

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/303360937>

## Turkish Version of the Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale: Reliability and Validity

**Article** in *The Family Journal* · May 2016

DOI: 10.1177/1066480716648702

---

CITATIONS

0

READS

104

**3 authors**, including:



**Asli Bugay**

Middle East Technical University

**39** PUBLICATIONS **168** CITATIONS

SEE PROFILE

**Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:**



Development of an Online Psychological Support Training for Psychological Counselors (TUBITAK 1001) [View project](#)

# Turkish Version of the Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale: Reliability and Validity

The Family Journal: Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families  
1-6

© The Author(s) 2016  
Reprints and permission:  
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav  
DOI: 10.1177/1066480716648702  
tfj.sagepub.com



Aslı Bugay<sup>1</sup>, Melek Kalkan<sup>2</sup>, and Raket Delevi<sup>3</sup>

## Abstract

The present study examined the reliability and validity of the Turkish version of the Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale (DAPS). The Turkish version of DAPS and Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS) was administered to 263 (157 female and 104 male) Turkish university students and 2 participants didn't specify their gender. Internal reliability was calculated and Cronbach's  $\alpha$  coefficients ranged between .87 and .90. Criterion validity (Pearson correlation) between the DAPS and the MPS ranged from .27 to .50. Additionally, a confirmatory factor analysis result revealed good model fit indices for the three-factor model of the DAPS. The findings suggested that the Turkish version of DAPS can be reliably used to measure participants' expectations for their partners or significant others among a Turkish sample.

## Keywords

perfectionism, dyadic perfectionism, scale, reliability, validity

Conflict is inevitable in romantic relationships. Dissolution between partners and distress in their relationships tends to negatively impact individuals' mental and physical health (Baumeister & Leary, 1995; Brown & Ryan, 2003; Shek, 1995). Many studies have been conducted to determine the factors that predict the level of maladjustment and distress in intimate relationships and relevant personal characteristics (Haring, Hewitt, & Flett, 2003). Personality traits play a significant role in perception and satisfaction of relationships. For instance, an individual may have extremely high standards for others; their preoccupation with meeting those standards may negatively impact their close relationships by creating tension and reducing flexibility within the relationship. Studies have shown that there is a link between perfectionism, relationship maladjustment, and relationship problems (Epstein & Eidelson, 1982; Hewitt, Flett, & Mikail, 1995). Even though perfectionism is considered to be a stable personality trait, relationship perceptions and dynamics play an important role in the development and maintenance of perfectionism (Lopez, Fons-Scheyd, Morúa, & Chaliman, 2006).

Perfectionism is described as setting high standards for the individual (oneself) and others and wanting everything to be in coordination (Kottman & Ashby, 2000; LoCicero, Ashby, & Kern, 2000; Rice & Preusser, 2002; Stoeber, 2012). Perfectionism has been conceptualized in a variety of ways. For instance, Rice, Ashby, and Slaney (1998) Frost, Heimberg, Hold, Mattia, and Neubauer (1993) identified two dimensions of perfectionism: positive and negative. Positive perfectionism enables the individual to set realistic goals and brings satisfaction when these targets are reached. Therefore, positive perfectionists do not feel anxious about reaching high standards (Hamachek,

1978). On the other hand, negative perfectionism involves setting unrealistic standards and not accepting any mistakes (Hamachek, 1978). Negative perfectionists are overanxious in meeting their expectations, and they feel depressed and disappointed when they cannot attain perfection (Kottman & Ashby, 2000). Negative perfectionism is closely related to negative interpersonal perceptions and judgments (Lopez et al., 2006). Thus, negative perfectionism is usually destructive to interpersonal relationships and reduces self-respect (Ashby & Rice, 2002).

