

## Perfectionism among Turkish Secondary Students\*

### Türk Ortaöğretim Öğrencilerinde Mükemmeliyetçilik

Fatih Camadan\*\*  
Recep Tayyip Erdogan University

Galip Yüksel\*\*\*  
Gazi University

#### Abstract

The aim of this study was to analyze perfectionism among Turkish secondary school students. Perfectionism was compared according to the some variables like academic achievement, type of school, field (Quantitative, Verbal and Equally Weighted) and gender. The study was performed with 271 female and 320 male students. In this study Frost Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (FMPS) adapted into Turkish by Özbay and Mısırlı-Taşdemir (2003), was used. At the end of the study, in all subscales of perfectionism scale, there was significant variation according to student's academic success levels. There was significant variation according to the school types in all subscales except *Personal Standards* subscale. While there was significant variation according to the field, in *Parental Criticism* and *Concern over Mistakes* subscales; according to gender, there was significant variation only in *Doubt about Actions* subscale. To not accept nonperfect situations while trying to reach a goal may cause that students have procrastination behaviors and more anxiety. Therefore, their academic achievement may be affected negatively. With individual and group psychological counseling to perfectionist students can help them to notice their characteristics well and determine realistic goal. In this way, their academic achievement can be contributed positively.

**Keywords:** perfectionism, Turkish secondary school students, academic achievement, type of school, field (quantitative, verbal and equally weighted), FMPS (frost multidimensional perfectionism scale)

---

\*This study was presented as oral presentation at the XI. National Congress of Psychological Counseling and Guidance (3-5 October 2011, Selcuk/Izmir)

\*\*Recep Tayyip Erdogan University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Psychological Services in Education Programme, [camadan.fatih@gmail.com](mailto:camadan.fatih@gmail.com).tr

\*\*\*Gazi University, Faculty of Education, Department of Educational Sciences, Psychological Services in Education Programme, [gyuksel@gazi.edu.tr](mailto:gyuksel@gazi.edu.tr)

### Özet

Bu araştırmanın amacı Türk ortaöğretim öğrencilerinin mükemmeliyetçiliklerinin incelenmesidir. Öğrencilerin mükemmeliyetçilikleri akademik başarılarına, öğrenim gördükleri okul türüne, öğrenim gördükleri alana (Sayısal, Sözel, E.A.) ve cinsiyetlerine göre karşılaştırılmıştır. Araştırma 271 kız ve 320 erkek öğrenciyle gerçekleştirilmiştir. Araştırma kapsamında Türkçe'ye uyarlaması Özbay ve Mısırlı Taşdemir (2003) tarafından yapılan Çok Boyutlu Mükemmeliyetçilik Ölçeği (ÇBMÖ) kullanılmıştır. Araştırma sonucunda mükemmeliyetçilik ölçeğinin tüm alt ölçeklerinde öğrencilerin akademik başarılarına göre anlamlı farklılıklar bulunmuştur. *Kişisel Standartlar* alt ölçeğinin dışındaki diğer tüm alt ölçeklerde de öğrencilerin öğrenim gördükleri okul türüne göre anlamlı farklılıklar görülmüştür. Bunun yanı sıra öğrenim gördükleri alana göre *Ebeveynsel Eleştiri ve Hatalara Aşırı İlgi* alt ölçeklerinde; cinsiyetlerine göre ise sadece *Davranışlardan Şüpheli* alt ölçeğinde anlamlı farklılıklara rastlanmıştır. Mükemmel olmayan durumları kabul etmeden bir takım hedeflere ulaşmaya çalışmak, öğrencilerin erteleme davranışları sergilemelerine ve daha fazla kaygı yaşamalarına neden olabilmektedir. Dolayısıyla akademik başarıları bu durumdan olumsuz şekilde etkilenebilmektedir. Yapılacak bireysel ve grupla psikolojik danışmalarla; mükemmeliyetçi öğrencilerin kendi özelliklerini daha iyi fark etmelerinde ve gerçekçi hedefler belirlemelerinde onlara yardımcı olunabilir. Bu şekilde akademik başarılarına da katkı sağlanabilir.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** mükemmeliyetçilik, Türk ortaöğretim öğrencileri, akademik başarı, okul türü, alan (sayısal, sözel, E.A.), ÇBMÖ (çok boyutlu mükemmeliyetçilik ölçeği)

