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ABSTRACT The aim of the paper is to examine the relationship between perfectionism and anger in university students’ sample. The paper is a survey model composed of 725 students. The data used to determine the individual qualities in the paper are Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale, Multidimensional Anger Scale and ‘Individual Information Inventory’. In this study, it was discovered that social dimensional perfectionism of male students’ perfectionism level is found expressively higher than those of females. In other sub-dimensions, no remarkable differences were found. According to gender, when the feeling of not being taken seriously sub-dimension considered, it was also discovered that the anger level of female students has been found higher than male students’ and on the other hand concerning the unconcern behavior sub-dimension, anger of male students has been found higher than those of females. The researcher also discovered that there is a positive and significant correlation between students’ perfectionism and anger.

INTRODUCTION

Perfectionism is a personality factor that is generally defined as adherence to excessively high standards (Frost et al. 1990; Hewitt et al. 1989; Hewitt and Flett 1991b). Researchers who have emphasized on different aspects of perfectionism have included in the core of their definitions the fact that perfectionism involves high personal standards (Slaney et al. 2002).

With both its adaptive and maladaptive aspects, perfectionism is a multifaceted dimension of personality. High personal standards and setting high personal goals for oneself belong to the adaptive dimension of perfectionism whereas self-oriented perfectionism is maladaptive and involves constantly criticizing the self and having concerns over others’ criticisms and expectations (Blatt et al. 1982).

It has been identified in the studies (Rimm 2007; Silverman 2007) that have been conducted in the past fifteen years that perfectionism has a multidimensional nature and is to a large extent correlated with adaptive results. On the other hand, the focal point of most of the studies conducted in the previous years had been concerned with “the insidious nature of perfectionism” (Pacht 1984), its “destructiveness” (Blatt 1995), or maladaptive consequences of perfectionism (Flett and Hewitt 2002). According to Hall (2006), perfectionism may result in negative conditions such as developing a maladaptive impact, deterioration in physical health and emergence of burn-out. Flett and Hewitt (2005), observed that the risks of perfectionism manifest themselves through various factors such as anxiety, fear of failure, self-respect, performance of success, and self-presentation concerns.

Norman et al. (1998), sees a perfectionist person who may exhibit sadness and various psycho-pathological conditions as a result of their thoughts. Perfectionism has been found to be correlated with diverse personality traits and psychological disorders based on the sample collected from university students. It was found to be associated with, according to Barrow and Moore (1983), concerns over being evaluated or judged, stress, depression, guilt, procrastination and inadequate study (Gould et al. 1996; Haines et al. 1996; Preusser et al. 1994; Scott 2007), eating disorders (Chan and Owens 2006; Cooper et al. 1985; Mizes 1988), and burnout (Mitchelson and Burns 1998). According to Dakanalis et al. (2014) maladaptive perfectionism served as mediator between both insecure attachment patterns and eating disorder symptomatology. It also interacted with insecure attachment to predict higher levels of eating disorder symptoms-hijghtlighting the importance of both insecure attachment patterns and maladaptive aspects of perfectionism as treatment targets.

According to Hamachek’s theory (1978), certain components of perfectionism are related with adaptivity (Frost et al. 1993). Moreover, Flett and Hewitt (2002) presented findings indicating that
perfectionism has a normal (adaptive) aspect. On the other hand, pure personal standards perfectionism (high standards/low concerns) was generally associated with the highest capacity for emotion regulation and pure evaluative concerns perfectionism (low standards/high concerns) with the lowest (Hill and Davis 2014).

There are two scales that are widely used to measure perfectionism, which is defined as a multidimensional structure and both of these scales are called Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (Frost et al. 1990; Hewitt and Flett 1991b).

Researchers used Hewitt and Flett’s (1991b) scale in present paper. Three fundamental dimensions of perfectionism are as follows: firstly, self-oriented perfectionism involves requirements for perfection of the self; secondly, other-oriented perfectionism involves requirements for perfection of their values; thirdly, socially-prescribed perfectionism involves others’ expectations of the self for him/her to be perfect (Hewitt and Flett 2001).

