Educational Measurement and Evaluation Review (2017), Vol. 8 Issue 1

Assessing Achievement Goals as Mediator on the Effect of Perfectionism on Procrastination

Carlo Magno
Mapua University
Queen Marie Katrina O. Alcantara
Nacoma Services
Christian Dave N. Domingo
Xavier School
Maria Queenie Y. Isidro
Ateneo Center for Organizational Research and Development

Abstract
The present study advances the role of achievement goals on perfectionism and procrastination. It was hypothesized in the present study that achievement goals mediate the effect of perfectionism on procrastination. The 2 x 2 achievement goals framework by Elliot and McGregor (2001) was used to determine how achievement goals are predicted by perfectionism. The Achievement Goal Questionnaire-Revised (AGQ-R), Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS), and Procrastination Assessment Scale-Students (PASS) were administered to 349 Filipino college undergraduate students. The meditational analysis was conducted following the procedure by Hayes (2009) using PROCESS. Results showed only performance and avoidance goal orientations act as mediators between the effects of perfectionism on procrastination. Theoretical insights regarding the academic and contextual conceptualizations of achievement goals and perfectionism were discussed.

Keywords: Perfectionism, achievement goals, procrastination

Introduction

Some students delay their work depending on the motivation they have on a task. Reasons for delaying tasks involve the feeling that students do not have the competence to complete it, when the intention is mainly to outperform others, or when students fear of performing poorly compared to

others. Delay of one's work is referred to as procrastination (Solomon & Rothblum, 1984). Certain sources of procrastination are explained in the motivation literature as achievement goals. The goal orientation theory or achievement goal theory states that these [achievement goals] are "competence-relevant" goals that a person aims for in a setting where one sees the opportunity to achieve (Elliot, Maier, & Pekrun, 2009). These goals are influential because they help individuals in constructing possible future achievement outcomes or events, and help them in engaging into more productive and adaptive ways of learning. Recently, a 2 x 2 achievement goal framework was proposed by Elliot and McGregor (2001) where the mastery/performance dimension are combined with the approach/avoidance dimension to come up with four types of goal orientation namely mastery approach goals, mastery avoidance goals, performance approach goals, and performance avoidance goals. The notion of an avoidance goal shown in studies was an intuitive aspect in explaining procrastination (Ferrari, Johnson, & McCown, 1995). It has been consistent in various studies that avoidance goals are positively related with procrastination. This was further clarified in a competitive model by Seo (2009) where mastery avoidance and performance avoidance were used as predictors of procrastination.

The type of achievement goals that students adopt varies depending on the standards individuals set for themselves. These standards are defined as perfectionism (Hewitt & Flett, 1991). This claim is supported by the previous studies that investigated the effect of perfectionism on achievement goals (Gaudreau & Verner-Fillion, 2010). Results from the previous studies showed that Self-Oriented Perfectionism (SOP) is positively related with achievement goals, particularly on the mastery-approach and performance-approach goals (Gaudreau & Verner-Filion, 2010). Socially Prescribed Perfectionism (SPP), on the other hand, showed a positive relationship with mastery avoidance, performance-approach, and performance-avoidance goals (Gaudreau & Verner-Filion, 2010). Most of what the researches have done that examine perfectionism and achievement goal orientations together seem to be focused in performance in sports (e. g., Hotham, Stoeber, & Uphill, 2009), and studies about achievement goals and perfectionism in an academic context needs to be further investigated (Elliot & McGregor, 2001; Gaudreau & Verner-Filion, 2010).

Another important development in the achievement goal theory literature is the studies that supported the relationship between achievement goals and procrastination (e. g., Howell & Buro, 2009; Howell & Watson, 2007). These studies have shown that that the delay of one's work due to failure in their self-regulatory processes is associated with their mastery-

avoidance and performance-avoidance goal orientations. This provides evidence that achievement goals explain variation in procrastination.

Previous studies also showed that one's perfectionist tendencies are said to be associated with students' procrastination (e. g., Onwuegbuzie, 2000; Ferrari & Tice, 2000); however, the said relationship still seems to be equivocal due to the inconsistencies in the results between these two variables (Blankstein, Flett, Hewitt, & Koledin, 1992).

In recent reviews, there seem to have no studies done where the relationship between perfectionism and procrastination is mediated by achievement goals as added effects. Hence, the present study proposed that achievement goals can act as a mediator that explains the equivocal relationship of the dimensions of perfectionism and procrastination. One major strength of the present study is the hypothesized prediction among the variables rather than just correlations. Hence, if perfectionism predicts achievement goals, and achievement goals in turn predict procrastination, it is possible to come up with a more integrative model involving these three variables.

