

PERFECTIONISM AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING OF STUDENT TEACHERS

Su Nwe Win¹ and Moe Moe Naing²

Abstract

The primary purpose of this study was to investigate the effect of perfectionism on psychological well-being of student teachers. Descriptive survey method and quantitative approach were used in this study. A total of 1200 student teachers (600 males and 600 females) attending the first year to fifth year from Yangon University of Education, Sagaing University of Education and University for the Development of the National Races of the Union participated in this study. Revised Almost Perfect Scale (APS-R) and Psychological Well-Being Scale (PWBS) were used as research instruments. Revised Almost Perfect Scale consisted of 23 items and three subscales: high standards, order and discrepancy. Psychological Well-Being Scale consisted of 42 items and six subscales: autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life and self-acceptance. In this study, by using cluster analysis, three distinct perfectionism profiles (i.e., adaptive, maladaptive and non-perfectionists) were extracted. There was no significant difference in perfectionism types by gender and university. But, concerning the education level, significant differences were found. There were significant differences in psychological well-being by gender, education level and university. And then, the between-group differences were examined through a series of univariate analyses of variance based on the perfectionism profile membership. As expected, in overall psychological well-being and all its factors: autonomy, environmental mastery, personal growth, positive relations with others, purpose in life, self-acceptance, significant differences were found among adaptive perfectionist, maladaptive perfectionist and non-perfectionist student teachers.

Keywords: perfectionism, psychological well-being

Introduction

Significance of the Study

Nowadays, the prevalence of perfectionism among university students has been reported particularly high (Rice & Ashby, 2007), and new theories have been presented to explain its impacts (Fallahchai, Fallahi & Jami, 2017). According to Grzegorek, Slaney, Franze, and Rice (2004), the problems caused by it have the relatively high frequency. Researches have shown that adaptive perfectionism is associated with psychological adjustment (Miquelon, Vallerand, Grouzet & Cardinal, 2005), more positive forms of self-esteem regulation (Trumpeter, Watson, & O'Leary, 2006), higher self-esteem (Chufar & Pettijohn, 2013) and willingness to do challenging work and higher average at university or school (Bieling, Israeli, Smith & Antony, 2003). Researchers also reported that negative or maladaptive perfectionism is related to fear of failure (Stoeber & Rambow, 2007), suicide risk (O'Connor, 2007), eating disorders, hopelessness and insomnia (Bieling, Israeli & Antony, 2004), and anxiety disorders and depression (Iarovici, 2014).

Student teachers are also university students. Therefore, there may be perfectionism problems among student teachers who are university students. It does not matter if their perfectionistic personality traits are normal. But, it can be problematic if there are abnormal or maladaptive perfectionists among them. According to Fallahchai et al. (2017), maladaptive perfectionists have lower levels of psychological well-being than adaptive perfectionists.

¹ Senior Assistant Teacher, B.E.H.S. Myoma, Paungde

² Associate Professor, Department of Educational Psychology, Yangon University of Education

Therefore, student teachers who have maladaptive personality traits may have lower levels of psychological well-being. Psychological well-being means not only the presence of positive emotions and happiness and contentment but also the development of one's potential, having some control over one's life, having a sense of purpose (working towards valued goals) and experiencing positive relationships (Huppert, 2009).

Individuals with high levels of well-being are likely to be more productive at work and contribute to their communities (Anand & Nagle, 2016). Therefore, psychological well-being is also essential for student teachers. Student teachers who have lower levels of psychological well-being may have problems in their academic performance and lower levels of achievement. And, it is sure they will not become good teachers. This can be dangerous for the country. It is necessary to remedy them and raise their psychological well-being levels. If this study is made, student teachers' problems concerned with perfectionism and psychological well-being levels may be discovered. If so, remedial interventions and supports may be instituted to solve these problems and challenges.

Purposes of the Study

1. To cluster student teachers according to their perfectionism types
2. To examine the differences in perfectionism types of student teachers by gender, education level and university
3. To examine the differences in psychological well-being of student teachers by gender, education level and university
4. To investigate the differences in psychological well-being among adaptive perfectionist, maladaptive perfectionist and non-perfectionist student teachers
5. To investigate the differences in the factors of psychological well-being among adaptive perfectionist, maladaptive perfectionist and non-perfectionist student teachers

Definitions of Key Terms

Perfectionism: Perfectionism is a personality characteristic typified by a tendency to set and strive toward extremely, often unrealistically, high standards for performance and achievement. It can be either adaptive or maladaptive in nature (Stoeber & Otto, 2006).

