

THE EFFECTS OF TEACHERS' PERFECTIONISM ON LEARNERS' PERFECTIONISM IN AN EFL SETTING

SARA KASHEFIAN-NAEINI¹, RAMLEE MUSTAPHA², NAZANIN TAGHVATALAB³

¹ Department of English Language, Faculty of Paramedical Sciences, Shiraz University of Medical Sciences, Shiraz, Iran

² Department of Engineering Technology, Faculty of Technical and Vocational Education, Sultan Idris Education University, Malaysia

³ Department of Foreign Languages, Sepidan Branch, Islamic Azad University, Sepidan, Iran

ABSTRACT: The present study intended to determine the effects of teachers' perfectionism on learners' perfectionism among students attending an English language course in Shiraz, Iran. The study was based on primary observation of 100 students of varying age groups ranging from 18 to 55 who attended EFL institutes. These students were enrolled in two levels— elementary and intermediary and their perfectionism along with their perception of their teachers' perfectionism were collected through some sets of questionnaires based on Frost Multi-dimensional Perfectionism Scale and Scale on English Language Teacher Perfectionism. The statistical procedures encompassed Multivariate of Analysis (MANOVA) and the pertinent data were analyzed using SPSS version 22. The key finding showed that marital status had significant impacts on learners' perfectionism. However, teachers' perfectionism and learners' perfectionism were not related. The findings yielded a clear understanding of learners and effective ways to improve the teaching-learning environment. Moreover, having a profound understanding of the learners' performance can provide a new perspective for learners in different educational settings.

KEYWORDS: Teachers' perfectionism, learners' perfectionism, EFL, Iran

I. INTRODUCTION

Perfectionism is a relative process and it is a mean to an end. There is no ultimate or an infinite end to it as the process of perfection and the tool one undertakes is more important than what is achieved in the end. One main factor that can influence the whole educational setting between students and teacher relation is when the focus is on meeting the end with no freedom of exercising their will and understanding to their fullest. There are two ways in which one can achieve a desired end or perfectionism: over-imposed unrealistic standards upon one or standard and achievable goals set according to a person's caliber and capabilities. These differed standards may or may not result in a good end within an educational setting. Setting high standards by the teacher is important in order to develop a sense of motivation, cognition and performance of the student (Flett & Hewitt 2009).

When standards of perfectionism are set very high, they affect the performance level of those students who are imposed to bring out those standards. It could even be understood that performance levels differ for each student; the performance level of a disabled student will not be the same as a 'normal' student (Adderholdt & Jan, 1999). Moreover, setting standards not keeping in mind those aspects of students would be unrealistic and unnatural since some perfectionist tendencies differ in range, from healthy to dysfunctional behavior. It is imperative to monitor and evaluate this continuum, classifying it into three categories, (a) work and school; (b) play and hobbies; (c), family and social relations. The above categorization can help define and redefine understanding perfectionism and also helps understand how perfectionist ways often leads to relationship issues and mood disorders when the perfectionist's expectations are not met (Burns, 1980). Perfectionism among teachers is a highly debated issue since perfectionist teachers' teaching methods do not focus on the qualitative improvement of the student. It may also make the teaching one-sided and homogenous especially for EFL students since English is not the first language for them.

There are myriad causes for learner perfectionism. A significant cause of learners' perfection in education, especially a language learning class is teachers' behavior. When teachers just focus on correctness and avoid mistakes, learners try to be perfect, and set unrealistic goals. They want to speak as fluently as a native speaker and without any mistakes in pronunciation and grammar. These goals are unreachable in a short period; therefore, the students prefer to be silent and avoid participating in the parts he/she has doubt which leads to learners' perfectionism. The result is a stressful classroom environment created by teachers.

More studies need to be carried out on Iranian EFL students since this form of research will help understand issues regarding perfectionism not only with Iranian students but any country's EFL students in the long run. Furthermore, it will help comprehend the teacher-student relation better and take measures to bridge the gap for better interactive communication between teacher and student. Therefore, there is a need for understanding the role

of teachers' perfectionism in learners' perfectionism amongst EFL students in Iran. Therefore, the present study aims at investigating the relationship between teachers' perfection and learners' perfectionism among Iranian foreign language institute learners. Moreover, it strives to determine the effect of marital status on learners' perfectionism.