The current study utilized the 2 x 2 achievement goal framework by Elliot and McGregor (2001). The 2 x 2 achievement goal framework posits that achievement goals influence students' performance depending on how they view their learning and how much they engage in the task (Covington, 2000). Achievement goals have four basic factors namely mastery approach, mastery avoidance, performance approach, and performance avoidance. Mastery approach goal is a type of goal orientation wherein an individual engages in tasks with the purpose of seeking to learn and to master the task (Elliot & McGregor, 2001). Mastery avoidance goal is a type of goal orientation wherein an individual avoids tasks due to feelings of incompetence and incapability of accomplishing the task (Elliot & McGregor, 2001). Performance approach goal is a type of goal orientation wherein an individual engages in tasks with the purpose of outperforming others (Elliot & McGregor, 2001). Performance avoidance goal is a type of goal orientation wherein an individual avoids tasks due to fear of performing poorly relative to others (Elliot & McGregor, 2001). The present study is focused on investigating the mediating role of the achievement goals on the effect of perfectionism on procrastination.

Hewitt and Flett's (1991) conceptualized perfectionism with three subscales: Self-oriented perfectionism (SOP), socially prescribed perfectionism (SPP) and other-oriented perfectionism (OOP). Self-oriented perfectionism means that individuals have a strong motivation to be perfect and have high expectation to one's self and to one's performance. On the other hand, socially prescribed perfectionism means that individuals believe that others have set high expectations and high critical evaluation towards them and their

performance. Lastly, other-oriented perfectionism means that individuals set high standards towards their significant others (Hewitt & Flett, 1991). The present study only included the self-oriented perfectionism and socially prescribed perfectionism, as these two factors are focused on the perfectionistic expectations of individuals towards themselves. Other-oriented perfectionism was not included in the present study because perfectionism in the present study is oriented towards others and not to the self (Chang & Rand, 2000).

According to Solomon and Rothblum (1984), procrastination is the act of intentionally delaying a task to the point of distress. In the study done by Howell and Watson (2007), procrastination is the outcome of achievement goals. While, in another study, achievement goals were used as a mediator between perfectionism and academic achievement (Gaudreau & Verner-Filion, 2010), providing evidence that perfectionism is a predictor of achievement goals. Given this sequence, an integrative model was built where achievement goals mediates the effect of the factors of perfectionism on procrastination. This sequence explains students who set high standards for themselves adapt specific learning goals on a task. When standards and goals are set, students do not likely procrastinate or delay their work.

Self-Oriented Perfectionism, Achievement Goals and Procrastination

Self-oriented perfectionism, mastery approach, and procrastination. When individuals set high standards for themselves, they seek to engage on their tasks with the purpose of learning and mastering the tasks, and hence they do not delay their work. This means that mastery approach goal mediates the effect of self-oriented perfectionism on procrastination. This assertion was supported by the previous studies done by Howell and Watson (2007) and Gaudreau and Verner-Fillion (2010) where the results of their study indicate a positive relation between self-oriented perfectionism and mastery approach goal, as well as a negative correlation between mastery approach goal and procrastination. Furthermore, since one common element between self-oriented perfectionism and mastery approach goal orientation is a strong intrinsic motivation; such individuals will engage on their tasks and therefore will be less associated with procrastinating behaviors.

Self-oriented perfectionism, mastery avoidance, and procrastination. When individuals set high standards for themselves, they do not avoid tasks in which they know that they will fail as they consider the task as a challenge, but they will tend to delay their work. This shows that mastery

avoidance mediates the effect of self-oriented perfectionism on procrastination. This conceptualization was shown to be feasible in the study done by Gaudreau and Verner-Fillion (2010) and Howell and Watson (2007) where they showed that that self-oriented perfectionism is negatively related with mastery avoidance goals, and in turn, mastery avoidance goal showed a positive relationship with procrastination.

Self-oriented perfectionism, performance approach, and procrastination. When individuals set high standard for themselves, they seek to engage in tasks with the purpose of outperforming others, but they tend to delay their work. This means that performance approach mediates the effect of self-oriented perfectionism on procrastination. It was mentioned in the study done by Gaudreau and Verner-Filion (2010) that individuals who have a performance approach goal orientation are just interested in achievement outcomes, but not on achievement activities. Hence, even though self-oriented perfectionists engage in tasks, if their purpose for engaging is not to learn, but rather to surpass the performance of others, they will have the tendency to postpone their work.

