The Relationship between Iranian Male and Female EFL Learners' Motivation and their Identity: Perfectionism and Hardiness

Nazila Tokhmehforoushan Khiabani[1], Nasrin Hadidi Tamjid *[2]

1,2. Department of English, Tabriz Branch, Islamic Azad University, Tabriz, Iran
*Corresponding author: nhadidi@iaut.ac.ir

Abstract

The learners' identity is one of the most important key elements of learning to motivate learners to learn English. The aim of this study was to investigate the relationship between the male and female EFL learners' motivation and their identity with a focus on gender. The study had a descriptive correlational design. The participants of this study were 50 Iranian male and 50 female postgraduate English majors, aged between 23 and 41, who were selected through convenient sampling. Three questionnaires of motivation, hardiness, and perfectionism were distributed among the participants. The results of Pearson correlation analyses demonstrated that there was not a significant relationship between EFL learners' motivation and their hardiness in both genders. Also, the results showed no significant relationship between EFL learners' motivation and their perfectionism in the two groups. Moreover, the results of independent-sample t-tests failed to find any significant difference between male and female students' motivation and their hardiness and perfectionism.

Keywords: motivation, identity, hardiness, perfectionism

Introduction

Motivation is a common word in our everyday speech and writing. Most often, it is used to explain our own behavior and people's behavior. For example, some individuals are described as highly motivated, meaning that they work hard at whatever task they undertake. It is said that others are poorly motivated because they do not study or work diligently. According to Dornyei (1998), motivation is one of the most important elements that affects the rate and success of second/ foreign language acquisition. He believes that motivation has a great influence on an L2 learners' learning outcome. He also notes that it makes the primary decision to learn the L2, and that later it drives people to continue the long and often boring learning process; indeed, as he claims, there are many factors regarding L2 acquisition which presuppose motivation to some extent. In Dornyei's opinion, without sufficient motivation even individuals with remarkable abilities cannot fulfill long-term goals, and suitable curricula and good teaching are not enough to ensure student achievement and mastery. On the other hand, high motivation can be an important element to address considerable deficiencies both in language aptitude and learning conditions (Dornyei, 1998).

According to Zoghi, Kazemi, and Kalani (2013), gender has also been regarded as an important factor that plays a specific role and influences second language acquisition since evidence has shown that while both boys and girls have improved their performances, girls achieve higher marks than boys in EFL learning. As Zoghi et al. (2013) state, "there are some differences between the language of men and that of women, and no education or social conditioning can wholly erase these differences" (p.1). In fact, educational research in the last several decades has proven that some gender differences manifestly influence students' academic interests, needs, and achievements (Halpern, 1986, as cited in Zoghi, et al., 2013).

Of all the learner variables, the most influential are those related to learners' emotions, attitudes and identities. According to Kuurme and Carlson (2012), the formation of identity is one of the most important functions of learning. Kaur and Phil (2014) believe that there is a strong relationship between identity development and the acquisition of English language to improve one's communication skills. They further add that identity development enhances one's own physical, emotional and psychological being. Kaur and Phil also

maintain that the personality of an individual is supposed an inner characteristic that organizes one's behavior.

Perfectionism is one essential characteristic of identity. Based on Miquelon and Vallerand's (2005) statements, striving for being perfect and setting excessively high performance standards characterizes perfectionism as a personality trait, which is also accompanied by overly critical self-evaluations and concerns regarding others' evaluations. According to Pishgadam and Akhondpoor (2011), more perfectionist students get lower scores in the skills of reading, speaking, and listening. With regard to Gregersen and Horwitz (2002), fear of committing errors and negative evaluation of others are a result of being overly concerned with the evaluation of his/her performance and competence in the target language.

Hardiness is another feature of identity. Different conditions of stress and psychological pressure can affect individuals' ability to be productive (Cole, Field, & Harris, 2004). Defined as any set of "circumstances that threaten or are perceived to threaten our wellbeing, and thereby tax our coping abilities" (Weiten, Lloyd, & Lashley, 1991, p.65), stress can have lasting effects on performance and cognitive functioning. According to Britt, Adler, and Bartone (2001), hardiness is a pattern of personality characteristics that distinguish those who remained healthy under life stress compared to those who are susceptible to health problems.

