

The Effect of English Teachers' Perfectionism and Self-Efficacy Perceptions on their Professional Motivation Levels

OPEN ACCESS

Volume: 11

Special Issue: 1

Month: July

Year: 2023

E-ISSN: 2582-1334

Received: 09.02.2023

Accepted: 18.05.2023

Published: 15.07.2023

Citation:

Seçgin, P. Ç., Ince, M., & Eker, C. (2023). The Effect of English Teachers' Perfectionism and Self-Efficacy Perceptions on their Professional Motivation Levels. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, 11(S1), 80–100.

DOI:


<https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v11iS1-July.6075>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License

Pelin Çelik Seçgin

Freelance Researcher, Turkey

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3088-1147>


Murat Ince

Zonguldak Bülent Ecevit University, Turkey

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0557-0419>

Cevat Eker

Zonguldak Bülent Ecevit University, Turkey

 <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4215-1854>

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to examine the effect of English language teachers' perfectionism and self-efficacy perceptions on their professional motivation levels. The research was a relational survey model and causal comparison research. The study consisted of 450 English teachers working in official primary and secondary schools affiliated to the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) in Zonguldak province and its districts in the 2021-2022 academic year. "Personal Information Form", "Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale", "Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale" and "Teacher Professional Motivation Scale" were used as data collection tools. Frequency, percentage, arithmetic mean, *t*-test for independent groups, one-way analysis of variance, correlation analysis and regression analysis were used to analyse the data. As a result of the study, it was found that English language teachers' perfectionism varied in favour of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority according to professional seniority; it did not vary according to gender and institution of employment. It was seen that self-efficacy perceptions changed in favour of female teachers according to gender, in favour of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority according to professional seniority, and in favour of teachers working in primary schools according to the institution of employment. It was seen that professional motivation levels changed in favour of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority according to professional seniority, in favour of teachers working in primary schools according to the institution of employment; it did not change according to gender. There was no significant relationship between English teachers' professional motivation levels and their perfectionism, but there was a significant relationship between English teachers' professional motivation levels and their self-efficacy perceptions. A positive, significant and low level relationship was found between perfectionism and self-efficacy perception general scores. The variables "order", "parental criticism", "parental expectations" and "effectiveness for classroom management" were found to be predictors of English teachers' professional motivation levels.

Keywords: English Teachers, Perfectionism, Self-Efficacy Perception, Professional Motivation

Introduction

Individuals need education first from their families and then from their teachers. It is possible for them to grow up in accordance with the society and to reach high levels of material and spiritual welfare in the society with the education given. Teachers contribute to the shaping of society by influencing the student and indirectly the society. In order for the society to be shaped in a good way, the teacher must be qualified. Qualified teachers affect the quality

of education in the school. One of the personality traits that a qualified teacher should have is perfectionism. Perfectionism is defined as an individual's desire for the better and striving to achieve the better throughout his/her life (Uysal Özyurt, 2019, p. 1). Abuhanoğlu, Teke, Çelen, and Açıknel (2015) defined perfectionism as always seeking better and reaching better, and Yüksel, Türkücü, and Albayrak (2020) stated that perfectionism in teachers brings student success. An English teacher who adopts perfectionism should not forget that he/she is a good role model for his/her students and should show an attitude that does not distract students from language learning by being careful not to damage their self-confidence (Shokrollahi & Baradaran, 2014, p. 14). In addition to teaching the vocabulary and rules of the language, the English teacher should be able to teach the culture of English and the lifestyles of societies that accept English as their mother tongue (Süer, Demirkol & Oral, 2019, p. 1987).

In order for a qualified EFL teacher to be a suitable role model for his/her students and to influence their performance, he/she should also have self-efficacy perception (Ghaemi & Damirchiloo, 2015, p. 231). According to Bandura (1977), self-efficacy perception is to make effort and cope with difficulties; it is directly proportional to success. Bandura referred to the perception of self-efficacy in his Social Learning Theory and defined it as the level of confidence that an individual has in himself to achieve success and goals (Bandura, 1997, p. 36). Şahin and Şahin (2017) also mentioned the importance of teacher's self-efficacy perception in order to raise quality individuals and provide quality education and stated that self-efficacy is the most important factor affecting education. Based on the definitions, it can be said that self-efficacy perception varies according to the individual's goal. Therefore, it is possible to say that as a teacher's perception of self-efficacy increases, his/her interest in students will increase, he/she will behave more ethically and shape his/her teaching according to the needs of students; in addition, a teacher with a high perception of self-efficacy will be a quality teacher who is open to new methods and techniques and does not adopt traditional teaching by staying away from teacher-centred lecturing. According to Woolfolk,

the higher the self-efficacy perception of a teacher, the more effort the teacher makes while teaching (Shaughnessy, 2004, p. 154). The education and training to be given by the teacher and the success level of the class are directly proportional to the teacher's self-efficacy (Özdemir & Eker, 2021, p. 2). Teacher self-efficacy can be considered important because it can affect classroom behaviours and the methods and strategies they will use in lessons, which will be reflected in academic achievement. For an English teacher, this means having the ability to teach the target language effectively (Thomson & Woodman, 2018, pp. 2-3). Bandura (1997) stated that teacher self-efficacy perception has a direct effect on motivation, while Tunçer (2013) stated that the teacher's qualification and productivity increase in direct proportion to working motivation.

While Keser (2006) defined motivation as the force that directs the individual to behaviour and comes from within the individual; Buendia, Jessyka and Martin (2008) defined motivation as the combination of the individual's desire and attitude towards effort. Brown (2007) stated that the success of an individual in a complex task stems from motivation to work. Work motivation, also known as occupational motivation, is related to the individual's positive attitude towards the profession, willingness and effort towards the purpose of the profession (Robbins, 2001). Therefore, it can be said that teachers' occupational motivation positively affects the efficiency of teaching profession. Because when professional motivation increases, the teacher does his/her job with pleasure and performs his/her job in accordance with the standards without experiencing time constraints. A teacher who feels competent in his/her field starts the lesson with high motivation (Atay, 2004, p. 101). Work motivation is one of the most important factors that positively increase English teachers' attitudes in the classroom and lesson functioning (Aydın, Atalay & Göksu, 2017, p. 678). Because behaviour is affected by motivation and an English teacher with high work motivation increases the motivation of his/her students as well as his/her own motivation (Buendía & Martín, 2018, p. 30). In addition, a teacher with high work motivation aims to achieve the school's purpose and exhibits high performance (Ada, Akan, Ayık, Yıldırım &

Yalçın, 2013, p. 152). In this respect, it can be said that it helps the teacher to work in accordance with the mission and vision of the school. The higher the motivation of a teacher, the more positively the working environment is affected. The working environment of teachers with high professional motivation is more peaceful and these teachers are more beneficial to students (Taş & Selvitopu, 2020, p. 25).

It can be said that high perfectionism and self-efficacy perceptions of English teachers will positively affect both teachers' professional motivation levels and achievement. It is known that English teachers' having these characteristics has a positive effect on the education and training process. For this reason, it is important to reveal the effect of English teachers' perfectionism and self-efficacy perceptions on their professional motivation levels.

PURPOSE OF THE RESEARCH AND SUB-PROBLEMS

In this study in which the effects of English teachers' perfectionism and self-efficacy perceptions on their professional motivation levels were examined, it was aimed to find answers to the following sub-problems.

1. Does English teachers' perfectionism, self-efficacy and professional motivation vary according to;
 - gender
 - professional seniority
 - the institution of employment?
2. Is there a significant relationship between English teachers' perfectionism and self-efficacy perceptions and professional motivation levels?
3. Are English teachers' perfectionism and self-efficacy perceptions a significant predictor of their professional motivation levels?

METHOD

In the method section of the study, the research model, population-sample, data collection tools and data analysis were presented.

RESEARCH DESIGN

This research, in which the effects of English teachers' perfectionism and self-efficacy perceptions on their professional motivation levels were examined

according to various variables, is a research in the relational survey model. Relational survey models were research models that aimed to determine the degree or presence of change between two or more than two variables (Karasar, 2020, p. 114). In this study, the extent to which the independent (predictor) variable predicts the dependent (predicted) variable was also examined. Since the differentiation of the relevant variables of English language teachers according to the demographic characteristics (gender, professional seniority, institution of employment) was examined, the study is a causal comparison type study. In this respect, it is a causal comparison study (Büyüköztürk et al., 2017).

RESEARCH SAMPLE

The population of the study consisted of 611 English teachers working in official primary and secondary education institutions affiliated to the Ministry of National Education (MoNE) in Zonguldak province and its districts in the 2021-2022 academic year. The sample of the study consisted of 450 English teachers. The sample of the study constituted 73.6% of the population. While forming the sample of the study, convenience sampling method was chosen. Convenience sampling is based on existing items that are easy and fast to reach (Malhotra & Dash, 2016: 343). The descriptive statistics of the demographic characteristics of English teachers were shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Distribution of Teachers Participating in the Study According to Demographic Characteristics

	Groups	(f)	(%)
Gender	Woman	334	74,2
	Male	116	25,8
	0-5 years	61	13,6
Professional Seniority	6-10 years	96	21,3
	11-15 years	107	23,8
	16 and above	186	41,3
Employed Institution	Primary School	106	23,6
	Middle School	201	44,7
	High School	143	31,8

When Table 1 was analysed, it was seen that 334 (74.2%) of the English teachers participating in the study were female and 116 (25.8%) were male.

