

Adaptive and Maladaptive Perfectionists in Korean College Students*

Hyun-joo Park[†]

Dongguk University

The purpose of this study was twofold: (a) to validate the 2-factor structure of the Perfectionism Questionnaire (PQ; Rhéaume, Freeston, & Ladouceur, 1995, Perfectionistic Tendencies and Negative Consequences of Perfectionism) with 385 Korean college students and (b) to uncover the characteristics of adaptive and maladaptive perfectionists using semi-structured interviews. For the interview process, adaptive perfectionists ($n = 19$) and maladaptive perfectionists ($n = 24$) were recruited, based on their scores on the PQ. The results suggested that adaptive perfectionists evaluate their perfectionism positively, engaging in active and problem-focused coping when responding to stress-inducing scenarios. This paper concludes with a discussion on the implications for professionals working with college students with perfectionistic tendencies as well as suggestions for future research.

Key words : Perfectionism, adaptive perfectionists, maladaptive perfectionists, semi-structured interview

* This study was supported by the Dongguk University Research Fund awarded to the author in 2006.

[†] Corresponding author : Hyun-joo Park, Department of Education, Dongguk University, 3-26, Pil-dong, Chung-gu, Seoul 100-715, Korea

Tel : 02-2260-3383, Fax : 02-2277-1274, E-mail : hjpark@dongguk.edu

The past decade has witnessed a growing number of studies on the construct of perfectionism, which is generally defined as “the striving for flawlessness” (Flett & Hewitt, 2002, p. 5). With the development of major instruments of perfectionism [Frost Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (F-MPS; Frost, Marten, Lahart, & Rosenblate, 1990), Hewitt and Flett Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (H-MPS; Hewitt & Flett, 1991), and Almost Perfect Scale-Revised (APS-R; Slaney, Mobley, Trippi, Ashby, & Johnson, 1996)], perfectionism has been consistently associated with various psychological maladjustment, including depression (Blatt, 1995), anxiety (Juster et al., 1996), and eating concerns (Minarik & Ahrens, 1996). Clearly, perfectionism is one of the significant personality attributes that predict individuals’ psychological adjustment, and thus is a topic of interest for psychologists who typically work with this population.

One notable research area on perfectionism is the distinction between adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism. Earlier research on perfectionism focused on the negative aspects of perfectionism; however, several researchers soon suggested that a conceptual distinction be made between positive and negative aspects of perfectionism (Frost, Heimberg, Holt, Mattia, & Neubauer, 1993; Lynd-Stevenson & Hearne, 1999). For example, Frost et al. (1993) factor-analyzed items on two multidimensional perfectionism scales (F-MPS and H-MPS) with 553 undergraduates

and found two primary factors: maladaptive evaluative concerns and positive achievement striving, which represent the presence of both maladaptive and adaptive dimensions of perfectionism (Slaney, Ashby, & Trippi, 1995).

Approaching this research area from a different angle, a group of recent studies focused on identifying adaptive and maladaptive perfectionists and uncovering their differences in psychological attributes (Grzegorek, Slaney, Franze, & Rice, 2004; Parker, 1997; Rice & Mirzadeh, 2000; Rice & Slaney, 2002). While the previous studies examined positive and negative perfectionism (i.e., a dimensional approach), this line of research utilized a statistical method, mainly cluster analysis, to identify natural groupings of adaptive and maladaptive perfectionists (i.e., a typological approach). These studies consistently identified two groups of perfectionists (adaptive perfectionists and maladaptive perfectionists) and one group of nonperfectionists through cluster analysis, and investigated how the three groups differed in various adjustment indices using MANOVA. For instance, Rice and Slaney (2002) utilized 630 undergraduates across two studies and showed that adaptive perfectionists have higher levels of self-esteem and positive affect as well as less anxiety compared to the maladaptive counterpart. Similarly, Grzegorek et al. (2004) found that maladaptive perfectionists have higher levels of self-critical depression and lower levels of self-esteem than adaptive perfectionists ($N =$

273 undergraduates).

Although efforts have been made to distinguish adaptive perfectionists from maladaptive ones, a review of the literature reveals that most of the studies employed the survey method along with a quantitative approach (e.g., cluster analysis and MANOVA) and investigated the differences of the two groups of perfectionists as a group-comparison basis. Specifically, the adaptiveness and maladaptiveness of the two groups of perfectionists have been defined mainly based on the mean score differences on measures of psychological adjustment. Although this quantitative approach has shed light on general trends of the adaptive and maladaptive perfectionists as groups, specific characteristics of these groups have not been unveiled in the literature. In this regard, a qualitative approach can provide specific information about two perfectionists groups that may not be obtained by a quantitative methodology.

The author located two qualitative studies interviewing individuals with perfectionistic tendencies (Slaney & Ashby, 1996; Slaney, Chadha, Mobley, & Kennedy, 2000)¹⁾. Slaney and Ashby (1996) interviewed 37 individuals who were identified as having perfectionistic

tendencies either by themselves or by others. Slaney et al. (2000) explored perfectionism in India by interviewing five people (three graduate students and two professors) at the University of Delhi and concluded that the interview results were quite similar to the Slaney and Ashby (1996) results. However, both interview studies targeted mainly on uncovering general characteristics of the perfectionists, not specifically focusing on adaptive and maladaptive perfectionists. Thus, it deems a logical step to take a closer look at specific characteristics of the two groups of perfectionists using a qualitative method such as interviews.

