FORGIVENESS, PERFECTIONISM AND SELF-COMPASSION OF UNDERGRADUATE STUDENTS FROM SAGAING UNIVERSITY OF EDUCATION

Khin Theint Theint Zar[1], Tint Swe[2]

Abstract

The aim of this study is to investigate forgiveness, perfectionism, and self-compassion of undergraduate students from Sagaing University of Education. The study conducted a survey research design and employed with a quantitative method. As the research instruments, Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS; Thompson et al., 2005), Almost Perfect scale - Revised (APS-R; Slaney et al., 2001), and Self-Compassion Scale (SCS; Neff, 2003b) were applied. A total of 754 undergraduate students (310 males, 444 females) were selected from Sagaing University of Education as participants. Descriptive statistics, independent sample *t* test, correlation analysis and regression were used in this study. The results revealed that there was no significant difference in forgiveness, and perfectionism by gender but there was significant difference in self-compassion by gender, females are higher than males. The results showed that there was significant difference in forgiveness, and perfectionism by grade, only between third year and fifth year students. Third year students are higher than fifth year students. But there was no significant difference in self-compassion by grade. And, there was no significant difference in forgiveness, perfectionism, and self-compassion by subject stream. The findings revealed that there was low negative significant correlation between forgiveness and discrepancy of perfectionism and between self-compassion and discrepancy of perfectionism. According to Multiple Regression analyses, forgiveness was key predictor on perfectionism since adjusted R^2 result showed that 57% of variance in discrepancy of perfectionism which was explained by forgiveness. The results also showed that self-compassion was key predictor on perfectionism since adjusted R^2 result showed that 20% of variance in discrepancy of perfectionism which was explained by self-compassion. Finally, students' positive perception upon negative events and performances should be developed with the help of teachers and parents so that they might not blame themselves or others negatively when the things they don't want happen.

Keyword: Perfectionism, forgiveness, self-compassion

Introduction

Many researches have supported the psychological, emotional, and physical benefits of forgiveness for well-being (e.g., Lawler, Younger, Piferi, Billington, Jobe, Edmonson, et al., 2003; Witvliet, 2001, 2005; Worthington, 2005). At the same time, the field of psychology has gained much knowledge regarding perfectionism and its potentially destructive impact on individuals. Trying to be better in life was a very common and basic need that humankind has been experiencing for centuries. The term perfectionism is rooted in cultures because of human's competitions in workplaces and their striving high to attain resources on one hand and all cultures tendency to prompt a good life for their people in the other hand.

Research on perfectionism has developed extensively over time. The early perfectionism literature adopted a more singular and unidimensional construct (Burns, 1980). It was originally considered as a construct having only one definition and entirely negative consequences. Freud saw the desire for perfection as an aspect of narcissim, which he placed firmly in the realm of neurotic disorder. But further insights support the idea that perfectionism contains both positive and negative dimensions. More recently, a multifaceted conceptualization has proven popular and accurate (e.g., Frost, Marten, Lahart, & Rosenblat, 1990). In the field of psychology, Adler (1956) noted that striving for perfectionism is normal and innate because of the tendency of

---

[1] Senior Teacher, Branch of Basic Education High School (Talapar), Thayet
[2] Lecturer, Department of Educational Psychology, Sagaing University of Education

human social being. He argued that those who express healthy perfectionism search for goals that are obtainable, while those who express maladaptive perfectionism might have obsessive order and fear of critique.

Forgiving promotes continuity in interpersonal relationships by mending the inevitable injuries and transgressions that occur in social interaction. There exists much debate as to the conceptualization of forgiveness, and most have considered forgiveness of transgressions interpersonally to be the quite essential definition of forgiveness. However, strong trends in measuring forgiveness have now advanced the notion of assessing forgiveness using multiple aspects in a more comprehensive and dispositional manner. Many self-report measures have been developed to assess forgiveness. Several of these measures assess nondispotional forgiveness such as the forgiveness of another person for a specific transgression (McCollough et al., 1998), and forgiveness of a specific person for one or more transgressions (Hargrave & Sells, 2007).

However, Thompson et al asserted that forgiveness is a multidimensional construct composed of forgiveness of self, forgiveness of others, and forgiveness of situations beyond anyone's control (e.g., an illness or natural disaster). They have introduced and provided strong evidence for considering forgiveness under this new framework, in which it is defined as ".. the framing of a perceived transgression such that one's attachment to the transgressor, transgression, sequelae of the transgression is transformed from negative to neutral or positive". Under this approach, forgiveness is considered as a primarily intrapersonal phenomenon, having to do with a person's internal process of transforming the valence of their attachment to an event or outcome. Perfectionism has been introduced with self-oriented, other-oriented, and socially prescribed perfectionism dimensions (Hewitt & Flett, 1990). Self-oriented and other-oriented perfectionism are both described as originating from within an individual, while socially prescribed perfectionism has gathered some controversy due to its focus on the expectations of others. This means that, similar to forgiveness, the construct of perfectionism has been described using both interpersonal and intrapersonal terms.

