Determination of Differences in Personality Characteristics in Individual Types of Perfectionism in Humanistic Sciences

Dominka DOKTOROVÁ¹,
Nikola PITEKOVÁ²

¹ Univerzita sv. Cyrila a Metoda v
Trnave, Slovakia,
dominikka.doktorova@gmail.com

² Univerzita sv. Cyrila a Metoda v
Trnave, Slovakia,
majerska.nikola@gmail.com

Abstract: The main goal of this work is to compare the personality characteristics in individual types of perfectionism. In order to determine the perfectionism, we used Frost's Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (F-MPS) and NEO five-factor personal inventory (NEO-FFI) for personal characteristics. There questionnaires were administered to humanistic science students (N=344) in the age span of 19 to 26. Through the non-hierarchical aggregate analyse we identified three types of perfectionists in the sample: functional, dysfunctional perfectionists and non-perfectionists. The comparison of the individual typed of perfectionism with personality characteristics showed statistically significant differences in the following way: compared to the other two type the dysfunctional perfectionists achieved the highest score on the scale of neuroticism. Other differences between the perfectionist types did not show any statistical importance.

Keywords: *Perfectionism typology; personality characteristics; comparison of personality characteristics in individual perfectionism types; humanistic sciences.*

How to cite: Doktorová, D., & Piteková, N. (2020). Determination of Differences in Personality Characteristics in Individual Types of Perfectionism in Humanistic Sciences. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(4), 20-40. doi:10.18662/po/11.4/221

1. Introduction

First knowledge about perfectionism was quite explicit in its characteristics, it was researched in the field of psychopathology (Murgašová, 2011). In perfectionists we can often find so-called „fixed ideas“ and rigidity is one of its core elements (Molnar, 2010). Burns (1980, as cited by Siegle & Schuler, 2000) found out that perfectionists insistently, even obsessively, try to achieve impossible goals while they compare the extent of its achievement primarily with their own value. Their desire after perfection can be self-destructive (Patch, 1984, as cited by Parker & Stumpf, 1995; Rice et al., 2007; Siegle & Schuler, 2000; Stoeber & Otto, 2006; Stumpf & Parker, 2000). He characterizes it as a chase for „non-existing perfection“ which relates to many mental and physical disorders. (Buck, 2006; Doktorová, 2019; Patch, 1984, as cited by Parker & Stumpf, 1995; Stopková, 2005; Winter, 2006).

Self-harm serves as a tool to remove the tension, feelings of guilty, or even accumulated anger. Through self-harm the individual gets a feeling of complete control over his own life (Démuthová & Démuth, 2019; Petermann & Nitkowski, 2015; Sachsee, 2013). In connection with mentioned classifications of perfectionism there are researches (Doktorová & Piteková, 2020; Hawkins, 2005; Parker, 1997; Park & Jeong, 2015; Rice & Lapsley, 2001, as cited by Hawkins et al., 2006) which through the aggregate analysis of dimensions of Frost's Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (Frost et al., 1990), extend the construct into tripartite typology of perfectionist individuals (Hawkins, 2005). Characteristic of perfectionism is "setting extremely high goals" (Frost et al., 1990). However, the effort to be the best also hides pitfalls in the form of higher sensitivity to life problems (Stoeber & Otto, 2006). This knowledge of perfectionism can be applied in the field of public health. Based on the detection of perfectionism, it is possible to prevent the development of eating disorders and self-harm.

Personality is one of the key concepts in psychology (Blatný, 2010). The description of personality and its characteristics based on the specification of the most important individual differences in human activity, which are rooted in their language (Blatný, 2010). Francis Galton (1884, as cited by Ruisel & Halama, 2007) was the first to point out the importance of this lexical hypothesis and the fact that "linguistic description of traits can provide essential information about personality structure." Subsequently, lists of words were described and analyzed, which described the inner human states, the differences between people. Their result is the emergence

of the Big Five factors that we currently know as "Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to New Experiences, Friendliness and Conscientiousness" (Ruisel & Halama, 2007, p. 11). The most well-known methods in this area are NEO personality questionnaires, the latest version of which is NEO-FFI (NEO-Five Factor Inventory).

In order to get a deeper insight into the perfectionism problem, it is necessary to focus on the determination of connection between the personality and perfectionism which is in accordance with the imperfections of the former works focused on the very perfectionism problem and its typology (Murgašová, 2011; Sliviaková, 2007). Hewitt and Flett (1991) researched the relation between personality features and perfectionism. The result confirmed the existence of positive relation between socially conditioned perfectionism, neuroticism and conscientiousness and it is a negative relation with extroversion and affability.

Moulaei (2007, as cited by Forghani et al., 2013) found out that there is a negative relation between openness towards experience and negative perfectionism. Hill et al. (1997) found out that perfectionism shows a strong correlation with conscientiousness and slight connection with neuroticism and affability. Kohodarahimi (2010, as cited by Khatibi & Khormae, 2016) confirmed that there are important negative correlations between perfectionism, neuroticism and affability, however he did not find any important correlation between perfectionism, extroversion, openness towards experience and conscientiousness.