Although several methodological approaches are available for conducting a qualitative research (e.g., grounded theory, phenomenology, consensual qualitative research; see Heppner, Wampold, & Kivlighan, 2008), the semi-structured interview method along with the scenario-based approach were selected for the following two reasons. First, adopting the interview questions that were used by Slaney and Ashby (1996) and Slaney et al. (2000) is expected to provide valuable information about how the perfectionists in each study would respond to the similar interview questions. Second, the scenario-based approach (i.e., providing various scenarios and examining the responses to the scenarios) has promise in differentiating two seemingly similar groups and/or constructs. For example, Tangney and the associates (e.g., Tangney, Dearing, Wagner, &

1) It should be noted that there might be some disagreements about whether to classify these studies as qualitative research or not, given that both studies did not utilize systematic analysis suggested by the qualitative research methodology.

Gramzow, 2000) developed a scenario-based instrument to measure the constructs of shame and guilt, the Test of Self-Conscious Affect-3. They endorsed the scenario-based approach because it helps to differentiate the two similar yet distinctive affects.

In addition, few studies have empirically tested adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism in cultures other than the West, such as South Korea. Investigating perfectionism in diverse cultures has been strongly called for (Castro & Rice, 2003; Grzegorek et al., 2004; Slaney et al., 2000) to advance our comprehensive understanding of the construct. Moreover, examining the construct of perfectionism in Asian culture can provide insight on any culture-specific aspect of perfectionism; for example, higher levels of perfectionism were reported with Asian-American undergraduates compared to other ethnic groups (Castro & Rice, 2003). In this light, the main research question was: What are the specific characteristics of the adaptive and maladaptive perfectionists in Korean college students?

The Perfectionism Questionnaire (PQ; Rhéaume et al., 1995) has promise in distinguishing adaptive and maladaptive perfectionist groups. This is because the PQ has been used to form subgroups with different levels of perfectionistic tendencies in studying the relations between perfectionism and psychological distress such as obsessive-compulsive disorder (Rhéaume et al., 2000). Adapting Rhéaume et

al.'s (2000) method of selecting perfectionist groups, the current research consists of: (a) a preliminary study to translate and validate the PQ with Korean college students and (b) a main study to conduct semi-structured interviews with adaptive and maladaptive perfectionists selected on the basis of their scores on the PQ and to investigate their specific characteristics responding to stress-inducing scenarios.

A Preliminary Study: Validation of the Perfectionism Questionnaire in Korea

Method

Participants

Participants were 417 Korean college students from two universities in Seoul. Thirty two cases were deleted due to missing data at random and thus data from 385 students (227 males; 59.0%) were utilized in this study. Participants' mean age was 21.27 years ($SD = 2.13$).

Instruments

Perfectionism Questionnaire (PQ; Rhéaume et al., 1995)

Rhéaume et al. (1995) developed the PQ specifically for the purpose of distinguishing

adaptive perfectionists from maladaptive perfectionists. The PQ consists of two dimensions, the Perfectionistic Tendencies (PT: 10 items) and the Negative Consequences of Perfectionism (NCP: 24 items). What each subscale measures is self-explanatory from their names. The original developers used a 5-point Likert-type scale, yet a 7-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*) was used in this study in order to increase variability in responding. The alpha coefficients for the PT and NCP were reported as .82 and .96 in Rhéaume et al.'s study (1995).

Frost Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (F-MPS; Frost et al., 1990)

The F-MPS (Frost et al., 1990) is a 35-item instrument designed to assess individuals' perfectionism. The F-MPS was used as a convergent validity estimate in this study. The participants were asked to respond on a 5-point Likert-type scale (from 1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*), with higher scores indicating more endorsement in perfectionism. The F-MPS comprises six factors: (a) Concern over Mistakes (CM: negative reactions to making mistakes), (b) Personal Standards (PS: high standards for oneself), (c) Parental Expectations (PE: one's beliefs that parents set high standards), (d) Parental Criticism (PC: perceived criticism from parents), (e) Doubts about Actions (DA: propensity to doubt one's capability), and (f) Organization (O: orderliness). The reliability and

validity of the F-MPS has been well-documented (see Frost et al., 1990; Rice & Mirzadeh, 2000). In this study, the alpha coefficients for the total MPS and its subscales were as follows: .90 (total), .86 (CM), .77 (PS), .83 (PC), .73 (PE), .73 (DA), and .89 (O).

The Korean Version of the Beck Depression Inventory (K-BDI; Lee, 1993)

The K-BDI is a translated version of the BDI (Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock, & Erbaugh, 1961). The BDI is a widely-used, 21-item instrument of depressive symptoms. Various symptoms of depression are assessed on a 4-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 to 3. Possible total score ranges from 0 to 63 with higher scores indicating more severe depression. The reliability and validity of this measure have been well documented (e.g., Beck, Steer, & Garbin, 1988). Lee (1999) reported the alpha coefficient of the K-BDI as .86 with a sample of 516 Korean college students. The coefficient alpha for the K-BDI in this study was .89 ($N = 385$).