Self-oriented perfectionism, performance avoidance, and procrastination. When individuals set high standard for themselves, they tend to avoid tasks that will make them perform poorly relative to others, and hence, they tend to delay their work. This indicates that performance avoidance mediates the effect of self-oriented perfectionism on procrastination. According to Solomon and Rothblum (1984), one common characteristic between perfectionists and procrastinators is their extreme fear of failure. Therefore, even though self-oriented perfectionists have a strong motivation, such said individuals will still have the tendency to procrastinate as they constantly avoid tasks that will make them demonstrate poor performance relative to others.

Socially-Prescribed Perfectionism, Achievement Goals, and Procrastination

Socially-prescribed perfectionism, mastery approach goals and procrastination. When individuals believe that others expect high standard on them, they do not engage in tasks because the intrinsic interest is not coming from themselves, but from others. They tend to delay their work. This indicates that mastery approach mediates the effect of socially prescribed perfectionism on procrastination. According to Gaudreau and Verner-Fillion

(2010), mastery approach goals are positively associated with the individual's interests and the improvement of their self-regulation. However, since the drive of socially-prescribed perfectionists is coming from others and not from themselves, they do not engage in tasks, and therefore having the tendency of delaying their work.

Socially-prescribed perfectionism, mastery avoidance goals and procrastination. When individuals believe that others have high standard on them, they tend to avoid tasks which they think they will fail. Therefore, they tend to delay their work. This implies that mastery avoidance goals mediate the effect of socially prescribed perfectionism on procrastination. One example provided by Pintrich (2000) regarding mastery avoidance is the experience of students who have perfectionistic standards. It was mentioned that perfectionists do not want to make mistakes to avoid appearing incompetent and incapable, because of their fear of failure, socially-prescribed perfectionists tend to delay their work.

Socially-prescribed perfectionism, performance approach goals, and procrastination. When individuals believe that others have high standard on themselves, they engage in tasks to perform better than others, but they tend to delay their work. This means that performance approach goals mediate the effect of socially prescribed perfectionism on procrastination. Previous studies have confirmed that there is a positive relationship between socially prescribed perfectionism and procrastination (e. g., Blankstein, Flett, Hewitt, & Koledin, 1992). In addition, studies done on perfectionism and achievement goals showed that there is a positive relationship between SPP and performance approach goals (e. g., Stoeber, Stoll, Pescheck, & Otto, 2008). Given this, conceptualization of the relationship of these three variables can be studied.

Socially-prescribed perfectionism, performance avoidance goals, and procrastination. When individuals believe that others have high standard on themselves, they tend to avoid tasks that will make them perform poorly relative to others, and hence, they tend to delay their work. This denotes that performance avoidance goals mediate the effect of socially prescribed perfectionism on procrastination. Since it was asserted that SPP has a positive relationship with procrastination, and that socially prescribed perfectionists is characterized by intense fear of failure, then such individuals engage in procrastination with the purpose of avoiding negative performances relative to others.

The Present Study

The reviews points out how different achievement goals are predicted by and perfectionism and as a predictor of procrastination. The nature of achievement goals as a mediator for perfectionism and procrastination is explained in the incorporation of intrinsic motivation and tendency to approach rather than to avoid achievement situations in perfectionism (Flett, Blankstein, & Martin, 1995). This notion suggests a negative direction with variables such as procrastination. If perfectionism would be studied with procrastination, the notion of approach and avoidance needs to be part of the model tested. The incorporation of the tendency to approach or avoid situation needs to be demonstrated as a separate construct with that of perfectionism. The purpose of this study is to test whether the factors of achievement goals mediate the effect of the two factors of perfectionism on procrastination.

Method

Participants

The participants in the present study are undergraduate students from private universities in Manila. There are 349 students (statistical power of 1.00) 209 females and 140 males with mean age of 18.29. The current study made use of a purposive sampling to gather respondents to participate in the study. The criteria included in the sample are college students that are currently enrolled in a college/university, have engaged in doing several assignments and projects in school, and have experienced joining extracurricular activities in school. This ensures that they may at least have experienced procrastinating in a school-related task.

Instruments

Hewitt and Flett's Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (HFMPS). The HFMPS is an instrument with 45 items that has three dimensions (Hewitt & Flett, 1991). This scale tests a person's perfectionism on three accounts, when they have high standards for themselves (SOP), when they have high standards for their significant others (OOP), and when they think others have high standards for them (SPP). The scale is rated by the use of 7-point Likert scale (*7 being strongly agree and 1 being strongly disagree)* where each subscale/dimension has 15 items in the scale. The scale has a test reliability coefficient of .88, .85 and .75 for the subscales SOP, OOP and SPP

respectively (Hewitt, Flett, Turnbull-Donovan & Mikail, 1991). Clara, Cox, and Enns (2002) tested the questionnaire in both university and clinical samples and reported the model has a GFI value of .71 for both sample areas.

