

ASSESSMENT OF MINDFULNESS PRACTICES AS A MODERATOR BETWEEN
PERFECTIONISM AND INTERPERSONAL CONFLICT

by
Autumn Dozier

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts in Psychology

Middle Tennessee State University
August 2018

Thesis Committee:

Dr. Kim Ujcich Ward, Chair

Dr. Cameron Gordon

I dedicate this research to my late father.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my family for supporting my every endeavor. Without their efforts to pick up the pieces after my father's passing, I would not have been able to fulfill my ambitions with such ease. I would also like to thank Dr. Kim Ujcich Ward for her constant help and desire to see her students succeed. Lastly, I would like to thank the professors who aided me in the recruitment of participants for this study.

ABSTRACT

This study evaluates the relationships between perfectionism, self-compassion, mindfulness, relational conflict, and relationship satisfaction. Ninety-two college students completed questionnaires assessing personal and relationship perfectionism as well as related constructs. Correlational analyses indicated that there are positive correlations between (1) mindfulness and interpersonal perfectionism, (2) self-compassion and interpersonal perfectionism, (3) relationship conflict and interpersonal perfectionism. Additionally, there was a negative correlation between relationship satisfaction and interpersonal perfectionism. Assessment of moderation indicated no moderating effects of mindfulness or self-compassion predicting relational conflict interaction and dominance from interpersonal perfectionism discrepancy. Mindfulness did moderate relationship conflict submission from interpersonal perfectionism-discrepancy. Implications of these findings are discussed in terms of the potential use of mindfulness practices and self-compassion activities as prevention for negative outcomes of interpersonal perfectionism.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF APPENDICES	viii
CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION	1
Perfectionistic Cognition and Attitudes	2
Perfectionistic Behaviors	2
Perfectionism and Psychological Health Factors	3
Interpersonal Relationships and Perfectionism	5
Mindfulness, Self-Compassion, and Perfectionism	6
Summary and Purpose of the Current Study	9
CHAPTER II: METHOD	10
Participants	10
Measures	10
Demographic Information	10
Almost Perfect Scale	10
Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale	12
Self-Compassion Scale	12
Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire	13
Romantic Partner Conflict Scale	13

Couples Satisfaction Inventory -4	14
Positive and Negative Perfectionism Scale	14
Procedure	15
CHAPTER III: RESULTS	16
Correlational Analyses	16
Group Comparisons	26
CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION	28
Limitations and Future Directions	31
REFERENCES	33
APPENDICES	40

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 1. Percentages for Demographic Variables by Full Sample and by Romantic Relationship Status	11
Table 2. Correlations among Interpersonal Perfectionism, Mindfulness, Self-Compassion, and Relationship Satisfaction for the Full Sample	17
Table 3. Correlations among Interpersonal Perfectionism, Mindfulness, Self-Compassion, and Relationship Satisfaction for Those Currently in a Relationship for 3 Months or Longer	19
Table 4. Correlations among Interpersonal Perfectionism and Relationship Conflict Factors for the Full Sample	21
Table 5. Correlations among Interpersonal Perfectionism and Relationship Conflict Factors for Those Currently in a Relationship for 3 Months or Longer	22
Table 6. Moderation of Mindfulness on the Relationship of Interpersonal Perfectionism- Discrepancy and Relational Conflict Dominance	23
Table 7. Moderation of Self-Compassion on the Relationship of Interpersonal Perfectionism- Discrepancy and Relational Conflict Dominance	23
Table 8. Moderation of Mindfulness on the Relationship of Interpersonal Perfectionism-Discrepancy and Relational Conflict Submission	24
Table 9. Moderation of Self-Compassion on the Relationship of Interpersonal Perfectionism-Discrepancy and Relational Conflict Submission	24
Table 10. Moderation of Mindfulness on the Relationship of Interpersonal Perfectionism-Discrepancy and Relational Conflict Interaction	25
Table 11. Moderation of Self-Compassion on the Relationship of Interpersonal Perfectionism-Discrepancy and Relational Conflict Interaction	25
Table 12. Descriptives for All Dependent Variables by Relationship Group	27

LIST OF APPENDICES

	Page
Appendix A: Demographic Form	41
Appendix B: Almost Perfect Scale	43
Appendix C: Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale	44
Appendix D: Self-Compassion Scale	46
Appendix E: Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire	48
Appendix F: Romantic Partner Conflict Scale	50
Appendix G: Couples Satisfaction Inventory	52
Appendix H: Positive Perfectionism Scale	53
Appendix I: MTSU IRB Approval Letter	56

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The phrase, “perfectionism rarely begets perfection, or satisfaction - only disappointment” (Holiday, 2018) embodies the hardship of the perfectionist. Correspondingly, O’Connor and O’Connor (2003) mentioned that the perfectionist may meet high standards but may never experience satisfaction. Perfectionism has been defined by describing various constructs and behavior patterns. Ellis (1996) described perfectionism as an irrational belief in which one must always be competent and achieving in all aspects of life in order to avoid being worthless and inadequate. Frost, Marten, Lahart, and Rosenblate (1990) initially established a six-dimensional concept of perfectionism, including “excessive concern over mistakes; excessive personal standards; high parental expectations; parental criticism; exaggerated emphasis on precision, order, and organization; and doubts about actions.” Because Hewitt and Flett (1991) believed that Frost’s construct was not broad enough to define perfectionism, they described a multidimensional construct focusing on the self, society, and others. Self-oriented perfectionism is the intrinsic motivation to set high standards; social-oriented perfectionism is the idea that others have set unreasonably high standards for the individual; other-oriented perfectionism refers to setting excessively high standards for others. Perfectionism has been described as reflective of both behaviors and cognitions/attitudes. It also has been associated with a variety of mental health conditions as well as associated with interpersonal difficulties and challenges. This literature review will provide a collective display of perfectionism as it relates to cognitive, behavioral,

psychological, and interpersonal functioning. Finally, a project to assess the interrelationships between the constructs of perfectionism, relationship factors, self-compassion, and mindfulness practice is described.

Perfectionistic Cognition and Attitudes

Thoughts and beliefs are a core component of perfectionism, as evidenced by the perfectionist holding concern about making mistakes, believing others have set excessively high standards for her or him, etc. Further, Beck, Steer, and Carbin (1988) designed the *perfectionistic attitudes* model, comprised of perfectionistic self-expectations and interpersonal functioning. Perfectionistic attitudes are characterized by self-evaluation, high expectations, interpersonal vulnerability, fear of evaluation, and conditional self-worth contingencies. Additionally, Beck et al. identified the *dependent attitudes* model which is characterized by pleasing others, craving love and admiration, as well as seeking approval. Both perfectionistic attitudes and dependent attitudes include the idea that self-worth is contingent upon reaching impossible goals or earning the approval of others. By pursuing the satisfaction of self-worth contingencies, the perfectionist risks detriment to his or her mental and physical health. Conditional self-worth and self-acceptance potentially sets the stage for poor psychological health (Hill, Hall, & Appleton, 2011).

Perfectionistic Behaviors

Perfectionism is demonstrated behaviorally in various forms. According to Leonard and Harvey (2008), there are two types of perfectionism: positive and negative. Positive perfectionism (i.e., adaptive perfectionism) is characterized by striving for

success in a healthy manner whereas negative perfectionism (i.e., maladaptive perfectionism) is characterized by neurotic behavior and emotion in the process of striving for success. Simply said, negative perfectionism consists of excessive self-regulation and self-defeating behaviors (Bieling, Israeli, Smith, Antony, 2003). Further, Frost et al's (1990) theory of perfectionism asserts that perfectionists demonstrate a negative reaction to the mistakes they make, which is linked to focusing on unnecessary details, having difficulty relinquishing control, and overcommitting to tasks.

Perfectionists also doubt their own performance as well as others' performance, engaging in criticism and negative self-talk. Furthermore, perfectionists set excessively high standards that lead to engagement in competitive behaviors such as high work involvement, creating conflict among competitors, and refusal to rest. Lastly, perfectionists may behave compulsively in regard to order and organization. In some cases, perfectionists can seem careless due to the behaviors of arriving late, cramming last minute for exams, having difficulty making decisions, and procrastinating. This level of procrastination emanates from excessively high standards or more importantly, the excessive fear of failure (Flett, Hewitt, Blankstein, & Koledin, 1991).