The similarities between forgiveness and perfectionism highlight the possibility of an important relationship between the two. It is possible that a destructive element at play here may be an inability for perfectionistic individuals to forgive themselves. Once a perceived failure or inadequacy occurs, these individuals become incredibly vulnerable to future perceived failures, engaging in evaluative and critical condemnation of themselves or others, potentially demonstrating a low level of dispositional forgiveness.

Self-compassion, though recently introduced into the current psychological literature (Neff, 2003a), has held promise for improving mental health and well-being for many years. More recently, self-compassion has made its way into the psychological arena, with strong empirical support for its benefits. Self-compassion has been found to have a significant inverse relationship with perfectionism (Neff, 2003b), in that the more self-compassion the lower the maladaptive perfectionism. Self-compassionate individuals look with understanding upon their experiences rather than criticize them, take a balanced perspective toward negative feelings, see commonalities between their experience and those of others, accept inadequacies as implicitly part of the human condition, and create a mental space in which to be mindful of their feelings and internal processes (Neff, 2003a). With maladaptive perfectionism enacting a harsh judgment on inadequacies or negative experiences, it makes sense that a mindful, understanding, and kind

perspective toward oneself may help save an individual from becoming entrenched in a perfectionistic mindset.

The common humanity aspect of self-compassion, the ability to see oneself as similar to others, with implicit failures, mistakes, and inadequacies, increases a sense of interconnectedness (Neff, 2003b). This sense of belonging is often absent in maladaptive perfectionists, who exhibit low levels of social connection (Rice, et al., 2006). Therefore, the current study will observe whether self-compassion relate to perfectionism and forgiveness to perfectionism. So, undergraduate students (third year, fourth, and fifth year students) from Sagaing University of Education were selected as participants to study perfectionism, forgiveness, and self-compassion.

Aims of the Study

The main aim of this study is to study forgiveness, perfectionism, and self-compassion of undergraduate students from Sagaing University of Education.

The specific objectives of this study are:

- To examine forgiveness of undergraduate students from Sagaing University of Education based on gender, grade, and subject stream.

- To explore perfectionism of undergraduate students from Sagaing University of Education based on gender, grade, and subject stream.

- To investigate self-compassion of undergraduate students from Sagaing University of Education based on gender, grade, and subject stream.

- To observe whether there is a relationship among forgiveness, perfectionism and self-compassion of undergraduate students from Sagaing University of Education.

Research Questions

1. Is there any significant difference between forgiveness, perfectionism, and self-compassion of undergraduate students by gender?

2. Is there any significant difference between forgiveness, perfectionism, and self-compassion of undergraduate students by grade?

3. Is there any significant difference between forgiveness, perfectionism, and self-compassion of undergraduate students by subject stream?

4. Is there any relationship among forgiveness, perfectionism, and self-compassion of undergraduate students?

Scope of the Study

In this study, a total of 754 undergraduate students (310 males and 444 females) from third year, fourth year, and fifth year students from Sagaing University of Education were selected as participants.

Definition of Key Terms

Forgiveness can be defined as a steady change from being angry and not understanding, to a positive attitude which involves letting go of resentment and moving on (Ross et al, 2004).

Perfectionism can be defined as the excessively high personal standards as well as a tendency to be overly critical of one self, when those standards have not met (Frost, Marten, Lahart, & Rosenblate, 1990).

Self-Compassion simply represents compassion turned inward, and refers to how we relate to ourselves in instances of perceived failure, inadequacy or personal suffering (Neff, 2003a, 2003b).

Methodology

Sample of the Study

Students from Sagaing University of Education were selected as a sample for the study in the academic year 2018-2019.

Table 1 Number of Participants by Gender

No.	Grade of Students	Number of Students		
		Male	Female	Total
1.	Third Year	110	144	254
2.	Fourth Year	96	161	257
3.	Fifth Year	104	139	243
	Total	310	444	754

Instrumentation

The research instruments were the Heartland Forgiveness Scale (HFS; Thompson et al., 2005), the Almost Perfect Scale - Revised (APS-R; Slaney et al., 2001), and Self-Compassion Scale (SCS; Neff, 2003b). The Heartland Forgiveness Scale was developed by Thompson et al (2005). The HFS includes 18 items and it is kind of self-report measure. It has three subscales; Forgiveness of Self, Forgiveness of Others, and Forgiveness of Situations. The HFS scale was scored with five-point Likert scale (1= never, 2= seldom, 3= often, 4= almost always, and 5= always).

The Almost Perfect scale - Revised was developed by Slaney et al (2001). The APS-R consists of 23 items that measures the multidimensional construct of perfectionism. It includes three subscales; High Standards, Order, and Discrepancy. Responses to these items were based on a four-point Likert scale (1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= agree, 4= strongly agree).