According to Parker (1997), the research problem is to research the personality characteristics in three types of perfectionists (dysfunctional perfectionists, functional perfectionists and non-perfectionists).

As a base we are using Hawkins' (2005) predicament that through the F- MPS scale (Frost et al., 1990) it is possible to identify perfectionist types. Several studies pointed at the connection between perfectionism and personality characteristics (Rice et al., 2007; Stoeber et al., 2009; Khodarahimi, 2010, as cited by Khatibi & Khormae, 2016). Neuroticism is a personality dimension that positively correlates with perfectionism, especially with the disfunction one. In the connection with functional perfectionism there was a positive relation with self-respect found (Stumpf & Parker, 2000; Trumpeter et al., 2006, as cited by Öngen, 2009).

On the contrary, the dysfunctional perfectionism shows a connection with suicide (Blatt, 1995, as cited by Öngen, 2009) and other negative characteristics. Results of research aimed at comparing personality characteristics in different types of perfectionism could be a benefit in the educational process to use and establish in the education process in order to

find out methods in connection to needs of postmodern society and education. The main goal of the research work is to research and to compare the dimensions of NEO-FFI inventory (neuroticism, extroversion, openness towards experience, affability and conscientiousness) with three types of perfectionists and to find the connection between them. The secondary goal is to increase interest into the perfectionism phenomenon in our area. As well, we aim to point at the dysfunctional type of perfectionism as a phenomenon which influences man's life, especially in the negative point of view and at the importance of further research also outside the specific groups among non-clinical population.

On basis of present results of research (Blatt, 1995, as cited by Öngen, 2009; Hewitt & Flett, 1991; Khodarahimi, 2010, as cited by Khatibi, Khormae, 2016; Rice et al., 2007; Stoeber, et al., 2009) we have formulated following hypothesis and research question.

H1: We assume that dysfunctional perfectionists will have significantly higher score in the neuroticism scale than functional perfectionists and non-perfectionists.

H2: We assume that dysfunctional perfectionists will have significantly higher score in the conscientiousness scale than functional perfectionists and non-perfectionists.

H3: We assume that functional perfectionists will have significantly higher score in the affability scale than dysfunctional perfectionists and non-perfectionists.

H4: We assume that functional perfectionists will have significantly higher score in the openness scale than dysfunctional perfectionists and non-perfectionists.

RQ: How will the non-perfectionists score on the extroversion scale compared to the functional and dysfunctional perfectionists?

2. Methodology

2.1 Research question

University female students studying daily study program of one-field psychology (N=344) with age range from 19 to 26 years are our target group. On basis of aggregate analyse we divided the students into three aggregates. In the first aggregate there are students labelled as functional perfectionists, in the second as dysfunctional perfectionists and in the third as non-perfectionists. We performed the choice of research sample by an aimed choice. Studying in the first to fifth year of humanitarian field (UCM in Trnava, UK in Bratislava and UKF in Nitra) was the criterion of being

included in the research. Another criterion was that they should be women as in general the highest grade of perfectionism is being stated in women (Baker, 1995, as cited by Siegle & Schuler, 2000, 1995; Flett et al., 1998). The data gathering was executed between January and February 2020. Students took part in our research voluntarily, they were comparable in the matter of age, level of school and socio-economic status.

2.2 Materials and equipment

We work with 2 terms in our work. The operationalisation of the first one is not simple, regarding to the ambiguity of its understanding by the researchers. For the purposes of our research we will try to achieve it:

First one is perfectionism which is defined as a multidimensional construct which is characterized by appointing of unreachable goals.

Second one is a personality which is characterized through dimensions – neuroticism, extroversion, openness, affability and conscientiousness which determine who people behave in certain situations.

In order to measure perfectionism which is the main and dependant variable in our research we decided to use Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (Frost et al., 1990). In order to measure the personality characteristics which are marked in our research as independent variable we decided to use NEO five-factor personality inventory (Ruisel & Halama, 2007).

Frost's Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (F-MPS) - it consists of 35 items and the respondent marks his answers on Likert's 5-grade scale from 1 = very untypical to 5 = very typical. The scale consists of six following dimensions: concern about mistakes (CM); doubts about action (DA), personal standards (PS), organization (O), parent's criticism (PC), parent's expectation (PE) (Frost et al., 1990). Reliability in the sense of internal consistence of the questionnaire F-MPS was found though Cronbach's coefficient alpha and it shows high inner consistence ($\alpha=0,89$). The questionnaire was not available in Slovak version, thus we translated it into Slovak language from the available Czech version of the questionnaire and subsequently tested it through bilingual test.

NEO five-factor personality inventory (NEO- FFI) consists of 60 items in five dimensions – neuroticism, extroversion, openness, affability and conscientiousness which individually consist of twelve items. The respondent judges the degree of sententiousness of each quotation in himself on Likert's five-degree scale from 0 (I do not agree at all) to 4 (I completely agree). It is an inventory which is standardized for Slovak conditions.