- When the distribution according to professional seniority was analysed, 186 (41.3%) of the English teachers participating in the study were 16 years and above, 107 (23.8%) were 11-15 years, 96 (21.3%) were 6-10 years, and 61 (13.6%) of the participants were 0-6 years, respectively.
- When the distribution according to the institutions where they work was analysed, it was seen that 201 (44.7%), 143 (31.8%) and 106 (23.6%) English teachers working in secondary schools, high schools and primary schools, respectively, participated in the study.

DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

“Personal Information Form”, “Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale”, “Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale” and “Teacher Professional Motivation Scale” were used to collect data in the study.

In the study, a form prepared by the researcher was used to determine the participants according to gender, professional seniority and institution of employment. The form included closed-ended questions about the variables and the participants were asked to tick the appropriate option.

The “Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale” developed by Frost et al. (1990) to determine the perfectionism of English teachers was adapted into Turkish by Özbay and Taşdemir (2003). The scale is organised as a five-point Likert scale with a rating between 1 and 5 with 1 being strongly disagree, 2 being disagree, 3 being undecided, 4 being agree, and 5 being strongly agree. The scale consists of 6 sub-dimensions. These sub-dimensions are order, excessive interest in mistakes, suspicion of behaviour, family expectations, family criticism and personal standards. There are no items that need to be reversed in the scale. The possible score range is between 35-175 and as the score increases, perfectionism will increase. Cronbach’s alpha internal consistency method was used to calculate the reliability of the scale. Reliability coefficients for general tests and subtests are between .89 and .73. While the overall reliability coefficient of the test was .87, it was found .74 for “delusion” and .79 for

“affective”. Another reliability calculation was made using the test-retest method and the coefficient was found between .90 and .70. Factor analysis was used for validity. The analysis was conducted through SPSS. As a result of the first analysis, the correlation matrix between the items was examined and since the correlation between the items was determined, it was found appropriate to perform factor analysis. Then sampling suitability and Sphericity tests were applied and the suitability coefficient was found to be .84.

The “Teacher Self-Efficacy Scale” developed by Tschannen-Moran and Woolfolk Hoy (2001) was adapted into Turkish by Çapa, Çakıroğlu and Sarıkaya (2005) in order to determine the self-efficacy perceptions of English teachers. The scale is organised in Likert type with a rating between 1-5 with 1 being insufficient, 2 being slightly sufficient, 3 being somewhat sufficient, 4 being quite sufficient, 5 being very sufficient. The scale consists of 3 sub-dimensions: “Self-efficacy towards student participation”, “Self-efficacy towards instructional strategies”, “Self-efficacy towards classroom management”. There are no items that need to be reversed in the scale. The range of scores that can be obtained is between 24-120 and as the score increases, the self-efficacy perception will increase. Within the scope of the validity and reliability study of the scale, a pilot study was conducted with 97 pre-service teachers in Turkey. The internal consistency of the reliability of the scores in this sample ranged between .95 for the overall scale and between .85 and .88 for the sub-items. The correlation coefficients for the total and sub-items of the scale were positive and ranged between .35 and .77. The reliability of the proficiency scores for the whole scale is .93. While the overall reliability coefficient of the test was .93; in a 9-point scale, “Student Engagement”, “Instructional Strategies” and “Classroom Management” were found to be 6.92, 7.10 and 6.95, respectively.

In order to determine the professional motivation levels of teachers, Karabağ Köse et al. (2020) created the “Teacher Professional Motivation Scale”. The test is organised on a Likert-type scale of 1-5, with 1 being very negative and 5 being very positive. The scale consists of 4 sub-dimensions as “Physical facilities”, “In-school factors”, “Out-

of-school factors” and “Professional development and prestige”. There are no items that need to be reversed in the scale. The score range is between 25-125 and the higher the score, the higher the level of professional motivation. The validity and reliability study of the scale was conducted with 1054 teachers working at all levels. Firstly, a 54-item scale was created and it was transformed into a 25-item scale for pilot application in line with expert opinions. In the first stage, a paper and pencil application was carried out with 345 teachers. For the next stage, an online application was conducted with 423 teachers. Confirmatory factor analysis data were collected through online application. The obtained data results showed that the scale was compatible with four factors. The internal reliability coefficients of the sub-dimensions of the scale were analysed in two ways as paper-and-pencil and online and found to be acceptable, and it was concluded that the scale was valid and reliable both in paper-and-pencil and online.

ANALYSIS OF DATA

In order to determine the level of the effect of English teachers’ perfectionism and self-efficacy perceptions on their professional motivation levels, arithmetic mean and standard deviation from descriptive statistics were used for the mean scores. In the interpretation of the mean of the answers of English teachers in the scale, 1,00-1,79 for perfectionism scale was strongly disagree, 1,80-2,59 was disagree, 2,60-3,39 was undecided, 3,40-4,19 is agree, 4,20-5,00 was strongly agree; For the self-efficacy scale, 1,00-1,79 was inadequate, 1,80-2,59 was slightly adequate, 2,60-3,39 was somewhat adequate, 3,40-4,19 was quite adequate, 4,20-5,00 was very adequate; for the professional motivation scale, 1,00-2,59 was very negative, 2,60-3,39 was undecided, 3,40-5,00 was very positive.

Frequency (f), percentage (%), mean (\bar{x}) and standard deviation (SD) were used to describe the data. Skewness and kurtosis coefficients and Kolmogorow-Smirnov test were analysed to examine the normal distribution of the scores. Table 2 shows the statistics related to the normality of the scores.

Table 2 Normality Test Results for Score Distributions

Measurement	\bar{x}	SS	Kurtosis		Skewness		K-S Test (P)
			Coefficient	Standard H.	Coefficient	Standard H.	
Multidimensional Perfectionism	2,89	0,74	0,594	0,115	0,089	0,230	,97
Teacher Self-Efficacy	3,76	0,64	0,996	0,115	1,725	0,230	,94
Teacher Professional Motivation	3,41	0,96	0,339	0,115	0,062	0,230	,97

Kolmogorow-Smirnov Test, $p > 0,05$

When the skewness and kurtosis coefficients for the perfectionism, self-efficacy perception and vocational motivation scales were examined in Table 2, it was seen that the kurtosis and skewness coefficient values were in the range of ± 2 in all scales. According to George and Mallery (2019), kurtosis and skewness coefficient values can be considered normal if they are between ± 2 in many cases depending on the application. In the study, kurtosis and skewness values were within the normal range. In addition, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test results of the scales were $p > 0.05$. This value showed that the scale scores exhibit a normal distribution. When the skewness- kurtosis and Kolmogorov-Smirnov test were evaluated together, it was accepted that the

score distributions showed a normal distribution. Since the data showed a normal distribution, t-test for independent groups, one-way analysis of variance, Pearson Product Moment Correlation and Progressive Regression Analysis and LSD from multiple comparisons from post hoc tests were used in the analysis of the data.

FINDINGS

The first sub-problem of the study is “Do English teachers’ perfectionism, self-efficacy and professional motivation vary according to gender, professional seniority and institution of employment?”. Findings related to the first sub-problem are presented.

Table 3 Comparison of English Language Teachers' Perfectionism According to Gender

	Gender	N	\bar{x}	SS	Sd	t	p
Organisation	Woman	334	3,97	0,81	448	3,950	*0,00
	Male	116	3,60	1,00			
Excessive Attention to Errors	Woman	334	2,59	0,89	448	-1,868	0,60
	Male	116	2,77	0,90			
Suspicion of Behaviour	Woman	334	2,58	0,94	448	-2,702	0,48
	Male	116	2,85	0,97			
Family Expectations	Woman	334	2,57	0,99	448	-2,155	0,21
	Male	116	2,79	0,92			
Familial Criticism	Woman	334	2,27	0,98	448	-2,356	*0,03
	Male	116	2,52	1,08			
Personal Standards	Woman	334	3,12	0,79	448	0,686	0,21
	Male	116	3,06	0,86			
Perfectionism (General)	Woman	334	2,87	0,72	448	-0,924	0,47
	Male	116	2,95	0,78			

*p<0,05

When Table 3 was examined, a significant difference was observed between the means of female teachers (\bar{x} =3,97; SD=0,81) and male teachers (\bar{x} =3,60; SD=1,00) in the “order” sub-dimension of English teachers’ perfectionism in favour of female teachers (t =3,950; p <0,05). There was no significant difference between the averages of female teachers (\bar{x} =2,59; SD=0,89) and male teachers (\bar{x} =2,77; SD=0,90) in the “Interest in mistakes” sub-dimension (t = -1,868; p >0,05). There was no significant difference between the averages of female teachers (\bar{x} =2,58; SD=0,94) and male teachers (\bar{x} =2,85; SD=0,97) in the “suspicion of behaviours” sub-dimension (t = -2,702; p >0,48). In the “family expectations” sub-dimension, there was no significant difference between the means of female teachers (\bar{x} =2,57; SD=0,99) and male

teachers (\bar{x} =2,79; SD=0,92) (t = -2,155; p >0,05). In the “family criticism” sub-dimension, there was a significant difference between the averages of female teachers (\bar{x} =2,27; SD=0,98) and male teachers (\bar{x} =2,52; SD=1,08) in favour of male teachers (t = -2,356; p <0,03). In the “personal standards” sub-dimension, there was no significant difference between the averages of female teachers (\bar{x} =3,12; SD=0,79) and male teachers (\bar{x} =3,06; SD=0,86) (t = ,686; p >0,05), there was no significant difference between the averages of female teachers (\bar{x} =2,87; SD=0,72) and male teachers (\bar{x} =2,95; SD=0,78) according to the total scores of the perfectionism scale (t = 0,924; p >0,05).

