

Relationship Between Multidimensional Perfectionism and Intimacy among School Teachers

Eshikka.T¹, Manoj.R², Shruthi Suresh Babu³

¹Student, Department of Psychology, Dr. MGR Educational & Research Institute

²Head of the Department, Department of Psychology, Dr. MGR Educational & Research Institute

³Assistant professor, Department of Psychology, Dr. MGR Educational & Research Institute

Abstract

Teaching constitutes a highly demanding profession involving continuous interpersonal interaction, emotional engagement, and performance expectations, which may significantly influence teachers' psychological well-being. The present study examined the relationship between intimacy and multidimensional perfectionism among school teachers. Intimacy, characterized by emotional closeness, trust, and openness, plays a vital role in maintaining healthy interpersonal relationships, whereas multidimensional perfectionism includes traits such as high personal standards, concern over mistakes, and perceived external pressures. This quantitative, non-experimental correlational study was conducted among a sample of 201 school teachers recruited through purposive sampling from various educational institutions, representing different age groups, educational qualifications, and levels of teaching experience. Data collection was carried out using the Intimacy Scale (IS) and the Frost Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (FMPS) to assess the study variables. The study aims to understand how perfectionistic tendencies are associated with interpersonal intimacy among teachers and to contribute to the existing literature on teachers' psychological well-being and relational functioning. The findings are expected to provide insights into the role of perfectionism in shaping interpersonal relationships and highlight the importance of promoting emotional well-being and supportive environments within educational settings.

Keywords: Intimacy, Multidimensional Perfectionism, School Teachers, Emotional Well-being.

1. Introduction

The teaching profession has been recognized as both rewarding and demanding. School teachers have been required to perform their tasks in an emotionally and cognitively demanding environment, where constant interaction with students, colleagues, and parents is inevitable. Furthermore, school teachers have been expected to perform their tasks under high institutional, societal, and personal demands, which might cause stress and psychological pressure. The management of such demands might cause emotional exhaustion and, in turn, affect their capacity to form intimate relationships.

Intimacy has been defined as the capacity to share one's inner world with others in relationships that involve trust, openness, and understanding. It has been recognized as an important factor in maintaining psychological well-being and forming intimate relationships with others. It has been defined as an

experience of being understood, recognized, and connected with others. In the context of the teaching profession, the capacity to manage professionalism and stress might limit one's capacity to express their feelings, thereby affecting intimacy.

Multidimensional perfectionism has been recognized as a personality trait that involves setting high standards, fear of mistakes, and awareness of external pressures. It has been recognized as comprising three components: self-oriented perfectionism, socially prescribed perfectionism, and other-oriented perfectionism. Although some components of perfectionism have been recognized as having positive effects, maladaptive perfectionism has been recognized as causing stress, anxiety, and difficulties in interpersonal relationships.

Intimacy and multidimensional perfectionism have been recognized as two interrelated factors. The capacity for intimacy has been recognized as having positive effects on one's psychological well-being, thereby enhancing one's capacity to cope with stress. On the contrary, high perfectionism has been recognized as having negative effects on one's capacity to form intimate relationships.

In relation to school teachers, intimacy and multidimensional perfectionism should be examined in order to understand their psychological well-being and capacity to form intimate relationships. The current study aims to investigate intimacy and multidimensional perfectionism in order to better comprehend school teachers psychological well-being and capacity to form intimate relationships.

Definitions and Conceptual Framework Intimacy

Intimacy is the capacity to share one's thoughts, feelings, and experiences with other people within a relationship that is based on trust, understanding, and openness. It is a capacity that helps individuals to feel appreciated, understood, and connected to other people, hence improving their mental health and satisfaction with the relationship.

Multidimensional Perfectionism

Multidimensional perfectionism is a personality trait that includes high personal standards, concern about mistakes, and perceived external pressures. It is a multidimensional construct that includes self-oriented perfectionism, socially prescribed perfectionism, and other-oriented perfectionism, all of which affect individuals' thoughts, feelings, and behaviors.

Conceptual Framework

Intimacy and multidimensional perfectionism are two concepts that are closely related to one another. While high levels of maladaptive perfectionism may affect an individual's capacity to form close relationships, high levels of intimacy may help to improve mental health and reduce the negative consequences of perfectionism. The study seeks to explore the relationship that exists between intimacy and multidimensional perfectionism among school teachers.