Similarly, as Crookall and Oxford (1991) indicate, severe anxiety in learning a foreign language may lead to other problems related to self-esteem and self-confidence that can result in some delay in learning a new language. Many of students enter an indirect path in which the more they learn about their cognitive problems, the more they feel under stress; this stress limits learning a new language more (Ely, 1986). The researchers' findings show that college students, due to low self-esteem and low self-confidence caused by anxiety and stress, can possibly face greater loss of motivation in English foreign language learning. Akhbari, Mohtashami, and Tajari (2015) maintain that since there is a link between personality traits and mental health, another problem that learners in EFL contexts may face is lessening normal perfectionism and hardiness as resistant factors of stress to learn a foreign language, whereas these are main

personality characteristics of educational performance, achieving goals, and enhancing motivation.

At present, this recognition of oneself as a learner is practically neglected or unheard of in Iranian EFL context, both among professionals, policy makers, and learning individuals. Most studies on identity have focused on gender, ethnic, and cultural identity (e.g., Bussey, 2011; Umana Taylor, 2011; Unger, 2011, as cited in Schwartz, Luyckx, & Vignoles, 2011) in the educational systems. Regarding the relationship of the hardiness and perfectionism with stress control and the stressful environment of universities, and assuming that learner identity can facilitate language learning, it is important to investigate the relationship of these identity traits with motivation, as the motivation to learn a new language seems to be directly linked to personality traits.

In the present study, the main objective is to examine the role of psychological hardiness and perfectionism and their relationship to motivation in the EFL context with a focus on gender differences. Accordingly, the following questions were raised:

Q1. Is there a significant relationship between Iranian male EFL learners' motivation and their hardiness?

Q2. Is there a significant relationship between Iranian male EFL learners' motivation and their perfectionism?

Q3. Is there a significant relationship between Iranian female EFL learners' motivation and their hardiness?

Q4. Is there a significant relationship between Iranian female EFL learners' motivation and their perfectionism?

Q5. Is there a significant difference between Iranian male and female EFL learners' hardiness?

Q6. Is there a significant difference between Iranian male and female EFL learners' perfectionism?

Method

Participants

The population of the study includes postgraduate English majors of translation, literature and teaching, including male and female students, studying at Tabriz Azad University. 50 male and 50 female students with a

range in age from 23 to 41 were selected through convenient sampling as the participants of this study.

Instrumentation

For the purpose of the study, the researcher used three instruments: 1. Motivation Questionnaire (Dornyei & Taguchi, 2010), 2. Perfectionism Questionnaire (Hewitt & Flett, 1991), and 3. Hardiness Questionnaire (Kubasa, Maddi, & Kahn, 1982); reliability coefficients were measured.

Dornyei and Taguchi's (2010) *Motivation Questionnaire:* This questionnaire consists of three parts with 76 items based on English learning motivation. Each item in part one includes six choices with 1 denoting "strongly disagree" and 6 meaning "strongly agree" anchoring each end of the scale. Each item in part two also is measured by a six-point scale consisting of "not at all", "not so much", "so-so", "a little", "quite a lot", and "very much". Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the multi-item scales in the present study was 0.91, which indicated that this version of questionnaire has adequate internal consistency (0.7 and above is considered acceptable in social science research).

Kubasa, Maddi, and Kahn's (1982) *Questionnaire of Hardiness:* This instrument consists of 20 items. Esmaeilkhani, Ahadi, Mazaheri, Mehrabizadeh Honarmand, and Asghari (1389), using test- retest, reported the reliability to be 0.85 for females and 0.84 for males, and using cronbach alpha, the reliability was reported to be 0.91. Also, the reliability of each component of the hardiness was measured through cronbach alpha which came out to be commitment 0.84, control 0.82, and challenge 0.75 respectively. Each item contains four choices: "never", "rarely", "sometimes", and "often". Scoring in this scale is 1 to 4. The internal consistency of the questionnaire, in the present research, was .92. Different subscales of hardiness were as follows:

       a.   Commitment (items 1 to 9);

       b.   Control (items 10 to16); and

       c.   Challenge (items 17 to 20).