The findings showing the change in English teachers’ self-efficacy perceptions according to gender are presented in the table below.

Table 4 Comparison of English Language Teachers' Self-Efficacy Perceptions According to Gender

	Gender	N	\bar{x}	SS	Sd	t	p
Self-efficacy for student engagement	Woman	334	3,70	0,66	448	1,64	0,10
	Male	116	3,58	0,72			
Self-efficacy towards teaching strategies	Woman	334	3,87	0,61	448	2,88	*0,00
	Male	116	3,67	0,72			
Self-efficacy towards classroom management	Woman	334	3,81	0,70	448	1,66	0,09
	Male	116	3,69	0,76			
Self-efficacy (General)	Woman	334	3,79	0,62	448	2,03	*0,02
	MALE	116	3,64	0,70			

*p<0,05

When Table 4 was analysed, it is seen that there was no significant difference between the means of female teachers ($\bar{x}=3,70$; $SD=0,66$) and male teachers ($\bar{x}=3,58$; $SD=0,72$) with the value of ($t=1,64$; $p<0,10$) in the sub-dimension of “*Self-efficacy towards student participation*” of English teachers’ self-efficacy perceptions. In the sub-dimension of “*self-efficacy towards teaching strategies*”, there was a significant difference between the averages of female teachers ($\bar{x}=3,87$; $SD=0,61$) and male teachers ($\bar{x}=3,67$; $SD=0,72$) in favour of female teachers ($t=2,88$; $p<0,05$). There

was no significant difference between the averages of female teachers ($\bar{x}=3,81$; $SD=0,70$) and male English teachers ($\bar{x}=3,69$; $SD=0,76$) in the “*self-efficacy for classroom management*” sub-dimension ($t=1,66$; $p>0,05$). According to the total scores of the self-efficacy scale, there was a significant difference between the averages of female teachers ($\bar{x}=3,79$; $SD=0,62$) and male teachers ($\bar{x}=3,64$; $SD=0,70$) in favour of female teachers ($t=2,03$; $p<0,05$).

The findings showing the variation of English teachers’ professional motivation according to gender are presented in the table below.

Table 5 Comparison of English Language Teachers’ Professional Motivation Levels According to Gender

	Gender	N	\bar{x}	SS	SD	t	p
Physical Facilities	Woman	334	3,52	1,05	448	3,67	0,82
	Male	116	3,09	1,10			
In-School Factors	Woman	334	3,68	1,07	448	4,98	0,21
	Male	116	3,08	1,19			
Factors Outside School	Woman	334	3,04	1,04	448	1,24	0,46
	Male	116	2,90	1,02			
Professional Development and Reputation	Woman	334	3,74	0,95	448	4,65	0,75
	Male	116	3,26	0,97			
Professional Motivation (General)	Woman	334	3,52	0,91	448	4,11	0,22
	Male	116	3,08	1,02			

* $p<0,05$

When Table 5 was analysed, there was no significant difference between the averages of female teachers ($\bar{x}=3,52$; $SD=1,05$) and male teachers ($\bar{x}=3,09$; $SD=1,10$) in the “Physical Facilities” sub-dimension of English teachers’ professional motivation levels ($t=3,67$; $p>0,05$). In the “In-School Factors” sub-dimension, there was no significant difference between the averages of female teachers ($\bar{x}=3,68$; $SD=1,07$) and male teachers ($\bar{x}=3,08$; $SD=1,19$) ($t=4,98$; $p>0,05$). In the “Extracurricular Factors” sub-dimension, there was no significant

difference between the averages of female teachers ($\bar{x}=3,04$; $SD=1,04$) and male teachers ($\bar{x}=2,90$; $SD=1,02$) ($t=1,24$; $p>0,05$). There was no significant difference between the averages of female teachers ($\bar{x}=3,74$; $SD=0,95$) and male teachers ($\bar{x}=3,26$; $SD=0,97$) in the “Professional Development and Respect” sub-dimension ($t=4,65$; $p>0,05$). According to the total scores of professional motivation scale, there was no significant difference between the averages of female teachers ($\bar{x}=3,52$; $SD=0,91$) and male teachers ($\bar{x}=3,08$; $SD=1,02$) ($t=4,11$; $p>0,05$).

Table 6 Comparison of English Language Teachers’ Perfectionism According to Professional Seniority

	Professional Seniority	N	\bar{x}	SS	SD	F	p	Difference Status
Organisation	0-5 years (1)	61	3,02	1,01	3-446	26,90	*0,00	1-2 1-3 1-4
	6-10 years (2)	96	3,95	0,88				
	11-15 years (3)	107	4,15	0,67				
	16 years and over (4)	186	3,95	0,78				

EXCESSIVE ATTENTION TO ERRORS	0-5 YEARS (1)	61	2,71	0,87	3-446	9,56	*0,00	1-4 2-4 3-4
	6-10 YEARS (2)	96	2,94	1,00				
	11-15 YEARS (3)	107	2,74	0,76				
	16 YEARS AND OVER (4)	186	2,39	0,85				
SUSPICION OF BEHAVIOUR	0-5 YEARS (1)	61	2,77	0,84	3-446	4,04	*0,00	1-4 2-4
	6-10 YEARS (2)	96	2,86	1,07				
	11-15 YEARS (3)	107	2,68	0,92				
	16 YEARS AND OVER (4)	186	2,47	0,93				
FAMILY EXPECTATIONS	0-5 YEARS (1)	61	2,51	0,89	3-446	4,77	*0,00	1-2 2-3 2-4
	6-10 YEARS (2)	96	2,95	1,03				
	11-15 YEARS (3)	107	2,50	0,86				
	16 YEARS AND OVER (4)	186	2,56	1,00				
FAMILIAL CRITICISM	0-5 YEARS (1)	61	2,33	1,12	3-446	6,45	*0,00	1-2 2-3 2-4
	6-10 YEARS (2)	96	2,72	1,20				
	11-15 YEARS (3)	107	2,18	0,91				
	16 YEARS AND OVER (4)	186	2,22	0,87				
PERSONAL STANDARDS	0-5 YEARS (1)	61	2,66	0,78	3-446	11,31	*0,00	1-2 1-3 1-4 2-4 3-4
	6-10 YEARS (2)	96	3,26	0,93				
	11-15 YEARS (3)	107	3,34	0,67				
	16 YEARS AND OVER (4)	186	3,03	0,76				
PERFECTIONISM (GENERAL)	0-5 YEARS (1)	61	2,69	0,78	3-446	6,96	*0,00	1-2 1-3 1-4 2-4 3-4
	6-10 YEARS (2)	96	3,13	0,88				
	11-15 YEARS (3)	107	2,98	0,58				
	16 YEARS AND OVER (4)	186	2,78	0,69				

*p<0,05

When Table 6 was analysed, in the “order” sub-dimension of English teachers’ perfectionism, the averages of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =3,02; SD=1,01), the averages of teachers with 6-10 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =3,95; SS=0,88), English teachers with 11-15 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =4,15; SS=0,67), English teachers with 16 years of professional seniority and above (\bar{x} =3,95; SS=0,78) (F =26,90; p <0,05). In the sub-dimension of “Excessive Interest in Errors”, the means of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =2,71; SD=0,87), the means of teachers with 6-10 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =2,94; SS=1,00), 11-15 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =2,74; SS=0,76), and 16 years and more of professional seniority (\bar{x} =2,39; SS=0,85) (F =9,56; p <0,05). In the “Suspicion of Behaviours” sub-dimension, there was a significant

difference between the averages of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =2,77; SD=0,84), teachers with 6-10 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =2,86; SD=1,07), and teachers with 16 years or more of professional seniority (\bar{x} =2,47; SD=0,93) (F =4,04; p <0,05). In the “Family Expectations” sub-dimension, the means of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =2,51; SD=0,89), the means of teachers with 6-10 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =2,95; SS=1,03), teachers with 11-15 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =2,50; SS=0,86), and teachers with 16 years or more of professional seniority (\bar{x} =2,56; SS=1,00) (F =4,77; p <0,05). In the “Familial Criticism” sub-dimension, the means of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =2,33; SD=1,12), the means of teachers with 6-10 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =2,72; SS=1,20), 11-15 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =2,18;