2.3. Research procedure and variables of the research

Our research is a verification research and it is a quantitative research. In the form of organisation it belongs to typological procedures because on basis of former findings (Parker, 1997) and procedures in that area we will try to achieve identification and analysis of individual types of perfectionists, and it belongs to statistic procedures as well.

Appointing of dependent and independent variable: as dependent variable a typology of perfectionists can be set – functional, dysfunctional and non-perfectional; and as independent variable personality characteristics can be set.

2.4. Statistical processing

Evaluation and processing of acquired data was done through a statistics program SPSS 19 and Microsoft Excel Worksheet program. We used the following calculations and methods: reliability tests (values of Cronbach's alpha are stated in relation with the methods), descriptive statistics, non-hierarchical aggregate analysis, Kruskal-Wallis test, one-direction inter group ANOVU with planned comparison.

3 Results

Before the research sample was divided into the aggregates we focused on the degree of perfectionism among the students in the sample. The overview of the average and decisive anomalies for F-MPS dimension and overall score of perfectionism is mentioned in chart 1.

Table 1: Description of distribution of average values of dimensions and overall score of perfectionism in the research sample

DIMENSIONS F-MPS	AVERAGE	DECISIVE ANOMALY	N VALID
(CM) Concern about mistakes	22,57	6,679	344
(PS) Personal standards	22,01	4,341	344
(PE) Parent's expectation	13,73	3,916	344
(PC) Parent's criticism	8,86	2,986	344
(DA) Doubts about action	11,36	3,047	344
(O) Organization	22,44	4,259	344

N-quantity

Source: Authors' own conception

From the chart 1 accrues that in the terms of the dimension (CM) of concern about mistakes the students reach an average value ($M_{CM} = 22,57$) which means that their concern about mistakes in F-MPS reaches low average score. In the dimension of (O) organization they reach an average value ($M_O = 22,44$) which means that their organization in F-MPS reaches high average score. In the dimension of (PC) parent's criticism they reach average value ($M_{PC} = 8,86$) which means that their perception of parent's criticism reaches in F-MPS low average score. In other dimensions the reach medium average score ($M_{PS} = 22,01$; $M_{PE} = 13,73$; $M_{DA} = 11,36$).

H1: We assume that dysfunctional perfectionists will have significantly higher score in the neuroticism scale than functional perfectionists and non-perfectionists.

First, we were checking normal allocation of neuroticism between individual types of perfectionists. The normality test showed that this personal dimension has normal distribution in our research sample and therefore we decided to verify the hypothesis 1 by parametric test, one-way ANOVU with planned comparison.

Table 2: Importance of differences in neuroticism between three types of perfectionists

PERSONALITY DIMENSION	PERFECTIONIST TYPE	N	M	SD	F	P
NEUROTICISM	Functional perfectionists	178	27,10	7,427	4,770	0,030
	Dysfunctional perfectionists	106	29,52	9,707		
	Non-perfectionists	60	24,66	7,942		
	TOTAL	344				

N - quantity

M - arithmetic average

S - decisive anomaly

F- analysis of dispersion coefficient

p- achieved significance

Source: Authors' own conception

Chart 2 displays the importance of differences in neuroticism between individual types of perfectionists. More precisely, we were comparing the dysfunctional perfectionists in neuroticism with other two types. In the Levenov homogeneity test we found out that neuroticism is homogenous and thus the varieties are comparable. As we can see, dysfunctional perfectionists are significantly more neurotic in comparison

with functional perfectionists and non-perfectionists ($p=0,030$). Also in the case when we focus on the value of arithmetical averages of neuroticism in individual types we can observe that the highest value of neuroticism was attained by dysfunctional type of perfectionists ($M_2=29,42$) whereas they differ the most from non-perfectionists ($M_3=24,66$) and less significantly from the functional perfectionists ($M_1=27,10$). On basis of stated results, we can say that the dysfunctional type of perfectionists is significantly the most neurotic in comparison with the other two groups therefore **we accept the hypothesis number 1.**

H2: We assume that dysfunctional perfectionists will have significantly higher score in the conscientiousness scale than functional perfectionists and non-perfectionists.

Before we started with the comparison, we were checking normal allocation of conscientiousness between individual types of perfectionists. The normality test showed that conscientiousness has normal distribution in our research sample and therefore we decided to verify the hypothesis 2 by parametric test, one-way ANOVU with planned comparison.