Hewitt and Flett's (1991) *Questionnaire of Perfectionism:* The multidimensional perfectionism scale (MPS) includes 30 items which measure three dimensions of perfectionism: *self oriented perfectionism* (SOP), *other oriented perfectionism* (OOP), and *socially prescribed perfectionism* (SPP). Each of these dimensions contains 10 items and is measured on a 5-point Likert

scale from "absolutely disagree", "disagree", "neutral", "agree", and "absolutely agree" on the scale of 10 to 50. The total score of perfectionism is calculated from the sum scores of its three dimensions:

       a. SOP (items 1 to 10);
       b. OOP (items 11 to 20); and
       c. SPP (items 21 to 30).

In a pilot validation of the Persian form of this scale on a sample of students by Besharat (1381), the correlation coefficients of each component of the perfectionism were reported as respectively 0.88, 0.83, and 0.80. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient and retesting consistency were reported after one month as 0.91 and 0.85 respectively. The Cronbach's alpha of this scale in the present study was 0.87.

Procedure

Having selected the participants of the study, the researcher administered all three instruments in one session among the participants of the study, including male and female English majors of translation, literature and teaching. They were asked to answer all questions faithfully.

Consequently, on the basis of their answers to motivational questionnaire the students' motivation to learn English as a foreign language was represented. The lowest score was 76 and the highest score was 456. Those who scored higher than 266 were considered to be high in motivation. On the basis of their answers to the hardiness instrument, those who scored higher than 53 were considered to be high in hardiness and those who scored less than 15 were assumed to be low in hardiness. Moreover, on the basis of their answers to questions about perfectionism, those who scored higher than 90 were highly perfectionist, and those who scored lower than 60 reflect low perfectionism.

The researcher calculated the scores of the participants' answers to the three questionnaires. By employing a Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Test and an Independent-Samples T-Test as the statistical analyses, the researcher sought to discover whether there was a significant relationship and difference among perfectionism, hardiness, and language learning motivation between the male and female EFL learners.

Results

Initially, to check the normality of the distributions, the Kolmogrove-Smirnow test was used. The results of the test of the normality regarding the males and females' scores of hardiness, motivation, perfectionism and the components of hardiness and perfectionism are provided in Table 1.

Table 1

Kolmogrove- Smirnow Test for the Normality of Hardiness, Motivation, and Perfectionism Scores, and Hardiness and Perfectionism Components

		Hardiness	Motivation	Perfectionism	H_commitment	H_control	H-challenge	SOP	OOP	SPP
N		100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Normal Parameters[a,b]	Mean	2.380	4.226	2.312	2.410	3.125	2.480	3.362	2.996	2.996
	Std. Deviation	.6030	.5342	.6381	.6410	.5892	.09106	.7045	.6445	.6445
Most Extreme	Absolute	.062	.096	.084	.068	.073	.080	.060	.059	.059
Differences	Positive	.059	.050	.084	.068	.059	.080	.060	.059	.059
	Negative	-.062	-.096	-.054	-.057	-.073	-.079	-.057	-.051	-.051
Test Statistic		.062	.096	.077	.084	.068	.080	.073	.060	.059
Exact Sig. (2-tailed)		.812	.298	.573	.461	.711	.523	.633	.839	.854

a. Test distribution is Normal.
b. Calculated from data.

As indicated in Table 1, the *p* values of various variables were as follows: hardiness = .812, motivation = .298, perfectionism = .573, commitment = .461, control = .711, challenge = .523, SOP = .633, OOP = .839, and SPP = .854. Since the *p* values were greater than the alpha level (0.05), the normality of the data was met regarding all of the research variables.

In addition, the inspection of scatter plot of the male motivation and hardiness data indicated that the assumptions for linearity and homoscedasticity were not met. This means that there was no relationship between male motivation and hardiness scores.

