

**Perfectionism and Self-efficacy among
Working Young Adults in Kathmandu,
Nepal: A Cross-sectional Study**

**Nishtha Shrestha¹, Dil Bahadur Gurung² &
Eunisa Munankarmi³**

¹Social Science Independent Researcher (Nepal)

E-mail:<nishthashrestha011@gmail.com>

²Lead, Social Work, St. Xavier's College, Kathmandu (Nepal)

E-mail:<dilgurung@sx.edu.np>

³Lead, Psychology, St. Xavier's College, M.Phil Scholar in Psychology,
Kathmandu (Nepal) E-mail:<eunisamunankarmi@sx.edu.np>

Abstract

Perfectionism and self-efficacy are important psychological constructs influencing self-evaluation, standards, and coping with life's demands. However, their relationship remains insufficiently understood outside Western populations, particularly among working young adults in Nepal, where familial, social, and cultural pressures may shape these constructs differently. This study examined the relationship between perfectionism and self-efficacy among working young adults in Kathmandu, Nepal. A cross-sectional design was employed with a convenience sample of 95 participants aged 18–26 years. The Almost Perfect Scale-Revised (APS-R) and General Self-Efficacy Scale (GSE) measured perfectionism and self-efficacy, respectively. Findings showed that 83.2% of participants exhibited maladaptive perfectionist tendencies and 64.2% reported low self-efficacy. Pearson correlation revealed a negligible, statistically non-significant relationship between perfectionism and self-efficacy ($r = .025$, $p = .812$). Employment status was significantly associated with self-efficacy ($\chi^2 = 6.071$, $p = .021$), while gender and education level were not significantly associated with either variable. Binary logistic regression identified employment status ($OR = 0.282$, $p = .013$) and gender ($OR = 3.339$, $p = .023$) as significant predictors of self-efficacy, while no socio-demographic variable significantly predicted perfectionism. The findings suggest that although maladaptive perfectionism and low self-efficacy are prevalent, they are not linearly related. Other contextual and psychological factors may more strongly influence self-efficacy. The study underscores the need for culturally sensitive interventions and further research in the Nepali context.

Keywords

Perfectionism, Adaptive, Maladaptive, Self-efficacy, Working young adults.

Centre For Studies of National Development, Meerut

Editorial Office : D-59, Shastri Nagar, Meerut - 250 004 (INDIA)

Ph. : 0121-2763765, +91-9997771669, +91-9412200765

Perfectionism and Self-efficacy among Working Young Adults in Kathmandu, Nepal: A Cross-sectional Study

1. Introduction

Perfectionism refers to behaviours where an individual is overly critical of self-evaluations, has a fear of failing, excessively worries over mistakes, and sets unrealistic standards. The extreme desire to seem perfect is termed as perfectionism and in most cases, it has adverse emotional causations (Campbell, 2023). Individuals who have such odd behaviours to make themselves seem faultless are called perfectionists. Some of the indicators of perfectionism in an individual include: setting unrealistically high expectations, quick to find fault, overly critical of mistakes, possess fear of failure, shrug off compliments, forget to celebrate their success, etc. (Psychology Today, 2025). People with perfectionist tendencies experience various issues such as stress, relationship problems, obsessive compulsive tendencies, etc. Perfectionist behaviour can mainly be of two types: Adaptive perfectionism and Maladaptive perfectionism

Self-efficacy is the conviction that one can carry out tasks and handle future circumstances with success. According to Bandura (1977a), self-efficacy influences how people think, feel, motivate themselves, and act. It is an individual's belief in their capacity to execute behaviours necessary to produce specific performance attainments. It influences the way individuals handle objectives, duties and problems. It is also an expression of the confidence in having the ability to exercise control over personal motivation, behaviour, and social surroundings (Carey & Forsyth, 2009).

Past researches have provided valuable insights about the detrimental effects that perfectionist tendencies can have on people's self-efficacy, however they did not show any direct relation on perfectionism and self-efficacy. In the context of Nepal, especially among working young adults, this relationship has remained unexplored.

