

**INVESTIGATION ABOUT PERFECTIONISM AS A PREDICTOR OF PROBLEM-
SOLVING SKILLS AND ROMANTIC RELATIONSHIP SATISFACTION OF
MARRIED INDIVIDUALS**

By

İLKNUR KAYNAR

**DISSERTATION SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE MASTER’S DEGREE IN THE GUIDANCE AND
PSYCHOLOGICAL COUNSELING PROGRAM**

YEDİTEPE UNIVERSITY

June, 2022

THESIS SUBMISSION and APPROVAL FORM

TITLE: Investigation about perfectionism as a predictor of problem-solving skills and romantic relationship satisfaction of married individuals

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Serdar Körük
(Advisor)

(Signature)

.....

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Zerrin Bölükbaşı Macit
(Member)

(Signature)

.....

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi Burcu Aykaç
(Member)

.....

(Signature)

TESLİM EDEN : İlknur Kaynar
TEZ SAVUNMA TARİHİ : 06.06.2022
TEZ ONAY TARİHİ :

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 rules that are not original to this work.

Name, Last Name: İlknur Kaynar

Signature:

ABSTRACT

The aim of the study is to examine how the perfectionism levels of married individuals predict their problem-solving skills and romantic relationship satisfaction. In addition, the relationship between perfectionism, romantic relationship satisfaction and problem-solving skills of married individual according to demographic variables like gender, age, education level, income level, meeting with spouse, duration of marriage and number of child was examined. 522 married individuals (287 female, 235 male) were administered using Demographic Information Form, Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale (DAPS), Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) and Marital Problem-Solving Scale (MPSS). The data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 25.0 package program. Correlational research method was used to examine the relationship between study variables and demographic variables. In order to answer the research questions, Multiple Regression analysis, Independent T-Test analysis and One Way ANOVA analysis methods were used. According to the results, it was found that the Perfectionism positively correlated with all sub-dimension of own and negatively correlated with the Romantic Relationship Satisfaction and Problem Solving Skills scales. The difference sub-dimension of perfectionism negatively predicted the romantic relationship satisfaction and problem solving skills. High standards sub-dimension of perfectionism positively predicted problem solving skills in marriage. Lastly, significant differences were found between the variables and gender, education level, income level, meeting with spouse, duration of marriage and number of child of the participants. The results were discussed and some suggestions were made.

Keywords: Perfectionism, Romantic Relationship Satisfaction, Problem Solving Skills in Marriage.

ÖZET

Araştırmanın amacı evli bireylerin mükemmeliyetçilik düzeylerinin problem çözme becerilerini ve romantik ilişki doyumlarını nasıl yordadığını incelemektir. Ayrıca evli bireylerin cinsiyet, yaş, eğitim düzeyi, gelir düzeyi, eşle görüşme, evlilik süresi ve çocuk sayısı gibi demografik değişkenlere göre mükemmeliyetçilik, romantik ilişki doyumu ve problem çözme becerileri arasındaki ilişki incelenmiştir. 522 evli bireye (287 kadın, 235 erkek) Demografik Bilgi Formu, İkili İlişkilerde Olumlu Olumsuz Mükemmeliyetçilik Ölçeği (İİOOMÖ), İlişki Doyum Ölçeği (İDÖ) ve Evlilikte Sorun Çözme Ölçeği (ESÇÖ) uygulandı. Veriler Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) 25.0 paket programı kullanılarak analiz edildi. Çalışma değişkenleri ile demografik değişkenler arasındaki ilişkiyi incelemek için ilişkisel araştırma yöntemi kullanılmıştır. Araştırma sorularını cevaplamak için Çoklu Regresyon analizi, Bağımsız T-Testi analizi ve Tek Yönlü ANOVA analizi yöntemleri kullanılmıştır. Elde edilen sonuçlara göre Mükemmeliyetçiliğin kendi alt boyutlarının tümü ile pozitif, Romantik İlişki Doyumu ve Problem Çözme Becerileri ölçekleri ile negatif yönde ilişkili olduğu bulunmuştur. Mükemmeliyetçiliğin farklılık alt boyutu romantik ilişki doyumunu ve problem çözme becerilerini olumsuz yönde yordamaktadır. Mükemmeliyetçiliğin yüksek standartlar alt boyutu evlilikte problem çözme becerilerini pozitif olarak yordamaktadır. Son olarak katılımcıların cinsiyet, eğitim düzeyi, gelir düzeyi, eşle görüşme, evlilik süresi ve çocuk sayısı değişkenleri arasında anlamlı farklılıklar bulunmuştur. Sonuçlar tartışılmış ve bazı önerilerde bulunulmuştur.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Mükemmeliyetçilik, Romantik İlişki Doyumu, Evlilikte Problem Çözme Becerileri.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I would like to thank to my precious supervisor Assist. Prof. Serdar KÖRÜK. He guided me with his wisdom, experience, patience and devotion throughout my thesis period.

I would like to express my deepest and sincerest regards to my dear husband, Muhammet Esat KAYNAR, who gave me hope and motivated me when I was bored and struggling while writing my thesis. I would like to express my deepest love to my little daughter Zümra KAYNAR, who made me forget all the difficulties I went through with her hug, and to my little daughter Efnan KAYNAR, who grew up inside me and shared my stress with me during this process. I promise to do my best to be a worthy mother to you. Also, I can never forget the emotional support of my dear mother Emine DEMİR and my family.

Finally, I dedicate my thesis to my good-hearted father, Mustafa KAYNAR, who the most honest and hardworking person I have ever seen in my life. Rest in peace my dear father.

Table of Contents

TITLE PAGE	iv
THESIS SUBMISSION and APPROVAL FORM	v
DEDICATION FORM.....	iii
ABSTRACT.....	iv
ÖZET.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vii
 1. INTRODUCTION	 1
1.1. Problem Statement.....	4
1.2. Purpose of the Study	5
1.3. Importance of the Study.....	6
1.4. Assumptions.....	8
1.5. Limitations	8
1.6. Definitions.....	8
1.7. Abbreviations	9
2.LITERATURE REVIEW	9
2.1.Problem-Solving Skills.....	9
2.1.1. Problem Solving.....	9
2.1.2. Stages of the Problem-Solving Process.....	12
2.1.3. Factors Affecting Problem Solving.....	14
2.1.4. Theories about Problem-Solving Skills.....	16
2.1.4.1. John Dewey's Reflective Thinking Theory.....	16
2.1.4.2. Bandura's Problem-Solving and Self-Efficacy Model.....	16
2.1.4.3. Hermann's Creative Problem-Solving Model	16
2.1.4.4. Mountrose and the 5-Stage Problem-Solving Model	16
2.1.4.5. Problem-Solving Model in Köhler's Insight Learning.....	16
2.1.4.6. Thorndike's Problem-Solving by Trial and Error Model.....	19
2.1.4.7. Karl Popper's Problem-Solving Theory	19

2.1.5. Problem Solving Skills in Marriage	20
2.2. Romantic Relationship Satisfaction	22
2.2.1. Romantic Relationship	22
2.2.2. Relationship Satisfaction.....	27
2.2.3. Theories of Romantic Relationships	29
2.2.3.1. Sternberg's Triangular Theory of Love	29
2.2.3.2. Rusbult's Investment Model.....	30
2.2.3.3. Stendhal's Passionate Love Theory	31
2.2.3.4. Romantic Intimacy Theory	32
2.2.3.5. Colour Wheel Theory of Love.....	32
2.3. Perfectionism.....	33
2.3.1. Theories of Perfectionism.....	35
2.3.1.1. Psychoanalytic Theory.....	35
2.3.1.2. Individual Psychology	35
2.3.1.3. Holistic Theory	357
2.3.1.4. Cognitive Theory	358
2.3.1.5. Rational Emotive Behaviour Therapy	39
2.3.1.6. Social Learning Theory	40
2.3.2 Dimensions of Perfectionism	40
2.3.3 Causes of Perfectionism.....	44
2.3.4 Effects of Perfectionism.....	45
2.4. Research Analysing the Relationships between Perfectionism and Relationship Satisfaction.....	47
2.5. Research Analysing the Relationships between Perfectionism and Problem Solving Skills	47
3. METHOD	53
3.1. Design.....	53
3.2. Study Group.....	53
3.3. Data Collection Tools.....	533
3.3.1. Demographic Information Form	53
3.3.2. The Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale	54
3.3.3. Relationship Assessment Scale	55
3.3.4. Marital Problem-Solving Scale	56
3.4. Data Collection Process.....	56

3.5. Analysis of Data	56
4. FINDINGS	57
4.1. Preliminary Analyses.....	58
4.2. Research Results/Findings.....	58
5. RESULTS	75
6. DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS	78
6.1. DISCUSSION.....	78
6.1.1. Romantic Relationship Satisfaction Regression Findings	78
6.1.2. Problem-Solving Skills Regression Findings.....	80
6.1.3. Discussion Related to Gender	82
6.1.4. Discussion Related to Age	83
6.1.5. Discussion Related to Educational Status	84
6.1.6. Discussion Related to Income Level	85
6.1.7. Discussion Related to Meeting the Spouse	86
6.1.8. Discussion Related to Duration of the Marriage	87
6.1.9. Discussion Related to Number of Children.....	89
6.2. SUGGESTIONS	90
6.2.1. Suggestions Related to the Academic Studies	90
6.2.2. Suggestions Related to Practice	91
REFERENCES	92
7.APPENDICES	120

Lists of Tables

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample.....	52
Table 2. Mean Scores of the Perfectionism, R.R.S and P.S.S Scales and Difference, High Standards and Order Subscales.....	58
Table 3. Independent samples t-test results related to Perfectionism, R.R.S, P.S.S Scales, Difference, High Standards and Order Subscales with regard to gender	59
Table 4. Correlation Analysis Between Age, Perfectionism, R.R.S, P.S.S Scales, Difference, High Standards and Order Subscales	60

Table 5. One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results related to Perfectionism, R.R.S, P.S.S Scales, Difference, High Standards and Order Subscales with regard to education levels	60
Table 6. Tukey post hoc test results of Education Level	61
Table 7. One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results related to Perfectionism, R.R.S, P.S.S Scales, Difference, High Standards and Order Subscales with regard to income level .	62
Table 8. Tukey post hoc test results of Income Level	63
Table 9. One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results related to Perfectionism, R.R.S, P.S.S Scales, Difference, High Standards and Order Subscales with regard to meeting with spouse.....	64
Table 10. Tukey post hoc test results of Meeting With Spouse.....	65
Table 11. One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results related to Perfectionism, R.R.S, P.S.S Scales, Difference, High Standards and Order Subscales with regard to duration of the marriage	67
Table 12. Tukey post hoc test results of Duration of Marriage	68
Table 13. One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results related to Perfectionism, R.R.S, P.S.S Scales, Difference, High Standards and Order Subscales with regard to number of the children	69
Table 14. Tukey post hoc test results of Number of Children	70
Table 15. Correlation Analysis Between Perfectionism, R.R.S, P.S.S Scales, Difference, High Standards and Order Subscales	72
Table 16. Regression Findings of Romantic Relationship Satisfaction.....	74
Table17. Regression Findings of Problem Solving Skills	74

1. INTRODUCTION

Perfectionism can be defined as individual's constantly setting high standards for themselves and others and trying to protect them (Hill et al.1997; Rice et al. 1998), as well as the desire to reach the highest standard that is established (Frost et al. 1990). It is thought that setting standards can have positive results for individuals; in other words, perfectionism can cause perfection to be perceived as a positive concept for the development of the individual. Based on this point, researchers revealed that perfectionism has a multidimensional structure (Frost et al., 1990; Hewitt & Flett, 1991; Rice & Mirzadeh, 2000).

Slaney and Johnson (1992) divided perfectionism in two as positive and negative. Slaney and Johnson classified perfectionism as high standards, order and difference. The "high standards" dimension is the individual setting high personal standards and the level of self-expectancy, the "order" dimension involves the individual's need and preference for order and organization, and the "difference" dimension is the perception of the discrepancy between the individual's standards and their performance and the level of discomfort caused by this situation (Slaney et al., 2001). In general, studies suggest that the "difference" subscale is related to the negative aspects of perfectionism and the "high standards" and "order" subscales are related to the positive aspects of perfectionism (Ashby & Rice, 2002; Ashby et al., 2002; Parker, 1997; Rice & Lapsley, 2001; Rice et al., 2005, Slaney et al., 2001). This classification was created in order to measure the dual perfectionism levels of individuals, to determine the effect of their high performance standards on their partners and to what extent their partners fit their own expectations and how far they deviate from their expectations.

It is natural that perfectionism, which is effective in all areas of life, also affects dyadic relationships. The negative aspects of perfectionism are thought to have negative effects in interpersonal relationships and especially in romantic relationships (Habke and

Flynn, 2002). At the same time, it is claimed that perfectionism is compatible with relationship problems and dyadic couple adjustment decreases with the increase in perfectionism (Hewitt, Flett & Mikail, 1995).

Human beings are social organisms who interact with other individuals from the moment they are born. Caregivers, family, relatives, friendships and romantic relationships are different social relation areas that occur during human life. Satisfaction is felt in social areas where people largely depend on the quality of relationships with other individuals, including interpersonal interactions (Dwyer, 2000). Romantic relationships are a type of intimate relationship that includes passion, intimacy and commitment voluntarily accepted between two individuals (Connolly & McIsaac, 2011). Although intimate relationships begin in adolescence, they are social interactions that become very important in young adulthood. Healthy resolution of developmental crises in young adulthood is the basis for establishing healthy and satisfying close relationships in other stages of development (Erikson, 1984). Although it is important to establish a relationship and to get satisfaction from this relationship in every period of life, it is thought that establishing a romantic relationship and getting satisfaction from these relationships during young adulthood has particular importance. In this period, young adults are expected to accomplish development tasks such as choosing a spouse, living with a spouse and establishing a family (Havighurst, 1956).

Marriage is defined as the most important and basic human relationship as it provides a basic structure in terms of establishing family relationships and continuing to the next generation (Larson & Holman, 1994). In many different cultures, marriage has regulated the relationships between males and females for centuries and has enabled society to function with a certain order. People have tried to secure the continuation of their generation through marriage. Marriage is an institution that enables people to lead an orderly life and as a result directs people to comply with social rules (Bacanli, 2001).

Considering the importance of romantic relationships, one of the primary variables that determine the quality of relationships is relationship satisfaction. Relationship satisfaction is individuals' subjective evaluations of their relationships. According to Sabatelli (1988), relationship satisfaction is explained as the relationship between the expectations of individuals and the expectations of their partners. According to Hendrick (1988), relationship satisfaction generally refers to one's sexual attitudes, attachment, self-disclosure, and investment in the relationship in relation to emotions, thoughts, and behaviours in the relationship. In romantic relationships, couples often tend to evaluate their relationships, and this situation influences the couples' subjective well-being, relationship continuity and relationship satisfaction (Hinde, 1997). The satisfaction they obtain from the relationship is important to maintain a healthy relationship between couples, but it makes no sense to think that interpersonal relationships are completely unproblematic. There may be conflicts and problems in all types of human relationships, including close relationships, and all of these can negatively affect the individual's satisfaction with the relationship (Çırakoğlu & Tezer, 2010). For this reason, it is important to investigate the causes of problems in relationships and find the source of the problem.

Kalkan (2008) explained problem solving in romantic relationships as follows; it is the behaviour of partners in attempting to understand each other, express their feelings, and address each other's needs, feelings and thoughts. However, this definition is valid for solution strategies attempting to solve a relationship problem in a positive way, and inappropriate problem-solving forms can also be seen in these relationships. Because of this, people use different methods to solve their problems. These methods vary according to the environment in which people live, their personal characteristics, the education they receive, their discipline, their parents, and teachers; in short, the people and factors that affect them in their life (Özcan, 2007).

According to Cramer (2002), every step taken to solve problems in the relationship improves the relationship and increases the satisfaction received from the relationship. Conflict is inevitable in a romantic relationship. Gottman and Krokoff (1989) stated that problems arising from communication and deficiencies in conflict resolution skills cause problems in romantic relationships. Happiness in marriage is related to the couples' relationship skills, and problem solving is a very important relationship skill. According to studies about problem solving in marriage, effective problem-solving skills for marital problems contribute significantly to marital satisfaction (Erbek, Beştepe, Akar, Eradamlar, & Alpkın, 2005).

1.1. Problem Statement

Considering the breadth of the concept of perfectionism, it is normal for it to affect dyadic relationships as it is seen in many areas of life. Considering interpersonal relationships, it is thought that the negative aspects of perfectionism cause negative effects especially in romantic relationships (Habke and Flynn, 2002). In addition, it was argued that perfectionism is compatible with relationship problems and that dyadic couple adjustment decreases with the increase in perfectionism (Hewitt, Flett, & Mikail, 1995).

Social scientists have long focused on close relationship dynamics. They investigated the processes related to the establishment, continuation or termination of close relationships. Many researchers think that positive effects such as attraction, satisfaction and love ensure the permanence of a relationship, and they assume that the relationship will continue as long as the partners love each other and are happy and satisfied in their relationship (Berscheid, 1994).

According to Özabacı (2004), in a romantic relationship in which individuals know both themselves and the other person, the individual has certain expectations and needs. Though partners have similar expectations and needs in the relationship, these needs may

differ from time to time. With the differentiation of needs, problems may arise between partners, and the romantic relationship ceases to occur in the way idealised by the individual. Human relations are normally not entirely smooth and free from problems. Problems, conflicts, or dissatisfaction inevitably arise in all forms of interpersonal relationships, including romantic relationships (Çırakoğlu & Tezer, 2010).

Conflict is a natural element of human communication. Even the most successful and happy families have problems from time to time. The main reason for conflict is that two people have different expectations, needs, values or approaches. Conflict occurs when a person feels hindered in reaching their goal. Long-term marriages are the result of the couple's ability to solve problems. The quality of communication between spouses and their efforts to solve their problems affect the entire family. At this point, the task of family members is to learn how to solve their problems effectively. What matters is not the family's disagreements, conflicts, or problems, but how they react to this situation (Canel, 2011).

In this study, the aim is to examine the relationship between perfectionism of married individuals with romantic relationship satisfaction (RRS) and problem-solving skills (PSS) within their romantic relationships. In this context, the predictive level of perfectionism and PSS on RRS was examined.

1.2. Purpose of the Study

1. What is the predictive role of perfectionism levels of married individuals on problem-solving skills and romantic relationship satisfaction?
2. Do the perfectionism levels, problem-solving skills and romantic relationship satisfaction of married individuals differ according to;
 - a. gender?
 - b. age?
 - c. education level?

- d. socio-economic status?
- e. how they met their spouse?
- f. marital duration?
- g. having children?

1.3. Importance of the Study

The concept of perfectionism was the subject of many studies. But perfectionism in RRS and problem-solving skills concepts were not studied together. In this study, the individual's perfectionism, relationship satisfaction, problem-solving skills, age, gender, education level and attitudes were considered to be important.

The basis of this research is constituted by whether or not these factors significantly affect the individual's positive or negative perfectionist attitude. Considering that relationship satisfaction is an important predictor of the duration of marriage, it is remarkable that married individuals evaluate their relationships and are aware of their level of satisfaction from their romantic relationships. In addition, from the perspective of counsellors, understanding factors related to relationship satisfaction and benefiting clients who experience difficulties in their relationships seems critical in helping individuals to use their problem-solving skills in their relationships. In this respect, it is important to include variables that may affect the relationship satisfaction of married individuals in this study. One of these variables, perfectionism was included in the study and deemed worthy of research due to its dynamic nature in the development and maintenance of relationships (Lopez, Fons-Scheyd, Morua, & Chaliman, 2006). Similarly, problem-solving skills are deemed worthy of research, as they can be developed and are beneficial for individuals to develop healthy marital lives. As a result, the concept of perfectionism in romantic relationships is a very important concept that affects the relationship satisfaction and quality. In particular, individuals' PSS and RRS are

thought to be important predictors of self-oriented, other-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism.

Relationship satisfaction has a key role in the continuity of the marital relationship, which is important for the family and the whole society, and for an effective marital relationship. In this context, it is thought that the study will contribute to understanding how problem-solving skills used in the resolution of conflicts inevitably experienced in marital relationships are shaped by relationship satisfaction and perfectionism.

Romantic relationship satisfaction (RRS) enables individuals to experience pleasure and happiness derived from their romantic relationships by increasing the lifespan of their relationship. Nowadays, it is known that individuals experience attachment and trust problems after relationships end, as well as these relationships subsequently causing negative effects such as depression and anxiety. Therefore, it is predicted that a study about relationship satisfaction, which increases the quality of life of individuals and enables them to enjoy their relationships, will be important for married individuals.

Relationship satisfaction can be defined as the feelings, thoughts, and pleasure that individuals get from their romantic relationships. There are many factors that increase or decrease relationship satisfaction. It is thought that this study about relationship satisfaction, enabling individuals to enjoy their romantic relationships, will be important for married individuals. In the literature review about relationship satisfaction, the concept of perfectionism draws attention as it may have an impact on relationship satisfaction. As perfectionism can affect many areas of an individual's life, it can also affect their close relationships. This research was conducted considering that perfectionism will also affect satisfaction in romantic relationships.

The relationship of these variables with each other was examined and is thought to contribute to the literature. In addition to all these, the variables discussed in the research are

the topics that were recently studied around the world and in our country and therefore this study is important in terms of contributing to the literature about current issues. This research will form an original study that contributes to the field in the literature.

1.4. Assumptions

1. It is assumed that the participants in the research sample gave correct answers to the relevant forms and scales.
2. It is assumed that the scales used in this study (Relationship Assessment Scale, Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale and Marital Problem-Solving Scale) are valid and reliable.
3. It is assumed that the method chosen is suitable for the purpose, subject and problem in this research.

1.5. Limitations

1. The research group is limited to married individuals.
2. The data was collected using Google forms in 2021.
3. The variables examined in the study are limited by the measuring power of the self-reported measurement tools used.

1.6. Definitions

Romantic Relationship: This is defined as an on-going voluntary interaction that is mutually aware and is notable for a “special intensity” that can be accompanied by expressions of interest (Collins, 2003).

Romantic Relationship Satisfaction (RRS): RRS refers to the assessment that positive characteristics are more pronounced than negative characteristics in relationships (Bradbury, Fincham & Beach, 2000).

Perfectionism: This is expressed as the individual's constant determination of very high standards both for themselves and others and trying to preserve these high standards continuously (Frost, Heimberg, Holt, Mattia & Neubauer, 1993).

Problem Solving: This is the behaviour of partners in a romantic relationship to try to understand each other, express their feelings, and tend to each other's needs, feelings and thoughts (Kalkan, 2008).

1.7. Abbreviations

RAS: Relationship Assessment Scale

DAPS: Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale

MPSS: Marital Problem-Solving Scale

RRS: Romantic Relationship Satisfaction

PSS: Problem-Solving Skills

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

This section includes the literature about perfectionism, RRS and problem-solving skills. In this context, definitions of these concepts from past to present are given first. Then, the views of the theorists who contributed to the development of these concepts are explained. The reasons for these concepts and effects of these concepts on people are emphasised. Finally, the literature review ends by including national and international studies.

2.1. Problem-Solving Skills

2.1.1. Problem Solving

People often state that they have a problem when they encounter a difficult or unknown situation and have no way to find a solution to that event. Problem solving is the process of resolving this new situation and reaching a solution. This process ends when an

individual begins to understand all aspects of this problem and a satisfactory answer is found. Problem solving can be explained as knowing what needs to be done to reach a solution when the solution is not understood quickly (Cooper, 1986). In other words, problem solving is a serious cognitive process that takes place almost every day in daily life (Nokes, Schunn, & Chi, 2010). Solving the problem is not perceived as only finding a correct result, but rather an action that involves a mental process and abilities. Resolving a problem is also expressed as finding a way, getting rid of a difficulty, and deliberately searching for actions that can be taken to reach a goal in the most convenient way (Polya, 1957).

The concept of problem solving was first used in the field of medical education by Howard Barrows in the 1960s. In the field of education, it was first used and systematised by the American educator John Dewey (Dewey, 1910). According to Korsunsky (2003), a problem is defined as a task that cannot be solved within the scope of the person's current experience, but can be solved with creative thinking. The information required for solution is not specified. According to cognitive psychology, a problem occurs when there is no already visible standard or routine way to achieve a goal (Smith & Kosslyn, 2014).

According to Cüceloğlu (2009), problems have emotional, economic and physical dimensions. Problems can be long or short, and similarly simple or complex. These different types of problems can be mixed into each other and turn into larger and more complex problems. According to Robertson (2001), individuals are faced with a problem situation when they do not know how to reach their goals. If what to do about the situation is known, this is not a problem. However, if what needs to be done to reach the goal is not known exactly, there is a problem situation.

Zadnik and Loss (1995) defined problem solving as skills used in solving complex problems encountered in daily life. Ittenbach and Harrison (1990) stated that problem-solving skills are the accumulation of solution-oriented actions used by the individual to cope with

problems encountered in daily life from past experiences to the present, and the way of perceiving these experiences. Problem solving means “what individuals feel when they face daily problems, what they think, how they behave and how they deal with them” (Heppner, 1987). In other words, problem solving is defined as "the cognitive and behavioural process that involves creating effective response options to cope with a problematic situation and choosing the most appropriate" (D’Zurilla & Goldfried, 1971).