To examine the relationship between the male learners' motivation and hardiness, Pearson's correlation coefficient was calculated. Table 2 presents the analysis for the males' hardiness and motivation scores.

Table 2
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Analysis for Male Motivation and Hardiness

		Motivation	Hardiness
Motivation	Pearson Correlation	1	.117
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.418
	N	50	50
Hardiness	Pearson Correlation	.117	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.418	
	N	50	50

As illustrated in Table 2, the Pearson Correlation is 0.117 with a *p* value of 0.418. Since the *p* value is greater than the alpha level (0.05), it is concluded that there is no meaningful linear relationship between the male learners' motivation and hardiness. Moreover, the correlation between the male learners' motivation and hardiness scores was examined by controlling for the perfectionism variable effect. The result is illustrated in Table 3.

Table 3
The Partial Correlation for Males' Motivation and Hardiness Scores by Controlling the Perfectionism Effect

Control Variables			Motivation	Hardiness
Perfectionism	Motivation	Correlation	1.000	.110
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.450
		Df	0	47
	Hardiness	Correlation	.110	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	.450	.
		Df	47	0

a.   Gender = Male

As shown in Table 3, a correlation coefficient of 0.110 and a *p* value of 0.450 > 0.05 shows that there is no meaningful linear relationship between the male learners' motivation and hardiness scores.

To examine the relationship between the male learners' motivation and perfectionism scores more clearly, another Pearson's Product Moment Correlation analysis was run. Moreover, a scatter plot for the male learners' motivation and perfectionism data was done.

The result showed that the plot did not have a trend of linearity or nonlinearity. Table 4 shows the result for Pearson product moment correlation analysis for male learners' motivation and perfectionism scores.

Table 4
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Analysis for Males' Motivation and Perfectionism Scores

		Motivation	Perfectionism
Motivation	Pearson Correlation	1	.041
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.780
	N	50	50
Perfectionim	Pearson Correlation	.041	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.780	
	N	50	50

a. Gender = Male

The correlation coefficient of 0.041, and the *p* value of 0.78> 0.05 in Table 4 indicate that there is no meaningful linear relationship between the male learners' motivation and perfectionism scores. Additionally, the correlation between the male learners' motivation and perfectionism scores was examined by controlling for the hardiness variable effect. The result is illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5
The Partial Correlation for Male Motivation and Perfectionism by Controlling the Hardiness Effect

Control Variables			Motivation	Perfectionism
Hardiness	Motivation	Correlation	1.000	-.010
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.946
		Df	0	47
	Perfectionism	Correlation	-.010	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	.946	.
		Df	47	0

a. Gender = Male

The result in Table 5 reveals that the correlation coefficient is -0.010, which has a slight difference with the coefficient presented in Table 4. Since the *p* value is 0.946, more than the alpha level (0.05), rejects any meaningful linear relationship between the male learners' motivation and perfectionism scores.

To examine the relationship between the female learners' motivation and hardiness more carefully, Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Analysis was run. Furthermore, the scatter plot for the female learners' motivation and hardiness data was checked, and no trend of linearity or nonlinearity was found. Therefore, there was no significant relationship between the female learners' motivation and hardiness scores. The result of a Pearson correlation analysis is shown in Table 6.

Table 6
Pearson Product Moment Correlation Analysis for Female Motivation and Hardiness

		Motivation	Hardiness
Motivation	Pearson Correlation	1	-.055
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.703
	N	50	50
Hardiness	Pearson Correlation	-.055	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.703	
	N	50	50

a. Gender = Female

As shown in Table 6, the correlation coefficient is -0.055, with a *p* value of 0.703 > 0.05. Thus, there is no meaningful linear relationship between the

female learners' motivation and hardiness. Therefore, the third null hypothesis failed to be rejected. Furthermore, the correlation coefficient of the female learners' motivation and hardiness was calculated by controlling for the perfectionism variable effect. The result is illustrated in Table 7.