2. Theoretical Review

This study applied Multidimensional Theory of Perfectionism which defines perfectionism as a multifaceted personality characteristic comprising three components: Self-Oriented Perfectionism, Other-Oriented Perfectionism and Socially Prescribed Perfectionism (Lippman, 2025). As its name suggests, Self-Oriented Perfectionists set specific standards for themselves, Other-Oriented Perfectionism concerns perfectionist standards directed towards another person and social-oriented perfectionists believe that others will judge them according to a high standard (Hewitt & Flett, 1991). This theory therefore identifies the interplay

between perfectionism and self-efficacy that aligns with the focus of this study. In addition to Hewitt and Flett's (1991) multidimensional framework, this study also draws on Slaney's Discrepancy Model of Perfectionism (Slaney *et al.*, 2001), which underlies the Almost Perfect Scale-Revised (APS-R) used in this study. This model conceptualizes perfectionism along the dimensions of High Standards, Order, and Discrepancy (the perceived gap between one's standards and actual performance) and classifies individuals as adaptive perfectionists (high standards, low discrepancy) or maladaptive perfectionists (high standards, high discrepancy).

This study also applied Social Cognitive Theory presented by Bandura who argues that the interaction between the personal factors, the behavioural patterns, and the environmental factors led to the formation of human behaviour (Bandura, 1977b) or what he refers to as reciprocal determinism (Bandura, 1986). In this framework, self-efficacy is a critical construct and is characterized as the thoughts and the belief of the individual on the ability to organize and perform the steps that are required to control the situation that is about to occur (Bandura, 1977b, 1997). In the context of this theory, perfectionism can be treated as a maladaptive cognitive style, which negatively affects self-efficacy through the development of fear of failure and critical self-evaluations.

This study also applied the Social Role Theory which suggests that psychological and behavioural differences between men and women arise largely from socialization into distinct gender roles rather than from innate biological differences, with women socialized into communal, relationship-oriented roles and men socialized into agentic, achievement-oriented roles (Eagly, 1987). In the context of this study, this suggests that the belief that others hold on to a high standard, may be internalized differently by men and women due to role-consistent socialization around external evaluation. This suggests that gender-based socialization patterns may independently relate to both perfectionism and self-efficacy, providing a rationale for examining these associations separately whether gender moderates the perfectionism-self-efficacy relationship itself.

Moreover, this study applied Role Strain Theory to explain how employment status may relate to self-efficacy among working young adults. Role Strain Theory suggests that individuals occupying multiple roles simultaneously, such as being both a student and an employee, experience competing demands on their time and energy, which creates strain when the resources available are insufficient to meet the obligations of all roles adequately (Goode, 1960). In the context of this study, this theory identifies a plausible pathway through which employment status, particularly the demands associated with full-time versus part-time work, may relate to the self-efficacy of working young adults.

This study also draws on Human Capital Theory (Becker, 1964), which posits that education functions as an investment that builds knowledge, skills, and competencies over time. From this perspective, higher levels of educational attainment may be associated with greater accumulated mastery experiences,

potentially strengthening individuals' belief in their capacity to perform tasks successfully. At the same time, extended engagement with competitive academic environments and evaluative standards during higher education may also shape perfectionistic tendencies, particularly the socially prescribed dimension of perfectionism tied to external academic expectations. This theoretical link provides a rationale for examining the association between education level and both perfectionism and self-efficacy in this study

3. Perfectionism and Self-Efficacy

Kyeon *et al.* (2010) explored the differential effects of multi-dimensional perfectionism on academic achievement, depression, engagement, and burnout among medical students. The findings said that engagement had mediating effects on adaptive perfectionism and Grade Point Average, and burnout had mediating effects on maladaptive perfectionism and depression. This study demonstrated that academic achievement and emotional difficulties such as depression are determined by adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism, respectively.

