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Tamara Grabi
Borys Grinchenko Kyiv University
(Kyiv, Ukraine)

INTRODUCTION

The research of perfectionism of scientific and pedagogical staff of higher school in Ukraine is on the front burner because of the modernization and development of higher education, access to the Bologna Process and to the European educational research environment. Such factors as high level of competition, constantly increasing requirements for employees at the labor market etc., demand of new requirements from teachers of higher school, achievement of new heights, desire to be the best and obtaining success by focusing on avoiding failure.

Perfectionism of personality is an object of research in different spheres of human activity. Desire of person to achieve high results can be explained by socio-economic and socio-cultural changes. In addition, a cult of rationality and individual achievements promotes the pursuit to perfection.

OBJECTIVES

Taking into account above mentioned, we could state that there is a need to say that perfectionism is a complicated and not enough investigated personal feature, the pact of which covers all spheres of human life. That is why we devote our research for defining levels of perfectionism of scientific and pedagogical staff of the higher school.

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

The research of perfectionism of teachers of higher school was conducted in 2017 year. More than 1068 scientific and pedagogical staff of higher school from different regions of Ukraine took part in the investigation: 288 men, 666 women; age of the respondents was from 21 to 83 years (M = 40).

“The Big Three Perfectionism Scale” (Smith, 2016) was used in the research of perfectionism of scientific and pedagogical staff of higher school. For analysis of multidimensional construct of perfectionism, the authors constructed a self-report questionnaire designed for measuring three global perfectionism factors (rigid perfectionism, self-critical perfectionism, and narcissistic perfectionism), comprised of 10 scales, which were constructed using facets assuage theoretical confusion, reduce the possibility of omitting core content and afford greater reliability and precision in assessment (Smith, Fister & Fischer, 2003).
RESULTS

The research of perfectionism is the subject of interest of many foreign and Ukrainian researchers. However, despite of the great number of researches, the definition of perfectionism is open. Theoretical analysis of foreign and Ukrainian works shows that there is no commonly used definition of this concept.

We are going to define perfectionism of personality as a psychological construct that combines desire of a person to the excellence, high personal standards, desire to bring the results of activities to the highest standards (moral, aesthetic, intellectual) (Ilyin, 2011).

Using “The Big Three Perfectionism Scale”, the following levels of perfectionism’s components of scientific and pedagogical staff of the higher school were found out (Table 1).

Table 1. Levels of perfectionism of scientific and pedagogical staff of higher school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of perfectionism</th>
<th>Levels of manifestation in %</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low level</td>
<td>Middle level</td>
<td>High level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rigid perfectionism</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>41.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-oriented perfectionism</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>40.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Self-worth contingencies</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>40.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-critical perfectionism</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to the first factor of “The Big Three Perfectionism Scale” 41.1% of teachers of higher school has high level of “Rigid perfectionism”, 33.8% has middle level and just one quarter (24.7%) has low level. It means that mostly teachers of higher school are apt to the tendency to be perfect, they understand that they have to be an example for their students.

40.8% of respondents has high level of “Self-oriented perfectionism” 26.9% – middle level and 32.3% – low level. Almost half of respondents feel strong desire to be as perfect as possible and it is very important for them to be perfect in everything they attempt.

According to the scale “Self-worth contingencies”, 40.5% of respondents has high level, 32.2% – middle and 27.2% – low level. For three quarters of respondents striving to be as perfect as possible makes them feel
worthwhile, they always need to aim for perfection to feel “right” about themselves and their value as a person depends on being perfect.

The second factor of “The Big Three Perfectionism Scale” is “Self-critical perfectionism”. Here the middle level (38.9 %) prevails, then high level (35.9 %) goes and the last one – low level (25.2 %). It means that teachers of higher school are used to judge themselves harshly when they do not do something perfectly and they know that their students expect too much from them.

39.2 % of respondents has high level of “Concern over mistakes”, 30.4 % – middle and low levels. Almost 70 % of teachers of higher school are afraid of mistake; making a mistake, they feel themselves ashamed.