## I. INTRODUCTION

Doing one's best and setting goals beyond his/her abilities and trying to achieve them without making mistakes are two different things. While the first case influences the achievement process of that person positively, the second case not only makes gaining the desired thing more difficult but also may cause to have problems in this process. This situation can be explained with the person's showing a perfectionist attitude. According to American Psychiatry Association (1994), perfectionist attitude, causes the person to set too strict standards and these standards is difficult to achieve. The situation results in not completing or procrastinating the work (Slaney and Ashby, 1996). Freud mentioned that perfectionism manifests the general characteristics of obsessional neurosis and defined it as desire of a punitive and too controlling superego for great success and more influential behaviors (Whittaker, 2002). Frost, Marten, Lahart and Rosenblate (1990) defined perfectionism as one's setting standards above his/her capacities and lacking the tolerance of failing to reach these aims and remarked that it has six dimensions as; *Personal Standards, Organization, Concern over Mistakes, Doubts about Actions, Parental Expectations and Parental Criticism*. Hewitt and Flett (1991) dealt with perfectionism from both its personal and social aspects and in explaining this concept they mentioned three main dimensions forming that structure. They determined these dimensions as; *self-oriented perfectionism, other-*

*oriented perfectionism and socially prescribed perfectionism*. In this research perfectionism is defined as; setting goals beyond one's capacity for himself or for others and the concern of reaching these goals without making mistakes.

When we look at theories, Adler, accepted perfectionism as an inborn characteristic and dealt with it two dimensionally as; *healthy* and *unhealthy* perfectionism (Rice and Preusser 2002). Ellis (1962) argued that perfectionist mind is similar to *wrong knowledge* which affects spiritual health negatively. Similarly, Beck (1979) also mentioned that *cognitive distortions* and perfectionist mind are interrelated.

Nowadays, high school students have to be successful in their exams in order to be positioned into a faculty of a university. At the same time we see can see that the students are in a hard competition. Although at first glance, perfectionist attitude looks like a factor motivating them to success, later on it can cause the person to have difficulties, and because s/he spends his/her present energy for unfunctional works like repeating the same work again and again or too much regulation, s/he cannot achieve the expected result. However, the high motivation for success among perfectionist people should not be underestimated. It is considered that if their perfectionist attitudes can be channeled to the healthy side and if they are made to recognize their dimensions and set goals according to them, it can bring about beneficial results. As a support to this thought, in the studies of Gilman and Ashby (2003), Başer (2007) and Accordino, Accordino and Slaney (2000) it was found out that, the academic success of the students who got higher scores from *Personal Standards* subscale of perfectionism scale, was higher. Therefore, identifying the relationship of the variables, which are thought to have an affect on this case, with the perfectionism is considered to be helpful in terms of easing the recognition of the students and helping them better. In the light of this information, the aim of this study has been to find out the perfectionism of the secondary school students according to their academic success level, type of school, field (Quantitative, Verbal and Equally Weighted) and gender.

## II.METHOD

### Study Group

The study group of the research is composed of the 9<sup>th</sup> and 10<sup>th</sup> class students continuing to secondary education in Science High School, Ayrancı Anatolia High School, Balgat Anatolia Technical, Anatolia Vocational, Technical and Industrial Vocational High Schools and Balgat Aliye Yahşi Anatolia Female Vocational and Female Vocational Schools in 2007-2008 Academic year in Ankara. The study group includes 591 students, 271 females and 320 males. Concerning the genders and kinds of the schools, participant students are shown below in Table 1.

**Table 1.** The number of Students Participating in the Study Group Regarding the Genders and School Types

Gender/School Type	Anatolian High School	Science School	Girls Vocational School	Technical High School	Total
Girls	71	42	150	8	271
Boys	52	92	0	176	320
Total	123	134	150	184	591

Concerning the fields (Quantitative, Verbal and Equally Weighted) and grades, participant students are shown below in Table 2.