Perfectionism, and a number of different models are discussed aiming to explain how perfectionism develops, and adolescence are key periods for the development of perfectionism (Stoeber and Childs 2011). Recently, a paper investigated the effects of two forms of perfectionism - self-oriented perfectionism and socially-prescribed perfectionism - on university students’ reactions to repeated failure (versus repeated success) examining three negative emotions: anxiety, depression, and anger. Results showed that socially prescribed perfectionism predicted increased anxiety, depression, and anger after initial failure and further increased anger after repeated failure (Stoeber 2014). According to Sherry et al. (2014) self-critical perfectionism (a lower-order, narrow-band personality trait) may be a unique and a specific lower-order personality trait that is neither captured by nor redundant with neuroticism (a higher-order, broad-band personality trait). Self-critical perfectionism may represent part of the premorbid personality of individuals vulnerable to depressive symptoms.

Uz-Bas (2011) examined the relationship of the dimensions of perfectionism with anxiety, life satisfaction, and academic achievement, and to determine whether dimensions of perfectionism significantly predict anxiety, overall life satisfaction, and academic achievement. Results obtained from the study revealed that sensitivity to mistakes and need for admiration were significantly and positively correlated with anxiety, while contingent self-esteem and compulsiveness were significantly and positively correlated with all life satisfaction domains, overall life satisfaction, and academic achievement.

It was been proven that people are living beings that seek “pleasure”. All kinds of conditions, phenomena or persons that will prevent them from taking pleasure are the foremost causes of their feelings of anger (Baltas and Baltas 1993). At the same time, anger is an emotional reaction that occurs as a result of stress, threat or injury and characterized by certain facial expressions. Anger is an emotional state that takes place due to a perception of threat (Peurifoy 2002). Anger may lead to aggressiveness but it is not aggression. A person may be angry but does not act aggressively. Not all fits of anger lead to aggressive reactions (DiGiuseppe and Tafrate 2007). However, anger is a predictor of violent behaviors involving doing damage to property, a local assault and violation (Kroner and Reddon 1995).

At the same time, anger is a social emotion and arises from different assessments of social conditions or relationships, from perceptions of being judged unfairly or perception of violation of social communication (Denham and Bultemeier 1993; Julius et al. 1986).

Anger can be functional or dysfunctional. Adaptive functions of anger are associated with a developmental point of view. Human emotions have developed in the course of time to inform people about situations involving danger (DiGiuseppe and Tafrate 2007). Adaptive reactions of anger are healthy and functional reactions and they seek ways of protection against dangers and try to solve problems. Dysfunctional anger, on the other hand, can be identified as individuals’ aggression towards friendly or good people (DiGiuseppe and Tafrate 2007).

However, some theoreticians believe that anger is a maladaptive attempt that occurs as a results of conflict and personal disturbance in coping with a stressful environment (Cox et al. 1999). Healthy anger differs from unhealthy anger in how emotions serve the individual’s needs successfully (Grieger 1986). For example, if a person gives an angry response to a colleague’s rude comment about a certain topic, and the situation is solved positively, then the anger reac-
tion is healthy. If, however, he hits the rude colleague with a fist, this is a dangerous situation and this anger reaction is unhealthy (Lench 2004).

In addition to these, internal anger is characterized by behavioral frustration and is defined as the tendency to suppress emotions and behaviors (Deffenbacher et al. 1996; Smits and Kuppens 2005). Sufferers exhibit negative behaviors such as guilt and depression (Spielberger et al. 1995). External anger, on the other hand, is related with behavioral interaction and generally involves both direct and indirect physically or verbally aggressive behaviors exhibited towards an object or person present in the environment (Bridewell and Chang 1997; Kuppens et al. 2004).