Adaptive Perfectionism: Adaptive perfectionism is a personality trait characterized by the tendency to strive toward high performance or achievement standards in the absence of a corresponding tendency toward overly critical self-evaluation (Stoeber & Otto, 2006).

Maladaptive Perfectionism: Maladaptive perfectionism is a personality trait characterized by the tendency to strive toward high performance or achievement standards and to be overly critical in evaluations of one's behavior (Stoeber & Otto, 2006).

Non-Perfectionists: Non-perfectionists are individuals who set low to average standards for performance or achievement (Rice & Ashby, 2007).

Psychological Well-Being: Psychological well-being is defined as states that emerge from feeling of satisfaction with one's close interpersonal relationships and with one's occupation and financial situations (Bar-on, 2005).

Review of Related Literature

Adaptive and Maladaptive Dimensions of Perfectionism

Numerous researchers have investigated the psychological correlates of perfectionism, using a maladaptive and adaptive conceptualization of the construct (Musch, 2013). Some studies have utilized a dimensional approach in which perfectionism dimensions are combined to form independent factors and some have utilized a group-based approach in which perfectionism dimensions are used to form groups or subtypes of perfectionists (Stoeber & Otto, 2006). These subtypes include adaptive perfectionists, who possess high achievement or performance standards in the absence of overly critical self-evaluations; maladaptive perfectionists, who possess high achievement or performance standards in the presence of overly critical self-evaluations; and non-perfectionists, who possess low to average achievement or performance standards (Rice & Ashby, 2007).

Stoeber (2012b) reported that when these subtypes are compared, maladaptive perfectionists typically demonstrate higher levels of negative processes, outcomes and characteristics than the other groups and adaptive perfectionists show lower levels of negative processes, outcomes and characteristics than the other groups. Likewise, maladaptive perfectionists demonstrate lower levels and adaptive perfectionists demonstrate higher levels of positive processes, outcomes and characteristics than the other groups (Stoeber, 2012b). The correlation between perfectionism dimensions is less an issue for studies that employ a group-based approach because these studies use either dichotomization of perfectionism facet scores or cluster analysis to create groups with minimal overlap in the facets comprised of adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism. Therefore, the group-based approach in which perfectionism types were operationalized using the APS-R was used in the current study.

Multidimensional Model of Psychological Well-Being

Carol Ryff (1995) suggested that well-being should be defined with respect to positive properties. She developed a model which consists of six core dimensions of psychological well-being (Ryff, 1989a). Ryff's six dimensions of psychological well-being evoke different challenges that people have to encounter as they try to function positively (Ryff & Keyes, 1995) and these six dimensions are described separately with explanation and clarification as follows.

(i) Self-acceptance

Self-acceptance is a kind of self-evaluation that includes awareness and acceptance of both personal strengths and weaknesses (Ryff, 1989a). Self-accepting persons have a realistic perception of the self, including both their good and bad qualities and they are able to accept themselves (Ryff & Singer, 2003). Holding positive attitudes towards oneself is a core characteristic of positive psychological functioning (Ryff, 1989a).

(ii) Positive Relations with Others

This dimension of psychological well-being is linked to the ability to express strong feelings of empathy and affection for all human beings and to be capable of greater love, deeper friendship with others and more complete identification with others (Ryff & Singer, 1996). Positive relations and social support are the most common sources of happiness among people (Reis, 2012).

(iii) Autonomy

Ryff (1989a) equates autonomy with attributes such as self-determination, independence, internal locus of control, individuation and internal regulation of behavior. Underlying these attributes is the belief that an individual's thoughts and actions are his own and the agencies or causes outside his control should not determine them (Christopher, 1999).

(iv) Environmental Mastery

Environmental mastery refers to the ability of a person to manage the environment and to mould environments or to choose environments, which align with his or her needs and values (Ryff, 1989a). It means being able to control complex environmental and life situations (Ryff, 1989a) and to seize opportunities which present themselves.

(v) Purpose in Life

According to Ryff (1989a), a person who functions positively has goals, intentions and a sense of direction, all of which contribute to the feeling that life is meaningful. Purpose in life can be described as the perceived significance of one's existence and it involves the setting and reaching of goals which contribute to the appreciation of life (Ryff, 1989a; Ryff & Keyes, 1995).