The instrument used to measure self-compassion was Self-Compassion Scale developed by Neff (2003b). SCS includes 26 items tapping the tendency to be compassionate. It is measured across three dimensions using six factors, Self-Kindness vs Self-Judgment, Common Humanity vs Isolation, and Mindfulness vs Over-Identification. The SCS was scored with five-point Likert scale (1= never, 2= seldom, 3= often, 4= almost always, and 5= always).

Procedure

In this study, the related literature was accumulated from several available books from library, journals, reports, thesis, and other internet resources. And then, the instrumentation was prepared to assess forgiveness, perfectionism, and self-compassion of students. Next, pilot study was conducted with a sample of 95 undergraduate students from Sagaing University of Education. Then, the instrument was taken validity and reliability by using SPSS (20.0) software. According to pilot study, the instrument was taken validity and reliability so as to assess in data collection. Data collection was carried out in December, 2018. As soon as the required data for

the study was ready, the data were analyzed specifically. Finally, the needed suggestions were discussed with my supervisors and added the requirements. Before editing the final report, the first draft was prepared.

Data Collection

For collecting accurate data for this study, after getting the required authority permission of third year, fourth year, and fifth year of Sagaing University of Education, 754 students from third year, fourth year, and fifth year students were selected to answer the questionnaires. The students were asked to complete all items and assured the results were completely confidential. On average, the students spent 25 minutes to complete all items.

Data Analysis

In this study, quantitative data analyses were used to compute descriptive statistics to identify the mean, standard deviation, frequency, maximum and minimum scores of forgiveness, perfectionism and self-compassion of undergraduate students. Independent sample *t* test was used to inspect whether there were significant differences in forgiveness, perfectionism and self-compassion of student teachers by gender, and subject stream. Moreover, to find the significant differences among grade, one-way ANOVA was used. Then, if there were statistically different, Post Hoc Tukey (HSD) Test was conducted to determine which group had significant difference. Pearson Product-Moment Correlation and Regression were conducted to provide information about the relationship between forgiveness, perfectionism and self-compassion.

Data Analysis and Findings

Table 2   Descriptive Statistics for Dimensions of Forgiveness of Undergraduate Students from Sagaing University of Education

No.	Variable	*N*	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Mean Percent	*SD*
1.	Forgiveness of Self	754	12	68	19.77	65.90%	3.545
2.	Forgiveness of others	754	7	40	21.31	71.03%	3.661
3.	Forgiveness of Situations	754	10	61	20.82	69.4%	3.417
4.	Overall Forgiveness	754	38	90	63.88	70.98%	6.934

By the mean percentage of the components of forgiveness scales, forgiveness of others was the highest and forgiveness of self was the lowest.

Forgiveness of Undergraduate Students by Gender

Table 3 Mean and Standard Deviation of Forgiveness of Undergraduate Students by Gender

Variable	Gender	*N*	Mean	*SD*	Mean Difference
Forgiveness	Male	310	63.68	7.282	-.34
	Female	444	64.02	6.685	

According to Table 3, the mean scores of females were found greater than those of males in forgiveness.

Table 4 Result of Independent Sample *t* test for Forgiveness by Gender

Variable	Gender	*N*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Forgiveness	Male	310	-.666	752	.506
	Female	444			

According to Table 4, there were no significant difference in forgiveness between male and female students (*t* =-.666, *p* =.506).

Table 5 Comparison of Mean, Standard Deviation and the Result of Independent Sample *t* test for Dimensions of Forgiveness by Gender

Subscales	Gender	*N*	Mean%	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*	*MD*
Forgiveness of Self	Male	310	65.40%	3.731	-.987	752	.324	-.259
	Female	444	66.27%	3.409				
Forgiveness of others	Male	310	68.33%	3.733	-5.165***	752	.000	-1.376
	Female	444	72.93%	3.504				
Forgiveness of Situations	Male	310	67.2%	3.918	-4.473***	752	.000	-1.117
	Female	444	70.93%	2.936				

Note: ***The mean difference is significant at the 0.001 level.

Table 5 revealed that there was significant difference in forgiveness of others and forgiveness of situations among three dimensions of forgiveness.

Forgiveness of Undergraduate Students by Grade

Table 6 Mean and Standard Deviation for Forgiveness by Grade

Variable	Grade	*N*	Mean	*SD*
Forgiveness	Third Year	254	64.94	6.794
	Fourth Year	257	63.61	6.474
	Fifth Year	243	63.06	7.420
	Total	754	63.88	6.934

Third year had the highest mean score in forgiveness (64.94) and fifth year had the lowest mean score (63.06).

Table 7 Result of ANOVA for Forgiveness by Grade

Variable		Sum of Square	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*
Forgiveness	Between Groups	469.885	2	234.942	4.938**	.007
	Within Groups	35730.610	751	45.577		
	Total	36200.495	753			

Note: **The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level.