The following research questions are answered via the present study:

1. Does learners' marital status have any effects on their perfectionism?
2. Does teachers' perfectionism have any effects on learners' perfectionism?

II. Literature Review

Many scholars and academicians have extensively worked on behavioral and personality based aspects of students and their relations with teachers within classroom learning. Some of these researchers have focused on personal qualities and motivations (Hamachek, 1978) and students' attitude in a learning environment (e.g. Shahsavar & Jafari, 2019) while others focus on psychological aspect of learning and performances in inter-relational aspect of learning (David Burns, 1980; Hamachek, 1978). Discourses on teachers' perfectionism and how it affects learners' perfectionist ways are multi-dimensional, depending on what achievable targets and goals are set by the teacher within learning environment. Results also depend on how lenient or strict teachers are with the students and how student-friendly and approachable they become at the end (Pianta, Hamre, & Joseph, 2012). But factors such as age group, learning skills of the students, physical and mental state of mind of the students, social and cultural backgrounds of the students, EFL students, gender issues etc. also play a role in learners' perfectionism (Pianta et al., 2012). These factors are vital and should be taken into account before the teachers initiate the formal teaching process.

Over the previous decades, the term 'perfectionism' has been defined differently by many different researchers, leading to a lack of consensus in a universal definition. Along with the definition the context of the situation has also been radically different, rendering it equally important. Definitions have also differed from writers' and authors' interpretation and perception as well as social and cultural context of it. Experts in perfectionism such as Hollender (1978) play out the whole idea of perfectionism as practice from personal level and striving for that goal to a person. Hollender emphasizes scrupulously on achieving a defined and constructed goal before the learners' understanding which at times is beyond what is needed or required according to the situation. However, this kind of rigorous implication on students not only demotivates and costs the concentration level of the students but it also makes the whole teaching and learning process monotonous since creative thinking and creative articulation is not encouraged by the teacher.

A. Causal Factors of Perfectionist Tendencies

Although the phenomenon has not been sufficiently explained yet, authors Schruder et al. (2014) identify that certain biological and environmental factors are responsible for perfectionist tendencies in an individual. Studies observing the biological factors found that mothers' self-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism leads to the same in their sons (Cook & Kearney in Schruder et al. 2014), and similar overall perfectionism qualities in mothers and daughters (Frost et al, 1991 in Schruder et al. 2014). Overall, these studies suggest, albeit with much scope for further research, that heritage or genes can be linked to perfectionism in individuals. On the other hand, parenting style could be one of the environmental factors responsible for perfectionism, as suggested by Neumeister & Finch (2006). According to Craddock et al (2009), highly authoritarian parenting styles are related to functional perfectionism in their offspring; whereas DiPrima et al (2011) suggest that perfectionism as a result of parenting styles is different for male and female offspring (Schruder et al., 2014). Furthermore, some other researchers link cultural factors i.e. heritage to perfectionism (Jones, 2004 in Hashemi & Abbasi 2013), and social status and self-identity as other causal factors related to perfectionism (Hashemi & Abbasi, 2013). It can, however, be concluded in this context that there is scope for a considerable amount of research to be conducted in linking causal factors to perfectionism, especially learner's perfectionism. There can be multiple ways to look on what contributes to perfectionist ways in an individual. It has been reiterated time and again that different personality traits of a person along with socio-cultural and psychological factors play a role in perfectionism in an individual (Hamachek, 1978). Apart from this, biological or environmental factors also shape perfectionist ways of a person (Burns, 1993; Hamachek, 1978).

1. Biological and Environmental Factors

Hamachek (1978) asserts that the perfectionist ways of an individual is a result of the biological and environmental factors that the person was or is exposed to. The author also refers to biological factors as 'adaptive' and environmental factors as 'maladaptive'. In case of 'adaptive' perfectionism, the perfectionist's goals are set keeping in mind what the person can be achieved or not first, thus making it 'inter-motivational'; but in case of 'maladaptive' perfectionism, these standards or goals are set without keeping in mind whether it is achievable or not. Here in this context he talks about two factors that can be clubbed under biological and environmental factor. However, the gap in Hamachek's study is that the author fails to inculcate in his argument factors that actually

encompass the environment like socio-cultural, education, age, gender, health, economy, political situation that affects student and teacher relation at the end.