Table 3: Importance of conscientiousness in conscientiousness between three types of perfectionists

PERSONALITY DIMENSION	PERFECTIONIST TYPE	N	M	SD	F	P
CONSCIENTIOUSNESS	Functional perfectionists	178	31,62	7,048	2,624	0,110
	Dysfunctional perfectionists	106	32,73	4,638		
	Non-perfectionists	60	30,70	8,548		
	TOTAL	344				

Source: Authors' own conception

N - quantity

M - arithmetic average

SD - decisive anomaly

F- analysis of dispersion coefficient

p- achieved significance

Chart 3 displays the importance of differences in conscientiousness between individual types of perfectionists. We were comparing the

dysfunctional perfectionists in conscientiousness with the other two types. In the Levenov homogeneity test we found out that conscientiousness is homogenous and thus the varieties are comparable. We can see that in this case the dysfunctional perfectionists are not significantly more conscientious ($p=0,110$) than functional perfectionists and non-perfectionists. When we look at the values of arithmetical averages of conscientiousness in individual types of perfectionists, there are only minimal descriptive differences ($M_1=31,62$; $M_2=32,73$; $M_3=30,70$), however they are not significant. After the determination of the results we state that **we do not accept the hypothesis 2.**

H3: We assume that functional perfectionists will have significantly higher score in the affability scale than dysfunctional perfectionists and non-perfectionists.

Before we started with the comparison, we were checking normal allocation of affability between individual types of perfectionists. The normality test showed that affability has normal distribution in our research sample and therefore we decided to verify the hypothesis 3 by parametric test, particularly by one-way group ANOVU with planned comparison.

Table 4: Importance of differences in affability between three types of perfectionists

PERSONALITY DIMENSION	PERFECTIONIST TYPE	N	M	SD	F	P
AFFABILITY	Functional perfectionists	178	28,08	6,432	0,214	0,087
	Dysfunctional perfectionists	106	26,80	5,492		
	Non-perfectionists	60	28,75	6,731		
	TOTAL	344				

Source: Authors' own conception

N-quantity

M- arithmetic average

SD- decisive anomaly

F- analysis of dispersion coefficient

p- achieved significance

Chart 4 displays the importance of differences in affability between individual types of perfectionists. In comparison of functional perfectionists

in affability compared to the dysfunctional perfectionists and non-perfectionists the affability in the Levenov homogeneity test came out as homogenous, thus the varieties are comparable. The differences in affability in functional perfectionists compared to the other two types proved as statistically insignificant ($p=0,087$). However if we focus our attention on the descriptive values of arithmetical average, from the three types of perfectionists the non-perfectionists appear to be the most affable ($M_3=28,75$), followed by functional perfectionists ($M_1=28,08$) and as the least affable the dysfunctional perfectionists ($M_2=26,80$). However, these differences are only descriptive and statistically insignificant. From the stated results we see that there are no statistically important differences in affability between these three types of perfectionists and on basis of this fact **we do not accept the hypothesis 3.**

H4: We assume that functional perfectionists will have significantly higher score in the openness scale than dysfunctional perfectionists and non-perfectionists.

Before the verification of given hypothesis, we were first checking whether openness has normal allocation between individual types of perfectionists. On basis of its abnormal allocation in the sample we chose to use non-parametric Kruskal-Wallis test.

Table 5: Importance of differences in openness between three types of perfectionists

PERSONALITY DIMENSION	PERFECTIONIST TYPE	N	MR	SD	M	χ^2	P
OPENNESS	Functional perfectionists	178	91,98	6,060	25,88	2,728	0,256
	Dysfunctional perfectionists	106	75,57	6,056	23,47		
	Non-perfectionists	60	83,48	6,412	24,64		
	TOTAL	344					

Source: Authors' own conception

N- quantity

M- arithmetic average

χ^2 - chi square – value of χ^2 test

SD- decisive anomaly

F- analysis of dispersion coefficient

p- achieved significance

In the chart 5 we can see the importance of differences in openness between three types of perfectionists, particularly we compare functional perfectionists with the other two types. The differences in openness in functional perfectionists compared to dysfunctional perfectionists and non-perfectionists did not prove as statistically significant ($p=0,256$). In we consider the descriptive values of average sequence then actually the functional perfectionists achieve higher values in openness ($MR_1=91,98$), compared to them the non-perfectionists are less open towards experience ($MR_3=83,48$) and the lowest values are achieved by dysfunctional perfectionists ($MR_2=75,57$). These descriptive differences are however not important. On basis of stated results, **we do not accept the hypothesis 3** because the difference is not significant.

RQ: How will the non-perfectionists score on the extroversion scale compared to the functional and dysfunctional perfectionists?

First, we were checking normal allocation of extroversion between individual types of perfectionists. The normality test showed that extroversion has normal distribution in our research sample and on that basis, we decided to use parametric test, one-way intergroup ANOVU with planned comparison.

Table 7: Importance of differences in extroversion between three types of perfectionists

PERSONALITY DIMENSION	PERFECTIONIST TYPE	N	M	SD	F	P
EXTROVERSION	Functional perfectionists	178	30,46	7,285	0,142	0,707
	Dysfunctional perfectionists	106	31,20	7,471		
	Non-perfectionists	60	30,34	7,903		
	TOTAL	344				

Source: Authors' own conception

N- quantity
M- arithmetic average
SD- decisive anomaly
F- analysis of dispersion coefficient
p- achieved significance

Chart 7 is focused on the importance of differences in extroversion between three types of perfectionists. In comparison of non-perfectionists in extroversion compared to the functional perfectionists and dysfunctional perfectionists the extroversion in the Levenov homogeneity test came out as homogenous, thus the varieties are comparable. The differences in extroversion in non-perfectionists compared to the other two types proved as statistically insignificant ($p=0,707$). If we take a look on the descriptive values of arithmetical average, there are only minimal differences in extroversion between the individual types ($M_1=30,46$; $M_2=31,20$; $M_3=30,34$), however they are not significant. Individual types of perfectionists seem to be rather balanced in the extroversion degree.