Procrastination Assessment Scale-Students (PASS). The PASS is an instrument developed by Solomon and Rothblum (1984) to check for the procrastinating tendencies of college students. This scale is divided into two sections. The first section attempts to look for the occurrence of procrastination in college students when (1) writing a term paper, (2) studying for an exam, (3) keeping up with weekly reading assignments, (4) performing administrative tasks, (5) attending meetings, and (6) performing academic tasks in general. The questionnaire can be answered by a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 5 –always procrastinate to 1 – never procrastinate. Another set of 5-point scale measures the degree to which procrastination causes a problem on the given task (5 – always a problem to 1 – not at all a problem). And the last set of 5-point Likert scale is used to measure the degree to which they want to decrease procrastinating on the said academic task (5 – definitely want to decrease to 1 – do not want to decrease).

The second section of the PASS provides a scenario for students to respond where they would probably procrastinate (Solomon & Rothblum, 1984). There are 26 items answered in a 5-point Likert scale (5 – definitely the reason to 1 – not at all the reason). The statements measure how much respondents delay their task the last time they are in the given scenario. The PASS arrived with one score to represent the students' procrastination tendencies. PASS has a coefficient of .80 for the test retest correlation (Yong, 2010) and a coefficient alpha of approximately .77 (Yao, 2009).

Achievement Goal Questionnaire Revised (AGQ-R). The AGQ-R is a 12 item questionnaire that measures ones achievement goal orientation (Elliot & Murayama, 2008). It is a recent development from AGQ (Elliot & McGregor, 2001) which was replaced due to concerns about statistical validity and reliability. The questionnaire was meant to measure short but reliable and valid measures of the four types of achievement goals (mastery-approach goal, mastery-avoidance goal, performance-approach goal, and performance avoidance goal). There are three for each of the different types of achievement goals, and is measured using a 7-point Likert scale (7 – very true of me to 1 – not at all true of me). Elliot and Murayama (2008) checked for confirmatory factor analysis which was a value of .99. Their internal reliabilities were as follows: performance-approach goals = .83, mastery-avoidance goals = .87,

mastery-approach goals = .85 and performance avoidance goals =.77 (Eren, 2009).

Procedures

The researchers asked potential participants if they are willing to participate in the study. Once they have agreed, they were briefed about the study, and were given instructions on how to answer the questionnaires. After which, they were asked to sign the demographic information sheet as a proof of their willingness to participate. The individuals who agreed to participate are asked to complete three sets of measure, the HFMPS, PASS, and AGQ-R and a sheet for the demographic information. The respondents were given 15-25 minutes to answer the questionnaire and were asked to return the papers immediately upon completion. Once all the questionnaires were returned, the respondents were thanked by the researchers and they were informed that the researchers are willing to answer any questions regarding their participation in the study.

Results

The means and standard deviations for the factors of perfectionism, achievement goal orientations, and procrastination were determined. Pearson *r* was used to determine the relationship among the factors of perfectionism, achievement goal orientations, and procrastination. Lastly, the mediation analysis following the steps by Baron and Kenny (1986) was used. Specifically, the mediation tested whether each of the achievement goal orientation mediates effect of the factors of perfectionism on procrastination.

All factors of achievement goal orientations obtained high mean values, with performance avoidance goal (M =5.34, SD = 1.26) attaining the highest mean and variability. For the factors of perfectionism, both self-oriented perfectionism (M = 4.66, SD = .81) and socially prescribed perfectionism (M = 4.14, SD=.63) also attained high mean values. Procrastination (M = 2.88, SD = .44) got the lowest mean and variability among all the variables. The whole achievement goal orientation scale was able to obtain an alpha of .87, while whole procrastination scale obtained an alpha of .86 and the whole perfectionism scale had an alpha of .80, which are all good indicators of scale internal consistency.

Among the two factors of perfectionism, only self-oriented perfectionism showed a significant relationship with all types of goal orientations (mastery approach, r = .36, p < .05; mastery avoidance, r = .19, p< .05; performance approach, r = .38, p< .05; performance avoidance, r = .24,

$p<$ .05), while socially prescribed perfectionism showed a significant relationship only with the two performance goal orientations (performance approach r = .22, $p<$ .05; performance avoidance r = .21, $p<$ .05). It was also confirmed that self oriented perfectionism and socially prescribed perfectionism has a significant relationship with procrastination (r = - .14, $p<$ .05; r = .16, $p<$ .05 respectively).