2. Cultural Factors

Cultural factors are mostly in the context of cultural groups and how these different cultural groups contribute to perfectionism. One distinct ethnic group that has received considerable attention for their “exceptional” problem-solving abilities and performance has been Asian Americans (Sue & Okazaki, 1990). However, this group has also been noted for their excessive perfectionistic tendencies since the expectations are high (Yee, 1992) including extreme concerns about meeting high parental hope (Peng & Wright, 1994). On the other hand, one consistent outcome has been that most Asian Americans attempt or commit suicide at a rate considerably lower than that found among Caucasian Americans (Chang, 1998). Such findings suggest that cultural factors might play an important role in determining perfectionism. The author compares American Asians and Caucasian Americans to find out if the former group performs better in academia than the later, and finds that it has to do more with biological and environmental factor and less with cultural factor as such.

3. Psychological Factor

Perfectionism has been associated with higher levels of psychological maladjustment which leads to more anxiety and neurotic disorder in adolescence and lower levels of subjective well-being and psychological adjustment. Here, the main dimensions of perfectionism are perfectionistic strivings and perfectionistic concerns. Frost, Marten, Lahart, & Rosenblate's (1990) study shows how the two dimensions are related and helpful to subjective well-being of the adolescent's psychological adjustment and maladjustment, and disorder. Traditionally, perfectionism has been regarded as a sign of psychological maladjustment and disorder as people seeking treatment for anxiety and depression often showed elevated levels of perfectionism.

B. Types of Perfectionism

Personality traits of a teacher can be of different types, each having a different type of effect on the student. Similarly, there are types of perfectionism in a teacher which would have a major impact on learner's perfectionism as well. One type is the neurotic perfectionism which has been the one of the major works of Millon (1981, 1983). The writer explores neurotic perfectionism as a leading form of perfectionism, and how it is tied with fear and anxiety of that person. This affects the performance and everyday activities of that person.

The other type of perfectionism is narcissistic perfectionism which is not explored for its personal level implications as Millon et al (2012) would have argued but more on the overall effects of a person's well-being within a family. They term it more in the context of “hierarchical” type of perfectionism that comes down from father to son or daughter. This type of perfectionism is patriarchal in nature and it is not possible for an individual to imbibe those qualities. It could be termed as “lineage” or “trait” perfectionism and not narcissistic perfectionism, since narcissistic perfectionism would imply that a person's ways as the best ways and no other ways could please the person. In context of the learning environment, it could be understood as a teacher's rigid and compulsive imposition to a student because the teacher assumes and believes that his/her way is the best and no other outside suggestions will be entertained by the teacher. Perfectionist ways in itself already connotes heavy and strict impositions to student, and when coupled with narcissistic ways would make the learning process seem tiresome and rigorous (Pianta et al., 2012).

On the other hand, normal perfectionists are skilled artists or careful workers who are masters in their own craft (Schuler, 2000). Normal perfectionism is also known as adaptive perfectionism, referring to people who derive a sense of pleasure from the labor of a painstaking effort and who feel free to be less precise as the situation permits. Normal perfectionists may face problems like anxiety, depression and stress in an unsettling way and would work accordingly to relieve themselves from any discomfort (Hamachek, 1978). Hamachek also refers to this kind of perfectionism as ‘healthy’ perfectionism. A person who is easy going and care about the outcome of their craft can be categorized as healthy and normal perfectionist. Students of this nature would be enthusiastic and careful performers so that they do not commit many mistakes and their motivation to do well will be quite apparent (Schuler, 2000). However, this also depends on how the student tackles moods like anxiety, stress and depression, only then it can be determined if he/she has carefully mastered his/her skills to overcome any kind of situation.