Problem solving is "the process of overcoming difficulties in reaching a goal." This process seeks ways to relieve tension and bring the organism into an inner balance by adapting to the conditions and reducing barriers. Problem solving is a skill that needs to be learned and acquired, and this skill needs to be developed continuously (Bingham, 2004).

The tendency of individuals to solve the problem situation is related to psychological adaptation, courage, desire and self-confidence (Heppner & Anderson, 1985). Arenofsky (2001), who considered problem solving to be an important social skill and personality trait, stated that these skills are acquired during developmental periods and are effective on the individual's social adaptation and success in daily life. Heppner and Baker (1997) and Koberg and Bagnall (1981) listed the characteristics of a person with problem-solving skills as follows: being innovative and open to new ideas, expressing preferences and decisions clearly, having a sense of responsibility, having flexible thoughts, being courageous and adventurous, generating different ideas, being self-confident and self-sufficient, having a broad range of interests, acting logically and objectively, being comfortable and emotional, being active and full of energy, being creative and productive, and having a critical structure.

It was observed that individuals who do not rely on problem-solving skills spend less time focusing on problem solving and cannot develop appropriate thoughts for a solution. This situation increases the anxiety levels of individuals even more, and therefore individuals

become inadequate to effectively solve the problems they encounter (Jerath, Hasija, & Malhotra, 1993).

2.1.2. Stages of the Problem-Solving Process

Problem solving is the effort to find the best solution by breaking the mental problems related to the problem. Therefore, it is important to follow the processes revealed by scientific findings in the process of solving a problem (Öğülmüş, 2006). The first thing that is important in solving both individual and organizational problems is to know the stages of solving a problem. Even though the behavioural groups required by the problem-solving process differ from problem to problem and from person to person, there are certain basic and general stages in the process of solving a problem (Güçlü, 2003).

When the models used in the sources related to solving the problem are examined, these are more or less modified forms of the model developed by Dewey in 1910. Considering similar features, the stages of the process of solving a problem are as follows; identify the need to solve the problem, seek solution options, define the problem, decide what to do, put the decision into practice and evaluate the solution. (Sungur, 1992).

Since each individual has a unique way of thinking, there are different stages in problem solving. The stages of the problem-solving process determined by Morgan (2015) are as follows:

1. Preparation: What is the problem and how it occurs are determined in this stage and relevant information and materials are collected.
2. Incubation: In this stage, some facts that previously obstructed the solution begin to disappear. In this process, the individual engages in activities that may be useful in solving the problem and learns new information.
3. Understanding or Enlightenment: In this stage, a new idea is formed in the individual through comprehension and a new solution is produced for the

problem.

4. Assessment and Correction: In this stage, the individual tries to see if the new solution really solves the problem. If the solution is not successful, the individual returns to the starting point. If the solution is successful, the solution is reached and the problem is overcome. Heppner's (1978) effective problem-solving process deals with five stages as "general approach, defining the problem, creating options, decision making and evaluation" and explains that each stage includes different methods.

The four-stage problem-solving model developed by D'Zurilla and Goldfried (1971) is the best-known example of the process-oriented problem-solving model. Accordingly, the stages in the process of solving a problem are as follows;

1. Defining the Problem: This is the stage of defining the problem specifically and concretely. The goal and result are determined.
2. Generating Alternative Solutions: Individuals are asked to produce possible solutions with the brainstorming method. All suggested solutions are taken into consideration at this stage.
3. Choosing the Best Solution (Decision Making): The reward and cost of every possible solution are evaluated. The solution with the best reward/price ratio is selected and a plan is made for implementation.
4. Evaluation: The plan is put into practice and evaluated. If the desired result is not reached, the process is repeated.

Bransford and Stein (1993) discussed the problem-solving process in a five-fold model named IDEAL. According to this model, the problem-solving process is as follows:

1. Identify problems and opportunities
2. Define goals and represent the problem

3. Explore possible strategies
4. Anticipate outcomes and act
5. Look back and learn

The IDEAL model is used by many researchers in activities and research about problem solving.

As can be understood from the studies conducted, the basic stages in the problem-solving process were given by almost all researchers who do research in this field. There are basic steps followed in problem-solving processes; understanding and defining the problem, collecting the necessary information for the solution to the problem, determining the solution methods, choosing the most appropriate solution, applying the determined solution, solving and evaluating the problem.

2.1.3. Factors Affecting Problem Solving

The ability to solve a problem is related to many variables. These variables include the suitability of the problem to the age of the individual, having prior knowledge or education about the solution, personal skills, health, behaviours, benefits of the solution to the individual, personal characteristics, intelligence level, psychological adaptation, self-confidence, effectiveness of communication skills, decision-making styles, social and academic self-esteem (Morgan, 1999).

1. Cognitive factors: These include the abilities of the individual such as vocabulary, numerical ability, communication skills, creative thinking and similar abilities. Intelligence, which is accepted as a general term that covers a wide range of abilities such as vocabulary, numbers, problem solving, symbols, concepts, ideas and relationships, is defined as the ability of the individual to adapt to new situations and new problems (Özgüven, 1994).

2. Affective Factors: Motivation is a very important factor for the beginning and end stages of problem solving. In the preparation stage, which is the first stage of problem solving,

individuals must have high motivation to present the problem and gather the information required for solution. However, in the later stages, excessive motivation creates an obstacle and may cause the individual to keep trying wrong solutions in vain (Morgan, 2015).

3. *Age*: According to research by Ulupinar (1997), success in solving problems increases as we get older. However, this situation changes negatively after the age of 35. It is a correct approach to evaluate the effect of age on the ability to solve a problem with past experiences and experiences.

4. *Individual Differences*: According to research by Ulupinar (1997), those who are married, those who live alone, who define themselves as active researchers, who consider their family's attitude to be democratic and uninterested are more successful in solving problems. In addition, working groups are more successful in solving problems because the higher the working status, the higher the success in solving problems.

5. *Self-confidence*: It is very important for individuals to have confidence in solving the problems encountered. Confident individuals are more likely to recognise and accept problems and take action to deal with them. The individual's confidence in themselves and their abilities to solve problems and their belief that they can solve problems enable them to solve problems successfully. People who do not have this belief about themselves avoid taking steps to solve problems (Brown, 1988).

6. *Past Lives and Experiences*: Rather than general talent or giftedness, knowledge and experience create masters and facilitate the solution of problems (Thornton 1998). Successful or unsuccessful problem-solving experiences of individuals in the past can affect their problem-solving behaviour. Individuals who were consciously confronted with various problems during childhood and who received positive reinforcement developed positive attitude towards themselves about problem solving and their success in problem solving increased (Bingham, 2004).

7. Level of Knowledge About Problems: In some problematic situations, the person can reach a solution faster when skills and knowledge are linked. The more knowledgeable individuals are, the more analogies they can use to solve problems or organise something new. The more analogies are recognised, the more likely it is to act with a plan even in the most unexpected situations (Thornton, 1998).

8. Personality Traits of the Individual: Being afraid and having a shy personality structure negatively affect creativity in problem solving (Bingham, 2004). The sociability of a person is also very important in solving problems. Being open to different thoughts and problem-solving ability are related to sociability. Although the sociability is very important, how intelligence is used to solve problems is at the forefront of these skills. The mood of the person also has great importance when solving problems. Fear of making mistakes and looking funny, feeling impatient, avoiding anxiety, fear of taking risks and the need for guidance directly affect the problem-solving process (Stevens, 1998).

2.1.4. Theories about Problem-Solving Skills

2.1.4.1. John Dewey's Reflective Thinking Theory. Dewey's (1910) projective theory of thought is used as a problem-solving method for educational purposes. Basic studies about the problem-solving process began with John Dewey. Dewey defined the problem-solving method in 5 stages:

- realising the problem
- accessing and classifying the necessary information
- forming appropriate hypotheses
- testing appropriate hypotheses
- validating the result

Dewey emphasised that these stages can be changed, it is not necessary to follow any sequence, the process can be started from any desired step, the stages can be expanded and some can be removed (Sungur, 1992).

2.1.4.2. Bandura's Problem-Solving and Self-Efficacy Model. According to the social learning theory of Bandura (1977), individuals learn their problem-solving skills by imitating the behaviours of the people around them. In Bandura's (1977) self-efficacy model, people's beliefs about their abilities and coping skills also affect their problem-solving skills. In addition, individuals know what to do for a solution in cases where their problems are clearly obvious, whereas they are more affected and generalise in uncertain problem situations.

In Bandura's self-efficacy model, it is accepted that people's beliefs in their skills and coping skills and their perception of their ability to solve a problem will affect the amount of effort they will make. Self-efficacy expectations affect both coping and continuation of behaviour. The strength of individual's beliefs in their own competency determines whether they will cope with particular problems (Taylan, 1990; Çilingir, 2006).

2.1.4.3. Hermann's Creative Problem-Solving Model. Hermann (1988) is a researcher who has studied the structure of the brain and thinking. According to the model, the brain is functionally divided into four parts, and people do not use every part of their brain with the same frequency. Everyone has a unique thinking model developed differently from each other, and behaviours also differ through this thinking model. Hermann's creative problem-solving model acknowledges that problem solving is a common function of all parts of the brain. It is claimed that individuals are born with the ability to learn, think, and preferences and respond to the world with these abilities and preferences. It is also stated that using the brain in a certain way of thinking constantly enables those parts of the brain to develop.

2.1.4.4. Mountrose and the 5-Stage Problem-Solving Model. According to Mountrose (2000), there is a five-step method involving emotions in the process of solving a problem. Mountrose stated that to differentiate the behaviour, the thought and emotion underlying the behaviour should be revealed. The steps in the method proposed for solving a problem are as follows:

1. Defining the Problem: In the first stage, adults should only ask the children what happened and listen carefully to what the children say.
2. Expressing Emotions: Children should say how they feel about the problem situation. Adults should help children recognise and express their emotions in words.
3. Finding Negative Belief: The beliefs and thought processes that cause and underlie the problem must be discovered.
4. Finding Positive Belief: It is necessary to turn negative thoughts into positive ones by using three principles; accuracy, results and change.
5. Envisioning the Future: The person who transforms the negative belief to positive should now reconsider the problem with these new beliefs and imagine the future with this belief.

2.1.4.5. Problem-Solving Model in Köhler's Insight Learning. Köhler (1959) stated that complex learning involves two stages in his study. In the first stage, the solution of the problem is realised, and in the second stage, the solution in a similar situation is recalled. This shows that complex learning is closely related to memory and thinking. According to Gestalt psychologists, in the case of a problem occurring, the solution is immediate and complete. In other words, there are two situations for the problem of being solved or not solved, and there is no partial solution. However, the pre-solution period takes longer in this type of problem solving. In this period, the organism evaluates the problem it encounters and

the items and tools given for the solution of the problem, determines the possible methods for solving the problem, tests these methods mentally and takes action behaviourally when it discovers the most appropriate way to solve the problem. If success is achieved as a result of this behaviour, the principles used in the solution of the problem are transferred for use in the solution of other similar problems (as cited in Glassman & Hadad, 2009).

In this case, according to Köhler (1959), the solution to many problems is based on insight, which often brings a sudden solution. Therefore, if a problem has not been solved through careful preparation and step-by-step efforts, it may make sense to pause for a while to think about the problem and then return to the problem with a new perspective. Sometimes focusing deeply on the details of a problem can cause a specific solution to be overlooked (as cited in Morris, 2002).

2.1.4.6. Thorndike's Problem-Solving by Trial and Error Model. Thorndike is credited as the pioneer of contemporary research on problem solving. According to Thorndike, the most basic form of learning occurs through trial and error. As a result of many years of work, it was argued that problem solving can occur in small steps, not only through direct thinking and conclusions, but also by learning from experience and mistakes (As cited in Henson & Eller, 1999).

2.1.4.7. Karl Popper's Problem-Solving Theory. According to Popper's theory of solving problems, the problems that arise due to the inability of people to realise their expectations, various contradictions or the fact that the theories place individuals in an impasse oblige us to learn, increase our knowledge, experience and observe. Problem solving is universal and a matter of survival. According to Popper, life is a process of solving a problem above all (Sungur, 1997). It means striving to understand the problem, analysing it and understanding the logic pattern between the subunits. The theory advocates that we can

learn by experiencing the problem, trying to solve it and failing to solve it in the scientific sense (Sungur, 1997).

2.1.5. Problem Solving Skills in Marriage

Starting a romantic relationship and marriage can also lead to some relationship problems (Eşici, 2014). In marriage, couples must share a life together and decide together about some issues. Therefore, this situation forms the basis for problems between spouses (Güven, 2005). Some of the problems include communication problems, different opinions about the meaning of love, problems involving gender roles, problems with sexual intercourse, inability to have children, personality disorders, financial difficulties, harmful substance habits, extramarital affairs and infidelity, and reasons stemming from the families of the spouses (Köknel, 1997: as cited in Akkaya, 2010). In addition, the meanings that couples attach to marriage and high expectations from their marriage are among the most important reasons for problems in marriage (Karduz, 2009). These problems in marriage cause spouses to seek ways to solve problems and problem-solving skills are needed in marriage (Özgüven, 2000: cited by Çelenoğlu, 2011). The fact that spouses experience individual, financial or sexual problems in their marital life necessitates the development of methods to solve these problems. Spouses who have effective problem-solving skills discuss issues with each other in a vulnerable way. Spouses who are incapable of solving problems exhibit angry accusing behaviours towards each other (Cohan & Bradbury, 1997: cited by Çelenoğlu, 2011).

Although there are many factors affecting marital satisfaction, one of the most important factors is the extent to which the partners have problem-solving skills in marriage. Conflict is inevitable in any relationship involving at least two individuals. (Stinson et al., 2017). The main factor affecting marital life is not the conflict itself, but the conflict resolution strategies used. (Shakarami, Zaharakar, Mohsenzadeh, 2016). At this point,

managing the conflict in a constructive way can enable the spouses to understand each other and bring about positive changes in the relationship. (Ting-Toomey et al., 2000). As a matter of fact, studies have shown that effective management of conflicts increases relationship satisfaction and intimacy (Canary, 2003); However, in cases where the conflict is not managed well, it is seen that the dissatisfaction with the relationship increases and the relationship is damaged (Pruitt & Kim, 2004).

When the ways of coping with problems in marriage are investigated, five factors including self-blame, positive approach, conflict, spouses taking care of themselves, and avoidance were mentioned. The positive approach factor indicates the emotional aspect of marriage and positively affects the quality of marriages. The other four factors affect marriages negatively (Bowman, 1990: cited in Çelenoğlu, 2011). Before going through all these problem-solving stages, spouses must accept the problem exists in order to solve the problem. Ignoring problems will therefore delay solutions (Serin & Derin, 2008).

According to Yıldız (2012), people should follow certain paths in order to cope positively with problems in their marriage. It is important for spouses to perceive their problems as disturbing. Both partners in the couple must accept the problem exists. Ignoring problems can cause them to grow and lead to other problems. It is very important to correctly define the problem and options must be presented to solve the problem. It is necessary to find options through different problem-solving methods with a flexible and fluent thinking style and to look at the problem from different perspectives. Then, it is necessary to choose the most appropriate option and apply it. At this stage, spouses need to make joint decisions together and determine common benefits for their marriage. Finally, the outcomes should be evaluated. The ability to evaluate enables individuals to recognise their shortcomings, to reconsider events and problems, and to see the difference in the intended and reached point (Yıldız, 2012, as cited in Koca, 2013).

In another study, the ways of perceiving problems experienced by spouses in marriages and their solution styles were explained with the concepts of approach and avoidance. While the approach style indicates the spouses approach problems from a positive and constructive perspective, the avoidance style indicates that the spouses avoid problems by giving negative and destructive answers to problems (Bodtker and Jameson, 2001: as cited in Çelenoğlu, 2011: p. 10).

2.2. Romantic Relationship Satisfaction

2.2.1. Romantic Relationship

Human beings spend their lives in relationships of different types and levels. It is inevitable to be in social relationships with other people, as each individual is included in a social network of mother, father, siblings, relatives, teachers, friends and romantic partner. These social relationships are established on a compulsory or voluntary basis. Relationships that are established on a voluntary basis and that normally last long are often described as close relationships. Relationships between two adults that meet the need for emotional attachment, one or more psychological needs, and mutual dependency constitute close relationships (Furman & Buhrmester, 1992; Erber & Erber, 2001; Brehm, Kassin & Fein, 2002).

A close relationship is a type of relationship that includes frequent and strong interdependence. Interdependence is defined as changes in the feelings, thoughts and behaviours of one of the partners in a relationship that affect the other partner. Relationships emerge in different forms in infancy, childhood, adolescence and adulthood and shape individuals in the process. It is known that relationships occurring in one period affect the next period and the individual. For this reason, it is considered important to reveal and evaluate the nature and development of the periods from birth when dealing with relationships (Kelley et al., 1983). According to Erikson, while stating that individuals' basic

sense of trust in themselves and others is the basis of human development, it is said that any sense of insecurity that babies experience may negatively affect their ability to establish relationships during childhood and adulthood (Kail & Cavanaugh, 2015; Slavin, 2013).

It appears that a similar theory of social development was proposed a few years later by John Bowlby (1969). Like Erikson's theory, Bowlby's attachment theory emphasises that the baby's relationship with the caregiver is very important. Attachment theory highlights the close and strong emotional bonds established with special and important people in the lives of individuals (Berk, 2013; Santrock, 2011). Similar to Erikson, Bowlby stated that children who are attached to an adult or have a permanent socio-emotional relationship are more likely to survive (Kail & Cavanaugh, 2015). However, the quality of social relationships established in infancy is known to affect emotional and social development not only in infancy but also in later life. Quality of attachment in infancy also determines the quality of parent-child relationships and social relationships during childhood, adolescence and young adulthood. In other words, the commitment of the caregiver established in the first two years of life shapes the communication and interactions in lifelong relationships, from peers and friends to teachers, from romantic relationships to their future children (Arnett, 2012).

It was emphasised that intimacy and loyalty occur together in adolescence. Adolescents who trust their friends expect to spend good or bad times together. If a friend displays infidelity, the adolescent thinks that their secrets and feelings will be learned by others and therefore they may be humiliated and feel fear (Kail & Cavanaugh, 2015). In addition, adolescents who cannot establish close relationships satisfactorily and harmoniously may experience low self-esteem, loneliness and lack of social skills (Kerr, Stattin, Biesecker, & Ferrer-Wreder, 2003). On the other hand, adolescents who are able to develop close relationships may convert this relationship into a romantic relationship and begin to step into young adulthood. Romantic intimacy between adults includes values, beliefs, happiness,

preferences, emotions, secrets, and productivity, as well as sexual attraction (Arnet, 2000).

There are some differences between intimacy between spouses and closeness in other relationships. One of these differences is that spouses have sexual expectations from romantic intimacy (Akbay, 2015).

Close relationships are an important and indispensable aspect of human life. One of the types of close relationships is romantic relationships (Berscheid et al., 1989). Romantic relationships are a form of interpersonal relationship that include dating, living together, marriage, and other long-term relationships (Hendrick & Hendrick, 2006). Romantic relationships, which are established between lovers and married individuals, have three main characteristics: (1) feelings of attachment, liking and love; (2) fulfilment of psychological needs; and (3) mutual dependency (Berscheid et al., 1983).

According to Collins (2003), a romantic relationship is a type of relationship that includes the concepts of willingness and reciprocity and has five distinctive features. The first is participation and it emphasises whether young people flirt, at what age dating begins, and its frequency. The second feature is the choice of mate and it explains with whom the young person has romantic experiences. The third feature is relationship content and it includes the activities shared during the romantic relationship. Relationship quality, the fourth feature, is the ability to gain useful experiences from the relationship. Finally, the feature described as the cognitive and emotional processes of the relationship is related to emotional reactions, perceptions, expectations, schemas, references to the partner and the relationship that distinguish the relationship from other types of relationships. According to Kalkan and Yalçın (2012), romantic relationships are a type of relationship that includes love, attachment, emotional support and belonging, and these features are experiences that enrich and develop human life.

The most important developmental task that individuals in young adulthood are expected to fulfil is the formation and maintenance of romantic relationships (Sullivan, 1953; Erikson, 1968; Feldman, Gower, & Fisher, 1998). There are studies showing that healthy romantic relationships experienced during this period positively affect the personality development of the young person (Furman & Schaffer, 2003). In addition, the psycho-social development of young people is affected by their romantic relationships. Feiring (1996) also revealed that individuals gain skills such as intimacy, sharing, agreement, and self-disclosure thanks to romantic relationships. It was stated that having a romantic relationship also has an important role in self-worth (Connolly & Konarsky, 1994).

Erikson stated that finding a partner, connecting and having a romantic relationship become important in many ways to solve the development task of isolation versus intimacy during young adulthood. The foundations of romantic relationships occur in adolescence and gradually increase towards the end of adolescence because the wide friendships established during the adolescent period include the opposite sex. However, it was also stated that the origins of the establishment of romantic relationships and their healthy functioning begin with infancy. Beginning in infancy, secure attachment is the first step in the formation of a romantic relationship. Babies who are securely attached can establish good relationships with their peers during childhood and these good relationships can turn into close relationships during adolescence. Afterwards, this ensures emotional romantic relationships during young adulthood. Although seen as an extension of infancy, the beginning of romantic relationships is formed by the changes that occur in adolescence (Sigelman & Rider, 2018). Romantic relationships during the university years are the determinants of future marriages. In other words, the experiences gained in this period affect the quality of romantic relationships, choice of spouse and marital life (Erikson, 1968; Furman, 2002). Two different individuals who do not know each other meet in the pre-marital period and individuals need to know and

agree with each other in order to decide to marry. Therefore, the premarital period offers individuals the opportunity to get to know the person they will marry, to establish the necessary bond of love for agreement and marriage (Özgüven, 2000).

Marriage is the only form of partnership that is traditionally established and officially accepted in all societies, even though it varies across cultures (Tarhan, 2014). In all societies, marriage means a new period in life. There are many different reasons directing individuals toward marriage, such as the desire to feel better personally, to avoid loneliness, to provide sexual satisfaction, to be a parent, to improve economic conditions and to feel safe (Kalkan et al., 2012; Özabacı, 2014). Marital relationships differ from pre-marital relationships. In the relationship of newly-married individuals, emotional relationships are replaced by life's responsibilities. Thus, cooperation, sharing and the effort to fulfil responsibilities come to the fore in these relationships (Yavuzer, 2014).

Along with establishing a relationship with the opposite sex, one of the most important and difficult decisions in human life is the choice of partner (Ateş, 2014; Şenel, 2014). Making this choice correctly, which will affect a person's whole life, is thought to be one of the most important steps taken on the path to happy marriage. Making this decision is a complex process, it requires getting to know both oneself and the other person. When individuals focus only on getting to know the person they will marry and start a relationship without fully knowing their own wishes and needs and without making realistic expectations, they may have problems in establishing a healthy relationship (Tarhan, 2014).

The aim of individuals before marriage is to have a harmonious and fulfilling romantic relationship. In line with this purpose, there are many factors that affect the choice of partners. Some of these factors include socioeconomic characteristics, educational level, ideological and religious views, race and cultural differences, physical characteristics,

personality traits and age (Fincham and Cui, 2011; Kalkan et al., 2012; Karney, Beckett, Collins & Shaw, 2007).

According to Kağıtçıbaşı (1998; 2010), romantic relationships are shaped by cultural influences, as human behaviour cannot be independent from cultural influences. According to a study conducted in Turkey, to be able to say that a relationship is a romantic relationship, the most important point was the mutual protection of each partner. The concepts of volunteering and reciprocity in Turkish culture can be regarded as indispensable for romantic relationships (Erden- İmamoğlu, 2009).

It is thought that the formation and initiation of a romantic relationship, as well as the satisfaction of individuals with their relationship and the choice of a partner, should be evaluated because they shape quality of life and may be linked to many variables.

2.2.2. Relationship Satisfaction

Many researchers defined the concept of RRS. Relationship satisfaction is a complex term with different definitions. The concept of relationship satisfaction is related to sexual attitudes, feelings of love, loyalty, self -disclosure and relationship investment; it is an important area for evaluating the feelings, thoughts, and behaviours in a relationship (Hendrick, 1988). According to Sabatelli (1988), relationship satisfaction is the interaction between an individual's expectations and their partner's behaviour, and relationship satisfaction is equivalent to relationship stability, quality, and harmony, so these terms can be used interchangeably. When all aspects of the relationship are considered, relationship satisfaction was evaluated as subjective feelings of happiness and satisfaction by Hawkins (1968). Rusbult (1983) expressed the concept of relationship satisfaction as the positivity of one's feelings towards their partner and the interpersonal evaluation of the relationship. According to Campbell (1976), relationship satisfaction is the key point for people's happiness and general well-being.

According to Hendrick and Hendrick (1995), couples want to establish greater bonds and maintain this relationship due to the satisfaction they get from their relationships.

Relationship satisfaction includes subjective evaluations of the individual regarding all aspects of the relationship they experience. As long as people's feelings and thoughts are compatible with their behaviours, they can receive satisfaction from their partners.