Anger is a feeling that manifests itself in various dimensions. These dimensions are as follows; the anger symptoms subdimension is the dimension in which physical symptoms of anger such as loss of control, clenching the teeth, headache or not being able to think logically appear; of the anger eliciting situations, the subdimension of not being taken seriously is the dimension which appears when an individual’s ideas are not valued, when their deeds are not appreciated and when they feel they are not valued highly; of the anger eliciting situations, the exposure to unfair treatment subdimension is the one which appears when the individual is insulted, when they are blamed for something they did not do or when they are deceived; of the anger eliciting situations, the subdimension of being criticized is the one which appears when an individual is criticized and rebuked in front of others and when they are invariably accused regarding the same subject; the revenge reactions subdimension of the interpersonal anger dimension is the subdimension of anger concerned with which of the behaviors such as feeling guilty, destroying, threatening and punishing individuals demonstrate their anger when they encounter a person who annoys them (Balkaya and Sahin 2003).

The passive-aggressive reactions subdimension of the interpersonal anger dimension is the subdimension that indicates, when an individual encounters a person who annoys them, with which of the behaviors such as not talking to them, defending the self, reacting and not taking seriously they will react; the introverted reactions subdimension of the interpersonal anger dimension is the subdimension that is intended to determine, when an individual encounters a person who annoys them, with which of the behaviors they such as laughing, ignoring and disregarding they will react (Balkaya and Sahin 2003). The literal meaning of self-realization is “full productivity” and means individuals’ using and developing their capacity to the full in every way (Yesilyaprak 2000). Individuals who always wish for the better and strive to go a step further on the way to self-realization lead their lives with a view to reaching perfection. However, they may encounter some obstacles on the way and experience feelings of anger as a result of these obstacles. For example, perfectionist individuals with regard to social order feel anger towards people who they think have unrealistic standards (Koptagel-Iilal 1991). Anger showed a positive association with perfectionism (Aruguete et al. 2012; Macedo et al. 2015; Ongen 2009).

Objectives

In the light of these, the purpose of this paper is at determining whether there is a significant difference in subdimensions of perfectionism according to gender in university students, and whether there is a significant difference in subdimensions of anger according to gender in university students, as well as whether there is a significant relationship between perfectionism and anger in university students.

METHODOLOGY

Population and Sample

The population of this paper consists of students receiving education at different faculties of Selcuk University. The target population of the paper includes Education, Vocational Education, Science, Dentistry and Fine Arts Faculties of Selcuk University. The research sample was selected using the random cluster sampling method from among the 1st, 2nd, 3rd and 4th year students attending various departments of
these faculties PCG (Psychological Counseling and Guidance), Art Teaching, Statistics, Interior Architecture, Dentistry, Preschool Teaching) in the 2009-2010 autumn semester. The research sample consists of a total of 725 students, of whom 507 are female whereas 218 are male. Distribution of the students constituting the sample according to certain variables is given in Table 1 (Distribution of the students participating in the paper according to certain variables).

Table 1: Distribution of the students participating in the paper according to certain variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21-23</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24-...</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>26.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socio-economic</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Middle</td>
<td>652</td>
<td>89.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Psychological</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Counseling and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Being</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended</td>
<td>Art Teaching</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistics</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dentistry</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preschool Teaching</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interior Architecture</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>1.50-2.00</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point</td>
<td>2.01-2.50</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>33.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.51-3.00</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.01-3.50</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.51-4.00</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be understood from an examination of Table 1, the distribution of the students participating in the paper according to certain variables shows that about one third of the university students who participated in the paper (30%) are male students while two-thirds (70%) are female. When the university students are investigated in terms of their ages, it is observed that about 42% of them are in the age range of 18–20, 51% are within 21–23 age range, whereas 7% are 24 years old or above. When they are examined according to their years at university, it is seen that 26% of the university students are in the first year, 28% in the second year, 25% in the third year and 20% are in the fourth year. As far as the socio-economic levels of the students are concerned, 4.5% of them are of low socio-economic level, 90% are of middle socio-economic level and 5.5% are of high socio-economic level. When the university students are examined in terms of the departments they attend, it is seen that 27% of them attend PCG (Psychological Counseling and Guidance), 12% art teaching, 12% statistics, 23% dentistry, 17% preschool teaching, and 9% attend interior architecture departments. When they are investigated in terms of their cumulative grade point averages, it is seen that 5% of the university students have a CGPA of 1.50–2.00, 34% 2.01–2.50, 37% 2.51–3.00, 18% 3.01–3.50, and 5% 3.51–4.00.