Persons of self-oriented perfectionism have high internalized standards which are received as messages during adolescence. These individuals are careful to avoid committing even minor mistakes, or may have taken on adult responsibilities at an early age when they lacked the appropriate skills. Brustein (2013) asserts that the goal of these individuals is not just to excel but to avoid failure at any cost and be perfect. The standards set by self-oriented perfectionists are impossibly high to attain, coupled with self-criticism and inability to accept one's own mistakes (Antony & Swinson, 2009). The self-oriented perfectionist may compare himself/ herself to others with very different skills and attempt to emulate them to gain acceptance. These beliefs contribute to low-self-esteem, anxiety and depression level in the person and may not be of any benefit in the long run (Flett & Hewitt, 2011).

Other-oriented perfectionism refers to “a condition where the individual sets unrealistically high standards for others” (Antony & Swinson, 2009). They tend to set unrealistic impositions and criticize the work of others, which

further isolates them. Because they want things done their way, they have difficulty delegating and tend to overwork. Their difficulty in compromising affects their ability to live and work peacefully with others (Stoeber& Childs). This type of perfectionists often finds it hard to maintain relationships since they are skeptical about their ways and do not appreciate the work of others. Rather, he/she would only criticize and be critical about other person's capabilities (Flett& Hewitt, 2011).

Socially-prescribed perfectionists believe that others or the society has socially constructed impossibly high expectations for them that they can never meet (Hackfort&Tenenbaum, 2006). The fear of not being able to meet the expectations leads to depression, anxiety and resentment. When perfectionism of any type becomes extreme, the stress often contributes to physical ailments, which further inhibit one's ability to function well as it goes beyond the ability of a person (Flett& Hewitt, 2011).

C. Teachers' Perfectionism

Perfectionism of a teacher was explored by Frost et al., (1990) who described it as a personality style characterized by striving for flawlessness within himself/herself and to the student and then setting of excessively high standards for performance accompanied by tendencies for overly critical evaluations of one's behavior. Perfectionism exists among individuals of different professions, and teaching is no exception to this incidence. Perfectionism of a teacher depends purely on what temperament and personality traits that he/she possesses and what forms of teaching he applies within his classroom environment (Tang, Au, Schwarzer, & Schmitz, 2001). The result of a teacher's teaching methods is visible in the students' performance in the class (Mustapha et al, 2014). Teaching, according to Tang et al., (2001) is one of the most stressful professions in the world and when teachers use rigid and perfectionist ways of teaching; it could be quite taxing for the students. However, it must be noted here that not all perfectionist ways of the teacher can be taxing, as some students react favorably to it while others may not. It is up to the teacher to make the teaching environment lively and to inculcate sincerity and motivation in students; making the learning process less stressful and workable from both ends (Tang et al., 2001).

Perfectionism in teachers exists primarily in the above reviewed forms. The first type of teacher perfectionism, i.e. self-oriented perfectionism comprises those facets of perfectionism that may be considered normal, healthy, or adaptive. Common traits include striving for perfection and setting high personal standards. The other kinds of teacher perfectionism, in contrast, includes dimension of perfectionistic concerns considered neurotic, unhealthy, or maladaptive perfectionism. This type of perfectionist teacher expresses concern over mistakes and doubts about actions. Results of different types of perfectionism among teachers such as normal, self-oriented, healthy, adaptive, neurotic, maladaptive perfectionism and other-oriented forms vary differently.

D. Learner's perfectionism

Studies on perfectionism that have been conducted on the learners' or students' construct can be referred to as 'learner's perfectionism' (Pishghadam&Akhondpoor, 2011). A number of studies have been conducted to examine the effects and symptoms of learner's perfectionism. Perfectionism in learners can lead to anxiety, academic procrastination and worry (Chang et al, 2007; Stober&Joorman, 2001 in Pishghadam&Akhondpoor 2011). The problems of perfectionists are also applicable to perfectionist learners, such as impossibly high standards of performance, fear of failure which results in motivation rather than the pursuit of success, procrastination resulting in tardiness, trouble taking credit for achievements, etc. (Brophy, 1995; Burns, 1980; Pacht, 1984). A notable study was conducted by Gregersen&Horwitz (2002) on understanding learner's perfectionism in EFL students in which they concluded that anxious English learners set high standards of performance, procrastinate often, worry about others' opinion of their conduct, and obsess over small errors in their work.