4. Discussion

4.1. Interpretation of acquired results

After a retrospective evaluation of the goal of our work focused on distribution of the degree of perfectionism in the sample (see Chart 1). As it can be seen from our discoveries, the students are considered medium perfectionists according to the F-MPS questionnaire. They perceive their own concern about mistakes as low, they consider themselves to be highly organized, they perceive criticism from parents as low. In the matter of their personal standards they have befitting expectations and they evaluated their doubts about their action in the same way. From this conclusion of general, average degree of perfectionism it appears that there is the highest representation of functional perfectionists in the sample.

The values found out by us are in theoretical level comparable with the higher degree of perfectionist endeavours and lower degree of perfectionist concerns as it is described in functional perfectionists by Stoeber and Otto (2006). Sliviaková (2007) did her research, similarly as us, on university students ($N= 160$), who were administered with F-MPS scale. In average values of dimensions in students of Sliviakova (2007) we noticed the most markable difference in concern about mistakes dimension ($CM= 19,23$; $SD= 6,789$), which is, compared to our sample, notably lower ($CM= 22,57$; $SD= 6,679$) (comparison of individual values of dimensions are stated in Appendix 2).

The increase in the CM variable, in concern about mistakes, which higher values are typical for dysfunctional type of perfectionists means that the disposition to react negatively towards own mistakes and at the same time the tendency to perceive these mistakes as overall failure is increasing every year. This statement about the increase in concern about mistakes

dimension confirmed Křížová (2011) as well, whose results points at the development trend in the increase of dysfunctional type of perfectionists. Further comparisons that were performed by us were connected to the personality characteristics and individual types of perfectionist. We assumed that **dysfunctional perfectionists shall achieve higher score on the neuroticism scale than functional perfectionists and non-perfectionists (H1)**. Dysfunctional perfectionists were significantly more neurotic in comparison with functional perfectionists and non-perfectionists which means that our assumption was correct. This result is confirmed by the research of Hewitt and Flett (1991) who besides other things found out that there is a positive relation between socially conditioned perfectionism and neuroticism. These dimensions were stated by Stumpf and Parker (2000) as characteristic for perfectionistic concerns that are characteristic for unhealthy, i.e. dysfunctional perfectionism.

In a same way, from the results of research of Hill et al. (1997) a relation between neuroticism and socially prescribed perfectionism came out. The authors state that the socially prescribed perfectionism and perfectionism aimed at others is mainly maladaptive, thus dysfunctional. The results of the research of Enns et al. (2001, as cited by Lee, 2007) are in agreement with our results. From these results it came out that maladaptive perfectionism significantly correlates with neuroticism. Other researchers too (Kohodarahimi, 2010, as cited by Khatibi, Khormae, 2016; Stoeber et al., 2009) discovered the relation between negative perfectionism and neuroticism.

The main negative we see in the fact that none of the mentioned studies is comparative, but they all are correlation studies which decreases the impact of the support of these researches, as we found out. However, the connection between negative form of perfectionism and neuroticism showed as unambiguous in other researches whereas in our research the dysfunctional perfectionists are more neurotic what we consider to be an analogic result. We consider the impossibility of comparison of typology of perfectionists in neuroticism with other typological studies as a significant limit. Within the personality characteristics and types of perfectionists they assumed that dysfunctional perfectionists shall achieve significantly higher score in conscientiousness than functional perfectionists and non-perfectionists (H2). Dysfunctional perfectionists are not significantly conscientious than functional perfectionists or non-perfectionists. The difference was not proved although we expected it on basis of Hewitt and Flett's (1991) research. By Hewitt and Flett (1991) the socially prescribed perfectionism was again in positive relation to conscientiousness what is

typical for perfectionistic concerns and unhealthy perfectionism. However, other researches (Stumpf & Parker, 2000) point rather at the relation between conscientiousness to functional type of perfectionists. We did not expect this result under the fact that high overall score of perfectionism indicates dysfunctional type of perfectionists who stress the perfection and acknowledgement in assigned tasks (Frost & Marten, 1990).

On the other hand, we need to consider the fact that dysfunctional perfectionists showed the lowest value in the organisation dimension and compared to them the highest value was achieved by the functional perfectionists can are able to work on a task systematically and deliberately what can be connected to conscientiousness. The variability of the present findings (Hewitt & Flett, 1991; Stumpf & Parker, 2000) within the scope of the relation of conscientiousness to perfectionism in comparison to the insignificance of the differences found out by us can point at similar representation in individuals in the scope of the perfectionist typology.