Table 7 indicated that a statistically significant difference was found among grade in overall forgiveness (*p*<0.05).

Table 8   Result of Tukey HSD Test Multiple Comparison for Forgiveness

Variable	Grade (I)	Grade (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	*p*
Forgiveness	Third Year	Fourth Year	1.338	.073
		Fifth Year	1.883**	.007
	Fourth Year	Third Year	-1.338	.073
		Fifth Year	.545	.651

Note: **The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level.

The result of Post Hoc Tukey HSD Test revealed that the mean difference between third year and fifth year was 1.883 and it was significantly different at *p* = 0.007. However, there were no significant differences among other selected grades.

Forgiveness of Undergraduate Students by Subject Stream

Table 9 Mean and Standard Deviation of Forgiveness of Undergraduate Students by Subject Stream

Variable	Sub-stream	*N*	Mean	*SD*	Mean Difference
Forgiveness	Science	287	63.45	7.155	-.65
	Art	464	64.10	6.786	

According to Table 9, the mean scores of art stream students were found greater than those of science stream students in forgiveness.

Table 10 Result of Independent Sample *t* test for Forgiveness by Subject Stream

Variable	Sub-stream	*N*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Forgiveness	Science	287	-1.250	749	.212
	Art	464			

According to Table 10, there were no significant difference in forgiveness between science and art stream students (*t* =-1.250, *p* =.212).

Again, in order to study whether there was a significant difference in dimensions of forgiveness by subject stream, independent sample *t* test was used. The result revealed that there was no significant difference in dimensions of forgiveness of students according to subject stream.

Table 11 Descriptive Statistics for Dimensions of Perfectionism of Undergraduate Students from Sagaing University of Education

No	Variable	*N*	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Mean Percent	*SD*
1.	Discrepancy	754	11	48	29.80	62.08%	5.087
2.	High Standards	754	8	53	22.04	78.71%	3.282
3.	Order	754	4	16	12.03	75.19%	2.048
4.	Overall Perfectionism	754	37	92	64.53	70.14%	6.762

By the mean percentage of the components of perfectionism scales, discrepancy was the lowest and high standards subscale was the highest.

Perfectionism of Undergraduate Students by Gender

Table 12 Mean and Standard Deviation of Perfectionism of Undergraduate Students by Gender

Variable	Gender	*N*	Mean	*SD*	Mean Difference
Perfectionism	Male	310	64.33	7.224	-.35
	Female	444	64.68	6.424	

According to table 12, the mean scores of females were found greater than those of males in perfectionism.

Table 13 Result of Independent Sample *t* test for Perfectionism by Gender

Variable	Gender	*N*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Perfectionism	Male	310	-.686	752	.493
	Female	444			

According to Table 13, there were no significant difference in perfectionism between male and female students (*t* =-.686, *p* =.493).

Table 14 Comparison of Mean, Standard Deviation and the Result of Independent Sample *t* test for Dimensions of Perfectionism by Gender

Subscales	Gender	*N*	Mean%	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*	*MD*
Discrepancy	Male	310	69.16%	3.731	1.790	752	.074	.673
	Female	444	61.52%	3.409				
High Standards	Male	310	77.36%	3.733	-2.638**	752	.009	-.638
	Female	444	79.64%	3.504				
Order	Male	310	73.88%	3.918	-2.299*	752	.022	-.356
	Female	444	76.13%	2.936				

Note:*The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.
       **The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level.

Table 14 revealed that there was significant difference in high standards and order subscales among three dimensions of perfectionism.

Perfectionism of Undergraduate Students by Grade

Table 15 Mean and Standard Deviation for Perfectionism by Grade

Variable	Grade	*N*	Mean	*SD*
Perfectionism	Third Year	254	65.60	6.698
	Fourth Year	257	64.35	6.288
	Fifth Year	243	63.62	7.174
	Total	754	64.53	6.762

Third year students had the highest mean score in perfectionism (65.60) and those of fifth year had the lowest mean score (63.62).

Table 16   Result of ANOVA for Perfectionism by Grade

Variable		Sum of Square	*df*	Mean Square	*F*	*p*
Perfectionism	Between Groups	500.674	2	250.337	5.541**	.004
	Within Groups	33926.929	751	45.176		
	Total	34427.603	753			

Note: **The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level.

Table 16 indicated that a statistically significant difference was found among grade in overall perfectionism (*p*<0.05).

Table 17 Result of Tukey HSD Test Multiple Comparison for Perfectionism

Variable	Grade (I)	Grade (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	*p*
Perfectionism	Third Year	Fourth Year	1.248	.091
		Fifth Year	1.981**	.003
	Fourth Year	Third Year	-1.248	.091
		Fifth Year	.733	.601

Note: **The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level.

The result of Post Hoc Tukey HSD Test revealed that the mean difference between third year and fifth year was 1.981 and it was significantly different at $p = 0.003$. However, there were no significant differences among other selected grades.