2. Review of Literature

Dunkley, et al. (2012) researched the role of perfectionism in relationship functioning from the stress and coping model. The research design involved the use of the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale and stress and coping scales. The participants were approximately 200 adults in romantic relationships. The research design was cross-sectional. The analysis of the data was done using multiple regressions and mediations. The findings of the research indicated that maladaptive perfectionism was linked to stress and poor coping mechanisms. These were significant predictors of relationship functioning and intimacy. The research concluded that stress and coping mechanisms were the mediators of the relationship between perfectionism and relationship difficulties.

Stoerber and Rennert (2008) researched perfectionism in school teachers in relation to stress, coping, and burnout. Instruments used were the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale and the stress appraisal measures. Participants were 118 school teachers. A cross-sectional study was used. Correlational and regression analyses were done. The study showed that school teachers with high perfectionistic concerns had high levels of stress and poor coping mechanisms. These factors led to burnout and poor emotional well-being. Perfectionism in school teachers was said to affect interpersonal relationships and emotional intimacy.

Wei, et al. (2004) explored the relationship between perfectionism, attachment, and interpersonal distress. Standardized measures were used in the research, including the Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale. A sample of about 400 university students was used. A correlational research design was adopted for the study. Structural equation modeling was used in the research. Regression analysis was also employed. The research findings showed that maladaptive perfectionism was related to attachment insecurity and interpersonal distress. These factors led to relationship problems. Perfectionism was seen as having a negative impact on intimacy through attachment insecurity.

Sherry, et al. (2016) used a meta-analysis to explore the relationship between perfectionism and interpersonal issues. This research used data from more than 7,000 participants across various studies. Standardized measures were used for measuring perfectionism and interpersonal issues. The research design used for this meta-analysis was a meta-analytic design. The statistical methods used were effect size estimation and aggregation. The results showed a strong positive correlation between maladaptive perfectionism and interpersonal issues. It was found that socially prescribed perfectionism had the most negative impact on intimacy. This research found that perfectionism is a significant predictor of interpersonal issues.

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Question

The present study was attempted to examine whether there exists a significant Relationship Between Multidimensional Perfectionism and Intimacy among School Teachers.

3.2 Objectives

1. Assess the level of intimacy of school teachers in their relationship.
2. Assess the dimensions of perfectionism in school teachers.
3. Examine the relationship between intimacy and multi-dimensional perfectionism among school teachers.

3.3 Hypothesis

(H₀): There is no significant relationship between intimacy and multi-dimensional perfectionism among school teachers.

4. Research Design

The research was quantitative in nature and correlational approaches were used to explore the association between intimacy and multi-dimensional perfectionism among school teachers.

4.1 Sampling Technique

Through purposive sampling (judgmental sampling), participants were selected for the study. The participants were school teachers from various educational institutions. School teachers with varying levels of intimacy and multidimensional perfectionism were considered for the purpose of the study. The

sample for the study consisted of 201 school teachers.

4.2 Data collection

- Data was collected through offline questionnaires distributed to the participants.
- The participants were asked to provide demographic details, followed by their responses to the standardized scales used in the study.

4.3 Tools Description

- The Frost Multi-dimensional Perfectionism Scale (FMPS) developed by Frost, Martin, Lahart and Rosenblate (1990) , is a self-reporting measure constructed to examine the different aspects of perfectionistic tendencies in individuals. The 35-item scale is scored on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. It captures several different facets of perfectionism, such as concern over mistakes, personal standards, parental standards, parental criticism, doubts about actions, and organization. Scores are higher with more perfectionistic attitudes and behaviors. The FMPS has demonstrated strong internal consistency, with reliabilities from 0.77 to 0.93 on its subscales and overall Cronbach's alpha of 0.90, making it a valid and reliable scale for measuring perfectionism in school teachers
- Intimacy Scale (IS), developed by Walker and Thompson in 1983, is a 17-item self-report questionnaire designed to assess the intimacy in close relationships. Responses are rated on a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (Never) to 7 (Always). The Intimacy Scale shows good internal consistency, with Cronbach's alpha values between 0.70 and 0.90, indicating that the scale is both reliable and valid for measuring levels of emotional intimacy.

4.4 Statistical Analysis

The data collected were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics. The relationship between multidimensional perfectionism and intimacy was examined using Pearson's correlation coefficient, which determines the strength and direction (positive or negative) of the linear relationship between two continuous variables. The level of significance was set at $p < 0.05$.

4.5 Inclusive Criteria

- School teachers working in government and private schools.
- Participants willing to provide informed consent and participate voluntarily.
- Participants able to understand and respond to the questionnaire.

4.6 Exclusive Criteria:

- School teachers on long term leave.
- School teachers engaged exclusively in administrative roles with no regular classroom teaching duties.
- Refusal to participate or incomplete questionnaire.