Table 7

The Partial Correlation for Male Learners' Motivation and Hardiness by Controlling the Perfectionism Effect

Control Variables			Motivation	Hardiness
Perfectionism	Motivation	Correlation	1.000	-.112
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.443
		Df	0	47
	Hardiness	Correlation	-.112	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	.443	.
		Df	47	0

a. Gender = Female

As shown in Table 7, a correlation coefficient of -0.112 and a *p* value of 0.443 > 0.05 and reveal that there is no meaningful linear relationship between the female learners' motivation and hardiness scores. Additionally, to examine the relationship between the female learners' motivation and perfectionism scores, Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Analysis was run and the scatter plot for the female learners' motivation and perfectionism data was checked and the plot showed neither a trend of linearity nor nonlinearity. The result of Pearson correlation is shown in Table 8.

Table 8

Pearson Product Moment Correlation Analysis for Female Motivation and Perfectionism

		Motivation	Perfectionism
Motivation	Pearson Correlation	1	.246
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.085
	N	50	50
Perfectionism	Pearson Correlation	.246	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.085	
	N	50	50

a.   Gender = Female

As shown in Table 8, the correlation coefficient is 0.246 with a *p* value of 0.085 > 0.05 which indicates no meaningful linear relationship between female learners' motivation and perfectionism scores. The correlation coefficient of female learners' motivation and perfectionism scores was calculated by controlling for the hardiness variable effect. The result is illustrated in Table 9.

Table 9
The Partial Correlation for Male Motivation and Perfectionism by Controlling the Hardiness Effect

Control Variables			Motivation	Perfectionism
Hardiness	Motivation	Correlation	1.000	.263
		Significance (2-tailed)	.	.067
		Df	0	47
	Perfectionism	Correlation	.263	1.000
		Significance (2-tailed)	.067	.
		Df	47	0

a. Gender = Female

As illustrated in Table 9, the correlation coefficient is 0.263, which is not very different from the amount presented in Table 10. Moreover, the *p* value of 0.067 > 0.05 shows no meaningful linear relationship between female learners' motivation and perfectionism scores. Therefore, to investigate the difference between male and female groups with regard to hardiness, first descriptive statistics were calculated to describe basic features of both male and female groups' data. The results illustrated that the mean scores of hardiness in both groups of male and female learners were 2.36 and 2.39 respectively, a negligible difference. However, in order to examine the significance of the difference between the male and female learners' hardiness scores, an independent-samples t-test was carried out (Table 10).

Table 10

The Result of Independent Sample Test for Hardiness Data

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
	F	Sig.	'Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Hardiness Equal variances assumed	1.636	.204	314 98	.754	.0380	.1212	-.2024	.2784
Equal variances not assumed			314 96.148	.754	.0380	.1212	-.2025	.2785

As indicated in Table 10, there is not a significant difference between the male and female learners' hardiness scores, t (98) = 0.314, p= 0.754. Thus, there is no reason to reject the fifth null hypothesis. Furthermore, to study the difference between male and female learners' hardiness, the subscales of the hardiness instrument, namely Commitment, Control, and Challenge, were also examined. The related Descriptive Statistics illustrated that the mean scores of female and male learners in Commitment, Control and Challenge were 2.32 and 2.29, 2.45 and 2.36, and 2.47 and 2.49, respectively. The results of the independent-samples t-tests for the hardiness components of males and females did not show any significant differences (Table 11).

Table 11

The Result of Independent Samples T-Test for Hardiness Components

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means					95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	T	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Hardiness(commitment)	Equal variances assumed	.585	.446	.225	98	.822	.0289	.1282	-.2256	.2834
	Equal variances not assumed			.225	97.889	.822	.0289	.1282	-.2256	.2834
Hardiness(control)	Equal variances assumed	1.599	.209	.644	98	.521	.0829	.1286	-.1723	.3380
	Equal variances not assumed			.644	94.383	.521	.0829	.1286	-.1724	.3382
Hardiness(challenge)	Equal variances assumed	.471	.494	-.109	98	.913	-.0200	.1830	-.3832	.3432
	Equal variances not assumed			-.109	97.758	.913	-.0200	.1830	-.3832	.3432

As shown in Table 11, there is no meaningful difference between the variances of the components of male and female hardiness scores; thus, there is not any meaningful difference between the mean scores of the components of the male and female hardiness scores.