(vi) Personal Growth

An individual must continue to develop the self through growth in various facets of life to achieve peak psychological functioning (Ryff, 1989a). This means that an individual needs to continually evolve and solve problems thereby expanding his or her talents and abilities. Thus, this aspect of positive functioning is dynamic and involves a continual process of developing one's potential (Ryff & Singer, 2008).

Method

Sample of the Study

Student teachers from Yangon University of Education, Sagaing University of Education and University for the Development of the National Races of the Union were selected as the participants of the study. A total number of 1200 student teachers attending the first year to fifth year participated in this study. The sample consisted of 400 student teachers (200 males and 200 females) from YUOE, 400 student teachers (200 males and 200 females) from SUOE, 400 student teachers (200 males and 200 females) from UDNR.

Research Instruments

Revised Almost Perfect Scale (APS-R) developed by Slaney, Rice, Mobley, Trippi, and Ashby (2001) was used to measure the dimensions of perfectionism. APS-R has 23 items with three subscales: High Standards (7 items), Discrepancy (12 items), and Order (4 items). Each item was assessed along a 4-point Likert Scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. The reliability coefficient of the whole scale was 0.862.

Psychological Well-Being Scale developed by Carol Ryff (1989) was used to measure psychological well-being and the 42-item version was used in this study. This scale consists of six subscales: Autonomy (7 items), Environmental Mastery (7 items), Personal Growth (7 items), Positive Relations with Others (7 items), Purpose in Life (7 items), and Self-acceptance

(7 items). Each item was assessed along a 4-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly Disagree to Strongly Agree. The reliability coefficient of the whole scale was 0.810.

Data Collection Procedure

Firstly, research instruments, APS-R and PWB scales, were adapted to Myanmar version. Then, expert review was conducted for face validity and content validity of the instruments. According to their suggestions and recommendations, the questionnaires were modified. Afterward, a pilot testing was conducted to find out whether it had clarity in Myanmar Language and whether it was appropriate, relevant and clear to the students or not. Then, data collection was carried out at the three Universities of Education to collect the required data for the study. After collecting the data, data analysis process was conducted by step-by-step.

Data Analysis and Findings

Perfectionism Profiles and Grouping

Cluster analysis was used to identify groups of perfectionists and non-perfectionists based on the participants’ scores on the APS-R. A two-step procedure involving both hierarchical and non-hierarchical analyses was conducted following the approach of other researchers in studies of adaptive and maladaptive perfectionists (i.e. Rice & Slaney, 2002; Ashby & Bruner, 2005; Gucciardi, Mahoney, Jalleh, Donovan & Parkes, 2012). As a first step, a hierarchical analysis using Ward’s linkage method with the Euclidean distance measure was performed. Ward’s hierarchical method was chosen because it reduces the within cluster differences found in other methods (Aldenderfer & Blashfield, 1984). Standardized z scores of High Standards and Discrepancy factors were used as variables in the analysis. The agglomeration coefficient and dendrograms generated from Ward’s hierarchical method identified three solutions (three, four and five clusters) to be considered in the non-hierarchical analysis. Based on the theoretical background of the present study, a three-cluster solution was chosen for the subsequent analysis. A non-hierarchical k-means cluster analysis was conducted using the three-cluster solution.

Table 1 Mean Differences in High Standards and Discrepancy Among Perfectionism Profile Groups

Factors of Perfectionism	Perfectionism Type	N	Mean		SD		F	p
			Raw Score	z Score	Raw Score	z Score		
High Standards	AP	335	24.44	.85	1.828	.70	672.780***	.000
	NP	590	20.32	-.73	1.625	.62		
	MP	275	23.61	.53	2.051	.79		
Discrepancy	AP	335	24.61	-.84	4.115	.76	726.655***	.000
	NP	590	28.66	-.10	3.368	.62		
	MP	275	35.88	1.23	3.680	.68		

***p<0.001

Note: AP= Adaptive Perfectionists Group
 MP= Maladaptive Perfectionists Group
 NP= Non-perfectionists Group

Distribution of Student Teachers According to Demographic Variables Across the Three Perfectionism Clusters

To investigate whether the distribution of gender, education level and university (demographic variables) across the three perfectionism clusters was significantly different or not, Chi-square Test was performed.