Table 1

Means, Standard Deviations, Cronbach's Alpha, and Correlations of the Achievement Goals, Factors of Perfectionism and Procrastination

		(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1	Mastery Approach	---						
2	Mastery Avoidance	**.46***	---					
3	Performance Approach	**.53***	**.35***	---				
4	Performance Avoidance	**.32***	**.41***	**.65***	---			
5	Self Oriented Perfectionism	**.36***	**.19***	**.38***	**.24***	---		
6	Socially Prescribed Perfectionism	.05	.01	**.22***	**.21***	**.21***	---	
7	Procrastination	-.01	-.06	.02	.11*	**-.14***	**.16***	---
8	*M*	5.65	4.94	5.30	5.34	4.66	4.14	2.8
9	*SD*	.99	1.29	1.12	1.26	.81	.63	.44
10	Cronbach's Alpha	.82	.71	.81	.81	.84	.65	.86

*$p < .05$

PROCESS was used to test whether the four domains of achievement goals mediate the effect of self-oriented perfectionism and socially prescribed perfectionism on procrastination. The mediation model was tested following Hayes (2009) procedure. Direct and indirect effects were obtained using an Ordinary Least Square for parallel mediators.

There was a direct effect between SOP and SPP with procrastination. SOP had a significant path coefficient for all four achievement goals. On the other hand, SPP only had a significant path coefficient for performance approach and performance avoidance. Only performance approach and performance avoidance had significant paths to procrastination.

Significant indirect effects were obtained for SOP on procrastination through performance approach and avoidance. The same pattern of indirect effects for SPP on procrastination was obtained through performance approach and avoidance.

Table 2
Coefficients of Direct Effects

Mediators	SOP	SPP	Procrastination
Mastery Approach	**0.21***	0.01	0.02
Mastery Avoidance	**0.15***	0.01	0.01
Performance Approach	**0.30***	**0.16***	**0.19***
Performance Avoidance	**0.11***	**0.18***	**0.16***
SOP	--	--	**-.12***
SPP	--	--	**.15***
Indirect Effects			
Indirect effect of SOP (through Mastery Approach)	.06		
Indirect effect of SOP (through Mastery Avoidance)	.04		
Indirect effect of SOP (through Performance Approach)	**.20***		
Indirect effect of SOP (through Performance Avoidance)	**.23***		
Indirect effect of SPP (through Mastery Approach)	.08		
Indirect effect of SPP (through Mastery Avoidance)	.08		
Indirect effect of SPP (through Performance Approach)	**.22***		
Indirect Effect of SPP (through Performance Avoidance)	**.24***		

*$p < .05$

Discussion

The purpose of the present study is to test whether the types of achievement goals can mediate the effect of the factors of perfectionism on procrastination. The results of the correlation showed that the factors of perfectionism are related with procrastination. The self-oriented perfectionism factor showed a significant positive relationship with all types of achievement goal orientations, while the socially-prescribed perfectionism factor is only associated with certain types of achievement goal orientations. Lastly, only the two performance goal orientations are related with procrastination. The

findings from the mediation analysis revealed that performance approach goal and performance avoidance goal orientations act as significant mediators between factors of perfectionism and procrastination.

The present study confirmed the previous assertion that self-oriented perfectionism is negatively correlated with procrastination while socially-prescribed perfectionism is positively correlated with procrastination. This finding confirms the study done by Blankstein, Flett, Hewitt, and Koledin (1992) where they stated that one common component present in both socially-prescribed perfectionism and procrastination is extreme fear of failure. All types of achievement goal orientations are positively related with self-oriented perfectionism. Only the two performance goal orientations showed a significant positive relationship with socially prescribed perfectionism.

The findings from the mediation analysis revealed that among the types of achievement goal orientations, only performance approach goal and performance avoidance goal orientation act as mediators when perfectionism factors predict procrastination.

It was found that the performance approach goal orientation mediated the effect of self-oriented perfectionism on procrastination. The results of the present study is supported by the previous study done by Gaudreau and Verner-Filion (2010) where they asserted that individuals who adopt a performance approach goal orientation are just interested in achievement outcomes, but not in achievement activities. Hence, even though self-oriented perfectionists engage in their tasks, if their orientation is not coming from oneself but from external factors, they will still postpone their work.

The performance avoidance goal orientation mediated the effect of self-oriented perfectionism in predicting procrastination. This means that individuals will have that tendency of delaying their work even if they have high standards for themselves, as they will not engage in tasks in order to avoid performing poorly relative to others. The study of Solomon and Rothblum (1984) supports the results of the present study as they indicated that one common characteristic between perfectionists and procrastinators is their extreme fear of failure. Hence, even though self-oriented perfectionists have a strong motivation to achieve, they will still procrastinate because of their fear of appearing incompetent relative to others.