To investigate the difference between the male and female groups with regard to perfectionism, first, descriptive statistics were used to summarize data in both groups of males and females. The results showed that mean scores of perfectionism in both groups were 3.23 and 3.08, respectively, a negligible difference. To discern the significance of the difference between male and female perfectionism, another independent-samples t-test was carried out (Table 12).

Table 12
The Result of Independent Samples T-Test for Perfectionism Data

| | | Levene's Test for Equality of Variances | | t-test for Equality of Means | | | | | 95% Confidence Interval of the Difference | |
		F	Sig.	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Perfectionism	Equal variances assumed	.311	.578	-1.442	98	.152	-.1500	.1040	-.3564	.0564
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.442	97.269	.152	-.1500	.1040	-.3564	.0564

As shown in Table 12, Levene's Test for Equality of Variances shows that F= 311 and the *p* value is more than the alpha level (.05). Therefore, the variance of perfectionism in both male and female groups is assumed to be equal. This means that, from the viewpoint of perfectionism, both groups are homogeneous. Also, the result of the t-test, t (98) = -1.442, p= .152> 0.05, confirmed that there is no reason to reject the sixth null hypothesis and that there is no meaningful difference between the mean scores of male and female learners' perfectionism scores. Furthermore, to study the difference between the male and female learners' perfectionism in detail, the subscales of the

perfectionism instrument, including self oriented perfectionism (SOP), other oriented perfectionism (OOP), and social prescribed perfectionism (SPP) were examined. The descriptive statistics of the male and female perfectionism components indicated that the mean scores of the female and male learners in SOP, OOP, and SPP were 3.04 and 3.20, 3.29 and 3.43, and 2.91 and 3.07 respectively, which means that the difference between the perfectionism subscales of males and females could be ignored. However, three independent-samples t-tests were run to examine the significance of the differences, the results of which are illustrated in Table 13.

Table 13

The Result of the Independent Samples T-Test for Perfectionism Components

		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Perfectionism(SOP)	Equal variances assumed	1.322	.253	-1.312	98	.193	-.1540	.1174	-.3870	.0790
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.312	96.448	.193	-.1540	.1174	-.3870	.0790
Perfectionism(OOP)	Equal variances assumed	.676	.413	-.994	98	.323	-.1400	.1409	-.4196	.1396
	Equal variances not assumed			-.994	97.795	.323	-.1400	.1409	-.4196	.1396
Perfectionism(SPP)	Equal variances assumed	.988	.323	-1.213	98	.228	-.1560	.1286	-.4112	.0992
	Equal variances not assumed			-1.213	94.965	.228	-.1560	.1286	-.4113	.0993

As shown in Table 13, there is no meaningful difference between the variances of the subscales of the male and female perfectionism scores; that is, there is

not any meaningful difference between the mean scores of the components of the male and female perfectionism scores.

Discussion

The aim of the present study was to investigate the relationship between EFL learners' motivation and their identity traits from the standpoints of hardiness and perfectionism. The statistical analyses of the data showed that there was no significant relationship between EFL learners' motivation and their hardiness in both male and female groups. Furthermore, there is not a significant relationship between EFL learners' motivation and their perfectionism in either male or female groups. Similarly, no difference was found between the learners' motivation and their hardiness as well as the learners' motivation and their perfectionism in either male or female group.

A similar study was Wiley and Sons' (2000) research which examined the relationship between perfectionism and measures of achievement and achievement motivation and mental health aspects of depression and self-esteem among high school students. The results of multiple regression analyses indicated that students' personal standards were significant predictors of academic achievement and achievement motivation. Analyses of the relationship between perfectionism and depression and self-esteem found that as students' personal standards increased, their levels of depression decreased and their self-esteem increased. Furthermore, when students experienced a discrepancy between their personal standards and actual performance, their depression levels increased and their self-esteem decreased.