Data Collection Tools

In this paper, “Multi Dimensional Perfectionism Scale” was used to determine the students’ perfectionism scores while “Multi Dimensional Anger Scale” was used to determine their anger scores. “Personal Information Form” was prepared by the researcher in order to obtain information about the personal qualities of the university students (gender, age, year at university (class level), department, cumulative grade point average). Information about these data collection tools used in the paper is given below.

Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale

This scale, which was prepared by Hewitt and Flett (1991b) to measure adults’ perfectionist personality traits, is composed of three subscales, namely self-oriented perfectionism, other-oriented perfectionism and socially-prescribed perfectionism, each of which consists of fifteen items. The items are scored using a 7-point likert type scale (1= totally agree, 7= totally disagree). The test was adapted to Turkish by Oral (1999) and administered to 333 university students. It was seen as a result of the factor analysis that the three factors accounted for 37.5% of the total variance. The Cronbach Alpha internal consistency coefficient of the scale was found to be .91 for the self-oriented perfectionism” sub-scale, .80 for the “other-oriented perfectionism” sub-scale and .73 for the “socially-
prescribed perfectionism” sub-scale. The reliability study of the scale was repeated by Buyukbayraktar (2011). The results that were obtained are in parallel to the findings of Oral (1999), Dinc (2001) and Mizrak (2006).

**Multi-dimensional Anger Scale**

In the first dimension of the “Multi-dimensional Anger Scale”, which was prepared by Balkaya and Sahin (2003) in the form of a five-point likert type scale, physical symptoms of anger are explored in 14 items. In the second dimension, a total of 42 items is presented defining the factors that lead to formation of anger. In the third dimension, 30 items consisting of ideas connected with anger are given and in the fourth dimension, 47 items are given together with the question of “How often do you demonstrate the behaviors below to a person who annoys you?” In the fifth dimension, ways of dealing with anger are explored. This dimension contains 26 statements. Thus, the scale, which was composed of five dimensions, was called “Multi-dimensional Anger Scale” (MAS). The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients of the factor sub-scales formed from the factors that emerged as a result of the factor analyses made for each dimension of the “Multi-dimensional Anger Scale” were calculated separately. As a result of the analyses, it was found that the reliability coefficients of the 5 fundamental dimensions varied between $\alpha = .83$ and $\alpha = .93$, while the reliability coefficients of the 15 factor subscales varied between $\alpha = .64$ and $\alpha = .95$ (Balkaya and Sahin 2003). The results of the analyses conducted with regard to the reliability of the Multidimensional Anger Scale (MAS) seem to suggest that the scale is highly reliable. The reliability of MAS, whose reliability coefficients varied between .64 and .95, can be said to be within acceptable limits (Balkaya and Sahin 2003). The reliability test of the scale was repeated by Buyukbayraktar (2011). The results that were obtained are in parallel to the findings by Balkaya and Sahin (2003).

**Results**

In the first stage, the scales were evaluated separately and the scales of 40 participants who completed the scales wrongly or inadequately were not taken into consideration. SPSS.13 package program was used in the statistical analyses of the data. The significance test of the difference among the perfectionism and anger scores of the groups by the gender variable was performed via t-test. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient technique was used to analyze whether there was a significant relationship between the perfectionisms and angers of the university students.