Furthermore, we were checking the difference between types of perfectionists and conscientiousness. Particularly, we assumed that **functional perfectionists achieve significantly higher score than dysfunctional perfectionists or non-perfectionists on the conscientiousness scale (H3)**. The finding that on basis of arithmetic average the non-perfectionists appear to be the most conscientious from the three types of perfectionists is interesting but not significant. Our assumption was not significantly proved although the research of Moulacine (2007, as cited by Forghani et al., 2013) pointed at a significant relationship between positive perfectionism and conscientiousness which is not in the accordance with our findings. In the connection to our results the finding of Hill et al. (1997) is interesting. They noticed significantly negative correlation in conscientiousness with socially prescribed perfectionism, i.e. they found a relationship between unhealthy type of perfectionists and low conscientiousness. Understandably, we cannot claim that this relation would be valid vice-versa as well. It came out of our results that functional perfectionists are not more conscientious than dysfunctional perfectionists or non-perfectionists. However, it is possible, that in this context the conscientiousness could be more related to non-perfectionists if we were to compare them with the other two types. Such a research we have not, however, executed.

We were checking the difference between three types of perfectionists and openness towards new experience. More precisely we **assumed that functional perfectionists achieve significantly higher score on the openness scale than dysfunctional perfectionists or non-**

perfectionists (H4). In case that we consider the descriptive values of average order, then the functional perfectionists appear to be more conscientious than the other two types whereas the dysfunctional perfectionists appear to be the least conscientious. However, from the stated descriptive differences it is not possible to conclude significant difference. However, De Cuyper et al. (2015) found out the relation between openness with self-oriented perfectionism, on basis of perfectionist endeavours which are characterized by positive relation to openness in healthy perfectionists. The result of the findings of these authors were not in accordance with our results. On the other hand, the explanation that the difference was not showed in our results is shown in the Hewitt and Flett (1991) study. Their results did not show any significant correlation of openness with the perfectionist dimensions (H-MPS). In the scope of our findings it may mean that functional perfectionists do not appear to be more open towards new experience than non-perfectionists or dysfunctional perfectionists., however it is possible that non-perfectionists could show higher correlation with openness than the other two types.

In the individual perfectionist types, we were furthermore interested what score the non-perfectionists will achieve on the extroversion scale, compared to the functional and dysfunctional perfectionism (RQ). The differences in extroversion in non-perfectionists compared to the other two types showed to be statistically unimportant. In the same way neither the arithmetic average proved any significant difference between the types of perfectionists. On basis of analyse the individual types of perfectionists rather appear to be balanced in the scope of extroversion. In this area there is only few accessible researches (De Cuyper et al., 2015) that could be used for the comparison of our findings. De Cuyper et al. (2015) research pointed at the finding that socially prescribed and self-oriented perfectionism are characterized with low level of extroversion. On basis of knowledge that socially prescribed perfectionism is characterized for perfectionistic concerns and thus rather for unhealthy perfectionists and that self-oriented perfectionism for perfectionistic endeavors and it can be found mainly in unhealthy perfectionists we could assume that both the functional and dysfunctional perfectionists have low level of extroversion. In the scope of our findings it showed that non/perfectionists are not more extrovert than other two types which according to De Cuyper et al. (2015) are distinguished by low level of extroversion. It is possible that in our research all three types of perfectionists show similarly same, low level of extroversion.

4.2 Research limitations and possible sources of alteration

In our research we identified some limitations as well and they should be considered when the results are interpreted. In the connection to our research sample which exclusively consisted of women studying humanitarian field, we consider the impossibility of generalisation of these results to whole population of students to be a limitation. In the same way, the uneven representation in individual years of university studies and the low representation in scope of the individual perfectionists can alter our results to a certain level. Some students in the research could have given altered or socially expected answers and thus the result could be altered. That can decrease the overall validity of acquired results to a certain level. It would be suitable to use questionnaires standardized for our population.

4.3. Suggestion of future research focus

We would extend the research to finding of health and mental difficulties. Various authors give notice that perfectionism has inauspicious impact of man's health (Buck, 2006; Stopková, 2005). We would for example use a questionnaire of health difficulties (Brief Symptom Inventory) (Parker, 1997) or Beck's Anxiety (BAI) and depression (BDI) questionnaire. It would be interesting to observe what differences would occur in health problems in dysfunctional perfectionists compared to the other two groups. The eating disorders often appear along with the unhealthy type of perfectionism (Cockell et al., 2002; Doktorová, 2019).

Blatný (2010) state that personality features settle only after thirtieth year of life. In this context we would be interested to see how the individual personality characteristics would be changed if we compared them with the perfectionist types in the same sample after some time. Longitudinal research could add to the finding how the perfectionism develops in time and whether there will be overall changes in the research variables in representation of typology of perfectionists as well (Buck, 2006; Stopková, 2005).