The Korean Version of the Beck Anxiety Inventory (K-BAI; Kwon, 1992)

The K-BAI is a translated version of the BAI (Beck, Epstein, Brown, & Steer, 1988). The total 21-item instrument measures physical and emotional symptoms of anxiety using a 4-point Likert scale ranging from 0 to 3. The alpha coefficient of the K-BAI was .93 and the

split-half reliability estimate was .89 in Kwon's study (1992). In the present study, the coefficient alpha for the K-BAI was .91 ($N = 385$).

The Korean Version of the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (K-RSE; Lee, 1993)

This is a translated version of the RSE (Rosenberg, 1965), which is designed to measure an individual's global self-esteem. The 10-item RSE assesses self-esteem on a 4-point Likert scale (*strongly agree, agree, disagree, and strongly disagree*). The psychometric properties of the RSE have been well reported (Corwyn, 2000; McCarthy & Hoge, 1982). The alpha coefficient of the K-RSE was reported to be .84 in Chung (2001). In this study, the coefficient alpha for the K-RSE was .88 ($N = 385$).

The PQ and the F-MPS were translated by the author and the item contents were reviewed by two Korean students with master's degree in psychology who were fluent in both Korean and English.

Results

Exploratory Factor Analyses on the PQ

Given that the 2-factor structure of the PQ (the Perfectionistic Tendencies and the Negative Consequences of Perfectionism) has not been widely validated in the Western cultures, an

exploratory factor analysis was administered to examine the factor structure of the PQ with a sample of Korean college students. A principal axis factoring (PAF) analysis was conducted to explore the latent structure of the PQ. Bartlett's test of sphericity of $\chi^2(561, N = 385) = 8889.81, p < .000$ and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy of .95 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001) supported the factorability of the data. The Kaiser-Guttman criterion of eigenvalues greater than 1.00 indicated that six factors can be extracted from this data, yet examining the scree test (Cattell, 1966) suggested two or three factors. After scrutinizing the item contents, it was concluded that a 2-factor solution provided a conceptually and statistically sound structure.

Two items originally belonging to the Perfectionistic Tendencies factor were removed from the factor pattern matrix when the following criteria were applied: (a) factor loadings less than .40 (Pett, Lackey, & Sullivan, 2003), and (b) cross-loadings on the other factor exceeding .30. The final run of PAF with an oblique (promax) rotation yielded a total of 32 items for the PQ. Aligned with the original 2-factor structure of the PQ, the two factors were named as: (a) the Negative Consequences of Perfectionism (NCP; 24 items, explained 39.0% of the total variance; $\alpha = .81$) and (b) the Perfectionistic Tendencies (PT; 8 items, explained 8.2% of the total variance; $\alpha = .96$). The Korean version of the 2-factor structure of the PQ explained 47.2% of the total variances.

Table 1. Intercorrelations among the Primary Variables and their Internal Consistency Estimates

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	α
1. PT	---											.81
2. NCP	.38*	---										.96
3. CM	.02	.62*	---									.86
4. PS	.42*	.57*	.61*	---								.77
5. PE	-.01	.16*	.37*	.33*	---							.83
6. PC	-.13	.24*	.39*	.12	.53*	---						.73
7. DA	.15*	.61*	.53*	.46*	.17*	.22*	---					.73
8. O	.42*	.31*	.16*	.45*	.03	-.06	.25*	---				.89
9. K-BDI	-.04	.42*	.45*	.23*	.22*	.26*	.40*	-.02	---			.89
10. K-BAI	-.04	.36*	.35*	.24*	.24*	.20*	.36*	.06	.74*	---		.91
11. K-RSE	.29*	-.29*	-.39*	-.03	-.10	-.39*	-.37*	.12	-.58*	-.43*	---	.88

Note. PT = Perfectionistic Tendencies; NCP = Negative Consequences of Perfectionism; CM = Concern over Mistakes; PS = Personal Standards; PE = Parental Expectations; PC = Parental Criticism; DA = Doubts about Actions; O = Organization; K-BDI = Korean Beck Depression Inventory; K-BAI = Korean Beck Anxiety Inventory; K-RSE = Korean Rosenberg Self-Esteem.

$N = 385$.

* $p < .0045$ (a Bonferroni-type correction = $.05/11$).

In sum, the original 2-factor structure of the PQ was retained in South Korea.