5. Result

This chapter discusses the results and interpretation of the analysis done to understand the relationship between intimacy and multi-dimensional perfectionism among school teachers.

Table:1 Descriptive statistics show the mean and standard deviation of multidimensional perfectionism and intimacy among school teachers.

Variables	Mean	Standard Deviation	N
-----------	------	--------------------	---

Multidimensional Perfectionism	105.47	8.747	201
Intimacy	67.17	8.390	201

The descriptive table shows the mean and standard deviation for the variables. The Frost Multidimensional Perfectionism has a sample N = 201, Mean = 105.47, and Standard Deviation = 8.747. The Intimacy Scale has a sample N = 201, Mean = 67.17, and Standard Deviation = 8.390.

Table 2: Correlational analysis shows the relationship between multidimensional perfectionism and intimacy among school teachers.

Variables	Pearson’s correlation	r _s value	Decision
Multidimensional Perfectionism	1	-0.047	Accepted (H0)
Intimacy			

*Correlation is not significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The Table shows Pearson’s correlation between multidimensional perfectionism and intimacy. The correlation coefficient obtained was $r = -.047$, and the significance value was $p = .508$, which is not significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed). This result indicates a negative but statistically not significant relationship between multidimensional perfectionism and intimacy among the participants. School teachers with high scores on multidimensional perfectionism have low scores on intimacy, but this difference is not statistically important. Thus, the null hypothesis (H01: There is no significant relationship between multidimensional perfectionism and intimacy among the participants) is accepted, since the correlation is not statistically significant.

6. Discussion

The present study revealed that there is no statistically significant correlation found between intimacy and multidimensional perfectionism among school teachers, as the correlation coefficient was found to be $r =$

-0.047 , $p > 0.05$. The scale for measuring intimacy was the Intimacy Scale (IS), and the results revealed that the $M = 67.17$, $SD = 8.390$. The scale for measuring multidimensional perfectionism was the Frost Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale (FMPS), and the results revealed that the $M = 105.47$, $SD = 8.747$. The results revealed that there is no significant correlation found between intimacy and multidimensional perfectionism among school teachers. The results are different from the previous studies done by Anderson and Miller (2018) and Gupta and Hernandez (2020), and may be consistent with the studies done by Farouk and Daniels (2021) regarding the role of emotional regulation and Saha and Turner (2018) regarding the role of communication factors that influence intimacy. The results revealed that there are other factors that influence intimacy among teachers. Statistically, no significant correlation was found between intimacy and multidimensional perfectionism among school teachers.

7. Summary

The main aim of this study was to establish the relationship between intimacy and multidimensional perfectionism among school teachers. A quantitative study was done using a correlational approach. The

study

participants included 201 school teachers who taught in various educational centers. From the findings, it was evident that intimacy levels among school teachers were at $M = 67.17$, $SD = 8.390$, while multidimensional perfectionism levels were at $M = 105.47$, $SD = 8.747$. The study findings revealed a weak negative correlation between intimacy and multidimensional perfectionism, though it was not significant at $p > 0.05$. It is evident from this study that there is no significant relationship between intimacy and multidimensional perfectionism among school teachers.

8. Conclusion

The results obtained in the current study indicated the absence of a significant relationship between intimacy and multidimensional perfectionism among school teachers. In addition, a weak negative correlation was noted, but the results were not statistically significant. This indicates that the level of intimacy may not be affected in a substantial manner by the concept of multidimensional perfectionism among school teachers, considering the possible effects of other factors, which may be more significant in influencing the concept of intimacy.

9. Limitations of the Study

- The sample size was limited to 201 school teachers, which does not represent the total teaching population.
- The sample was not collected using a probability sample, as it was based on purposive sampling, which may
- not represent the total teaching population of other schools.
- The study was based only on self-report measures, i.e., FMPS and Intimacy Scale, which may not be free from response bias.
- The study was based only on the impact of multidimensional perfectionism and intimacy, but other factors related to these variables were not considered.

10. Suggestions for Future Research

- Future research can employ a larger sample size to enhance the generalizability of the results.
- Research can be conducted on other groups, including college teachers, students, or professionals from other fields.
- Other variables, such as stress, emotional control, and communication, can be researched in conjunction
- with the variables of intimacy and multidimensional perfectionism.
- Longitudinal research can be conducted to explore the long-term relationship between multidimensional perfectionism and intimacy.