Table 2 Distribution of Student Teachers According to Gender, Educational Level and University Across the Three Perfectionism Clusters

	Cluster 1	Cluster 2	Cluster 3	Total	χ^2
	Adaptive Perfectionists	Non-Perfectionists	Maladaptive Perfectionists		
	(N = 335)	(N = 590)	(N = 275)		
Gender					
Male	159 (26.5%)	291 (48.5%)	150 (25%)	600	3.244 (2), $p = .198$
Female	176 (29.3%)	299 (49.8%)	125 (20.8%)	600	
Education Level					
1 st Year	79 (32.9%)	84 (35%)	77 (32.1%)	240	36.820 (8)*** $p = .000$
2 nd Year	57 (23.8%)	132 (55%)	51 (21.3%)	240	
3 rd Year	68 (28.3%)	115 (47.9%)	57 (23.8%)	240	
4 th Year	53 (22.1%)	139 (57.9%)	48 (20%)	240	
5 th Year	78 (32.5%)	120 (50%)	42 (17.5%)	240	
University					
UDNR	103 (25.8%)	212 (53%)	85 (21.3%)	400	5.194 (4), $p = .268$
YUOE	122 (30.5%)	180 (45%)	98 (24.5%)	400	
SUOE	110 (27.5%)	198 (49.5%)	92 (23%)	400	

*** $p < 0.001$

Table 2 showed that the gender distribution across the three groups did not differ significantly. It could be interpreted that there was no association between perfectionism type and gender. But, significant differences were found in education level across the three clusters. In Adaptive group, the numbers of first year students and fifth year students were the highest and, in Maladaptive group, the numbers of first year students was the highest. In Non-Perfectionist group, the numbers of second year and fourth year students were the highest. Therefore, it could be assumed that there was a relationship between perfectionism type and education level. According to the result table, no significant differences were found in university across the three groups. It could be said that there was no association between perfectionism type and university.

Student Teachers' Psychological Well-Being

To explore the student teachers' psychological well-being, descriptive statistics were carried out and the results were shown in Table 3.

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics for Student Teachers’ Psychological Well-Being

Psychological Well-Being	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
Autonomy	1200	10	28	19.18	2.92
Environmental Mastery	1200	10	28	19.53	2.58
Personal Growth	1200	13	28	21.36	2.65
Positive Relations with Others	1200	9	28	20.35	2.86
Purpose in Life	1200	13	28	20.61	2.59
Self-Acceptance	1200	11	28	19.76	2.46
Total Psychological Well-Being	1200	87	162	120.78	11.20

Concerning the factors of psychological well-being, the mean score of personal growth was the highest, those of purpose in life and positive relations with others were the second highest, those of self-acceptance and environmental mastery were the third highest and that of autonomy was the lowest.

Comparison of Student Teachers’ Psychological Well-Being by Gender

To find out the differences in student teachers’ psychological well-being by gender, the analysis was made.

Table 4 Results of Independent Sample *t* test for Student Teachers’ Psychological Well-Being by Gender

Psychological Well-Being	Gender	N	Mean	SD	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Autonomy	Male	600	19.38	2.92	2.453	.014*
	Female	600	18.97	2.92		
Environmental Mastery	Male	600	19.54	2.68	.156	.876
	Female	600	19.52	2.48		
Personal Growth	Male	600	21.25	2.93	-1.494	.135
	Female	600	21.48	2.33		
Positive Relations with Others	Male	600	20.36	2.88	.101	.920
	Female	600	20.34	2.84		
Purpose in Life	Male	600	20.40	2.86	-2.759	.006**
	Female	600	20.81	2.27		
Self-Acceptance	Male	600	19.65	2.54	-1.537	.124
	Female	600	19.87	2.38		
Total Psychological Well-Being	Male	600	120.58	11.87	-.626	.531
	Female	600	120.99	10.49		

According to the results of *t*-test, there were significant differences in two factors, in autonomy at 0.05 level and in purpose in life at 0.01 level. This finding could be interpreted that male student teachers’ autonomy was higher than that of female student teachers and female student teachers’ purpose in life was higher than that of male student teachers. But, there were no significant mean differences in the other four factors and total psychological well-being with respect to gender.

Comparison of Student Teachers’ Psychological Well-Being by Education Level

In order to test whether student teachers were different in psychological well-being by education level, the analysis was conducted.