Yang *et al.* (2021) examined the mediator of depression between maladaptive perfectionism and Internet addiction and the moderator of gender. The findings indicated that maladaptive perfectionism was directly related to students' Internet addiction and indirectly predicted students' Internet addiction via the mediator of depression. Gender moderated the direct effect, rather than the indirect effect, of maladaptive perfectionism on Internet addiction. Even though males reported a lower score on Internet addiction, the effect of maladaptive perfectionism on Internet addiction was stronger for males than for females.

Hamachek (1978) in his study discussed the characteristics, antecedents, and behavioural symptoms of normal and neurotic perfectionism. He said that normal perfectionists set realistic standards for themselves and are capable of choosing to be less precise in certain situations, while neurotic perfectionists demand themselves of a usually unattainable level of performance, experience their efforts as unsatisfactory, and are unable to relax their standards. Most importantly, Stoeber & Otto (2006) found that healthy perfectionists show higher levels of self-esteem, agreeableness, academic adaptation and show lower levels of anxiety, depression, maladaptive coping styles, and interpersonal problems.

Hewitt & Flett (1991) demonstrated that the perfectionistic personality style is multidimensional with both personal and social components and that these components are important in maladjustment. A series of studies was conducted to demonstrate that three dimensions of perfectionism can be assessed with an adequate degree of consistency and validity and that they are related to phenomena like severe personality disorders and other symptoms of psychopathology. Similarly, Enns *et al.* (2002) suggested that adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism have unique developmental origins and that both have a differential relationship with depression proneness in adulthood. The research concluded that

under adaptive perfectionism, an individual develops the right goals, derives satisfaction and also enjoys a healthy mind. In a similar vein, Wang & Zhang (2017) also found that the maladaptive perfectionism was related to psychopathology (depression), while adaptive perfectionism was more closely correlated with positive features of mental health.

Locicero & Ashby (2000) investigated the relationship between perfectionism and self-efficacy among Caucasian (98%) undergraduate students from a mid-sized Midwestern university. The results showed that perfectionists and non-perfectionists differ significantly in their levels of self-efficacy. Specifically, adaptive perfectionists had higher levels of both general and social self-efficacies than non-perfectionists. Similarly, Bulina (2014) found that maladaptive perfectionism is associated with lower self-efficacy, and higher negative affect rates. The results of the study show that adaptive perfectionism is associated with higher self-efficacy, and lower negative affect.

Although the effect of perfectionism on self-efficacy has been examined in western literature, these findings cannot be directly applied to Nepali communities because of different culture, families, and social pressure. Little empirical research concerning the interaction of perfectionism with self-efficacy is involved in this regard. The significance of this study is that these pressures may affect the mental wellness of students in varying ways than western students.

4. Research Hypotheses

Based on theoretical and empirical evidence, below hypotheses have been set for this study:

- H₁: There is negative correlation between perfectionism and self-efficacy
- H₂: There is association between employment type and perfectionism level
- H₃: There is association between employment type and self-efficacy level
- H₄: There is association between gender and perfectionism level
- H₅: There is association between gender and self-efficacy level
- H₆: There is association between education level and perfectionism level
- H₇: There is association between education level and self-efficacy level

5. Methods

Cross-sectional research design is applied for this study where the Google survey form and two standardized scale questionnaire were emailed to 356 individuals however, after follow up, only 95 individuals responded the survey, so, 95 respondents were selected as convenience sample for this study. The survey form included two standardized scales Almost Perfect Scale-Revised of Slaney *et al*, (1996) and the General Self-Efficacy Scale of Schwarzer & Jerusalem (1995). In addition to the two scales, the survey collected demographic information including age, gender, employment status, and educational level. Employment status was

coded as a binary variable (Emp_01: 0 = Full-time, 1 = Part-time) for use in the chi-square and logistic regression analyses. For categorical analyses, total scores on the APS-R and GSE were dichotomized into adaptive/maladaptive perfectionism and low/high self-efficacy groups based on a median split of total scores.