Everyone can obtain high- or low-level satisfaction from their relationship. When the relationship is evaluated from different aspects, the level of happiness, pleasure and satisfaction received from the relationship is related to relationship satisfaction. Relationship satisfaction refers to the feelings, thoughts, and behaviours in the relationship (Demir, 2008).

There are strong correlations between relationship satisfaction, good communication and problem-solving skills. It is understood that the power of individuals to change their behaviour for relationship satisfaction is related to their approach to incoming messages by focusing on the positive. In other words, the message targeted by a spouse in problem-solving discussions is considered to be equal to the effect on their spouse; positive intention can cause a positive effect (Warner, 2004).

It was pointed out that the concept of RRS was named in many different ways such as "harmony in relationship", "success in relationship", "happiness" and "relationship quality" and these names are used interchangeably (Fincham & Beach, 2006). However, this concept later started to be described as "marital satisfaction" and "marital adjustment" (Trost, 1985). Nowadays, it has become "RRS" by reaching a wider audience.

After determining the relationship network of RRS, it is necessary to explain the behavioural, emotional, and cognitive relationship. Firstly, when the correlation of romantic relationships with behavioural situations is considered, it was observed that couples who do not experience satisfaction in their relationships tend to display dysfunctional behaviours such as criticizing, complaining, harbouring hostility, and reducing relationships and

interactions compared to couples with satisfaction (Fincham & Beach, 2006). On the other hand, couples who experience relationship satisfaction may display behaviours of repairing negative affect, being more sensitive and being able to intervene early (Fincham & Beach, 2006). Finally, Huston and Chorost (1994) emphasised that the use of affectionate expressions between couples can also prevent negative behaviours and strengthen RRS.

Emotional state can have a stronger effect on RRS than verbal expressions through positive and negative affect (Fincham & Beach, 2006). In particular, couples who do not experience RRS cannot change their non-verbal behaviour, although they can change their verbal behaviour. Therefore, couples who experience relationship satisfaction can act in a more positive way during problem-solving interactions with their partners (Johnson, et al., 2005).

2.2.3. Theories of Romantic Relationships

Numerous theories were proposed and studies performed about the place, nature and development of romantic relationships that create a bond between partners (Heath, 1976; Goldstein, Chesir-Teran, & McFaul, 2008). Many researchers explained romantic relationships and their nature. Studies on relationships have been increasingly continuing in the last two decades. There are some criteria for considering a relationship to be a romantic relationship.

2.2.3.1. Sternberg's Triangular Theory of Love. Sternberg (1988), who proposed the triangle love theory, explained the effects of a relationship on individuals based on intimacy, passion and attachment when evaluating the romantic relationship. In young adulthood, the quality of this relationship is as important as establishing a romantic relationship. The type of love relationship established may cause the individual to experience emotions such as excitement, happiness, joy, fun or anxiety, stress, anger and jealousy (Sigelman & Rider, 2018). The concept of intimacy in Sternberg's triangle love theory

includes elements such as warmth, intimacy, connection and boundaries in the romantic relationship. The concept of passion was described as a component related to sexuality, as well as motivations such as romantic and physical attraction. The concept of attachment was mostly specified cognitively and includes the decision to continue the relationship for a short or long time (Regan, 2008; Sternberg, 2006). According to Sternberg, though romantic love has not fully formed yet, the relationship may involve a high degree of passion and intimacy. When there is commitment and intimacy in companionate love, there is no passion. It is understood that there is only an obsessive passion in love, which is described as infatuation, without intimacy and commitment. In liking, there is no passion and there is also no commitment that could promise a long-term relationship, only intimacy in this type. In relationships described as empty love, there is only commitment without intimacy and passion. Individuals can sometimes experience fatuous love in their romantic relationships. This type of commitment is experienced without feeling intimacy and passion. Finally, Sternberg defined the perfect love. The achievement of consummate love qualifies as an ideal situation and is a type of romantic relationship that includes passion, intimacy, and commitment (Bernstein, Douglas, Penner, Clarke-Stewart & Roy, 2012; Santrock, 2011; Sigelman & Rider, 2018).

2.2.3.2. Rusbult's Investment Model. The Investment Model was developed to explain the establishment, maintenance and termination of interpersonal relationships (Rusbult, 1983). In this model, two characteristics of the close relationship are emphasised: satisfaction (the attraction felt towards the relationship and the partner) and attachment (the tendency to maintain the relationship). In addition, the Investment Model can have an impact on individuals' decisions to stay or leave their relationships.

The dissatisfaction experienced in romantic relationships was also explained by the Investment Model developed by Rusbult (1980). According to Rusbult, Zembrodt, and Gunn

(1982), individuals react in four ways when they experience dissatisfaction in their relationships. These include 'abandonment', 'utterance', 'loyalty' and 'negligence'.

Abandonment is ending a relationship or behaving in a deliberate way. Utterance expresses acting actively and constructively towards improving the situation. Loyalty means passively waiting and hoping for the situation to improve. Negligence is passively allowing the relationship to break up (Rusbult, Zembrodt, & Gunn, 1982).

According to the Investment Model, if the level of satisfaction from the relationship is high and a high level of investment is made in the relationship, relationship commitment will increase (Rusbult, 1983). On the other hand, if the individual does not invest too much in the relationship or if the individual finds suitable alternatives, the individual may terminate the relationship even if the relationship is satisfactory.

2.2.3.3. Stendhal's Passionate Love Theory. Stendhal explained the process by considering passionate love in seven processes (Hatfield, 1988). The first of these processes is the process of liking. In the process of liking, lovers interact with their lovers. The individual begins to find their loved one physically attractive. The second process is the expectation process. Lovers think about the happy moments they will spend with their loved ones. In this context, individuals dream. The process of hope constitutes the third process. The parties consider whether there is enough hope that they will fall in love or not. After this process, love is born. Another process seen with the birth of passionate love is the process of romantic attraction. The fifth process is the crystallization process. In this process, the lover discovers new beauties with their partner. The individual realises that life is more beautiful with their loved one. In the period of crystallization, the individual thinks that their beloved is unique and realises that they are happy to be falling in love. At the end of this process, strong desire and passion emerges. The individual enters a new process by starting to fear being rejected by their loved one. The individual doubts their love and begins to consider whether

love is mutual. Finally, the second crystallization period comes into play. During this period, individuals begin to think realistically whether this love will continue or not. The resulting love will either die or survive based on effort (Hatfield, 1988).

2.2.3.4. Romantic Intimacy Theory. According to Moss and Schwebel (1993), intimacy affects the social development of individuals, their level of self-adjustment and their physical health. In particular, intimacy has a complementary role in overcoming developmental stages, reinforcing friendships, establishing a happy marriage and achieving therapeutic success in psychotherapy. In addition to these, it was also shown that intimacy prevents the occurrence of physical illnesses and mental disorders.

Moss and Schwebel (1993) suggested that intimacy in a romantic relationship is determined by the positive affect a person experiences with their partner, their level of commitment, physical intimacy, and cognition. Five components were emphasised in the definition: "commitment, affective intimacy, cognitive intimacy, physical intimacy and mutuality" (Moss & Schwebel, 1993).

2.2.3.5. Colour Wheel Theory of Love. Lee (1988) likened love to colours, suggested that love can have multiple dimensions and in this context be classified as multi-dimensional forms of love. Lee's classification includes a total of six different forms of love including primary and secondary. All colours in the rainbow originate from three primary colours. Likewise, Lee's types of love consist of three main types: eros [passionate love], ludus [game-playing love] and storge [friendship love]. Other types of love are formed by the combination of these three main types of love. Lee named these three main varieties of love the primary colours of love. Mania (dependent love), pragma (logical love) and agape (selfless love) form the secondary colours of love. These secondary styles can be expressed as a combination of parts of the primary styles. For example, logical love (pragma) is a combination of friendship love and game-playing love; however, it is qualitatively very

different from both of these. Likewise, dependent love (mania) is a combination of passionate love and game-playing love, but it has very different properties. Finally, it can be said that selfless love (agape) is a combination of passionate love and friendship love. These six love styles are logically related, and each style has different characteristics (Lee, 1988).

Passionate love, one of the types of love included in this classification, is a type of love based on physical attraction. Passionate lovers can also clearly define their preferred physical characteristics. Game-playing love is a type of love that is low in bonding, entertainment, short-term and open to polygamy. Those who see love as a game enjoy being with more than one person at the same time. Friendship love is a type of love that develops over time, based on similarity and observance. For friendly lovers, it is very important to share various activities and interests with the person they are with. Logical love is a type of love for spouses in relationships that are considered to be sustained and provide a positive future. Logical lovers seek harmony in the person they are with, based on social and personality traits. Dependent love is a jealous, insecure, and somewhat pathological type of love. Dependent lovers do not trust each other and fear losing their partner. Selfless love is the love experienced by individuals who love the other person despite their flaws and think about their well-being more than their own. Selfless lovers believe in giving love because everyone deserves it (Lee, 1988).

2.3. Perfectionism

Perfectionism is defined as follows in the Turkish Dictionary of the Turkish Language Institution: “making an excessive effort to be perfect in any field” (TDK, 2018). According to Flett and Hewitt (2002), perfectionism is striving for perfection, and perfectionists are people who want to be perfect in all areas of life. According to Flett et al. (1989), perfectionism is a tendency to have high standards and goals for one self. So perfectionism refers to extreme and high personal standards (Slaney & Ashby, 1996).

The main problem in defining perfectionism is that this concept cannot fully distinguish between perfectionist people and highly competent and successful people (Frost et al., 1990). According to Hamachek (1978), being a perfectionist is not a bad thing. It can be a good thing when perfectionism is a motivating factor for people to do their job well (Hamachek, 1978). According to Burns (1980), some perfectionism can be effective in achieving great success. However, many studies on perfectionism reveal that this concept is associated with many negative personality traits.

Hollender (1965), Hamacheck (1978) and Burns (1980) examined perfectionism as a one-dimensional concept. They demonstrated that perfectionists aim for high standards that are difficult for them to reach, and accordingly, perfectionism is an incompatible feature. In later studies, it was thought that perfectionism can only be explained with a multi-dimensional approach. In this way, some researchers emphasised that interpersonal interaction factors should be evaluated, in addition to the perfectionism that individuals ascribe to themselves, by considering perfectionism in a multidimensional way (Forst et al., 1990; Hewitt & Flett, 1991, Slade & Owens, 1995).

Also, Hollender (1965) used the concept to express the attitude which individuals perform or want to realise, rather than what individuals think about themselves, or try to see themselves. In other words, Hollender considered perfectionism as the desire to show an unreasonably high quality performance in a given situation. Hollender (1978), who connected perfectionism learned in childhood and its development to the relationship established with the parents, stated that children can emerge from their desire to behave flawlessly and thus to be admired with the need for parental approval. Hollender (1978) saw perfectionism as a neglected personality trait and stated that perfectionists who are not satisfied with their performance may develop depression.

Hamachek (1978), who contributed to perfectionism, started to research the concept by considering it multi-dimensionally. Making a distinction between 'normal' and 'neurotic' perfectionism, the researcher focused on the strengths of normal perfectionists, on how they can realise situations. On the other hand, the researcher considered how neurotic perfectionists worry about their weaknesses and avoid making mistakes. With normal perfectionism, which can help individuals become competent and talented, individuals can have relatively well developed self-esteem and appreciate work done well by enjoying their skills (Hamachek, 1978). Burns (1980), who revealed the preliminary information about perfectionism, thought about perfectionism from the cognitive perspective. He regarded perfectionists as people who go beyond logic and strive forcibly and incessantly to achieve goals that are impossible to reach in a standard way, measuring their own values at the level of productivity and success.

Although perfectionism was considered to be an unchanging personality trait, researchers revealed that perceptions and experiences in the relationship play an important role in its development and maintenance (Lopez et al., 2006). Therefore, it is necessary to investigate how perfectionism is handled by various theorists. When the literature about perfectionism is examined, it can be concluded that this concept is widely used in the psychoanalytic approach, individual psychology, holistic approach, cognitive and rational emotional approach.

2.3.1. Theories of Perfectionism

2.3.1.1. Psychoanalytic Theory. It was suggested that the origins of perfectionism research are based on psychoanalytic theories (Stoeber, 2018). The classic psychoanalytic theory proposed by Sigmund Freud (1926; 1959) stated that perfectionism is a symptom of obsessional neurosis. The process of toilet habits gained in the anal period, which is the second of the psychosexual development stages, and the behaviours of the parents during this

process affect the child's personality development. It was stated that the child who encounters harsh reactions during this process may develop an obsession with perfectionism (Ayhan, 2007). The concept of perfectionism in psychoanalytic theory can be addressed by the functions of the superego in the developmental stages of the child, in the anal period and in the structural personality theory. According to Freud's structural personality theory, the super ego, the last developing system of personality, is the internal representative of traditional values and social ideals that are transferred to children by their parents and reinforced by reward and punishment practices. The superego really represents the very ideal, it wants to achieve perfection rather than dislike. The major functions of the superego are to suppress and inhibit the impulses from the id, to direct the ego to moral goals rather than realistic goals, and to strive to be perfect (Geçtan, 2006). According to Corey (2008), the super ego deals with ideals rather than reality, and strives for perfection, not to enjoy life.

2.3.1.2. Individual Psychology. In the first period, broad theoretical explanations about perfectionism were also expressed by Alfred Adler. Adler stated that all people start life with a feeling of inferiority. The first example of this is that a weak and desperate child depends on older and stronger adults for survival. According to Adler, this perception is the beginning of a lifetime of effort to cope with the feeling of inferiority. Adler calls this an effort for superiority (Burger, 2006). According to Alfred Adler, there is an effort towards superiority in every psychological phenomenon and this continues in parallel with physical development. The impulse to move from minus to plus and from bottom to the top also never ends (Adler, 1956). Individual psychology shows that there is a tendency toward perfection and the effort to rise upward in every human being (Adler, 2001).

In approximately the sixth year of childhood, the individual's views about self-perfection and completion begin to take shape within life goals. The life goal integrates the personality and becomes the source of motivation, and every effort to overcome the feeling of

inferiority develops in line with this goal. For Adler, the second experience of inferiority is the effort for superiority. He argued that the goal of success leads the individual toward superiority and allows them to cope with obstacles. The goal of excellence contributes to the development of the human community. Individuals deal with unwanted emotions such as unhappiness by striving for competence, superiority, and excellence (Corey, 2008). This feeling of inferiority that disturbs people is not a frightening feeling to be interpreted as a bad thing, and it is a feeling that is the source of the great achievements of human beings and encourages them to move forward. When people felt deficient or inferior, they sought ways to get rid of this feeling and tried to be superior and strong (Adler, 2006).

Adler (1930; 1956; 1964) suggested that perfectionism is natural, universal and can be a positive/healthy or a negative/unhealthy trait. In addition, Adler (1964) emphasised that perfectionism includes the purpose of being an ideal society. Adler stated that by evaluating perfectionist efforts as an adaptation process, this effort provides individuals with the opportunity to survive and develop targeted behaviour against environmental challenges. Beyond all this, Adler defined positive or negative perfectionism as a personality trait and suggested that it has a formative effect on relationships with others.

2.3.1.3. Holistic Theory. Karen Horney (1950; 1991) focused on the effects of perfectionist individuals that may harm themselves due to the difficult-to-reach internal commands. According to Horney, perfectionists make special commands and act according to their own unique idealised image. Therefore, perfectionists must know everything skilfully to reflect their best performance in every field. On the other hand, in case of any failure, individuals typically ignore the failure and attempt to interpret and show their actions are a great success, similar to a narcissistic personality style. Horney (1950; 1991) focused on four basic difficulties for perfectionists: (i) feeling of strain, (ii) discomfort in interpersonal relationships, (iii) disruption of spontaneity and (iv) self-hatred.

Karen Horney (1975) discussed the negative effects of perfectionism as a neurotic condition and alleged that it alienates the individual in this situation. These individuals want themselves to be perfect just as they expect other people to be perfect. These individuals cannot stand criticism, but they criticise the people around them mercilessly. Feelings such as self-anger, guilt, and self-hate can be seen in individuals who cannot achieve perfection. Finally, the desire to be perfect can be seen as a neurotic requirement in individuals that arises as a result of not trusting oneself. Individuals may think that they can eliminate this situation by achieving perfection (Horney, 2006).

According to Altıntaş and Gültekin (2005), Karen Horney revealed the neurotic need for perfection and infallibility and tendencies such as ruthless impulse toward perfection, self-blame, excessive superiority, fear of making mistakes, fear of being criticised or blamed, etc. are seen. Horney defined the need for perfection as a neurotic "desire to look perfect" rather than a sincere effort to attain authentic ideals. Such neurotic wannabes differ according to the value judgments of the culture in which the individual lives. In Horney's pride system, if neurotic people realise that they engage in behaviours that are incompatible with their self, which they consider flawless, they will definitely not like this behaviour. They don't think about the reasons that led to this behaviour or "I should have done better!" or "I shouldn't mind!" as they criticise themselves (Geçtan, 2006).

2.3.1.4. Cognitive Theory

Cognitive theorists argued that the experiences people have from a very early age determine their behaviour. The child's need to be loved, protected, and respected, for growth and development, and the need to be a good person are all interrelated. According to Ellis, the child easily adopts the values of adults who fulfil these needs. If the child is told that they must be perfect, otherwise the child will not be loved, the child accepts this as a universal truth without criticism. However, if the child fails to meet this expectation in every situation,

they think that they are worthless, inadequate and guilty and become worried because thoughts affect emotions (Altıntaş & Gültekin, 2005).

Cognitive therapists strive to reveal the basic assumptions of their patients that lead them to depression, anxiety, and anger; namely their patients' rules and values. Typical examples of these rules are: “I must be perfect”, “I must be loved by everyone” and “my worth is as much as others approve” (Leahy, 2007).

Aaron Beck (1976), one of the pioneers of cognitive psychology, stated that cognitive distortions are also valid for those with perfectionist traits. According to Beck (1976), perfectionists deal with the inner and outer world rigidly with polar thinking (black and white, good-bad etc.). In addition, Beck mentioned that there are cognitive errors that indicate systematic and permanent logical errors in individuals' thoughts underlying perfectionism.

Positive or negative events starting in childhood can cause the individual to misperceive and interpret events by distorting them. The repetition of these misperceptions and misinterpretations that individuals learn affects them for the rest of their lives (Beck, 2001). The "all or nothing" style of thinking is one of the cognitive distortions and can mean having fairly high standards. Perfectionists often set extremely high standards that are unrealistic for themselves or others. Sometimes it is useful for people to set standards for themselves to improve their current performance in order to reach a reasonable goal that they can achieve. However, perfectionism often involves extremely difficult or even impossible goals (Antony & Swinson, 2000).

2.3.1.5. Rational Emotive Behaviour Therapy. Ellis viewed perfectionism in terms of irrational beliefs and a negative perspective. According to these irrational beliefs, in order for an individual to be respected by others, they must be a talented, flawless individual who exerts excessive effort for everything and is successful in return for their efforts. Ellis said that people enter the world with this inclination (Burger, 2006).

Among the irrational beliefs that Ellis explained under 12 items, the ideas that play a role in the formation of perfectionism can be listed as follows:

1. It is a serious necessity for an adult to be loved or approved of by nearly every significant other in society.
2. Being competent and successful in all possible respects
3. Things not being as desired is a terrible and catastrophic situation
4. A correct, precise and perfect solution to problems encountered in life exists for all times and in every situation, and the failure to find a perfect solution is a disastrous situation
5. The general worth of a person depends on the well-being of their performance (Ellis, 2006).

2.3.1.6. Social Learning Theory. According to the theory, modelling and reinforcement are important but not sufficient by themselves for the acquisition of behaviours. Cognitive processes are also actively used in learning (Burger, 2006). According to Bandura, if the reinforcer is given only when perfection is achieved, the individual will learn from this experience that they must be perfect to receive reinforcers. Therefore, perfectionist attitudes will become a necessity in the individual. The expectation of being punished in cases where perfection is not achieved will make individuals feel inadequate and have a humiliating effect on them. Therefore, setting high standards in every field with the generalization of behavioural reinforcers leads to perfectionism. According to this theory, problematic perfectionist behaviour occurs when the level of perfection that the individual believes is necessary is too high to reach (Borynack, 2003).

2.3.2 Dimensions of Perfectionism

While there are many different definitions, conceptualizations and measures of perfectionism, the most common and influential conceptualization of multidimensional

perfectionism is Hewitt and Flett's (1991a) multidimensional perfectionism model. Hewitt and Flett (1991a) defined perfectionism in three dimensions in this model, considering that perfectionism is a constant personality trait and has social and personal aspects; self-oriented perfectionism, other-oriented perfectionism and socially prescribed perfectionism.

Self-oriented perfectionism includes the tendency of the person to set high standards that are difficult to reach, to have high motivation to achieve perfection and not make mistakes. The motivation to achieve perfection is mostly to avoid criticism from other people (Stoeber, Otto, 2006). People with high self-perfectionism, criticise themselves heavily for not meeting their standards; focus too much on their own mistakes, shortcomings and failures; overestimate their performance and cannot relax their own expectations according to the situation (Hewitt, Flett, 1991b).

The dimension of other-oriented perfectionism can have variable form that may sometimes be positive and sometimes negative (Stoeber, 2012). Other-oriented perfectionism involves the tendency of people to set expectations to be met and high standards that should be reached for other people instead of themselves. The relevance of this dimension of perfectionism to interpersonal relationships is obvious because people with other-oriented perfectionism expect other people to be perfect in many areas and when this situation is not met, they can be extremely punitive and hostile towards the other person. High levels of other-oriented perfectionism leads to blame, sarcasm, insecure attitudes, conflicts, stress and marital problems in interpersonal relationships (Hewitt, Flett, 1991b; Hewitt, Flett, & Mikail, 1995). On the other hand, it was stated that the other-oriented perfectionism dimension is related to self-confidence and competitiveness (Bieling, Israeli & Antony, 2004). People with a high level of other-oriented perfectionism have more respect for themselves, but less for others (Stoeber, 2014).

Socially prescribed perfectionism is another important dimension of interpersonal perfectionism, such as perfectionism towards others. In the socially prescribed perfectionism dimension, people have the perception that others set high standards that they need to reach and are evaluated within the framework of these standards. They also believe that in order to comply with the standards of others they must be constantly perfect and flawless, and if they fail to meet expectations, they will be harshly criticised. This is why they feel constantly under pressure (Hewitt & Flett, 1991b; Hewitt, Flett, 2004; cited in Stoeber, Harvey, Almedia & Lyons, 2013). Individuals with a high level of perfectionism may have more sensitivity to criticism, fear of negative evaluation, need for approval, blame themselves and others, low self-confidence, inability to express themselves emotionally, and psychological maladjustment, loneliness and shyness were also associated with this dimension. (Hewitt, Flett, 1991a; Hill, Zrull, Turlington, 1997; Flett, Hewitt, De Rosa, 1996). In the socially prescribed perfectionism dimension, the person ascribes control to the outside as they perceive that a standard has been set from the outside, and this causes the person to feel that they have low control and this increases the level of self-blame and the feeling of helplessness (Krantz, Rude, 1984; as cited in Hewitt, Flett, 1993) In addition to all these, the socially prescribed perfectionism dimension was found to be related to negative problem and conflict solving styles that could negatively affect relationships (Hewitt, Flett & Endler, 1995).

Another study explaining perfectionism was done by Frost et al. (1990). Frost et al. (1990) revealed that perfectionism plays an important role in psychopathology, but this concept does not have a definite definition yet and there is a lack of research on the subject. Frost et al. (1990) developed the "Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale" and revealed five dimensions related to this concept. The main dimension on this scale is excessive interest in errors. The other five dimensions are "high personal standards, parental criticism, parental

expectations, concern over mistakes and doubts and organization.” The most prominent aspect of these dimensions is to set high personal standards (Frost et al., 1990).

Personal standards are characterised by setting very high self-standards and the extreme importance of these standards in one's self-evaluation. It refers to excessive concern about mistakes, negative reactions to mistakes, and the tendency to see mistakes as failure. Familial expectation and criticism are also defined as the setting of very high standards by the family. The dimension of suspicion of behaviour is defined by the feeling that the work done is not sufficiently completed, and finally the dimension of order emphasises regularity related to perfectionism (Frost et al., 1990). In terms of excessive attention to mistakes, perfectionists have more negative mood, low confidence, and a higher sense of “I should do better” than other people. In addition, individuals who score high on the dimension of excessive interest in mistakes perceive that others will see their performance as poor and tend to share their own performance results less (Frost et al., 1995).

Investigating the positive and negative effects of perfectionism on interpersonal relationships, Slaney and Johnson developed the Almost Perfect Scale (APS) in 1992. However, the Almost Perfect Scale was later developed by Slaney et al. (2001) and revised with the name Almost Perfect Scale-Revised (APS-R). The Almost Perfect Scale-Revised consists of "high standards", "order" and "difference" subscales. The "high standards" dimension is the individual's level of setting high personal standards and self-expectation; the "order" dimension is the individual's needs and preference for order and organization; and the “difference” dimension is the perception of the discrepancy and difference between individuals' standards and their own performance and the level of discomfort caused by this situation (Slaney et al., 2001: 131).