Table 5 ANOVA Results of Student Teachers' Psychological Well-Being by Education Level

Psychological Well-Being	Education Level	N	Mean	SD	F	p
Autonomy	1.1	240	19.05	3.01	3.661**	.006
	2.1	240	18.80	2.84		
	3.1	240	18.93	2.72		
	4.1	240	19.44	2.86		
	5.1	240	19.66	3.11		
Environmental Mastery	1.1	240	19.05	2.64	6.212***	.000
	2.1	240	19.35	2.35		
	3.1	240	19.40	2.57		
	4.1	240	19.72	2.44		
	5.1	240	20.13	2.78		
Personal Growth	1.1	240	21.66	2.71	5.539***	.000
	2.1	240	21.09	2.24		
	3.1	240	20.97	2.79		
	4.1	240	21.19	2.67		
	5.1	240	21.90	2.70		
Positive Relations with Others	1.1	240	20.41	3.14	.812	.517
	2.1	240	20.28	2.63		
	3.1	240	20.23	2.93		
	4.1	240	20.20	2.81		
	5.1	240	20.61	2.76		
Purpose in Life	1.1	240	21.24	2.90	6.011***	.000
	2.1	240	20.64	2.30		
	3.1	240	20.39	2.36		
	4.1	240	20.14	2.64		
	5.1	240	20.62	2.60		
Self-Acceptance	1.1	240	19.41	2.55	3.436**	.008
	2.1	240	19.66	2.23		
	3.1	240	19.74	2.27		
	4.1	240	19.78	2.31		
	5.1	240	20.22	2.85		
Total Psychological Well-Being	1.1	240	120.81	11.45	3.768**	.005
	2.1	240	119.83	10.05		
	3.1	240	119.67	10.90		
	4.1	240	120.47	11.12		
	5.1	240	123.14	12.12		

p<0.01, *p<0.001

To obtain more detailed information for education level, Post-Hoc Test was carried out by Tukey's multiple comparison procedure.

Table 6 Results of Post-Hoc Analysis for Student Teachers’ Psychological Well-Being by Education Level

Psychological Well-Being	(I) Education Level	(J) Education Level	Mean Difference (I-J)	p
Autonomy	5.1	2.1	.854*	.012
Environmental Mastery	4.1	1.1	.667*	.036
		5.1	1.1	1.083***
	5.1	2.1	.783**	.007
		3.1	.733*	.015
Personal Growth	1.1	3.1	.692*	.033
		5.1	2.1	.813**
	5.1	3.1	.933**	.001
		4.1	.708*	.027
Purpose in Life	1.1	3.1	.846**	.003
		4.1	1.096***	.000
Self-Acceptance	5.1	1.1	.808**	.003
Total Psychological Well-Being	5.1	2.1	3.313*	.010
		3.1	3.471**	.006

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

According to the results, in autonomy, it could be easily seen that the mean score of fifth year students was higher than that of second year students. Therefore, it could be interpreted that fifth year students were able to live autonomously and assessed the selves based on their own personal values and standards significantly better than second year students. In environmental mastery, the mean score of fourth year students was higher than that of first year students. Moreover, in environmental mastery, the mean score of fifth year students was higher than those of first year, second year and third year students. It could be assumed that senior students had the better ability to manage the environment and to relate to different people in diverse situations and adapt to various contexts upon demand than their junior students.

In personal growth, the mean score of first year students was higher than that of third year students. It could be interpreted that first year students had the ability to develop their talents and abilities and to accomplish goals more than third year students. Moreover, fifth year students were higher in personal growth than second year, third year, and fourth year students. It could also be said that, except for first year students, second year, third year and fourth year students had a sense of personal growth lower than their seniors, fifth year students. In purpose in life, the mean score of first year students was higher than those of third year and fourth year students. It could be interpreted that first year students had goals which contribute to the appreciation of their life more than their seniors, third year and fourth year students.

Likewise, in self-acceptance, the mean score of fifth year students was significantly higher than first year students. It could be interpreted that, since fifth year students were older and more mature, they had more self-acceptance than first year students. In general psychological well-being, the mean score of fifth year students was higher than those of second year and third year students. Therefore, it could be assumed that second year and third year students had lower levels of psychological well-being than their seniors, fifth year students.

Comparison of Student Teachers' Psychological Well-Being by University

In order to test whether student teachers were different in psychological well-being with respect to their university, the analysis was conducted.