Perfectionism and Psychological Health Factors

Psychological health and mood is related to the perfectionist mentality. Ulu and Tezer (2010) reported that maladaptive perfectionism is positively correlated with neuroticism, a negative emotional state related to the feeling of anxiety, sadness, and agitation, and negatively correlated with extraversion and agreeableness. These dysfunctional mental states occurring in perfectionism are associated with multiple

clinical symptoms. The severity and persistence of symptoms in clinical patients with depressive disorders are associated with perfectionistic and dependent attitudes (Sherry, Hewitt, Flett, & Harvey, 2003). Additionally, self-oriented perfectionism is positively correlated with suicidal ideation and depression. However, some literature suggests that perfectionism is only activated by moderating factors (e.g., stress). When stress is present, depression as well as suicide ideation stems from psychological vulnerabilities associated with perfectionism (O'Connor & O'Connor, 2003).

Perfectionistic cognitions are a component of obsessive compulsive disorder (OCD). The individual who has OCD may doubt his or her completion of tasks, resulting in the needless repetition of these tasks. Moreover, Social Anxiety is developed and maintained by perfectionistic beliefs (Antony, Purdon, Huta, & Swinson, 1998). According to Heimberg, Juster, Hope, and Mattia (1995), individuals with social anxiety hold three types of beliefs: (a) social situations may become humiliating therefore, they are dangerous; (b) the only way to avoid humiliation is to meet excessively high social standards; and (c) this social standard can never be met. Additionally, perfectionists attempt to maintain a perfect self-image and avoid the display of any imperfections. Perfectionistic self-presentation is associated with social anxiety (Newby et al., 2017).

In a similar pattern, Hewitt, Flett, and Ediger (1995) characterized perfectionism as an associated feature of some eating disorders. The core of eating disorder vulnerabilities is composed of: doubting performance, avoiding harm, and depending on approval. These facets overlap with the constructs of perfectionism. The frequency and effect of distressing events is influenced by perfectionism. Falling short of a goal is

viewed as a failure because perfectionists' evaluative criteria is overly demanding. Perfectionists view these self-proclaimed failures as a sign of imperfection. Thus, these traits of perfectionism relate to eating disorder symptoms in the sense that individuals hold a strict requirement of meeting body standards developed from the self or society. Because the individual fears a display of imperfections and an admission of having difficulties, perfectionistic self-presentation is also considered an influence of eating behavior. Accordingly, anorexia and bulimia are associated with self-oriented perfectionism. Individuals with eating disorders have the self-appointed idea that tasks should be conducted perfectly and tend to think of achievement in an all or nothing manner. Moreover, socially prescribed perfectionism is associated with eating disorders as well. Social factors that influence eating behavior include perceived parental expectations and sensitivity to the perceptions of others and to society's beauty standards.

Interpersonal Relationships and Perfectionism

Perfectionism is not only an intrapersonal experience but can be an interpersonal experience and affect social relationships. It is argued that self-oriented perfectionism is less destructive than other-oriented perfectionism because focus is directed away from the self (O'Connor & O'Connor, 2003). This perspective may be true, but it does not recognize the difficulties that other-oriented perfectionism creates in interpersonal relationships. According to Hewitt and Flett (1991), relationship problems result from the requirement of perfectionism, harsh evaluation of significant others, and the perception that significant others require perfection from oneself. Chen, Hewitt, and Flett (2015) also introduced the Perfectionism Social Disconnection Model by stating that

perfectionism originates from difficult relational experiences with attachment figures. The early experiences give rise to insecure attachment with others. They hypothesized and found that a strong need for belongingness and shame was a mediator for insecure attachment and interpersonal components of perfectionism. Consistent with this belief system, two types of perfectionism, other-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism, are defined. Both types of perfectionism are associated with interpersonal behaviors. Because other-oriented perfectionists feel as though their significant others do not fulfill their expectations, they participate in authoritarian, dominant, and blaming behaviors. On the other hand, socially prescribed perfectionists feel as though they do not meet the expectations of their significant others, potentially resulting in hostile, blaming, self-controlling, excessively responsible (i.e., taking responsibility for their faults as well as their partner's faults), submissive, and aggressive behaviors (Habke, Hewitt, & Flett, 1999; Haring, Hewitt, & Flett, 2003). Individuals high in socially prescribed perfectionism experience higher rates of negative social interactions and difficulties being intimate in relationships. These unrealistic expectations are related to marital distress, quality of the sexual relationship, and sexual dysfunction. Collectively, perfectionists can be significant others and mates who are difficult to get along with (Habke et al., 1999).

Mindfulness, Self-Compassion, and Perfectionism

Although rigid, perfectionistic behaviors and attitudes can potentially be altered through different techniques and exercises. Mindfulness, an intentional awareness of momentary experiences without judgement (Lutz, Brühl, Doerig, Scheerer, Achermann, et al., 2016), has been evaluated in relation to perfectionistic behaviors and attitudes.

Although much of research on mindfulness has been conducted with general populations, studies conducted on college-aged groups have demonstrated a relationship between mindfulness-based practices and the reduction of distress as well as perfectionism.

In assessment-based studies, researchers have found a relationship between mindfulness and distress reduction relating to perfectionism. Kerrigan et al. (2017) explored the effects of a mindfulness-based stress reduction program at a university. Results demonstrated that students are exposed to high levels of stress due to the culture of perfectionism at universities. Students who completed a program designed to teach mindfulness techniques reported increases in well-being. Furthermore, Short, and Mazmanian (2013) investigated the relationship between rumination and psychological distress among perfectionistic university students. Perfectionism was rated using three separate perfectionism scales. Results indicated that those high in mindfulness reported lower levels of socially prescribed perfectionism, rumination, and distress. Self-compassion is a key component in mindfulness-based practices and is a potential mediator between maladaptive perfectionism and psychological distress in college students (Mehr & Adams, 2016). Mehr and Adams (2016) explored self-compassion as a mediator of perfectionism and depressive symptoms in university students. Results suggested that self-compassion may alleviate the effect of maladaptive perfectionism on depressive symptoms. Additionally, Brodar, Crosskey, and Thompson (2015) examined the relationship of self-compassion, perfectionistic self-presentation, forgiveness, and support in an undergraduate Christian community using self-report scales. Results indicated that higher levels of self-compassion were related to lower levels of

perfectionistic self-presentation, and higher levels of self-compassion were related to higher levels of forgiveness and support.

In an intervention, Beck et al. (2017) explored the effects of mindfulness practice on graduate students' levels of self-compassion and perfectionism. Participants engaged in a weekly mindfulness practice and completed self-compassion and perfectionism scales before and after the mindfulness sessions. Results demonstrated that participants' stress and perfectionism levels decreased whereas their self-compassion levels increased. Further, Hindman et al. (2015) compared the effects of formal mindfulness programs to the effects of informal mindfulness programs on stress reduction in university students. Results indicated that a formal mindfulness program may be more beneficial to students rather than an informal, brief mindfulness program. Ritvo et al. (2013) explored the increase in life satisfaction associated with the reduction in negative thoughts in students who attended mindfulness tutorials. Students attended mindfulness tutorials involving guided meditation and discussion once per week during a 14-week semester. Findings demonstrated reductions in automatic thoughts and increased satisfaction in the life of college students. Contrarily, the results of one study suggest that perfectionistic thoughts and behaviors may mitigate any positive effects of mindfulness training. Azam et al. (2015) investigated the role of mindful meditation on the heart rate variability of perfectionistic undergraduate students and found that perfectionistic thoughts and behaviors hinder relaxation effects of mindfulness.

Summary and Purpose of the Current Study

Perfectionistic cognitions and attitudes are based on the idea that self-worth relies upon meeting impossible standards, either set by the self or others. As a result, self-defeating behaviors that represent negative reactions to mistakes are present. In some cases, perfectionism may lead to poor psychological health including depressive disorders, obsessive compulsive disorders, and eating disorders as well as difficulties within interpersonal relationships. Mindfulness practices, however, have been shown to potentially contribute to greater overall well-being in perfectionists. In addition, self-compassion may reduce perfectionistic cognitions and behaviors that result in distress. Collectively, past studies assessing the relationships among these factors have several limitations. Many studies used small, non-diverse samples, leading to limitations in the generalizability of their findings. Because intrapersonal experiences are typically observed by self-report, assessment by survey as opposed to more direct assessment was relied upon. Additionally, perfectionism is most frequently measured on a negative perfectionistic scale rather than a positive perfectionistic scale (e.g., Short & Mazmanian, 2013). Finally, failing to assess the potential role of interpersonal constructs, including interpersonal perfection and relationship conflict and satisfaction, is one of the primary limitations related to the purpose of the current study.