Another interesting research on the subject was carried out by Moradan, Kazenian, &Niroom, (2013) on 'The relationship between Perfectionism and listening Comprehension among EFL Students of Kerman University' in Iran. The aim of the research was to measure the relationship between perfectionism and its effects on and relationship with listening comprehension. The gender aspect was taken into account in this research. Two methods were used for this research; MPS (Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale) and LC (Longman Complete). Results showed that there was a negative correlation between MPS and LC and it was also found out that female subjects were more perfectionist than their counterparts.

Teachers' perfectionist ways can impact learners' perfectionist ways, and at the end it can encapsulate the level of intimacy or the level of closeness in relational level (Martin & Ashby, 2004). Intimacy between student and teacher can bring about individual relationship between the two, which is considered the principal factor associated with health, adaptability, happiness and sense of meaning (Schaefer & Olson, 1981). It also involves removing barriers between teacher and student relationship and to create increased closeness and connection between them thereby creating a positive environment for students which according to Mousavi and Kashefian (2011) creating such an environment is an effective way to aid students.

The present study aimed at determining factors which influence learners' perfectionism in EFL contexts. There are many factors which affect the learners' perfectionism; some of which are ethnicity, motivation, gender, age, field of study, etc. The variable in this study which were more particularly related to learner's background was marital

Status (Single, Never married, Married, Widowed, Divorced, Separated). Researchers such as Burns (1980) and Hamachek (1978) maintained that biological and environmental factors can be influential factors in learners' perfectionism. Therefore, they have been included in the present study because all of these factors are believed to have impacts on learners' perfectionism.

III. Methodology

A. Participants

Participants in the current study were 100 males and females English students randomly selected from language institutes. Classes ranged in size from 8 to 20 students and ages of the students in the sample ranged from 18 to 55. All participants were asked to complete a series of questionnaires. The participants were among 11 classes with different teachers. They were selected from both gender.

B. Instruments

Participants were required to complete the following instruments:

1. A Scale on English Language Teacher Perfectionism (SELTP)
2. Frost Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (MPS)

The questionnaire developed were pre-examined before conducting the actual survey, as pre-examination assumes a crucial part of research methodology (Craig & Douglas, 2005). The facets arising from pre-examination of questionnaire were resolved before conducting the survey. The questionnaire structures were close ended, so as to get the exact answer consuming less amount of time. There were four sections in the whole questionnaire:

Section A: Demographic profile, comprising of questions related to the general background of the respondents, such as age, ethnicity, marital status, education, occupation, etc.

Section B: Scale on English Language Teacher Perfectionism, developed by Pishghadam, Fatemi, and Ghaviandam (2013), consisting of 30 questions, based on 4 point Likert scale ranging from always to never. And lastly,

Section C: Frost Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale, a 35 item self-report measure of perfectionism developed by Frost, Marten, Lahart, & Rosenblate (1990), based on 5 point Likert scale, ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree.

Initially a cover letter explaining the nature and reason of survey along with a requisition of permission, for conducting the same were intimidated to the selected institutes. Later, upon receiving the vote of permission from the authorities of the institutes, questionnaires were given to the respective students. The survey was based on voluntary participation of the respondents.

For verifying the data accuracy, two factors needed to be sorted out, namely, data validity and data reliability. Validity and reliability of data are two primary facets which is necessary to be considered while selecting the data collection procedure. Validity has been defined by Berdie & Anderson, (1974) as a factor concerned with whether the data collected yields the intended information. A set of questionnaire is held valid only when they are successful in entailing the true responses appropriate to the information looked-for. Thus, in meeting such a factor, it is essential that the questionnaire developed, is easy to understand by the respondents, just as the researcher intends them to understand. In the current study, to establish the validity of the questionnaire, it was given to a number of professors and they were asked to mark inappropriate items for the survey among the EFL students. Berdie and Anderson, (1974) also opined that, reliability factor of the questionnaires depends on the stability, observed over time- meaning that the particular set of questions will convey the same consistent meaning to all individual across time and nature. To ensure the reliability of the questionnaire developed in the current study, the researcher has applied the Alpha Cronbach computer reliability analysis for the statistical tool. The minimum reliability co-efficient value according to Cronbach and Gleser, (1957) should be 0.60, which in the present study reflected a reliability value of 0.933, thus stabilizing satisfactory reliability co-efficient.