SS=0,91), and 16 years and more of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=2,22$; SS=0,87) ($F=6,45$; $p<0,05$). In the “Personal Standards” sub-dimension, the means of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=2,66$; SD=0,78), the means of teachers with 6-10 years of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=3,26$; SS=0,93), 11-15 years of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=3,34$; SS=0,67), and 16 years and more of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=3,03$; SS=0,76) ($F=11,31$; $p<0,05$). According to the total scores of perfectionism scale, the mean scores of teachers with 0-5 years of

professional seniority ($\bar{x}=2,69$; SD=0,78), teachers with 6-10 years of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=3,13$; SS=0,88), teachers with 11-15 years of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=2,98$; SS=0,58), teachers with 16 years or more of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=2,78$; SS=0,69) ($F=6,96$; $p<0,05$).

The findings showing the change in English teachers’ self-efficacy perceptions according to professional seniority are presented in the table below.

Table 7 Comparison of English Language Teachers’ Self-Efficacy Perceptions According to Professional Seniority

	Professional Seniority	N	\bar{x}	SS	Sd	F	p	Difference Status
Self-efficacy for student engagement	0-5 years (1)	61	3,30	0,78	3-446	7,543	*0,00	1-2 1-3 1-4
	6-10 years (2)	96	3,77	0,57				
	11-15 years (3)	107	3,76	0,59				
	16 years and over (4)	186	3,69	0,70				
Self-efficacy towards teaching strategies	0-5 years (1)	61	3,49	0,72	3-446	6,139	*0,00	1-2 1-3 1-4
	6-10 years (2)	96	3,85	0,57				
	11-15 years (3)	107	3,85	0,52				
	16 years and over (4)	186	3,88	0,70				
Self-efficacy towards classroom management	0-5 years (1)	61	3,40	0,74	3-446	7,195	*0,00	1-2 1-3 1-4
	6-10 years (2)	96	3,84	0,56				
	11-15 years (3)	107	3,78	0,68				
	16 years and over (4)	186	3,88	0,76				
Self-efficacy (General)	0-5 years (1)	61	3,40	0,71	3-446	7,478	*0,00	1-2 1-3 1-4
	6-10 years (2)	96	3,82	0,52				
	11-15 years (3)	107	3,80	0,55				
	16 years and over (4)	186	3,82	0,69				

* $p<0,05$

When Table 7 was analysed, in the “*Self-efficacy for student participation*” sub-dimension of English teachers’ self-efficacy perceptions, the mean scores of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority are ($\bar{x}=3,30$; SD=0,78), the mean scores of teachers with 6-10 years of professional seniority were ($\bar{x}=3,77$; SS=0,57), 11-15 years of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=3,76$; SS=0,59), 16 years and more of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=3,69$; SS=0,70) ($F=7,543$; $p<0,05$). In the sub-dimension of “*self-efficacy towards instructional strategies*”, the means of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=3,49$; SD=0,72), the means of teachers with 6-10 years of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=3,85$; SD=0,57),

the means of teachers with 11-15 years of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=3,85$; SD=0,52), and teachers with 16 years or more of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=3,88$; SD=0,70) ($F=6,139$; $p<0,05$). In the sub-dimension of “*self-efficacy for classroom management*”, the averages of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=3,40$; SD=0,74), the averages of teachers with 6-10 years of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=3,84$; SD=0,56), 11-15 years of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=3,78$; SD=0,68), and 16 years and more of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=3,88$; SD=0,76) ($F=7,195$; $p<0,05$). According to the total scores of the self-efficacy scale, the mean scores of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority ($\bar{x}=3,40$;

SD=0,71), the mean scores of teachers with 6-10 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =3,82; SS=0,52), 11-15 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =3,80; SS=0,55), and 16 years and more of professional seniority (\bar{x} =3,82; SS=0,69) (F =7,478; p <0,05).

The findings showing the change in English teachers' professional motivation according to their professional seniority are presented in the table below.

Table 8 Comparison of English Language Teachers' Professional Motivation Levels According to Professional Seniority

	Professional Seniority	N	\bar{x}	SS	Sd	F	p	Difference Status
Physical Facilities	0-5 years (1)	61	2,83	1,19	3-446	7,206	*0,00	1-2
	6-10 years (2)	96	3,56	0,93				1-3
	11-15 years (3)	107	3,53	1,04				1-4
	16 years and over (4)	186	3,45	1,07				
In-School Factors	0-5 years (1)	61	2,84	1,26	3-446	10,655	*0,00	1-2
	6-10 years (2)	96	3,63	0,98				1-3
	11-15 years (3)	107	3,81	1,10				1-4
	16 years and over (4)	186	3,52	1,09				3-4
Factors Outside School	0-5 years (1)	61	2,43	0,77	3-446	9,115	*0,00	1-2
	6-10 years (2)	96	3,28	1,02				1-3
	11-15 years (3)	107	3,09	1,11				1-4
	16 years and over (4)	186	3,01	1,02				2-4
Professional Development and Reputation	0-5 years (1)	61	2,92	0,98	3-446	13,120	*0,00	1-2
	6-10 years (2)	96	3,76	0,87				1-3
	11-15 years (3)	107	3,65	0,98				1-4
	16 years and over (4)	186	3,75	0,94				
Professional Motivation (General)	0-5 years (1)	61	2,77	0,98	3-446	11,681	*0,00	1-2
	6-10 years (2)	96	3,56	0,85				1-3
	11-15 years (3)	107	3,57	0,93				1-4
	16 years and over (4)	186	3,44	0,94				

* p <0,05

When Table 8 was analysed, in the “physical facilities” sub-dimension of English teachers' professional motivation levels, the averages of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority were (\bar{x} =2,83; SD=1,19), the averages of teachers with 6-10 years of professional seniority are (\bar{x} =3,56; SS=0,93), 11-15 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =3,53; SS=1,04), and 16 years and more of professional seniority (\bar{x} =3,45; SS=1,07) (F =7,206; p <0,05). In the “In-school factors” sub-dimension, the means of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =2,84; SD=1,26), the means of teachers with 6-10 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =3,63; SS=0,98), 11-15 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =3,81; SS=1,10), and 16 years and more of

professional seniority (\bar{x} =3,52; SS=1,09) (F =10,655; p <0,05). In the “out-of-school factors” sub-dimension, the averages of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =2,43; SD=0,77), teachers with 6-10 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =3,28; SS=1,02), 11-15 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =3,09; SS=1,11), and 16 years and more of professional seniority (\bar{x} =3,01; SS=1,02) (F =9,115; p <0,05). In the sub-dimension of “professional development and prestige”, the means of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =2,92; SD=0,98), the means of teachers with 6-10 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =3,76; SS=0,87), 11-15 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =3,65; SS=0,98), 16 years and more of professional seniority (\bar{x} =3,75;

SS=0,94) (F=13,120; p<0,05). According to the total scores of professional motivation scale, the mean scores of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =2,77; SD=0,98), the mean scores of teachers with 6-10 years of professional seniority (\bar{x} =3,56; SS=0,85), 11-15 years of professional

seniority (\bar{x} =3,57; SS=0,93), and 16 years and more of professional seniority (\bar{x} =3,44; SS=0,94) (F=11,681; p<0,05).

The findings showing the variation of English teachers' perfectionism according to the institution of employment are presented in the table below.