When mastery goal orientations were used to mediate the effect of the factors of perfectionism on procrastination, both mastery approach and mastery avoidance goals did not turn out as mediators. One reason could be that these goals are considered to be more adaptive as compared to performance goal orientations, and this assertion is supported by previous studies as mastery goals are positively correlated with task interest, task

engagement, deep processing learning, and academic achievement (Ames, 1992; Bernardo, 2008; Harackiewicz, Barron, Carter, Lehto, & Elliot, 1997; McGregor & Elliot, 2002).

In relation to the present study, both mastery goals did not act as mediators between self-oriented perfectionism and procrastination. However, self-oriented perfectionism showed a direct link with procrastination, and a significant positive relationship with both mastery goals. Given this, individuals who have high standards for themselves will engage on their tasks with the purpose of learning and mastering the task (mastery approach), or they will avoid behaviors that will make them commit mistakes, and be seen as incompetent or a failure (Brophy, 2005). However, the findings suggest that it does not matter whether such individuals will adopt a mastery approach goal or mastery avoidance goal, for as long as they will set high standards for themselves, their tendency to procrastinate is reduced**.**

The relationship among socially-prescribed perfectionism, mastery goals, and procrastination are more complex. In the present study, socially-prescribed perfectionism did not show a significant relationship with both mastery goals, and these mastery goals did not show a significant relationship with procrastination either, but a direct effect between socially-prescribed perfectionism and procrastination is evident. These results suggest that individuals who believe that others have high standards for them will tend to procrastinate even if they do not adopt these mastery goal orientations at all. The positive relationship between socially-prescribed perfectionism and procrastination is also consistent with the result of the study done by Blankstein, Flett, Hewitt, and Koledin (1992) who also found that among the subscales of HF's multidimensional perfectionism, socially-prescribed perfectionism is the most associated with procrastination. The significant relationship between these two constructs is expected because procrastination is a maladaptive behavior and among the subscales of HF multidimensional perfectionism scale, SPP is considered to be a form of maladaptive perfectionism (Frost, Heimberg, Holt, Mattia, & Neubauer, 1993). However, the non-significant relationship of socially prescribed perfectionism with mastery avoidance and mastery approach goals is inconsistent with recent literatures. In the study done by Hewitt, Flett, and Endler (1995), they support the positive relationship between socially prescribed perfectionism and mastery avoidance goal, as they asserted that such said perfectionists would be more likely "avoid rather than approach a problem." On the other hand, the findings from the study of Gaudreau and Verner-Fillion (2010) suggested the negative relationship of socially prescribed perfectionism and mastery approach goals, as such said perfectionists would only engage in tasks with the purpose of

meeting the high standards imposed by others, and therefore they are not concerned of learning and mastering these tasks. The non-significant relationship between socially prescribed perfectionism and mastery goals can be explained by the extent on which culture influences our conceptualization of these two constructs.

The results of the present study also indicated that performance approach goal did not turn out as a mediator of socially prescribed perfectionism predicting procrastination. However, socially-prescribed perfectionism showed a direct link with procrastination, and a significant positive relationship with performance approach goal. This finding suggests that individuals who believe that others have high standards for them will still tend delay their tasks, even if they do not adopt a performance approach goal orientation at all. As mentioned earlier, the direct effect of socially-prescribed perfectionism and procrastination can be explained by the study done by Blankstein, Flett, Hewitt, and Koledin (1992) for they asserted that the fear of failure is what makes these socially-prescribed perfectionists to delay their tasks. However, the result also indicated that there is a significant positive relationship between socially prescribed perfectionism and performance approach goal, indicating that when individuals believe that others have high standards for themselves, they will engage in the tasks but with the purpose of outperforming others. This finding is supported by the study done by Gaudreau and Verner-Fillion (2010) where they asserted that socially-prescribed perfectionists will also engage in their tasks in the hope of avoiding failure, but this engagement are only concerned with attaining achievement outcomes (e. g., higher grades, academic recognition) and not on achievement activities (e. g., task engagement, task interest). To make the relationship between socially prescribed perfectionism and performance approach goal more cultural-specific, the study done by Bernardo (2008) mentioned that the achievement goals being adopted by Filipinos have its social dimensions, where, to an extent, "significant others and groups define the goals, standards, means of goals attainment, and acceptance of achievement outcomes" of individuals. The result of this study suggested that the performance approach goals of most Filipino students are defined by their personal-standards oriented (individual's standard for himself), parent-oriented (wishes, goals, and standards set by parents), and teacher-oriented (wishes, goals, and standards set by teachers) motivations.