C. Procedure

The present study involves exploratory, descriptive and explanatory methods of research. Exploratory research method assists the researcher to become well-versed with basic information, individual and concerns associated with the concept and developing a clear vision of the different happenings surrounding the study. Descriptive research method contributes in describing a process, mechanism or relationship in verbal or numerical term. Besides, it also takes into view information that acts as contradictory to prior established belief regarding the topic (Sue & Ritter, 2011). Explanatory research method succors in the determination of accuracy of a principle or theory. After comparing the various explanations, it identifies the most appropriate one and thereby builds and elaborate on it to make it complete. It, in short, extends a theory into new avenues (Neuman, 2006).

Since this study involves quantitative analysis of 100 EFL students in Iran to analyze teacher's perfectionism, the three methods including exploratory and descriptive ones have been applied to explore the data on factors which contribute towards and perfectionism and also to determine the role of teacher's perfectionism on learner's perfectionism. The results of literature survey will then be applied to descriptively determine the factors within the sample. Sample for conducting survey were selected from elementary and intermediate adult students (age ranging within 18 to 55).

D. Data Analysis

For analyzing the data obtained from the collection procedure, usage of statistical techniques is most crucial and popular. The statistical tool applied mostly depends on the particular research question that needs to be answered through such analysis (Wilumila, 2002). In the current quantitative study SPSS 22.0 software has been utilized to analyze the statistical data collected. The responses from the contributors were quantitatively coded and the data were put into the excel sheet, which was further transferred to the SPSS file. The SPSS software was applied to process the data collected in terms of descriptive statistics- frequency analysis and inferential statistics- correlation & regression analysis, following which the desired outcome was reached.

V. Results

A. MANOVA Results for Marital Status among Students

In order to find out whether or not significant differences existed between Iranian students with different marital status and its effects on learners' perfectionism, the means were calculated. The results are depicted in Table 1. It came to light that the means of those who are single is higher in learners' perfectionism. To check whether the differences were statistically significant, a multivariate test was conducted on the variable marital status.

Table 1: Means and Standard deviations of Students with different Marital Status

Variable	Marital Status	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Learners' perfectionism	single	3.2169	.22511	48
	married	3.0421	.25730	37
	separated	2.9510	.40148	3
	divorced	3.0000	.20483	9
	widowed	3.1078	.29461	3
	Total		3.1215	.25598

A MANOVA test was performed to determine any effect of marital status on the learners' perfectionism. The multivariate test was performed on the data at the 0.05 level of significance. Significant differences between marital status and the research variables were noted (Wilks' $\Lambda = .784$, $F = 3.036$, $p = .003$). The detailed results are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Multivariate Test for learners' perfectionism by marital status

Effect	Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Partial Squared	Eta
Wilk's Lambda	.784	3.036 ^b	8.000	188.000	.003	.114	

To find out the effects of the dependent variables of learners' perfectionism on marital status, univariate analysis was performed. The results displayed in Table 3 below showed that there was a significant main effect for learners' perfectionism in the case of marital status ($f = 4.789$, $p = .001$). In other words, marital status seems to have a significant influence on learners' perfectionism.

Table 3: Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (Marital Status)

Variable	Dependent Variable	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Squared	Eta
Marital status	Learners' perfectionism	.891	4	.223	3.780	.007	.137	

As marital status had more than two levels and the univariate analysis revealed a significant main effect of marital status for learners' perfectionism, the Bonferroni post-hoc for observed means was run. This test displayed that the means of single and married group were significantly different. Table 4 below shows where the differences lie.