**Data Analysis**

In the first dimension of the “Multi-dimensional Anger Scale”, which was prepared by Balkaya and Sahin (2003) in the form of a five-point likert type scale, physical symptoms of anger are explored in 14 items. In the second dimension, a total of 42 items is presented defining the factors that lead to formation of anger. In the third dimension, 30 items consisting of ideas connected with anger are given and in the fourth dimension, 47 items are given together with the question of “How often do you demonstrate the behaviors below to a person who annoys you?” In the fifth dimension, ways of dealing with anger are explored. This dimension contains 26 statements. Thus, the scale, which was composed of five dimensions, was called “Multi-dimensional Anger Scale” (MAS). The Cronbach Alpha reliability coefficients of the factor sub-scales formed from the factors that emerged as a result of the factor analyses made for each dimension of the “Multi-dimensional Anger Scale” were calculated separately. As a result of the analyses, it was found that the reliability coefficients of the 5 fundamental dimensions varied between $\alpha = .83$ and $\alpha = .93$, while the reliability coefficients of the 15 factor subscales varied between $\alpha = .64$ and $\alpha = .95$ (Balkaya and Sahin 2003). The results of the analyses conducted with regard to the reliability of the Multidimensional Anger Scale (MAS) seem to suggest that the scale is highly reliable. The reliability of MAS, whose reliability coefficients varied between .64 and .95, can be said to be within acceptable limits (Balkaya and Sahin 2003). The reliability test of the scale was repeated by Buyukbayraktar (2011). The results that were obtained are in parallel to the findings by Balkaya and Sahin (2003).