Table 9 Comparison of English Language Teachers' Perfectionism According to the Institution of Employment

	Employed Institution	N	\bar{x}	SS	Sd	F	p	Difference Status
Organisation	Primary School (1)	106	3,64	0,93	2-447	6,292	*0,00	1-2
	Secondary School (2)	201	4,01	0,82				
	High School (3)	143	3,85	0,89				
Excessive Attention to Errors	Primary School (1)	106	2,69	0,98	2-447	1,319	0,26	No difference
	Secondary School (2)	201	2,67	0,81				
	High School (3)	143	2,53	0,94				
Suspicion of Behaviour	Primary School (1)	106	2,69	1,02	2-447	0,385	0,68	No difference
	Secondary School (2)	201	2,66	0,87				
	High School (3)	143	2,59	1,03				
Family Expectations	Primary School (1)	106	2,59	0,99	2-447	1,630	0,19	No difference
	Secondary School (2)	201	2,71	0,94				
	High School (3)	143	2,52	1,00				
Familial Criticism	Primary School (1)	106	2,39	1,12	2-447	0,844	0,43	No difference
	Secondary School (2)	201	2,37	0,97				
	High School (3)	143	2,24	0,98				
Personal Standards	Primary School (1)	106	2,96	0,82	2-447	3,548	0,03*	1-2
	Secondary School (2)	201	3,21	0,80				
	High School (3)	143	3,06	0,80				
Perfectionism (General)	Primary School (1)	106	2,85	0,83	2-447	1,727	0,17	No difference
	Secondary School (2)	201	2,96	0,67				
	High School (3)	143	2,89	0,74				

*p<0,05

When Table 9 was analysed, it was seen that there is a significant difference between the averages of English teachers working in primary school (\bar{x} =3,64; SD=0,93) and those working in secondary school (\bar{x} =4,01; SD=0,82) in the "order" sub-dimension of English teachers' perfectionism (F=6,292; p<0,05). In the "excessive interest in mistakes" sub-dimension, there was no significant difference between the averages of primary school teachers (\bar{x} =2,69; SD=0,98), middle school teachers (\bar{x} =2,67; SD=0,81) and high school teachers (\bar{x} =2,53; SD=0,94) (F=1,319; p>0,05). In the "Suspicion of behaviours" sub-dimension, there was no significant

difference between the averages of primary school teachers (\bar{x} =2,69; SD=1,02), secondary school teachers (\bar{x} =2,66; SD=0,87) and high school teachers (\bar{x} =2,59; SD=1,03) (F=0,385; p>0,05). In the "family expectations" sub-dimension, there was no significant difference between the averages of primary school teachers (\bar{x} =2,59; SD=0,99), secondary school teachers (\bar{x} =2,71; SD=0,94) and high school teachers (\bar{x} =2,52; SD=1,00) (F=1,630; p>0,05). In the "family criticism" sub-dimension, there was no significant difference between the averages of primary school teachers (\bar{x} =2,39; SD=1,12), secondary school teachers (\bar{x} =2,37; SD=0,97) and high school

teachers ($\bar{x}=2,24$; $SD=0,98$) ($F=0,844$; $p>0,05$). In the “personal standards” sub-dimension, there was a significant difference between the averages of the primary school teachers ($\bar{x}=2,96$; $SD=0,82$) and the secondary school teachers ($\bar{x}=3,21$; $SD=0,80$) ($F=3,548$; $p<0,05$). According to the total scores of perfectionism scale, there was no significant difference between the averages of primary school

teachers ($\bar{x}=2,85$; $SD=0,83$), secondary school teachers ($\bar{x}=2,96$; $SD=0,67$) and high school teachers ($\bar{x}=2,89$; $SD=0,74$) ($F=1,727$; $p>0,05$).

The findings showing the change in English teachers’ self-efficacy perceptions according to the institution of employment are presented in the table below.

Table 10 Comparison of English Language Teachers’ Self-Efficacy Perceptions According to the Institution of Employment

	Employed Institution	N	\bar{x}	SS	Sd	F	p	Difference Status
Self-Efficacy for Student Engagement	Primary School (1)	106	3,58	0,72	2-447	1,415	0,24	No difference
	Secondary School (2)	241	3,71	0,65				
	High School (3)	143	3,68	0,67				
Self-efficacy towards instructional strategies	Primary School (1)	106	3,69	0,68	2-447	3,462	*0,03	1-3
	Secondary School (2)	241	3,82	0,63				
	High School (3)	143	3,91	0,63				
Self-efficacy towards classroom management	Primary School (1)	106	3,62	0,79	2-447	3,780	*0,02	1-2 1-3
	Secondary School (2)	241	3,82	0,65				
	High School (3)	143	3,85	0,72				
Self-efficacy (General)	Primary School (1)	106	3,63	0,69	2-447	2,845	*0,05	1-2 1-3
	Secondary School (2)	241	3,79	0,61				
	High School (3)	143	3,81	0,64				

* $p<0,05$

When Table 10 was analysed, it was seen that there was no significant difference between the averages of primary school teachers ($\bar{x}=3,58$; $SD=0,72$), secondary school teachers ($\bar{x}=3,71$; $SD=0,65$) and high school teachers ($\bar{x}=3,68$; $SD=0,67$) in the “*self-efficacy towards student participation*” sub-dimension of English teachers’ self-efficacy perceptions ($F=1,415$; $p>0,05$). In the sub-dimension of “*self-efficacy towards teaching strategies*”, there was a significant difference between the averages of the teachers working in primary schools ($\bar{x}=3,69$; $SD=0,68$) and the averages of the teachers working in high schools ($\bar{x}=3,91$; $SD=0,63$) ($F=3,462$; $p<0,05$). In the sub-dimension of “*self-efficacy for classroom management*”, there was a significant difference between the averages of primary school teachers ($\bar{x}=3,62$; $SD=0,79$), secondary school teachers ($\bar{x}=3,82$; $SD=0,65$) and high school teachers ($\bar{x}=3,85$; $SD=0,72$) ($F=3,780$; $p<0,05$). According to the total scores of self-efficacy scale, there was

a significant difference between the averages of primary school teachers ($\bar{x}=3,63$; $SD=0,69$), secondary school teachers ($\bar{x}=3,79$; $SD=0,61$), and high school teachers ($\bar{x}=3,81$; $SD=0,64$) ($F=2,845$; $p=0,05$).

The findings showing the variation of English teachers’ professional motivation according to the institution of employment are presented in the table below.

When Table 11 was analysed, it was seen that there was a significant difference ($F=7,499$; $p<0,05$) between the averages of primary school teachers ($\bar{x}=3,14$; $SD=1,25$), secondary school teachers ($\bar{x}=3,61$; $SD=0,95$) and high school teachers ($\bar{x}=3,31$; $SD=1,05$) in the “physical facilities” sub-dimension of English teachers’ professional motivation levels. In the “In-school factors” sub-dimension, there was a significant difference between the averages of the teachers working in primary schools ($\bar{x}=3,32$; $SD=1,33$) and the averages of the teachers working in

high schools ($\bar{x}=3,61$; $SD=1,08$) ($F=2,216$; $p>0,01$). In the sub-dimension of “Factors outside the school”, a significant difference was observed between the averages of the teachers working in primary schools ($\bar{x}=2,80$; $SD=1,05$) and the averages of the teachers working in secondary schools ($\bar{x}=3,09$; $SD=0,98$) ($F=3,001$; $p=0,05$). In the “professional development and prestige” sub-dimension, there was no significant difference between the averages of primary school

teachers ($\bar{x}=3,48$; $SD=1,05$), secondary school teachers ($\bar{x}=3,69$; $SD=0,86$) and high school teachers ($\bar{x}=3,62$; $SD=1,06$) ($F=1,569$; $p>0,05$). According to the total scores of the vocational motivation scale, there was a significant difference between the averages of the teachers working at primary school ($\bar{x}=3,20$; $SD=1,10$) and secondary school ($\bar{x}=3,50$; $SD=0,85$) ($F=3,513$; $p<0,05$).

Table 11 Comparison of English Language Teachers’ Professional Motivation According to the Institution of Employment

	Employed Institution	N	\bar{x}	SS	Sd	F	p	Difference Status
Physical Facilities	Primary School	106	3,14	1,25	2-447	7,499	*0,00	1-2 2-3
	Middle School	201	3,61	0,95				
	High School	143	3,31	1,05				
In-School Factors	Primary School	106	3,32	1,33	2-447	2,216	*0,01	1-3
	Middle School	201	3,57	1,04				
	High School	143	3,61	1,08				
Factors Outside School	Primary School	106	2,80	1,05	2-447	3,001	*0,05	1-2
	Middle School	201	3,09	0,98				
	High School	143	3,04	1,10				
Professional Development and Reputation	Primary School	106	3,48	1,05	2-447	1,569	0,20	No difference
	Middle School	201	3,69	0,86				
	High School	143	3,62	1,06				
Professional Motivation (General)	Primary School	106	3,20	1,10	2-447	3,513	*0,03	1-2
	Middle School	201	3,50	0,85				
	High School	143	3,43	0,97				

* $p<0,05$

The second sub-problem of the study is “Is there a significant relationship between English language teachers’ perfectionism and self-efficacy perceptions

and professional motivation levels?”. The findings related to the second sub-problem are presented in the table below.