The findings of this study are also in line with the findings of some other studies that have reported no gender differences in SOP and SPP (Hewitt & Flett, 1991). However, contrary to the present study, a recent study by Caglar, Bilgili, Karaca, Ayaz, and Aşçi (2010, as cited in Hassan, Abd- El-Fattah, Abd-El-Maugoud, & Badary, 2012) showed that females scored significantly higher than males on the SOP subscale but scored lower than males on the SPP subscale.

Another study which examined personality traits and motivation was Akhbari et al's (2015). Although they focused on motivation towards failure avoidance, they found a significant relationship between these two personality

traits, hardiness and resilience, and the students' motivation. The results of this study also contradict Cole, Field, and Harris's (2004) findings which showed that simultaneously considering the combined effects of students' learning motivation and psychological hardiness can increase our understanding of the learning experience and its impact on important learning outcomes. Since learning motivation is flexible and students' level of learning motivation may change over the course of the term, it might increase, decrease, and stay the same; therefore, Cole et al employed a different methodology and used a survey questionnaire at different times of the course to capture students' attitudes and reactions over the different stressful times considering their initial learning and post learning motivation. However, they predicted that the positive relationship between class-specific motivation to learn and affective outcomes will be stronger when hardiness is high. Conversely, the positive relationships between learning motivation and affective outcomes were weaker when students had low hardiness.

Stoeber and Otto (2006) also suggested that striving for perfection was related to hope of success, motivation for school, and school achievement, but studying the relationship between perfectionism and academic motivation, this study provides opposite evidence.

Finally, the findings of this research are not in line with the findings of Miquelon and Vallerand (2005), who tested an integrative model on the role of perfectionism, academic motivation, and psychological adjustment difficulties in undergraduate students. Their model posited that self-oriented perfectionism facilitates self-determined academic motivation, whereas socially prescribed perfectionism enhances non-self-determined academic motivation.

In sum, the findings from the current study reveal difference between the male and female EFL learners' motivation and their identity, hardiness and perfectionism. However, a number of limitations should be considered when interpreting the results of this research. One of the limitations was related to time. Due to lack of time, it was not possible to interview the participants individually as well as have them fill the questionnaires. It was not possible to study the students' behavior in schools since this research could be done among both M.A and school students to compare their behavior and English foreign language learning motivation. Other motivation questionnaires might have yielded different results. Therefore, it is concluded that if identity, as one of the

key elements of the personality factors, is investigated more carefully in the longitude studies with the right materials and instruments at other levels of language proficiency, it can contribute to the knowledge in this field. Language learning researchers in general and foreign language learning researchers in particular need to continue conducting empirical research to investigate the factors that contribute to language learning such as motivation and personality traits. It is hoped that through modifications made to the design, sampling, or the instruments, more reliable results can be obtained.

References

Akhbari, M. R. Mohtashami, A. R., & Tajari, F. (2015). Studying the relationship between hardiness and resilience personality traits and academic achievement among students of Kashan University. *Science Journal, 36* (3), 1-8.

Besharat, M., E. (2002). Perfectionism dimensions in depressed and stressful patients. *The Journal of Psychological Sciences, 3*, 248-263. [in Persian]

Britt, T. W., Adler, A. B., & Bartone, P. T. (2001). Deriving benefits from stressful events: The role of engagement in meaningful work and hardiness. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 6*, 53–63.

Cole, M.S., Field, S.H., & Harris, S.G. (2004). Student learning motivation and psychological hardiness: interactive effects on students' reactions to a management class. *Academy of Management Learning and Education*, *3* (1), 64 – 85.

Crookall, D., & Oxford, R. (1991). *Dealing with anxiety: Some practical activities for language learners and teacher trainees.* New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Dornyei, Z. (1998). Motivation in second and foreign language learning. *Language Teaching*, *31*, 117-135.

Dornyei, Z., & Taguchi, T. (2010). *Questionnaires in second language research* (2nd ed.). New York, Routledge.