Furthermore, Hewitt and Flett (1991a, 1991b) defined perfectionism as a multidimensional personality trait and identified three types of perfectionism, namely, *self-oriented perfectionism*, *other-oriented perfectionism*, and *socially prescribed perfectionism*. In self-oriented perfectionism, the individual sets unrealistic standards for himself or herself, evaluates himself or herself in an overly critical way, and has a high motivation to achieve perfection and avoid mistakes (Hewitt & Flett, 1991b, p. 457). In other-oriented

<sup>1</sup> Guidance and Psychological Counseling Program, Northern Cyprus Campus, Middle East Technical University, Guzelyurt, Turkey

<sup>2</sup> Department of Educational Science, The Guidance and Psychological Counseling Program, Ondokuz Mayıs University, Samsun, Turkey

<sup>3</sup> Department of Child and Family Studies, California State University, Los Angeles, CA, USA

## Corresponding Author:

Aslı Bugay, Guidance and Psychological Counseling Program, Northern Cyprus Campus, Middle East Technical University, Guzelyurt, KKTC, via Mersin 10, Turkey.

Email: abugay@metu.edu.tr

perfectionism, the individual sets these unrealistic standards also for significant others (Hewitt & Flett, 1991b, p. 457). Lastly, socially prescribed perfectionism entails the individual's belief or perception that their significant others have unrealistic standards for them (Hewitt & Flett, 1991b, p. 457). The individual perceives that his or her partner has unrealistic expectations, expects perfect or excellent behaviors, and thinks that the partner criticizes him or her (Hewitt & Flett, 2002). Self-oriented perfectionism tends not to be strongly associated with interpersonal behaviors; however, other-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism are linked with behaviors that may be detrimental to interpersonal relationship (Haring et al., 2003).

Studies have shown that other-oriented perfectionists have high standards in their relationships (Flett, Hewitt, Shapiro, & Rayman, 2001). These individuals form their relationships according to both their performance standards for their partners and their prejudgments about whether their partners meet these standards. If they consider their partners to meet their personal standards or perceive them as satisfactory, it is predicted that the relationship will be compatible; otherwise, it is perceived as an unsatisfactory and conflicted relationship (Lopez, Fons-Scheyd, Bush-King, & McDermott, 2011). One's idealized expectations of his or her partner and perceived contradiction regarding the partner's performance can be defined as a feature of maladaptive relationship perfectionism (Lopez et al., 2006). Unrealistic standards and expectations often cause feelings of failure and inadequacy in the partner, and the belief that the partner cannot meet these expectations often causes general dissatisfaction and anger (Hewitt et al., 1995).

Burns (1980) stressed that perfectionism can have negative implications for marriage because perfectionists react defensively to criticism; they tend to hide their flaws, and they set high standards that might cause disappointment concerning others. These high standards are usually used to create irrational relationship beliefs and unrealistic expectations (e.g., partners must be completely faithful to one another in close relationships; partners must provide practical support for each other to the utmost of their capabilities; sharing interests and hobbies keeps relationships healthy; the success of a relationship depends on how well any conflict is dealt with; and in most successful relationships, partners are completely sensitive to each other's feelings; Flett et al., 2001). Ultimately, disappointments resulting from unfulfilled expectations cause individuals' relationship satisfaction to decrease. In addition, perfectionists' high level of insensitivity and lack of positive perspectives toward their partners are directly involved in problem solving process. These individuals tend to feel desperate and powerless when they face difficulties in their relationships and they use maladaptive coping styles (Flett et al., 2001). Perfectionism in romantic relationships also has a negative impact on long-term commitment. Individuals who have perfectionist expectations of their partners get less satisfaction from the relationship and tend to show short-term commitment (Stoeber, 2012).

Overall, several studies have revealed that perfectionism is related to low-relationship satisfaction (Hewitt et al., 1995),

low-dyadic adjustment (Flett et al., 2001), relationship difficulties (Johnson & Slaney, 1996), reduced sexual satisfaction (Habke, Hewitt, & Flett, 1999), and maladaptive coping styles (Haring et al., 2003). All these studies propound the necessity and the importance of understanding of perfectionism.

There are several perfectionism scales including the Romantic Relationship Perfectionism Scale (Matte & Lafontaine, 2012) and the Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale (DAPS; Shea, Slaney, & Rice, 2006) to assess dyadic perfectionism in romantic relationships. The Romantic Relationship Perfectionism Scale, a 14-item instrument, measures perfectionism in romantic relationships in two subscales: Self-Oriented Romantic Perfectionism and Other-Oriented Romantic Perfectionism. The factor structure of this scale depends on the structural covariance level and the measurement error level (Matte & Lafontaine, 2012).