According to the scale “Doubts about actions”, 40.7 % of respondents have middle level 31.8 % – high and 27.6 % – low levels. Such situation can be explained by the fact that teachers are mostly sure about their actions. They are used to be an example to their students, so, that is why most of them have middle level of this scale. However, 31.8 % have high level, it means that they doubt and feel uncertain about most things they do and sometimes they are not sure if they are doing things the correct way.

82.2 % of respondents has a high level of “Self-criticism”, 14.1 % - middle level and just 3.6% - low level. Teachers of higher school, as they think, have to perform themselves in the perfect way because they understand that many of students’ eyes are looking at the teacher during classes, consultations etc. That is why teachers feel disappointed with themselves, when they do not do something perfectly and it is difficult for them to forgive themselves when their performance or actions are not flawless.

According to the scale “Socially prescribed perfectionism”, 56.6% of respondents have a middle level 34.9% - high level and 8.5% - low level. Such situation can be explained by the fact that teachers of high school understand and used to the fact that other people expect them to be perfect, that students make excessive demands of them.

37 % of teachers of higher school has high level of “Narcissistic perfectionism”, 32.3 % – middle level and 30.8 % have low level. Teachers of higher school tend to consider that other people do things perfectly because they demand it from themselves firstly and only then from others. In addition, teachers, due to their professional activity, used to be highly critical of other people’s imperfections. It is like professional deformation. In addition, other manifestations of professional deformation are entitlement and grandiosity.

34.5 % of respondents have high level of “Other oriented perfectionism”, 33.6 % – low level and 32 % – middle level. Teachers of higher school demand perfection from their families and friends. Teachers’ children feel different manifestations of this type of perfectionism. For teachers it is very important that other people should do things perfectly.

According to the scale “Hypercriticism”, 39 % of respondents have middle level 34.6 % – low level and 26.4 % – high level. Such situation can be explained by the fact that teachers of higher school understand that hypercriticism for students is unproductive way. If they would get frustrated when other people make mistakes very soon they will get burnout.

37.2 % of respondents have middle level of “Entitlement”, 32 % – low level and 30.8 % – high level. It means that most teachers of higher school understand that other people should not bend the rules for them and they are not entitled to special treatment from other people. We can explain it due to
the fact that most interaction between teachers and students is based on parity grounds.

37.6% of respondents have high level of “Grandiosity”, 32.7% - middle level and 29.7% - low level. It means that most teachers of higher school are used to feel themselves as perfect; also, they are used to appear in front of a large audience of students. Scientific and pedagogical staff of higher school are experts in their fields of scientific research and they know that are absolutely the best at what they do. That is why many teachers have a sense of their grandiosity.

**CONCLUSIONS**

The problem of perfectionism of personality is the subject of interest of many foreign and Ukrainian researchers. According to “The Big Three Perfectionism Scale”, a significant number of teachers of higher school have average and high levels of perfectionism of personality. The prospects for further research will be directed at studying the influence of organizational and professional factors and the result of professional activity on perfectionism of an individual in activity of scientific and pedagogical staff of higher school more detailed.

**RESOURCES FOR WELL-BEING: HUMAN CURIOSITY**

*Gabriela-Mariana Marcu*
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*(Sibiu, Romania)*

**INTRODUCTION**

Human curiosity has not been very often in the researchers’ attention, most of its dimensions being studied in relationship with education and learning. As a multidimensional concept it was mostly defined as "Behaviour Search for Information", personality component, pre-set for empathy, a pillar for trust or a function related to survival. Beyond these attempts of catching the core of curiosity, it is also interesting to look at its underpinnings, as Celeste Kidd and Benjamin Y. Hayden (2015) propose in their paper “The psychology and neuroscience of curiosity”: “We suggest that, rather than worry about defining curiosity, it is more helpful to consider the motivations for information-seeking behavior and to study it in its ethological context.”

Instead of trying to identify curiosity taxonomy, Kidd & Hayden (2015) have a different approach in the context of Tinbergen’s four questions. Named after Dutch biologist Nikolaas Tinbergen, these questions are designed to provide four complementary scientific perspectives on any particular behavior (Tinbergen, 1963). These questions also offer four points of view, from which one can describe behavior or a broad class of behaviors, even if its limits are still not very clear: (1) function, (2) evolution, (3) mechanism and (4) development.