The findings of the present study advances theoretical insights in the relationships among perfectionism, achievement goals, and procrastination in three ways: (1) Individuals who have high standards for themselves will not delay their tasks, unless they want to outperform others or they want to avoid

performing poorly relative to others, (2) Individuals who believe that others have high standards for them will have the tendency to delay their work, more so when they do not engage to avoid performing poorly relative to others, and (3) Not all achievement goals would lead both types of perfectionists to delay their work, as collectivist values and factors may play an important role in moderating the influence of achievement goal construct and perfectionism on the self.

The results of the study brings a theoretical insight that individuals who have high standards for themselves will not delay their work, unless they want to outperform others or they want to avoid performing poorly relative to others. Setting high standards on the self indicates task engagement and intrinsic motivation, as individuals will always strive to achieve in the hope of fulfilling these self-imposed standards (e. g., Kilbert, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Saito, 2005; Gaudreau & Verner-Filion, 2010). The tendency to not procrastinate lies behind the reason of engaging into the tasks. If individuals have high standards for themselves will engage with the purpose of mastering the task, their tendency to procrastinate is lessened (e. g., Howell & Watson, 2007; Gaudrea & Verner-Filion, 2010). However, individuals will delay their tasks even if they have high standards for themselves when their reason for their engagement is to just outperform others or to avoid demonstrating incompetence as compared to others (e. g. Solomon & Rothblum, 1984; Gaudrea & Verner-Filion, 2010).

Another theoretical insight explains that individuals who believe that others have high standards for them will have the tendency to delay their work, more so when they do not engage on their tasks to avoid performing poorly relative to others. Individuals will tend to exhibit procrastinating tendencies if they are driven to work not by their own standards, but by the standards imposed by others on them (Blankstein, Flett, Hewitt, & Koledin, 1992). Failing to meet the standards imposed by others make these kinds of individuals fearful and avoidant of the tasks that they have to do, as they do not want others to associate their failures with their lack of competence or ability in comparison with others (Ferrari & Tice, 2000).

Another theoretical insight explains that not all achievement goals would lead both types of perfectionists to delay their work, as collectivist values and factors may play an important role in moderating the influence of achievement goal construct and perfectionism on the self. As mentioned in the study done by Bernardo (2008), mastery approach goals and performance goals has its individual and social dimensions. In the individual dimension, one's personal performance standard is what motivates individuals to engage on their tasks. On the other hand, the social dimensions pertain to the parent-oriented

and teacher-oriented motivations that were also considered by individuals as these help them to perform better on their tasks. In relation to the present study, the significant positive relationship between socially prescribed perfectionism and performance approach goal orientation is believed to have its cultural-specific underpinnings. Also, the result that mastery goals did not have a significant relationship with socially prescribed perfectionism is inconsistent with the results from the existing literature. However, the researchers believe that the lack of significant relationship between these two variables can be stemmed from the extent to which collectivistic values and practices such as fulfilling role obligations, "basking as a reflection of glory", maintaining harmonious relationships, and seeing one's self as important member of social in-groups play an important role when dealing with conceptualizations of socially prescribed perfectionism and achievement goal motivations in the Philippines, as these cultural (particularly collectivistic) factors can explain reason as to why not all achievement goals mediate the effect of factors of perfectionism on procrastination.

References

Ames, C. (1992). Classrooms: Goals, structures, and student motivation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*, 261–271.

Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). The moderator-mediator variable distinction in social psychological research: Conceptual, strategic, and statistical considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(6), 1173-1182.

Blankstein, K., Hewitt,P., Flett, G., & Koledin, S. (1992). Components of perfectionism and procrastination in college students. *Social Behavior and Personality, 20*(2), 85-94.

Bernardo, A. B. I. (2008). Individual and social dimensions of Filipino students' achievement goals. *International Journal of Psychology, 43*(5),886-891.

Bernardo, A., Salanga, M., & Aguas, K. (2008). Filipino adolescent students' conceptions of learning goals. In O. S. Tan, D. M. McInerney, A. D. Liem, & A. G. Tan (Eds.), *What the West can learn from the East: Asian perspectives on the psychology of learning and motivation* (pp. 169-190). Grenwich, CT: Information Age Publishing.

Brophy, J. (2005). Goal theorists should move on from performance goals. *Educational Psychologist, 40,* 167-176.

Chang, E. C., & Rand, K. L. (2000). Perfectionism as a predictor of subsequent adjustment: evidence for a specific diathesis-stress mechanism among college students. *Journal of CounselingPsychology, 47*(1),129-137.

Church, A. T., & Katigbak, M. S. (1992). The cultural context of academic motives: A comparison of American and Filipino college students. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 23*, 40-58.