**Table 2.** The Number of Students Participating In the Study Group Regarding the Fields (Quantitative, Verbal and Equally Weighted) and Grades

Grade/ Fields	Quantitative	Verbal	Equally Weighted	Total
9.	-	-	-	344
10.	177	25	45	247
Total	177	25	45	591

In Table 3, information about the age of the participants is given.

**Table 3.** Information about the Age of the Participants

Age	Frequency(f)	Percentage (%)
15	7	1.2
16	333	56.3
17	247	41.8
18	4	.7
Total	591	100

Scrutinizing the data in Table 3, it appears that 333 (%56,3) of the participants are 16, 247 (%41,8) of them are 17; 7 (%1,2) of them are 15 and 4 (%7) of them are 18 years old. Moreover, the average age of participants is found to be 16.42.

### Data Collection Instrument

In this study, Frost Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale, developed by Frost and others (1990) and whose adoption to Turkish was made by Özbay and Mısırlı-Taşdemir (2003) was used.

### Frost Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale

Having been developed by Frost et al. (1990), Frost Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (FMPS) is a 5-point-Likert-type scale with 35 items. FMPS consists of subscales such as “Concern over Mistakes” (9 items: 9,13,14,18,10,25,21,23,4), “Personal Standards” (6 items: 24,12,16,19,30,6), “Parental Expectations” (5 items: 11,20,26,1,15), “Parental Criticism” (6 items: 5,3,35,22), “Doubts about Actions” (5 items: 33,34,32,17,28), “Organization” (6

items: 29,31,27,7,8,2). By means of the evolution between 1-5, it is arranged to correspond to the answers: (1) certainly not agree, (2) disagree, (3) Neutral, (4) agree, (5) certainly agree. The highest possible scores are overall of 175 points with “Organization” 30 points, “Concern over Mistakes” 45 points, “Doubts about Actions” 25 points, “Parental Expectations” 25 points, “Parental Criticism” 30 points, “Personal Standards” 30 points.

The internal reliability of the scale was found as .90, and the reliability of the subscales was found between .77 and .93 (Bencik, 2006). The scale was adapted, en passant, into Turkish by Özbay and Mısırlı-Taşdemir (2003). The factors are interpreted and named as “Concern over Mistakes”, “Personal Standards”, “Parental Expectations”, “Parental Criticism”, “Doubts about Actions”, “Organization” that accounted for %47.8 of the total variance. Reliability of the test was provided through the method of internal consistency between the items and the results show that alpha values/measurements varied between .63 and .87 for scale and subscale. Cronbach reliability co-efficient was found as .83 (Özbay and Mısırlı-Taşdemir, 2003). In this study, reliability coefficients were reckoned as .85 for “Concern Over Mistakes” subscale; .68 for “Personal Standards” subscale, .81 for “Parental Expectations” subscale, .68 for “Parental Criticism” subscale, .62 for “Doubts About Actions” subscale and for .85 “Organization” subscale.

Frost et al (1990) explained the six aspects of perfectionism in the following way; *Personal Standards*: they set goals over their capacity and have difficulty in doing. These people are also seen to achieve great goals but they have stress when they can't achieve. However the personal standards adjusted by adaptive perfectionists lead to positive results; their academic achievements are high and academic procrastinations are low. *Organization*: They show due diligence to both their works and their environments to be extremely regular. However this is over normal and makes them too uncomfortable to disorder. *Concern Over Mistakes*: They try hard to be perfect in their works and they believe that making mistakes has an outstanding role in getting success. They overestimate even the smallest mistakes in this process. They worry about disable of getting approval of other people. *Doubts About Actions*: They generate thoughts that if there is something missing in their work or it could be better. So they can't be fully satisfied. This situation causes people to make harsh criticism on themselves. This maladaptive perfectionism causes these people have mental problems. *Parental Expectations*: They think that their parents have expectations in their works and they try hard to get their approval. The idea is common that their failure will not be approved by their parents. *Parental Criticism*: The perfectionist behaviour of the parents and so their harsh criticism on the mistakes done, have effects on the perfectionist behaviours of these people.