In light of all this information, in the first studies about the concept of perfectionism, the concept was addressed in one dimension. During studies carried out in later years, it was

explained as being two-dimensional and multi-dimensional. Whether it is considered as one-dimensional or multi-dimensional, it is not possible to talk about a single definition of the concept of perfectionism.

2.3.3 Causes of Perfectionism

When the literature about the factors that cause perfectionism is examined, there is no in-depth study about what perfectionism stems from. There are many factors that lay the groundwork for perfectionism; some of these factors originate from the individuals themselves and sometimes from their environment.

According to Hamachek (1978), the most important factor causing perfectionism is the family, and the expectations of the family and the status of being evaluated by the family contribute significantly to the child's perfectionism. In other words, the family's perfectionist characteristics indicate that the child may also be a perfectionist. In addition, Flett et al. (2002) stated that children can adopt the perfectionist behaviours of their parents by modelling and imitating them through social learning. On the other hand, the high standards that families expect of children and the great meanings attributed to these standards can cause children to become perfectionists. Indeed, children think that only when they are perfect, they will be approved and accepted by their families (Hamachek, 1978). According to Frost et al. (1990), children who are criticised excessively by their parents may have increased perfectionism, so the parent-child relationship is related to perfectionism.

Egan, Wade, Shafran and Antony gathered the factors that could lead to perfectionism under three headings in their 2014 work; there may be personal, learning and genetic factors. Egan et al. emphasised the parental role in the personal factors heading. Under the heading of the learning factor, the achievement of individuals who set high goals has a positive effect, but if this affects all areas of their lives, it may have negative consequences for them.

Although there is not much information about genetic factors as the third factor, it is thought that genetic factors may have an effect on perfectionism due to studies conducted on twins.

In light of all this information; it can be stated that the factors that cause perfectionism may include family, friends, learning and genetics. After these reasons for perfectionism, the effects of this concept on the individual will be examined.

2.3.4 Effects of Perfectionism

Today, the relationship between perfectionism and psychopathology is included in studies about perfectionism. In fact, more than the relationship between perfectionism and psychopathology, there are research findings showing that perfectionism is considered a variable that can cause psychopathology. When the relevant studies are examined, the relationship between the concepts of depression, anxiety and stress and perfectionism is mentioned. Also, perfectionism may cause many problems such as nutritional disorders, chronic fatigue, insomnia, chronic headache, indigestion, obsession, premature death and suicide. However, the motivational aspect of perfectionism can be mentioned among the possible positive effects.

Perfectionists are more prone to produce stress when faced with ordinary life events, and in this case, the probability of these individuals displaying stress-based psychological symptoms and stress-based psychological diseases increase. Perfectionists who think that they cannot reach the highest standards feel inadequate and uncomfortable with this situation. This ailment can occur as many forms of depression or different types in perfectionist individuals, and research shows that there is a relationship between perfectionism, stress and anxiety (Küçü, 2018).

Perfectionists are characterised by a fear of failure, and therefore it was stated that they are more likely to become depressed because of this fear (Flett, Hewitt, Blankstein, & Mosher, 1995). On the other hand, the fact that perfectionists ruminate too much is

considered to be another factor that can cause depression (Egan et al., 2014). Egan and colleagues stated the last point in the relationship between perfectionism and depression. They showed that depressive symptoms may occur when the procrastination and fear of avoidance that perfectionists experience due to the fear of not meeting high standards become cyclical.

It was also stated that worrying about mistakes inherent in perfectionism and high personal standards can increase pathological anxiety (Handley, Egan, Kane, & Rees, 2014). Similarly, social anxiety will increase in perfectionists who know that acceptable standards are high in social situations (Rosser, Issakidis, & Peters, 2003). In this respect, it is inevitable that the level of social anxiety rises and anxiety continues in perfectionists who establish a belief about being competent and perfect in social environments and constantly evaluate themselves (Egan et al., 2014, p.39).

In addition, the possibility of perfectionist individuals experiencing social phobia may increase (Juster et al., 1996). It was reported that individuals with perfectionist tendencies are also more likely to display suicidal behaviour (Hewitt, Flett & Turnbull - Donovan, 1992).

The possibility of the occurrence of the psychopathological disorders listed below increases in perfectionists; eating disorders (anorexia, bulimia nervosa and binge eating; Hewitt, Flett, & Ediger, 1995), panic disorders (Saboonchi, Lundh, & Öst, 1999), psychosomatic disorders (Forman, Tosi, & Rudi, 1987), obsessive-compulsive disorders (Rheaume, Ladouceur and Freeston, 2000) extreme anger and hostility (Saboonchi and Lundh, 2003). Negative perfectionism can cause psychopathology as well as interpersonal conflict, alienation, weak social relationships and isolation. In addition, perfectionism can affect familial events such as divorce and mismatch (Sherry, Mackinnon, & Gautreau, 2016).

In all these studies about perfectionism, it is clearly seen that perfectionism can negatively affect individuals both in personal and interpersonal situations, as well as from mental and physical aspects.

2.4. Research Analysing the Relationships between Perfectionism and Relationship Satisfaction

The concept of RRS is a subject that has been widely studied by both national and international researchers. Studies that reveal the concept of RRS and its relationship with perfectionism concept in national and international arena will be discussed.

Satıcı (2018) aimed to propose a model for RRS of young adults and conducted two independent studies in this context. As a result of the research, a decrease in the level of perfectionism caused an increase in the emotional intelligence and mindfulness levels of young adults, and these increases increased the satisfaction from romantic relationships. It was seen that a low level of perfection can increase direct relationship satisfaction.

Şensoy, Arıcı and İkiz (2019) investigated the predictive role of perfectionism and trust level in romantic relationships of university students in terms of relationship satisfaction. The participants in the study consisted of 325 university students who were already in romantic relationships. According to the results of the research, there was a positive relationship between relationship satisfaction, self-oriented perfectionism and trust in bilateral relations; and there was a statistically significant negative correlation with other-oriented perfectionism.

Kol (2020) investigated the relationship between positive and negative perfectionism and relationship satisfaction in adult individuals between the ages of 18-40 who were in romantic relationships. According to the results of the research, as perfectionism in the relationship increased, the satisfaction from the relationship decreased. Contrary to this, as

the perfectionism in the relationship decreased, the satisfaction from the relationship increased.

Hewitt, Flett, and Mikail (1995) examined the relationship between patients with pain and their relationship compliance and perfectionism with their partners. According to the results of the study, the relationship satisfaction levels of these patients were related to their partners' other-oriented perfectionism. However, patients with spouses who had higher other-oriented perfectionism scores saw their partners as being less supportive. In addition, the compatibility of patients with high socially prescribed perfectionism with their families and spouses was found to be low. Relationship satisfaction of these patients was found to be related to their partners' other-oriented perfectionism.

Dimitrovsky et al. (2002) examined the relationship between perfectionism, depression, and relationship satisfaction in pregnant and non-pregnant women. In both groups, depression had a positive relationship with self-oriented perfectionism and a negative relationship with relationship satisfaction. A negative relationship was found between socially prescribed perfectionism and relationship satisfaction in pregnant women.

Lopez et al. (2006) investigated dual perfectionism at 3-month intervals in college students with romantic relationships. Dual perfectionism scores were found to be associated with adult attachment and relationship satisfaction. When attachment styles were controlled, dual perfectionism was found to be an important predictor of relationship continuity. As a result, dual perfectionism was found to be an important risk factor in dysfunction of the relationship.

Stoeber (2012) examined dyadic perfectionism, relationship satisfaction, and long-term commitment of university students and their partners. According to research results, while partner-oriented perfectionism had a positive effect on partner-prescribed

perfectionism, it had a negative effect on relationship satisfaction and commitment. Partner-prescribed perfectionism had a negative effect on relationship satisfaction.

2.5. Research Analysing the Relationships between Perfectionism and Problem-Solving Skills

The concept of problem-solving skills in marriage is a subject that has been studied by both national and international researchers. Studies that reveal the relationship between the concept of problem-solving skills in marriage and perfectionism in the national and international arena are discussed below.

Yıldız (2020) studied the predictive effects of the concept of perfectionism on irrational belief levels and problem-solving skills by working with 383 adolescents. Positive perfectionism and negative perfectionism had significant predictive effects on irrational beliefs and problem-solving skills. A significant positive correlation was found between positive perfectionism and problem-solving skills. A significant negative correlation was found between negative perfectionism and problem-solving skills.

Flett et al. (1996) examined the relationship between perfectionism and problem-solving skills and found that low problem-solving skills negatively affect perfectionism because it was stated that the problems encountered must be solved perfectly. In the study conducted by Flett et al. (1996), problem solving was measured with two different scales. One of them was problem solving orientation and the other was problem-solving skills. According to the results of the research, there was a positive relationship between self-oriented perfectionism, other-oriented perfectionism and problem-solving skills. There was a negative relationship between socially prescribed perfectionism and problem solving orientation. Flett et al. (1996) also explained that problem solving skills contribute to the relationship between perfectionism and stress. They stated that perfectionists with a low level

of problem solving orientation are sensitive to stress and live with high levels of stress in the long term.

Cheng (2001) investigated perfectionism and problem-solving skills and stated that there was an important relationship between perfectionism and problem-solving skills.

Chang (2002) investigated the relationship between perfectionism, problem-solving skills, depression and suicidal tendency. As a result of the research, there was a low level negative relationship between perfectionism and problem-solving skills. In other words, a high level of perfectionism caused a low level of problem-solving skills. However, it was concluded that high perfectionism and low problem-solving skills may increase the probability of depression and suicide in individuals.

Berberena (2009) investigated the relationship between perfectionism and problem-solving skills. As a result of the research, perfectionism seemed to negatively affect problem-solving skills. A high level of perfectionism caused low problem-solving skills. In this context, it can be said that perfectionism predicts problem-solving skills.

Argus and Thompson (2008) examined the effects of perceived problem-solving skills, perfectionism, and mindful awareness on depression. According to the research results, negative perfectionism increased depression. Problem-solving skills also had an important role in influencing perfectionism and depressive symptoms. In addition, mindful awareness had a negative effect on the relationship between problem-solving skills and depression, while it had a positive effect on the relationship between negative perfectionism and depression. However, high problem-solving skills positively affect positive perfectionism, while they affect negative perfectionism negatively.

McKinnon et al. (2012) examined perfectionism, conflict, and depression in romantic relationships. According to the results of the study, dual conflict plays a mediating role between perfectionism and depression in individuals in romantic relationships.

Sherry et al. (2012) examined the relationship between perfectionism and conflict in their research based on the diaries of individuals in romantic relationships. According to the results of the research, the person's partner-prescribed perfectionism was found to be an important predictor of conflict. Partner-oriented perfectionism causes self-inhibiting behaviour in men.

3. METHOD

This section contains information about the research model, study group, data collection tools, data collection process and statistical techniques used for data analysis.

3.1. Design

In this study conducted as quantitative research, the correlational design was used. Correlational design is a study in which the relationship between two or more variables is examined without any intervention to these variables. Correlational studies are divided in two as exploratory and predictive relational studies. Exploratory correlation study is used to try to understand an important phenomenon by analysing the relationships between variables. In predictive correlation studies, the relationship between the variables is examined and attempts are made to estimate one of the variables based on the other (Fraenkel & Wallen, 2006). This study is a predictive correlational study since the aim was to investigate the relationships between perfectionism, problem-solving skills and RRS.

3.2. Study Group

A total of 522 married individuals voluntarily participated in the study via online questionnaires. Among the participants, 287 (55%) were women and 235 (45%) were men. Detailed information about the sample of the study is presented in the tables.

Table 1*Demographic Characteristics of the Sample*

		N	%
Gender	Female	287	55
	Male	235	45
Age	18-24	54	10
	25-34	220	42
	35-44	154	30
	45-54	67	13
	55 and above	27	5
Education Level	High School and below	219	42
	Bachelors	246	47
	Graduate School	57	11
Income Level	0-2500 TL	52	11
	2501-5000 TL	184	35
	5001-10000 TL	211	40
	10000 TL and above	75	14
Meeting with Spouse	Flirting	245	47
	Arranged by family	166	32
	Arranged by friends	91	17
	Other	20	4
Duration of the Marriage	0-5 years	232	44
	6-10 years	68	13
	11-20 years	126	24
	20 years and above	96	19
Number of the Children	0	129	25
	1	134	26
	2	138	26
	3	74	14
	4 and above	47	9
Total		522	100

In the Table 1 above the distribution of the demographic data of the research sample were presented. According to the findings; 287 (%55) of the sample are female and 235 (%45) of the sample are male. For the age distribution; 54 (%10) of the sample is aged between 18-24, 220 (%42) of the sample aged between 25-34, 154 (%30) aged between the 35-44, 67 (%13) aged between the 45-54 and finally 27 (%5) of the sample aged 55 and above. Education level of the sample distributed as follows; 219 (%49) of the sample have the education level of high school and below, 246 (%47) of the sample has the bachelor's degree and 57 (%11) of the sample has graduate degree.

Income level of the participants distributed as follows; 52 (%11) of the participants have a monthly income level of 0-2500 TL, 184 (%35) of the participants' income level is between the 2501-5000 TL, 211 (%40) of the participants' income level is between the 5001-10000 TL and lastly, 75 (%14) of the participants have a monthly income level of 10000 TL and above.

Sample's meeting with the spouse findings distributed as follows; 245 (%44) of the participants meet with the spouse by flirting, 166 (%32) of the participants meet with the spouse by family arrangement, 91 (%17) of the participants meet with the spouse by friends arrangement and lastly, 20 (%4) of the participants identified their meeting with the spouse style as other. In another variable the duration of the marriage were questioned and answers distributed as follows; 232 (%44) of the participants' marriage aged 0-5 years, 68 (%13) of the participants' marriage aged 6-10 years, 126 (%24) of the participants' marriage aged 11-20 years and finally 96 (%19) of the participants' marriage is aged 20 years and above. Finally, number of the children distributed as follows; 129 (%25) of the participants don't have a child, 134 (%26) of the participants have only one child, 138 (%26) of the participants have two children, 74 (%14) of the participants have three children, and lastly, 47 (%9) of the participants have four children.

3.3. Data Collection Tools

The Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale, Relationship Assessment Scale, Marital Problem Solving Scale and demographic information form developed by the researcher were used as data collection tools within the scope of the research.

3.3.1. Demographic Information Form

This form was prepared by the researcher in order to gather information about the characteristics of the participants which are thought to be related to the variables. The

demographic information form included questions about participant gender, education level, occupation, working status, year of marriage and whether they have children.

3.3.2. The Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale

The original version of the Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale (DAPS) was developed by Shea, Slaney, and Rice (2006) and adapted to Turkish by Taluy (2018). This scale developed by Shea, Slaney and Rice aims to measure perfectionism in close relationships. The scale uses a 7-point Likert type rating. DAPS consists of 26 items and three sub-dimensions which are “difference”, “high standards” and “order”. The difference sub-dimension measures the perceived inadequacy of their partner by the individuals. The high standards sub-dimension measures the individual’s assessment of their high performance regarding their partner. The order sub-dimension is related to the individuals' expectations of their partners being neat and clean. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient calculated to test the reliability of the scale was .85.

In order to test the construct validity of the scale, factor analysis was applied to the scores attained in each sub-dimension, and the items came together in three sub-dimensions in parallel with the original form. In factor analysis, different from the original scale, the 3th statement in the "difference" sub-dimension of the original scale was reverse coded and included in the "high standards" sub-dimension in the Turkish form. Again, the 19th statement in the "high standards" sub-dimension of the main scale was included in the "difference" sub-dimension in the Turkish form. Therefore, the expressions included in sub-factors in the scale adapted to Turkish differed from the original scale. In the Turkish version of the scale, items 1, 4, 6, 9, 10, 12, 23, 24, and 26 are included in the difference sub-dimension. The high standards sub-dimension includes items 3, 5, 8, 11, 14 and 25. The order sub-dimension includes items 2, 7, 17 and 22. Reverse scored expressions (3, 16, and 21) are consistent with the original scale.

The researchers stated that the “difference” sub-dimension in DAPS is related to the negative / incompatible aspects of perfectionism. They stated that the "high standards" and "order" sub-dimensions are related to the positive / compatible sides of perfectionism (Slaney, Rice et. al., 2001). The obtained results reveal that DAPS has sufficient validity and reliability in the Turkish sample.

In this study, Cronbach alpha internal consistency reliability for the DAPS was found to be .87. DAPS had three sub-dimensions and the reliability of these dimensions was examined. The Cronbach alpha value for the difference sub-dimension was found to be .95. The Cronbach alpha value for the high standards sub-dimension was found to be .81. The Cronbach alpha value for the order sub-dimension was found to be .77. Scale reliability was high as all sub-dimensions had values above .70. In cases where this value is above .70, it is generally accepted that the scale is reliable. However, in scales where the number of questions is limited, the value of .60 can also be taken as the limit of reliability (Sipahi, Yurtkoru & Çinko, 2008)

3.3.3. Relationship Assessment Scale

The Relationship Assessment Scale, developed by Hendrick (1988), was used to obtain data about the relationship satisfaction of the participants. The scale consists of 7 items and is a 7-point Likert type scale. The 4th and 7th items on the scale are scored in reverse. High scores from the scale indicate that the participant's relationship satisfaction is high, and low scores indicate low satisfaction from the relationship.

The adaptation study of the scale into Turkish was carried out by Curun (2001), and it was stated that the scale has 7-item and one-dimensional structure in parallel with the original study. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient calculated to test the reliability of the scale was found to be .86.

As a result of studies about RAS, it was revealed that the scale is a short, psychometrically valid and reliable measurement tool for measuring relationship satisfaction. The fact that RAS is short and reliable and can be used for married, engaged, living together or partner couples, in short, for all couples who have a romantic relationship, is an important aspect of RAS.

In this study, Cronbach alpha internal consistency reliability for RAS was found to be 0.93. Since this value is over .70, the reliability of the scale is high.

3.3.4. Marital Problem-Solving Scale

The Marital Problem-Solving Scale (MPSS) was developed by Baugh, Avery and Sheets-Haworth (1982) and consists of 9 items and 7 rating degrees. It was developed to determine the perceptions of married people about their ability to solve problems encountered in their marriage. Hünler and Gençöz (2002) adapted this scale to Turkish. The scale, which was originally evaluated with 7 degrees, was converted to a 5-point Likert-type rating scale by the researchers in order to facilitate participant answers. The highest score that can be obtained from the problem-solving scale in marriage is 45 and the lowest score is 9. High scores indicate that individuals perceive themselves as successful in terms of problem-solving skills in their marriage. The Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficient calculated to test the reliability of the scale was found to be 0.95.

In this study, Cronbach's alpha internal consistency reliability for MPSS was found to be 0.94.

3.4. Data Collection Process

A theoretical framework was developed by scanning the literature, reading and analysing the sources, and the scales were applied. Approval was obtained from Yeditepe University Ethics Committee. When creating the theoretical framework, many articles,

theses, published journals and books were used. The data for the study were collected using Google Forms completed by married individuals in Istanbul province in March 2021.

In order to provide the necessary data for the thesis, survey questions included the Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale which includes 26 items, the Relationship Assessment Scale that contains 7 items, Marital Problem-Solving Scale including 9 items and a social demographic data form that contains 10 items. The research consisted of 52 questions in 4 comprehensive scales. The survey took about 15 minutes to complete.

Participants were informed about the study on the page before the scales which included the voluntary consent form. This page emphasised that voluntary participation is essential, that the participants could withdraw from the research if they wished, that they should fill in the forms completely, and stated the purpose and method of the research. It was also stated that name and surname were not required.

3.5. Analysis of Data

Firstly, internal consistency reliability was measured using Cronbach α before the main analysis. For the main analyses of the study, the Pearson Correlation Coefficient was used to evaluate correlations between variables. Then multiple regression analysis was conducted to determine the predictive role of perfectionism on romantic relationship satisfaction and problem solving skills. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and independent samples t test were used for the demographic variables. Subprograms of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 25.0 were used to conduct all statistical analyses in this research.

4. FINDINGS

In this part, the findings obtained as a result of the statistical analyzes made to examine the problem and sub-problems of the research are presented.

4.1. Preliminary Analyses

In the Table 2 below, the average scores of the sample's obtained from the research scales and subscales were presented. According to the findings the average scores of the research samples obtained as follows; perfectionism (M=100.45, SS=23.4), difference (M=49.7, SS=18.7), high standards (M=27.2, SS=7.3), order (M=23.4, SS=4.4), romantic relationship satisfaction (M=40.7, SS=9.2) and problem solving skills in marriage (M=37.69, SS=8.1).

Table 2

Mean Scores of the Perfectionism, R.R.S and P.S.S Scales and Difference, High Standards and Order Subscales

	Mean	Std. D.	Skewness	Kurtosis	Minimum	Maximum
Perfectionism	100.45	23.4	0,699	0,329	41	174
Difference	49.73	18.7	0,988	-0,051	27	104
High Standarts	27.27	7.3	-0,439	-0,314	6	42
Order	23.43	4.4	-1,291	1,934	4	28
Romantic Relationship Satisfaction	40.75	9.2	-1,493	1,525	7	49
Problem Solving Skills in Marriage	37.69	8.1	-1,123	0,301	11	45

As seen in the Table 2., all of the research scales have skewness and kurtosis values between the -2 and +2, (George & Mallery, 2019) and it indicates that the research data have normal distribution. Therefore, the parametric tests were used in the hypothesis testing of the research.

4.2. Research Results/Findings

In this part of the chapter the hypothesizes that created in line with the research questions and the research goals will be tested through the statistical testing methods and evaluated.

In the Table 5 below the results of the independent samples t-test that carried out between the gender and research scales for exploring the statistically significant mean differences were presented.

Table 3

Independent samples t-test results related to Perfectionism, R.R.S, P.S.S Scales, Difference, High Standards and Order Subscales with regard to gender

	Group	n	Mean	SD	SE	t	df	p
Perfectionism	Female	287	101,12	23,92	1,41	0,716	520	0,475
	Male	235	99,64	22,84	1,49			
Difference	Female	287	51,66	19,31	1,14	2,594	520	0,010
	Male	235	47,40	17,87	1,17			
High Standarts	Female	287	26,66	7,15	0,42	-2,152	520	0,032
	Male	235	28,04	7,49	0,49			
Order	Female	287	22,80	4,57	0,27	-3,610	520	0,000
	Male	235	24,21	4,23	0,28			
Romantic Relationship Satisfaction	Female	287	39,69	9,55	0,56	-2,941	520	0,003
	Male	235	42,06	8,62	0,56			
Problem Solving Skills in Marriage	Female	287	36,77	8,35	0,49	-2,874	520	0,004
	Male	235	38,82	7,85	0,51			

It can be seen in the Table 3 above there are statistically significant mean differences between the gender and Difference [$t(520) = 0.716$, $p < .05$], High Standards [$t(520) = 2.594$, $p < .05$], Order [$t(520) = -2.152$, $p < .05$], Romantic Relationship Satisfaction [$t(520) = -3.610$, $p < .05$] and Problem Solving Skills in Marriage [$t(520) = -2.874$, $p < .05$].

Table 4 presented below, shows the results of the pearson correlation analysis between the age and research variables to examine the correlation relationships between the variables.

Table 4

Correlation Analysis Between Age, Perfectionism, R.R.S, P.S.S Scales, Difference, High Standards and Order Subscales

	Perfectionism	Difference	High Standards	Order	Romantic Relationship Satisfaction	Problem Solving in Marriage
Age	r 0,039	0,042	0,018	-0,003	-0,055	-0,022

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

According to the data in the table 4, there is no statistically significant correlation relationship between age and the research scales and subscales ($p > .05$).

In order to predict whether the research scales and subscales have a significant mean difference according to education level one way Anova analysis was conducted. The results were presented in the Table 5 below.

Table 5

One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results related to Perfectionism, R.R.S, P.S.S Scales, Difference, High Standards and Order Subscales with regard to education levels

	Education Level	n	Mean	Sd	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Perfectionism	High School and below	219	101,42	25,31	470,20	2,00	235,10	0,427	0,652
	Bachelors	246	99,46	21,66					
	Graduate School	57	101,05	23,52					
Difference	High School and below	219	51,22	19,81	946,35	2,00	473,18	1,343	0,262
	Bachelors	246	48,96	17,45					
	Graduate School	57	47,39	20,13					
High Standarts	High School and below	219	26,68	7,80	502,97	2,00	251,48	4,478	0,009
	Bachelors	246	27,18	6,87					
	Graduate School	57	30,00	6,86					
Order	High School and below	219	23,52	4,49	8,16	2,00	4,08	0,203	0,816
	Bachelors	246	23,31	4,42					
	Graduate School	57	23,67	4,66					
Romantic Relationship	High School	219	39,86	10,22	306,26	2,00	153,13	1,812	0,164

Satisfaction	and below								
	Bachelors	246	41,35	8,34					
	Graduate								
	School	57	41,61	8,50					
Problem Solving Skills in Marriage	High School and below	219	37,19	8,75	119,21	2,00	59,60	0,894	0,411
	Bachelors	246	37,91	7,86					
	Graduate								
	School	57	38,65	7,24					

It can be seen in the Table 5 above the only statistically significant mean difference is between the education level and High Standards [$F(2.00) = 4.478$, $p < 0.05$].