Table 7 ANOVA Results of Student Teachers' Psychological Well-Being by University

Psychological Well-Being	University	N	Mean	SD	F	p
Autonomy	UDNR	400	18.98	2.74	1.759	.173
	YUOE	400	19.37	3.01		
	SUOE	400	19.18	3.01		
Environmental Mastery	UDNR	400	19.59	2.44	.217	.805
	YUOE	400	19.53	2.71		
	SUOE	400	19.47	2.60		
Personal Growth	UDNR	400	21.18	2.55	2.286	.102
	YUOE	400	21.57	2.57		
	SUOE	400	21.34	2.82		
Positive Relations with Others	UDNR	400	20.54	2.83	1.696	.184
	YUOE	400	20.17	2.96		
	SUOE	400	20.33	2.77		
Purpose in Life	UDNR	400	20.91	2.48	6.351**	.002
	YUOE	400	20.64	2.70		
	SUOE	400	20.27	2.56		
Self-Acceptance	UDNR	400	19.48	2.19	4.335*	.013
	YUOE	400	19.83	2.59		
	SUOE	400	19.98	2.57		
Total Psychological Well-Being	UDNR	400	120.68	10.64	.265	.767
	YUOE	400	121.11	11.46		
	SUOE	400	120.56	11.50		

*p<0.05, **p<0.01

To obtain more exact information for university, Post-Hoc Test was carried out by Tukey's multiple comparison procedure.

Table 8 Results of Post-Hoc Analysis for Student Teachers' Psychological Well Being by University

Psychological Well-Being	(I) University	(J) University	Mean Difference (I-J)	p
Purpose in Life	UDNR	SUOE	.648**	.001
Self-Acceptance	SUOE	UDNR	.497*	.012

*p<0.05, **p<0.01

According to the results, in total psychological well-being, the mean scores of participants from the three universities were not significantly different. But for purpose in life, the mean score of UDNR students was higher than that of SUOE students. It could be interpreted that student teachers from UDNR had purposes, goals and intentions to achieve success more than student teachers from SUOE. Moreover, in self-acceptance, the mean score of SUOE students was higher than that of UDNR students. It could be assumed that student teachers from SUOE had more

positive views about their life and more satisfied with their life than student teachers from UDNR.

The Impact of Perfectionism Type on Psychological Well-Being of Student Teachers

To investigate the differences in psychological well-being and all its factors among adaptive perfectionist, maladaptive perfectionist and non-perfectionist student teachers, the analysis was conducted.

Table 9 ANOVA Results of Student Teachers' Psychological Well-Being by Their Perfectionism Type

Factors of Psychological Well-Being	Perfectionism Type	N	Mean	SD	F	p
Autonomy	AP	335	20.59	3.06	59.140***	.000
	NP	590	18.64	2.38		
	MP	275	18.60	3.23		
Environmental Mastery	AP	335	21.09	2.50	99.060***	.000
	NP	590	18.98	2.12		
	MP	275	18.81	2.79		
Personal Growth	AP	335	22.86	2.60	89.628***	.000
	NP	590	20.61	2.15		
	MP	275	21.15	2.92		
Positive Relations with Others	AP	335	21.93	2.85	81.770***	.000
	NP	590	19.79	2.33		
	MP	275	19.61	3.14		
Purpose in Life	AP	335	22.17	2.59	99.540***	.000
	NP	590	19.91	2.08		
	MP	275	20.20	2.78		
Self-Acceptance	AP	335	21.01	2.45	71.951***	.000
	NP	590	19.45	2.10		
	MP	275	18.91	2.63		
Total Psychological Well-Being	AP	335	129.64	10.46	191.793***	.000
	NP	590	117.38	8.50		
	MP	275	117.29	11.27		

***p<0.001

To obtain more detailed information for the differences among perfectionism types, Post-Hoc Test was carried out by Tukey's multiple comparison procedure.

Table 10 Results of Post-Hoc Analysis for Student Teachers' Psychological Well-Being by Their Perfectionism Type

Psychological Well-Being	(I) Perfectionism Type	(J) Perfectionism Type	Mean Difference(I-J)	<i>p</i>
Autonomy	AP	NP	1.941***	.000
		MP	1.981***	.000
Environmental Mastery	AP	NP	2.112***	.000
		MP	2.275***	.000
Personal Growth	AP	NP	2.248***	.000
		MP	1.704***	.000
	MP	NP	.544**	.007
Positive Relations with Others	AP	NP	2.148***	.000
		MP	2.320***	.000
Purpose in Life	AP	NP	2.257***	.000
		MP	1.971***	.000
Self-Acceptance	AP	NP	1.563***	.000
		MP	2.099***	.000
	NP	MP	.536**	.005
Total Psychological Well-Being	AP	NP	12.27***	.000
		MP	12.35***	.000

*** $p < 0.001$

According to the results, it could be easily seen that adaptive perfectionist group of student teachers had higher mean scores in overall psychological well-being and all its components than maladaptive group and non-perfectionist group. It could be interpreted that adaptive group of student teachers had a higher level of psychological well-being than both maladaptive and non-perfectionist groups of student teachers. Maladaptive perfectionists and non-perfectionists were not significantly different in overall psychological well-being and its four components. But, in personal growth and self-acceptance, the differences between the mean scores of non-perfectionist and maladaptive perfectionist student teachers were significant. It could be interpreted that although the personal growth of maladaptive perfectionists was lower than the adaptive group, theirs was still higher than those of non-perfectionists, but it was more difficult for maladaptive perfectionists to accept themselves and their existence than non-perfectionists.