**RESULTS**

The data analyses obtained from an investigation of the relationship between the perfectionisms and angers of the university students are presented in the form of tables. When Table 2 (t-test results of the perfectionism sub-dimensions by gender) is examined, it is seen that the arithmetic mean of the female students in the self-oriented perfectionism sub-dimension is 53.78, whereas the arithmetic mean of the male students is 52.92. The t-value which was calculated as a result of the t-test conducted to see whether the difference between the point averages was significant or not was found to be (t=0.972; p>0.05). This value does not indicate a statistically significant difference at the level of 0.05. While the point average of the female students in the other-oriented perfectionism sub-dimension was 39.23, the point average of the male students was found to be 38.43. The t-value which was calculated as a result of the t-test conducted to see whether the difference between the point averages was significant or not was calculated to be (t=1.334; p>0.05). This value does not indicate a statistically significant difference at the level of 0.05. While the arithmetic mean of the female students in the socially-prescribed perfectionism sub-dimension was 32.86, the arithmetic mean of the male students was 34.83. The t-value which was calculated as a result of the t-test conducted to see whether the difference between the point averages was significant or not was calculated to be (t=1.334; p>0.05). This value does not indicate a statistically significant difference at the level of 0.05. While the arithmetic mean of the female students in the socially-prescribed perfectionism sub-dimension was 32.86, the arithmetic mean of the male students was 34.83. The t-value which was calculated as a result of the t-test conducted to see whether the difference between the point averages was significant or not was calculated to be (t=1.334; p>0.05). This value does not indicate a statistically significant difference at the level of 0.05. Therefore, it can be said that male students’ socially-prescribed perfectionisms are higher than those of the female students. When the overall perfectionism scores are taken into account, it is seen that point average of the female students was 122.79, whereas it was 122.86 for the male students. The t-value which was calculated as a
The result of the t test conducted to see whether the difference between the point averages was significant or not was found to be \( t = 0.48 \); \( p > 0.05 \). This value does not indicate a statistically significant difference at the level of 0.05. When Table 3 (t-test results of the anger sub-dimensions by gender) is examined, it is seen that the arithmetic mean of the female students in the anger symptoms sub-dimension was 31.14 whereas arithmetic mean of the male students was 29.83. The t-value which was calculated as a result of the t-test conducted to see whether the difference between the point averages was significant or not was found to be \( t = 1.751 \); \( p > 0.05 \). This value does not indicate a statistically significant difference at the level of 0.05. While the arithmetic mean of the female students in the not being taken seriously sub-dimension of the anger eliciting situations was 63.21, the arithmetic mean of the male students was 58.94. The t-value which was calculated as a result of the t-test conducted to see whether the difference between the point averages was significant or not was found to be \( t = 4.750 \); \( p < 0.05 \). This value represents a statistically significant difference at the level of 0.05. While the arithmetic mean of the female students in the exposure to unfair treatment sub-dimension of the anger eliciting situations was 49.44, the arithmetic mean of the male students was 47.63.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Significance (Schefee Test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Self-oriented</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>53.78</td>
<td>10.88</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.364</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionism</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>52.92</td>
<td>10.85</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Other-oriented</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>39.23</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>1.334</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionism</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>38.43</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Socially-prescribed</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>32.86</td>
<td>9.71</td>
<td>2.651</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionism</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>34.83</td>
<td>7.80</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>122.79</td>
<td>18.03</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>122.86</td>
<td>17.35</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) indicates that the difference is significant; \( p < 0.05 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimensions</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Significance (Schefee Test)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Anger Symptoms</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>31.14</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>1.751</td>
<td>.116</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>29.83</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Anger Eliciting Situations</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>63.21</td>
<td>10.65</td>
<td>4.750</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Being Taken Seriously</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>58.94</td>
<td>12.06</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to Unfair</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>49.44</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>4.043</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Unfairly</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>47.63</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being Criticized</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>9.64</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>2.574</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>9.13</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Interpersonal Anger</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>45.43</td>
<td>15.31</td>
<td>-3.439</td>
<td>.761</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revengeful Reactions</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>49.71</td>
<td>15.48</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive-Aggressive Reactions</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>21.93</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>1.004</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>21.56</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inward-oriented Reactions</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>13.94</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.163</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>12.72</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unconcerned Reactions</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>8.40</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>-4.60</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>8.53</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger Total</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>243.15</td>
<td>36.24</td>
<td>1.700</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>218</td>
<td>238.19</td>
<td>35.62</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(*) indicates that the difference is significant; \( p < 0.05 \)
t value which was calculated as a result of the t-test conducted to see whether the difference between the point averages was significant or not was found to be \( t = 4.043; p > 0.05 \). This value does not indicate a statistically significant difference at the level of 0.05. While the arithmetic mean of the female students in the being criticized sub-dimension of the anger eliciting situations was 9.64, it was 9.13 for the male students. The t-value which was calculated as a result of the t-test conducted to see whether the difference between the point averages was significant or not was found to be \( t = 2.574; p > 0.05 \). This value does not indicate a statistically significant difference at the level of 0.05. While the arithmetic mean of the female students in the revengeful reactions sub-dimension of the interpersonal anger was 45.43, the arithmetic mean of the male students was 49.71. The t-value which was calculated as a result of the t test conducted to see whether the difference between the point averages was significant or not was found to be \( t = 3.439; p > 0.05 \). This value does not indicate a statistically significant difference at the level of 0.05. While the arithmetic mean of the female students in the passive-aggressive reactions sub-dimension of interpersonal anger was 21.93, the arithmetic mean of the male students was 21.56. The t-value which was calculated as a result of the t-test conducted to see whether the difference between the point averages was significant or not was found to be \( t = 1.004; p > 0.05 \). This value does not indicate a statistically significant difference at the level of 0.05. While the arithmetic mean of the female students in the inward-oriented reactions sub-dimension of interpersonal anger was 13.94, the arithmetic mean of the male students was 12.72. The t-value which was calculated as a result of the t-test conducted to see whether the difference between the point averages was significant or not was found to be \( t = 4.163; p > 0.05 \). This value does not indicate a statistically significant difference at the level of 0.05. While the arithmetic mean of the female students in the unconcerned reactions sub-dimension of interpersonal anger was 8.40, arithmetic mean of the male students was 8.53. The t-value which was calculated as a result of the t-test conducted to see whether the difference between the point averages was significant or not was found to be \( t = .460; p < 0.05 \). This value represents a statistically significant difference at the level of 0.05. When anger is considered for total scores, it is seen that arithmetic mean of the female students was 243.15, whereas arithmetic mean of the male students was 238.19. The t-value which was calculated as a result of the t-test conducted to see whether the difference between the point averages was significant or not was found to be \( t = 1.700; p > 0.05 \). This value does not indicate a statistically significant difference at the level of 0.05.

When Table 4 (results of simple correlation aimed at determining the relationship between perfectionism and anger) is examined, it is seen that there is a low, positive and significant relationship between the students’ perfectionisms and anger (r=0.185, p<0.01). According to this, it can be said that as perfectionism increases, anger, too, rises in parallel to it.