The current study focused on interpersonal relationship factors and perfectionism. In addition, no identified studies assessed the potential role of mindfulness and self-compassion in the relationship between perfectionism and interpersonal relationships, so a secondary goal of the current study was to assess these factors.

CHAPTER II

METHOD

Participants

The sample consisted of 92 undergraduate and graduate students at a large state university in the southeastern United States. Fifty-nine participants reported currently being in a romantic relationship for 3 months or more, and 33 participants reported not being in a current relationship ($n = 32$) or currently in one for less than 3 months ($n = 1$). Ages ranged from 18 to 54 years ($m = 24.39$, $SD = 6.85$). Of the sample, 72.8 % were female and 27.2 % were male. The participants also were ethnically diverse, with 64.1% Caucasian, 19.6% African American, 6.5% Hispanic, and 9.8% identified as *other*. See Table 1 for a summary of the demographics. The participants were recruited from the Psychology Department Research Pool and from individual psychology courses, some of whom received course or extra credit.

Measures

Demographic information. The participants completed a demographic survey (see Appendix A), including sections to indicate age, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, relationship status, and relationship duration.

Almost Perfect Scale. The participants completed the Almost Perfect Scale-Revised (APS-R; Slaney, Mobley, Trippi, Ashby, & Johnson, 1996). The APS-R is a Likert rating scale (1= *strongly disagree*; 7= *strongly agree*) consisting of 23 items that measure perfectionism in terms of high standards, order, and discrepancy between one's expectations and one's own performance (see Appendix B). The measure is scored by

Table 1

Percentages for Demographic Variables by Full Sample and By Romantic Relationship Status

Variable	Full Sample (<i>N</i> = 92)	In Current Relationship (<i>n</i> = 59)	Not in Current Relationship (<i>n</i> = 33)
<i>Gender</i>			
Male	27.2	25.4	30.3
Female	72.8	74.6	69.7
<i>Ethnicity</i>			
African American	19.6	13.6	30.3
Caucasian	64.1	69.5	54.5
Hispanic	6.5	8.5	3.0
Other	9.8	8.5	12.1
<i>Sexual Orientation</i>			
Asexual	4.3	1.7	9.1
Bisexual	9.8	11.9	6.1
Heterosexual	77.2	78.0	75.8
Homosexual	5.4	5.1	6.1
Other	3.3	3.4	3.0
<i>Relationship Status</i>			
Not currently in	34.8	0	97.0
In for 0-2 months	1.1	0	3.0
In for 3-12 months	15.2	23.7	0
In for 12+ months	48.9	76.3	0

adding the indicated points together in each subscale (i.e., standards, order, discrepancy) and then dividing by the total number of items on the subscale. The internal consistency values range from .85 to .92 and has reported high concurrent validity with other scales of perfectionism (e.g., Slaney et al., 1996).

Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale. The participants completed the Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale (DAPS; Shea & Slaney, 1999). The DAPS is a Likert rating scale (1= *strongly disagree*; 7= *strongly agree*) consisting of 26 items that measure perfectionism regarding relationships with others, including interpersonal standards, order, and discrepancy between one's expectations of significant others and significant others' performance (see Appendix C). The measure is scored by adding the indicated points together in each subscale (i.e., standards, order, discrepancy) and then dividing by the total number of items on the subscale after taking into account the reversed scores. Construct validity of this scale was reported by Shae and Slaney (1999). The DAPS has reported internal consistency coefficients ranging from .73 to .93 for each subscale (e.g., Lopez, Fons-Scheyd, Morua, & Chaliman, 2006; Mee, Hazan, Baba, Talib, & Zakaria, 2015).

Self-Compassion Scale. The participants completed the Self-Compassion Scale (SCS; Neff, 2003). The Self-Compassion Scale is a Likert rating scale (1= *almost never*; 5= *almost always*) consisting of 26 items that measure self-kindness, self-judgement, common humanity, isolation, mindfulness, and over-identification (see Appendix D). The grand self-compassion average is scored by adding all indicated points and dividing the total number of items on the 6 scales. Higher levels of self-compassion are indicated by

higher scores. SCS has demonstrated concurrent validity, discriminant validity, convergent validity, test-retest reliability, and internal consistency coefficients of .90 -.95 (Neff, 2003).

Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire. The participants completed the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire (FFMQ; Baer, Smith, Hopkins, Krietemeyer, & Toney, 2008). The FFMQ is a Likert rating scale (1= *never or very rarely true*; 5= *very often or always true*) consisting of 39 items with the following subscales: observation, description, acting with awareness, non-judgement of inner experience, and non-reaction to inner experience (see Appendix E). Subscale scores are derived by adding the indicated points together in each section (i.e., observe, describe, acting with awareness, etc.) after taking into account the reversed scores. Higher scores indicate more mindfulness practices. The FFMQ has adequate reliability (i.e., coefficient alphas range from .72 to .92) as well as convergent, discriminant, and incremental validity (Baer et al., 2008).

Romantic Partner Conflict Scale. The participants also completed the Interactional Reactivity, Compromise, Domination, and Submission subscales of the Romantic Partner Conflict Scale (RPCS; Zacchilli, Hendrick, & Hendrick, 2009). The RPCS is a Likert rating scale (0= *strongly disagree*; 4= *strongly agree*) consisting of 39 items that measure everyday conflict experienced by individuals in romantic relationships on six separate scales (see Appendix F). Only four of the six subscales were administered and analyzed due to their relevance to perfectionistic interpersonal relationships. The measure is scored by adding the indicated points together for each subscale and then

dividing by total number of items on each subscale. The internal consistency coefficients range from .65 to .90 for Compromise, .60 to .95 for Avoidance, .67 to .80 for Interactional Reactivity, .77 to .81 for Separation, .75 to .85 for Domination, and .70 to .87 for Submission. The RPCS demonstrates internal consistency, test-retest reliability, and construct validity (Zacchilli et al., 2009).

Couples Satisfaction Inventory – 4. Participants completed the Couples Satisfaction Inventory (CSI-4; Funk & Rogge, 2007). The Couples Satisfaction Inventory is a Likert rating scale (0 = *extremely unhappy*, 6 = *perfect*) consisting of four items that measure a person's overall satisfaction in their current relationship (see Appendix G). The measure is scored by summing the indicated points together. The scores range from 0 to 24. Higher levels of relationship satisfaction are indicated by higher scores. Scores that are less than 13.5 indicate relationship dissatisfaction. This measure has excellent internal consistency (i.e., coefficient alpha = .94) as well as convergent and divergent validity (Funk & Rogge, 2007).

Positive and Negative Perfectionism Scale. Finally, participants also completed the Positive and Negative Perfectionism Scale (PANPS; Terry-Short et al., 1995). The PANPS is a Likert rating scale (1= *strongly disagree*; 5= *strongly agree*) consisting of 40 items that measure positive and negative perfectionism (see Appendix H). For the purpose of this study, the participants only completed the 20 items relating to positive perfectionism. Items were summed to give a subscale score in which higher values indicate greater positive perfectionism. Internal consistency coefficients ranged from .83 to .84 for the positive perfectionism subscale (Egan, Piek, Dyck, & Kane, 2011).

Procedure

The participants provided informed consent prior to participation (see Appendix H). Following consent, they were given a packet of questionnaires including the demographic information, APS, DAPS, SCS, FFMQ, RPCS, PANPS and CSI-4. The order of the questionnaires was counterbalanced to control for potential order effects with the exception of the demographic form, which was first in all packets. Once the surveys were complete, participants were debriefed and received their credit/extra credit.

CHAPTER III

RESULTS

Correlational Analyses

It was hypothesized that there would be a negative correlation between interpersonal perfectionism, on the one hand, and mindfulness and self-compassion, on the other hand. In other words, the more interpersonal perfectionism, the less likely the individual is mindful and self-compassionate. Among the full sample and those in a relationship, Pearson correlations indicate a significant positive correlation between mindfulness and interpersonal perfectionism in the area of order, $r = 0.23, p = .004$; $r = 0.23, p = .028$. No significant correlations were found between mindfulness and the other interpersonal perfectionism subscales (see Table 2). Additionally, a significant positive correlation was found when examining the relationship between interpersonal perfectionism and self-compassion. More specifically, higher interpersonal perfectionism in the area of order was significantly predictive of higher levels of self-compassion, $r = 0.22, p = .004$; $r = 0.22, p = .039$. No significant relationship was found between self-compassion and the other two areas of interpersonal perfectionism (see Table 2).