On the other hand, the DAPS, a 26-item instrument, measures dyadic perfectionism in three dimensions: high standards, discrepancy, and order. Shea, Slaney, and Rice (2006) tested the psychometric properties across two samples from different universities. Their findings validated the factor structure of the scale by confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) and provided empirical support for reliability and construct validity of the scale. Fons-Scheyd (2008) examined the relationship between the dimensions of dyadic perfectionism and other measures to test the criterion validity of the scale. Their findings showed that the DAPS scores were generally correlated with scores on relationship styles, problem solving attitudes, and respect for one's partner. In addition to these studies, Lopez, Fons-Scheyd, Morúa, and Chaliman (2006) and Slaney, Pincus, Uliaszek, and Wang (2006) provide further empirical evidence for the reliability and validity of the DAPS.

Dyadic perfectionism is a fairly new topic in Turkey and research in this area has been limited mainly due to the absence of a Turkish version of a scale to measure dyadic perfectionism. A few studies were conducted on dating and married couples where general perfectionism was examined (Bilge et al., 2010; Koydemir, Sun-Selişik, & Tezer, 2005), but dyadic perfectionism has not been researched. Although one's general perfectionism indirectly affects romantic relationships, it is suggested that dyadic perfectionism explains compatibility variance more adequately than general perfectionism (Shea et al., 2006). Therefore, adapting a dyadic perfectionism scale into the Turkish language and culture is necessary to enhance the limited empirical understanding of dyadic perfectionism in this culture. Thus, the aim of the current study was to examine the basic psychometric properties of the DAPS to encourage premarital and marital research in this topic in the Turkish culture.

## **Method**

### *Participants and Procedure*

Participants consisted of 263 (157 female and 104 male) Turkish university students and 2 participants didn't specify their gender. The ages of participants ranged between 18 and 58

years, and the mean age was 25.40 years (standard deviation [SD] = 8.57). As for the relationship status, 74% (195) of the participants were single and 26% (68) were married. One hundred and twenty-nine single participants reported being in a committed relationship. Single participants were randomly selected among college students, whereas the married participants were recruited through snow balling from university faculty. In order to see if the scale was applicable regardless of relationship status, both singles and married participants were included. The participants who were not in a romantic relationship were instructed to answer these questions based on previous relationships that they have experienced. All of the participants volunteered to participate in the current study. The completion of the survey took approximately 15–20 min.

### Instruments

**DAPS.** This scale was developed by Shea et al. (2006) to measure dyadic perfectionism in romantic relationships. The DAPS consists of 26 items and three subscales: Discrepancy Subscale, High Standards Subscale, and Order Subscale. The items are scored on a Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Sample items include “*My significant other can generally meet the standards that I have set for him or her*” and “*I have very high standards for my significant other.*” Shea et al. (2006) reported adequate psychometric properties of the DAPS with the internal reliability coefficients for total and subscores ranging between .82 and .93.

**Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS).** In order to test the criterion validity of the Turkish version of the DAPS, it was decided to use the MPS. The scale was developed by Frost, Marten, Lahart, and Rosenblate (1990) to assess several dimensions of perfectionism. MPS consists of 35 items with a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The MPS consists of six subscales: Concern Over Mistakes, Personal Standards, Parental Expectations, Parental Criticism, Doubts About Action, and Organization. The scale has adequate psychometric characteristics for use with both child and adult nonclinical populations (Ablard & Parker, 1997; Parker & Adkins, 1995). As for the psychometric properties of the Turkish version of the MPS, Özbay and Mısırlı-Taşdemir (2003) reported internal reliability coefficients for total and subscores ranging between .63 and .87. The total Cronbach’s  $\alpha$  value was found to be .83 and the split-half Cronbach’s  $\alpha$  value was found to be .80. The interitem correlation coefficients were found to be .90 for the current data.