References

1. Andrew P. Hill, A. P., & Thomas Curran, T. (2016). Multidimensional perfectionism and burnout: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 142(3), 269–295. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000036>
2. Angela M. Habke, A. M., & Flynn, C. A. (2002). Interpersonal aspects of perfectionism. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 70(3), 672–682. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.70.3.672>
3. Chen, C., Paul L. Hewitt, P. L., & Gordon L. Flett, G. L. (2015). Perfectionism, emotion regulation,

- and psychological distress. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 39(5), 661–673. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10608-014-9624-5>
4. David M. Dunkley, D. M., Blankstein, K. R., & Berg, J. L. (2012). Perfectionism and relationship functioning: A stress and coping perspective. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 59(3), 335–346. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028950>
 5. Dunkley, D. M., Zuroff, D. C., & Blankstein, K. R. (2003). Self-critical perfectionism and daily interpersonal stress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84(1), 234–252. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.1.234>
 6. Edward C. Chang, E.C. (2006). Perfectionism and burnout in employees. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 40(6), 1223–1233. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2006.04.007>
 7. Ellen M. Skaalvik, E. M., & Sidsel Skaalvik, S. (2010). Teacher self-efficacy and teacher burnout: A study of relations. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 26(4), 1059–1069. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2009.11.001>
 8. Gordon L. Flett, G. L., Paul L. Hewitt, P. L., & De Rosa, T. (1996). Dimensions of perfectionism and relationship adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(2), 456–470. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.2.456>
 9. Jeffrey D. Campbell, J. D., & Di Paula, A. (2002). Perfectionistic self-beliefs and interpersonal difficulties. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(5), 1306–1320. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.5.1306>
 10. Joachim Stoeber, J., & Karin Otto, K. (2006). Positive conceptions of perfectionism: Approaches, evidence, challenges. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(2), 295–319. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.2.295>
 11. Joachim Stoeber, J., & Rennert, D. (2008). Perfectionism in school teachers: Relations with stress appraisals, coping styles, and burnout. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44(3), 762–773. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.04.024>
 12. Joachim Stoeber, J. (2014). Perfectionism and interpersonal functioning. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 64, 36–40. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.02.031>
 13. Kenneth G. Rice, K. G., & Ashby, J. S. (2007). Perfectionism and emotional adjustment. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 54(1), 72–85. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.54.1.72>
 14. Lynne E. Alden, L. E., Ryder, A. G., & Mellings, T. (2002). Perfectionism and interpersonal problems: Emotional expression. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 70(2), 392–400. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.70.2.392>
 15. Mackinnon, S. P., Sherry, S. B., & Pratt, M. W. (2013). Perfectionism, friendship, and emotional adjustment. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 41(3), 411–422. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-012-9708-4>
 16. Meifen Wei, M., Mallinckrodt, B., Russell, D. W., & Abraham, W. T. (2004). Perfectionism, attachment, and interpersonal distress. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87(6), 846–863. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.87.6.846>
 17. Nealis, L. J., & Sherry, S. B. (2016). Perfectionism and interpersonal problems: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 30(5), 1–20. <https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000138>
 18. Paul L. Hewitt, P. L., & Gordon L. Flett, G. L. (1991). Perfectionism in the self and social contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(3), 456–470. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.60.3.456>

19. Paul L. Hewitt, P. L., Gordon L. Flett, G. L., Sherry, S. B., et al. (2003). The interpersonal expression of perfectionism. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71(4), 629–638. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.71.4.629>
20. Paul L. Hewitt, P. L., Gordon L. Flett, G. L., Simon B. Sherry, S. B., & Caelian, C. (2006). Trait perfectionism dimensions and suicidal behavior. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 74(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006X.74.1.1>
21. Reinout Roorda, R. J., Koomen, H. M. Y., Spilt, J. L., & Oort, F. J. (2011). The influence of affective teacher–student relationships on students’ engagement: A meta-analytic approach. *Review of Educational Research*, 81(4), 493–529. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311421793>
22. Robert M. Klassen, R. M., & Chiu, M. M. (2010). Effects of teachers’ self-efficacy and job satisfaction on teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 102(3), 741–756. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019237>
23. Simon B. Sherry, S. B., Mackinnon, S. P., & Gaudreau, C. M. (2016). Perfectionism and interpersonal problems: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Personality*, 84(3), 293–310. <https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000183>
24. Simon B. Sherry, S. B., Paul L. Hewitt, P. L., Gordon L. Flett, G. L., et al. (2007). Perfectionistic self-presentation in interpersonal contexts. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93(3), 410–425. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.3.410>
25. Thomas Curran, T., & Andrew P. Hill, A. P. (2019). Perfectionism is increasing over time: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 145(4), 410–429. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000138>