Conclusion, Discussion and Recommendations

Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions

In concluding the results, education level related difference was found to be on perfectionism types. It was found that in Adaptive group, the numbers of first year students and fifth year students were the highest and, in Maladaptive group, the number of first year students was the highest. In Non-Perfectionist group, the number of first year students was the lowest. Therefore, it can be said that first year students have more perfectionistic tendencies than their seniors. Among them, as there are adaptive perfectionists, there are also maladaptive

perfectionists. Therefore, teacher trainers should be aware of the students who are maladaptive when teaching them. As they are just first year students, their education level is low as compared to their senior students, so teachers should teach and support them to reduce their maladaptive tendencies and should also help while they are trying to change themselves. Moreover, gender related difference was found to be on two factors of psychological well-being. Males were higher in autonomy and females were higher in purpose in life.

Moreover, education level related difference was found to be on overall psychological well-being. The oldest students in the university, fifth year students had highest levels of psychological well-being than their juniors. Therefore, it can be said that the higher the education level, the higher the psychological well-being. Therefore, teachers should teach junior students how to live well and peacefully in their life and give emotional support to raise their psychological well-being. In addition, university related difference was found on two factors of psychological well-being. Among the three universities, UDNR students were the highest in purpose in life. Therefore, teachers from YUOE and SUOE should be aware of this fact and help students have more purposes, more goals and more intentions to achieve success like UDNR students. Moreover, SUOE students were the highest in self-acceptance. Therefore, teachers from YUOE and UDNR should be aware of this fact and teach students to accept themselves including both their good and bad qualities. Finally, in concluding the results, perfectionism had a significant effect on psychological well-being of student teachers. It is found that adaptive perfectionists had a higher level of psychological well-being than maladaptive perfectionists and non-perfectionists. Therefore, if societies including parents, teachers and caregivers found that their children, student teachers, are perfectionists, they should be careful whether their perfectionistic traits are adaptive or maladaptive.

Parents, teachers and caregivers should cultivate the children to improve their adaptive perfectionistic traits and to reduce maladaptive perfectionistic tendencies so as to enhance their psychological well-being. Moreover, it is important that parents and teachers themselves should not be maladaptive perfectionists because their behaviors and thinking can influence their children. By cultivating the student teachers not to have maladaptive perfectionistic tendencies, their psychological well-being will be high and they will become physically and mentally healthy and strong teachers who will be able to serve the interest of the country.

Limitations of the Study

A major limitation of this study is cross-sectional study design, so causal-relationships among the variables could not be established. Longitudinal studies should be employed to test the hypotheses. But, due to the shortage of time and relevant resources, such kind of design was impossible for this study. Another limitation is that the sample size was not sufficient to represent the whole student teachers because the participating institutions were drawn only from three Universities of Education. More than twenty Colleges of Education are still left to be included in this study. Moreover, only questionnaire survey method was used in this study and it should be followed up by qualitative research methods to obtain in-depth information about perfectionistic traits and psychological well-being.

Recommendations for Future Research

To confirm and validate the findings of this study, it is suggested longitudinal studies should be undertaken. The present study has some necessities because of its recruited scope and

selected sample. In this study, the sample used is student teachers from three Universities of Education. To be more representative, future research should be conducted not only with student teachers from Universities of Education but also with student teachers from Education Colleges. Moreover, since perfectionism problems can also happen among state school students, future research in this area should be carried out for basic education students.