Validity Estimates of the PQ

Convergent validity estimates were examined by correlating the PQ with another measure of perfectionism, F-MPS (see Table 1). In order to guard against potential increase in Type I error due to multiple calculations of correlation, p -value was set to $.0045$ ($.05/11$) using a Bonferroni-type adjustment. The Perfectionistic Tendencies (PT) was positively related to the

Personal Standards (PS), the Doubts about Actions (DA), and the Organization (O) subscales of the F-MPS, r s ranging from $.15$ (with DA) to $.42$ (with PS and O), $p < .0045$. The Negative Consequences of Perfectionism (NCP) revealed positive associations with all of the six subscales of the F-MPS, r s ranging from $.16$ (with the Parental Expectations) to $.62$ (with the Concern over Mistakes), $p < .0045$. These results provided support for the preliminary evidences for the convergent validity of the PQ. It is also noteworthy that PT and NCP were positively associated ($r = .38$, $p < .0045$),

indicating both variables may tap into the construct of perfectionism.

We also examined concurrent validity estimates of the PQ from the correlations with the K-BDI (depression), K-BAI (anxiety), and K-RSE (self-esteem). As seen in Table 1, the PT and NCP were associated with the three criterion variables in conceptually expected ways. Specifically, the PT was positively correlated with the K-RSE ($r = .29, p < .0045$) but not with the K-BDI and K-BAI, indicating that perfectionistic tendency itself is not directly related with depression and anxiety. In contrast, the NCP showed a negative association with the K-RSE ($r = -.29$) and positive relations with both the K-BDI ($r = .42$) and K-BAI ($r = .36$) (all $ps < .0045$). In sum, the correlation analyses indicated that the Korean version of the PQ showed appropriate evidence for both convergent and concurrent validity.

A Main Study: Adaptive and Maladaptive Perfectionists and their Distinctive Characteristics

Method

Participants and Procedure

From the participants of the preliminary study ($N = 385$), 19 adaptive perfectionists and 24

maladaptive perfectionists were recruited based on their scores on the PQ. Adopting the Rhéaume et al.'s criteria (2000), adaptive perfectionists were those with high perfectionistic tendencies (upper 75%) and with low negative consequences of perfectionism (lower 50%)². Maladaptive perfectionists were those with high perfectionistic tendencies (upper 75%) and high negative consequences of perfectionism (upper 75%). In other words, adaptive perfectionists were those students who reported on PQ that they have high levels of perfectionism (i.e., high on PT), yet their high perfectionistic tendencies did not have negative influences on them and did not interfere with their performance (i.e., low on NCP). On the other hand, maladaptive perfectionists were those who reported on PQ that they also have high levels of perfectionism (i.e., high on PT) and they perceived their perfectionistic tendencies as causing distress to themselves (i.e., high on NCP; for example, they feel that their performances are never good enough due to high standards).

The author conducted semi-structured

- 2) Different criteria were applied to recruit two groups of perfectionists: adaptive perfectionists (i.e., upper 75% on PT and lower 50% on NCP) and maladaptive perfectionists (i.e., upper 75% on PT and upper 75% on NCP). This decision was made because only three adaptive perfectionists remained when low NCP (lower 25%) along with high PT (upper 75%) criterion was used, which makes it difficult to form the adaptive perfectionists group. This appears to stem from the fact that PT and NCP have overlapping parts ($r = .38$).

interviews with the two groups of perfectionists. The interview survey was created with contents adopted from the structured interview questions of Slaney and Ashby (1996).

Result

The interviewer asked the two groups of perfectionists to rate the overall influence of their perfectionism on themselves on a 5-point scale (1 = *only negative*, 2 = *mostly negative*, 3 = *positive and negative*, 4 = *mostly positive*, and 5 = *only positive*). No one in the adaptive group reported their perfectionism had a negative effect on them: 10 (53%) endorsed themselves on mostly positive, 8 (42%) on positive and negative, and 1 on only positive. Unlikely, those

in the maladaptive group were found to have a more ambivalent attitude on the influence of their perfectionism: two-thirds ($n = 27$; 63%) of the group reported positive and negative, 14 (33%) reported mostly positive, and one person each reported only positive and mostly negative. Thus, it appears that students in the adaptive group appraise their perfectionistic tendencies toward a more positive direction than their counterpart.

Next, the interviewer gave open questions and asked the two groups to provide specific examples of how their perfectionism influenced them both positively and negatively. The participants were allowed to provide multiple answers. Then the participants' responses were categorized with the frequencies in each category being calculated (see Table 2 for the positive

Table 2. Positive Consequences of Perfectionism and Their Frequencies

Categories	Adaptive Perfectionists ($n = 19$)	Maladaptive Perfectionists ($n = 24$)
Good performances in the exams/grades	12 (63.2%) ^a	18 (75.0%)
Systematic organization skills	2 (10.5%)	5 (20.8%)
Good interpersonal relationships	3 (15.8%)	3 (12.5%)
Earning people's trust	3 (15.8%)	2 (8.3%)
Multi-tasking capabilities	2 (10.5%)	2 (8.3%)
Neatness/Organization	3 (15.8%)	1 (4.2%)
Preparing in advance	1 (5.3%)	1 (4.2%)
Total number of responses	26	32

Note. ^a = The percentiles were calculated per each perfectionists group because multiple answers were allowed. For example, 12 out of 19 adaptive perfectionists (i.e., 63.2% in the adaptive perfectionists group) reported good performances in the exams/grades as positive consequences of perfectionism.