Perfectionism of Undergraduate Students by Subject Stream

Table 18 Mean and Standard Deviation of Perfectionism of Undergraduate Students by Subject Stream

Variable	Sub- stream	*N*	Mean	*SD*	Mean Difference
Perfectionism	Science	287	64.14	6.925	-.60
	Art	464	64.74	6.651	

According to Table 18, the mean scores of art stream students were found greater than those of science in perfectionism.

Table 19 Result of Independent Sample *t* test for Perfectionism by Subject Stream

Variable	Sub- stream	*N*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Perfectionism	Science	287	-1.178	749	.239
	Art	464			

There was no significant difference in perfectionism between science and art students. The result revealed that there was no significant difference in dimensions of perfectionism of students according to subject stream.

Table 20 Descriptive Statistics for Dimensions of Self-Compassion of Undergraduate Students from Sagaing University of Education

No	Variable	*N*	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Mean Percent	*SD*
1.	Self-Kindness	754	7	25	18.67	74.68%	2.900
2.	Self-Judgment	754	6	65	14.62	58.48%	3.436
3.	Common Humanity	754	4	20	15.15	75.75%	2.596
4.	Isolation	754	4	20	11.89	59.45%	3.103
5.	Mindfulness	754	5	20	14.82	74.10%	2.526
6.	Over-Identification	754	4	18	10.11	50.55%	2.170
7.	Overall Self-Compassion	754	59	147	85.25	65.58%	8.570

By the mean percentage of the components of self-compassion scales, common humanity was the highest and over-identification was the lowest.

Self-Compassion of Undergraduate Students by Gender

Table 21 Mean and Standard Deviation of Self-Compassion of Undergraduate Students by Gender

Variable	Gender	*N*	Mean	*SD*	Mean Difference
Self-Compassion	Male	310	84.21	8.641	-1.76
	Female	444	85.97	8.455	

According to Table 21, the mean scores of females were found greater than those of males in self-compassion.

Table 22 Result of Independent Sample *t* test for Self-Compassion by Gender

Variable	Gender	*N*	*t*	*df*	*p*
Self-Compassion	Male	310	-2.784**	752	.006
	Female	444			

Note: **The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level.

According to Table 22, there were significant difference in self-compassion between male and female students (*t* =-2.784, *p* =.006).

Table 23 Comparison of Mean, Standard Deviation and the Result of Independent Sample *t* test for Dimensions of Self-Compassion by Gender

Subscales	Gender	*N*	Mean%	*SD*	*t*	*df*	*p*	MD
Self-Kindness	Male	310	72.72%	2.998	-3.943***	752	.000	-.838
	Female	444	76.08%	2.781				
Self-Judgment	Male	310	58.4%	4.064	-.151	752	.880	-.038
	Female	444	58.56%	2.922				
Common Humanity	Male	310	73.85%	2.738	-3.274**	752	.001	-.637
	Female	444	77.05%	2.461				
Isolation	Male	310	58.85%	2.988	-.869	752	.385	-.200
	Female	444	59.85%	3.182				
Mindfulness	Male	310	73.4%	2.565	-1.227	752	.220	-.229
	Female	444	74.55%	2.496				
Over-Identification	Male	310	51.1%	2.214	1.150	752	.251	.185
	Female	444	50.15%	2.137				

Note: **The mean difference is significant at the 0.01 level.
***The mean difference is significant at the 0.001 level.

Table 23 revealed that there was significant difference in self-kindness and common humanity subscales among three dimensions of self-compassion.

Self-Compassion of Undergraduate Students by Grade

Table 24 Mean and Standard Deviation for Self-Compassion by Grade

Variable	Grade	*N*	Mean	*SD*
Self-Compassion	Third Year	254	84.89	8.384
	Fourth Year	257	85.43	8.704
	Fifth Year	243	85.42	8.644
	Total	754	85.25	8.570

Fourth year had the highest mean score in self-compassion (85.43) and third year had the lowest mean score (84.89).

Table 25 Result of ANOVA for Self-Compassion by Grade

Variable		Sum of Square	df	Mean Square	F	p
Self-Compassion	Between Groups	48.092	2	24.046	.327	.721
	Within Groups	55256.530	751	73.577		
	Total	55304.622	753			

Table 25 indicated that no significant difference was found among grade in overall self-compassion.

Self-Compassion of Undergraduate Students by Subject Stream

Table 26 Mean and Standard Deviation of Self-Compassion of Undergraduate Students by Subject Stream

Variable	Sub- stream	N	Mean	SD	Mean Difference
Self-Compassion	Science	287	85.69	8.879	.65
	Art	464	85.04	8.364	

The mean scores of science stream students were found greater than those of art stream students in self-compassion.

Table 27 Result of Independent Sample *t* test for Self-Compassion by Subject Stream

Variable	Sub- stream	N	t	df	p
Self-Compassion	Science	287	1.002	749	.317
	Art	464			

There were no significant difference in self-compassion between science and art students ($t = 1.002$, $p = .317$).