The results of the Tukey post hoc test performed to determine the source of statistically mean differences were presented in the table 6 below.

Table 6

Tukey post hoc test results of Education Level

Sub Scale		Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	ptukey
High Standarts	High School and below	Bachelors	-0,49850	0,67617
		Graduate School	-3,31963*	1,08221
		High School and below	0,49850	0,67617
	Bachelors	Graduate School	-2,82114*	1,06988
		High School and below	3,31963*	1,08221
	Graduate School	Bachelors	2,82114*	1,06988

According to the results participants who have graduate school degree have higher high standards score than the participants who have bachelor's degree and high school and below degrees.

In order to predict whether the research scales and subscales have a significant mean difference according to income level one way Anova analysis was conducted. The results were presented in the Table 7 below.

It can be seen in the Table 7 that, there are statistically significant mean differences between the Income Level and Difference [$F(3.00) = 5.040$, $p < 0.05$], High Standards [$F(3.00) = 4.010$, $p < 0.05$] and Problem Solving Skills in Marriage [$F(3.00) = 5.369$, $p < 0.05$].

The results of the Tukey post hoc test performed to determine the source of statistically mean differences were presented in the table 8 below.

Table 8

Tukey post hoc test results of Income Level

			Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Difference	0-2500	2500-5000	5,78888	2,91583	0,195
		5000-10000	7,37787	2,87443	0,051
		10000 and above	12,63026*	3,35031	0,001
	2500-5000	0-2500	-5,78888	2,91583	0,195
		5000-10000	1,58899	1,87268	0,831
		10000 and above	6,84138*	2,54347	0,037
	5000-10000	0-2500	-7,37787	2,87443	0,051
		2500-5000	-1,58899	1,87268	0,831
		10000 and above	5,25239	2,49590	0,153
	10000 and above	0-2500	-12,63026*	3,35031	0,001
		2500-5000	-6,84138*	2,54347	0,037
		5000-10000	-5,25239	2,49590	0,153
High Standards	0-2500	2500-5000	1,15803	1,14139	0,741
		5000-10000	-1,02789	1,12518	0,798
		10000 and above	-1,61487	1,31147	0,607
	2500-5000	0-2500	-1,15803	1,14139	0,741
		5000-10000	-2,18592*	0,73305	0,016
		10000 and above	-2,77290*	0,99563	0,028
	5000-10000	0-2500	1,02789	1,12518	0,798
		2500-5000	2,18592*	0,73305	0,016
		10000 and above	-0,58698	0,97701	0,932
	10000 and above	0-2500	1,61487	1,31147	0,607
		2500-5000	2,77290*	0,99563	0,028
		5000-10000	0,58698	0,97701	0,932
Problem Solving Skills in Marriage	0-2500	2500-5000	-1,24080	1,26945	0,762
		5000-10000	-1,66569	1,25142	0,544
		10000 and above	-5,11385*	1,45861	0,003
	2500-5000	0-2500	1,24080	1,26945	0,762
		5000-10000	-0,42489	0,81530	0,954

	10000 and above	-3,87304*	1,10734	0,003
5000-10000	0-2500	1,66569	1,25142	0,544
	2500-5000	0,42489	0,81530	0,954
	10000 and above	-3,44815*	1,08663	0,009
10000 and above	0-2500	5,11385*	1,45861	0,003
	2500-5000	3,87304*	1,10734	0,003
	5000-10000	3,44815*	1,08663	0,009

According to the multiple comparisons for the Difference subscale the group of income level of 0 – 2500 TL significantly higher than the income groups of 2501 – 5000 TL, 5001 – 10000 TL and 10001 TL and above. For the High Standards subscale, the income group of 10000 TL and above significantly higher than the income groups of 0 – 2500 TL, 2501 – 5000 TL and 5001 – 10000 TL. For the Problem Solving Skills in Marriage the income level group of 10000 TL and above significantly higher than the income groups of 0 – 2500 TL, 2501 – 5000 TL and 5001 – 10000 TL.

In order to predict whether the research scales and subscales have a significant mean difference according to income level one way Anova analysis was conducted. The results were presented in the Table 9 below.

Table 9

One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results related to Perfectionism, R.R.S, P.S.S Scales, Difference, High Standards and Order Subscales with regard to meeting with spouse

	Meeting With Spouse	n	Mean	Sd	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Perfectionism	by meeting	245	96,13	21,15	9367,776	3	3122,592	5,847	0,001
	arranged	166	105,09	25,35					
	via friends	91	104,02	23,82					
	others	20	98,70	23,41					
Difference	by meeting	245	45,87	16,18	7294,166	3	2431,389	7,137	0,000
	arranged	166	54,13	20,59					
	via friends	91	51,66	20,33					
	others	20	51,90	16,91					
High Standarts	by meeting	245	27,02	7,53	413,187	3	137,729	2,587	0,052
	arranged	166	27,28	7,05					
	via friends	91	28,69	6,76					
	others	20	24,00	8,72					
Order	by meeting	245	23,24	4,62	32,756	3	10,919	0,545	0,652
	arranged	166	23,68	4,38					
	via friends	91	23,67	3,88					

	others	20	22,80	5,88					
Romantic Relationship Satisfaction	by meeting	245	42,78	7,32	2053	3	684,333	8,416	0,000
	arranged	166	38,66	10,49					
	via friends	91	39,89	9,80					
	others	20	37,25	10,89					
Problem Solving Skills in Marriage	by meeting	245	39,13	7,10	1030,815	3	343,605	5,256	0,001
	arranged	166	36,19	8,98					
	via friends	91	37,09	8,71					
	others	20	35,30	8,73					

In can be seen in the Table 9 that, there are statistically significant mean differences between the Meeting with Spouse and Perfectionism [$F(3.00) = 5.847$, $p < 0.01$], Difference [$F(3.00) = 7.137$, $p < 0.01$] Romantic Relationship Satisfaction [$F(3.00) = 8.416$, $p < 0.05$] and Problem Solving Skills in Marriage [$F(3.00) = 5.256$, $p < 0.05$]

The results of the Tukey post hoc test performed to determine the source of statistically mean differences were presented in the table 10 below.

Table 10

Tukey post hoc test results of Meeting With Spouse

			Mean Difference	Std. Error	Sig.
Subscales			(I-J)		
Perfectionism	by meeting	arranged	-8,95975*	2,32319	0,001
		via friends	-7,89137*	2,83704	0,029
		others	-2,56939	5,37434	0,964
	arranged	by meeting	8,95975*	2,32319	0,001
		via friends	1,06838	3,01434	0,985
		others	6,39036	5,47000	0,647
	via friends	by meeting	7,89137*	2,83704	0,029
		arranged	-1,06838	3,01434	0,985
		others	5,32198	5,70724	0,787
	others	by meeting	2,56939	5,37434	0,964
		arranged	-6,39036	5,47000	0,647
		via friends	-5,32198	5,70724	0,787
Difference	by meeting	arranged	-8,25906*	1,85546	0,000
		via friends	-5,78587	2,26587	0,053
		others	-6,02653	4,29233	0,497
	arranged	by meeting	8,25906*	1,85546	0,000
		via friends	2,47319	2,40747	0,734
		others	2,23253	4,36874	0,956
	via friends	by meeting	5,78587	2,26587	0,053
		arranged	-2,47319	2,40747	0,734
		others	-0,24066	4,55821	1,000
	others	by meeting	6,02653	4,29233	0,497
		arranged	-2,23253	4,36874	0,956
		via friends	0,24066	4,55821	1,000
Romantic Relationship	by meeting	arranged	4,12705*	0,90651	0,000
		via friends	2,89356*	1,10702	0,045

Satisfaction	arranged	others	5,53367*	2,09707	0,042
		by meeting	-4,12705*	0,90651	0,000
		via friends	-1,23348	1,17620	0,721
	via friends	others	1,40663	2,13440	0,912
		by meeting	-2,89356*	1,10702	0,045
		arranged	1,23348	1,17620	0,721
	others	others	2,64011	2,22697	0,636
		by meeting	-5,53367*	2,09707	0,042
		arranged	-1,40663	2,13440	0,912
		via friends	-2,64011	2,22697	0,636
	by meeting	arranged	2,94387*	0,81281	0,002
		via friends	2,04270	0,99260	0,168
		others	3,83061	1,88032	0,176
Problem Solving Skills in Marriage	arranged	by meeting	-2,94387*	0,81281	0,002
		via friends	-0,90117	1,05463	0,828
		others	0,88675	1,91379	0,967
	via friends	by meeting	-2,04270	0,99260	0,168
		arranged	0,90117	1,05463	0,828
		others	1,78791	1,99679	0,807
	others	by meeting	-3,83061	1,88032	0,176
		arranged	-0,88675	1,91379	0,967
		via friends	-1,78791	1,99679	0,807

Multiple comparisons indicated that for perfectionism the participants who have met the spouse by family arrangement have higher mean score than the groups of flirting, arranged by friends and others. For difference, the groups of participants who have met the spouse by family arrangement have higher scores than the groups of the flirting, arranged by friends and others. For the romantic relationship satisfaction, the participants who have met with spouse by flirting have higher scores than the groups of family arrangement, others and arranged by friends. For the problem solving skills in marriage the participants who have met with spouse by flirting have higher scores than the groups of family arrangement, others and arranged by friends.

In order to predict whether the research scales and subscales have a significant mean difference according to duration of marriage one way Anova analysis was conducted. The results were presented in the Table 11 below.

Table 11

One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results related to Perfectionism, R.R.S, P.S.S Scales, Difference, High Standards and Order Subscales with regard to duration of the marriage

	Duration of the Marriage	n	Mean	Sd	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Perfectionism	0 - 5	232	96,69	20,00	6280,649	3	2093,55	3,877	0,009
	6 - 10	68	104,24	27,51					
	11 - 20	126	104,26	26,14					
	21 and above	96	101,88	23,22					
Difference	0 - 5	232	45,20	16,18	10116,15	3	3372,051	10,059	0,001
	6 - 10	68	56,66	20,51					
	11 - 20	126	53,73	19,86					
	21 and above	96	50,57	19,39					
High Standards	0 - 5	232	27,86	7,19	477,577	3	159,192	2,997	0,03
	6 - 10	68	24,93	8,50					
	11 - 20	126	27,13	7,41					
	21 and above	96	27,73	6,36					
Order	0 - 5	232	23,63	4,46	52,917	3	17,639	0,882	0,45
	6 - 10	68	22,65	4,78					
	11 - 20	126	23,40	4,61					
	21 and above	96	23,57	4,06					
Romantic Relationship Satisfaction	0 - 5	232	43,13	7,23	3222,432	3	1074,144	13,587	0,001
	6 - 10	68	37,43	9,77					
	11 - 20	126	37,76	11,11					
	21 and above	96	41,29	8,62					
Problem Solving Skills in Marriage	0 - 5	232	39,57	7,23	2487,39	3	829,13	13,253	0,001
	6 - 10	68	33,88	7,93					
	11 - 20	126	35,53	9,31					
	21 and above	96	38,69	7,45					

In can be seen in the Table 11 that, there are statistically significant mean differences between the duration of the marriage and Perfectionism [$F(3.00) = 3.877$, $p < 0.05$], Difference [$F(3.00) = 10.059$, $p < 0.05$], High Standards [$F(3.00) = 2.997$, $p < 0.05$], Romantic Relationship Satisfaction [$F(3.00) = 13.587$, $p < 0.05$] and Problem Solving Skills in Marriage [$F(3.00) = 13.253$, $p < 0.05$].

The results of the Tukey post hoc test performed to determine the source of statistically mean differences were presented in the table 12 below.

Table 12*Tukey post hoc test results of Duration of Marriage*

Sub Scales			Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Perfectionism	0-5	6-10	-7,54564	3,20459	0,087
		11-20	-7,57225*	2,57171	0,018
		20 and above	-5,18534	2,82012	0,256
	6-10	0-5	7,54564	3,20459	0,087
		11-20	-0,02661	3,49680	1,000
		20 and above	2,36029	3,68334	0,919
	11-20	0-5	7,57225*	2,57171	0,018
		6-10	0,02661	3,49680	1,000
		20 and above	2,38690	3,14822	0,873
	20 and above	0-5	5,18534	2,82012	0,256
		6-10	-2,36029	3,68334	0,919
		11-20	-2,38690	3,14822	0,873
Difference	0-5	6-10	-11,46349*	2,52482	0,000
		11-20	-8,53188*	2,02619	0,000
		20 and above	-5,37464	2,22190	0,075
	6-10	0-5	11,46349*	2,52482	0,000
		11-20	2,93161	2,75505	0,712
		20 and above	6,08885	2,90202	0,155
	11-20	0-5	8,53188*	2,02619	0,000
		6-10	-2,93161	2,75505	0,712
		20 and above	3,15724	2,48041	0,581
	20 and above	0-5	5,37464	2,22190	0,075
		6-10	-6,08885	2,90202	0,155
		11-20	-3,15724	2,48041	0,581
High Standards	0-5	6-10	2,93560*	1,00508	0,019
		11-20	0,73508	0,80658	0,799
		20 and above	0,13290	0,88449	0,999
	6-10	0-5	-2,93560*	1,00508	0,019
		11-20	-2,20051	1,09673	0,187
		20 and above	-2,80270	1,15523	0,073
	11-20	0-5	-0,73508	0,80658	0,799
		6-10	2,20051	1,09673	0,187
		20 and above	-0,60218	0,98740	0,929
	20 and above	0-5	-0,13290	0,88449	0,999
		6-10	2,80270	1,15523	0,073
		11-20	0,60218	0,98740	0,929
Romantic Relationship Satisfaction	0-5	6-10	5,70715*	1,22613	0,000
		11-20	5,37172*	0,98398	0,000
		20 and above	1,84195	1,07902	0,321
	6-10	0-5	-5,70715*	1,22613	0,000
		11-20	-0,33543	1,33793	0,994
		20 and above	-3,86520*	1,40931	0,032
	11-20	0-5	-5,37172*	0,98398	0,000
		6-10	0,33543	1,33793	0,994
		20 and above	-3,52976*	1,20456	0,019
	20 and above	0-5	-1,84195	1,07902	0,321
		6-10	3,86520*	1,40931	0,032
		11-20	3,52976*	1,20456	0,019
Problem Solving	0-5	6-10	5,68661*	1,09074	0,000

Skills in Marriage	11-20	4,03722*	0,87533	0,000
		0,88147	0,95988	0,795
	6-10	0-5	-5,68661*	1,09074
		11-20	-1,64939	1,19021
	20 and above	0-5	-4,80515*	1,25370
		11-20	-3,15575*	1,07156
	11-20	0-5	-4,03722*	0,87533
		6-10	1,64939	1,19021
	20 and above	0-5	-0,88147	0,95988
		6-10	4,80515*	1,25370
	6-10	11-20	3,15575*	1,07156
		20 and above	0,88147	0,95988

Multiple comparisons indicated that for the Perfectionism the participants who have marriage duration between the 11 – 20 years have the highest scores. For the Difference, participants who have marriage duration between the 6 – 10 years have the highest scores. For the High Standards, participants who have marriage duration between the 0 – 5 years have the highest scores. For the Romantic Relationship Satisfaction, participants who have marriage duration between the 0 – 5 years have the highest scores. Lastly, for the Problem Solving Skills in Marriage, participants who have marriage duration between 0 -5 years have the highest scores.

In order to predict whether the research scales and subscales have a significant mean difference according to number of children, one way Anova analysis was conducted. The results were presented in the Table 13 below.

Table 13

One Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) results related to Perfectionism, R.R.S, P.S.S Scales, Difference, High Standards and Order Subscales with regard to number of the children

	Number of children	n	Mean	Sd	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	p
Perfectionism	0	129	96,67	21,15	9043,344	4	2260,836	4,22	0,002
	1	134	97,63	22,99					
	2	138	104,60	25,30					
	3	74	106,88	26,23					
	4 and above	47	96,60	15,84					
Difference	0	129	46,22	16,08	8442,858	4	2110,714	6,224	0,01
	1	134	47,66	18,16					
	2	138	53,99	20,90					
	3	74	55,30	20,69					
	4 and above	47	44,11	12,58					

High Standarts	0	129	26,91	7,60	186,356	4	46,589	0,866	0,484
	1	134	27,09	7,46					
	2	138	26,91	7,49					
	3	74	27,95	7,02					
	4 and above	47	28,83	6,12					
Order	0	129	23,53	4,36	57,711	4	14,428	0,72	0,578
	1	134	22,88	4,93					
	2	138	23,70	4,25					
	3	74	23,64	4,67					
	4 and above	47	23,66	3,68					
Romantic Relationship Satisfaction	0	129	42,70	7,38	2541,897	4	635,474	7,891	0,01
	1	134	41,85	8,06					
	2	138	37,96	10,79					
	3	74	38,58	10,91					
	4 and above	47	43,91	5,47					
Problem Solving in Marriage	0	129	38,67	7,47	1015,367	4	253,842	3,874	0,004
	1	134	38,01	7,82					
	2	138	36,55	8,67					
	3	74	35,68	9,77					
	4 and above	47	40,60	5,39					

It can be seen in the Table 13 there are significantly differences between the number of children and Perfectionism [$F(4.00) = 4.220$, $p < 0.05$), Difference [$F(4.00) = 6.224$, $p < 0.05$), Romantic Relationship Satisfaction [$F(4.00) = 7.891$, $p < 0.05$) and Problem Solving Skills in Marriage [$F(4.00) = 3.874$, $p < 0.05$).

Table 14

Tukey post hoc test results of Number of Children

Sub Scales		Mean Difference (I-J)		Std. Error	Sig.
Perfectionism	0	1	-0,96766	2,85499	0,997
		2	-7,93478*	2,83462	0,042
		3	-10,21171*	3,37529	0,022
		4 and above	0,07092	3,94355	1,000
	1	0	0,96766	2,85499	0,997
		2	-6,96712	2,80716	0,096
		3	-9,24405*	3,35226	0,047
		4 and above	1,03858	3,92385	0,999
	2	0	7,93478*	2,83462	0,042
		1	6,96712	2,80716	0,096
		3	-2,27693	3,33493	0,960
		4 and above	8,00570	3,90905	0,245
	3	0	10,21171*	3,37529	0,022
		1	9,24405*	3,35226	0,047
		2	2,27693	3,33493	0,960
		4 and above	10,28263	4,31720	0,122

	4 and above	0	-0,07092	3,94355	1,000
		1	-1,03858	3,92385	0,999
		2	-8,00570	3,90905	0,245
		3	-10,28263	4,31720	0,122
Difference	0	1	-1,44712	2,27144	0,969
		2	-7,76845*	2,25523	0,006
		3	-9,08024*	2,68539	0,007
		4 and above	2,11067	3,13749	0,962
	1	0	1,44712	2,27144	0,969
		2	-6,32133*	2,23338	0,039
		3	-7,63312*	2,66706	0,035
		4 and above	3,55780	3,12182	0,785
	2	0	7,76845*	2,25523	0,006
		1	6,32133*	2,23338	0,039
		3	-1,31179	2,65328	0,988
		4 and above	9,87912*	3,11005	0,014
	3	0	9,08024*	2,68539	0,007
		1	7,63312*	2,66706	0,035
		2	1,31179	2,65328	0,988
		4 and above	11,19091*	3,43477	0,010
	4 and above	0	-2,11067	3,13749	0,962
		1	-3,55780	3,12182	0,785
		2	-9,87912*	3,11005	0,014
		3	-11,19091*	3,43477	0,010
Romantic Relationship Satisfaction	0	1	0,84693	1,10689	0,940
		2	4,73391*	1,09899	0,000
		3	4,11659*	1,30861	0,015
		4 and above	-1,21722	1,52892	0,932
	1	0	-0,84693	1,10689	0,940
		2	3,88698*	1,08834	0,004
		3	3,26967	1,29968	0,089
		4 and above	-2,06415	1,52128	0,656
	2	0	-4,73391*	1,09899	0,000
		1	-3,88698*	1,08834	0,004
		3	-0,61731	1,29296	0,989
		4 and above	-5,95113*	1,51555	0,001
	3	0	-4,11659*	1,30861	0,015
		1	-3,26967	1,29968	0,089
		2	0,61731	1,29296	0,989
		4 and above	-5,33381*	1,67379	0,013
	4 and above	0	1,21722	1,52892	0,932
		1	2,06415	1,52128	0,656
		2	5,95113*	1,51555	0,001
		3	5,33381*	1,67379	0,013
Problem Solving Skills in Marriage	0	1	0,65949	0,99852	0,965
		2	2,12369	0,99140	0,204
		3	2,99874	1,18049	0,083
		4 and above	-1,92133	1,37924	0,632
	1	0	-0,65949	0,99852	0,965
		2	1,46420	0,98179	0,569
		3	2,33925	1,17244	0,270
		4 and above	-2,58082	1,37235	0,329
	2	0	-2,12369	0,99140	0,204
		1	-1,46420	0,98179	0,569

	3	0,87505	1,16638	0,944
	4 and above	-4,04502*	1,36717	0,027
3	0	-2,99874	1,18049	0,083
	1	-2,33925	1,17244	0,270
	2	-0,87505	1,16638	0,944
	4 and above	-4,92007*	1,50992	0,010
4 and above	0	1,92133	1,37924	0,632
	1	2,58082	1,37235	0,329
	2	4,04502*	1,36717	0,027
	3	4,92007*	1,50992	0,010

Multiple comparisons indicated that for the Perfectionism the participants who have three children have higher scores than the participants who have only one child, two children, four and above and none. for the Difference the participants who have three children have higher scores than the participants who have only one child, two children, four and above and none. For the Romantic Relationship Satisfaction, the participants who have four children and above have higher scores than the who have one child, two children, three children and none. For the Problem Solving Skills in Marriage the participants who have four children and above have higher scores than the who have one child, two children, three children and none.

In this section, the correlation analysis results and findings are presented. Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine the correlations of variables. The results were presented in Table 15.

Table 15

Correlation Analysis Between Perfectionism, R.R.S, P.S.S Scales, Difference, High Standards and Order Subscales

		1	2	3	4	5	6
1.Perfectionism	r	-					
2.Difference	r	.902**	-				
3.High Standards	r	.630**	.272**	-			
4.Order	r	.419**	.080	.523**	-		

5.Romantic Relationship Satisfaction	r	-.675**	-.792**	-.124**	-.008	-
6.Problem Solving Skills in Marriage	r	-.547**	-.686**	-.024	.057	.833**

$n=522$, * $p<.001$

It can be seen in the Table 15 there are statistically significant correlation relationship between the Perfectionism and other research scales and subscales ($p<.01$). Perfectionism positively correlated with the Difference ($r=.902$), High Standards ($r=.630$), Order ($r=.419$) and negative correlated with the Romantic Relationship Satisfaction ($r=-.675$) and Problem Solving Skills ($r=-.547$). Difference positively correlated with the High Standards ($r=.272$) and negatively correlated with the Romantic Relationship Satisfaction ($r=-.792$) and Problem Solving Skills in Marriage ($r=-.686$). High Standards negatively correlated with the Romantic Relationship Satisfaction ($r=-.124$) and Problem Solving Skills in Marriage ($r=-.024$) and positively correlated with the order ($r=.523$). Romantic Relationship Satisfaction is positively correlated with the Problem Solving Skills in Marriage ($r=.833$).

In this section, the regression analyses results and findings are presented. Multiple Linear Regression Analysis was conducted to estimate predictors of Romantic Relationship Satisfaction and Problem Solving Skills in Marriage

Multiple regression analysis conducted for Romantic Relation Satisfaction. VIF and tolerance values were examined in order to avoid the multicollinearity problem. The tolerance ranged from .67 to .92, with VIF values between 1.08 and 1.48. Durbin-Watson value is 1.94, that is, there is no auto-correlation problem. Bonferroni protocol was applied to prevent type 1 error in all regression analyzes and the statistical significance value was

determined as $p=.01$ instead of $p=.05$. The findings of the multiple regression analysis for Direct Aggression Exposure are presented in Table 16 below.

Table 16

Regression Findings of Romantic Relationship Satisfaction

<i>Romantic Relationship Satisfaction</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Constant)	57,091	1,420		40,204	0,000
Difference	-0,401	0,014	-0,818	-29,577	0,000
High	0,117	0,041	0,093	2,887	0,004
Standards					
Order	0,017	0,064	0,008	0,268	0,789

$n= 518, R= .797, R^2=.635, F= 301.200, p<.001$

As seen in Table 16, the model for Romantic Relationship Satisfaction is significant [$F(518)= 301.200, p<.001, R^2=.635$]. Considering the standardized coefficients (β) of the predictor variables, the Difference ($\beta= -0.818, p<0.01$) negatively predicts participants' Romantic Relationship Satisfaction. 63% of the variance can be explained by this model.

Multiple regression analysis conducted for Problem Solving Skills in Marriage. VIF and tolerance values were examined in order to avoid the multicollinearity problem. The tolerance ranged from .67 to .92, with VIF values between 1.08 and 1.38. Durbin-Watson value is 1.95, that is, there is no auto-correlation problem. Bonferroni protocol was applied to prevent type 1 error in all regression analyzes and the statistical significance value was determined as $p=.01$ instead of $p=.05$. The findings of the multiple regression analysis for Direct Aggression Exposure are presented in Table 17 below.