## Results

### Translation Procedures

First, three counselors with PhD degrees who are fluent in English, working independently, translated the scale into Turkish. Then, the researchers selected the best fit translation for

**Table 1.** Parameter Estimates of the Long Version of Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale (DAPS).

Items		Factors	Weight	SE	CR
d16	←	Factor1	.372**		
d15	←	Factor1	.547**	.251	4.027
d14	←	Factor1	.488**	.443	3.916
d13	←	Factor1	.614**	.284	4.124
d12	←	Factor1	.750**	.412	4.257
d11	←	Factor1	.742**	.313	4.250
d10	←	Factor1	.654**	.314	4.170
d9	←	Factor1	.815**	.425	4.300
d8	←	Factor1	.723**	.351	4.235
d7	←	Factor1	.381**	.292	3.619
d6	←	Factor1	.718**	.414	4.231
d5	←	Factor1	.545**	.304	4.024
d4	←	Factor1	.681**	.349	4.197
d3	←	Factor1	.643**	.368	4.158
d2	←	Factor1	.423**	.250	3.752
d1	←	Factor1	.494**	.286	3.928
d17	←	Factor2	.717**		
d18	←	Factor2	.691**	.083	10.403
d19	←	Factor2	.684**	.072	10.304
d20	←	Factor2	.800**	.086	11.956
d21	←	Factor2	.700**	.084	10.546
d22	←	Factor2	.782**	.089	11.701
d23	←	Factor3	.903**		
d24	←	Factor3	.887**	.054	18.962
d25	←	Factor3	.742**	.050	14.484
d26	←	Factor3	.683**	.064	12.775

Note. CR = critical ratio.

\* $p < .05$ ; \*\* $p < .001$ .

each item from the three translated versions of the DAPS. Next, an English language teacher with a MS degree evaluated the equivalence of translation in the two languages. After all necessary modifications were made, the final version of the translation was created and this was used in the current study.

### CFA

AMOS, Version 16.0, software was used to perform the CFA. Maximum likelihood and covariance matrices were used to test the three-factor model of the Turkish version of the DAPS. Each parameter’s estimated value (column 1), standard error (column 2), and critical ratio (column 3) are presented in Table 1.

In order to evaluate the results of the structural model, the Tucker–Lewis index (TLI), the comparative fit index (CFI), the root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) were used as recommended by Kline (2005).

The findings revealed good model fit indices for the three-factor model of the DAPS,  $\chi^2(296) = 704.4$ ,  $p < .0001$ ;  $\chi^2/df$  ratio = 2.38; TLI = .89, CFI = .87, RMSEA = .073, SRMR = .076. Therefore, the goodness-of-fit indices (TLI, CFI, RMSEA, and SRMR) suggested that the model fit was adequate, and the findings confirmed the three-factor model of the DAPS, providing evidence for the construct validity.

**Table 2.** Descriptive Statistics of the DAPS and MPS.

Variables	M	SD	Minimum	Maximum	Kurtosis	Skewness	Cronbach's $\alpha$
Discrepancy	35.73	10.86	16	65	-0.10	0.64	
High standards	20.00	5.17	6	30	-0.25	-0.14	.90
Order	16.05	2.83	4	20	1.17	-1.33	.87
DAPS total	71.65	14.33	31	115	0.46	0.51	.88
MPS	99.23	17.18	47	163	0.48	0.29	.90

Note. DAPS = Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale; MPS = Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale.

### Criterion-Related Validity

Criterion-related validity of the scale was calculated based on the correlation between the Turkish versions of DAPS and MPS. The Pearson correlation coefficient revealed significant positive correlation between DAPS and MPS scores ( $r = .50$ ,  $p < .01$ ), suggesting that participants with a high-DAPS score tended to score higher on MPS. Significant positive correlations were found between the Discrepancy Subscale and MPS scores ( $r = .38$ ,  $p < .001$ ), between the High Standard Subscale and MPS scores ( $r = .45$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and between the Order Subscale and MPS scores ( $r = .27$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

### Descriptive Statistics and Reliability

The range, means, *SDs*, kurtosis, skewness, and Cronbach's  $\alpha$  coefficients of the variables are presented in Table 2. In order to provide evidence of reliability, the internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach's  $\alpha$ ) was calculated for the Turkish version of DAPS. Cronbach's coefficient  $\alpha$  for DAPS total was  $\alpha = .90$ , Discrepancy Subscale  $\alpha = .90$ , High Standards Subscale  $\alpha = .87$ , and Order Subscale  $\alpha = .88$ , indicating adequate internal consistency.