Table 4: Bonferroni Post-Hoc Test for Learners' Perfectionism by Marital Status

group	single	married	separated	divorced	widowed
single		.1748*	.2659	.2169	.1091
married			.0911	.0421	-.0657
separated				-.0490	-.1569

perfectionist ones, teacher's perfectionism does not exert any influences on learner's perfectionism. Teachers and learners benefit from the results of this study. First, teachers become aware of the significance of their behavior in the classroom environment and as the results showed how they can have influence on learners' behavior. The present study provides teachers awareness of interactions between the learners and teachers. Second, teachers' awareness can lead to an improving classroom environment in which both teachers and learners can benefit more from a friendly, supportive learning environment.

REFERENCE

- [1] Adderholdt, M., PH.D., & Goldberg, J. (1992). *Perfectionism: What's Bad about Being Too Good?* Free Spirit Pub.
- [2] Antony, M. M., & Swinson, R. P. (2009). *When Perfect Isn't Good Enough: Strategies for Coping with Perfectionism*. Oakland: New Harbinger Publications.
- [3] Berdie, D. R., & Anderson, J. F. (1974). *Questionnaires: Design and Use*. Scarecrow Press, Incorporated. Retrieved from <https://books.google.co.in/books/about/Questionnaires.html?id=73F-AAAAMAAJ&pgis=1>
- [4] Brophy, J. (1995). *Elementary Teachers' Perceptions of and Reported Strategies for Coping with Twelve Types of Problem Students*. East Lansing.
- [5] Brustein, M. (2013). *Perfectionism: A Guide for Mental Health Professionals*. Berlin: Springer Publishing Company.
- [6] Burns, D. (1980). The Perfectionist's Script for Self-Defeat. *Psychology Today*, November, 34–52.
- [7] Burns, D. (1993). *The Perfectionist's Script for Self-Defeat*. New York: Harper Collins.
- [8] Chang, E. C. (1998). Cultural Differences, Perfectionism, and Suicidal Risk in a College Population: Does Social Problem Solving Still Matter? *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 22(3), 237–254. <http://doi.org/10.1023/A:1018792709351>
- [9] Chang, E. C. (2000). Perfectionism as a predictor of positive and negative psychological outcomes: Examining a mediation model in younger and older adults. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 47, 18–26.
- [10] Cronbach, L. J., & Gleser, G. C. (1957). *Psychological tests and personnel decisions*. University of Illinois Press. https://books.google.co.in/books/about/Psychological_tests_and_personnel_decisi.html?id=1BMNAAAIAAJ&pgis=1
- [11] Flett, G. L., & Hewitt, P. L. (2002). *Perfectionism: Theory, Research & Treatment*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- [12] Flett, G. L., & Hewitt, P. L. (2011). Perfectionism and Cognitive Factors in Distress and Dysfunction in Children and Adolescents: Introduction to the Special Issue. *Journal of Rational-Emotive & Cognitive-Behavior Therapy*, 30(2), 53–61. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s10942-011-0134-4>
- [13] Frost, R. O., Marten, P., Lahart, C., & Rosenblate, R. (1990). The dimensions of perfectionism. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 14(5), 449–468. <http://doi.org/10.1007/BF01172967>
- [14] Gregersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K. (2002). Language Learning and Perfectionism: Anxious and Non-Anxious Language Learners' Reactions to Their Own Oral Performance. *The Modern Language Journal*, 86(4), 562–570. <http://doi.org/10.1111/1540-4781.00161>
- [15] Hackfort, D., & Tenenbaum, G. (2006). *Essential Processes for Attaining Peak Performance*. Meyer & Meyer Verlag.
- [16] Hamachek, D. E. (1978). Psychodynamics of normal and neurotic perfectionism. *Psychology*, 15, 27–33.
- [17] Hashemi, M., & Abbasi, M. (2013). The Role of the Teacher in Alleviating Anxiety in Language Classes. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences*, 4(3), 640–646.
- [18] Millon, T. (1981). *Disorders of personality: DSM-III, Axis II*. Wiley.
- [19] Millon, T. (1983). *Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory*. Minneapolis: National Computer Systems.
- [20] Millon, T., Millon, C. M., Meagher, S., Grossman, S., & Ramnath, R. (2012). *Personality Disorders in Modern Life*. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons.
- [21] Moradan, A., Kazenian, E., & Niroo, Z. (2013). The Relationship between Perfectionism and Listening Comprehension among EFL Students of Kerman University. *International Journal of Linguistics and Communication*, 1(1), 8–16.
- [22] Mousavi, H. S., & Kashefian-Naeeni, S. (2011). Aninvestigation into the role of EFL learners' attitudes, motivation and proficiency in learning among Iranian students of National University inMalaysia. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 23(4), 593-603.
- [23] Mustapha, R., Abdul Rahim, Z.L., & Azman, M.N.A. (2014). Exploring the problems faced by technical school students in learning engineering courses. *Journal of Engineering, Science and Technology*, 9(6), 690-701.