Table17

Regression Findings of Problem Solving Skills

<i>Problem Solving Skills</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>β</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
(Constant)	47,340	1,477		32,046	0,000
Difference	-0,319	0,014	-0,732	-22,623	0,000

High Standards	0,176	0,042	0,158	4,168	0,000
Order	0,060	0,067	0,033	0,901	0,368
<i>n</i> = 518, <i>R</i> = .708, <i>R</i> ² = .501, <i>F</i> = 173.090, <i>p</i> < .001					

As seen in Table 17, the model for Problem Solving Skills in Marriage is significant [$F(518) = 173.090$, $p < .001$, $R^2 = 0.501$]. Considering the standardized coefficients (β) of the predictor variables, the Difference ($\beta = -0.732$, $p < 0.01$) negatively predicts participants' Problem Solving Skills in Marriage and High Standards ($\beta = 0.158$, $p < 0.01$) positively predicts participants' Problem Solving Skills in Marriage. 50% of the variance can be explained by this model.

5. RESULTS

1. Perfectionism positively correlated with difference, high standards, and order and negatively correlated with the Romantic Relationship Satisfaction and Problem Solving Skills scales. Difference positively correlated with high standards and negatively correlated with the Romantic Relationship Satisfaction and Problem Solving Skills in Marriage scales. Romantic relationship satisfaction positively correlated with the problem solving skills in marriage.
2. The difference sub-dimension negatively predicted the romantic relationship satisfaction of participants.
3. The difference sub-dimension negatively predicted problem solving skills in marriage and high standards positively predicted problem solving skills in marriage of participants.
4. There were statistically significant differences between gender and difference, high standards, order, romantic relationship satisfaction and

problem-solving skills of married individuals participating in the research. While women had higher scores than men in the difference sub-dimension, men had higher scores than women for the variables of high standards, order, romantic relationship satisfaction and problem-solving skills.

5. There were no significant relationships between perfectionism and sub-dimensions, romantic relationship satisfaction and problem-solving skills scores of married individuals participating in the research and the age variable.
6. There were statistically significant differences between the high standards subscale and the education level of married individuals participating in the research. Participants with a postgraduate education level had the highest scores.
7. There were statistically significant differences between the difference, high standards sub-dimensions, and problem-solving skills in marriage and income levels of married individuals participating in the research. Multiple comparisons indicated that for the difference subscale the group with income level of 0 – 2500 TL had significantly higher scores than groups with income 2501 – 5000 TL, 5001 – 10000 TL and 10001 TL and above. For the high standards subscale, the group with income 10000 TL and above had significantly higher points than the groups with income 0 – 2500 TL, 2501 – 5000 TL and 5001 – 10000 TL. For the problem-solving skills in marriage, group with income level 10000 TL and above had significantly higher points than the income groups of 0 – 2500 TL, 2501 – 5000 TL and 5001 – 10000 TL.

8. There were statistically significant differences between how the individual met their spouse and perfectionism, difference, romantic relationship satisfaction and problem-solving skills in marriage. Multiple comparisons indicated that for perfectionism, participants who met their spouse through family arrangements had higher mean score than the groups who met by dating, arranged by friends and others. For difference, the groups of participants who met their spouse by family arrangement had higher scores than the groups who met their spouses through dating, arranged by friends and others. For the romantic relationship satisfaction, the participants who met their spouse by dating had higher scores than those who met their spouses through family arrangement, others and arranged by friends. For problem-solving skills in marriage, the participants who met their spouse by dating had higher scores than those who met their spouses through family arrangement, others and arranged by friends.
9. There were statistically significant differences between the duration of the marriage and perfectionism, difference, high standards, romantic relationship satisfaction and problem solving skills in marriage. Multiple comparisons indicated that for perfectionism, the participants with marriage duration between 11 – 20 years had the highest scores. For difference, participants who had marriage duration between 6 – 10 years had the highest scores. For high standards, participants with marriage duration between 0 – 5 years had the highest scores. For Romantic Relationship Satisfaction scale, participants with marriage duration between 0 – 5 years had the highest scores. Lastly, for the Problem-

Solving Skills in Marriage scale, participants with marriage duration between 0 -5 years had the highest scores.

10. There were statistically significant differences between the number of children and perfectionism, difference, romantic relationship satisfaction and problem-solving skills in marriage. Multiple comparisons indicated that for perfectionism, participants with three children had higher scores than participants with only one child, two children, four and above and none. For difference, the participants with three children had higher scores than the participants who had only one child, two children, four and above and none. For Romantic Relationship Satisfaction scale, the participants with four children and above had higher scores than those with one child, two children, three children and none. For Problem Solving Skills in Marriage scale, the participants with four children and above had higher scores than those with one child, two children, three children and none.

6. DISCUSSION AND SUGGESTIONS

In this section, discussion and suggestions are given. Firstly, the similarities and the differences of the findings are discussed based on the literature. Lastly, suggestions are given based on the findings and some implications for future studies are presented.

6.1. DISCUSSION

6.1.1. Romantic Relationship Satisfaction Regression Findings

In this study, the predictive role of the perfectionism level of married individuals on romantic relationship satisfaction was examined. According to research findings, difference,

which is a sub-dimension of perfectionism, negatively predicts the romantic relationship satisfaction of married individuals.

When the relevant literature is examined, in studies conducted about DAPS, relationship satisfaction and individuals with or without relationship commitment, it was observed that the "difference" sub-dimension was the determinant of relationship satisfaction in all three studies (Fons-Scheyd, 2008; Lopez et al., 2006; Shea et al. , 2006). Trub et al. (2018) emphasised that there was a significant relationship between perfectionism and romantic relationship satisfaction, and that perfectionism negatively predicted romantic relationship satisfaction. Likewise, Petersen (2017) stated that perfectionism had a significant effect on romantic relationship satisfaction. It was predicted that there may be some important points of perfectionism in the decrease of romantic relationship satisfaction. Negative perfectionism can affect romantic relationships as it can create negative communication patterns in couples (Arcuri, 2013). In addition, it was thought that romantic relationship satisfaction may decrease because perfectionism can cause destructive reactions, insensitivity and obsessive obsession with the spouse (Flett et al., 2001). The negative aspects of perfectionism create negative effects in romantic relationships (Habke & Flynn 2002: 151), it was also argued that perfectionism is associated with relationship problems and as perfectionism increases, dyadic adjustment decreases (Hewitt, Flett & Mikail 1995: 335). Shea et al. (2006) found that DAPS scores were associated with self-criticism in both men and women, and relationship satisfaction especially for women. Consistent with this finding, other studies about DAPS (Fons-Scheyd 2008; Lopez et al. 2006) examined relationship satisfaction and individuals with or without relationship commitment. According to these findings, as "difference" increases, relationship satisfaction decreases. The “difference” dimension of dyadic perfectionism is thought to be an important risk factor for the dysfunction of the relationship (Lopez et al. 2006: 543). Lopez et al. (2006) suggested that

DAPS “difference” scores also contribute to social desirability, initial relationship satisfaction, level of commitment, and later relationship distress. The increase in the difference sub-dimension in both men and women decreases relationship satisfaction. According to this result, research findings support the presence of a negative and significant relationship between difference and relationship satisfaction in both men and women (Shea et al., 2006; Taluy, 2013). There was a negative relationship between the difference sub-dimension and the investment made by the individual in the relationship in both genders (Taluy, 2013,). When both men and women see that there are differences between their partner's behaviour and their own expectations, they are not willing to invest in the relationship, and as a result, romantic relationship satisfaction may decrease. In addition, when both male and female university students feel that their partner will not meet their expectations, satisfaction obtained from their relationships may decrease as a result of adopting negative communication patterns (Satici, 2018).

According to the previous and current research results, perfectionism, especially the negative sub-dimension of difference, is a factor that leads to negative results for relationship satisfaction or reinforces negative results. Perfectionism can interfere with maintaining healthy relationships, it can cause problems, arguments and conflicts in relationships. Perfectionist partners can push each other and all these factors can cause a decrease in satisfaction from the relationship. For this reason, it is thought that perfectionism may harm relationship satisfaction because it harms communication.

6.1.2. Problem-Solving Skills Regression Findings

In this study, the predictive role of perfectionism levels of married individuals on problem-solving skills in marriage was examined. According to the research findings, the difference sub-dimension negatively predicted problem-solving skills in marriage of married

individuals. Also, the high standards subdimension positively predicted problem-solving skills in marriage of married individuals.

When the relevant literature is examined, the relationship between perfectionism, problem solving skills, depression and suicidal tendency was investigated in the study conducted by Chang (2002). As a result of the research, a low-level negative relationship was found between perfectionism and problem-solving skills. When examining the relationship between perfectionism and problem solving skills, perfectionism was revealed to negatively affect problem-solving skills. High levels of perfectionism result in low problem-solving skills (Berberena, 2009). In this context, perfectionism predicts problem solving skills. According to Hamachek (1978), normal perfectionists are flexible people who are content to achieve their own high standards and constantly accept that their standards cannot be met. They are motivated by trying to maximise their success and can use positive learning strategies.

When current research and previous studies are examined, it seems that the relationship between perfectionism and problem-solving skills has been studied very little. According to the studies conducted, there was a negative relationship between perfectionism and problem-solving skills. At the same time, the studies did not directly focus on perfectionism and problem solving skills, and many other variables were studied together with these variables. Since difference is the negative sub-dimension of perfectionism, it has a negative effect on problem-solving skills. Factors such as perceived inadequacy in their partner, communication problems, perfect problem-solving desires, and overly detailed approach to problems in perfectionist individuals may cause a lack of problem-solving skills. When perfectionist individuals focus on the problem, when they get stuck in too much detail, the problem can become unsolvable. Moreover, when perfectionists see perceived inadequacy in their partner, their problem-solving skills may also suffer. In addition, perfectionists with

high standards may find that solving their problems is a gradual process. They may know that the solution to the problem does not always turn out the way they want.

6.1.3. Discussion Related to Gender

According to findings of this study, there were statistically significant mean differences between gender and the difference, high standards, order subdimensions, romantic relationship satisfaction and problem solving skills. For the difference subdimension, women had higher scores than men. For the variables of high standards, order, romantic relationship satisfaction and problem solving skills, men had higher scores than women.

According to Siegle and Schuler (2000), it was found that perfectionism differs according to gender. It was stated that men also show more perfectionist tendencies than women and set personal standards that are more difficult to achieve. Curtis et al. (2017) stated that men get more satisfaction from their romantic relationships than women. Sari (2008) examined the relationships between irrational beliefs about romantic relationships, attachment dimensions, and relationship satisfaction in university students. As a result of the research, it was concluded that the gender variable predicted relationship satisfaction. In addition, relationship satisfaction of female students was found to be lower than that of male students. Flett (1998) and Slaney and Ashby (1999) pointed out that men focus more on “high personal standards” than women (Cited Erözkan, 2005). In all studies examining gender and perfectionism together, it was revealed that men had higher levels of perfectionism than women. When we consider the dimensions of perfectionism in these studies, men scored higher for high personal standards and perfectionism towards others than women. Some of the studies examining the correlations between romantic relationship satisfaction and gender reported no difference between men and women in terms of relationship satisfaction (Hamamcı, 2005; Stackert and Bursik, 2003), while others revealed that women's relationship

satisfaction is lower than men (DeBord, Romans and Krieshok, 1996; Collins and Read, 1990; Kirkpatrick and Davis, 1994). In this study, the reason why women's relationship satisfaction was lower than men may be that women had higher difference sub-dimension score than men.

While men can find relationship satisfaction in success and results, women can experience relationship satisfaction through sharing, being valued and caring. Since women are process-oriented and men are result-oriented, men's relationship satisfaction may be higher. This may also be valid for problem-solving skills in marriage. Since the left brain, which is related to areas such as logic, reasoning, analysis and calculation, is more dominant in men than women, problem-solving skills of men can be more effective in relationships. The order sub-dimension measures the judgment and expectations from one's partner about being neat and orderly. The fact that men expect women to be more organised underlines the importance of gender roles once again. The high standards sub-dimension assesses individuals' expectations of superior performance regarding their partner. Since men expect their partners to do their best, their standards for their partners may be high.

6.1.4. Discussion Related to Age

When the research findings are examined, the variables of perfectionism and its sub-dimensions, romantic relationship satisfaction and problem solving skills did not change according to the age variable.

When the relationship between perfectionism and age is examined, there are different results in the literature. In Yaoar's study conducted in 2008, the perfectionist personality traits and empathy levels of university students were examined according to different variables and perfectionism was stated not to differ according to age. In Büyükbayraktar's 2011 study with a sample of university students, it was reported that perfectionism differs according to age and that perfectionism decreases with age. Pamir's study conducted in 2008 examined the

relationship between perfectionism levels of high school students and parental attitudes and revealed that perfectionism increases with age. These studies are not consistent with our research.

According to the results of the research, the perfectionism levels, problem-solving skills and romantic relationship satisfaction of the participants did not change according to the age variable. This may be because perfectionism can be easily observed in all age groups. There was no correlation between increasing or decreasing age and perfectionism.

6.1.5. Discussion Related to Educational Status

According to the findings, a statistically significant difference was found between the high standards subscale and the level of education. Also, participants with graduate education level received the highest scores. There was no significant difference between problem-solving skills, romantic relationship satisfaction, order, and difference with educational level. In addition, there was no significant relationship between relationship satisfaction and educational level.

When the literature is examined, data support this research. Hewitt and Flett (1991) stated that high parental education increased the level of excellence. They explained that the reason for this is that the increasing education level also increases expectations. These study findings support the current research. Individuals with a high level of education have increased expectations of their spouse's high performance, and their perfectionism increases. In addition, in line with the results of our research, in the study conducted by Jose and Alfons in 2007 examining whether various demographic variables affect marital satisfaction, it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between educational level and marital satisfaction.

Based on this information, it may be an expected result that the higher standards variable increases as the education level increases. Because individuals with a high level of

education can expect their spouses to do their best and put pressure on them in this way. In addition, positive perfectionists may perceive fewer problems when their performance does not meet their standards, as they have high personal standards and they are easily organised.

6.1.6. Discussion Related to Income Level

When the research findings are examined, there were statistically significant mean differences between income levels with the difference and high standards sub-dimensions, and problem solving skills in marriage. In the study, for the difference subscale, the group with income level of 0 – 2500 TL had significantly higher points than the 2501 – 5000 TL, 5001 – 10000 TL and 10001 TL and above income groups. For the high standards subscale, the group with income 10000 TL and above had significantly higher points than the 0 – 2500 TL, 2501 – 5000 TL and 5001 – 10000 TL income groups. For problem-solving skills in marriage, the group with income level of 10000 TL and above had significantly higher points than the 0 – 2500 TL, 2501 – 5000 TL and 5001 – 10000 TL income groups.

When the literature is examined, data support the research. Purdon, Antony, and Swinson (1999) determined that those with high-income levels had significantly higher levels of perfectionism compared to those with low and medium incomes. Mofield and Peters (2015) reached similar results.

Based on this information, the reason why married individuals with low income level have higher scores for the difference sub-dimension compared to other income levels may be due to the fact that they measure the perceived inadequacy in their partner according to their income level. This situation may cause those with low income level to have a higher level of negative perfectionism than those with high income level. In addition, the high standards sub-dimension increased as the income level increased. There is a direct proportion between the individual's evaluation of superior performance expectations for their partners and their income level. It is possible to expect success in many areas due to the high environmental and

individual expectations of married individuals with high income levels in order to maintain their economic prosperity. Likewise, there is a direct proportion between marital problem-solving skills and income level. Increasing financial income facilitates problem solving. In today's world, the importance of material power is too great to be denied, as can be seen it even facilitates the solution of problems in marriage. As the income level decreases, problem-solving skills decrease, so material wealth in marriage can be important.

6.1.7. Discussion Related to Meeting the Spouse

When the findings of the study are examined, perfectionism, difference, romantic relationship satisfaction and problem-solving skills in marriage were significantly different according to how the participants met their spouse. In the study, multiple comparisons indicated that for perfectionism the participants who met their spouse through family arrangement had higher mean score than the groups who met by dating, arranged by friends and others. For the difference subdimension, the participants who met their spouse by family arrangement had higher scores than the groups who met through dating, arranged by friends and others. For romantic relationship satisfaction, the participants who met their spouse by dating had higher scores than the groups who met through family arrangement, others and arranged by friends. For problem-solving skills in marriage the participants who met their spouse by dating had higher scores than the groups who met through family arrangement, others and arranged by friends.

In the literature, Fox stated that arranged marriages showed significantly lower marital quality and marital compatibility than love and logic marriages in 1975. Similarly, Lev-Wiesel and Al-Krenwi in 1999 showed that dyadic compatibility of arranged marriages was lower than that of love marriages. Xiaohe and Whyte in 1990 also suggested that couples engaged in love marriages felt better about their marriage and were more satisfied in their marital relationship than in arranged marriages. In Taştan's (1996) study, communication

between spouses in a problem-solving situation was examined. The couples who got married by agreement had more positive communication than the couples who got married in an arranged manner, if they did not realise that there was a problem in the chart. Although there is no evidence found by Larson (1992) that these are true in marriage, the myths of the perfect spouse, the perfect self and the perfect relationship, which he defines as widely accepted beliefs, reduce the satisfaction of individuals with close relationships when choosing a spouse. This situation causes the person to make the wrong decisions because individuals make these inquiries a lot (Larson, 2000: as cited in Güngör, Yılmaz and Çelik, 2011).

According to the results of the research, problem-solving skills in marriage and romantic relationship satisfaction were higher for participants who met their spouse by dating. The reason for this may be that couples who marry after dating assess their marriage more positively, and have higher friendship, sharing, communication, love, respect and appreciation in their marriages. For the difference sub-dimension and perfectionism, the scores of the individuals with arranged marriages were higher than the other groups. This may be due to the fact that perfectionist individuals strive for perfection, set extremely high standards for themselves and evaluate themselves overly critically, resulting in decreased relationship satisfaction. In particular, individuals who marry by arrangement may have higher expectations than those who marry by dating. Since individuals who marry by dating know each other better and know their compatibility and expectations, there may be a decrease in the rate of perceived inadequacy in their partners.

6.1.8. Discussion Related to Duration of the Marriage

When the research findings are examined, there were statistically significant mean differences between the duration of the marriage and perfectionism, difference, high standards, romantic relationship satisfaction and problem-solving skills in marriage. Multiple comparisons indicated that for perfectionism, the participants with marriage duration between

11 – 20 years had the highest scores. For the difference subdimension, participants with marriage duration between 6 – 10 years had the highest scores. For the high standards subdimension, participants with marriage duration between 0 – 5 years had the highest scores. For romantic relationship satisfaction, participants with marriage duration between 0 – 5 years had the highest scores. Lastly, for problem-solving skills in marriage, participants with marriage duration between 0 - 5 years had the highest scores.

There are not enough studies about perfectionism and marriage duration. Taşköprü conducted research in 2013 examining the relationship between marital satisfaction and problem-solving skills, coping with stress and duration of marriage. In the findings of the studies, a significant relationship was found between the duration of marriage, problem-solving skills, and marital satisfaction with many variables. Urgancı and Eker (2018) also showed that there was a positive relationship between problem-solving skills and marital satisfaction. In the analysis, the participants' marital satisfaction, spousal support and problem-solving scores were found to be high in the first 5 years of marriage. As time passed, marital attrition and problems increased, causing a decrease in marital satisfaction.

According to the results of the research, the reason why the marriage duration with the highest romantic relationship satisfaction was 0-5 years may be due to the excitement and passion experienced in the early stages of the relationship. When the time spent in romantic relationships extends, individuals have the opportunity to get to know each other better and increase their commitment. Negative experiences, which are more likely to be experienced as the duration of the relationship is prolonged, may cause a decrease in the feeling of passion and trust required for relationship satisfaction. The fact that problem-solving skills in marriage are higher in the first years of marriage can be explained as follows. The first years of marriage can be thought of as a period when problems are less magnified and the feelings of individuals towards each other are more intense and warmer. In addition, the fact that

problem-solving skills are more active in the first years of marriage and at younger ages may also explain these results. The duration of marriage for married individuals with the highest perfectionism scores were between 11-20 years. It is thought that this interval coincides with the most intense and productive period in family and business life of married individuals. They may also be parents who have adolescent. A high perfectionism score may be a possible result of this. The reason why the difference sub-dimension was high for 6-10 years of marriage may be due to having children. Having children in a marriage can make parents expect each other to be perfect parents. In addition, it is the years when the most conflicts are experienced in marriage because the highest divorce rates are seen in these years. The year of marriage with the highest high standards subdimension points was between 0-5 years. Newly married individuals may have high expectations from each other as they recognise each other's different and new features.

6.1.9. Discussion Related to Number of Children

When the findings of the study are examined, perfectionism, difference, romantic relationship satisfaction and problem-solving skills in marriage had significant differences according to the number of children. Multiple comparisons indicated that for perfectionism, participants with three children had higher scores than the participants with only one child, two children, four and above and none. For the difference subdimension, the participants with three children had higher scores than the participants with only one child, two children, four and above and none. For romantic relationship satisfaction, the participants with four children and above had higher scores than those with one child, two children, three children and none. For problem-solving skills in marriage, the participants with four children and above had higher scores than those with one child, two children, three children and none.

In the literature, Callan (1984) found (50 childless couples and 41 couples with children) that couples with children were more satisfied with marriage than those without

children. In the study conducted by Bilici (2009), marital satisfaction and problem-solving skills of family members with and without children were compared. Participants consisted of 400 married individuals (200 women and 200 men), 200 of whom had children and 200 of whom did not. Marriage satisfaction and problem-solving skills differed significantly depending on the number of children. There are not enough studies about perfectionism and the number of children.

According to the results of the research, individuals with four or more children had the highest scores for romantic relationship satisfaction and marital problem-solving skills. Since these individuals have many children, they are individuals who can improve their problem solving and find effective solutions to problems. In addition, since they have four or more children, they may have found they were successful in raising children and had the opportunity to increase their relationship satisfaction.

6.2. SUGGESTIONS

6.2.1. Suggestions Related to the Academic Studies

1. This study is important academically, as it was conducted with married individuals. In the literature, the number of studies investigating the variables of perfectionism, romantic relationship satisfaction and problem-solving skills in marriage is limited. In this regard, in the future; personality traits, parental education level, parental attitude, number of siblings, birth order, etc., from which more information can be obtained about individuals' romantic relationship satisfaction and problem-solving skills. Studies can be carried out to include personal and environmental variables. It is expected that examining these variables together will contribute to future studies.
2. The variables in the study were examined together for the first time.

Therefore, in order to increase the generalizability of the study, repeated studies can be done with similar and different samples. Some further studies examining the same variables will contribute the generalizability of the study.

3. Parental attitudes, attachment styles, psychiatric illness diagnoses and personal characteristics of individuals may be investigated in the context of perfectionism.

4. Qualitative or meta-analysis research methods may be used to deepen the research.

6.2.2. Suggestions Related to Practice

1. This study was carried out with married individuals. Since romantic relationship satisfaction is an important concept in the later years of life, training can be prepared to explain the importance of perfectionism and problem-solving skills in their romantic relationships to unmarried young adults.

2. Perfectionism leads to significant benefits and harms for romantic relationship satisfaction and marital problem-solving skills. For this reason, seminars and conferences can be organised in order to convey information about perfectionism to large masses and to increase awareness about the concepts.

3. This study made it possible to understand the effects of the difference sub-dimension, which is the negative sub-dimension of perfectionism, on problem-solving skills, and to make sense of the difficulties experienced during marriage. When this dimension is examined, it can support marital therapy studies.

REFERENCES

- Adler, A. (1930/1956). Striving for Superiority. In H. L. Ansbacher, & R. R. Ansbacher (Eds.), *The Individual Psychology of Alfred Adler: A Systematic Presentation in Selections From His Writings*. Harper and Row.
- Adler, A. (1956). Striving for superiority. H. L. Ansbacher, & R. R. Ansbacher (Eds.), *The individual psychology of Alfred Adler: A systematic presentation in selections from his writings*. (pp. 100-109). Basic Books.
- Adler, A. (1964). On the Origin of the Striving and Superiority and of Social Interest. In H. L. Ansbacher, R. R. Ansbacher (Eds.), *Superiority and Social Interest: A Collection of Later Writings*. Northwestern University Press.
- Adler, A. (2001). *Psikolojik Aktivite: Üstünlük Duygusu ve Toplumsal İlgi* (B. Çorakçı, Trans.). Say Yayınları.
- Adler, A. (2006). *Sosyal Roller ve Kişilik* (T. Yörükan, T. Trans.). Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.
- Akbay, S. (2015). *Ana-Babaya bağlanma ile romantik yakınlık ve otantik benlik arasındaki ilişkilerde bağlanma stillerinin aracı rolünün incelenmesi* [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation]. Mersin Üniversitesi
- Akkaya, M. (2010). *Bağlanma Stilleri, Stresle Başa Çıkma Tarzları, Problem Çözme Becerileri ve İletişim Tarzlarının Boşanma Süreci Üzerindeki Etkilerinin İncelenmesi*, [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Karadeniz Teknik Üniversitesi
- Altıntaş, E., & Gültekin, M. (2005). *Psikolojik Danışma Kuramları*. Aktüel Yayınları.
- Antony, M.M., & Swinson, R.P. (2000). *Mükemmeliyetçilik: Dost Sandığınız Düşman*. (A. Açıkgöz, Trans.). Kuraldışı Yayıncılık
- Arcuri, A. (2013). *Dyadic Perfectionism, Communication Patterns and Relationship Quality in Couples*, [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation]. University of Windsor.