### Discussion

Perfectionism appears to be an important factor in a variety of aspects of romantic relationships including marital satisfaction and marital commitment (Stoeber, 2012). Although research in this area has been increasing in the United States, there is limited research in this area in Turkey. This is mainly due to the lack of a reliable and valid scale. In order to examine perfectionism in romantic relationships in Turkey, valid and reliable assessment is crucial. Driven by this motivation, this study investigated the reliability and validity of the Turkish version of the DAPS among Turkish participants.

CFA was performed to test the construct validity of the scale. The results of the CFA showed that the tree-factor model of the DAPS provided an adequate fit for the current data. Further, correlational analyses were performed to test the criterion-related validity of the scale. The findings revealed significant positive correlation between the DAPS and MPS scores. Particularly, significant positive correlations were found between the Discrepancy Subscale and MPS scores, between the High Standard Subscale and MPS scores, and between the Order Subscale and MPS scores. Thus, dyadic

perfectionism was found to be associated with higher multidimensional perfectionism in the expected direction. Finally, the internal consistency coefficient (Cronbach's  $\alpha$ ) indicated high-internal consistency estimates for the scale. The results show that the DAPS can be reliably utilized to measure dyadic perfectionism among Turkish married individuals.

The current study should be evaluated in the context of several limitations. First, sample was a convenience sample which prevents us from generalizing the results. Second, we did not conduct test-retest reliability which would have provided more information about the consistency of the instrument. Furthermore, the cross-cultural nature of this study was another limitation. Future studies should look at this scale in longitudinal designs to see how perfectionism changes over-time. The validity and reliability findings that were obtained through this study have limitations within the frame of the sample, on which the study was conducted. If we use the scale in samples that are differentiated qualitatively and quantitatively, we can reach more powerful and generalized findings regarding the validity and reliability of the scale.

Considering the negative impact of perfectionism on relationship and overall well-being has important clinical implications for marriage and family therapists. This scale can be used as an assessment tool to give Turkish clinicians an understanding of partners' levels of perfectionism. Raising partners' self-awareness about own and partner's perfectionism can be of great help in couple's understanding of their relational dynamic. In addition, research in this area underlines the importance of psychoeducation about the negative impact of perfectionism in romantic relationships. Given that perfectionism has negative impacts on romantic relationships such as propensity to criticism, defensiveness, disappointment, irrational beliefs, and unrealistic expectations, defensively to criticism (Burns, 1980), talking about this personality trait with couples can have preventative as well as interventional value.

This scale is also important in furthering research in this area. The fact that the DAPS is able to distinguish between the perfectionism in romantic relationships and general perfectionism is important for the related studies that will be carried out in the future.

Overall, this study provides a good introduction to the psychometric properties of the scale. New psychometric research needs to be conducted with the intention of examining the use of the scale in applications in Turkey. The comparison of dyadic perfectionism levels of people who have low relationship

and marriage satisfaction or who are divorced would contribute greatly to the scale's validity.

### Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

### References

- Ablard, K. E., & Parker, W. D. (1997). Parents' achievement goals and perfectionism in their academically talented children. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 26*, 651–668.
- Ashby, J. S., & Rice, K. G. (2002). Perfectionism, dysfunctional attitudes, and self-esteem: A structural equations analysis. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 80*, 197–203.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin, 117*, 497–529. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.117.3.497
- Bilge, F., Doğan, N., Gençtanırım, D., Arıcıoğlu, A., Yalçın, İ., Baydan, Y., . . . Sarı, T. (2010). Çok boyutlu ilişkiler üzerine bir araştırma. *Eğitim Araştırmaları, 41*, 37–53.
- Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: Mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 822–848.
- Burns, D. D. (1980). The perfectionist scrip for self-defeat. *Psychology Today, 14*, 34–51.
- Epstein, N. B., & Eidelson, R. J. (1982). Cognition and relationship maladjustment: Development of a measure of dysfunctional relationship beliefs. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 50*, 715–720.
- Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., Shapiro, B., & Rayman, J. (2001). Perfectionism, beliefs, and adjustment in dating relationships. *Current Psychology, 20*, 289–312.
- Fons-Scheyd, A. L. (2008). Further validation of a measure of dyadic perfectionism. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 68*, 2826.
- Frost, R. O., Heimberg, R. G., Holt, C. S., Mattia, J. L., & Neubauer, A. L. (1993). A comparison of two measures of perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 14*, 119–126.
- Frost, R. O., Marten, P., Lahart, C., & Rosenblate, R. (1990). The dimensions of perfectionism. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 14*, 449–468. doi:10.1007/BF01172967
- Habke, A. M., Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1999). Perfectionism and sexual satisfaction in intimate relationships. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 21*, 307–322.
- Hamachek, D. E. (1978). Psychodynamics of normal and neurotic perfectionism. *Psychology: A Journal of Human Behavior, 15*, 27–33.
- Haring, M., Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (2003). Perfectionism, coping, and quality of intimate relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 55*, 143–158.
- Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1991a). Dimensions of perfectionism in unipolar depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 100*, 98–101.
- Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1991b). Perfectionism in the self and social contexts: Conceptualization, assessment, and association with psychopathology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 456–470.
- Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (2002). Perfectionism, stress, and coping in maladjustment. In G. L. Flett & P. L. Hewitt (Eds.), *Perfectionism: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 253–285). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Hewitt, P. L., Flett, G. L., & Mikail, S. F. (1995). Perfectionism and relationship adjustment in pain patients and their spouses. *Journal of Family Psychology, 9*, 335–347.
- Johnson, D. P., & Slaney, R. B. (1996). Perfectionism: Scale development and a study of perfectionistic clients in counseling. *Journal of College Student Development, 37*, 29–41.
- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford.
- Kottman, T., & Ashby, J. S. (2000). Perfectionistic children and adolescents: Implications for school counselors. *Professional School Counseling, 3*, 182–188.
- Koydemir, S., Sun-Selişik, Z. E., & Tezer, E. (2005). Evlilik uyumu ve mükemmeliyetçilik boyutları arasındaki ilişkiler. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi, 3*, 65–75.
- LoCicero, K. A., Ashby, J. S., & Kern, R. (2000). Multidimensional perfectionism and lifestyle approaches in middle school students. *Journal of Individual Psychology, 56*, 419–434.
- Lopez, F. G., Fons-Scheyd, A., Bush-King, I., & McDermott, R. C. (2011). A latent class analysis of dyadic perfectionism in a college sample. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 44*, 32–51.
- Lopez, F. G., Fons-Scheyd, A., Morúa, W., & Chaliman, R. (2006). Dyadic perfectionism as a predictor of relationship continuity and distress among college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*, 543–549.
- Matte, M., & Lafontaine, M. F. (2012). Assessment of romantic perfectionism: Psychometric properties of the romantic relationship perfectionism scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 45*, 113–132.
- Özbay, Y., & Mısırlı-Taşdemir, Ö. (2003). Çok boyutlu mükemmeliyetçilik ölçeği: geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması. VII. Ulusal Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Kongresi, 9-11 Temmuz 2003, İnönü Üniversitesi, Malatya, Turkey.
- Parker, W. D., & Adkins, K. K. (1995). A psychometric examination of the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 17*, 323–334.
- Rice, K. G., Ashby, J. S., & Slaney, R. B. (1998). Self-esteem as a mediator between perfectionism and depression: A structural equations analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45*, 304–314.
- Rice, K. G., & Preusser, K. J. (2002). The adaptive/ maladaptive perfectionism scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 34*, 210–222.
- Shea, A. J., Slaney, R. B., & Rice, K. G. (2006). Perfectionism in intimate relationships: The Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 39*, 107–125.

- Shek, D. T. L. (1995). Marital quality and psychological well-being of married adults in a Chinese context. *Journal of Genetic Psychology, 156*, 45–56.
- Slaney, R. B., Pincus, A. L., Uliaszek, A. A., & Wang, K. T. (2006). Conceptions of perfectionism and interpersonal problems evaluating groups using the structural summary method for circumplex data. *Assessment, 13*, 138–153.
- Stoeber, J. (2012). Dyadic perfectionism in romantic relationships: Predicting relationship satisfaction and longterm commitment. *Personality and Individual Differences, 53*, 300–305.