### **Process**

In order to find out the variation in the student's perfectionism points according to their academic success, type of school and field (Quantitative, Verbal and Equally Weighted) ANOVA; to find out the variation according to genders *t*-

test was used. A statistical analysis data of this study was conducted through using SPSS 17.0 program and the margin of error was accepted as .05.

### III. RESULTS (FINDINGS)

Before making analyses in determining whether the points that students get from the sub scales of the perfectionism scale, show meaningful differences on their academic achievement levels, it is seen that the number of the students whose academic achievements are between 3.50-4.00 is 25. So, firstly the state of homogeneity of variances is examined by the size which is one of the conditions of the ANOVA Test. To that end, Levene test was done. As Bütüner (2008) said; if the meaningfulness level ( $p$ ) in the Levene test is more than 0.05, the dispersion provides variance homogeneity or vice versa. After it is seen that as a result of Levene's test was carried out under research, the variances for all of the sub scales had divided homogeneously ( $p > .05$ ), one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was applied. Levene's test results for each sub scales are as follows: Levene Organization =1.293,  $p=.265$ ; Levene Doubts About Action =1.878,  $p=.096$ ; Levene Parental Expectation =.810,  $p=.542$ ; Levene Parental Criticism =1.801,  $p=.111$ ; Levene Personal Standards =.657,  $p=.656$ ; Levene Concern Over Mistakes =1.304,  $p=.260$ . The results of ANOVA reached after this stage, which is applied in order to test if the perfectionism scale's subscale scores of the students showed a significant variation according to their academic success level is given in Table 4.

**Table 4.** Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA Results of the Perfectionism Scale's Subscale Scores according To Academic Success Level

Perfectionism Scale's Subscale	Academic Success Level	N	X	Ss	sd	F	p	Tukey
Organization	1	79	25.16	3.85				
	2	102	25.05	4.97				
	3	101	23.23	5.48				1-5
	4	24	22.46	5.53	590	6.20	.000	2-5
	5	151	22.07	5.27				
	6	134	23.44	5.25				
	Total	591	23.52	5.21				
Doubts About Action	1	79	15.29	3.42				1-5
	2	102	15.84	3.92				1-6
	3	101	14.52	3.27				2-5
	4	24	15.58	2.67	590	12.63	.000	2-6
	5	151	13.23	3.56				3-5
	6	134	12.88	3.72				4-5
	Total	591	14.19	3.74				4-6
Parental Expectation	1	79	17.05	3.93				2-5
	2	102	17.94	3.98	590	3.27	.006	2-6

	3	101	17.58	3.85				
	4	24	17.67	3.25				
	5	151	16.52	4.19				
	6	134	16.25	3.50				
	Total	591	17.00	3.91				
Parental Criticism	1	79	10.37	2.85	590	21.70	.000	1-5
	2	102	10.65	3.45				1-6
	3	101	9.64	2.94				2-5
	4	24	10.46	3.11				2-6
	5	151	7.99	2.92				3-6
	6	134	7.40	3.07				4-5
	Total	591	9.01	3.31				4-6
Personal Standards	1	79	19.79	3.26	590	3.60	.000	
	2	102	20.52	3.49				
	3	101	19.75	3.33				
	4	24	20.58	3.13				1-6
	5	151	20.46	3.61				3-6
	6	134	21.39	3.00				
	Total	591	20.48	3.38				
Concern Over Mistakes	1	79	26.73	5.95	590	9.92	.000	
	2	102	26.75	6.56				1-5
	3	101	25.11	5.66				1-6
	4	24	27.88	7.26				2-5
	5	151	22.95	6.07				2-6
	6	134	22.86	6.57				4-5
	Total	591	24.66	6.47				4-6

Note: 1=2.00-2.5, 2=2.5-3.00, 3= 3.00-3.50, 4= 3.50-4.00, 5= 4.00-4.50, 6=4.50-5.00