- [24] Neuman, W. L. (2006). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*. Pearson. Retrieved from https://books.google.co.in/books/about/Social_Research_Methods.html?id=nObtAAAAMAAJ&pgis=1
- [25] Pacht, A. (1984). Reflections on Perfection. *American Psychologist*, 39, 386–290.
- [26] Peng, S., & Wright, D. (1994). Explanation of Accademic Performance of Asian American students pp. 346-352. *The Journal of Educational Research*, 87(6), 346–354.
- [27] Pianta, R., Hamre, B., & Joseph, P. (2012). *Teacher-Student Relationships and Engagement: Conceptualizing, Measuring, and Improving the Capacity of Classroom Interactions*. Berlin: Springer Science.
- [28] Pishghadam, R., & Akhondpoor, F. (2011). Learner Perfectionism and its Role in Foreign Language Learning Success, Academic Achievement, and Learner Anxiety. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research*, 2(2), 432–440. <http://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.2.2.432-440>
- [29] Pishghadam, R., Fatemi, A. H., & Ghaviandam, S. (2013). Designing and Validating a Scale on English Language Teacher Perfectionism (SELTP). *The Iranian EFL Journal*, 9(1), 11–22. Retrieved from <http://profdoc.um.ac.ir/articles/a/1033353.pdf>
- [30] Schaefer, M., & Olson, D. (1981). PERSONAL ASSESSMENT OF INTIMACY IN RELATIONSHIPS SCALE. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 1, 47–60.
- [31] Schruder, C., Sharpe, G., & Curwen, T. (2014). Perfectionistic Students: Contributing Factors, Impacts and Teacher Strategies. *Journal of Elementary Education*, 24(1), 79–98.
- [32] Shahsavari, Z., Jafari, P. (2018). Examining gender differences in students' attitude toward blogs using measurement invariance. *The International Journal of Diversity in Education*, 18(2), 13-25.
- [33]
- [34] Schuler, P. A. (2000). *Voices of Perfectionism: Perfectionistic Gifted Adolescents in a Rural Middle School*. Storrs: DIANE Publishing.
- [35] Stoeber, J., & Childs, J. H. (n.d.). *Perfectionism*. New York.
- [36] Stoeber, J., & Stoeber, F. S. (2009). Domains of perfectionism: Prevalence and relationships with perfectionism, gender, age, and satisfaction with life. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46(4), 530–535.
- [37] Sue, S., & Okazaki, S. (1990). Asian-American educational achievements. A phenomenon in search of an explanation. *The American Psychologist*, 45(8), 913–20.
- [38] Sue, V. M., & Ritter, L. A. (2011). *Conducting Online Surveys (Vol. 23)*. SAGE Publications. Retrieved from <https://books.google.com/books?id=Nc0gAQAAQBAJ&pgis=1>
- [39] Tang, C. S.-K., Au, W.-T., Schwarzer, R., & Schmitz, G. (2001). Mental health outcomes of job stress among Chinese teachers: role of stress resource factors and burnout. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22(8), 887–901. <http://doi.org/10.1002/job.120>
- [40] Wilumila, M. F. (2002). *Sampling In Research*. Nairobi. Retrieved from https://www.uonbi.ac.ke/fridah_mugo/files/mugo02sampling.pdf
- [41] Yee, A. H. (1992). Asians as stereotypes and students: Misperceptions that persist. *Educational Psychology Review*, 4(1), 95–132. <http://doi.org/10.1007/BF01322396>