Covington, M. V. (2000). Goal theory, motivation, and school achievement: An integrative review. *Annual Review Psychology, 51,* 171-200.

Elliot, A. J., & McGregor, H. A. (2001). A 2 X 2 achievement goal framework. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 80,* 501–519.

Elliot, A. J., Maier, M., & Pekrun, R. (2009). Achievement goals and achievement emotions: Testing a model of their joint relations with academic performance. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 10,* 115-135.

Elliot, A. J., & Murayama, K. (2008). On the measurement of achievement goals: Critique, illustration, and application. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 100*, 613-628.

Eren, A. (2009). Examining the teacher efficacy and achievement goals as predictors of Turkish student teachers' conceptions about teaching and learning. *Australian Journal of Teacher Education*, *4*, 69-87.

Ferrari, J. R., & Tice, D. M. (2000). Procrastination as a self-handicap for men and women: A task-avoidance strategy in a laboratory setting. *Journal of Research in Personality, 34*, 73–83.

Flett, G., Blankstein, K. R., & Martin, T. R. (1995). Dimensions of perfectionism and procrastination. In J. R. Ferrari, J. L. Johnson, & W. G. McCown (Eds.), *Procrastination and task avoidance: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 21-34). NY: Plenum.

Frost, R. O., Heimberg, R. G., Holt, C. S., Mattia, J. L, & Neubauer, A. L. (1993). A comparison of two measures of perfectionism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 14***,** 119-126.

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

Gaudrea, P., & Verner-Filion, J. (2010). From perfectionism to academic adjustment: The mediating role. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *49*, 181-186.

Harackiewicz, J. M., Barron, K. E., Carter, S. M., Lehto, A. L., & Elliot, A. J. (1997). Predictors and consequences of achievement goals in the college classroom: Maintaining interest and making the grade. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 1284–1295.

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., & Endler, N. S. (1995). Perfectionism, coping and depression symptomatology in a clinical sample. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, 2*, 47-58.

Hewitt, P. L., Flett, G. L., Turnbull-Donovan, W., & Mikail, S. F. (1991). The multidimensional perfectionism scale: Reliability, validity, and psychometric properties in psychiatric samples. *A Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 3*(3), 464-468.

Hotham, S., Stoeber, J., & Uphill, M. (2009). Predicting race performance in triathlon: The role of perfectionism, achievement goals, and personal goal setting. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *31,* 211-245.

Howell, A., & Buro, K. (2009). Implicit beliefs, achievement goals, and procrastination: A meditational analysis. *Learning and Individual Differences, 19,* 151-154.

Howell, A. J., & Watson, D. C. (2007). Procrastination: Associations with achievement goal orientation and learning strategies. *Personality and Individual Differences, 43*, 167−178.

Johnson, B. (2001). Toward a new classification of nonexperimental quantitative research. *Educational Researcher, 30*(2), 3-13.

Kilbert, J. J., Langhinrishen-Rohling, J., & Saito, M. (2005). Adaptive and maladaptive aspects of self-oriented versus socially prescribed perfectionism. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*, 141-156.

McGregor, H. A., & Elliot, A. J. (2002). Achievement goals as predictors of achievement-relevant processes prior to task engagement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 94*, 381–395.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2000). Academic procrastinators and perfectionistic tendencies among graduate students. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 15*(5), 103-110.

Pintrich, P. R. (2000). Multiple goals, multiple pathways: The role of goal orientation in learning and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 3,* 544–555.

Salanga, M.G.C. (2003). *Perfectionism in Filipino university students*. Unpublished masters thesis, De La Salle University, Manila, Philippines.

Seo, E. H. (2008). Self-efficacy as a mediator in the relationship between self-oriented perfectionism and academic procrastination. *Social Behavior and Personality, 36*(6), 753-764.

Seo, E. H. (2009). The relationship of procrastination with a mastery goal versus an avoidance goal. *Social Behavior and Personality, 37*(7), 911-919.

Solomon, L. J., & Rothblum, E. D. (1984). Academic procrastination: frequency and cognitive-behavioural correlates. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *31*, 504–510.

Stoeber, J., Stoll, O., Pescheck, E., & Otto, K. (2008). Perfectionism and achievement goals in athletes: Relations with approach and avoidance orientations in mastery and performance goals. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, *9*, 102–121.

Yao, M. P. (2005). An *exploration of multidimensional perfectionism, academic self-efficacy, procrastination frequency, and Asian American cultural values in Asian American university students.* Unpublished master's thesis, The Ohio State University.

Yong, F. L. (2010). A study on the assertiveness and academic procrastination of English and communication students at a private unversity. *American Journal of Scientific Research*, *6*, 62-71.