The Pro's and Con's of Perfectionism in the Workplace

Jeff Foster, Ph.D., and Stephen B. Nichols, M.S., and Sudeep Sharma, M.S.
Hogan Assessment Systems

"Let managers beware of either trying to be miracle men or pretending to be saints". – Benjamin M. Selekman.

The famous HR researcher Benjamin M. Selekman argued in his classic paper "Sin Bravely: the danger of perfectionism" that managers should try to avoid perfectionism as it can produce negative outcomes in their work life (1959: 105). Like Selekman, most psychologists have traditionally viewed perfectionism as a one-dimensional, maladaptive construct (Greenspon, 2000; Pacht, 1984; Slaney & Ashby, 1996). In this study, we explore both positive and negative outcomes of perfectionism across multiple work-related contexts as viewed from supervisors, peers, and study participants.

Positive and Negative Aspects of Perfectionism

Despite some early efforts to distinguish between "normal" and "neurotic" perfectionism (Hamachek, 1978), research on the topic has historically focused on relationships between perfectionism and negative outcomes, such as shame and guilt (e.g., Sorotzkin, 1985), depression (e.g., Hewitt & Dyck, 1986), anxiety (e.g., Flett, Hewitt, & Dyck, 1989), and personality disorders (e.g., Broday, 1988). Perfection has also been linked to other maladaptive behaviors, such as paranoia (Blankstein & Dunkley, 2002), procrastination (Hewitt & Flett, 1991), alcoholism (Frost et al. 1990), irrational beliefs (Stumpf & Parker, 2000), neuroticism (Hewitt, Flett & Blankstein, 1991), low self-esteem (Flett, Hewitt, Blankstein & O'Brien, 1991; Hewitt & Flett, 1991;

Slaney, Rice & Ashby, 2002), suicide (Hewitt, Caelin, Flett, Sherry, Collins & Flynn, 2002), and social phobia (Antony, Purdon, Huta & Swinson 1998).

More recent work, however, has indicated that perfectionism may be multi-dimensional in nature (Hewitt & Flett, 1991) and can result in both positive and negative outcomes (Frost, Heimberg, Holt, Mattia, & Neubauer, 1993; Parker, 1997; Rice & Slaney, 2002; Slaney & Ashby, 1996). According to Maslow, striving for perfection through self-actualization is an "indication of the absence of neurosis" (Peters, 2005: 3). Silverman (2005) argues that the root of excellence is perfectionism; it is what motivates individuals to achieving higher goals (in Peters, 2005). Frost and colleague's found that the high personal and organizational standards are typically associated with healthy experiences (Frost, Lahart & Rosenblate, 1991; Frost & Martin, 1990). Finally, Hewitt and Flett argue that self-oriented perfectionism, and to a lesser extent, other-oriented perfectionism, is associated with adaptive social skills (Flett & Hewitt, 2002; Flett, Hewitt & De Rosa, 1996).

In a study of self-efficacy in career decision making, Ashby, Bieschke, and Slaney (1997) found that those classified as adaptive perfectionists had significantly higher scores of accurate self-appraisal, goal selection, making plans for the future and problem-solving (Slaney et al, 2002) as compared to those classified as non-perfectionists. Furthermore, self-oriented perfectionism has been associated with a number of positive adaptive qualities, including achievement striving, positive affect, high self-esteem, self-efficacy, self-actualization, resourcefulness, perceived control, adaptive coping with stress, positive appraisals of personal projects, adaptive learning strategies, good academic performance, and positive interpersonal characteristics, such as

self-assurance, assertiveness, and altruistic social attitudes (Blankstein & Dunkley, 2002; Burns & Fedewa, 2005). Other-oriented perfectionism has been associated with an elevated level of assertiveness (Flett et al. 1996).