5. Conclusion

The perfectionism and its division into individual types has become a relatively frequent subject of research, especially abroad, and is gradually gaining awareness in other countries, but in Slovakia there is not yet enough interest in this topic. Comparisons of individual types of perfectionism with personality characteristics showed statistically significant differences. We found that the highest dysfunctional perfectionists scored on the

neuroticism scale compared to the other two types. The emerging adulthood in our conditions is characterized by a low level of stability and the search for one's own "self", in agreement with Arnett (2007), which can lead to, for example, self-harm and disorders (Doktorová, 2019). Curran and Hill (2017, as cited by American Psychological Association, 2018) found that the rate of perfectionism in the population increased significantly from 1989 to 2016. This increase determined by many factors: greater media pressure, comparisons of young people, increased demands for education, or higher demands for career growth. Due to the increased level of perfectionism, it is necessary to find out what are the differences in personality characteristics in individual types of perfectionism in order to create a program that stimulates adaptive form of perfectionism.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by the Slovak Research and Development Agency under the contract no. APVV-17-0123

References

- American Psychological Association. (2018). Perfectionism among young people significantly increased since 1980s, study finds: Excessive desire to succeed, compete with others may have negative impact on youth psychological health. <https://doi.org/10.1037/e501092018-001>
- Arnett, J. J. (2007). Emerging adulthood: What is it, and what is it good for? *Child Development Perspectives*, 1(2), 68-73. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-8606.2007.00016.x>
- Blatný, M. (Coord.) (2010). *Psychologie osobnosti: Hlavní témata, současné přístupy* [Personality psychology: main topics, current approaches] Grada Publishing.
- Buck, M. (2006). Perfekcionizmus: Kauzálny vzťah medzi myslením, emóciami a patologickým správaním [A causal relationship between thinking, emotions, and pathological behavior]. http://www.ped.muni.cz/z21/2006/konference_2006/sbornik_2006/pdf/028.pdf
- Cockell, S. J., Hewitt, P. L., Seal, B., Sherry, S., Goldner, E. M., Flett, G. L., & Remick R. A. (2002). Trait and self-presentational dimensions of perfectionism among women with Anorexia Nervosa. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 26(6), 745-758. [http://personality.psychology.dal.ca/pdfs/Cockelletal.\(2002\).pdf](http://personality.psychology.dal.ca/pdfs/Cockelletal.(2002).pdf)

- De Cuyper, K., Claes, L., Hermans, D., Pieters G., & Smits D. (2015). Psychometric properties of the multidimensional perfectionism scale of Hewitt in a Dutch-speaking sample: Associations with the big five personality traits. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 97(2), 182-190. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2014.963591>
- Demuthova, S., & Demuth, A. (2019). The prevalence and most frequent forms of self-harm in adolescents. In International Conference on Research in Psychology (pp. 39-51). Diamond Scientific Publication. <https://www.dpublication.com/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/ICRPCONF-1-162.pdf>
- Doktorová, D. (2019). Perfekcionizmus a jeho spojitost' so seba poškodzovaním v strednom školskom veku [Perfectionism and its link to self-harm at middle school] In: *Kondášove dni 2019: Zborník vedeckých recenzovaných príspevkov z konferencie* [Kondas days 2019: Proceedings of scientific peer-reviewed papers from the conference] (pp. 35-43). Trnava.
- Doktorová, D., & Piteková, N. (2020). Tripartite typology of perfectionism among psychology students. *Postmodern Openings*, 11(1), 45-60. <https://doi.org/10.18662/po/11.1sup1/122>
- Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., Blankstein, K. R., & Pickering, D. (1998). Perfectionism in relation to attributions for success or failure. *A Journal for Diverse Perspectives on Diverse Psychological Issues*, 17(2), 249-262. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-998-1010-y>
- Forghani, M. H., Ghafari M., Shirangi, S. Y., Ghandehari F., & Emadzadeh, M. K. (2013). The role of personality traits in perfectionism orientation (Isfahan Melli Bank employees as case study). *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance and Management Sciences*, 3(1), 52-59. <http://www.hrmars.com/admin/pics/1434.pdf>
- Frost, R. O., & Marten, P. A. (1990). Perfectionism and evaluative threat. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 14(6), 559-572. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01173364>
- Frost, R. O., Marten, P. A., Lahart, C., & Rosenblate, R. (1990). The dimensions of perfectionism. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 14(5), 449-468. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01172967>
- Hawkins, C. C. (2005). A clarification of multidimensionality and perfectionist typology with the Frost multidimensional perfectionism scale. *Australian Association for Research in Education*. <http://www.aare.edu.au/data/publications/2005/haw05684.pdf>
- Hawkins, C. C., Watt H. M. G., & Sinclair, K. E. (2006). Psychometric properties of the Frost multidimensional perfectionism scale with Australian adolescent girls (clarification of multidimensionality and perfectionist typology).

- Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 66(6), 1001-1022. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164405285909>
- Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1991). Perfectionism in the self and social contexts: conceptualization, assessment and association with psychopathology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(3), 456-470. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.60.3.456>
- Hill, R. W., McIntire, K., & Bacharach, V. R. (1997). Perfectionism and the big five factors. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 12(1), 257-270. <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=aph&AN=9704204887&site=ehost-live>
- Khatibi, M., & Khormae, F. (2016). Personality and perfectionism: A review. *Journal of Educational and Management Studies*, 6(1), 13-19. [http://jems.science-ine.com/attachments/article/37/1.%20Educ.%20Manage.%20Stud.,%206\(1\)%2013-19,%202016.pdf](http://jems.science-ine.com/attachments/article/37/1.%20Educ.%20Manage.%20Stud.,%206(1)%2013-19,%202016.pdf)
- Křížová, K. (2011). *Problematika perfekcionizmu u matematicky nadaných dětí* [Problems of perfectionism in mathematically gifted children] [Doctoral thesis]. Masarykova Univerzita Brno, Slovakia. http://is.muni.cz/th/364734/fss_m/DP_final.pdf
- Lee, L. (2007). Dimensions of perfectionism and life stress: predicting symptoms of psychopathology [Doctoral thesis]. Queen's University Kingston. https://qspace.library.queensu.ca/bitstream/handle/1974/883/Lee_Lisa_200709_PHD.pdf?sequenceid=F7FCBCCE80330DBFE6169BEDBF0C04BB?sequence=1
- Molnar, D. S. (2010). *The light and dark sides of perfectionism: Implications for health and well-being* [Doctoral thesis]. Brock University St. Catharines. https://dr.library.brocku.ca/bitstream/handle/10464/3428/Brock_Molnar_Daniel_le_2011.pdf?sequence=2&isAllowed=y
- Murgašová, M. (2011). *Vzťah perfekcionizmu a emocionálnej Inteligencie k pracovnému výkonu* [Relation of perfectionism and emotional Intelligence to work performance] [Doctoral thesis]. Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave, Slovakia.
- Öngen, D. E. (2009). The relationship between perfectionism and multidimensional life satisfaction among high school adolescent in Turkey. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 37(1), 52-64. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.2161-1912.2009.tb00091.x>
- Park, H., & Jeong, D. Y. (2015). Psychological well-being, life satisfaction, and self-esteem among adaptive perfectionists, maladaptive perfectionists, and

- nonperfectionists. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 72, 165–170. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.08.031>
- Parker, W. D. (1997). An empirical typology of perfectionism in academically talented children. *American Educational Research Journal*, 34(3), 545–562. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1163249>
- Parker, W. D., & Stumpf, H. (1995). An examination of the multidimensional perfectionism scale with a sample of academically talented children. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 13(4), 372–383. <https://doi.org/10.1177/073428299501300404>
- Petermann, F., & Nitkowski, D. (2015). *Selbstverletzendes Verhalten. Erscheinungsformen, ursachen und interventionsmöglichkeiten* [Selfharming behaviour. Appearances, causes and possibilities for intervention]. Hogrefe.
- Rice, K. G., Ashby, J. S., & Slaney, R. B. (2007). Perfectionism and the five-factor model of personality. *Assessment*, 14(4), 385–398. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191107303217>
- Ruisel, I., & Halama, P. (2007). NEO päťfaktorový osobnostný inventár [NEO Five-Factor Inventory]. In P. T. Costu & R. R. McCrae (Eds.), *Podľa NEO* [Five-Factor Inventory]. Testcentum.
- Sachsse, U. (2009). Selbstverletzendes Verhalten [Selfharming behaviour]. In U. Sachsse (Ed.), *Traumazentrierte psychotherapie*. Theorie, klinik und praxis [Trauma-centered psychotherapy. Theory, clinic and practice] (pp. 80–91). Schattauer.
- Siegle, D., & Schuler, P. A. (2000). Perfectionism differences in gifted middle school students. *Roeper Review*, 23(1), 39–44. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02783190009554060>
- Sliviová, A. (2007). Akademická prokrastinace ve vztahu k perfekcionismu [Academic procrastination in relation to perfectionism] [Doctoral dissertation]. Masarykova Univerzita Brno, Slovakia. http://is.muni.cz/th/64581/ff_m/Akademicka_prokrastinace_ve_vztahu_k_perfekcionismu.pdf
- Stoeber, J., & Otto, K. (2006). Positive conceptions of perfectionism: Approaches, evidence, challenges. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(4), 295–319. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1004_2
- Stoeber, J., Feast, A. R., & Hayward, J. A. (2009). Self-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism: Differential relationships with intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and test anxiety. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47(5), 423–428. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.04.014>

- Stopková, K. (2005). Perfeccionismus ve vztahu k vybraným kognitivním funkcím [Perfectionism in relation to selected cognitive functions] [Doctoral dissertation]. Masarykova Univerzita Brno, Slovakia. https://is.muni.cz/auth/th/52153/ff_m/
- Stumpf, H., & Parker, W. D. (2000). A hierarchical structural analysis of perfectionism and its relation to other personality characteristics. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 28(5), 837-852. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869\(99\)00141-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0191-8869(99)00141-5)
- Winter, R. (2006). *Perfeccionizmus, cesta do neba, alebo do pekla?* [Perfectionism, a journey to heaven or hell?]. Porta Libri.