When Table 4. is analyzed, it is seen that those having the academical GPA of 2.00-2.50, 2.50-3.00 and 3.50-4.00 have higher subscale scores of *Doubts about Actions* [ $F_{(5-585)}=12.63$ ,  $p<.05$ ], *Parental Criticism* [ $F_{(5-585)}=21.70$ ,  $p<.05$ ], *Concern over Mistakes* [ $F_{(5-585)}=9.92$ ,  $p<.05$ ] compared to those having 4.00-4.50 and 4.50-5.00 GPA. It is also visible that *Organization* [ $F_{(5-585)}=6.20$ ,  $p<.05$ ] and *Parental Expectations* [ $F_{(5-585)}=3.27$ ,  $p<.05$ ] subscale scores of those having the GPA of 4.00-4.50 and 4.50-5.00 are lower than the ones having 2.00-2.50 and 2.50-3.00 GPA. However, it is also seen that those with the GPA of 4.50-5.00 have higher subscale scores of *Personal Standards* [ $F_{(5-585)}=3.60$ ,  $p<.05$ ] compared to those with the GPA of 2.00-2.50 and 3.00-3.50.

The results of ANOVA, which is applied in order to test if the perfectionism scale's subscale scores of the students showed a significant variation according to school type, is given in Table 5.

**Table 5.** Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA Results of the Perfectionism Scale's Subscale Scores according to School Type

Perfectionism Scale's Subscale	School Type	N	X	Ss	sd	F	p	Tukey
Organization	1	134	21.96	5.52				3-1
	2	123	21.96	5.23				3-2
	3	184	24.45	4.68	590	15.11	.000	4-1
	4	150	25.07	4.81				4-2
	Total	591	23.52	5.21				
Doubts About Action	1	134	13.28	3.79				3-1
	2	123	12.98	3.82				3-2
	3	184	15.29	3.60	590	13.84	.000	4-1
	4	150	14.65	3.32				4-2
	Total	591	14.19	3.74				
Parental Expectation	1	134	15.51	3.90				
	2	123	17.11	3.79				2-1
	3	184	17.72	3.81	590	9.36	.000	3-1
	4	150	17.37	3.84				4-1
	Total	591	17.00	3.91				
Parental Criticism	1	134	7.55	3.06				
	2	123	7.93	3.07				3-1
	3	184	10.15	2.89	590	26.38	.000	3-2
	4	150	9.83	3.45				4-1
	Total	591	9.02	3.31				4-2
Personal Standards	1	134	20.63	3.69				
	2	123	20.76	2.95				
	3	184	20.55	3.90	590	1.36	.253	
	4	150	20.13	3.41				
	Total	591	20.48	3.38				
Concern Over Mistakes	1	134	22.96	6.44				
	2	123	22.97	6.56				3-1
	3	184	26.49	5.91	590	11.96	.000	3-2
	4	150	25.32	6.41				4-1
	Total	591	24.66	6.47				4-2

Note: 1= Science School, 2= Anatolian High School, 3= Technical High School, 4= Girls Vocational School

When the Table 5. is analyzed, it is seen that the students attending Technical High School have higher subscale scores of *Organization* [ $F_{(3-587)}=15.11$ ,  $p<.05$ ]; *Doubts about Actions* [ $F_{(3-587)}=13.84$ ]; *Parental Criticism* [ $F_{(3-587)}=26.38$ ,  $p<.05$ ] and *Concern over Mistakes* [ $F_{(3-587)}=11.96$ ,  $p<.05$ ] than students attending Science and Anatolian High Schools. Additionally, it is seen that the student's



attending Science High Schools have lower *Parental Expectation* [ $F_{(3-587)}=9.36$ ,  $p<.05$ ] subscale scores compared to the students attending Technical and Girl Vocational High Schools. It was also seen that *Personal Standards* subscale scores does not vary significantly according to school types [ $F_{(3-587)}=1.36$ ,  $p>.05$ ].