Conceptualizations of Perfectionism

Two main conceptualizations of perfectionism emerge in the literature. Frost et al. (1990) identified perfectionism as having five dimensions. The first dimension, which the authors considered the major dimension, is **concern over mistakes**. This reflects a tendency to interpret mistakes as equivalent to failure, and the belief that one will lose the respect of others following failure. The second dimension is the setting of excessively high **personal standards**, which individuals often fail to meet. The third dimension is **parental expectations,** which involves the extent to which an individual's parents are perceived as setting high expectations. The fourth dimension is **parental criticism,** which involves the extent to which an individual's parents are overly critical. The final dimension is **doubts about actions,** which is the tendency to doubt the quality of one's performance. Subsequent researchers added a sixth dimension to this model, named **organization,** which reflects an individual's tendency to be orderly and organized (Alden, Ryder & Mellings, 2002; Frost et al. 1990; Frost, Turcotte, Heimberg, Mattia, Holt & Hope, 1995)

Alternatively, Hewitt and Flett (1991) identified three dimensions of perfectionism. According to this conceptualization, although the behaviors exhibited are frequently similar among the dimensions, the distinguishing features among the dimensions involve (a) from whom the perfectionist expectations derive (i.e. the self or others) and (b) to whom the behaviors are directed (i.e. toward the self or others) (Hewitt

& Flett, 2002). The first dimension is self-oriented perfectionism, in which the individual has unrealistic standards for themselves, strives for these standards, is overly critical of themselves, tends to overly focus on their flaws, and tries to avoid failure. The second dimension is other-oriented perfectionism, in which the individual has unrealistic standards and expectations about the abilities of others and is often overly evaluative of others' performance. The third dimension is socially-prescribed perfectionism, in which the individual believes that others have perfectionist expectations and motives about them and feels that they must attain these standards (Blankstein & Winkworth, 2004; Hewitt & Flett, 1991; Kobori, Yamagata & Kijima, 2005).

We do not intend for this review to be exclusive or exhaustive, but rather to illustrate the multidimensional and multi-categorical nature of perfectionism. In this paper, we present research that further investigates the relationships between perfectionism and a range of work outcomes. Specifically, we examine the direction and magnitude of the relationship between perfectionism and different work related competencies as rated from multiple perspectives.

Methods

Predictor Scale

In the present study, we examined the effects of self-oriented perfectionism at work. We assessed perfectionism using the Hogan Development Survey (Hogan & Hogan, 1997). The HDS is a 168-item self-report assessment that contains 11 primary scales. These scales index behavioral tendencies that can emerge and negatively impact performance, particularly when an individual is fatigued, ill, stressed, bored, or lacking social vigilance.

Specifically, we examined relationships between the HDS Diligent scale and work related outcomes. The Diligent scale measures the degree to which a person is picky, critical, and overly conscientious. High scorers on the Diligent scale are typically viewed by others as resistant to change, micromanaging, stubborn when under pressure, and slow to make decisions (Hogan, Hogan, & Warrenfeltz, 2007).

The Diligent scale predicts behaviors ranging from being relaxed, tolerant, and willing to delegate at the low end to being meticulous, picky, critical, and overly conscientious at the high end. The HDS Technical Manual (R. Hogan & J. Hogan, 2009) specifically states that people with high scores on the Diligent scale are viewed by others as being perfectionistic. As further outlined in the manual:

> Their meticulous attention to detail is useful and even important in many jobs, but it has a down side, too. Such people have trouble prioritizing their work because they believe that every task must be done equally well--which becomes increasingly difficult as a person becomes busier. They have trouble delegating--because they want to be sure that things are done right--which deprives their subordinates of opportunities to learn. They tend to micromanage their staff, and their conservatism may make them resistant to change. They will be good with details, but they will rarely be a source of true innovation. At their best, these people are good role models who uphold the highest standards of professionalism in performance and comportment; they are typically popular with their bosses because they are so reliable. At their worst, however, they are fussy, particular, nit-picking micro-managers who deprive their subordinates of any choice or control over their work. The micro-management alienates their staff who soon

refuse to take any initiative and simply wait to be told what to do and how to do it. (p. 55)

The HDS Technical Manual (R. Hogan & J. Hogan, 2009) also provides evidence about the construct validity of the HDS Diligent scale when compared to a number of other well validated personality measures. Specifically, Diligent has demonstrated significant positive correlations with the Prudence scale on the Hogan Personality Inventory (R. Hogan & J. Hogan, 2009; r = .31), the Order (r = .47) and Conscientious scales on the NEO PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992; r = .45), the Conscientious scale on the IPIP (r = .61), and the Perfectionism scale on the 16PF (Conn & Rieke, 1994; r = .55). It has also demonstrated significant negative relationships with the CPI Flexibility scale (Gough, 1975; r = -.49). When compared to scales on the Motives, Values, and Preferences Inventory (J. Hogan & R. Hogan, 1997), which contains ten scales indicating what motives employees in their jobs, individuals with high scores on Diligent are also likely to score high on Security (r = .47) and Commerce (r = .32).

In general, these results indicate that high scores on the Diligent scale reflect a number of potentially beneficial characteristics, such as being orderly, attentive to details, fastidious, and precise. In contrast, high score may also reflect a number of negative characteristics, such as being overly controlling, rigid, inflexible, resistant to change, prejudice, intolerance, and compulsive. Furthermore, individuals with high Diligent scores are likely to be driven by a desire for job security and money. Finally, comparisons to scores on cognitive ability assessments indicate that Diligent may show negative correlations with both tactical and strategic reasoning, as well as verbal fluency (R. Hogan & J. Hogan, 2009).

Based on studies comparing Diligent scores to adjective checklists filled out by individuals who are familiar with the participant, the HDS Technical Manual indicates that individuals with high scores on Diligent are viewed by observers as organized (r = .36), systematic (r = .34), efficient (r = .31) and practical (r = .19). Observers also indicate that they do things effectively (r = .28), do a thorough job (r = .25), make plans and follow through (r = .24), and persevere until tasks are completed (r = .19) (R. Hogan & J. Hogan, 2009). These results not only parallel many common definitions of perfectionism, but also demonstrate how perfectionism can be viewed as both positively and negatively by others.

Criterion Measures

To examine relationships between perfectionism and work outcomes, we used data from the Hogan archive. The archive contains results from over 250 criterion-related validity studies conducted over the last 20 years. The studies represent a range of jobs, organizations, and industries. For use in synthetic validity (see Hogan, Davies, & Hogan, 2007), criterion data in the Hogan archive is categorized into 56 competencies. These competencies represent behaviors that are frequently rated as critical for success in multiple jobs, such as goal setting, teamwork, dependability, interpersonal skills, and trustworthiness.

McClelland and his colleagues (e.g., Boyatzis, 1982) introduced the concept of *competency*, which they defined as performance capabilities that distinguish effective from ineffective personnel. McClelland defined competencies empirically in terms of the requirements of particular jobs in particular contexts. This rigorous approach is rare in a field characterized by ad hoc competency models. We developed our list of competencies

based on an extensive review of over 30 competencies models used by organizations and/or presented in peer review journals.

The studies included are empirical validation studies with either supervisor ratings as criteria or 360 degree feedback ratings as criteria. We categorized ratings by each of our 56 competencies. All data were collected in the English language, although some studies were completed using data collected outside of the US. All studies included one or more types of job analyses during the initial stages of the research. Over 40% of the studies (k = 11) used an evaluation of job competencies that led to the development of competency-based criterion rating scales. Several studies used worker-oriented methods to determine the knowledge, skills, and abilities required for successful job performance. These job analyses generally followed the Goldstein, Zedeck, and Schneider (1993) method for content validation research (cf. R. Hogan & Hogan, 1995, p. 75). The remaining studies (k =15) used the Job Evaluation Tool. This personality-based job analysis uses questionnaire rating items to profile jobs in terms of the FFM dimensions, derailment characteristics, work group values, and competencies required. Raymark, Schmit, and Guion (1997) describe a similar method for evaluating personality-based job requirements. Although job analysis results are often used to justify predictor measures, these results were used to develop criterion dimensions.

Samples

We identified 26 independent samples (total N = 3,059) from published articles, chapters, technical reports, and dissertations between 1997 and 2008 that were catalogued in our archive. The studies met the following criteria: (a) they used job analysis to estimate personality-based job requirements; (b) they used a concurrent (k = 11) or

predictive (k = 15) validation strategy with working adults; (c) the criteria were content explicit, not just overall job performance, and these were classified reliably by subject matter experts; and (d) the predictor variables were scales of the HDS. We excluded studies using: (a) clinical patients and therapists; (b) undergraduate or graduate students; (c) only self-reported performance criteria; (d) performance criteria other than ratings; (e) only an overall performance criterion; (f) laboratory or assessment center studies; and (g) studies unrelated to work contexts. Studies compiled for the meta-analysis are from occupational samples of managers, executives, and professionals. Both number of studies and sample sizes varied by competency.

Analyses

We used the meta-analytic procedures specified by Hunter and Schmidt (1990) to cumulate results across studies and to assess effect sizes. All studies used zero-order product-moment correlations, which eliminated the need to convert alternative statistics to values of r. Corrections were made for sampling error, unreliability in the measures, and range restriction. Reliability of the personality measures was estimated using within-study coefficient alpha [M = .59; range = .43 (Leisurely) to .68 (Cautious, Colorful)], rather than relying exclusively on the values reported in the 1997 HDS manual. Although some researchers (e.g., Murphy & De Shon, 2000) argue against the use of rater-based reliability estimates, we followed procedures outlined by Barrick and Mount (1991) and Tett et al. (1991), and used the .508 reliability coefficient proposed by Rothstein (1990) as the estimate of the reliability of supervisory ratings of job performance. The frequency-weighted mean of the job performance reliability distribution was .59, which is comparable to the value of .56 reported by Barrick and Mount (1991), and the mean

square root reliability of .76 corresponds to the value of .778 reported by Tett et al. (1991). Also, we computed a range restriction index for HDS scales. Following procedures described by Hunter and Schmidt (1990), we divided each HDS scale's within-study standard deviation by the standard deviation reported in the HDS Technical Manual. This procedure produced an index of range restriction for each HDS scale within each study, and we used these values to correct each predictor scale for range restriction.

Our procedure uses both negative and positive correlations rather than mean absolute values for averaging correlations. This is the major computational difference between the current analyses and those presented by Tett et al. (1991, p. 712). We did not correct correlation coefficients to estimate validity at the construct level. Although some (e.g., Mount & Barrick, 1995a; Ones, Schmidt, & Viswesvaran, 1994) argue this is a relevant artifact that can be corrected, we believe it is premature to estimate the validity of the perfect construct when there is no firm agreement on the definition of the perfect construct.

We used meta-analysis to examine relationships between scores on the Diligent scale and each competency. Meta-analysis averages findings from multiple studies examining relationships between similar variables. The procedure controls for error due to sampling, measurement, range restriction, and potential moderating variables and provides a best estimate of these relationships across jobs and organizations (Smith & Glass, 1977). Moderators represent other job or organizational characteristics that affect the relations under examination.

We used procedures outlined by Hunter and Schmidt (2004), who argue that differences in a test's validity across studies reflect statistical artifacts (e.g., sampling

deficiency) and measurement problems (e.g., predictor/criterion unreliability, range restriction) rather than other characteristics unique to specific jobs or situations. These meta-analytic procedures demonstrate that correlations between performance measures and cognitive ability tests (Schmidt & Hunter, 1977), biographical data inventories (Schmidt & Rothstein, 1994), personality inventories (Barrick & Mount, 1991; Barrick, Mount, & Gupta, 2003; Hogan & Holland, 2003; Hough, 1992; Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002; Salgado, 1997, 1998; Tett, Jackson, & Rothstein, 1991), assessment center exercises (Arthur, Day, McNelly, & Edens, 2003; Gaugler, Rosenthal, Thornton, & Benson, 1987), and situational judgment tests (McDaniel, Morgeson, Finnegan, Campion, & Braverman, 2001) generalize across jobs and organizations.

Results

Data for all three rater types were available for 37 competencies, of which 18 produced at least one significant outcome, which is significantly higher than one would expect due to chance at a $p < .05$ alpha level. Table 1 presents the results for competencies with at least one significant outcome.

[Insert Table 1 about here]

As shown in Table 1, scores on the HDS Diligent scale were positively related to supervisory ratings of initiative, peer ratings of both initiative and meets goals, and self-report ratings for all 18 competencies included in the table except for stress tolerance. Furthermore, HDS Diligent scores were negatively related to supervisory ratings of financial acumen, motivating others, negotiation, risk management, stress tolerance, and valuing diversity. They were also negatively related to peer ratings of financial acumen,

leadership, and risk management. There were no significant negative relationships with self-report ratings.

Discussion

We found that perfectionism demonstrated both positive and negative relationships with multiple competencies. The majority of self-report performance ratings were positively correlated with perfectionism, indicating that perfectionists tend to view themselves as good performers across a variety of work areas. In contrast, the direction of the relationships varied by competency for both supervisor and peer ratings, although the majority of significant relationships were negative.

To varying magnitudes, all three sources tended to agree that perfectionists show above average initiative and service orientation. Even more interesting, however, is areas where the direction of the relationships changed according to rater source. For example, perfectionists tend to rate themselves high on financial acumen, indicating that they are good at working with equations, understanding financial information, and forecasting future business and market trends. Supervisors and peers both disagree, demonstrating much less confidence in the financial acumen of perfectionists. The same general pattern can be found for dependability, leadership, risk management, and valuing diversity. These results indicate that, in many cases, what perfectionists view as strengths, others tend to view as problem areas.

In general, results for this study confirm previous research on perfectionism when examined in relationship to specific job ratings. From the perspective of supervisors and peers, perfectionism is viewed as producing both positive and negative outcomes. Individuals who are high on perfectionism measures, however, tend to view themselves

in a very positive light. In other words, what perfectionists see as positive personal characteristics are often viewed by others as neutral, or even negative.

References

Alden, L.E., Ryder, A.G., & Mellings, T.M.B. (2002). Perfectionism in the Context of Social Fears: Toward a Two-Component Model. In G.L. Flett & P.L. Hewitt, (Eds.). *Perfectionism: Theory, Research and Treatment.* (pp. 373-391) Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Ashby, J., Bieschke, K., & Slaney, R. (1997, August). *Multidimensional perfectionism and career decision-making self-efficacy.* Poster presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.

Antony, M.M., Bieling, P.J., Cox, B.J., Enns, M.W., & Swinson, R.P. (1998). Psychometric properties of the 42-Item and 21-Item versions of the depression anxiety stress scales in clinical groups and a community sample. *Psychological Assessment, 10*, 176-181.

Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The Big-Five personality dimensions and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 1-26.

Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K. & Gupta, R. (2003). Meta-Analysis of the relationship between the Five-Factor model of personality and Holland's occupational types. *Personnel Psychology, 56*, 45-74.

Blankstein, K.R., & Dunkley, D.M. (2002). Evaluative concerns, self-critical, and personal standards perfectionism: A structural equation modeling strategy. In G.L. Flett & P.L. Hewitt, (Eds.). *Perfectionism: Theory, Research and Treatment.* (pp 285-315). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Blankstein, K.R., & Winkworth, G.R. (2004). Dimensions of perfectionism and levels of attributions for grades: Relations with dysphoria and academic performance. *Journal of Rational-Emotive and Cognitive-Behavior Therapy, 22,* 271-299.

Boyatzis, R. E. (1982). *The competent manager: A model for effective performance*. New York: Wiley.

Broday, S. F. (1988). Perfectionism and millon basic personality patterns. *Psychological Reports, 63,* 791-794.

Burns, L.R., & Fedewa, B.A. (2005). Cognitive styles: links with perfectionistic thinking. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38,* 103-113.

Conn, S. R., & Rieke, M. L. (1994). *The 16PF fifth edition technical manual*. Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.

Flett, G.L., & Hewitt, P.L. (2002). *Perfectionism: Theory, Research & Treatment.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Flett, G.L., Hewitt, P.L., Blankstein, K.R., & O'Brien, S. (1991). Perfectionism and learned resourcefulness in depression and self esteem. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12.*61-68.

Flett, G.L., Hewitt, P.L., & De Rosa, T. (1996). Dimension of perfectionism, psychosocial adjustment, and social skills. *Personality and Individual Differences, 20,* 143-150.

Flett, G. L., Hewitt, P. L., & Dyck, D. G. (1989). Self-oriented perfectionism, neuroticism, and anxiety. *Personality and Individual Differences, 10,* 731-735.

Frost, R. O., Heimbergm 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., Lahart, C.M., & Rosenblate, R. (1991). The development of perfectionism: A study of daughters and their parents. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 15,* 469-489.

Frost, R.O., & Marten, P.A. (1990). Perfectionism and evaluative threat. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 14,* 559-572.

Frost, R.O., Marten, P., Lahart, C.M., & Rosenblate, R. (1990). The dimensions of perfectionism. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 14,* 449-468.

Frost, R.O., Turcotte, T.A., Heimberg, R.G., Mattia, J.I., Holt, C.S., & Hope, D.A. (1995). Reactions to mistakes among subjects high and low in perfectionistic concern over mistakes. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 19,* 195-205.

Goldstein, I. L., Zedeck, S., & Schneider, B. (1993). An exploration of the job analysis-content validity process. In N. Schmitt, W. Borman, & Associates (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 3-34). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Gough, H. G. (1975). *Manual for the California Psychological Inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Greenspon, T. S. (2000). "Health perfectionism" is an oxymoron! Reflections on the psychology of perfectionism and the sociology of science. *Journal of Secondary Gifted Education, 11,* 197-208.

Hamachek, D. E. (1978). Psychodynamics of normal and neurotic perfectionism. *Psychology, 15,* 27-33.

Hewitt, P.L., Caelian, C.F., Flett, G.L., Sherry, S.B., Collins, L., & Flynn, C.A. (2002). Perfectionism in children: Associations with depression, anxiety, and anger. *Personality and Individual Differences, 32,* 1049-1061.

Hewitt, P. L., & Dyck, D. G. (1986). Perfectionism, stress, and vulnerability to depression. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 10,* 137-142.

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.

Hewitt, P.L., & Flett, G.L. (2002). Perfectionism and stress processes in psychopathology. In G.L. Flett & P.L. Hewitt, (Eds.), *Perfectionism: Theory, Research and Treatment.* (pp. 255-284) Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Hewitt, P.L., Flett, G.L., & Blankstein, K.R. (1991). Perfectionism and neuroticism in psychiatric patients and college students. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12,* 273-279.

Hogan, J., Davies, S., & Hogan, R. (2007). Generalizing personality-based validity evidence. In S. M. McPhail (Ed.), *Alternative validation strategies* (pp. 181-229). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (1997). *Hogan Development Survey manual.* Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems.

Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2009). *Hogan Development Survey manual* (2nd ed.). Tulsa, OK: Hogan Press.

Hogan, R., Hogan, J., & Warrenfeltz, R. (2007). *The Hogan Guide: Interpretation and use of Hogan inventories.* Tulsa, OK: Hogan Assessment Systems.

Hogan, J., & Holland, B. (2003). Using theory to evaluate personality and job-performance relations: A socioanalytic perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88,* 100-112.

Hough, L. M. (1992). The "Big Five" personality variables—construct confusion: Description versus prediction. *Human Performance, 5,* 139-156.

Hunter, J. E., & Schmidt, F. L. (2004). *Methods of meta-analysis: Correcting error and bias in research findings* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Judge, T.A., Bono, J.E., Ilies, R., & Gerhardt, M.W. (2002). Personality and leadership: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 87,* 765-780.

Kobori, O., Yamagata, S., & Kijima, N. (2005). The relationship of temperament to multidimensional perfectionism trait. *Personality and Individual Differences, 38.* Pg 203-211.

Mount, M. K., & Barrick, M. R. (1995a). The big five personality dimensions: Implications for research and practice in human resources management. In G. R. Ferris (Ed.), *Research in Personnel and Human Resources Management* (vol. 13, pp. 153-200). JAI Press.

Murphy, K. R., & DeShon, R. (2000). Interrater correlations do not estimate the reliability of job performance ratings. *Personnel Psychology,* 53(4), 873-900.

Ones, D. S., Schmidt, F. L., & Viswesvaran, C. (1994, April). *Examination of construct validity with linear composites and generalizability coefficient corrected correlations*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Society for industrial and Organizational Psychology, Nashville, TN.

Pacht, A. R. (1984). Reflections on perfection. *American Psychologist, 39*, 386-390.

Parker, W. D. (1997). An empirical typology of perfectionism in academically talented children. *American Educational Research Journal, 34*, 545-562.

Peters, C. (5/3/2009). *Perfectionism.* http://www.nexus.edu.au/teachstud/gat/peters.htm.

Ram, A. (2005). *The relationship of positive and negative perfectionism to academic achievement, achievement motivation, and well-being in tertiary students.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation.

Raymark, P. H., Schmit, M. J., & Guion, R. M. (1997). Identifying potentially useful personality constructs for employee selection. *Personnel Psychology*, 50, 723-736.

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.

Riley, C., & Shafran, R. (2005). Clinical perfectionism: A preliminary qualitative analysis. *Behavioral and Cognitive Psychotherapy, 33*, 369-374.

Rothstein, H. R. (1990). Interrater reliability of job performance ratings: Growth to asymptote level with increasing opportunity to observe. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 75*, 322-327.

Salgado, J. F. (1997). The five factor model of personality and job performance in the European community. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82,* 36-43.

Selekman, B. M. (1959, January-February). The balanced scorecard – Measures that drive performance. *Harvard Business Review, 37,* 105-118.

Silverman, L. K. (5/3/2009). *Perfectionism.* http://www.gifteddevelopment.com/Articles/Perfectionism.html.

Slaney, R. B., & Ashby, J. S. (1996). Perfectionists: Study of a criterion group. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 74*, 393-398.

Slaney, R.B., Rice, K.G., & Ashby, J.S. (2002). A Programmatic Approach to Measuring Perfectionism: The Almost Perfect Scales. In G.L. Flett & P.L. Hewitt, (Eds.), *Perfectionism: Theory, Research and Treatment.* (pp. 63-88). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Stumpf, H., & Parker, W.D. (2000). A hierarchical structural analysis of perfectionism and its relation to other personality characteristics. *Personality and Individual Differences, 28,* 837-852.

Sorotzkin, B. (1985). The quest for perfection: Avoiding guilt or avoiding shame? *Psychotherapy, 22*, 564-571.

Tett, R. P., Jackson, D. N., & Rothstein, M. (1991). Personality measures as predictors of job performance: A meta-analytic review. *Personnel Psychology, 44*, 703-742.

Table 1. Competency correlates with perfectionism

Competency	p – Supervisor	p – Peer	p – Self
Achievement Orientation	.04	.03	.22*
Business Acumen	.00	-.01	.22*
Dependability	-.11	-.19	.16*
Financial Acumen	-.18*	-.20*	.38*
Initiative	.10*	.07*	.22*
Interpersonal Skills	-.01	.00	.16*
Leadership	-.02	-.06*	.19*
Meets Goals	.01	.16*	.13*
Motivates Others	-.06*	-.03	.18*
Negotiation	-.08*	-.03	.14*
Planning & Organizing	.02	.11	.23*
Quality Orientation	-.02	-.06	.26*
Risk Management	-.13*	-.28*	.15*
Service Orientation	.08*	.02	.10*
Stress Tolerance	-.08*	-.06	.05
Teamwork	.07	.01	.12*
Trustworthiness	-.13	.00	.17*
Values Diversity	-.16*	-.09	.28*

*Denotes significance using a 95% Confidence Interval