Table 3. Negative Consequences of Perfectionism and Their Frequencies

Categories	Adaptive Perfectionists (<i>n</i> = 19)	Maladaptive Perfectionists (<i>n</i> = 24)
Getting worse results	0 (0.0%)	9 (37.5%)
Too sensitive in the relationships	2 (10.5%) ^a	5 (20.8%)
Feeling stressed in the group work	3 (15.8%)	4 (16.7%)
Spending too much time in organization	1 (5.3%)	5 (20.8%)
Self-criticizing when not achieving goals	2 (10.5%)	3 (12.5%)
Giving up altogether if not a good start	0 (0.0%)	5 (20.8%)
Preparing for the exams in high school	0 (0.0%)	5 (20.8%)
Negative feedback from others	0 (0.0%)	3 (12.5%)
Neurotic symptoms (e.g., anxiety)	0 (0.0%)	2 (8.3%)
Attempting to do everything	0 (0.0%)	2 (8.3%)
Total number of responses	8	43

Note. ^a = The percentiles were calculated per each perfectionists group because multiple answers were allowed (see the Note in Table 2).

consequences and Table 3 for the negative consequences). As for the positive consequences, the adaptive perfectionists (*n* = 19) provided 26 responses (1.4 responses per person) and the maladaptive group (*n* = 24) gave 32 responses (1.3 responses per person). As seen in Table 2, both groups reported that their perfectionism helped them to have better achievement in tests and grades. Other positive consequences of perfectionism were systematic organization skills, good interpersonal relationships, multi-tasking capabilities, etc.

Interesting results came from the negative consequences. As for the frequencies of the negative consequences, the adaptive perfectionists

as a group provided eight responses (0.4 response per person), whereas the maladaptive perfectionists reported 43 (1.8 responses per person). Furthermore, there were six categories where only the maladaptive perfectionists provided responses (Table 3): (a) getting worse results because of their perfectionism (*n* = 9; 37.5%) (b) giving up altogether if it is not a good head start (*n* = 5; 20.8%); (c) preparing for the examinations in high school (*n* = 5; 20.8%); (d) negative feedback from others (*n* = 3; 12.5%); (e) neurotic symptoms (e.g., anxiety) (*n* = 2; 8.3%); and (f) attempting to do everything (*n* = 2; 8.3%). In summary, it appears that maladaptive perfectionists experience

more diverse forms of negative consequences of perfectionism compared to adaptive ones.

Finally, the interviewer gave the two groups two scenarios about stress-inducing situations and asked them to freely provide their cognitive and behavioral responses to the given situation. This was an exploratory approach to examine the two groups' behaviors and thoughts in highly plausible life situations. Per scenario, we asked the participants (a) what they are going to do in the situation (behavioral responses), and (b) what kind of thoughts come up to them (cognitive responses). The behavioral responses across the two scenarios are presented in Table 4 and the cognitive responses are presented in the text.

The first situation was: *I need to turn in two papers by tomorrow, but I haven't started writing them yet. Both papers are equivalent to the midterm exam and 5-10 pages in length.* From Table 4, we can see that the adaptive perfectionists cope with the situation more proactively than the maladaptive counterpart. The majority of the adaptive perfectionists ($n = 17$; 90.0%) said that they would work hard on the papers and try to turn both in. On the contrary, about half of the maladaptive perfectionists ($n = 11$; 45.0%) said that they would turn in only one paper and four students even reported that they may give up on both papers. Regarding cognitive responses, both groups reported problem-solving thinking, such as "I need to do my best," "I have to stay up all night," and "I

need to act quickly." However, compared to the adaptive perfectionists, the maladaptive perfectionists frequently talked about avoidance, such as "Should I drop the course?," "I just want to hide," "I want to drink," and "I don't know... whatever!"

Another scenario was: *I wake up and realize that I am late for a meeting with friends. Even if I leave my house immediately, I'm already 30 minutes late.* With regard to the behavioral responses (Table 4), most of the adaptive perfectionists ($n = 15$; 79.0%) said that they would hurry up and leave home immediately. The maladaptive perfectionists group varied in their responses, with a quarter ($n = 6$; 25.0%) responding that they would just skip the meeting without notice. When asked to describe their cognitive responses to the second scenario, both groups reported problem-solving thinking, such as "I need to hurry up." However, those in the maladaptive group presented negative evaluation about self, evidenced in the responses such as "I can achieve nothing with this attitude," "What kind of person will I be?," or "How lazy I am!" The maladaptive perfectionists also expressed avoidance thinking, e.g., "What kind of excuse could I make?" or "Whatever! I'm just going to sleep more."

Discussion

This study is the first attempt to uncover the

characteristics of adaptive and maladaptive perfectionists in South Korean college students using semi-structured interviews. The 2-factor structure of the Perfectionism Questionnaire (PQ; Rhéaume et al., 1995, Perfectionistic Tendencies and Negative Consequences of Perfectionism) was generally retained in South Korea, providing support for universality of the construct across cultures. Preliminary evidence of the reliability and validity estimates of the PQ were suggested with Korean college students.