References

- Aldenderfer, M.S., & Blashfield, R.K. (1984). *Cluster analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Anand, K., & Nagle, Y.K. (2016). Perceived stress as predictor of psychological well-being. *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 3(4), 211-217.
- Ashby, J.S., & Bruner, L.P. (2005). Multidimensional perfectionism and obsessive-compulsive behaviors. *Journal of College Counselling*, 8(1), 31-40.
- Bar-On, R. (2005). The impact of emotional intelligence on subjective well-being. *Perspectives in Education*, 23, 41-61.
- Bieling, P.J., Israeli, A.L., & Antony, M.M. (2004). Is perfectionism good, bad, or both? Examining models of the perfectionism construct. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36(6), 1373-1385.
- Bieling, P.J., Israeli, A.L., Smith, J., & Antony, M.M. (2003). Making the grade: The behavioral consequences of perfectionism in the classroom. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 35(1), 163-178.
- Christopher, J. C. (1999). Situating psychological well-being: Exploring the cultural roots of its theory and research. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 77, 141-152.
- Chufar, B.M., & Pettijohn, T. (2013). Meeting high standards: The effect of perfectionism on task performance, self-esteem, and self-efficacy in college students. *Psychology Behavior Science*, 2, 117-123.
- Fallahchai, R., Fallahi, M. & Jami, A.M. (2017). Perfectionism and well-being in graduate, undergraduate and Ph.D. students: Adaptive versus maladaptive. *Iranian Evolutionary Educational Psychology Journal*, 1(2), 48-57.
- Grzegorek, J.L., Slaney, R.B., Franze, S., & Rice, K.G. (2004). Self-Criticism, dependency, self-esteem and grade point average satisfaction among clusters of perfectionists and nonperfectionists. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 51(2), 192-200.
- Gucciardi, D.F., Mahoney, J., Jalleh, G., Donovan, R.J., & Parkes, J. (2012). Perfectionistic profiles among elite athletes and differences in their motivational orientations. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology*, 34, 159-183.
- Huppert, F. A. (2009). Psychological well-being: Evidence regarding its causes and consequences. *Applied Psychology: Health and Well-being*, 1(2), 137-164.
- Iarovici, D. (2014). *Mental health issues and the university student*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Miquelon, P., Vallerand, R.J., Grouzet, F.M., & Cardinal, G. (2005). Perfectionism, academic motivation, and psychological adjustment: An integrative model. *Personality and Social Bulletin*, 31(7), 913-924.
- Musch, E. (2013). *The impact of perfectionism type on the career self-efficacy, vocational identity, and interest differentiation of college students*. (Doctoral Dissertation, The Florida State University, Florida, US). Retrieved October 2, 2018, from <https://www.google.com.mm/url?sa=t&source=web&rct=j&url=https://fsu.digital.flvc.org/islandora/object/fsu:183838/datastream/PDF/view&ved=2ahUKEwj0z8TBlo3eAhUWdysKHSpnBD8QFjAAegQIBBAB&usq=AOvVaw2A1ZmLa3hhnXgx-W9Nxxw>
- O'Connor, R. C. (2007). The relations between perfectionism and suicidality: A systematic review. *Suicide and Life-Threatening Behavior*, 37(6), 698-714.
- Rice, K.G., & Ashby, J.S. (2007). An efficient method for classifying perfectionists. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54(1), 72-85.

- Rice, K.G., & Slaney, R.B. (2002). Clusters of perfectionists: Two studies of emotional adjustment and academic achievement. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 35, 35-48.
- Ryff, C. D. (1989a). Happiness is everything or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069-1081.
- Ryff, C. D. (1995). Psychological well-being in adult life. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 4(4), 99-104.
- Ryff, C.D., & Singer, B.H. (1996). Psychological well-being: Meaning, measurement and implications for psychotherapy research. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics*, 65, 14-23.
- Ryff, C.D., & Singer, B.H. (2003). Flourishing under fire: Resilience as a prototype of challenged thriving. In C. Keyes, & J. Haidt (Eds.), *Positive psychology and the life well-lived* (pp. 15-36). Washington, DC: APA.
- Ryff, C.D., & Singer, B.H. (2008). Know thyself and become what you are: A eudaimonic approach to psychological well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 9(1), 13-39.
- Stoeber, J. (2012b). The 2×2 model of perfectionism: A critical component and some suggestions. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 53, 541-545.
- Stoeber, J., & Rambow, A. (2007). Perfectionism in adolescent school students: Relations with motivation, achievement and well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42(7), 1379-1389.
- Stoeber, J., & Otto, K. (2006). Positive conceptions of perfectionism: Approaches, evidence, challenges. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(4), 295-319.
- Trumpler, N., Watson, P., & O'Leary, B.J. (2006). Factors within multidimensional perfectionism scales: Complexity of relationships with self-esteem, narcissism, self-control, and self-criticism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 41(5), 849.