Again, in order to study whether there was a significant difference in dimensions of self-compassion by subject stream, independent sample *t* test was used. The result revealed that there was no significant difference in dimensions of self-compassion of students according to subject stream.

Relationship between Forgiveness and Perfectionism of Undergraduate Students

Table 28   Relationship between Forgiveness and Perfectionism of Undergraduate Students

	F of Self	F of Others	F of S	D	HS	O
F of Self		.210**	.194**	-.286**	.061	.103**
F of Others			.434**	-.158**	.144**	.138**
F of S				-.262**	.120**	.110**
D					-.093*	-.058
HS						.144**
O						1

As shown in Table 28, dimensions of perfectionism were significantly slightly correlated with dimensions of forgiveness. So, it can be interpreted that if students had high discrepancy in perfectionism, they will be low in forgiveness.

Regression Result for Forgiveness and Perfectionism of Undergraduate Students

Table 29 Model Summary for Forgiveness and Discrepancy of Perfectionism

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.760	.578	.578	3.305

It can be concluded that 57% of discrepancy can be predicted from forgiveness.

Table 30 Results of Regression on Forgiveness and Discrepancy of Perfectionism

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	*t*	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	5.838	1.116		5.230	.000
Forgiveness	-.558	.017	-.760	-32.116	.000

It was found that the predictor forgiveness significantly predicted discrepancy of perfectionism.

$$D = 5.838 - 0.558F$$

D= Discrepancy, F= Forgiveness

It can be interpreted that if students have high discrepancy of perfectionism, they will be low in forgiveness.

Relationship between Self-Compassion and Perfectionism of Undergraduate Students

Table 31 Relationship between Self-Compassion and Perfectionism of Undergraduate Students

	SK	SJ	CH	Iso	M	OI	D	HS	O
SK		-.064	.440**	-.041	.535**	-.327**	-.089*	.237**	.225**
SJ			-.023	.495**	-.022	.272**	.358**	-.086*	.077*
CH				-.008	.474**	-.323**	-.003	.230**	.109**
Iso					-.045	.315**	.474**	-.074*	.008
M						-.370**	-.136**	.286**	.229**
OI							.260**	-.245**	-.118**
D								-.093*	-.058
HS									.144**
O									

As shown in Table 4.32, dimensions of perfectionism were significantly slightly correlated with dimensions of self-compassion.

Regression Result for Self-Compassion and Perfectionism of Undergraduate Students

Table 32 Model Summary for Self-Compassion and Discrepancy of Perfectionism

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.450	.203	.202	4.545

It can be concluded that 20% of discrepancy can be predicted from self-compassion.

Table 33   Results of Regression on Self-Compassion and Discrepancy of Perfectionism

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	*t*	Sig.
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**		
1(Constant)	52.585	1.656		31.756	.000
Self-compassion	-.267	.019	-.450	-13.827	.000

It was found that the predictor self-compassion significantly predicted discrepancy of perfectionism.

$$D = 52.585 - 0.267SC$$

D= Discrepancy, SC= Self-Compassion

It can be interpreted that if students have high discrepancy of perfectionism, they will be low in self-compassion.

Conclusion, Discussion and Suggestions

According to the results of descriptive statistics, the mean percentage of forgiveness of others was the highest among the three parts of forgiveness scale. It can also be seen that forgiveness of self was the lowest among the three subscales. The result was in line with the study of Magdalena Wedemalm, 2012. In addition, it was observed that the value of mean and mean percentage were high in overall forgiveness. So, it can be concluded that forgiveness of undergraduate students from Sagaing University of Education was good.

In descriptive analysis for perfectionism, the results showed that the mean score of perfectionism was 64.53 and standard deviation was 6.762. The value of mean percentage was 70.14%. Based on the results, it can be concluded that perfectionism of undergraduate students from Sagaing University of Education was high. Also, it can be seen that high standards subscale was the highest among the three subscales of perfectionism and discrepancy was the lowest rather than the other two subscales. Thus, it can be interpreted that students have high level in having high standards, positive form of perfectionism and low in discrepancy, the negative form of perfectionism.

In terms of descriptive statistics for self-compassion, the results showed that the overall mean score and standard deviation of self-compassion are 85.25 and 8.570. The mean percentage for overall self-compassion was 65.58%. So, it can be interpreted that self-compassion of students from Sagaing University of Education are high. In addition, common humanity subscale is the highest among the six subscales of self-compassion and over-identification was the lowest. Thus, it can be concluded that undergraduate students from Sagaing University of Education have the high skill in common humanity, part of self-compassion and have the lowest skill in over-identification, part of self-criticism.