The interview results were consistent with the

previous findings (Slaney & Ashby, 1996; Slaney et al., 2000) in that perfectionists evaluated their perfectionism both positively and negatively and academic work and interpersonal relationships were major areas that were affected by their perfectionism. However, after carefully reviewing the interview results of Slaney et al. (2000) and Slaney and Ashby (1996), the author suspects that both adaptive and maladaptive perfectionists were mixed in the participants pool in the two studies. From the current study, it can be suggested that it is maladaptive perfectionists to

Table 4. Behavioral Responses to the Stress-inducing Scenarios

Responses	Adaptive Perfectionists (n = 19)	Maladaptive Perfectionists (n = 24)
Situation A: <i>I need to turn in two papers by tomorrow, but I haven't started writing them yet. Both papers are equivalent to the midterm exam and 5-10 pages in length</i>		
Work hard and turn in both papers	17 (90.0%)	3 (13.0%)
Work moderately and turn in both papers	0 (0.0%)	5 (21.0%)
Ask to delay the due dates	1 (5.0%)	1 (4.0%)
Give up one and turn in one paper	1 (5.0%)	11 (45.0%)
Give up both papers	0 (0.0%)	4 (17.0%)
Total	19 (100.0%)	24 (100.0%)
Situation B: <i>I wake up and realize that I am late for a meeting with friends. Even if I leave my house immediately, I'm already 30 minutes late</i>		
Hurry up and leave home immediately	15 (79.0%)	7 (29.0%)
Let the friends know that I will be late	0 (0.0%)	7 (29.0%)
Go if the meeting is important	4 (21.0%)	4 (17.0%)
Skip the meeting without notice	0 (0.0%)	6 (25.0%)
Total	19 (100.0%)	24 (100.0%)

possess more ambivalent attitudes toward their perfectionism, while adaptive perfectionists evaluate that their perfectionism plays a positive role in their lives. The study results also expanded the previous findings by specifying how adaptive and maladaptive perfectionists assess their perfectionism differently and delineating positive and negative consequences of perfectionism by each perfectionist group.

Furthermore, the findings of this study with interviews provide additional information to the existing literature that typically utilized quantitative methods (i.e., cluster analysis) to group different perfectionists. Specifically, maladaptive perfectionists' cognitive responses to the stress-inducing scenarios are worth further examining because they can provide clues to explaining the statistical differences between maladaptive and adaptive perfectionists, which have been found in quantitative research (Grzegorek et al., 2004; Rice & Slaney, 2002). For example, maladaptive perfectionists' negative evaluation about self such as "I can achieve nothing with this attitude" and "What kind of person will I be?" provides additional information to understand the result of maladaptive perfectionists exhibiting lower level of self-esteem compared to the adaptive perfectionists (Grzegorek et al., 2004; Rice & Slaney, 2002). Maladaptive perfectionists' such self-critical cognitions also may play a central role in their higher level of self-critical depression (Grzegorek et al., 2004) as well as depressed affect and

anxiety (Rice & Slaney, 2002) compared to the adaptive counterpart.

Similarly, the two groups' responses to the stress-inducing scenarios shed light on the perfectionists' behavioral patterns and coping styles. Particularly, the maladaptive perfectionists responded that they would just dismiss a considerable amount of the required assignments (giving up one paper that is equivalent to the midterm) and interpersonal commitments (skipping the meeting with friends without notice). On the contrary, the adaptive perfectionists' behavioral responses were endorsed on proactive and problem-focused coping styles, which is also consistent with Rice and Lapsley (2001) who reported adaptive perfectionists used more problem-focused coping and less dysfunctional coping. This result suggests that it is the maladaptive perfectionists who are likely to use avoidance-oriented coping strategy (Endler & Parker, 1990) and procrastinate when encountering stressful situations. The avoidance thinking (e.g., "I just want to hide away") coupled with the avoidance behaviors can exacerbate their vulnerability to stress. This result can be linked with Dunkley, Blankstein, Halsall, Williams, and Winkworth's (2000) findings of avoidant coping as a mediator between evaluative concerns perfectionism (maladaptive perfectionism) and distress.

This study provides ample implications for student development personnel and mental health professionals working with Korean college

students with perfectionistic tendencies. First, counselors in the university counseling centers need to assess what their clients mean by perfectionism and what the consequences of their perfectionistic tendencies are. For maladaptive perfectionists, their perfectionistic tendencies need to be the intervention target because they reported suffering from negative consequences of perfectionism and perceived their perfectionism as causing distress to them. On the other hand, adaptive perfectionists' organization skills and problem-focused coping can serve as assets in tackling their presenting concerns. Moreover, given that using problem-solving thinking and coping behaviors were found to be a sharp contrast between the two groups of perfectionists, counselors need to pay special attention to clients' coping styles as a key target for intervention when they work with perfectionistic students. Because maladaptive perfectionists typically reported self-criticism as well as avoidance thinking and behaviors, mental health professionals are advised to design interventions specifically targeting to (a) assess the contents of their self-talk and the kinds of coping strategies they utilize, (b) examine how their perfectionistic tendencies contribute to creating their maladaptive thoughts and behaviors, (c) challenge the consequences of self-critical thoughts and avoidant coping behaviors, and (d) help them to learn alternative and self-enhancing thoughts and to engage in active coping and approach problems.

Limitations of the study need to be noted. First, a more close examination of the PQ is necessary. The 32-item, 2-factor structure of the PQ based on a Korean college student sample needs to be cross-validated with other populations in Korea using a confirmatory factor analysis. The two factors (NCP and PT) explained 47.2% of the total variances and this may not be large enough to support the validity of the factor analysis. However, it should also be noted that the decision-making criteria of EFA rests largely upon human judgment and theory. According to Kahn (2006), "... this involves subjectivity as to what percentage of variance is large enough to be important, and there are no agreed-upon rules to guide these decisions" (p. 690). Thus, continued research efforts should be made to further investigate the item content and factor structure of the scale. Although efforts were made to translate the PQ into Korean appropriately, lack of the back-translation procedure further necessitates future research on the PQ. In addition, the psychometric properties of the PQ need to be scrutinized. Given that both the PQ and F-MPS have not been validated in Korea, the results on the convergent validity of the PQ are preliminary at this point. Third, the Rhéaume et al.'s (2000) criteria for screening adaptive and maladaptive perfectionists as well as Slaney and Ashby's (1996) interview questions need to be further examined in order to see if they are appropriate in Korean culture.

Finally, an in-depth interview with these two

groups of perfectionists utilizing a more robust qualitative methodology is in order. Although (a) the current study adopted the interview questions and methods used by Slaney and Ashby (1996), and (b) the interview studies by Slaney and Ashby (1996) and Slaney et al. (2000) are regarded as qualitative studies (Suddarth & Slaney, 2001), caution should be made in deciding whether the interview methods exercised in this study (i.e., categorizing the responses and counting the frequencies) can be classified as a qualitative approach. In addition, the internal validity of the interview might have been compromised due to the fact that the researcher served as the interviewer with no rater involved when categorizing the responses. Despite several limitations, this study using semi-structured interviews has potential to advance our comprehensive understanding of different types of perfectionists and their characteristics, particularly in Asian culture.

References

- Beck, A. T., Epstein, N., Brown, G., & Steer, R. A. (1988). An inventory for measuring clinical anxiety: Psychometric properties. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56*, 893-897.
- Beck, A. T., Steer, R. A., & Garbin, M. G. (1988). Psychometric properties of the Beck Depression Inventory: Twenty-five years of evaluation. *Clinical Psychology Review, 8*, 77-100.
- Beck, A. T., Ward, C. M., Mendelson, M., Mock, J. E., & Erbaugh, J. K. (1961). An inventory for measuring depression. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 4*, 561-571.
- Blatt, S. J. (1995). The destructiveness of perfectionism. *American Psychologist, 50*, 1003-1020.
- Castro, J. R., & Rice, K. G. (2003). Perfectionism and ethnicity: Implications for depressive symptoms and self-reported academic achievement. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 9*, 64-78.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The score test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 1*, 245-276.
- Chung, N-W. (2001). Factor structure of the Korean version of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI). *The Korean Journal of Counseling and Psychotherapy, 13*, 221-237.
- Corwyn, R. F. (2000). The factor structure of global self-esteem among adolescents and adults. *Journal of Research in Personality, 34*, 357-379.
- Dunkley, D. M., Blankstein, K. R., Halsall, J., Williams, M., & Winkworth, G. (2000). The relation between perfectionism and distress: Hassles, coping, and perceived social support as mediators and moderators. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47*, 437-453.
- Endler, N. S., & Parker, J. D. A. (1990). Multidimensional assessment of coping: A critical evaluation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 844-854.
- Flett, G. L., & Hewitt, P. L. (Eds.) (2002).

- Perfectionism: Theory, research, and treatment.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Frost, R. O., Heimberg, R. G., Holt, C. S., Mattia, J. I., & Neubauer, A. L. (1993). A comparison of two measures of perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 14*, 119-126.
- Frost, R. O., Marten, P. A., Lahart, C., & Rosenblate, R. (1990). The dimensions of perfectionism. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 14*, 449-468.
- Grzegorek, J. L., Slaney, R. B., Franze, S., & Rice, K. G. (2004). Self-criticism, dependency, self-esteem, and grade point average satisfaction among clusters of perfectionists and nonperfectionists. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 51*, 192-200.
- Heppner, P. P., Wampold, B. E., & Kivlighan, D. M. (2008). *Research design in counseling.* Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- 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*, 456-470.
- Juster, H. R., Heimberg, R. G., Frost, R. O., Holt, C. S., Mattia, J. I., & Faccenda, K. (1996). Social phobia and perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 21*, 403-410.
- Kahn, J. H. (2006). Factor analysis in counseling psychology research, training, and practice: Principles, advances, and applications. *The Counseling Psychologist, 34*, 684-718.
- Kwon, S. M. (1992). *Differential roles of dysfunctional attitudes and automatic thoughts in depression: An integrated model of depression.* Unpublished dissertation, University of Queensland, Australia.
- Lee, Y-H. (1993). *The relationships among attribution styles, life events, event attributions, hopelessness, and depression: An analysis using covariance structural model.* Unpublished dissertation, Seoul National University, South Korea.
- Lee, Y-H. (1999). A study of the reliability and validity of the Depression Adjective Check List - Korean version. *Korean Journal of Clinical Psychology, 18*, 151-164.
- Lynd-Stevenson, R. M., & Hearne, C. M. (1999). Perfectionism and depressive affect: The pros and cons of being a perfectionist. *Personality and Individual Differences, 26*, 549-562.
- McCarthy, J. D., & Hoge, D. R. (1982). Analysis of age effects in longitudinal studies of adolescent self-esteem. *Developmental Psychology, 18*, 372-379.
- Minarik, L. M., & Ahrens, A. H. (1996). Relations of eating behavior and symptoms of depression and anxiety to the dimensions of perfectionism among undergraduate women. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 20*, 155-169.
- Parker, W. D. (1997). An empirical typology of perfectionism in academically talented children. *American Educational Research Journal, 34*, 545-562.
- Pett, M. A., Lackey, N. R., & Sullivan, J. J. (2003). *Making sense of factor analysis: The use of factor analysis for instrument development in health care research.* London: Sage

- Publications.
- Rhéaume, J., Freeston, M. H., & Ladouceur, R. (1995). Functional and dysfunctional perfectionism: Construct validity of a new instrument. *Communication presented at the 15th Annual Convention of the WCBCT, Copenhagen, July 1995*.
- Rhéaume, J., Freeston, M. H., Ladouceur, R., Bouchard, C., Gallant, L., Talbot, F., & Vallières, A. (2000). Functional and dysfunctional perfectionists: are they different on compulsive-like behaviors? *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, 38, 119-128.
- Rice, K. G., & Lapsley, D. K. (2001). Perfectionism, coping, and emotional adjustment. *Journal of College Student Development*, 42, 157-168.
- Rice, K. G., & Mirzadeh, S. A. (2000). Perfectionism, attachment, and adjustment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47, 238-250.
- Rice, K. G., & Slaney, R. B. (2002). Clusters of perfectionists: Two studies of emotional adjustment and academic achievement. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 35, 35-48.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Slaney, R. B., & Ashby, J. S. (1996). Perfectionists: Study of a criterion group. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 74, 393-398.
- Slaney, R. B., Ashby, J. S., & Trippi, J. T. (1995). Perfectionism: Its measurement and career relevance. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 3, 279-297.
- Slaney, R. B., Chadha, N., Mobley, M., & Kennedy, S. (2000). Perfectionism in Asian Indians: Exploring the meaning of the construct in India. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 28, 10-31.
- Slaney, R. B., Mobley, M., Trippi, J., Ashby, J. S., & Johnson, D. (1996). *The Almost Perfect Scale-Revised*. Unpublished manuscript, The Pennsylvania State University. (Available from the first author).
- Suddarth, B. H., & Slaney, R. B. (2001). An investigation of the dimensions of perfectionism in college students. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 34, 157-165.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics* (4th ed.). Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
- Tangney, J. P., Dearing, R. L., Wagner, P. E., & Gramzow, R. (2000). *The Test of Self-Conscious Affect-3 (TOSCA-3)*. Fairfax, VA: George Mason University.
- 원 고 접 수 일 : 2008. 2. 25
수정원고접수일 : 2008. 4. 30
계 재 결 정 일 : 2008. 5. 9

적응적 완벽주의자와 부적응적 완벽주의자 집단의 특성 연구

박 현 주

동국대학교

본 연구는 다음의 두 가지 목적에서 수행되었다. 첫째, 한국 대학생 385명을 대상으로 완벽주의 질문지(Perfectionism Questionnaire, Rhéaume et al., 1995)의 2요인 구조(완벽주의 성향, 완벽주의의 부정적 결과)를 타당화하고자 하였다. 둘째, 적응적 완벽주의자 집단과 부적응적 완벽주의자 집단의 특성을 반구조화 면접을 통해서 밝히고자 하였다. 반구조화 면접을 위해 PQ 점수에 기초하여 19명의 적응적 완벽주의자 집단과 24명의 부적응적 완벽주의자 집단이 선발되었다. 타당화 연구 결과, 한국 대학생에서 PQ의 2요인 구조가 지지되었으며 PQ의 신뢰도와 타당도에 대한 예비 자료가 제시되었다. 반구조화 면접 결과 적응적 완벽주의자 집단이 자신의 완벽주의를 긍정적으로 평가하는 것으로 나타났으며 또한 부적응적 완벽주의자 집단에 비해 스트레스를 유발하는 각본에 대해 적극적이고 문제해결적인 방식으로 대처하는 경향을 보였다. 본 연구 결과가 기존의 완벽주의자에 대한 면접 연구 결과와 비교하여 가지는 함의점, 완벽주의 성향을 가진 대학생 내담자 집단의 상담에 있어서의 임상적 함의점, 그리고 추후 연구 제안 및 연구의 한계에 대해 논의하였다.

주요어 : 완벽주의, 적응적 완벽주의자, 부적응적 완벽주의자, 반구조화된 면접