Table 12 The Relationship between English Language Teachers’ Perfectionism and Self-Efficacy Perceptions and Professional Motivation Levels

	[1]	[2]	[3]	[4]	[5]	[6]	[7]	[8]	[9]	[10]	[11]	[12]	[13]	[14]	[15]	[16]
Perfectionism [1]	1,00															
Layout [2]	0,50*	1,00														
Excessive attention to errors [3]	0,92*	0,28*	1,00													
Suspicion of behaviour[4]	0,82*	0,14	0,80*	1,00												

Family Expectations [5]	0,85*	0,21*	0,76*	0,68*	1,00														
Familial criticism [6]	0,83*	0,16*	0,79*	0,73*	0,81*	1,00													
Personal standards [7]	0,87*	0,46*	0,75*	0,58*	0,65*	0,57	1,00												
Perception of self-efficacy [8]	0,21*	0,46*	0,08	-0,06	0,13	0,07	0,36*	1,00											
Self-efficacy for student engagement [9]	0,17*	0,44*	0,04	-0,09	0,10	0,10	0,04	0,31*	1,00										
Self-efficacy towards teaching strategies[10]	0,24*	0,40*	0,14	-0,00	0,17*	0,11	0,36*	0,95*	0,84*	1,00									
Self-efficacy for classroom management[11]	0,19*	0,29*	0,06	-0,08	0,09	0,05	0,34*	0,29*	0,83*	0,85*	1,00								
Physical facilities [12]	0,08	-0,04*	0,02	-0,04	0,04	-0,13	0,17*	0,29*	0,28*	0,27*	0,28*	1,00							
In-school factors [13]	-0,02	0,33*	-0,08	-0,12	-0,11	-0,23*	0,06	0,24*	0,21*	0,20*	0,27*	0,81*	1,00						
Extracurricular factors[14]	-0,00	0,20*	-0,03	-0,05	-0,03	-0,17*	0,06	0,14	0,11	0,10	0,19*	0,66*	0,65*	1,00					
Professional development and reputation[15]	-0,03	0,31*	-0,12	-0,15	-0,06	-0,21*	0,10	0,28*	0,28*	0,22*	0,29	0,69*	0,69*	0,68*	1,00				
Professional Motivation[16]	0,00	0,32*	-0,06	-0,10	-0,06	-0,22*	0,10	0,27*	0,25*	0,22*	0,29*	0,91*	0,94*	0,81*	0,82*	1,00			

*p<0,01

When Table 12 was analysed, it was seen that there was no significant relationship between English teachers' perfectionism general scores and professional motivation general scores, but there was a significant relationship between English teachers' self-efficacy perceptions and professional motivation levels. This result showed that the professional motivation of English teachers whose self-efficacy perception increased would also increase. A positive, significant and low level relationship was found between perfectionism and self-efficacy perception general scores at the level of $r=0,21$. This result showed that as English teachers' perfectionism levels increased, their self-efficacy perceptions would also increase. When the correlation values between the general scores of perfectionism and the

sub-dimensions of self-efficacy perceptions were analysed, it was found that there were positive, significant, low level relationships at the level of $r=0,17$ with the sub-dimension of self-efficacy for student participation, $r=0,24$ with the sub-dimension of self-efficacy for teaching strategies, and $r=0,19$ with the sub-dimension of self-efficacy for classroom management. This result showed that as English teachers' perfectionism increased, self-efficacy perception sub-dimensions would also increase. Positive, significant and low level relationships were found between order and self-efficacy towards student engagement at the level of $r=0,17$, between self-efficacy towards teaching strategies at the level of $r=-0,24$ and between self-efficacy towards classroom management at the level of $r=-0,19$.

Negative and positive, significant, low and medium level relationships were found between excessive interest in mistakes and self-efficacy towards student participation at the level of $r=0,44$; self-efficacy towards teaching strategies at the level of $r=0,40$; self-efficacy towards classroom management at the level of $r=0,29$; physical facilities at the level of $r=-0,04$; in-school factors at the level of $r=0,33$; out-of-school factors at the level of $r=0,20$; professional development and prestige sub-dimension at the level of $r=0,31$. There was a positive, significant, low and low level relationship at the level of $r=0,17$ between parental criticism sub-dimension and self-efficacy towards teaching strategies. There were negative, significant and low level relationships between personal standards and in-school factors at the level of $r=-0,23$; between out-of-school factors at the level of $r=-0,17$; between professional development and prestige at the level of $r=-0,21$.

When the correlation values between self-efficacy general scores and perfectionism sub-dimensions were analysed, a positive, significant, moderate relationship was found between the order sub-dimension and $r=0,46$; between the personal standards sub-dimension and $r=0,36$. When the correlation values between self-efficacy general scores and professional motivation sub-dimensions were examined, positive, significant and low level relationships were found between the physical facilities sub-dimension at the level of $r=0,29$; between the in-school factors sub-dimension at the level of $r=0,24$; between the professional development and prestige sub-dimension at the level of $r=0,28$. There was a positive, significant and low level relationship between the self-efficacy for student participation sub-dimension and the physical facilities sub-dimension at the level of

$r=0,28$; between the in-school factors sub-dimension at the level of $r=0,21$; between the professional development and prestige sub-dimension at the level of $r=0,28$. There was a positive, significant and low level relationship at the level of $r=0,28$ between the sub-dimension of self-efficacy towards teaching strategies and the sub-dimension of physical facilities at the level of $r=0,28$; between the sub-dimension of in-school factors at the level of $r=0,21$; between the sub-dimension of professional development and prestige at the level of $r=0,28$.

When the correlation values between the general scores of vocational motivation and the sub-dimensions of perfectionism were examined, positive and negative, significant, low level relationships were found between the order sub-dimension at the level of $r=0,32$ and between the sub-dimension of familial criticism at the level of $r=-0,22$. When the correlation values between the general scores of professional motivation and the sub-dimensions of self-efficacy perceptions were examined, positive, significant, low level relationships were found between the sub-dimension of self-efficacy for student participation at the level of $r=0,25$; between the sub-dimension of self-efficacy for teaching strategies at the level of $r=0,22$; between the sub-dimension of self-efficacy for classroom management at the level of $r=0,29$. This result showed that as the professional motivation of English teachers increased, self-efficacy perception sub-dimensions would also increase.

The third sub-problem of the study is “Are English teachers’ perfectionism and self-efficacy perceptions a significant predictor of their professional motivation levels?”. The findings related to the third sub-problem are presented in the table below.

Table 13 English Language Teachers’ Perfectionism and Self-Efficacy Perceptions Predicting Professional Motivation Levels

Dependent Variable	Organisation	St. Beta	T	p	R ²	Flat. R ²	F
Model 1 Professional Motivation	Organisation	0,329	7,372	0,00	0,108	0,106	54,352
Model 2 Professional Motivation	Organisation	0,375	8,663	0,00	0,185	0,182	50,855
	Familial Criticism	-0,282	-6,876	0,00			
Model 3 Professional Motivation	Organisation	0,351	8,137	0,00	0,210	0,205	39,541

MODEL 3 PROFESSIONAL MOTIVATION	Familial Criticism	-0,505	-6,876	0,00	0,210	0,205	39,541
	FAMILY EXPECTATIONS	0,277	3,737	0,00			
MODEL 4 PROFESSIONAL MOTIVATION	ORGANISATION	0,274	5,739	0,00	0,232	0,226	33,699
	FAMILIAL CRITICISM	-0,496	-6,843	0,00			
	FAMILY EXPECTATIONS	0,271	3,700	0,00			
	SELF-EFFICACY TOWARDS CLASSROOM MANAGEMENT	0,169	3,604	0,00			

p<0,05

When Table 13 was analysed, it was seen that the variables “order”, “parental criticism”, “family expectations” and “activities for classroom management” were predictors of English teachers’ professional motivation levels. When only “order” sub-dimension was taken as a predictor variable, it explained approximately 11% of the professional motivation levels. In the second model, “order” and “familial criticism” sub-dimensions explained 18.5% of professional motivation. In the third model, the sub-dimensions of “order”, “familial criticism” and “family expectations” explained 21% of professional motivation levels. In the fourth model, “order”, “parental criticism”, “family expectations” and “self-efficacy towards classroom management” sub-dimensions explained 23% of the professional motivation levels. Since the model with the largest R2 value, which was the percentage of explanation of the dependent variable, was accepted, the fourth model could be accepted as the model showing the predictive power of the research. The ANOVA value of the accepted model was F=33,699 and it was significant (p<0,05). Accordingly, it was seen that there were 4 independent variables as significant predictors of English language teachers’ professional motivation levels. When regression coefficients (St. Beta) were analysed, “order” sub-dimension contributed 27%, “parental criticism” sub-dimension -5%, “family expectations” sub-dimension 27% and “self-efficacy for classroom management” 17% to the variance of professional motivation levels in order of importance. While three of the predictor variables positively affected the dependent variable, “parental criticism” variable negatively affected the dependent variable. Accordingly, 23% of English teachers’

professional motivation levels were predicted by the scores of “order”, “parental criticism” and “family expectations” from the perfectionism sub-dimensions and “self-efficacy for classroom management” from the self-efficacy perception sub-dimensions. Excessive interest in mistakes, suspicion of behaviours, personal standards sub-dimensions of perfectionism scale and self-efficacy perception, self-efficacy for student participation and self-efficacy for teaching strategies sub-dimensions were not significant predictors.

CONCLUSION AND DISCUSSION

The results obtained from this study in which the effects of English language teachers’ perfectionism and self-efficacy perceptions on their professional motivation levels were examined are listed below.