Concerning the gender, the difference of male and female undergraduate students in forgiveness will be presented. According to the results of independent sample *t* test, there were no significant differences in forgiveness of undergraduate students between males and females. The possible reason may be that both males and females perceive most of the things in positive perspectives and can easily forgive during their carefree and young university student lives. So, it

has no significant difference in forgiveness according to gender. Moreover, forgiveness between males and females undergraduate students was compared with three dimensions. According to the result of *t* test, there was significant difference in forgiveness of others and forgiveness of situations and there was no significant difference in forgiveness of self. It can be possible that according to the gender nature, females have less hostile nature and can easily feel compassionate for others than males thus females have high forgiveness of others and situations than males.

Next, the difference of male and female difference of undergraduate students in perfectionism will be presented. Depending on the independent sample *t* test, there was no significant difference in perfectionism between male and female students. The possible reason may be that male and female want to be the best in everything what they do and they will criticize themselves when they do not get the intended results. Thus, it has no significant difference in perfectionism according to gender. The present study was in line with the findings of Grzegorek et al., 2004, Rice & Dellwo, 2002, and Rice & Mizadeh, 2000. In addition, perfectionism between males and females was investigated with three dimensions. The independent sample *t* test showed that there was significant difference in high standards subscale and order subscale but not in discrepancy subscale.

Finally, the results of self-compassion between males and females will be presented. According to the independent sample *t* test, there was significant difference in self-compassion between male and female students. The result shows that self-compassion of female students are higher than the self-compassion of male students. The reason may be that females are more soft-minded and can easily feel sympathy than males thus they can be higher in self-compassion rather than males. Moreover, self-compassion between males and females was investigated with six dimensions. The independent sample *t* test showed that there was significant difference only in self-kindness and common humanity subscales among the six subscales and other subscales have no significant difference. The current study was in line with the results of Neff, 2003b.

Concerning the grade, the comparison of forgiveness of undergraduate students will be discussed. According to the ANOVA result, there was significant difference in forgiveness of undergraduate students by grade. Based on the results of Post Hoc Tukey HSD Test, it was found that there was significant difference between forgiveness of third year and fifth year students but not in between the other grades. Forgiveness of third year students is higher than the forgiveness of fifth year students. The possible reason may be that younger students have less stress, can accept things with positive perspectives and can easily forget bad things thus third year students have higher forgiveness than fifth year students.

Secondly, the comparison of perfectionism of undergraduate students will be discussed. According to the ANOVA result, there was significant difference in perfectionism of student teachers by grade. Based on the results of Post Hoc Tukey HSD Test, it was found that there was significant difference between perfectionism of third year and fifth year students but not in between the other grades. Forgiveness of third year students is higher than the forgiveness of fifth year students. It can be possible that in the beginning of third year, all students have to choose specialized major and take exams for it. And also it is the year when students from education colleges start to enter. Thus, third year students can have more competitive spirits and high standards for their academic activity. So, it can be acceptable the fact that third year students have higher perfectionism than fifth year students.

Finally, self-compassion of undergraduate students was compared by grade. The ANOVA result showed that no significant difference in self-compassion was found according to grade. The possible reason may be that the feeling of self-compassion does not depend on the grade level they reach, and stress for academic work. Therefore, it can be concluded that there was no significant difference in self-compassion by grade.

Concerning the subject stream, the differences in forgiveness of undergraduate students by subject stream will be discussed. According to the results of independent sample *t* test, there were no significant differences in forgiveness of undergraduate students between science and art streams. The possible reason may be that the mind of forgiveness is not dependent on the subject that one takes but on the trust and sympathy of individual towards himself or herself and others.

Next, the comparison of perfectionism of student teachers by subject stream will also be observed. According to the ANOVA result, there was no significant difference in perfectionism of undergraduate students by subject stream. The data showed that perfectionism rates are relatively high across all majors, but not statistically significant between academic majors. The possible reason may be that as the age is becoming more and more developed not only in social media but also in focusing in performance of each individual. Thus, everyone in all fields is driven to have high quality and to be perfect. Therefore, it can be possible that there was not statistically significant between academic majors. The present study was in line with the findings of Daniel, P. V, 2009.

Finally, self-compassion of undergraduate students was compared according to subject stream. Based on the results of independent sample *t* test, there were no significant differences in self-compassion of undergraduate students between science and art streams. The possible reason may be that compassionate mind is dependent on seeing one's own experience in light of the common human experience, acknowledging that suffering, failure, and inadequacies are part of the human condition and that all people including oneself are worthy of compassion. Thus, it can be possible that self-compassion is not influenced by subject stream.

Moreover, correlation analysis was conducted to investigate the relationship between perfectionism and forgiveness, and perfectionism and self-compassion. The result showed that discrepancy of perfectionism, maladaptive form has low negative correlation with forgiveness of self, forgiveness of others, and forgiveness of situations but high standard and order- adaptive perfectionism has slightly positive correlation with dimensions of forgiveness. So, it can be interpreted that if students had high discrepancy in perfectionism, they will be low in forgiveness. The result was in line with the findings of Brooke A.M, 2010.