It also was hypothesized that interpersonal perfectionism would be negatively correlated with relationship satisfaction. Pearson correlations were computed to assess this relationship. Among the full sample, there was a significant negative relationship between interpersonal perfectionism in the area of discrepancy and relationship satisfaction, $r = -0.373, p < .000$. The more participants reported engaging in discrepant interpersonal perfectionism, the less satisfied they were in their romantic relationships.

Table 2

Correlations among Interpersonal Perfectionism, Mindfulness, Self-Compassion, and Relationship Satisfaction for the Full Sample

		DAPS Stand	DAPS Order	FFMS	SCS	PANPS	CSI
DAPS Discp	Pearson Correlation	.338**	.336**	-.144	-.007	.355**	-.373**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	.001	.175	.946	.001	.000
	N	91	91	90	90	90	91
DAPS Stand	Pearson Correlation		.623**	-.023	.137	.413**	.115
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.826	.196	.000	.278
	N		92	91	91	91	91
DAPS Order	Pearson Correlation			.230*	.217*	.318**	-.074
	Sig. (2-tailed)			.028	.039	.002	.487
	N			91	91	91	91
FFMS	Pearson Correlation				.668**	.044	.002
	Sig. (2-tailed)				.000	.678	.983
	N				90	90	90
SCS	Pearson Correlation					.029	.027
	Sig. (2-tailed)					.783	.800
	N					90	90
PANPS	Pearson Correlation						.063
	Sig. (2-tailed)						.555
	N						90

Note. DAPS Discp – Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale, Discrepancy; DAPS Stand – Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale, Standards; DAPS Order – Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale, Order.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

No other interpersonal perfectionism factors were associated with relationship satisfaction (see Table 2).

Although no specific hypotheses were predicted regarding positive perfectionism, the relationship between positive perfectionism and relationship factors, self-compassion, and mindfulness was assessed with Pearson correlations. Positive perfectionism (as assessed by the PANPS) was not significantly related to any variable except RPSC Dominance, $r = .30$, $p = .03$ (see Table 2).

Separate correlational analyses were conducted for those currently in a romantic relationship for 3 months or longer ($n = 59$) to assess if the same pattern emerged (see Table 3). Among those in a current relationship, there was a significant negative relationship between interpersonal perfectionism standards and mindfulness, $r = -0.262$, $p = .045$. That is, higher levels of interpersonal perfectionism in the area of perfectionistic standards are associated with lower levels of mindfulness (See Table 3). No other interpersonal perfectionism factors were related to mindfulness or self-compassion. Further, interpersonal perfectionism was not significantly correlated with relationship satisfaction.

Finally, it was predicted that the relationship between interpersonal perfectionism and relationship conflict behaviors would be moderated by mindfulness practice and self-compassion such that the more mindful practices an individual engages in and the more self-compassionate one is, the less effect interpersonal perfectionism has on relationship variables such as conflict. Pearson correlations were calculated to assess the relationship between interpersonal perfectionism and relationship conflict. Among the full sample,

Table 3

Correlations among the Interpersonal Perfectionism, Mindfulness, Self-Compassion, and Relationship Satisfaction for Those Currently in a Relationship for 3 Months or Longer

		DAPSSStand	DAPSSOrder	FFMS	SCS	PANPS	CSI
DAPSDiscp	Pearson Correlation	.275*	.233	-.255	-.011	.294*	-.159
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.035	.076	.051	.932	.025	.228
	N	59	59	59	58	58	59
DAPSSStand	Pearson Correlation		.622**	-.262*	.029	.354**	.202
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.045	.830	.006	.124
	N		59	59	58	58	59
DAPSSOrder	Pearson Correlation			.108	.173	.259*	.196
	Sig. (2-tailed)			.417	.194	.050	.137
	N			59	58	58	59
FFMQ	Pearson Correlation				.619**	.028	-.045
	Sig. (2-tailed)				.000	.836	.734
	N				58	58	59
SCS	Pearson Correlation					-.007	-.024
	Sig. (2-tailed)					.961	.857
	N					57	58
PANPS	Pearson Correlation						.067
	Sig. (2-tailed)						.616
	N						58

Note. DAPS Discp – Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale, Discrepancy; DAPS Stand – Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale, Standards; DAPS Order – Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale, Order.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

there was a significant positive relationship between interpersonal perfectionism discrepancy and relational conflict interaction, dominance, and submission with (see Tables 4 and 5). Because this significant relationship was identified, the potential moderating effects of mindfulness and self-compassion then were analyzed within each of these relationships using linear multiple regression. Standardized scores were calculated for DAPS discrepancy, SCS, and FFMQ. Then moderator variables were created by multiplying Z-scores for discrepancy with Z-scores for compassion and mindfulness. Linear regression analyses showed no moderating effects for either mindfulness or self-compassion for the predictability of relationship conflict interaction or relationship conflict dominance from interpersonal perfectionism-discrepancy. Mindfulness was a significant moderator, however, for predicting relationship conflict submission from interpersonal perfectionism-discrepancy. Tables 6 through 11 show the model fit for each of these regression analyses.

Table 4

Correlations among Interpersonal Perfectionism and Relationship Conflict Factors for the Full Sample

		DAPS Discp	DAPS Stand	DAPS Order
RPCS Interact	Pearson Correlation	.504**	.159	.118
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.133	.264
	N	90	91	91
RPCS Comp	Pearson Correlation	-.208	-.061	.028
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.050	.568	.793
	N	89	90	90
RPCS Dom	Pearson Correlation	.263*	.093	.132
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.012	.382	.212
	N	90	91	91
RPCS Submit	Pearson Correlation	.329**	.167	.168
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.114	.112
	N	90	91	91

Note. DAPS Discp – Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale, Discrepancy; DAPS Stand – Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale, Standards; DAPS Order – Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale, Order. RPCS Interact- Romantic Partner Conflict Scale, Interaction; RPCS Comp – Romantic Partner Conflict Scale, Compromise; RPCS Dom - Romantic Partner Conflict Scale, Domination; RPCS Submit - Romantic Partner Conflict Scale, Submission.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 5

Correlations among Interpersonal Perfectionism and Relationship Conflict Factors for Those Currently in a Relationship for 3 Months or Longer

		DAPS Discp	DAPS Stand	DAPS Order
RPCS Interact	Pearson Correlation	.329*	-.023	-.007
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.011	.861	.959
	N	59	59	59
RPCS Comp	Pearson Correlation	-.050	.032	.161
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.710	.811	.231
	N	57	57	57
RPCS Dom	Pearson Correlation	.184	.246	.127
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.168	.063	.344
	N	58	58	58
RPCS Submit	Pearson Correlation	.344**	.172	.195
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.008	.196	.142
	N	58	58	58

Note. DAPS Discp – Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale, Discrepancy; DAPS Stand – Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale, Standards; DAPS Order – Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale, Order. RPCS Interact- Romantic Partner Conflict Scale, Interaction; RPCS Comp – Romantic Partner Conflict Scale, Compromise; RPCS Dom - Romantic Partner Conflict Scale, Domination; RPCS Submit - Romantic Partner Conflict Scale, Submission.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 6

Moderation of Mindfulness on the Relationship of Interpersonal Perfectionism-Discrepancy and Relational Conflict Dominance

		Coefficients^a				
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	.339	.787		.431	.668
	DAPSDiscp	.313	.110	.298	2.854	.005
	FFMSTotal	.003	.005	.059	.567	.572
	moderatorMind	.077	.106	.076	.730	.468

a. Dependent Variable: RPCSDom

Table 7

Moderation of Self-Compassion on the Relationship of Interpersonal Perfectionism-Discrepancy and Relational Conflict Dominance

		Coefficients^a				
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	.972	.549		1.770	.080
	DAPSDiscp	.278	.111	.263	2.499	.014
	SCSTotal	-.059	.158	-.039	-.374	.709
	moderatorComp	-.009	.106	-.009	-.085	.932

a. Dependent Variable: RPCSDom

Table 8

Moderation of Mindfulness on the Relationship of Interpersonal Perfectionism-Discrepancy and Relational Conflict Submission