When the results obtained for the first sub-problem of the study were analysed, it was found that there was no significant difference between the averages of female teachers and male teachers according to the total scores of English teachers’ perfectionism. This result can be interpreted as that teachers have high expectations in their work without gender factor. There are research results in the literature that are similar to this result. In the studies conducted by Sula Ataş and Kumcağız (2019) and Ulu Kalın (2020), it was concluded that the total scores of individuals’ perfectionism scale did not differ according to gender variable. There are also studies in the literature that contradict the research result. While Kahraman and Pedük (2014) concluded that the perfectionism of gifted female students was higher than that of male students; Sula Ataş and Kumcağız (2019) and Cowie et al. (2018) concluded that the perfectionism

levels of boys were higher than girls. It can be said that these different results in the literature are due to the fact that different samples were studied and different measurement tools were used. A significant difference was found in favour of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority in English teachers' perfectionism. It can be thought that this result of the study is due to the fact that English teachers with less professional seniority are more vigorous not only physically but also mentally. There are studies in the literature that contradict the results of the research. Sancar (2020) found that the total scores and sub-dimensions of teachers' perfectionism did not change according to their professional seniority. In the study conducted by Uysal Özyurt (2019), no significant difference was found according to the total scores of the perfectionism scale. When the perfectionism of English teachers was analysed, no significant difference was found according to the institution of employment. The reason for the significant difference in the sub-dimensions of "Order" and "Personal standards" may be due to the fact that teachers working in primary schools need to control young students.

It can be said that the fact that the general average of English teachers' self-efficacy perception was in favour of women due to the fact that women are more aware of their self-efficacy perceptions as a result of encountering sexual discrimination more and they make more effort to overcome the prejudice against them and trust themselves more. There are research results in the literature that are similar to this result. In the research conducted by Özdemir and Erdoğan (2017), a significant difference was found in favour of female pre-service teachers in terms of self-efficacy belief in teaching primary reading and writing. There are also studies in the literature that contradict the research result. Er (2020) found that male teachers' self-efficacy perceptions were higher than female teachers. In the study conducted by Candaş and Özmen (2022), it was found that teachers' self-efficacy perceptions did not differ significantly according to gender variable. When the total scores of the self-efficacy scale of English teachers were examined according to professional seniority, a significant difference was found in favour of teachers with 0-5 years of seniority. According to this result

of the study, it may be that teachers who are new to the profession have fresh knowledge, excitement and desire to teach. There are research results in the literature that are similar to this result. In the study conducted by Çok and Günbatar (2022), it was seen that teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority had higher self-efficacy perceptions than teachers with 20 years and more professional seniority. There are also studies in the literature that contradict the research result. In the results of Yenen and Dursun's (2019) study, it was concluded that teachers' self-efficacy perceptions increased in direct proportion to professional seniority and that there was a significant difference in favour of those with high professional seniority in "classroom management". This situation showed the importance of experience in the profession in controlling the classroom and students' behaviours as the professional seniority increases. In the literature, there are also studies in which there is no differentiation according to professional seniority. According to the result of the research conducted by Baş Dönergüneş (2022), it was concluded that the scores of mathematics literacy self-efficacy perceptions of classroom teachers did not differ significantly according to professional seniority. According to the total scores of the self-efficacy scale of English teachers, a significant difference was observed in favour of teachers working in primary schools. There are research results in the literature that are similar to this result. Haatainen and Turkka (2021) found that teachers working in primary school had higher self-efficacy perceptions than teachers working in secondary school. There are also studies in the literature that contradict the research result. In Aktürk and Delen's (2020) study, contrary to our research, it was concluded that teachers working in secondary schools had higher self-efficacy perceptions than teachers working in primary schools. In the study conducted by Çok and Günbatar (2022), it was concluded that teachers' self-efficacy perceptions did not differ according to the institution they worked in.

According to the total scores of the professional motivation scale of English teachers, there was no significant difference between the averages of female teachers and male teachers. This result showed that different genders of English teachers had no effect

on their professional motivation levels. There are research results in the literature that are similar to this result. Özdemir and Kurşun (2021) found that occupational motivation did not differ according to gender. There are also studies in the literature that contradict the research result. Ertürk (2016) found a significant difference in favour of female teachers. Different results in the literature may be due to various reasons such as different socio-cultural environments of individuals and differences in age groups. When the total scores of the professional motivation scale of English teachers were examined according to professional seniority, a significant difference was found in favour of teachers with 0-5 years of professional seniority. The reason for this may be the decrease in excitement and increase in mental and physical fatigue as seniority increases. There are research results in the literature that are similar to this result. In the study conducted by Orhan (2020), it was found that there was a significant difference in the total mean scores of the scale. There are also studies in the literature that contradict the research result. In Ertürk's (2016) study, it was concluded that the intrinsic motivation levels of teachers with a seniority of 16 years and above were higher. In Orhan's (2020) study, it was concluded that teachers did not show a significant difference according to their professional seniority. According to the total scores of the professional motivation scale of English teachers, there was a significant difference between the averages of the teachers according to the institution they worked in. There are research results in the literature that are similar to this result. In the study conducted by Orhan (2020), the professional motivation levels of the teachers were examined according to the institution of employment and no significant difference was found in the overall mean scores.

When the results related to the second sub-problem of the research were analysed, it was concluded that there was no significant relationship between English teachers' professional motivation levels and their perfectionism, but there was a significant relationship between English teachers' professional motivation levels and their self-efficacy perceptions. This result showed that the professional motivation of English teachers whose self-efficacy perception

increased would also increase. A positive, significant and low level relationship was found between perfectionism and self-efficacy perception general scores. According to this result, as English teachers' perfectionism increased, their self-efficacy perceptions would also increase. There are research results in the literature that are similar to this result. Aydın et al. (2017) found that there was no change in students' self-efficacy, but there was an increase in intrinsic motivation levels. Barkanyi (2021) found a significant relationship between self-efficacy and motivation. Ghaemi and Damirchiloo (2015) found a significant and high level relationship between self-efficacy, perfectionism and motivation levels of language learners. In another result of the same study, there is a significant relationship between perfectionism and self-efficacy. In the study conducted by Karaman, Vela, and Eşici (2020), a decrease was observed in the academic motivation level of secondary school students whose perfectionism perception increased. According to the results of the same study, self-efficacy perception was found to be related to motivation. There are also studies in the literature that contradict the research result. In the study conducted by Pul and Aksu (2021), no significant difference was found in the general averages of self-efficacy scores. Sarıkaya (2018) concluded that there was no significant relationship between perfectionism and self-efficacy perceptions of music teacher candidates.

In the results related to the third sub-problem of the study, it was determined that "order", "parental criticism", "parental expectations" and self-efficacy for classroom management variables were predictors of English teachers' professional motivation levels. Accordingly, it was seen that there are 4 independent variables as important predictors of EFL teachers' professional motivation levels. While three of the predictor variables affected the dependent variable positively, the variable "familial criticism" affected the dependent variable negatively. Accordingly, 23% of English teachers' professional motivation levels were predicted by the scores of "order", "parental criticism" and "family expectations" from the sub-dimensions of perfectionism and "self-efficacy for classroom management" from the sub-dimensions of self-efficacy perception. It was seen

that “excessive interest in mistakes”, “suspicion of behaviours”, “personal standards” sub-dimensions of perfectionism scale and “self-efficacy towards student participation” and “self-efficacy towards teaching strategies” sub-dimensions of self-efficacy perception were not significant predictors. There are also studies in the literature that contradict the research result. Kaçmaz and Demirtaş (2020) found that self-efficacy perception was a significant predictor of perfectionism.

REGARDING THE RESULTS OF THE RESEARCH THE FOLLOWING SUGGESTIONS HAVE BEEN DEVELOPED

Various guidance can be given to teachers with more than 16 years of professional seniority about burnout and inadequacy. When the self-efficacy perceptions of male teachers are analysed, since they consider themselves more inadequate than female teachers, seminars on gender equality and awareness in society can be given and survey studies can be applied to investigate the reasons for this situation. Since the self-efficacy perceptions and work motivation of teachers working in secondary and high schools were found to be more inadequate than those working in primary schools, it can be suggested to plan group and individual studies for English teachers working in these institutions.