Before making analyses in determining whether the points that students get from the sub scales of the perfectionism scale, show meaningful differences on their fields, it is seen that there are 25 students in verbal and 45 students in Equally Weighted field. So, firstly the state of homogeneity of variances is examined by the size which is one of the conditions of the ANOVA Test. To that end, Levene test was done. As Bütüner (2008) said; if the meaningfulness level ( $p$ ) in the Levene test is more than 0.05, the dispersion provides variance homogeneity or vice versa. After it is seen that as a result of Levene's test was carried out under research, the variances for all of the sub scales had divided homogeneously ( $p>.05$ ), one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) test was applied. Levene's test results for each sub scales are as follows: Levene *Organization* =.369,  $p=.692$ ; Levene *Doubts About Action* =1.926,  $p=.148$ ; Levene *Parental Expectation* =.010,  $p=.990$ ; Levene *Parental Criticism* =.521,  $p=.595$ ; Levene *Personal Standards* =1.456,  $p=.235$ ; Levene *Concern Over Mistakes* =2.293,  $p=.103$ . The results of ANOVA reached after this stage, which is applied in order to test if the perfectionism scale's subscale scores of the students showed a significant variation according to field, is given in Table 6.

**Table 6.** Descriptive Statistics and ANOVA Results of the Perfectionism Scale's Subscale Scores according to Field

Perfectionism Scale's Subscale	Field	N	X	Ss	sd	F	p	Tukey
Organization	1	25	24.80	4.72				
	2	177	23.42	5.24	246	.82	.443	
	3	45	23.36	5.09				
	Total	247	23.55	5.16				
Doubts About Action	1	25	14.76	3.24				
	2	177	13.97	3.90	246	1.90	.151	
	3	45	13.04	3.09				
	Total	247	13.88	3.72				
Parental Expectation	1	25	16.80	3.84				
	2	177	17.47	4.09	246	.71	.495	
	3	45	16.80	3.84				
	Total	247	17.28	4.02				
Parental Criticism	1	25	10.64	3.53				
	2	177	8.75	3.11	246	4.36	.014	1-2
	3	45	8.49	3.15				1-3
	Total	247	8.89	3.21				
Personal	1	25	20.24	3.67	246	1.46	.234	

Standards	2	177	20.75	3.39				
	3	45	19.82	3.00				
	Total	247	20.53	3.36				
Concern Over Mistakes	1	25	27.96	4.65	246	7.57	.001	1-2 1-3
	2	177	24.23	6.43				
	3	45	22.02	5.54				
	Total	247	24.20	6.28				

Note: 1= Verbal, 2= Quantitative, 3= Equally Weighted

When Table 6. is analyzed, students studying verbal field have higher subscale scores of *Parental Criticism* [ $F_{(2-244)}=4.36$ ,  $p<.05$ ] and *Concern over Mistakes* compared to students studying Quantitative and Equally Weighted fields. Nevertheless, it is also seen that *Organization* [ $F_{(2-244)}=.44$ ,  $p>.05$ ], *Doubts about Actions* [ $F_{(2-244)}=.15$ ,  $p>.05$ ], *Parental Expectations* [ $F_{(2-244)}=.50$ ,  $p>.05$ ] and *Personal Standards* [ $F_{(2-244)}=.23$ ,  $p>.05$ ] subscale scores does not vary significantly according to field they study.

The results of t-test, which is applied in order to test if the perfectionism scale's subscale scores of the students showed a significant variation according to gender, is given in Table 7.

**Table 7.** Descriptive Statistics and t-test Results of the Perfectionism Scale's Subscale Scores according to Gender

Perfectionism Scale's		Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	Ss	sd	t	p
Subscale								
Organization	Female	271	23.65	5.43	589	.53	.600	
	Male	320	23.42	5.01				
Doubts About Action	Female	271	13.56	3.68	589	3.83	.000	
	Male	320	14.73	3.71				
Parental Expectation	Female	271	16.86	4.03	589	.80	.427	
	Male	320	17.12	3.81				
Parental Criticism	Female	271	8.79	3.56	589	1.54	.129	
	Male	320	9.21	3.08				
Personal Standards	Female	271	20.28	3.45	589	1.28	.203	
	Male	320	20.64	3.32				
Concern Over Mistakes	Female	271	24.18	6.80	589	1.68	.097	
	Male	320	25.08	6.17				

When the Table 7. is analyzed, it is seen that only *Doubts about Actions* subscale scores shows a significant variation according to gender; males' scores are higher than females' scores [ $t_{(589)}=3.83$ ,  $p<.05$ ].