		Coefficients^a				
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	1.458	.786		1.853	.067
	DAPSDiscp	.331	.110	.302	3.024	.003
	FFMSTotal	-.005	.005	-.090	-.902	.370
	moderatorMind	-.254	.106	-.239	-2.407	.018

a. Dependent Variable: RPCSSubmit

Table 9

Moderation of Self-Compassion on the Relationship of Interpersonal Perfectionism-Discrepancy and Relational Conflict Submission

		Coefficients^a				
		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
Model		B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
1	(Constant)	.826	.553		1.494	.139
	DAPSDiscp	.342	.112	.313	3.056	.003
	SCSTotal	.006	.159	.004	.038	.970
	moderatorComp	-.127	.107	-.122	-1.192	.237

a. Dependent Variable: RPCSSubmit

Table 10

Moderation of Mindfulness on the Relationship of Interpersonal Perfectionism-Discrepancy and Relational Conflict Interaction

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.699	.719		-.972	.334
	DAPSDiscp	.540	.101	.507	5.344	.000
	FFMSTotal	.004	.005	.084	.887	.378
	moderatorMind	.005	.097	.005	.053	.958

a. Dependent Variable: RPCSInteract

Table 11

Moderation of Self-Compassion on the Relationship of Interpersonal Perfectionism-Discrepancy and Relational Conflict Interaction

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.181	.497		-.364	.717
	DAPSDiscp	.550	.101	.513	5.461	.000
	SCSTotal	.016	.143	.010	.112	.911
	moderatorComp	.021	.096	.021	.218	.828

a. Dependent Variable: RPCSInteract

Group Comparisons

Although not part of the initial methods, due to recruiting from whole classes, some of the participants were not currently in romantic relationships. To assess group differences, participants were grouped into 2 groups: those currently in a relationship for 3 months or longer ($n = 59$) and those not currently in a relationship ($n = 32$) or in one for less than 3 months ($n = 1$). Chi-square analyses indicated no group differences for gender, ethnicity, or orientation. ANOVAs were conducted to test for group differences in each of the dependent measures (see Table 12). These analyses were exploratory, so no specific hypotheses were proposed. Results suggest that Interpersonal Perfectionism-Discrepancy was significantly higher for those not currently in a relationship, $F(1, 89) = 11.01, p = .001$. However, interpersonal perfectionism- order was higher for those currently in a relationship, $F(1, 90) = 8.97, p = .004$ compared to those not in a relationship. Relational conflict in the areas of interaction and dominance were higher for those not currently in a relationship, $F(1, 89) = 13.03, p = .001$ and $F(1, 89) = 4.53, p = .036$, respectively. Finally, as expected, relationship satisfaction was higher for those currently in a relationship, $F(1, 89) = 42.32, p < .001$, compared to those reporting satisfaction with their most recent relationship.

Table 12

Descriptives for All Dependent Variables by Relationship Group

Variable	Current Relationship (<i>n</i> = 59) <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)	No Current Relationship (<i>n</i> = 33) <i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
APS - Order	5.35 (1.19)	5.45 (1.21)
APS - Standards	6.10 (.72)	6.10 (.80)
APS - Discrepancy	3.85 (1.38)	3.86 (1.46)
DAPS - Order	4.74 (1.21)	5.49 (1.05)
DAPS - Standards	5.31 (1.11)	5.58 (1.27)
DAPS - Discrepancy	2.31 (.84)	2.95 (.95)
PANPS	79.72 (9.59)	80.48 (9.20)
SCS	2.85 (.59)	3.08 (.73)
FFMP	125.37 (17.27)	130.84 (20.91)
RPCS - Interaction	.98 (.81)	1.72 (1.13)
RPCS – Compromise	2.93 (.53)	2.76 (.84)
RPCS – Submission	1.62 (.96)	1.85 (1.08)
RPCS - Dominance	1.33 (.93)	1.78 (1.00)
CSI-4	16.86 (3.73)	10.56 (5.46)

CHAPTER IV

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the current study was to assess interpersonal perfectionism factors in relation to self-compassion, mindfulness, relationship conflict, and relationship satisfaction. Additionally, there is a lack of research investigating the potential role of mindfulness and self-compassion as moderators between interpersonal perfectionism and relational factors. College students currently in romantic relationships and those not in relationships currently completed a battery of questionnaires that were then analyzed to assess these potential relationships.

It was hypothesized that interpersonal perfectionism would be negatively correlated with mindfulness and self-compassion. Looking at the full sample, mindfulness was positively correlated with interpersonal perfectionism in the area of order. It is possible that one would be more focused on order when being mindful, being that order requires one to be more aware of the present moment and environment. Additionally, there was a positive correlation between interpersonal perfectionism in the area of order and self-compassion. One could display self-compassion by having order in his or her life. Past research suggests a relationship between mindfulness-based practices and the reduction of distress as well as perfectionism (Lutz et al., 2016). Our results did not align with these conclusions, with one potential reason being that interpersonal perfectionism rather than personal perfectionism was measured. Also, we looked at different areas of interpersonal perfectionism rather than interpersonal perfectionism as a whole.

It was further hypothesized that interpersonal perfectionism would be negatively correlated with relationship satisfaction. This hypothesis was partially supported. Analyzing the full sample, there was a significant negative correlation between interpersonal perfectionism - discrepancy and relationship satisfaction. This finding indicates that one who finds more discrepancy between set standards and his or her significant other's actions may experience lower relationship satisfaction. Past research suggests that interpersonal perfectionism-discrepancy is related to marital distress, quality of the sexual relationship, and sexual dysfunction (e.g., Habke et al., 1999). Interestingly, this analysis among only those in a current romantic relationship showed no significant correlation between interpersonal perfectionism and relationship satisfaction. One potential reason for this outcome may be that those who participated in interpersonal perfectionism did not remain in romantic relationships whereas those who do not participate in interpersonal perfectionism are in satisfying relationships. The group comparisons conducted suggest this explanation may be supported for interpersonal perfectionism-discrepancy, which was significantly higher for those not currently in relationships. Order-based interpersonal perfectionism, however, was actually higher for those in relationships. Although the sample for each of these groups was somewhat small, this variation in type of interpersonal perfectionism reported by those in relationships and those not warrants further investigation.

Regarding the potential moderating role of mindfulness and self-compassion, the results were surprising. Previous studies have shown that perfectionism levels decrease,

and self-compassion increases after mindfulness practices are implemented (e.g., Beck et al., 2017). Additionally, previous research suggests that self-compassion may alleviate the effect of maladaptive perfectionism on depressive symptoms (e.g., Mehr & Adams, 2016).

In the current study, there was a significant relationship between relational conflict and interpersonal perfectionism such that the more one participates in interpersonal perfectionism finding discrepancy between set standards and his or her significant other's actions, the more one experiences interactive conflict, dominating behavior, or overly submissive behavior. These relationships, however, were not moderated by self-compassion, and mindfulness only significantly moderated the relationship between interpersonal perfectionism-discrepancy and relationship conflict submission (and not conflict interaction or conflict dominance). It is possible that a controlled formal mindfulness implementation may have a deeper impact on perfectionistic thoughts and behaviors than the mindfulness practices that the participants reported. It is unknown the extent of the participants' education in mindfulness techniques or accurate reporting of their behaviors. Also, as with previous interpretations, we assessed interpersonal rather than personal perfectionism, which may have different relationships with mindfulness and self-compassion.

Groups differed in some of the variables measured. Interpersonal perfectionism in the area of order was higher for those currently in a relationship, however, interpersonal perfectionism in the area of discrepancy was higher for those not currently in a relationship. Additionally, relational conflict interaction and dominance was higher for

those not currently in a relationship. Relational satisfaction was higher for those currently in a relationship. Looking at these group differences, we can infer that those who participate in interpersonal perfectionism discrepancy and relational conflict interaction and dominance are no longer in relationships maybe due to their perfectionistic behaviors toward their significant others, which supports the notion that relationship satisfaction may be more prevalent in those who remain in a relationship.

Limitations and Future Directions

There are limitations to consider. The generalizability of the results may have been stronger if the sample size was larger. Future studies should include a larger sample which would increase statistical power as well as possibly increase generalizability of the findings. Although the participants in the current study were ethnically diverse, they were college educated and mostly female which may have affected the outcome. Also, there was variability in sexual orientation. Further, the assessment was based on self-report. For example, it is possible that the participants could have reported mindful actions without completely understanding those said actions. Additionally, those who were not in a relationship answered the relationship items based on their previous relationship. It is possible that reporting based on a previous time frame may have resulted in less accurate results. Also, if the participant was no longer in their previous relationship, it could be due to relational conflict and related to interpersonal perfectionism. Relationship duration is a factor that possibly influenced results. In future studies, one could consider recruiting participants whose relationships are in different time periods (e.g., lasting months vs years) and compare these groups. Through the current study, we have discovered

relationships among these variables. Although mindfulness was not a moderator of interpersonal perfectionism and relational conflict in this study, mindfulness did moderate perfectionistic behaviors in previous studies that explored personal perfectionism. It would be worthwhile to explore interpersonal perfectionism outside the realm of romantic relationships to assess moderation possibilities and to later implement formal mindfulness training to measure mindfulness as a moderator between interpersonal perfectionism and relational conflict.

REFERENCES

- Antony, M. M., Purdon, C. L., Huta, V., & Swinson, R. P. (1998). Dimensions of perfectionism across the anxiety disorders. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *36*, 1143-1154. doi:10.1016/S0005-7967(98)00083-7
- Azam, M. A., Katz, J., Fashler, S. R., Changoor, T., Azargive, S., & Ritvo, P. (2015). Heart rate variability is enhanced in controls but not maladaptive perfectionists during brief mindfulness meditation following stress-induction: A stratified-randomized trial. *International Journal of Psychophysiology*, *98*, 27-34. doi:10.1016/j.ijpsycho.2015.06.005
- Baer, R. A., Smith, G. T., Hopkins, J., Krietemeyer, J., & Toney, L. (2008). Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire. *PsycTESTS Dataset*. doi:10.1177/1073191105283504
- Beck, A. R., Verticchio, H., Seeman, S., Milliken, E., & Schaab, H. (2017). A mindfulness practice for communication sciences and disorders undergraduate and speech-language pathology graduate students: Effects on stress, self-compassion, and perfectionism. *American Journal of Speech-Language Pathology*, *26*, 893-907. doi:10.1044/2017_AJSLP-16-0172
- Beck, A. T., Steer, R. A., & Carbin, M. G. (1988). Psychometric properties of the Beck Depression Inventory: Twenty-five years of evaluation. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *8*, 77-100. doi:10.1016/0272-7358(88)90050-5
- Bieling, P. J., Israeli, A., Smith, J., & Antony, M. M. (2003). Making the grade: The behavioural consequences of perfectionism in the classroom. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *35*, 163-178. doi:10.1016/S0191-8869(02)00173-3

- Brodar, K. E., Crosskey, L. B., & Thompson, R. J. (2015). The relationship of self-compassion with perfectionistic self-presentation, perceived forgiveness, and perceived social support in an undergraduate Christian community. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 43*, 231-242. doi:0091-6471/410-730
- Chen, C., Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (2015). Preoccupied attachment, need to belong, shame, and interpersonal perfectionism: An investigation of the perfectionism social disconnection model. *Personality and Individual Differences, 76*, 177-182. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.12.001
- Egan, S., Piek, J., Dyck, M., & Kane, R. (2011). The reliability and validity of the positive and negative perfectionism scale. *Clinical Psychologist, 15*, 121-132. doi:10.1111/j.1742-9552.2011.00029.x
- Ellis, A. (1996). Reason and emotion in psychotherapy: A comprehensive method of treating human disturbances. New York: Citadel.
- Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., Blankstein, K. R., & Koledin, S. (1991). Dimensions of perfectionism and irrational thinking. *Journal of Rational-Emotive & Cognitive-Behavior Therapy, 9*, 185-201. doi:10.1007/BF01061229
- Frost, R. O., Marten, P., Lahart, C., & Rosenblate, R. (1990). The dimensions of perfectionism. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 14*, 449-468. doi:10.1007/BF01172967

- Funk, J.L., & Rogge, R.D. (2007). Testing the ruler with item response theory: Increasing precision of measurement for relationship satisfaction with the couples satisfaction index. *Journal of Family Psychology, 21*, 572-583. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.21.4.572
- Greenspon, T. S. (2000). 'Healthy perfectionism' is an oxymoron! Reflections on the psychology of perfectionism and the sociology of science. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 11*, 197-208. doi:10.4219/jsge-2000-631
- Habke, A. M., Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1999). Perfectionism and sexual satisfaction in intimate relationships. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 21*, 307-322. doi:10.1023/A:1022168715349
- Haring, M., Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (2003). Perfectionism, coping, and quality of intimate relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65*, 143-158. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2003.00143.x
- Heimberg, R. G., Juster, H. R., Hope, D. A., & Mattia, J. I. (1995). Cognitive-behavioral group treatment: Description, case presentation, and empirical support. In M. B. Stein, M. B. Stein (Eds.), *Social phobia: Clinical and research perspectives* (pp. 293-321). Arlington, VA, US: American Psychiatric Association.
- Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1991). Perfectionism in the self and social contexts: Conceptualization, assessment, and association with psychopathology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 456. doi: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. *International Journal of Eating Disorders, 18*, 317-326. doi:10.1002/1098-108X(199512)18:4<317::AID-EAT2260180404>3.0.CO;2-2
- Hill, A. P., Hall, H. K., & Appleton, P. R. (2011). The relationship between multidimensional perfectionism and contingencies of self-worth. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*, 238-242. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2010.09.036
- Hindman, R. K., Glass, C. R., Arnkoff, D. B., & Maron, D. D. (2015). A comparison of formal and informal mindfulness programs for stress reduction in university students. *Mindfulness, 6*, 873-884. doi:10.1007/s12671-014-0331-1
- Holiday, R. (2016, Oct. 18). How to Beat Perfectionism, Make Progress, and Find Happiness. *Psychology Today*. Retrieved from <https://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/the-obstacle-is-the-way/201610/how-beat-perfectionism-make-progress-and-find-happiness>
- Kerrigan, D., Chau, V., King, M., Holman, E., Joffe, A., & Sibinga, E. (2017). There is no performance, there is just this moment: The role of mindfulness instruction in promoting health and well-being among students at a highly-ranked university in the United States. *Journal of Evidence-Based Complementary & Alternative Medicine, 22*, 1-10. doi:10.1177/2156587217719787
- Leonard, N. H., & Harvey, M. (2008). Negative perfectionism: Examining negative excessive behavior in the workplace. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 38*, 585-610. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2007.00318.x

- Lopez, F. G., Fons-Scheyd, A., Morúa, W., & Chaliman, R. (2006). Dyadic perfectionism as a predictor of relationship continuity and distress among college students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53*, 543–549. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.53.4.543
- Lutz, J., Brühl, A. B., Doerig, N., Scheerer, H., Achermann, R., Weibel, A., . . . & Herwig, U. (2016). Altered processing of self-related emotional stimuli in mindfulness meditators. *NeuroImage, 124*, 958-967.
doi:10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.09.057
- Mee, F. F., Hazan, S. A., Baba, M., Talib, M. A., & Zakaria, N. S. (2015). Relationship between perfectionism and marital satisfaction among graduate students. *International Journal of Education and Research, 3*. doi:10.1515/ppb-2017-0034
- Mehr, K. E., & Adams, A. C. (2016). Self-compassion as a mediator of maladaptive perfectionism and depressive symptoms in college students. *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy, 30*, 132-145. doi:10.1080/87568225.2016.1140991
- Neff, K. D. (2003a). The development and validation of a scale to measure self-compassion. *Self and Identity, 2*, 223-250. doi:10.1080/15298860309027
- Newby J., Pitura V. A., Penney A. M., Klein R. G., Flett G. L., Hewitt P. L. (2017). Neuroticism and perfectionism as predictors of social anxiety. *Personality and Individual Differences, 106*, 263-267.
doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.10.057
- O'connor, R. C., & O'connor, D. B. (2003). Predicting hopelessness and psychological distress: The role of perfectionism and coping. *Journal of Counseling*

Psychology, 50, 362. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.50.3.362

- Ritvo, P., Vora, K., Irvine, J., Mongrain, M., Azargive, S., Azam, M. A., . . . & Cribbie, R. (2013). Reductions in negative automatic thoughts in students attending mindfulness tutorials predict increased life satisfaction. *International Journal of Educational Psychology*, 2, 272-296. doi:10.4471/ijep.2013.28
- Shea A. J., & Slaney R. B. (1999). The Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale. Unpublished manuscript, The Pennsylvania State University, University Park.
- Sherry, S. B., Hewitt, P. L., Flett, G. L., & Harvey, M. (2003). Perfectionism dimensions, perfectionistic attitudes, dependent attitudes, and depression in psychiatric patients and university students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 50, 373. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.50.3.373
- Short, M. M., & Mazmanian, D. (2013). Perfectionism and negative repetitive thoughts: Examining a multiple mediator model in relation to mindfulness. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 55(6), 716-721. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2013.05.026
- Slaney, R. B., Mobley, M., Trippi, J., Ashby, J. S., & Johnson, D. P. (1996). The Almost Perfect Scale—Revised. Unpublished manuscript, The Pennsylvania State University.
- Terry-Short, L. A., Owens, R. G., Slade, P. D., & Dewey, M. E. (1995). Positive and negative perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 18, 663-668. doi:10.1016/0191-8869(94)00192-U
- Ulu, I. P., & Tezer, E. (2010). Adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism, adult attachment, and big five personality traits. *The Journal of Psychology*, 144, 327-340.

doi:10.1080/00223981003784032

Zacchilli, T. L., Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. (2009). The Romantic Partner Conflict Scale: A new scale to measure conflict in dating relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 26, 1073-1096. doi:10.1177/0265407509347936

Appendices

Appendix A
Demographic Form

1. What is your age?
 - A. 18-26 years
 - B. 27-40 years
 - C. 41-59 years
 - D. 60+ years
2. What is your ethnicity?
 - A. African American
 - B. Caucasian
 - C. Hispanic
 - D. Other
3. What is your gender?
 - A. Male
 - B. Female
 - C. Other
 - D. Choose not to respond

4. What is your sexual orientation?
 - A. Homosexual
 - B. Bisexual
 - C. Heterosexual
 - D. Asexual
 - E. Other

5. Describe your current partner relationship status.
 - A. Not currently in a relationship
 - B. In a monogamous relationship for 0-2 months
 - C. In a monogamous relationship for 3-12 months
 - D. In a monogamous relationship for 12+ years

Appendix B

Almost Perfect Scale

The following items are designed to measure attitudes people have toward themselves, their performance, and toward others. There are no right or wrong answers. Please respond to all of the items. Use your first impression and do not spend too much time on individual items in responding.

Respond to each of the items using the scale below to describe your degree of agreement with each item. Fill in the appropriate number circle on the computer answer sheet that is provided.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. I have high standards for my performance at work or at school.
2. I am an orderly person.
3. I often feel frustrated because I can't meet my goals.
4. Neatness is important to me.
5. If you don't expect much out of yourself, you will never succeed.
6. My best just never seems to be good enough for me.
7. I think things should be put away in their place
8. I have high expectations for myself.
9. I rarely live up to my high standards.
10. I like to always be organized and disciplined.
11. Doing my best never seems to be enough.
12. I set very high standards for myself.
13. I am never satisfied with my accomplishments.
14. I expect the best from myself.
15. I often worry about not measuring up to my own expectations.
16. My performance rarely measures up to my standards.
17. I am not satisfied even when I know I have done my best.
18. I try to do my best at everything I do.
19. I am seldom able to meet my own high standards of performance.
20. I am hardly ever satisfied with my performance.
21. I hardly ever feel that what I've done is good enough.
22. I have a strong need to strive for excellence
23. I often feel disappointment after completing a task because I know I could have done better.

Appendix C

Dyadic Almost Perfect Scale

The following items are designed to measure attitudes people have about romantic/intimate relationships. There are no right or wrong answers. Please respond to all of the items. Use your first impression and do not spend too much time on individual items. The terms “significant other” and “partner” are used interchangeably. If you do not have a current significant other or partner, please use someone who has filled that role for you in the past.

Instructions:

Respond on the answer line to the left of each item by using the scale below to describe your degree of agreement or disagreement with each statement.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree

1. I often feel disappointment after my partner completes a task because I know that she/he could have done better.
2. I expect my significant other to be an orderly person.
3. My significant other can generally meet the standards that I have set for him/her.
4. My significant other rarely lives up to my standards.
5. I have very high standards for my significant other.
6. My partner’s best rarely seems to be enough for me.
7. Neatness should be important to my significant other.
8. I expect the best from my significant other.
9. I am rarely satisfied with my partner’s accomplishments.
10. I often feel frustrated because my significant other does not meet the goals I have for him/her.
11. I expect my partner to try to do her/his best at everything she/he does.

12. I have trouble with my partner leaving things incomplete.
13. My partner's best never seems to be good enough for me.
14. I have high standards for my significant other's performance at work or at school.
15. My significant other often does not measure up to my expectations.
16. I usually feel like what my partner has done is good enough.
17. I think my partner should be organized.
18. I am hardly ever satisfied with my partner's performance.
19. I have a strong need for my partner to strive for excellence.
20. My significant other is seldom able to meet my standards for performance.
21. I usually feel pretty satisfied with what my significant other does.
22. I expect my partner to think things should be put away in their place.
23. My partner's performance rarely measures up to my standards.
24. I am not satisfied, even when I know my significant other has done his/her best.
25. I have high expectations of my significant other.
26. I can get pretty upset when my partner doesn't do as well as I think she/he should.

Appendix D
Self-Compassion Scale

How I Typically Act Toward Myself in Difficult Times

Please read each statement carefully before answering. To the left of each item, indicate how often you behave in the stated manner.

Almost Never

Almost Always

1

2

3

4

5

1. I'm disapproving and judgmental about my own flaws and inadequacies.
2. When I'm feeling down I tend to obsess and fixate on everything that's wrong.
3. When things are going badly for me, I see the difficulties as part of life that everyone goes through.
4. When I think about my inadequacies, it tends to make me feel more separate and cut off from the rest of the world.
5. I try to be loving towards myself when I'm feeling emotional pain.
6. When I fail at something important to me I become consumed by feelings of inadequacy.
7. When I'm down and out, I remind myself that there are lots of other people in the world feeling like I am.
8. When times are really difficult, I tend to be tough on myself.
9. When something upsets me I try to keep my emotions in balance.

10. When I feel inadequate in some way, I try to remind myself that feelings of inadequacy are shared by most people.
11. I'm intolerant and impatient towards those aspects of my personality I don't like.
12. When I'm going through a very hard time, I give myself the caring and tenderness I need.
13. When I'm feeling down, I tend to feel like most other people are probably happier than I am.
14. When something painful happens, I try to take a balanced view of the situation.
15. I try to see my failings as part of the human condition.
16. When I see aspects of myself that I don't like, I get down on myself.
17. When I fail at something important to me I try to keep things in perspective.
18. When I'm really struggling, I tend to feel like other people must be having an easier time of it.
19. I'm kind to myself when I'm experiencing suffering.
20. When something upsets me, I get carried away with my feelings.
21. I can be a bit cold-hearted towards myself when I'm experiencing suffering.
22. When I'm feeling down I try to approach my feelings with curiosity and openness.
23. I'm tolerant of my own flaws and inadequacies.
24. When something painful happens, I tend to blow the incident out of proportion.
25. When I fail at something that's important to me, I tend to feel alone in my failure.
26. I try to be understanding and patient towards those aspects of my personality I don't like.

Appendix E

Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire

Please rate each of the following statements using the scale provided. Write the number in the blank that best describes your own opinion of what is generally true for you.

1	2	3	4	5
never or very rarely true	rarely true	sometimes true	often true	very often or always true

1. When I'm walking, I deliberately notice the sensations of my body moving.
2. I'm good at finding words to describe my feelings.
3. I criticize myself for having irrational or inappropriate emotions.
4. I perceive my feelings and emotions without having to react to them.
5. When I do things, my mind wanders off and I'm easily distracted.
6. When I take a shower or bath, I stay alert to the sensations of water on my body.
7. I can easily put my beliefs, opinions, and expectations into words.
8. I don't pay attention to what I'm doing because I'm daydreaming, worrying, or otherwise distracted.
9. I watch my feelings without getting lost in them.
10. I tell myself I shouldn't be feeling the way I'm feeling.
11. I notice how foods and drinks affect my thoughts, bodily sensations, and emotions.
12. It's hard for me to find the words to describe what I'm thinking.
13. I am easily distracted.
14. I believe some of my thoughts are abnormal or bad and I shouldn't think that way.
15. I pay attention to sensations, such as the wind in my hair or sun on my face.

