmelerde, benzer şekilde mükemmeliyetçiliğin Uyumsuzluk alt ölçeğinde, yani olumsuz mükemmeliyetçilikte, otoriter ve açıklayıcı/otoriter ebeveynlerin izin verici/şımartan olanlardan daha yüksek puanlarla değerlendirildiği görülmüştür. Diğer bir ifadeyle anne ve babaların tutumlarında sıkı denetim ve kontrolün yüksek olması olumsuz mükemmeliyetçiliğin ortaya çıkması için zemin hazırlar. Yüksek sıkı denetim/kontrol altında, kişisel standartların getirdiği beklentilerin ve asıl performansın doğurduğu sonuçların uyuşmaması kişide stres ve sıkıntı yaratmaktadır. Öğrencilerin yaşadıkları bu uyumsuzluk hissi ve sıkıntı ile anne ve babalarından algıladıkları tutum arasında doğrudan bir ilişki kurdukları çıkarılmaktadır. Frost, Lahart ve Rosenblate (1991) 'in bulgularıyla doğru orantılı olarak ebeveynlerden gelen yüksek beklenti ve sert, otoriter tutumlar mükemmeliyetçilik oluşturulmasıyla bağlantılıdır. Benzer şekilde Kawamura ve arkadaşları (2002) sert, otoriter ebeveynlikle olumsuz mükemmeliyetçilik arasında doğrudan bağlantı kurmuştur. Babaların açıklayıcı/otoriter stilleri ile otoriter stilleri arasındaki anlamlı farkın Standartlarla, yani olumlu mükemmeliyetçilikle olan ilişkisi ilgi çekicidir. Babalardan algılanan sıkı denetim/kontrolün yüksek olmasının beklendiği olduğu bu araştırma sonuçlarıyla doğru orantılıdır. Ancak çocukların sağlıklı sınırlar içerisinde daha başarılı olmak için kendilerine gerçekçi ve yüksek standartlar koyduklarına belirleyici etkenin babalarından gördükleri ilgi ve sevgi olduğu ortaya çıkmıştır.

APPENDIX E

TEZ FOTOKOPİSİ İZİN FORMU

ENSTİTÜ

Fen Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Uygulamalı Matematik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Enformatik Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>
Deniz Bilimleri Enstitüsü	<input type="checkbox"/>

YAZARIN

Soyadı : Alvan
Adı : Gizem
Bölümü : Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışmanlık

TEZİN ADI (İngilizce): Perfectionism and Perceived Parenting Style among University Students

TEZİN TÜRÜ: Yüksek Lisans Doktora

1. Tezimin tamamından kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
2. Tezimin içindekiler sayfası, özet, indeks sayfalarından ve/veya bir bölümünden kaynak gösterilmek şartıyla fotokopi alınabilir.
3. Tezimden bir bir (1) yıl süreyle fotokopi alınamaz.

TEZİN KÜTÜPHANEYE TESLİM TARİHİ: