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Abstract

In this research, it’s aimed to investigate the relationship between locus of control and perfectionism perception of the public primary school administrators in central districts of Ankara. The target population of the study is composed of public primary school administrators working in Ankara in 2010-2011 academic year. The study group constitutes 391 (selected by stratified sampling method) public primary schools administrators. To gather the required data; “personal information form”, “multidimensional perfectionism” and “multidimensional locus of control scales” were used. The structural validity of the multidimensional perfectionism and locus of control scales were tested by exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis (EFA-CFA). Whether school administrators’ perfectionism and locus of control perceptions differ or not based on their gender and educational levels was analyzed by t test. Whether school administrators’ perfectionism and locus of control perceptions differ or not according to their assignment, age and experience was analyzed by one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) and LSD test was used to determine the source of this difference. Whether locus of control predicts perfectionism perceptions or not multiple regression analysis was used. The significance level was .05 .
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1. Introduction

People are always in search of getting the best for themselves. The search of the best is the result of perfectionism. Most of the people want to achieve the best but unfortunately it is not always possible to be perfect. This is because perfectionism doesn’t have limitations. There is always better than the best and the perfectionist is always in search of how to reach this. The search of perfectionism both improves the person himself/herself and his/her organization in one way and it may impede the progress of the person and the organization in another way. Because of this, to investigate the perfectionism perception of administrators is important for themselves, their workers and the organizations. The aim of this research is to investigate the relationship between perfectionism perception and the locus of control of the primary school administrators. School administrators will be informed about their perfectionism and its effects. In school administrators’ perfectionism, putting forward the role of the locus of control contributes to give suggestions about the subject. Besides, school administrators’ perfectionism is discussed in the area of educational administration.

2. Literature

Perfectionism is one of the important characteristics of human behavior which can change person to person. Through their life, humans see themselves as perfect because of different reasons or they tried to be perfect or they are looking forward to see it in others. In one respect trying to be perfect creates unsatisfied people and it puts them in negative situations, in another respect it can be a way of progress of the person. Naturally, this situation results in the exposure of different point of views.

Some of the people see perfectionism from a positive point of view while, some of the people may not. Actually, perfectionism is a characteristic of personality which involves both the negative and positive sides. While adaptive effects of perfectionism has positive effects in people’s lives (such as; to reach the personal goals, to increase life standards, order, self sufficiency, self respect, etc.) the maladaptive effects of perfectionism has negative effects in human life (such as; anxiety, concern, procrastination, pressure, aggressiveness, anger etc.) As a matter of fact in many studies (Beck, 1976; Chang, 1998; Accordino, Accordino & Slaney, 2000; Flett, Besser, Davis & Hewitt; 2003; Stoeber & Rambow, 2006; Stoeber & Rennert, 2008; Özler & Altun, 2011; Dunkley, Blankstein & Berg, 2011 vb. gibi) the adaptive and maladaptive results have been put forward. Perfectionism is a concept which involves completeness, flawlessness, efficiency (Stoeber, Kobori & Tanno, 2010). To achieve these values a person has to study for them constantly. According to the perfectionism perception, there is always better than the best achieved. Seeking for the best may improve one person but it may result in over challenging himself. As a result of this s/he may exposed to physical or mental health problems.

Although the first studies related to perfectionism have been started on the second half of the twentieth century by Adler, 1956; Ellis, 1962; Missildine, 1963; Horney, 1970 the leading studies have been done especially by Burns, 1980; Frost, Marten, Lahart & Rosenblate, 1990; Hewitt & Flett, 1991 on the last quarter of the twentieth century. According to traditional point of view perfectionism is accepted as negative and unidimensional (Burns, 1980; Pacht, 1984). This view investigates the perfectionism pathologically. As a matter of fact, unidimensional view focuses on self oriented consciousness of person (Broday, 1988; Halgin & Leahy, 1989; Blatt, 1995). Even though, previous studies related to perfectionism handled it unidimensionally, the recent studies (Frost, Marten, Lahart & Rosenblate, 1990; Hewitt & Flett, 1991; Slaney, Mobley, Trippi, Ashby & Johnson, 2001; Hill, Huelsman, Furr, Kibler, Vicente & Kennedy, 2004; Stöber, Otto & Stoll, 2004 vb. gibi) handled perfectionism multidimensionally and multifaceted. Frost & the others (1990) put forward six dimensions; (1) perfectionistic personal standards, (2) concern over mistakes, (3) doubts about action, (4) parental expectations, (5) parental criticism and (6) order which they find important to understand perfectionism. Stoeber (1998), suggested that Frost & the others (1990)’s multidimensional scale can be handled with four dimensions; and these dimensions are; (1) concern over mistakes and doubt about action, (2) parental expectation and criticism, (3) perfectionistic personal standards, and (4) order. Though Purton, Antony & Swinson (1999) claimed that multidimensional scale can be as the following; (1) concern over mistakes, (2) perceived parental pressure, (3) achieving goals. Hewitt & Flett (1991) developed a different multidimensional facet of perfectionism scale. In their scale perfectionism is examined under three dimensions; (1) self- oriented, (2) others oriented, and (3) socially prescribed perfectionism. Slaney, Mobley, Trippi, Ashby &
Johnson (1996) analysed perfectionism under three dimensions; (1) perfectionistic standards, (2) order, and (3) inconsistency. On the other hand Hamachek (1978) examined perfectionism under two dimensions; neurotic and the normal. Slade & Owens (1998) analyzed as a two processed model such as positive and negative dimensions.

As it is explained above perfectionism has been handled by different researchers with different approaches. However, the scales (such as Frost & the others, 1990; Hewitt & Flett, 1991; Slaney & the others, 1996; Hill & the others, 2004; Slaney, Rice, Mobley, Trippi & Ashby, 2001) which accessed by the researcher perfectionism can be handled by two dimensions. These are positive and negative or adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism. Hence Terry-Short, Owens, Slade ve Dewey (1995) examined perfectionism as positive and negative, Hill & the others (1997) with Beiling & the others (2004) examined as affirmative and negative, Cox & the others (2002) examined as adaptive and maladaptive. Perfectionism’s positive, normal, healthy or adaptive dimensions involve perfectionistic strivings, self-oriented perfectionism, high personal standards, and others oriented perfectionism etc. relate to positive characteristics and procedures and consequences. Perfectionisms’ negative, neurotic, unhealthy and maladaptive dimensions involve concern over mistakes, doubts about action, socially prescribed perfectionism, and perceived pressure to be perfect, the different emotions between high expectations and results, negative reaction to imperfection etc. are related to negative characteristics and procedures and consequences.

It is obvious that there is a difference between adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism. However, the main difference might be the evaluation of their outcome of their efforts. According to Adler (1956); adaptive perfectionists are the ones who profit the perfect but maladaptive perfectionists are the one who strive to show their own characteristics. Hamachek (1978) described adaptive perfectionists as people who are striving for high standards and receiving satisfying results whereas he described neurotic perfectionist as someone who can not control the results of their actions. To Ellis (1962) maladaptive perfectionist is a person who has irrational beliefs. For Halgin & Leahy (1989) maladaptive perfectionists’ has unhealthy high perfectionism because of their inadequate ability of evaluating the consequences. The conceptual difference between adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism recalls the concept of locus of control (Perisamy & Ashby, 2002).

As a personality characteristic; locus of control has the tendency to perceive that an individual believes the results are the outcomes of his behavior or controlled by external forces such as fate, luck, chance or the others. Those with an internal locus of control perceive the outcome of events to be contingent on their own actions, whereas those with an external locus of control perceive the outcome of events to be contingent with external factors (Rotter, 1966). If a person puts the responsibility of his actions to other powers it is called an external control. If a person takes the responsibility of himself/herself it is called internal control (Levenson, 1974). Hence, the people with an internal control have more to say about their own lives than the ones with external control. One persons’ locus of control affects his/her perfectionism. In fact, the person has the tendency to be perfect naturally innate. However this perfectionism tendency can arise and descend by the effect of environment or the person himself.

Because of this reason, it is important to reveal one persons’ internal or external locus of controls’ effect on his perfectionism. Despite the clear conceptual link between locus of control and perfectionism (Perisamy ve Ashby, 2002) the researcher of this study could identify no studies about the administrators. This study was designed to investigate the relationship between locus of control and perfectionism. School administrators’ multidimensional perfectionism behaviours and attitude can increase or decrease their efficiency. To reach the defined aims of the schools depends on the school administrators’ effective management. Although school administrators’ aim to manage in schools effectively or try to be perfect or he is expected to be perform perfective, he may encounter some hinderances such as politics, executives, personal characteristics, teachers, students, parents, non-governmental organizations, chance, luck, other powers etc. For this reason, a persons’ having internal or external locus of control is important for himself/herself and his/her organization. Hence, some of the researchers (Flett, Hewitt, Blankstein & Dynin, 1994; Hill, McIntire & Bcharach, 1997; Perisamy & Ashby, 2002; Ganske & Ashby, 2005) investigated the personal factors related to perfectionism to reveal the factors and differences which affects the perfectionism.

Among the sources that the researcher reached there weren’t any studies about the relationship between perfectionism and locus of control of school administrators. It is important for the researcher that there is no study in such an important area. Since there is no research on school administrators which is an important factor in the school efficiency and the concept of perfectionism in management which is desired, observed and expected by the people,
the researcher decided to study in this area. Therefore, the investigator intends to reveal the perfectionism of administrators, raise awareness among them and review their perception of perfectionism with this study.

3. Methods

The study which is a descriptive survey was carried out with causal comparative and correlational, in quantitative method which aimed to reveal the relationship between school administrators’ perceptional perfectionism and locus of control (Borg & Gall, 1989; Büyüköztürk, Çakmak, Akgün, Karadeniz & Demirel, 2008; Balcı, 2009). In this research perception of perfectionism of public primary school administrators and the relationship between perception of perfectionism and locus of control were aimed to be defined with the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (Hewitt ve Flett, 1991) and Multidimensional Locus of Control Scale (Levenson, 1974). Validity and reliability studies of the scales which were translated into Turkish were done by the researcher. Kaiser – Meyer-Olkin (KMO) and Barlett’s test of sphericity were used to determine whether factor analysis was suitable for the independent variables. The KMO were found to be .88 for the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale and .77 for Multidimensional Locus of Control Scale, which suggests that the correlation matrixes were appropriate for factor analysis. Barlett’s test of sphericity also indicated that the factor models were appropriate for each scales.

The structural validity of the multidimensional perfectionism and multidimensional locus of control scales were tested by exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis (EFA-CFA). Principal component factor analysis indicated that each scale had three subdimensions as their original forms. In the factor analysis; the eigenvalues of factors were found higher than 1 for each subscale. Factor loadings of items that settled at each subscale of MPS with three factors varied between .32 and .81. [(Self oriented perfectionism, 13 items, factor loading between .32 - .81), (others oriented perfectionism, 6 items, factor loading between .53 - .70) and (socially prescribed perfectionism, 5 items, factor loading between .64 - .79)]. Factor loadings of items that settled at each subscale of MLOCS with three factors varied between .42 and .78. ; (internal locus of control, 8 items, factor loading between .42 - .78), (others based locus of control, 6 items, factor loading between .46 - .71) and (chance based locus of control, 5 items, factor loading between .48- .77)]. Each of the subdimensions of perfectionism scale explained over the 40 % of total variance and each of the subdimensions of locus of control scale explained over the 30 % of total variance. The indices calculated for the fit of MPS’ three factor structures to the data are as follows: $X^2$ (df=249) =470.32; $X^2$/df=1.88; CFI=0.96; SMSR=0.077; RMSEA= 0.068. When CFA results were evaluated according to these criteria, they indicated that the model is good. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were calculated to determine the reliability of the MPS (Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale). The calculated alpha coefficient is .86 for Self Oriented Perfectionism, .69 for Others Oriented Perfectionism, .78 for Socially Prescribed Perfectionism and, .90 for whole scale. The indices calculated for the fit of MLOCS’ three factor structures to the data are as follows: $X^2$ (df=149) =241.04; $X^2$/df= 1.62; CFI=0.92; SMSR=0.078; RMSEA= 0.057. When CFA results were evaluated according to these criteria, they indicated that the model is good. The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients were calculated to determine the reliability of the MLOCS (Multidimensional Locus of Control Scale). The calculated alpha coefficient is .77 for internal locus of control; .60 for others based locus of control and, .62 for chance based locus of control and, 78 for whole scale.

The target population was composed of public primary school administrators (from 584 primary school, 1682 administrators) working in Ankara in 2010-2011 educational year. The sample was selected by stratified sampling method and the samples of schools were chosen by random sample technique (Karasar, 1982). Scales were given to 391 administrators in 226 primary schools and all the scales were received by the researcher. Unfortunately, during the analysis some of the questionnaires were found invalid because of missing answers and improper filling. As a result five questionnaires weren’t included to the research. Finally the sample included a total of 386 administrators. The sample of the administrators were consist of 17 % female (n: 66), 83 % male (n: 320). When the age of participants considered; 13 % of administrators were 35 and less (n: 49); 17 % of the administrators were from 36 to 40 (n: 64); 18 % of the administrators were from 41 to 45 (n: 70); 17 % of administrators were from 46 to 50 (n: 64); 36 % of the administrators were 51 and above (n: 139). 14 % of the administrators were graduates (n: 53); 83 % of the administrators were undergraduates (n: 233). 28 % of the administrators had 5 and less years of management experience (n: 106); 20 % of the administrators had 6-10 years of management experience (n: 77); 15 % of the
administrators had 11-15 years of management experience (n: 57); 18 % of the administrators had 16-20 years of management experience (n: 69); 20 % of the administrators are 21 and above (n: 77).

4. Findings and discussion

4.1. Findings and discussions on primary school administrators perception of perfectionism

Among the statements showing primary school administrators self oriented perfectionism; the statement which showed the highest self oriented perfectionism of school principal was 'when I am working on an assignment I will not be content until the work is flawless' (X̄=6,15) and the statement which showed the lowest self oriented perfectionism of school principal was 'I don't have to be flawless in each work that I have done' (X̄=3,88). Among the statements that showed primary school administrators others oriented perfectionism; the statement which showed the highest perfectionism perception was 'I want the other people do their job in the best way' (X̄=5,90) and the statement which showed the lowest perfectionism was 'I can't stand seeing the other people around me making mistakes' (X̄=4,36). Among the statements that showed primary school administrators socially prescribed perfectionism; the statement which showed the highest perfectionism perception was 'I am always expected to be successful in every work I have done by the people around me' (X̄=5,30) and the statement which showed the lowest perfectionism in 'Even if they don't show me, when I make mistakes the other people around me are embarrassed for me' (X̄=4,40). When the perception of perfectionism examined under the headings of dimensions; the highest one was self oriented perfectionism (X̄=5,44); the second one was others oriented perfectionism (X̄=5,08); and the third one was socially prescribed perfectionism (X̄=4,94).

There was a significant relationship between the gender and the self oriented perfectionism of primary school administrators [t(384) = 2,59; p< .05]. Women's (X̄=73,97); self oriented perfectionism was relatively higher than men's (X̄=70,01). There was not any significant difference between others oriented [t(384) = 1,92; p>.05] and socially prescribed perfectionism [t(384) = .50; p>.05 ] in respect of gender. There was no significant differences among the assignment of administrators in the dimension of self oriented [F (2,383) = 0,423; p>.05] and the other oriented perfectionism [F (2,383) = 1,175; p>.05] whereas socially oriented [F (2,383) = 4,387; p< .05] perfectionism had a meaningful difference. LSD test was used to determine the source of this difference. Vice principal's (X̄=26,61) socially prescribed perfectionism was relatively higher than assistant principal's (X̄=24,06) but there was no significant difference among the principle (X̄=25,14). According to this finding vice principle’s socially prescribed perfectionism was relatively higher than assistant principal. Primary school administrators education, age and experience level didn't make any significant difference in their self oriented; others oriented or socially prescribed perception perfectionism.

4.2. Findings and discussions related to the locus of control of the primary school administrators

While the statement 'As a result of my hard work I get what I want,' showed school administrators high level internal locus of control; the statement; (X̄=4,79) ' Whether I get involved in a car accident or not mostly depends on how good a driver I am.' showed the lowest level internal locus of control (X̄=3,37). The expression;' In order to have my plans work, I make sure that they fit in with the deires of people who have power over me' (X̄=3,88) showed highest level of others based locus of control on school principals; the expression 'If important people were to decide they didn’t like me I probably wouldn’t make many friends (X̄=1,82) ' showed the lowest level of others based locus of control.Among the statements that showed school administrators chance based locus of control; the statement 'I have often found that what is going to happen will happen' (X̄=3,34) shows highest level and the statement 'When I get what I want it’s usually because I’m lucky' (X̄=1,45) showed the lowest level of chance based locus of control. Primary school principals perceived internal locus of control (X̄ = 4,22) at highest level; others based locus of control (X̄ = 2,82) at secondary level and chance based locus of control (X̄ = 2,27) at the lowest level. Primary school administrators' gender, education, assignment, age and experience didn't make any significant difference in their internal locus of control, others and chance based locus of control.
4.3. Findings and discussions related to the relationship between the primary school administrators' perfectionism and locus of control

The correlations of the relationship between the locus of control and perfectionism test results are presented in the Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>SOP</th>
<th>OOP</th>
<th>SPP</th>
<th>ILOC</th>
<th>OBLOC</th>
<th>CBLOC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OOP</td>
<td>.713**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPP</td>
<td>.571**</td>
<td>.616**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILOC</td>
<td>.497**</td>
<td>.403**</td>
<td>.402**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBLOC</td>
<td>.127*</td>
<td>.246**</td>
<td>.302**</td>
<td>.223**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBLOC</td>
<td>.057</td>
<td>.187**</td>
<td>.257**</td>
<td>.112*</td>
<td>.634**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOP: Self Oriented Perfectionism; OOP: Others Oriented Perfectionism; SPP: Socially Prescribed Perfectionism; ILOC: Internal Locus of Control; OBLOC: Others Based Locus of Control; CBLOC: Chance Based Locus of Control; p value .01** & .05*

When the Table 1 inspected a positive and higher level significant correlation between the self oriented perfectionism and others oriented perfectionism ($r= .71; p< .01$), a positive and medium level significant correlation of socially prescribed perfectionism ($r= .57; p< .01$), a positive and medium level significant correlation of internal locus of control ($r= .50; p< .01$), a positive and lower level significant correlation of others based locus of control ($r= .13; p< .05$). There was a positive and medium level significant correlation between the others oriented perfectionism and socially prescribed perfectionism ($r= .62; p< .01$), a positive and medium level significant correlation of internal locus of control ($r= .40; p< .01$), a positive and lower level significant correlation of others based locus of control ($r= .25; p< .01$), a positive and lower level significant correlation of chance based locus of control ($r= .19; p< .01$). There was a positive and medium level significant correlation between social prescribed perfectionism and the internal locus of control ($r= .40; p< .01$), a positive and medium level significant correlation of others based locus of control ($r= .30; p< .01$), a positive and lower level significant correlation of chance based locus of control ($r= .26; p< .01$). There was positive and lower level significant correlation between internal locus of control and others based locus of control ($r= .22; p< .01$), a positive and lower level significant correlation of chance based locus of control ($r= .11; p< .05$). Finally there was a positive and medium level significant correlation between others based locus of control and chance based locus of control ($r= .63; p< .01$).

According to the findings it was found that there were meaningful positive relationships among the dimensions of perfectionism and these were relatively related to positive/healthy dimensions such as self oriented and others oriented perfectionism. Among the locus of control dimensions there were positive and significant relationships, relatively the most powerful relationship was between perceived and chance based locus of controls which were classified as external locus of control. When the relationship between the dimensions of the locus of control and perfectionism examined we can say that relatively the most powerful relationship was between self oriented perfectionism and internal locus of control. In terms of the findings it can be said that when the administrators' self oriented perfectionism increases their internal locus of control increases as well. It means that school administrators self oriented perfectionism is strongly controlled by their perfectionism.

The findings of this research supported the previous research findings. As a matter of fact researchers such as Hewitt & Flett, (1991); Frost & the others, (1993); Wyatt & Gilbert, (1998); Flett, Besser, Davis & Hewitt, (2003); Akkaya, (2007); Mizrak, (2006) ve Flett, Panico & Hewitt, (2011) suggested the positive significant relations among perfectionism dimensions; the positive significant relations among the locus of control dimensions was suggested by Levenson (1974, 1981) and the relationship between the locus of control and perfectionism was suggested by Flett, Hewitt, Blankstein & O'Brien, (1991); Flett, Hewitt, Blankstein & Masher, (1995) ve Perisamy & Ashby, (2002). They claimed that there was a high positive and significant relationship between the internal locus of control and
self oriented perfectionism. Flett, Hewitt, Blankstein & Pickering (1998) were also claimed that there can be a relationship between internal locus of control and self oriented perfectionism.

4.4. Findings and discussions about the results of multiple regressions between Primary School Administrators perfectionism and the locus of control

Self oriented perfectionism and locus of control scale were calculated through the multivariate linear regression analysis, and the results were presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Multivariate Regression Matrix between self oriented perfectionism and the locus of control sub–dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self Oriented Perfectionism</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S(H₀)</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>3.452</td>
<td>.194</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>17.759</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Locus of Control</td>
<td>.461</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>10.81</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others Based Locus of</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.459</td>
<td>.646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance Based Locus of</td>
<td>- .012</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>- .015</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As evidenced in Table 2, multivariate regression analysis results for determining the prediction of the linear combination of internal, others and chance based locus of control regarding the self oriented perfectionism were statistically significant \( R^2=.25; F(3,382) = 41.823; p<0.01 \). It was found that sub-dimensions of the locus of control (internal locus of control, others and chance based locus of control) altogether explained 25% of the changes in self oriented perfectionism. However, when t test related to regression coefficient examined it was found that only internal locus of control dimension (\( β=.493, t_{(385)} =10.81 \ p<.01 \)) significantly predicted the self oriented perfectionism; others based (\( β=.027, t_{(385)} = .459 \ p>.01 \)); and chance based (\( β=-.015, t_{(385)} =.260 \ p>.01 \)) locus of control didn’t predict the self oriented perfectionism significantly. In addition to this, according to standardized regression coefficient (\( β \)) the order of significance of the self oriented perfectionism predictor variable were respectively: internal locus of control, others and chance based locus of control. This result can be interpreted as 75% of the changes in the self oriented perfectionism score can be explained by the other variables.

The findings have shown that, school administrators’ self oriented perfectionism effort depends on them. The relationship between self oriented perfectionism and internal locus of control can be perceived healthy. It can be said that, school administrators’ self oriented perfectionism isn’t restrained by dogmatic beliefs such as chance, luck or fate when they achieve their self oriented perfectionism in their own right or with their own efforts. The administrators who believe that reaching both organizational and personal aims are under their control can be more successful. By using high level of perfectionism efforts and showing low level concern of perfectionism administrators can achieve their own and organisational goals conveniently.

Others oriented perfectionism and locus of control scale were calculated through the multivariate linear regression analysis, and the results are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Multivariate Regression Matrix between others oriented perfectionism and the locus of control sub–dimensions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Others Oriented Perfectionism</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S(H₀)</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.967</td>
<td>.227</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13.068</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Locus of Control</td>
<td>.389</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.369</td>
<td>7.808</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others Based Locus of Control</td>
<td>.117</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>1.969</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance Based Locus of Control</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>1.172</td>
<td>.242</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 3; multivariate regression analysis results for determining the prediction of the linear combination of internal, others and chance based locus of control regarding the others oriented perfectionism were...
statistically significant \[R^2=0.19; F(3;382) = 30.089; p<0.01\]. It explained that independent variables of the locus of control (internal locus of control, others and chance based locus of control) altogether explained 19% of the changes in others oriented perfectionism. However, when t test related to regression coefficient examined it was found that both internal locus of control (\(\beta=0.369, t(385)=7.808\) p<.01) and the others based locus of control (\(\beta=0.119, t(385) = 1.969\) p<.05) significantly predicted the others oriented perfectionism; but chance based (\(\beta=0.070, t(385) = 1.172\) p>.01) locus of control didn’t predict the others oriented perfectionism. In addition to this, according to standardized regression coefficient (\(\beta\)) the order of significance of the others oriented perfectionism predictor variables were respectively: internal locus of control, others and chance based locus of control. This result can be interpreted as 81% of the changes in the others oriented perfectionism score can be explained by the other variables.

According to the findings; it can be said that school administrators’ self oriented perfectionism effort depends on them as well as the other powerful sources which are possibly control (district and provincial director of education, supervisors and parents etc.)

Socially prescribed perfectionism and locus of control scale were calculated through the multivariate linear regression analysis, and the results were presented in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Socially Prescribed Perfectionism</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SHT</th>
<th>(\beta)</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>2.428</td>
<td>2.251</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.687</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Locus of Control (ILOC)</td>
<td>.422</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>7.669</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others Based Locus of Control (OBLOC)</td>
<td>.157</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>2.398</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chance Based Locus of Control (CBLOC)</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>2.153</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As indicated in Table 4; multivariate regression analysis results for determining the prediction of the linear combination of internal, others and chance based locus of control regarding the socially prescribed perfectionism were statistically significant \([R^2=0.22; F(3;382) = 35.625; p<0.01]\). It was found that independent variables of the locus of control (internal locus of control, others and chance based locus of control) altogether explained 22% of the changes in socially prescribed perfectionism. When t test related to regression coefficient examined it was found that all the dimensions; internal (\(\beta=0.356; t(385)=7.669\); others (\(\beta=0.143; t(385) = 2.398\); and chance based (\(\beta=0.126; t(385)=2.153\); p<.01) locus of control significantly predicted the socially prescribed perfectionism. According to standardized regression coefficient (\(\beta\)) the order of significance of the socially prescribed perfectionism predictor variables were respectively: internal locus of control, others and chance based locus of control. This result can be interpreted as 78% of the changes in the socially prescribed perfectionism score can be explained by the other variables.

It can be said according to the findings, school administrators’ socially prescribed perfectionism effort depends on them; the other powerful sources which are possibly control (district and provincial director of education, supervisors and parents etc.) and also dogmatic beliefs such as chance, luck or fate which are considered as ineffective. If the administrators’ socially prescribed perfectionism makes them reach positive conclusions it can be attributed to them; if they reach negative conclusions it can be attributed to others; if no one is in charge it can be attributed to dogmatic factors such as luck, chance and fate etc.

5. Conclusion

At the end of the research, it was observed that school administrators perfectionism perceptions was above the average and their self oriented perfectionism was relatively higher than other perfectionism dimensions (others oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism) and their internal locus of control was relatively higher than the others locus of control dimensions (others and chance based locus of control). When the effects of demographic variables on school administrators’ perfectionism and locus of control perceptions were investigated, it was found out that women’s self oriented perfectionism perceptions was higher than men’s; vice principals’ socially prescribed
perfectionism perceptions was significantly higher than assistant principals’. It was observed that between school administrators’ perfectionism and locus of control positive significant relations existed and relatively the highest relation was between self oriented perfectionism and internal locus of control. It was also observed that the only predictor of self oriented perfectionism was internal locus of control; others oriented perfectionism predictors are internal and others based locus of control; on the other side socially prescribed perfectionism predictors were all dimensions of locus of control.
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