From the correlation result between perfectionism and self-compassion, it can be seen that discrepancy of perfectionism, maladaptive form has low negative correlation with self-kindness, common humanity, and mindfulness of self-compassion but high standard and order- adaptive perfectionism has slightly positive correlation with these dimensions of self-compassion. Moreover, discrepancy has high positive correlation with self-judgment, isolation, and over-identification but high standard and order- adaptive perfectionism has slightly negative correlation with these dimensions of self-compassion. So, it can be interpreted that if students had high discrepancy in perfectionism, they will be low in self-compassion.

In today's performance-focused society, an unrelenting pursuit of ideal standards that leave no room for error, or perfectionism, is often revered with little consideration of its

consequences. In such society, children and youths had started to become to feel so many burdens for their academic goals, job opportunities and also in social relationships. Thus, perfectionism has become a personality characteristic for those who work or study under performance pressures and expectations. Teachers play an important role for nurturing youths to become intellectual students. They have to guide and assist their pupils to become outstanding students with high morals and social skills. Thus, all teachers need to know the concept of perfectionism and its consequences. If so, they can help pupils who have social or intra-psychic pressures for peak performance and flawless outcomes.

Teachers and parents should understand the importance of perfectionism and the positive and negative consequences of perfectionism. They need to give children motivation to convert maladaptive perfectionism to positive striving perfectionism. Teachers and parents should encourage children to improve the spirit of accepting the negative events and mistakes of oneself and others. The current research is merely focused on undergraduate students from Sagaing University of Education. So, further research needs to explore in education colleges and in other universities to obtain more detailed information about perfectionism, forgiveness, and self-compassion. It should be observed among different age population because according to the literature, the older ages were associated with higher levels of forgiveness, and lower levels of discrepancy of perfectionism. It should be explored with basic education school students and different grades to obtain more detailed information. It will be needed to investigate perfectionism, forgiveness, and self-compassion on other factors such as parental involvement, age, and career and home environment. To sum up, it is also needed to investigate perfectionism with other concepts such as burn-out, academic stress, depression, academic achievement, academic procrastination, life satisfaction, social anxiety, test anxiety and self-esteem.

Acknowledgements

References

Adler, A. (1927b). *Understanding human nature*. (W. B. Wolfe. Trans). New York, NY: Greenberg.

Burns, D. D. (1980). The perfectionist's script for self-defeat. *Psychology Today, 14(6)*, 34–52.

Frost, R. O., Marten, K. J., Lahart, C., & Rosenblate, R. (1990). The dimensions of perfectionism. *Cognitive Therapy & Research, 14*(5), 449-468. doi:10.1007/BF01 172967

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. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.51.2.192

Hargrave, T. D., & Sells, J. N. (2007). The development of a forgiveness scale. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 23*(1), 41-62.

Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1990). Perfectionism and depression: A multidimensional analysis. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 5*, 423-438.

Lawler, K. A., Younger, J. W., Piferi, R. L., Billington, E., Jobe, R., Edmonson, K., et al. (2003). A change of heart: Cardiovascular correlates of forgiveness in response to interpersonal conflict. *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 26*, 373–393.

McCullough, M. E., Rachal, K. C., Sandage, S. J., Worthington, E. L., Jr., Brown, S. W., & Hight, T. L. (1998). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships II: Theoretical elaboration and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 1586–1603.

Neff, K. D. (2003a). Self-compassion: An alternative conceptualization of a healthy attitude toward oneself. *Self and Identity, 2*, 85-102.

Neff, K. D. (2003b). The development and validation of a scale to measure self-compassion. *Self and Identity, 2*, 223-250.

Rice, K. G., & Dellwo, J. P. (2002). Perfectionism and self-development: Implications for college adjustment. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 80*, 188-196.

Rice, K. G., Leever, B. A., Christopher, J., & Porter, J. D. (2006). Perfectionism, stress, and social (dis)connection: A short-term study of hopelessness, depression, and academic adjustment among honors students. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 53(4)*, 524-534.

Rice, K. G., & Mirzadeh, S. A. (2000). Perfectionism, attachment, and adjustment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 47(2)*, 238-250.

Witvliet, C. V. O. (2001). Forgiveness and health: Review and reflections on a matter of faith, feelings, and physiology. *Journal of Psychology and Theology, 29*, 212–224.

Witvliet, C. V. O. (2005). Unforgiveness, forgiveness, and justice: Scientific findings on feelings and physiology. In E. L. Worthington, Jr. (Ed.), *Handbook of forgiveness* (pp. 305–319). New York, NY: Routledge.

Worthington, E. L., Jr. (Ed.). (2005). *Handbook of forgiveness*. New York: Routledge.

Worthington, E. L., Jr., & Drinkard, D. T. (2000). Promoting reconciliation through psychoeducational and therapeutic interventions. *Journal of Marriage and Family Therapy, 26*, 93–101.