- Arenofsky, J. (2001). Developing your problem solving skills. *Career World*, 29(4):18- 19.
- Argus, G., & Thompson, M. (2008). Perceived social problem solving, perfectionism and mindful awareness in clinical depression: An exploratory study. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 32(6): 745-757.
- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging Adulthood: A Theory of Development from the Late Teen through Twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55, 469-480.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.469>
- Arnett, J. J. (2012). *Human Development: A Cultural Approach*. Pearson Education, Inc.
- Ashby, J. S., & Kenneth G. Rice (2002). Perfectionism, dysfunctional attitudes, and self-esteem: A structural equations analysis. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 80, 197-203.
- Ateş, R. (2014). Evlilikte ilk yıllar, çatışmalar ve “Güç” kavramı. In H. Yavuzer (Ed.), *Evlilik Okulu: Evlilikte Kişilerarası İlişkiler ve İletişim Becerileri* (pp. 114-124). Remzi Kitabevi.
- Ayhan, İ. (2007). Psikanalitik Yaklaşım: Bilinçaltından Notlar. *TUBİTAK Bilim ve Teknik Dergisi*, 472.
- Bacanlı, H. (2001). Eş tercihleri. *Türk Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Dergisi*, 15(2), 7- 16.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2): 191-215.
- Baugh, C. W., Avery, A. W., & Sheets-Haworth, K. L. (1982). Marital Problem-Solving Scale: A measure to assess relationship conflict negotiation ability. *Family Therapy*, 9(1), 43-51.

- Beck J. S. (2001). *Bilişsel Terapi Temel İlkeler ve Ötesi* (N. H. Şahin, Trans.). Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayını.
- Beck, A. (1976). *Cognitive Therapy And The Emotional Disorders*. Meridian.
- Berberena, S. (2009). *Investigating the relation between dimensions of perfectionism and social problem-solving*, [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Central Connecticut University.
- Berk, E. L. (2013). *Çocuk Gelişimi* (A. Dönmez, Trans.). İmge Kitabevi.
- Bernstein, D., Penner, L. A., Clarke-Stewart A., & Roy, E. J. (2012). *Psychology*. (9th Ed.). Cengage Learning.
- Berscheid, E. (1994). Interpersonal relationships. *Annual review of psychology*, 45(1), 79-129.
- Berscheid, E., Snyder, M., & Omoto, A. M. (1989). Issues in studying close relationships: Conceptualizing and measuring closeness. In C. Hendrick (Ed.), *Close relationships* (pp. 63-91). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Beştav, G. F. (2007). *Romantik ilişki doyumu ile cinsiyet, bağlanma stilleri, rasyonel olmayan inançlar ve aşka ilişkin tutumlar arasındaki ilişkilerin incelenmesi*. [Unpublished Master' s Thesis], Hacettepe Üniversitesi.
- 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. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(03\)00235-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(03)00235-6)

- Bilici, Z. (2009). *Çocuk sahibi olan ve olmayan ailelerin problem çözme becerilerinin ve yaşam doyumlarının karşılaştırılması* [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Ondokuzmayıs Üniversitesi.
- Bingham, A. (2004). *Çocuklarda Problem Çözme Yeteneklerinin Geliştirilmesi* (A. F. Oğuzkan, Trans.). Milli Eğitim Basımevi.
- Borynack, Z. A. (2003). *Contextual Influences In The Relationship Of Perfectionism And Anxiety: A Multidimensional Perspective* [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation]. Oklahoma University.
- Bradbury, N. T., Fincham F. D., & Beach S. R. H. (2000). Research On The Nature And Determinants Of Marital Satisfaction: A Decade In Review. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 62 (4), 964 – 980 DOI: [10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00964.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-3737.2000.00964.x)
- Bransford, J. D., & Stein, B. S. (1993). *The Ideal Problem Solver*. W. H. Freeman.
- Brehm, S S., Kassin, S. M., & Fein, S. (2002). *Social Psychology*. (5th ed.). Houghton Mifflin Company
- Brown, S. (1998). Emotional Well-Being and Its Relation to Health. *British Medical Journal*, 317, 1608–1609.
- Burger, J.M. (2006). *Kişilik* (İ. D. E. Sarıoğlu, Trans.). Kaknüs Yayınları
- Burns, D. D. (1980). *The Perfectionist's Script For Self-Defeat*. *Psychology Today*, 14, 6: 34–52.
- Büyükbayraktar, Ç. (2011). *Üniversite Öğrencilerinde Mükemmeliyetçilik ve Öfke İlişkisi* [Unpublished Master's thesis] Selçuk Üniversitesi,

- Çağrı, O. P. (2008). *Lise Öğrencilerinin Mükemmeliyetçilik Düzeyleri ile Anne Baba Tutumları Arasındaki İlişki* [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Muğla Üniversitesi.
- Callan, V. J. (1984). Childlessness and marital adjustment. *Australian Journal of Sex, Marriage and Family*, 5(4), 210-214.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01591487.1984.11004295>
- Campbell, A. (1976). Subjective measures of well-being. *American Psychologist*, 31(2), 117–124. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.31.2.117>
- Canary, D. J. (2003). Managing interpersonal conflict: A model of events related to strategic choices. In J. O. Greene & B. R. Burles (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills* (pp. 515–549). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum
- Canel, A. N. (2007). *Ailede problem çözme, evlilik doyumu ve örnek bir grup çalışmasının sınanması*, [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. Marmara Üniversitesi.
- Canel, A. N. (2011). Ailenin kendi doğal kaynaklarını kullanma yoluyla problem çözme becerisinin kazanılması. *Aile yaşam becerileri*. (1st ed., pp. 27-40), Aile ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Genel Müdürlüğü Yayınları.
- Çelenoğlu, A. (2011). *Evli Bireylerin, Bağlanma Stillerine ve Kendilik Algısına göre Evlilikte Yaşanan Sorunlarla Başa Çıkma Yollarının İncelenmesi*, [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Haliç Üniversitesi.
- Chang, E. C. (2002). Examining the link between perfectionism and psychological maladjustment: Social problem-solving as a buffer. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 26 (5): 581-595.

- Cheng, S. K. (2001). Life stress, problem-solving, perfectionism, and depressive symptoms in Chinese. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 25(3): 303-310.
- Çilingir, A. (2006). *Fen lisesi ile genel lise öğrencilerinin sosyal becerileri ve problem çözme becerilerinin karşılaştırılması*, [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Atatürk Üniversitesi.
- Çırakoğlu, O. C., & Tezer, E. (2010). Kontrol odağı ve eleştirel düşünmenin üniversite öğrencilerinin ilişki doyumsuzluklarına verdikleri tepkiler üzerindeki yordayıcı rolü [The predictive role of locus of control and critical thinking on reactions to relationship dissatisfactions of university students]. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, 13(26), 29–41.
- Collins, N. L., & Read, S. J. (1990). Adult attachment, working models, and relationship quality in dating couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(4), 644–663. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.4.644>
- Collins, W. A. (2003). More and myth: the developmental significance of romantic relationships during adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 13(1), 124
- Collins, W. A. (2003). More Than Myth: The Developmental Significance of Romantic Relationships During Adolescence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 13(1), 1 – 24 DOI:[10.1111/1532-7795.1301001](https://doi.org/10.1111/1532-7795.1301001)
- Connolly, J., & Konarsky, R. (1994). Peer self-concept in adolescence: Analysis of factor structure and of associations with peer experience. *Journal of Research in Adolescence*, 4, 385-403.
- Connolly, J., & McIsaac, C. (2011). Romantic relationships in adolescence. M. K. Underwood & L. H. Rosen (Eds.), *Social development: Relationships in infancy, childhood, and adolescence* (8th ed., pp.180-199). New York: Guilford.

- Cooper, T. (1986). Problem solving. *Queensland: Mathematics Education*. Brisbane College of Advanced Education.
- Corey, G. (2008). *Psikolojik Danışma, Psikoterapi Kuram ve Uygulamaları* (T. Ergene, Trans.). Mentis Yayıncılık.
- Cramer, D. (2002). Linking Conflict Management Behaviours and Relational Satisfaction: The Intervening Role of Conflict Outcome Satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 19(3), 425–432. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407502193007>
- Cüceloğlu, D. (2009). *İnsan ve Davranış*. Remzi Kitabevi.
- Curtis, D. S., Epstein, N. B., & Wheeler, B. (2017). Relationship Satisfaction Mediates the Link Between Partner Aggression and Relationship Dissolution: The Importance of Considering Severity. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 32(8), 1187–1208. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260515588524>
- Curun, F. (2001). *The Effects Of Sexism And Sex Role Orientation On Romantic Relationship Satisfaction*. [Unpublished Master' s Thesis], Middle East Technical University.
- D'Zurilla, T. J., & Goldfried, M. R. (1971). Problem solving behavior modification. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 78(1): 107-126.
- DeBord, J., Romans, J. S., & Krieschok, T. (1996). Predicting dyadic adjustment from general and relationship-specific beliefs. *The Journal of psychology*, 130(3), 263–280. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.1996.9915008>
- Demir, M. (2008). Sweetheart you really make me happy: Romantic relationship quality and personality as predictors of happiness among emerging adulthood. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9, 257-277

Dewey, J. (1910). *How We Think*. D.C. Heath & Co. Publishers, USA.

Dimitrovsky, L., Levy-Shiff, R., & Schattner-Zanany, I. (2002). Dimensions of depression and perfectionism in pregnant and nonpregnant women: their levels and interrelationships and their relationship to marital satisfaction. *The Journal of psychology*, 136(6), 631–646. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980209604824>

Dwyer, D. (2000). Types of relationships. *Interpersonal Relationships* (1st ed., pp. 1-14). Routledge.

Egan, S. J., Wade, T. D., Shafran R.&, Antony M. M. (2014). *CognitiveBehavioral Treatment Of Perfectionism*. New York: Guilford Publications.

Ellis, A. (2006). What is Irrational? <http://www.rebtnetwork.org/library/ideas.html>

Erbek, E., Beştepe, E., Akar, H., Eradamlar, N. ve Alpkan, R. L. (2005). *Evlilik uyumu. Düşünen Adam*, 18(1), 39-47.

Erber, R., & Erber, M. W. (2001). *Intimate relationships: Issues, theories, and research*. Massachusetts: Allyn and Bacon.

Erden-İmamoğlu, S. (2009). *Kişilerarası ilişkiler*. Yeni İnsan Yayınevi.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. W.W. Norton & Company.

Erikson, E. H. (1984). *İnsanın Sekiz Çağı*. (T. B. Üstün, V. Şar, Trans.). Birey ve Toplum Yayıncılık.

Erözkan, A. (2005, September, 21-23). Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Mükemmeliyetçilik ve Depresyon Düzeylerinin Bazı Değişkenlere Göre İncelenmesi. VIII. Ulusal Psikolojik Danışma ve Rehberlik Kongresi, İstanbul, Türkiye.

- Eşici, H. (2014). *Romantik İlişki Kalitesinin Erken Dönem Uyumsuz Şemalar, Bağlanma ve Psikolojik İhtiyaçlar Açısından İncelenmesi*, [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Feiring, C. (1996). Concepts of romance in 15-year old adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 6, 181–200.
- Feldman, S. S., Gowen, L. K., & Fisher, L. (1998). Family relationships and gender as predictors of romantic intimacy in young adults: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 8(2), 263-286.
- Fincham, F. D. and Cui, M. (2011). *Romantic relationships in emerging adulthood*. Cambridge University Press.
- Fincham, F. D., & Beach, S. R. H. (2006). Relationship Satisfaction. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 579–594). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511606632.032>
- Fincham, F. D., Stanley, S. M. ve Beach, S. R. H. (2007). Transformative processes in marriage: An analysis of emerging trends. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 69(2), 275-292. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00362.x
- Flett, G. L., Endler, N. S., Tassone, C., Hewitt, P. L., (1995), Perfectionism and Components of State and Trait Anxiety. *Current Psychology*, 13(4), 326-350
- Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., Blankstein, K. R., & Mosher S. (1995). Perfectionism, life events, and depressive symptoms: A test of a diathesis-stress model. *Current Psychology* 14, 112–137. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02686885>

- Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., Shapiro, B. & Rayman, J. (2001). Perfectionism, beliefs, and adjustment in dating relationships. *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality, Social*, 20(4), 289-311. [https://doi: 10.1007/s12144-001-1013-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-001-1013-4)
- Flett, P. L., Hewitt, P. L., & De Rosa, T.. (1996). Dimensions of Perfectionism, Psychosocial Adjustment, and Social Skills. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 24, 109-113.
- Fons-Scheyd, A. (2008). *Further Validation of a Measure of Dyadic Perfectionism*. [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation]. University of Houston.
- Forman, M. A., Tosi, D. J., & Rudy, D. R. (1987). Common irrational beliefs associated with the psychophysiological conditions of low back pain, peptic ulcers and migraine headache: A multivariate study. *Journal of Rational-Emotive Therapy*, 5, 255–265. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01073816>
- Fox, G. L. (1975). Love Match and Arranged Marriage in a Modernizing Nation: Mate Selection in Ankara, Turkey. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 37(1), 180–193. <https://doi.org/10.2307/351042>
- Fraenkel, J. R., & Wallen, N. E. (2006). *How to design and evaluate research in education*. (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Freud, S. (1926/1959). *Inhibitions, Symptoms And Anxiety* (J. Strachey, Trans.). WW Norton & Company.
- Frost, R. O., Marten, P., Lahart C., & Rosenblate R. (1990). The Dimensional of Perfectionism. *Cognitive Therapy and Research* 14, 5: 449-468. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01172967>

- 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.
- Frost, R.O., Turcotte, T.A., Heimberg, R.G., Maitta, J.I., Hold, C.S., & Hope, D.A. (1995). Reactions to mistakes among subjects high and low in perfectionistic concern over mistakes. *Cognitive Therapy and Research* 19, 195–205.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02229694>
- Furman, W. & Schaffer, L. (2003). The role of romantic relationships in adolescent development. In P. Florsheim (Ed.), *Adolescent romantic relations and sexual behavior: Theory, research, and practical implications*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Furman, W. (2002). The emerging field of adolescent romantic relationships. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 11, 117-180.
- Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (1992). Age and sex differences in perceptions of networks of personal relationships. *Child Development*, 63, 103-115.
- Geçtan, E. (2006). *Psikanaliz ve sonrası*. Metis Yayınları.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2019). *IBM SPSS Statistics 26 Step by Step: A Simple Guide and Reference* (16th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429056765>
- Glassman, W. E., & Hadad, M. (2009). *Approaches to Psychology*. McGraw-Hill Education.
- Goldstein, S. E., Chesir-Teran, D. & McFaul, A. (2008). Profiles and correlates of relational aggression in young adults' romantic relationships. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 37, 251-265.

- Gottman, J. M., & Krokoff, L. J. (1989). Marital interaction and satisfaction: A longitudinal view. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 57(1), 47–52. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.57.1.47>
- Güçlü, N. (2003). Lise müdürlerinin problem çözme becerileri. *Milli Eğitim Dergisi*, 160, 272–300
- Güngör, H. , Yılmaz, M. & Çelik, S. (2011). Romantizm ve Eş Seçimi Tutum Ölçeğinin Uyarlanması: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması . *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, 4(36), 180-188. Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/tr/pub/tpdrd/issue/21456/229837>
- Güven, N. (2005). *İlişkilerle İlgili Bilişsel Çarpıtmalar ve Evlilikte Problem Çözme Becerilerinin Evlilik Doyumu ile İlişkisi*, [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. Ankara Üniversitesi.
- Habke, A. M., & Flynn, C. A. (2002). Interpersonal Aspects of Trait Perfectionism. In G.L. Flett & P. L. Hewitt (Eds.), *Perfectionism: Theory, Research and Treatment* (pp: 151-180). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Hamachek, D. E. (1978). Psychodynamics Of Normal And Neurotic Perfectionism. *Psychology: A Journal of Human Behavior*, 15(1), 27–33.
- Hamamcı, Z. (2005). Dysfunctional Relationship Beliefs in Marital Satisfaction and Adjustment. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 33, 313-328. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2005.33.4.313>
- Handley, A. K., Egan, S. J., Kane R. T., & Rees, J. S. (2014). The relationships between perfectionism, pathological worry and generalised anxiety disorder. *BMC Psychiatry* 14, 98. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-244X-14-98>

- Hatfield, E.(1988). Passionated and companionated love. In R. J. Sternberg, & M. L. Barnes (Eds.), *In Psychology of Love* (pp. 191-213). New Haven, Yale University Press.
- Havighurst, R. J. (1956). Research On The Developmental-Task Concept. *The School Review* 64, 5: 215-223).
- Hawkins, J. L. (1968). Associations between companionship, hostility, and marital satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 30(4), 647–650. <https://doi.org/10.2307/349510>
- Heath, A. (1976). Rational choice ve social exchange. *A Critique of exchange theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50(1), 93–98. <https://doi.org/10.2307/352430>
- Hendrick, S. S. (1988). The relationship assessment scale. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 15(1), 137-142.
- Hendrick, S. S., & Hendrick, C. (2006). Measuring respect in close relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 23(6), 881–899. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407506070471>
- Hendrick,S., ve Hendrick, C. (1995). Gender differences and similarities in sex and love. *Personal Relationships*, 2, 55-65.
- Henson, K.T., & Eller, B. F. (1999). *Educational Psychology For Effective Teacher*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Heppner, P. P. (1978). A review of the problem solving literature and it's relationship to the counseling process. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 25, 366–375.

- Heppner, P. P. (1987). Introduction: Broadening the conceptualization of problem solving within career planning. *Journal of Career Development*, 14(1): 3-7.
- Heppner, P. P., & Anderson, W. P. (1985). The relationship between problem solving selfappraisal and psychological adjustment. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 4: 415–427.
- Heppner, P.P., & Baker, C. E. (1997). Applications of the problem solving inventory. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 29(4): 229- 241.
- Hermann, N. (1988). *The Creative Brain*. Lake Lure New York.
- 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(3), (pp: 456–470).
<https://doi.org/10.1037//0022-3514.60.3.456>
- Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1991a). Dimensions of perfectionism in unipolar depression. *Journal of abnormal psychology*, 100(1), 98–101.
<https://doi.org/10.1037//0021-843x.100.1.98>
- 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(3), 456–470. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.60.3.456>
- Hewitt, P. L., Flett, G. L., & Ediger, E. (1995). Perfectionism traits and perfectionistic self-presentation in eating disorder attitudes, characteristics, and symptoms. *The International journal of eating disorders*, 18(4), 317–326.
[https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-108x\(199512\)18:4<317::aid-eat2260180404>3.0.co;2-2](https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-108x(199512)18:4<317::aid-eat2260180404>3.0.co;2-2)

- 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(3), 335–347. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.9.3.335>
- Hewitt, P. L., Flett, G. L., (1993), Dimensions of Perfectionism, Daily Stress, and Depression: A Test of the Specific Vulnerability Hypothesis. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 102, 58-65.
- Hewitt, P. L., Gordon L. F., & Turnbull- Donovan, W. (1992). Perfectionism And Suicide Potential. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 31(2), 181-190.
- Hill, R. W., Zrull, M. C., & Turlington, S. (1997). Perfectionism and interpersonal problems. *Journal of personality assessment*, 69(1), 81-103.
- Hinde, A. R. (1997). *Relationships: A Dialectical Perspective*. New York: Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315784830>
- Hollender, M. H. (1965). Perfectionism. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 6(2), 94–103. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-440X\(65\)80016-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-440X(65)80016-5)
- Hollender, M. H. (1978). Perfectionism, a Neglected Personality Trait. *Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, 39, 384-394.
- Horney, K. (1950/1991). *Neurosis And Human Growth: The Struggle Toward Self-Realization*. Norton.
- Horney, K. (2006). Nevrozlar ve İnsan Gelişimi. *Öz geliştirme Kavgası* (S. Budak, Trans.). Öteki Yayıncılık.

- Hünler, O. S., & Gençöz, T. (2003). Boyun eğici davranışlar ve evlilik doyumu ilişkisi, algılanan evlilik problemleri çözümünün rolü. *Türk Psikoloji Dergisi*, 18 (51). S. 99-108
- Huston, T. L., & Chorost, A. F. (1994). Behavioral buffers on the effect of negativity on marital satisfaction: A longitudinal study. *Personal Relationships*, 1, 223-239.
- Ittenbach, R. F., & Harrison, P. L. (1990). Predicting ego-strength from problem-solving ability of college student. *Measurement & Evaluation in Counseling & Development*, 23(3): 128-137.
- Jerath, J. M., Hasija, S., & Malhotra, D. (1993). A study of state anxiety scores in a problem solving situation. *Studia Psychologica*, 35, (2), 143-150.
- Johnson, M. D., Cohan, C. L., Davila, J., Lawrence, E., Rogge, R. D., Karney, B. R., Sullivan, K. T., & Bradbury, T. N. (2005). Problem-Solving Skills and Affective Expressions as Predictors of Change in Marital Satisfaction. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73(1), 15–27. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.73.1.15>
- Jose, O., & Alfons, V. (2007). Do demographics affect marital satisfaction?. *Journal of sex & marital therapy*, 33(1), 73–85. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00926230600998573>
- Juster, H. R., Heimberg, R. G., Frost, R. O., Holt, C. S., Mattia, J. I., & Faccenda, K. (1996). Social phobia and perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 21, 403-410.
- Kagıtçıbaşı, Ç. (1998). *Kültürel psikoloji – kültür bağlamında insan ve aile*. Yapı Kredi Yayınları.
- Kagıtçıbaşı, Ç. (2010). *Benlik, aile ve insan gelişimi-kültürel psikoloji*. Koç Üniversitesi Yayınları.

- Kail, R. V., & Cavanuagh, J. C. (2015). *Human development: A life-span view* (7th Ed.). Cengage Learning
- Kalkan, M. (2008). Ergenler İçin Romantik İlişkilerde Sorun Çözme Ölçeğinin Geliştirilmesi, Geçerlik ve Güvenirliği. *Çocuk ve Ergen Ruh Sağlığı Dergisi*, 15 (3), 131-138.
- Kalkan, M., & Yalçın, İ. (2012). Evlilik öncesi dönem ve romantik ilişkiler. In M. Kalkan, ve Z. Hamamcı (Eds.), *Evlilik öncesi psikolojik danışma* (pp: 1- 9). Anı Yayıncılık.
- Kalkan, M., Hamamcı, Z. ve Yalçın, İ. (2012). *Evlilik öncesi psikolojik danışma*. Anı Yayıncılık.
- Karduz, F. A. (2009). *Evli Çiftlerin Duygusal Zeka Düzeyleri ile Çift Uyum Düzeyleri Arasındaki İlişki*, [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Sakarya Üniversitesi.
- Karney, B. R., Beckett, M. K., Collins, R. L. and Shaw R. (2007). *Adolescent romantic relationships as precursors of healthy adult marriages: A review of theory, research, and programs*. RAND Corporation.
- Kelley, H.H., Berscheid, E. Christensen, A., Harvey, J. H., Huston, T.L., & Levinger, G. (1983). *Close Relationships*. San Francisco: Freeman.
- Kerr, M., Stattin, H., Biesecker, G., & Ferrer-Wreder, L. (2003). Relationships with parents and peers in adolescence. In *Handbook of psychology, Developmental psychology* (6th ed.) (pp. 395–419).
- Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Davis, K. E. (1994). Attachment style, gender, and relationship stability: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(3), 502–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.66.3.502>
- Koberg, D., & Bagnall, J. (1981). *The All New Universal Traveler*. William Kaufmann Inc.