Ely, C. M. (1986). An analysis of discomfort, risk taking, sociability and motivation in the L2 classroom. *Language Learning*, *36* (1), 1-25.

Esmaeelkhani, F., Ahadi, H., Mazaheri, M., Mehrabizadeh Honarmand, M., & Asghari, P. (2010). A study of the relationship between unitary and multiple intelligence, self – efficacy psychological hardiness and conflict adaption management style among students. *New Discoveries in Psychology, 4(11),* 107-123. [in Persian]

Gregersen, T., & Horwitz, E. K. (2002). Language learning and perfectionism: Anxious and non-anxious. *The Modern Language Journal*, *86*, 562-570.

Hassan, H. K., Abd- El-Fattah, S. M., Abd-El-Maugoud, M. K., & Badary, A. H. A. (2012). Perfectionism and performance expectations at university: Does gender still matter? *European Journal of Education and Psychology*, *5*, 2, 133-147.

Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L. (1991). Perfectionism in the self and social contexts: Conceptualization, assessment, and association with psychopathology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*, (3), 456-470.

Kaur, J., & Phil, M. (2014). Personality development with English language acquisition. *Language in India: Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow, 14*, 115-122.

Kobasa, S. C., Maddi, S. R., & Kahn, S. (1982). Hardiness and health: A prospective study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *42*, 168–170.

Kuurme, T., & Carlsson, A. (2012). The importance and meaning of learning at school in students' consciousness. *International Education Studies, 5* (4), 166-167.

Miquelon, P., & Vallerand, R.J. (2005). Perfectionism, academic motivation, and psychological adjustment: An integrative model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31* (7), 913-924.

Pishghadam, R., & Akhondpoor, F. (2011). Learner perfectionism and its role in foreign language learning success, academic achievement, and learner anxiety. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 2* (2), 432-440.

Schwartz, S. J., Luyckx, K., & Vignoles, V. L. (Eds.). (2011). *Handbook of identity theory and research.* New York, Springer Science+ Business Media.

Stoeber, J. & Otto, K. (2006). Perfectionism in adolescent school students: Relations with motivation, achievement, and well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *42* (7), 1-38.

Weiten, W., Lloyd, M. A., & Lashley, R. L. (1991). *Psychology applied to modern life: Adjustment in the 90s*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brook & Cole Publishing.

Wiley, J., & Sons (2000). An investigation of perfectionism, mental health, achievement, and achievement motivation in adolescents. *Psychology in the Schools*, *37* (6), 535-545.

Zoghi, M., Kazemi, A., & Kalani, A. (2013). The Effect of Gender on Language Learning. *Journal of Novel Applied Sciences*, *2* (4), 1124-1128.

منابع فارسی

اسمعیل خانی، ف.، احدی، ح.، مظاهری، م. م.، مهرابی زاده هنرمند، م.، و عسگری، پ. (۱۳۸۹). بررسی رابطه ساده و چند گانه هوش هیجانی، خود کارآمدی و سرسختی روان شناختی با سبک مدیریت تعارض سازش در دانشجویان. *فصل نامه یافته های نو در روان شناسی*، دوره ۴، شماره ۱۱، ۱۲۳–۱۰۷.

بشارت، م. ع. (۱۳۸۱). ابعاد کمال‌گرایی در بیماران افسرده و مضطرب. *مجلۀ علوم روانشناختی*، ۳، ۲۶۳ـ ۲۴۸.

Biodata

Nasrin Hadidi Tamjid has a Ph.D. in TEFL. She is an assistant professor who has been teaching at Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch for 18 years. Moreover, she is the editor of the Applied Linguistic Journal at this university. She is also an official translator to the justice administration. She has published and presented a number of papers in different international journals and conferences. Her main research interests are alternative assessment, teacher education, second language teaching, and writing.

Nazila Tokhmehforoushan holds an MA in TEFL and BA in English translation from Islamic Azad University, Tabriz Branch. She has been teaching English in English language institute for 6 years. Her fields of interest are EFL teachers' and learners' individual personality and identity.