#### IV. DISCUSSION

At the end of the research, it is found out that the students whose academic success level are higher got higher scores from *Personal Standards* subscale compared to students with lower success level; and from *Organization, Doubts about Actions, Parental Expectations, Parental Criticism and Concern over Mistakes* subscales they get lower scores than students whose academic success levels are lower. In the researches about this subject, Gilman and Ashby (2003), Başer (2007), Accordino and Slaney (2000) found out that the ones with higher academic success get higher scores only from *Personal Standards* subscale in comparison to the students with lower academic success. It is seen that the results of those researches are consistent with the findings of this research. In their research, Beswick, Rothblum and Mann (1988) and Owens and Newbegin (1997) have found out that when the delaying attitude increases, academic success decreases. In addition to that, procrastinating is found to be positively related with perfectionism in the studies of Bronlow and Reasinger (1996), Sadler (1993) and Onwuegbuzie (2000). Thus, the raise in the points of the students in *Organization, Doubts about Actions, Parental Expectations, Parental Criticism and Concern over Mistakes* subscales are connected with their procrastinating and this situation is said to have negative effects on their academic achievements ultimately. In support for this idea, in the research Akkaya (2007) made, it is concluded that increase the procrastinating of participants occurs with the raise of the perfectionism points of them and in addition it does not have any positive effects upon their academic achievements.

In *Personal Standards* subscale, it can be remarked that the reason of the fact that the students with higher academic success level have higher scores is that these students have higher goals.

The scores of the students of Science and Anatolian High Schools are found to be lower in all subscales than the students of Technical and Female Vocational High Schools. In some researches on this subject (Parker, 1997 and Parker, 2000) it is concluded that the perfectionism points of gifted students is low. When the school types are compared, it is known that students of Science and Anatolian High schools are more successful in the academic area than the students of Technical and Girl Vocational High Schools. That is because these students can attend these schools only if they can be successful in certain exams. In the research, parallel to the results explained above, the fact that the perfectionism levels of students with lower academic success level are higher can be explained to be influential on scores according to school types.

The students studying *verbal* field got higher scores from *Parental Criticism and Concern over Mistakes* subscales than students of Quantitative and Equally Weighted fields. There was not a significant difference between the scores of students of Quantitative and Equally Weighted fields. No research is found directly about this issue, neither in our country nor abroad. In addition to that, in his

study, Yaoar (2008) could not find a significant difference between the perfectionism scores of Social Science and Science and Mathematics departments' students. That result is in contradiction with the result of the research. However, in Birol's study (2005); Students of Social Sciences High School got higher scores from *Parental Criticism* and *Concern over Mistakes* subscales compared to the students of Science High School. These results and the results of the research are parallel.

It was seen that, male students got higher scores than female students only from *Doubts about Actions* subscale of perfectionism scale. Sapmaz (2006) found out that perfectionism scores does not vary significantly according to genders. That finding is similar to the result of the research. However, in the researches by Bencik (2006) and Yaoar (2008), male students got higher scores than female students from *Doubts about Actions* subscale. These results support the results of the research. When we think about the fact that in our country male children are given more responsibility and they are encouraged more to find an occupation and to earn their lives; it can be said that this approach causes males to be concerned about acting in the wrong way and that causes their subscale scores of *Doubts about Actions* to be higher.

## V. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

In the research, in all subscales of perfectionism scale, there was significant variation according to student's academic success levels. There was significant variation according to the school types in all subscales except *Personal Standards* subscale. While there was significant variation according to the field, in *Parental Criticism* and *Concern over Mistakes* subscales; according to gender, there was significant variation only in *Doubt about Actions* subscale. In the research, it was seen that students with lower academic success level got higher scores from perfectionism subscales than students with higher academic success level. Within the scope of individual and group psychological counseling studies with the students having perfectionist characteristics; students can be helped with discovering their efficient and inefficient sides and with setting achievable goals. In this way, the academic success level of the students can be increased. In addition to that, the study can be done with different high school types (General High School, Social Sciences High School and Fine Arts High School) and with the students of different grades (Primary School, University). In this way, the generalizability of the data obtained from the research can be increased.