- Koca, D. A. (2013). *Bir Aile Eğitim Programının Evli Annelerin Evlilik Doyumu, Evlilikte Sorun Çözme Becerisi ve Psikolojik İyi Oluşuna Etkisi*, [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Marmara Üniversitesi.
- Köhler, W. (1959). Gestalt psychology. *American Psychologist*, 14(12): 727-734.
- Kol, K. (2020). *Olumlu olumsuz mükemmeliyetçilik ile ilişki doyumu arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. İstanbul Gelişim Üniversitesi .
- Korsunsky, B. (2003). *Cognitive mechanism of solving non-trivial physics problems*, [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. Harvard University.
- Küçü, E. (2018). *Lise Öğrencilerinde Mükemmeliyetçilik, İhtiyaç Doyumu ve Psikolojik İyi Oluş Arasındaki İlişkinin İncelenmesi*, [Unpublished Master' s Thesis]. Dokuz Eylül Üniversitesi.
- Larson, J. H. (1992). "You're my one and only": Premarital counseling for unrealistic beliefs about mate selection. *American Journal of Family Therapy*, 20(3), 242–253. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01926189208250893>
- Larson, J. H., & Holman, T. B. (1994). Premarital Predictors of Marital Quality and Stability. *Family Relation*, 43, 228-237. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2307/585327>
- Leahy, R.L. (2007). Bilişsel terapi müdahaleleri. In R.L. Leahy (Ed.). *Bilişsel Terapi ve Uygulamaları* (pp. 23- 41). Litera Yayıncılık
- Lee, JA. (1988). Love styles. RJ Sternberg, & ML Barnes (Eds.), *In Psychology of Love*. (pp. 38-67). Yale University Press.
- Lev-Wiesel, R., & Al-Krenawi, A. (1999). Attitude towards marriage and marital quality: A comparison among Israeli Arabs differentiated by religion. *Family Relations: An*

- Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies*, 48(1), 51–56. <https://doi.org/10.2307/585682>
- 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(4), 543–549. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.53.4.543>
- Mackinnon, S. P., Sherry, S. B., Antony, M. M., Stewart, S. H., Sherry, D. L., & Hartling, N. (2012). Caught in a bad romance: perfectionism, conflict, and depression in romantic relationships. *Journal of the Division of Family Psychology of the American Psychological Association (Division 43)*, 26(2), 215–225. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0027402>
- Mofield, E., & Peters, M.P. (2015). Multidimensional perfectionism within gifted suburban adolescents: an exploration of typology and comparison of samples. *Roeper Review*, 37(2):97– 109. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783193.2015.1008663>
- Morgan, C. T. (1999). *Psikolojiye Giriş* (H. Arıcı, Trans.). Meteksan.
- Morgan, C. T. (2015). *Psikolojiye Giriş* (S. Karakaş, R. Eski Trans.). Eğitim Yayınevi.
- Morris, C. G. (2002). *Psikolojiyi Anlamak* (H. B. Ayvaşık, & M. Sayıl, Trans.). Türk Psikologlar Derneği Yayınları.
- Moss, B. F., & Schwebel, A. I. (1993). Defining intimacy in romantic relationships. *Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies*, 42(1), 31–37. <https://doi.org/10.2307/584918>
- Moss, B.F., & Schwebel, A.I. (1993). Defining Intimacy in Romantic Relationships. *Family Relations*, 42, 31-37.

- Mountrose, P. (2000). *Eğitim: 6 İle 18 Yaş Çocuklarıyla Sorunları Çözmede 5 Aşama* (S. Can, Trans.). Kariyer Yayınları.
- Nokes, T. J., Schunn, C. D., & Chi M. T. H. (2010). *Problem Solving and Human Expertise*. International Encyclopedia of Education (pp. 265-272).
- Öğülmüş, S. (2006). *Kişiler arası Sorun Çözme Becerileri ve Eğitimi*. (3rd ed., pp. 71-74), Nobel Yayınevi.
- Özabacı, N. (2014). Evlilik öncesi ilişkiler. In H. Yavuzer (Ed.), *Evlilik Okulu: Evlilikte Kişilerarası İlişkiler ve İletişim Becerileri* (pp: 48-60). Remzi Kitabevi.
- Özabacı, N., 2004, Evlilik Öncesi İlişkiler, In H. Yavuzer (Ed.), *Evlilik Okulu* (pp.39-53), İstanbul: Remzi Yayınevi.
- Özcan, C. T. (2007) *Kişilerarası Sorun Çözme Eğitiminin Dikkat Eksikliği Hiperaktivite Bozukluğu Olan Çocuklardaki Karşı Gelme Belirtileri Üzerine Etkileri* [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation]. Gülhane Askeri Tıp Akademisi.
- Özgüven, İ. E. (1994). *Psikolojik Testler*. Yeni Doğu Matbaası.
- Özgüven, İ. E. (2000). *Evlilik ve aile terapisi*. Pdrem Yayınları.
- Parker, W. D. (1997). An Empirical Typology of Perfectionism in Academically Talented Children. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34, 545-562.
- Petersen, M. (2017). *The Impact of Perfectionism In Couple Conflict and Relationship Satisfaction: An Exploration of the Mediating Influence of Perfectionism in Gottman's Conflict Model* [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation]. Azusa Pacific University.
- Polya, G. (1957). *How to SolveIt: A New Aspect of Mathematical Method*. (2nd ed.). Princeton University Press.

- Pruitt, D. G., & Kim, S. H. (2004). *Social conflict: Escalation, stalemate, and settlement*. NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Purdon, C., Antony, M. M., & Swinson, R. P. (1999). Psychometric properties of the frost multidimensional perfectionism scale in a clinical anxiety disorders sample. *Journal of clinical psychology*, 55(10), 1271–1286. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-4679\(199910\)55:10<1271::AID-JCLP8>3.0.CO;2-A](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-4679(199910)55:10<1271::AID-JCLP8>3.0.CO;2-A)
- Regan, P. C. (2008). *General theories of love*. In *The mating game: a primer on love, sex and marriage*. Sage Publications.
- Rheaume, J., Ladouceur, R., & Freeston M. H. (2000). The Prediction Of Obsessive Compulsive Tendencies. Does Perfectionism Play A Significant Role?. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28, 583-592. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(99\)00121-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(99)00121-X)
- Rice, K. G., & Lapsley D. K. (2001). Perfectionism, Coping, and Emotional Adjustment. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42, 157-167.
- Rice, K. G., & Mirzadeh, S. A. (2000). Perfectionism, attachment, and adjustment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47(2), 238–250. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.47.2.238>
- Rice, K. G., Lopez, F. G., & Vergara D. (2005). Parental / Social Influences on Perfectionism and Adult Attachment Orientations. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 24, 4: 580-605. DOI:[10.1521/jscp.2005.24.4.580](https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2005.24.4.580)
- Robertson, S. I. (2001). *Problem Solving*. Psychology Press.

- Rosser, S., Issakidis, C., & Peters, L. (2004). Perfectionism and Social Phobia: Relationship Between the Constructs and Impact on Cognitive Behavior Therapy. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 27, 143-151.
- Rusbult, C. E. (1983). A longitudinal test of the investment model: The development (and deterioration) of satisfaction and commitment in heterosexual involvements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 45(1), 101–117. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.45.1.101>
- Rusbult, C. E., Zembrodt, I. M., & Gunn, L. K. (1982). Exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect: Responses to dissatisfaction in romantic involvements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43(6), 1230–1242. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.43.6.1230>
- Sabatelli, R. M. (1988). Exploring Relationship Satisfaction: A Social Exchange Perspective on the Interdependence Between Theory, Research, and Practice. *Family Relations*, 217-222.
- Saboonchi, F., & Lundh, L. G. (2003). Perfectionism, anger, somatic health, and positive affect. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35(7), 1585–1599. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(02\)00382-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00382-3)
- Saboonchi, F., Lundh, L. G., & Ost, L. G. (1999). Perfectionism and self-consciousness in social phobia and panic disorder with agoraphobia. *Behaviour research and therapy*, 37(9), 799–808. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0005-7967\(98\)00183-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0005-7967(98)00183-1)
- Santrock, J. W. (2011). *Yaşam Boyu Gelişim* (G. Yüksel, Trans.). Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.

- Sarı, T. (2008). *Üniversite öğrencilerinde romantik ilişkilerle ilgili akılcı olmayan inançlar, bağlanma stilleri ve ilişki doyumu arasındaki ilişkiler* [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation], Hacettepe Üniversitesi.
- Satıcı, B. (2018). *Genç Yetişkinlerde Mükemmeliyetçilik İle Romantik İlişki Doyumu Arasında Duygusal Zeka Ve Bilinçli Farkındalığın Aracılık Rollerinin İncelenmesi*, [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. Yıldız Teknik Üniversitesi
- Shakarami, M., Zaharakar, K., & Mohsenzadeh, F. (2016). Determine the contribution of conflict resolution styles in predicting marital commitment. *Journal of Research & Health*, 6, 438- 444. Doi: 10.7508/jrh.2016.04.009
- Stinson, M. A., Bermudez, J. M., Gale, J., Lewis, D., Meyer, A. S., & Templeton, G. B. (2017). Marital satisfaction, conflict resolution styles, and religious attendance among latino couples: Using the Actor-partner interdependence model. *The family journal. Counseling and Therapy for Couples and Families*, 25 (3), 215-223. Doi: 10.1177/1066480717710645
- Serin, N. B., & Derin, R. (2008). İlköğretim Öğrencilerinin Kişilerarası Problem Çözme Becerisi Algıları ve Denetim Odağı Düzeylerini Etkileyen Faktörler. *Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi*, 5 (1), 1-18.
- 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.
- Sherry, S. B., Mackinnon, S. P., & Gautreau, C. M. (2016). Perfectionists do not play nicely with others: Expanding the social disconnection model. *Perfectionism, health, and well-being* (pp. 225-243). Springer, Cham.

- Siegle, D., & Schuler, P.A. (2000). Perfectionism differences in gifted middle students. *Roeper Review*, 23(1), 39-44.
- Sigelman, C. K., & Rider, E. A. (2018). *Life-span human development* (9th Ed.). Cengage Learning
- Sipahi, B. Yurtkoru, E. S., & Çinko, M. (2008). *Sosyal bilimlerde SPSS ile veri analizi*. Beta Basım Yayım Dağıtım.
- Slaney, R. B., & Ashby, J. S. (1996). Perfectionists: Study of a criterion group. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 74(4), 393-398.
- Slaney, R. B., & Johnson D. (1992). *The Almost Perfect Scale*. [Unpublished manuscript]. Pennsylvania State University.
- 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(3), 130-145, DOI: [10.1080/07481756.2002.12069030](https://doi.org/10.1080/07481756.2002.12069030)
- Slavin, R. E. (2013). *Eğitim Psikolojisi* (G. Yüksel, Trans.). Ankara: Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Smith, E. E., Kosslyn, S. M. (2014). *Bilişsel Psikoloji* (M. Şahin, Trans.). Nobel Akademik Yayıncılık.
- Stackert, R. A., & Bursik, K. (2003). Why am I unsatisfied? Adult attachment style, gendered irrational relationship beliefs, and young adult romantic relationship satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34(8), 1419–1429. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(02\)00124-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00124-1)

- Sternberg, R. J. (1988). Triangulating love. In R. J. Sternberg, & M. L. Barnes (Eds), *The psychology of love* (pp. 119-138). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2006). A Duplex Theory of Love. In R. J. Sternberg & K. Weis (Eds.), *The new psychology of love* (pp. 184–199). Yale University Press.
- Stevens, M. (1998). *Daha İyi Nasıl... Sorun Çözümleme* (A. Çimen Trans.). Timaş Yayınları.
- Stoeber, J. (2012). Dyadic perfectionism in romantic relationships: Predicting relationship satisfaction and longterm commitment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 53(3), 300-305. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.04.002>
- Stoeber, J. (2014). How other-oriented perfectionism differs from self-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*, 36(2), 329–338. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10862-013-9397-7>
- Stoeber, J. (2018). The psychology of perfectionism: An introduction. In J. Stoeber (Ed.), *The psychology of perfectionism: Theory, research, applications* (pp. 3-16). Routledge
- Stoeber, J., & Otto, K. (2006). Positive Conceptions of Perfectionism: Approaches, Evidence, Challenges. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(4), 295–319. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1004_2
- Stoeber, J., Harvey, L. N., Almeida, I., & Lyons, E. (2013). Multidimensional sexual perfectionism. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 42(8), 1593–1604. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-013-0135-8>
- Sullivan, H. S. (1953). *The interpersonal theory of psychiatry*. Norton.
- Sungur, N. (1992). *Yaratıcı Düşünce*. Özgür Yayın Dağıtım.

- Şenel, H. G. (2014). Eş seçim kararı. In H. Yavuzer (Ed.), *Evlilik Okulu: Evlilikte Kişilerarası İlişkiler ve İletişim Becerileri* (pp: 61-74). Remzi Kitabevi
- Şensoy, G. , Asıcı, E., & İkiz, F. E. (2019). İlişki Doyumunun Mükemmeliyetçilik ve Güven Aracılığıyla Yordanması. *Pamukkale Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi*, 46(46) , 230-249. <https://doi.org/10.9779/pauefd.454315>
- Taluy, N. (2013). *İkili İlişkilerde Mükemmeliyetçilik ve Çatışma Çözme Tepkileri: Yatırım Modeli Çerçevesinde Yapılan Bir Çalışma* [Unpublished Doctoral dissertation]. Ankara Üniversitesi.
- Taluy, N. (2018). İkili İlişkilerde Olumlu Olumsuz Mükemmeliyetçilik Ölçeği: Geçerlik ve Güvenirlik Çalışması. *Uhudağ Üniversitesi Fen-Edebiyat Fakültesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* , 19 (35) , 645-667 . <https://doi.org/10.21550/sosbilder.399658>
- Tarhan, N. (2014). *Evlilik psikolojisi*. Timaş Yayınları
- Taşköprü, M. (2013). *Evlilik doyumu ile problem çözme becerileri, stresle başa çıkma ve evlilik süresi arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* [Unpublished Master's thesis]. İstanbul Bilim Üniversitesi
- Taştan, N. (1996). *Interspousal Communication in a Problem Solving Situation* [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Orta Doğu Teknik Üniversitesi.
- Taylan, S. (1990). *Heppner'in problem çözme envanterinin uyarlama güvenirlik ve geçerlik çalışmaları*, [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Ankara Üniversitesi.
- Terry-Short, L.A, Owens, R.G., Slade, P.D. and Dewey, M.E. (1995) Positive and Negative Perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 18, 663-668. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(94\)00192-U](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(94)00192-U)

- Thornton, S. (1998). *Çocuklar Problem Çözüyor* (Ö. Kurumlar, Trans.). Gendaş Yayınları, 1998.
- Ting-Toomey, S., Yee-Jung, K. K., Shapiro, R. B., Garcia, W., Wright, T. J., & Oetzel, J. (2000). Ethnic/cultural identity salience and conflict styles in four US ethnic groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24, 47–81.
- Trost, J. E. (1985). Abandon Adjustment. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 4, 7: 1072-1073.
- Trub, L., Powell, J., & Biscardi, K., & Rosenthal, L. (2018). The “Good Enough” Parent: Perfectionism and Relationship Satisfaction Among Parents and Nonparents. *Journal of Family Issues*, 39(10). <https://doi.org/10.1177%2F0192513X18763226>
- Türk Dil Kurumu. (2018). Mükemmeliyetçilik [perfeksiyonist]. Retrieved July 4, 2018 from http://tdk.gov.tr/index.php?option=com_karsilik&view=karsilik&kategori1=karsilik_1iste&ayn1=bas&kelime1=perfeksiyonist
- Ulupınar, S. (1997). Hemşirelik Eğitiminin Öğrencilerin Sorun Çözme Becerilerine Etkisi, [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. İstanbul Üniversitesi.
- Urgancı, Ç., Eker, E. (2018). İstanbul 112 Acil Sağlık Hizmetleri Çalışanlarının Mesleki Tükenmişlik Düzeyleri ve Algılanan Stresle Başa Çıkma Evlilik Doyumunu Yordamlama Gücü. *Aydın İnsan ve Toplum Dergisi*, 4(2) , 35-60 . Retrieved from <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/aitdergi/issue/43705/536155>
- Warner, L. L. (2004). *Role of Relationship Satisfaction In The Use Of Indirect Aggressive Behavior Among Intimate Couples*, [Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation]. Oklahoma State University.

- Xiaohe, X., & Whyte, M. K. (1990). Love matches and arranged marriages: A Chinese replication. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 52(3), 709–722. <https://doi.org/10.2307/352936>
- Yaoar, A. A. (2008). *Üniversite Öğrencilerinin Mükemmeliyetçi Kişilik Özelliği ile Empati Düzeylerinin Farklı Değişkenler Açısından İncelenmesi* [Unpublished Master's thesis]. Gazi Üniversitesi.
- Yavuzer, H. (2014). Aile ilişkileri ve çocuk. In H. Yavuzer (Ed.), *Evlilik Okulu: Evlilikte Kişilerarası İlişkiler ve İletişim Becerileri* (pp. 164-171). Remzi Kitabevi.
- Yıldız, E. C. (2020). *Ön ergenlerin olumlu ve olumsuz mükemmeliyetçilik düzeylerinin mantıkdışı inançlar ve problem çözme becerisi ile ilişkisinin incelenmesi*, [Unpublished Master's Thesis]. Işık Üniversitesi.
- Zadnik, M. G., & Loss, R. D. (1995). Developing numerical problem-solving skills through estimations of quantities in familiar contexts. *Australian Science Teachers Journal*, 41(1): 15-19.

7. APPENDICES

7.1. Appendix-1: Demographic Information Form

DEMOGRAFİK BİLGİ FORMU

1. Cinsiyetiniz?

Kadın: ☐ Erkek: ☐ Diğer: ☐

2. Yaşınız?

18-24: ☐ 25-34: ☐ 35-44: ☐ 45-54: ☐ 55 ve üzeri: ☐

2. Eğitim Düzeyiniz?

Lise ve altı: ☐ Lisans: ☐ Lisansüstü: ☐

3. Gelir Düzeyiniz?

0-2500: ☐ 2501-5000: ☐ 5001-10000: ☐ 10000 ve üzeri: ☐

4. Eşinizle Nasıl Tanışarak Evlendiniz?

Kendimiz tanıştık: ☐ Arkadaş vasıtasıyla: ☐ Görücü usulü: ☐

5. Ortalama İlişki Süreniz?

0-5 yıl: ☐ 6-10 yıl: ☐ 11-20 yıl: ☐ 20 ve üzeri: ☐

6. Çocuk Sayınız?

0: ☐ 1: ☐ 2: ☐ 3: ☐ 4 ve üzeri: ☐

7.2. Appendix-2: Relationship Assessment Scale

İLİŞKİ DOYUMU ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıda romantik ilişkilerden sağlanan doyuma ilişkin ifadeler bulunmaktadır. Her bir maddenin ilişkilerinizdeki duygu ve düşüncelerinizi ne oranda yansıttığını karşılardaki 7 aralıklı ölçek üzerinde, ilgili rakam üzerine çarpı (X) koyarak belirtiniz.

	Hiç karşılamıyor						Çok iyi karşılıyor
1) Sevgiliniz ihtiyaçlarınızı ne kadar iyi karşılıyor?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Çok daha kötü						Çok daha iyi
3) Diğerleriyle karşılaştırıldığında ilişkiniz ne kadar iyi?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Hiç bir zaman						Her zaman
4) Ne sıklıkla ilişkinize hiç başlamamış olmayı istiyorsunuz?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Hiç sevmiyorum						Çok seviyorum
6) Sevgilinizi ne kadar seviyorsunuz?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Hiç yok						Çok var
7) İlişkinizde ne kadar problem var?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7.3. Appendix-3: Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale

İkili İlişkilerde Olumlu Olumsuz Mükemmeliyetçilik Ölçeği (İİOOMÖ)

Aşağıdaki maddeler insanların romantik/yakın ilişkiler hakkındaki tutumlarını ölçmek için tasarlanmıştır. Soruların doğru ya da yanlış yanıtları yoktur. Lütfen bütün maddeleri yanıtlayınız. Herbir madde için ilk izleniminizi kullanın ve tek tek maddeler üzerinde fazla zaman harcamayınız.

“Benim için önemli kişi” ya da “eşim/ilişki yaşadığım kişi” kavramları birbirlerinin yerine kullanılmıştır. Lütfen her bir ifadenin size ne derece uyduğunu belirtmek için aşağıda verilen ölçektekisayıardan sizin için uygun olanı her maddenin sağındaki yanıt çizelgesine işaretleyiniz.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Kesinlikle Katılmıyorum	Katılmıyorum	Biraz Katılmıyorum	Kararsızım	Biraz Katılıyorum	Katılıyorum	Kesinlikle Katılıyorum
1) Eşim/ilişki yaşadığım kişi bir görevi tamamladıktan sonra sık sık düş kırıklığı yaşarım çünkü daha iyisini yapabilecek durumda olduğunu bilirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2) Benim için önemli kişinin düzenli bir insan olmasını beklerim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4) Benim için önemli kişi nadiren standartlarıma uyar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5) Benim için önemli kişiye ilişkin çok yüksek standartlarım var.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7) Benim için önemli kişi derli toplu olmaya önem vermelidir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8) Benim için önemli kişiden en iyisini beklerim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10) Sık sık engellenmiş hissederim çünkü benim için önemli kişionun için koyduğum amaçları karşılamaz.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13) Eşim/ilişki yaşadığım kişi için en iyi olan benim için hiçbir zaman yeterince iyi değildir.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14) Benim için önemli kişinin işte ya da okuldaki performansına ilişkin yüksek standartlarım vardır.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17) Eşimin/ilişki yaşadığım kişinin planlı ve düzenli olması gerektiğini düşünüyorum.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21) Benim için önemli kişinin yaptıklarından oldukça doyum sağlarım.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22) Eşimin/ilişki yaşadığım kişinin herşeyin yerli yerinde saklanması gerektiğini düşünmesini beklerim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26) Eşim/ilişki yaşadığım kişi yapmasını düşündüğüm kadar iyi iş yapmadığında oldukça sinirlenebilirim.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7.4. Appendix-4: Marital Problem-Solving Scale

EVLİLİKTE SORUN ÇÖZME ÖLÇEĞİ

Aşağıda evlilikte karşılaştığınız problemleri (sorunları) çözme konusunda kendinizi nasıl gördüğünüze ilişkin 9 soru bulunmaktadır. Bu soruların her birinin karşısında 1’den 5’e kadar sayılar yer almaktadır. Her cümleyi dikkatlice okuyunuz ve evlilikte karşılaştığınız problemleri (sorunları) çözme becerinizi nasıl algılıyorsanız buna en uygun seçeneği çarpı (X) işareti koyarak işaretleyiniz.

1. Diğer çiftlere kıyasla, kendi sorun çözme becerinizden ne kadar eminsiniz?

Hiç emin değil (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Çok emin

3. Eşinize, bir sorun için bir çözüm önerme konusunda, kendinizi ne kadar rahat hissedersiniz?

Çok rahatsız (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Çok rahat

4. İlişkinizde karar verme sürecine ne kadar katkınız olur?

Hiç (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Çok

6. Eşinizle sorunları tartışırken, eşiniz sizin duygularınızı ne kadar iyi anlar?

Asla (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Her zaman

7. Sorunlara getirilen çözümlerden ne kadar memnunsunuz?

Hiç memnun (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Çok memnun değil

9. Bir çift olarak ilişkideki farklılıklar ya da sorunları çözme konusunda kendinizi nasıl değerlendirirsiniz?

Çok etkisiz (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) Çok etkili

7.5. Appendix-5: Ethics Committee Approval

YEDİTEPE ÜNİVERSİTESİ BEŞERİ VE SOSYAL BİLİMLER ETİK KURULU KOMİSYONU

05.07.2021 TARİHLİ
20/2021 No'lu TOPLANTI KARARLARI

- 7) Yeditepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Eğitim Yönetimi ve Denetimi Yüksek Lisans Öğrencilerinden Volkan Tüter'in "Özel Okul Yöneticilerinin Teknolojik Dönüşüm Sürecinde Kalite 4.0 Algılarının Endüstri 4.0 Hakkındaki Farkındalık Düzeylerine Göre İncelenmesi" başlıklı araştırmasının Beşeri Bilimler etik standartlarına uygunluğu Yeditepe Üniversitesi Beşeri ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu tarafından değerlendirilmiş ve onaylanmıştır.
- 8) Yeditepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü İşletme Doktora Öğrencilerinden Ceyda İnanlı Tan'ın "A Different Perspective in Consumer Segmentation: The Relation Between Socially Responsible Consumer Behavior and Consume Self-Esteem Under the Light of Personal Traits Frugality and Need for Uniqueness" başlıklı araştırmasının Beşeri Bilimler etik standartlarına uygunluğu Yeditepe Üniversitesi Beşeri ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu tarafından değerlendirilmiş ve onaylanmıştır.
- 9) Yeditepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Bilgi Teknolojileri ve Sosyal Medya Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Öğrencilerinden Marzieh Parvaneh Akhteh Khaneh'in "Perceptions of Turkish, Iranian and Netherlander Students toward Dropout in MOOC" başlıklı araştırmasının Beşeri Bilimler etik standartlarına uygunluğu Yeditepe Üniversitesi Beşeri ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu tarafından değerlendirilmiş ve onaylanmıştır.
- 10) Yeditepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Rehberlik ve Psikolojik Danışmanlık Yüksek Lisans Öğrencilerinden İlknur Kaynar'ın "Evli Çiftlerin Problem Çözme Becerilerinin ve İlişki Doyumlarının Bir Yordayıcısı Olarak Mükemmeliyetçiliğin İncelenmesi" başlıklı araştırmasının Beşeri Bilimler etik standartlarına uygunluğu Yeditepe Üniversitesi Beşeri ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu tarafından değerlendirilmiş ve onaylanmıştır.
- 11) Yeditepe Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü İngiliz Dili Eğitimi Yüksek Lisans Öğrencilerinden Gaye Özyoldaş Çakmak'ın "Yabancı Dilde Dilbilgisi Öğretiminde Betimsel Yaklaşımın Önemi (Bir Derlem Çalışması)" başlıklı araştırmasının Beşeri Bilimler etik standartlarına uygunluğu Yeditepe Üniversitesi Beşeri ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Etik Kurulu tarafından değerlendirilmiş ve onaylanmıştır.