**DISCUSSION**

When the results are examined, no difference is observed between the overall perfectionism levels of the female and the male students (studies supporting this finding, Sapmaz 2006, Sun-Selisik 2003), but it is seen that perfectionisms of the male students were significantly higher than the female students in the socially-prescribed perfectionism sub-dimension, which is one of the perfectionism dimensions. In socially-prescribed perfectionism, the environment’s expectations of the individual to be perfect stand out. When the matter is considered from this perspective, expectations from men in our society increase especially after a certain age. Given that researchers have conducted a study on a sample consisting of university students, it can be thought that expectations from male university students who are about to begin working life will be higher. There are studies in the relevant literature in support of researchers’ paper stating that boys’ socially-prescribed perfectionism levels are higher than girls (de Azevedo et al. 2009; Dinc 2001; Siegle and Schuler 2000; Tuncer and Voltan-Acar 2006). According to Blankstein et al. (2007) on the other hand, so-

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>X</th>
<th>ss</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perfectionism</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>122.81</td>
<td>17.82</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>241.63</td>
<td>36.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When Table 4 (results of simple correlation aimed at determining the relationship between perfectionism and anger) is examined, it is seen that there is a low, positive and significant relationship between the students’ perfectionisms and anger (r=0.185, p<0.01). According to this, it can be said that as perfectionism increases, anger, too, rises in parallel to it.
cially-prescribed perfectionism was found to be higher in women than in men. While Dinc (2001) argued that girls are more perfectionist than boys in the other-oriented perfectionism, de Azevedo et al. (2009) found that boys had higher scores than girls in other-oriented perfectionism. However, there are also studies which indicate that self-oriented perfectionism and other-oriented perfectionism levels do not exhibit variation in terms of gender (Tuncer and Voltan-Acar 2006). A paper developed and tested a model in which SPP indirectly through the fear of negative evaluations (Casale et al. 2014). Moreover, there are still other studies in support of the fact that men are more perfectionist than women (Erozkan 2005; Siegle and Schuler 2000; Slaney and Ashby 1996; Tuncer and Voltan-Acar 2006). According to Yaoar (2008) and Circir (2006), in university students’ girls’ levels of perfectionism was found to be higher than boys’. According to Hankin et al. (1997) too, girls’ perfectionisms are higher than boys’. Misirli-Tasdemir (2004) encountered a difference in terms of gender. Boys received higher perfectionism scores than girls. On the other paper there isn’t a significant difference between the moral developmental levels of students and their perfectionism according to their gender (Acuner et al. 2014).

From the findings of this study, it was found that the angers of the girls and the boys differed significantly in the not being taken seriously sub-dimension of the anger eliciting situations and unconcerned reactions sub-dimension of interpersonal anger. Not being taken seriously, a sub-dimension of anger eliciting situations, is a state of anger that is felt when the individual’s ideas are not valued highly, when their deeds are not appreciated and when they are not adequately evaluated (Balkaya and Sahin 2003). The angers of the girls were found to be higher than those of the boys in the not being taken seriously sub-dimension. Given the assumption that girls are more sentimental than boys, their needs for being taken seriously may be higher than those of the boys. Iliceto et al. (2012) was to explore gender-related differences concerning anger expression and interpersonal relationships in a sample of overweight/obese subjects. Overweight/obese subjects have a tendency to turn feelings of anger inward on to themselves together with impaired interpersonal relationships, especially in women. According to a study conducted by Batigun and Sahin (2003), too, women had higher scores in the sub-dimension of not being taken seriously than men. Likewise, according to a study carried out by Balkaya and Sahin (2003), women had higher levels of anger than men in anger eliciting situations. Furthermore, there are other studies reporting that women’s levels of anger are higher than those of men (Brody et al. 1995; Ross and Willigen 1996; Sala 1997). These findings are in support of the findings obtained in researchers’ paper. In the unconcerned reactions sub-dimension, on the other hand, the boys’ anger is higher than the girls’. The feeling of anger is more frequently seen among men than women. The reason for this may be the cultural differences in their upbringing and different expectations of the society from them. The almost only emotion that men are allowed to feel is anger. While men are taught to be competitive and aggressive, women are taught to be supportive (Mckay and Dimmeyer 1998; Navaro 1999). According to a study conducted by Malatesta-Magai et al. (1992) and Marchetti (2007), too, men’s anger levels were higher than women’s. Balkaya and Sahin (2003) were not able to find a difference in the anger symptoms sub-dimension according to gender. According to Aydin et al. (2005), university students’ constant anger and styles of anger expression do not exhibit variation by gender. Moreover, some studies conducted in other countries indicate that anger does not vary by gender in non-clinical samples (Kopper 1993; Kopper and Epperson 1991). When the findings obtained are examined according to the anger sub-dimensions in researchers’ paper, it is seen that they are in support of the findings that appear to be insignificant.