REFERENCES

- Abuhanoğlu, H., Teke, A., Çelen, Ö., & Açıkel, C. (2015). Perfectionism in associate and undergraduate schools training health manpower. *TAF Preventive Medicine Bulletin*, 14(5), 413-423.
- Ada, Ş., Akan, D., Ayık, A., Yildirim, İ., & Yalçın, S. (2013). Motivation factors of teachers. *Atatürk University Journal of Institute of Social Sciences*, 17(3), 151-166.
- Aktürk, A. O., & Delen, A. (2020). The relationship between teachers technology acceptance levels and self-efficacy beliefs. *Journal of Science Education Art and Technology*, 4(2), 67-80.
- Atay, D. (2004). Motivational strategies of english teachers. *Journal of Hasan Ali Yücel Faculty of Education*, 1, 99-108.
- Aydin, S., Demir Atalay, T., & Göksu, V. (2017). Investigation of the effect of project-based learning process on academic self-efficacy and motivation of secondary school students. *Bartın University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 6(2), 676-688.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 191-215.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. New York: W. H. Freeman and Company.
- Bárkányi, Z. (2021). Motivation, self-efficacy beliefs, and speaking anxiety in language moocs. *ReCALL*, 33(2), 143-160.
- Baş Dönergüneş, S. (2022). The relationship between mathematics literacy self-efficacy perceptions of classroom teachers and mathematics teaching efficacy belief levels. *National Journal of Education*, 1(2), 134-155.
- Buendía, M., Jessyka, C., & Martín, J. L. O. (2018). Motivation: A key issue in the EFL classroom. *The International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities, and Nations: Annual Review*, 17(1), 27-43.
- Büyüköztürk, Ş., Çakmak, K., Akgün, E., Özcan, E., Karadeniz, Ş., & Demirel, F. (2017). *Scientific Research Methods*. Ankara: Pegem Academic Publishing.
- Candaş, B., & Özmen, H. (2022). Science teachers self-efficacy in the context of special field competences. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 12(1), 62-92.
- Cowie, M. E., Nealis, L. J., Sherry, S. B., Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (2018). Perfectionism and academic difficulties in graduate students: Testing incremental prediction and gender moderation. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 123, 223-228.
- Çapa, Y., Çakiroğlu, J., & Sarıkaya, H. (2005). Validity and reliability study of Turkish adaptation of teacher self-efficacy scale. *Education and Science*, 30(137), 74-81.
- Çelik, H., Ekşi, H., & Gülsu, N. (2017). Investigation of secure attachment and perfectionism in middle childhood in the context of various variables. *Turkish Journal of Psychological Counselling and Guidance*, 7(47), 53-68.

- Çok, C., & Günbatar, M. S. (2022). Teachers Self-efficacy perceptions of distance education in the COVID-19 pandemic process. *Educational Technology Theory and Practice*, 12(1), 57-81.
- Deniz, S., & Tican, C. (2017). Investigation of prospective teachers views on teacher self-efficacy beliefs and professional anxiety. *Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 17(4).
- Ekinci, N. (2017). Motivational factors affecting prospective teachers choice of teaching profession and field of study. *Elementary Education Online*, 16(2), 394-405.
- Er, K. O. (2020). The relationship between teacher self-efficacy beliefs and educational beliefs of pre-service teachers. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 15(1), 8-18.
- Ertürk, R. (2016). Teachers work motivations. *Journal of Educational Theory and Practice Research*, 2(3), 1-15.
- Frost, R. O., Marten, P., Lahart, C., & Rosenblate, R. (1990). The dimensions of perfectionism. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 14(5), 449-468.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2019). *IBM SPSS Statistics 25 step by step a Simple Guide and Reference*. New York: Routledge.
- Ghaemi, H., & Damirchiloo, S. (2015). The relationship among perfectionism, motivation, and self-efficacy of EFL learners. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research*, 5(2), 230-242.
- Haatainen, O. M., Turkka, J. S., & Aksela, M. (2021). Science teachers perceptions and self-efficacy beliefs related to integrated science education. *Education Sciences*, 11(6), 1-20.
- Kaçmaz, N., & Demirtaş Yildiz, V. (2020). Self-regulated learning, self-efficacy and perfectionism in gifted children. *Trakya University Journal of Social Sciences*, 22(1), 389-404.
- Kahraman, S., & Pedük, Ş. B. (2014). Determination of perfectionism levels of 6th, 7th and 8th grade gifted students. *Trakya University Journal of Social Sciences*, 16(2), 137-150.
- Karabağ Köse, E., Karataş, E., Küçükçene, M., & Taş, A. (2020). Teacher professional motivation scale validity and reliability study: Comparison of online and paper and pencil applications. *Pamukkale University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 51, 479-498.
- Karaman, M. A., Vela, J. C., & Eşici, H. (2020). Middle school students academic motivation in Turkey: Levels of perfectionism and self-efficacy. *Middle School Journal*, 51(5), 35-45.
- Karasar, N. (2020). *Scientific Research Method: Concepts, Principles, Techniques*. Ankara: Nobel Academic Publishing.
- Keser, A. (2006). *Motivation in Working Life*. Bursa: Alfa Publishing.
- Orhan, H. (2020). *The Relationship between Teachers Work Motivations and Teacher Leadership*. Necmettin Erbakan University.
- Özbay, Y., & Taşdemir, Ö. (2003). Multidimensional perfectionism scale: Validity and reliability study. *National Psychological Counselling and Guidance Congress*.
- Özdemir, C., & Erdoğan, T. (2017). Determination of classroom teacher candidates self-efficacy beliefs regarding primary reading and writing instruction. *Abant İzzet Baysal University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 17(1), 314-331.
- Özdemir, F., & Eker, C. (2021). Investigation of the relationship between playfulness tendencies and professional self-efficacy perceptions of preschool teacher candidates. *Karaelmas Journal of Educational Sciences*, 9(1), 1-20.
- Özdemir, S., & Kurşun, Z. (2021). Investigation of academic motivation and vocational motivation of support programme for disabled students. *Journal of Sustainable Educational Studies*, 2(1), 19-34.
- Pul, H. H., & Aksu, H. H. (2020). Self-efficacy beliefs of classroom teachers and classroom teacher candidates towards mathematics teaching. *Journal of Educational Theory and Practice Research*, 6(1), 99-114.
- Robbins, S. P. (2001). *Organisational Behaviour*. Prentice-Hall.
- Sancar, Y. (2020). *The Relationship between Burnout and Perfectionism Levels of Teachers*. Mehmet Akif Ersoy University.

- Saracaloğlu, A. S., Saygi, C., Yenice, N., & Altin, M. (2016). Investigation of perfectionism and emotional intelligence levels of music and classroom teacher candidates. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 1(38), 70-89.
- Sarikaya, M. (2018). *Predicting Music Performance Anxiety According to Music Teacher Candidates Perfectionism and Self-Efficacy Beliefs*, Necmettin Erbakan University.
- Shaughnessy, M. F. (2004). An interview with Anita Woolfolk: The educational psychology of teacher efficacy. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(2), 153-176.
- Shokrollahi, M., & Baradaran, A. (2014). On the relationship between iranian EFL teachers perfectionism and their reflectivity. *International Journal of Language Learning and Applied Linguistics World*, 7(3), 13-28.
- Sula Ataş, N., & Kumcağiz, H. (2019). Adolescents academic procrastination behaviours, academic self-efficacy beliefs and perfectionism. *Hacettepe University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 35(2), 375-386.
- Süer, S., Demirkol, M., & Oral, B. (2019). Investigation of primary school english teachers perceptions of competence regarding the implementation of primary school english curriculum. *Electronic Journal of Social Sciences*, 18(72).
- Şahin, C., & Şahin, S. (2017). Prospective teachers attitudes towards teaching profession, self-efficacy beliefs and student recognition levels. *Turkish Journal of Educational Sciences*, 15(2), 224-238.
- Taş, A., & Selvitopu, A. (2020). Investigation of job satisfaction and professional motivation levels of high school teachers. *Journal of Bayburt Faculty of Education*, 15(29), 23-42.
- Thompson, G., & Woodman, K. (2018). Exploring Japanese high school english teachers foreign language teacher efficacy beliefs. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Teacher Education*, 1-18.
- Tschannen-Moran, M., & Woolfolk Hoy, A. (2001). Teacher efficacy: Capturing an elusive construct. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 17(7), 783-805.
- Tunçer, P. (2013). Performance evaluation and motivation in organisations. *Journal of Court of Accounts*, 88(1), 87-108.
- Ulu-Kalin, Ö. (2020). Perfectionism in social studies teacher candidates. *Studies in Educational Research and Development*, 4(1), 1-25.
- Uysal Özyurt, Y. A. (2019). *Investigation of Teachers Perfectionism and Self-Sensitivity Levels in terms of Different Variables*. Gaziantep University.
- Yenen, T., & Dursun, F. (2019). English language teachers teaching process self-efficacy and reflections on classroom environment. *Mersin University Journal of Faculty of Education*, 15(2), 607-627.
- Yüksel Yukay, M., Türkücü, R., & Albayrak, İ. (2020). You are where i'm afraid to be: The power of fear of negative evaluation and perfectionism to predict vicarious embarrassment in young and middle adult teachers. *Kastamonu Education Journal*, 28(5).

Author Details

Pelin Çelik Seçgin, Freelance Researcher, Turkey, **Email ID:** pelincelik81@hotmail.com

Murat Ince, Zonguldak Bülent Ecevit University, Turkey, **Email ID:** muratince20@hotmail.com

Cevat Eker, Zonguldak Bülent Ecevit University, Turkey, **Email ID:** cevateker@gmail.com