16. I have trouble thinking of the right words to express how I feel about things
17. I make judgments about whether my thoughts are good or bad.
18. I find it difficult to stay focused on what's happening in the present.
19. When I have distressing thoughts or images, I "step back" and am aware of the thought or image without getting taken over by it.
20. I pay attention to sounds, such as clocks ticking, birds chirping, or cars passing.
21. In difficult situations, I can pause without immediately reacting.
22. When I have a sensation in my body, it's difficult for me to describe it because I can't find the right words.
23. It seems I am "running on automatic" without much awareness of what I'm doing.
24. When I have distressing thoughts or images, I feel calm soon after.
25. I tell myself that I shouldn't be thinking the way I'm thinking.
26. I notice the smells and aromas of things.
27. Even when I'm feeling terribly upset, I can find a way to put it into words.
28. I rush through activities without being really attentive to them.
29. When I have distressing thoughts or images I am able just to notice them without reacting.
30. I think some of my emotions are bad or inappropriate and I shouldn't feel them.
31. I notice visual elements in art or nature, such as colors, shapes, textures, or patterns of light and shadow.
32. My natural tendency is to put my experiences into words.
33. When I have distressing thoughts or images, I just notice them and let them go.
34. I do jobs or tasks automatically without being aware of what I'm doing.
35. When I have distressing thoughts or images, I judge myself as good or bad, depending what the thought/image is about.
36. I pay attention to how my emotions affect my thoughts and behavior.
37. I can usually describe how I feel at the moment in considerable detail.
38. I find myself doing things without paying attention.
39. I disapprove of myself when I have irrational ideas.

Appendix F

Romantic Partner Conflict Scale

Think about how you handle conflict with your romantic partner. Specifically, think about a **significant** conflict issue that you and your partner have disagreed about recently. Using the scale below, fill in which response is most like how you handled conflict. If you do not have a romantic partner, respond with your most current partner in mind. If you have never been in a romantic relationship, answer in terms of what you think your responses would most likely be.

For each item, answer as follows:

- 0 = Strongly disagree with statement
- 1 = Moderately disagree with statement
- 2 = Neutral, neither agree nor disagree
- 3 = Moderately agree with statement
- 4 = Strongly agree with statement

1. We try to find solutions that are acceptable to both of us.
2. We often resolve conflict by talking about the problem.
3. Our conflicts usually end when we reach a compromise.
4. When my partner and I disagree, we consider both sides of the argument.
5. In order to resolve conflicts, we try to reach a compromise.
6. Compromise is the best way to resolve conflict between my partner and me.
7. My partner and I negotiate to resolve our disagreements.
8. I try to meet my partner halfway to resolve a disagreement.
9. The best way to resolve conflict between me and my partner is to find a middle ground.
10. When we disagree, we try to find a solution that satisfies both of us.
11. When my partner and I have conflict, we collaborate so that we are both happy with our decision.
12. My partner and I collaborate to find a common ground to solve problems between us.

13. We collaborate to come up with the best solution for both of us when we have a problem.
14. We try to collaborate so that we can reach a joint solution to a conflict.
18. When my partner and I disagree, we argue loudly.
19. Our conflicts usually last quite a while.
20. My partner and I have frequent conflicts.
21. I suffer a lot from conflict with my partner.
22. I become verbally abusive to my partner when we have conflict.
23. My partner and I often argue because I do not trust him/her.
29. When we argue or fight, I try to win.
30. I try to take control when we argue.
31. I rarely let my partner win an argument.
32. When we disagree, my goal is to convince to my partner that I am right.
33. When we argue, I let my partner know I am in charge.
34. When we have conflict, I try to push my partner into choosing the solution that I think is best.
35. When we have conflict, I usually give in to my partner.
36. I give in to my partner's wishes to settle arguments on my partner's terms.
37. Sometimes I agree with my partner so the conflict will end.
38. When we argue, I usually try to satisfy my partner's needs rather than my own.
39. I surrender to my partner when we disagree on an issue.

Appendix G

Couples Satisfaction Inventory

0	1	2	3	4	5	6
Extremely Unhappy	Fairly Unhappy	A Little Unhappy	Happy	Very Happy	Extremely Happy	Perfect

1. Please indicate the degree of happiness, all things considered, of your relationship.

0	1	2	3	4	5
Not at all TRUE	A Little TRUE	Somewhat TRUE	Mostly TRUE	Almost completely TRUE	Completely TRUE

2. I have a warm and comfortable relationship with my partner

0	1	2	3	4	5
Not at all	A little	Somewhat	Mostly	Almost Completely	Completely

3. How rewarding is your relationship with your partner?
4. In general, how satisfied are you with your relationship?

Appendix H

Positive and Negative Perfectionism Scale

	5 Strongly Agree	4 Agree	3 Don't Know	2 Disagree	1 Strongly Disagree
2. My family and friends are proud of me when I do really well.					
3. I take pride in being meticulous when doing things.					
6. I like the acclaim I get for an outstanding performance.					
7. When I am doing something I cannot relax until it's perfect.					
8. It feels as though my best is never good enough for other people.					
9. Producing a perfect performance is a reward in its own right.					
10. The problem of success is that I must work even harder.					
11. If I make a mistake I feel that the whole thing is ruined.					
12. I feel dissatisfied with myself unless I am working towards a higher standard all the time.					
13. I know the kind of person I ought or want to be, but feel I always fall short of this.					
14. Other people respect me for my achievements.					

15. As a child however well I did, it never seemed good enough to please my parents.					
16. I think everyone loves a winner.					
17. Other people expect nothing less than perfection of me.					
18. When I'm competing against others, I'm motivated by wanting to be the best.					
19. I feel good when pushing out the limits.					
20. When I achieve my goals I feel dissatisfied.					
21. My high standards are admired by others.					
22. If I fail people, I fear they will cease to respect or care for me.					
23. I like to please other people by being successful.					
24. I gain great approval from others by the quality of my accomplishments.					
25. My successes spur me on to greater achievements.					
26. I feel guilty or ashamed if I do less than perfectly.					
27. No matter how well I do I never feel satisfied with my performance.					
28. I believe that rigorous practice makes for perfection.					
29. I enjoy the glory gained by successes.					
30. I gain deep satisfaction when I have perfected something.					
31. I feel I have to be perfect to gain people's approval.					

32. My parents encouraged me to excel.					
33. I worry what others think if I make mistakes.					
34. I get fulfillment from totally dedicating myself to a task.					
35. I like it when others recognize that what I do requires great skill and effort to perfect.					
36. The better I do, the better I am expected to do by others.					
37. I enjoy working towards greater levels of precision and accuracy.					
38. I would rather not start something than risk doing it less than perfectly.					
39. When I do things I feel others will judge critically the standard of my work.					
40. I like the challenge of setting very high standards for myself.					

Appendix I

MTSU IRB Approval Letter

IRB
INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD
 Office of Research Compliance,
 010A Sam Ingram Building,
 2269 Middle Tennessee Blvd
 Murfreesboro, TN 37129

**IRBN007 – EXEMPTION DETERMINATION NOTICE**

Friday, April 13, 2018

Investigator(s): Autumn Dozier; Kimberly Ujeich Ward
 Investigator(s) Email(s): ard5a@mtmail.mtsu.edu; kimberly.ward@mtsu.edu
 Department: Psychology

Study Title: AN ASSESSMENT OF MINDFULNESS PRACTICES AS A
 MODERATOR BETWEEN PERFECTIONISM AND INTERPERSONAL
 CONFLICT
 Protocol ID: **18-1239**

Dear Investigator(s),

The above identified research proposal has been reviewed by the MTSU Institutional Review Board (IRB) through the **EXEMPT** review mechanism under 45 CFR 46.101(b)(2) within the research category (2) *Educational Tests*. A summary of the IRB action and other particulars in regard to this protocol application is tabulated as shown below:

IRB Action	EXEMPT from further IRB review***	
Date of expiration	NOT APPLICABLE	
Participant Size	120 [One Hundred Twenty]	
Participant Pool	Adults 18+	
Mandatory Restrictions	1. Participants must be adults age 18+ 2. Informed consent must be obtained 3. Identifying information may not be collected	
Additional Restrictions	None	
Comments	None	
Amendments	Date	Post-Approval Amendments
	None	

***This exemption determination only allows above defined protocol from further IRB review such as continuing review. However, the following post-approval requirements still apply:

- Addition/removal of subject population should not be implemented without IRB approval
- Change in investigators must be notified and approved
- Modifications to procedures must be clearly articulated in an addendum request and the proposed changes must not be incorporated without an approval
- Be advised that the proposed change must comply within the requirements for exemption
- Changes to the research location must be approved – appropriate permission letter(s) from external institutions must accompany the addendum request form