When the findings are examined, it was seen that there is a low, positive and significant relationship between the students’ perfectionisms and anger expression (r=0.185, p<.01). According to this, it can be said that as perfectionism increases, so does anger. According to a study conducted by Zwemer and Deffenbacher (1984), overall anger is influenced by personal perfectionism. In an-
other study conducted by Saboonchi and Lundh (2003), the relationships among perfectionism, anger, physical health and positive affect were investigated. In that study, constant anger was found to be correlated with self-oriented perfectionism. On the basis of all these studies, it can be said that the causality relationship between anger and perfectionism occurs predominantly in the form of individuals’ self-oriented anger. In addition to these, studies reporting that perfectionism is in a positive relationship with anger reactions (Dunn et al. 2006), that there is a relationship between socially-prescribed perfectionism and anger (Arale 2009), that self-oriented perfectionism predicts anger in men (Blankstein and Lumley 2008), that the socially-prescribed perfectionism factor is related with anger (Macedo et al. 2009), that perfectionism is related with suppressing anger (Azzi 2007), that positive perfectionism is in a negative relationship with experiencing anger (Besharat and Shahidi 2010), socially prescribed perfectionism was significantly correlated with anger (Hewitt et al. 2002). In adults, anger have been associated with both self-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism (Hewitt and Flett 1991a; Hill et al. 1997). Self-oriented perfectionism is related to anger through perceived and experienced frustration, while socially prescribed perfectionism is related to anger through perceived and experienced mistreatment by others (Esfahani and Besharat 2010). And finally that high personal standards are in a positive relationship with anger (Dunn 2006) are in paper between perfectionism and anger was not found relationship (Fracalanza et al. 2014).

CONCLUSION

From the foregoing analysis, it has been discovered that male students’ perfectionism level is found expressively higher than those of females. In line with these results, male students are more affected than the society they live in and come to the conclusions that shape their lives accordingly. This situation may vary from society to society. In other sub-dimensions, no remarkable differences were found. According to gender, when the feeling of not being taken seriously sub-dimension considered, the anger of female students has been found higher than male students’ and on the other hand concerning the unconcern behavior sub-dimension, anger of male students has been found higher than those of females. In terms of age feature as it concerns attention to the needs and interests, men can more reckless attitude towards society. Developmental characteristics resulting from the occurrence of these situations can cause anger in people. It has been observed that there is a positive and significant correlation between students’ perfectionism and anger.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations were made based on the findings and conclusion of this study.

1. This study can be carried out on different samples consisting of different occupational groups.
2. As a result of researchers’ finding, a more effective psychological counseling and guidance service can be offered to individuals experiencing problems with perfectionism or anger given that these two concepts are correlated using the findings of this study as a guild.
3. There is the need to prepare a psycho-educational program compatible with the characteristics of the group about whom inferences have been made and this program can be applied on volunteering individuals.
4. Guidance service in group guidance sessions according to the needs of the group in relation with perfectionism and should be pursued to enlighten people on perfection and anger management.
5. Perfectionism and anger guidance programs may increase the success of all students from all educational levels.

NOTE

* This study is a part of Cagla Girgin Buyukbaynak’tar’s master thesis.
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