## References

- Accordino, D.B., Accordino, M.P. and Slaney, R.B. (2000). An investigation of perfectionism, mental health, achievement and achievement motivation in adolescents. *Psychology in the Schools*, 37(6), 535-545.
- Akkaya, E. (2007) *Academic procrastination among faculty of education students: the role of gender, age, academic achievement, perfectionism and depression* (Unpublished PhD thesis). METU, Ankara.
- Baser, S.C. (2007) *Batıkent ilköğretim okulu sekizinci sınıf öğrencilerinde mükemmeliyetçiliğin akademik başarıya etkisi* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Ankara University, Ankara.
- Beck, A.T. (1979). *Cognitive therapy and the emotional disorders*. New York: A Meridian Book.
- Bencik, S. (2006). *Üstün yetenekli çocuklarda mükemmeliyetçilik ve benlik algısı arasındaki ilişkinin incelenmesi* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Hacettepe University, Ankara.
- Beswick, G., Rothblum, E. D. and Mann, L. (1988). Psychological Antecedents of student procrastination. *Australian Psychologist*, 23(2), 207-217.
- Biröl, Z. N. (2005) *Fen lisesi ve sosyal bilimler lisesi öğrencilerinin mükemmeliyetçilik, benlik saygısı, liderlik özelliklerinin incelenmesi* (Unpublished PhD thesis). KTU, Trabzon.
- Brownlow, S. and Reasinger, Renee D. (2000). Putting off until tomorrow what is better done today: Academic procrastination as a function of motivation toward college work. *Journal of Social Behaviour Personality*, 2000 Special Issue, 15(5) 15-35.
- Bütüner, S.Ö. (2008). Kitap incelemesi, sosyal bilimler için veri analizi el kitabı. *İlköğretim Online*, 7(1), 6-8.
- Frost, R. O., Marten, P., Lahart, C. and Rosenblate, R. (1990). The dimensional of perfectionism. *The Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 14(5), 449-468.
- Gilman, R. and Ashby, J.S. (2003) Multidimensional perfectionism in a sample of middle school students: An exploratory investigation. *Psychology in the Schools*, 40(6), 677-689.
- Hewitt, R. L. and 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), 456.

- Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2000) Academic procrastinators and perfectionistic tendencies among graduate students. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, 2000 Special Issue, 15(5), 103-110.
- Owens, M. A. and Newbegin, I. (1997). Procrastination in high school achievement: A causal structural model. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, 12, 869-888.
- Ozbay, Y. and Mısırlı-Tasdemir, Ö. (2003). Çok boyutlu mükemmeliyetçilik ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenirlik çalışması. VII. *National Congress of Psychological Counseling and Guidance, Malatya*.
- Parker, W. D. (1997). An empirical typology of perfectionism in academically talented children. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34(3), 545-562.
- Parker, W. D. (2000). Healthy perfectionism in the gifted. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education*, 11(4), 173-182.
- Rice, K.G. and Preusser, K.J. (2002). The adaptive/maladaptive perfectionism scale. *Measurement And Evaluation İn Counselling And Development*, 34, 210-222.
- Sadler, C. D. (1993). Multidimensional perfectionism and academic procrastination: Relationships with depression in university students. *Psychological Reports*, 73, 863-871.
- Sapmaz, F. (2006). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin uyumlu ve uyumsuz mükemmeliyetçilik özelliklerinin psikolojik belirti düzeyleri açısından incelenmesi* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Sakarya University, Sakarya.
- Slaney, R. B. and Ashby, J. (1996). Perfections: Study of a criterion group. *Journal of Cunselling and Development*, 74(4), 393-398.
- Whittaker, P. D. (2002). *Perfectionism's relationship to anxiety, depression and attributional style within a stressful task paradigm* (Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation). Texas Tech University, USA.
- Yaoar, A. (2008). *Üniversite öğrencilerinin mükemmeliyetçi kişilik özelliği ile empati düzeylerinin farklı değişkenler açısından incelenmesi* (Unpublished PhD thesis). Gazi University, Ankara.