Data were analyzed using SPSS. Descriptive statistics were used to summarize demographic characteristics and the distribution of perfectionism and self-efficacy levels. Pearson correlation was used to examine the linear relationship between total perfectionism and total self-efficacy scores. Chi-square tests of independence were used to examine bivariate associations between each socio-demographic variable (gender, employment status, and education level) and the categorized levels of perfectionism and self-efficacy. Finally, binary logistic regression was conducted to examine whether age, gender, employment status, and education level jointly predicted perfectionism level and self-efficacy level, with overall model fit assessed using the Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test. Statistical significance was set at $= .05$ for all analyses.

6. Findings and Analysis

SPSS (Statistical Package for the Social Sciences) was the principal software utilized for data analysis due to its extensive capabilities and efficiency of working with complex datasets. SPSS can conduct statistical procedures applicable to the current study. Use of this software has provided in-depth information regarding the strength and significance of the associations between perfectionism and self-efficacy within the sample of participants. Therefore, SPSS allowed for rigorous, accurate, and useful analysis to learn about perfectionism and self-efficacy within the local socio-cultural context.

6.1 Demographic Characteristics

Table-1: Demographic Distribution of Selected Respondents

Characteristic	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	44	46.3
Female	51	53.7
Total	95	100.0
Employment Type		
Full-time employed	40	42.1
Part-time employed	55	57.9
Total	95	100.0
Educational Level		
High School	9	9.5
Bachelor's Degree	79	83.2
Master's Degree	7	7.4
Total	95	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

Demographic profile of the sample (N = 95) presented in the Table-1 reveals several notable patterns. With respect to gender, the distribution was fairly balanced, though female respondents formed a slight majority of the sample, while male respondents made up just under half. This near-even split suggests that the study captured perspectives from both genders in relatively comparable proportions, reducing the likelihood of gender-based sampling bias. Turning to employment status, a clear majority of respondents were part-time employed, while a substantial minority (though still representing more than four in ten participants), were employed on a full-time basis. This indicates that part-time work arrangements were somewhat more common within the sample, though full-time employment remained well represented rather than negligible. The most pronounced disparity emerged in educational attainment. The vast majority of respondents held a Bachelor's Degree, establishing it as the dominant educational qualification by a wide margin. In contrast, High School and Master's Degree holders together constituted only a small minority of the sample, with Bachelor's degree holders outnumbering Master's degree holders by more than ten to one, and outnumbering those with only a High School education by nearly nine to one. Taken together, this suggests that the sample was reasonably diverse in terms of gender and employment status, but comparatively homogeneous in educational background, being heavily concentrated at the undergraduate level.

6.2 Descriptive Statistics

Table-2: Perfectionism and Self-efficacy

Category/Variable	Frequency	Percent
Perfectionism		
Adaptive	16	16.8
Maladaptive	79	83.2
Total	95	100.0
Self-efficacy		
Low Efficacy	61	64.2
High Efficacy	34	35.8
Total	95	100.0

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

The above table presents the distribution of participants (N = 95) across two conceptual categories (perfectionism and self-efficacy) that reveals a pronounced imbalance. The vast majority of participants were classified as exhibiting maladaptive perfectionism, establishing it as the dominant pattern within the sample by a wide margin. In stark contrast, only a small minority of respondents displayed adaptive perfectionism, accounting for less than one-fifth of the total sample. This disparity indicates that maladaptive perfectionistic tendencies (characterized by excessive self-criticism, fear of failure, and unrealistic standards), were far more prevalent among respondents than healthier, striving-

oriented perfectionism, with maladaptive perfectionists outnumbering their adaptive counterparts by nearly five to one.

Turning to levels of general self-efficacy, the sample similarly showed an uneven split, though less extreme than the perfectionism distribution. A majority of respondents reported low self-efficacy, representing almost two-thirds of the sample, while just over a third of respondents demonstrated high self-efficacy. Taken together, this distribution suggests that the sample was predominantly characterized by maladaptive perfectionistic tendencies alongside comparatively low levels of self-efficacy.

Table-3: Perfectionism and the General Self-efficacy Scores

Category/Variable	Total (N)	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	SD
PERFECTIONISM	95	12	76	51.92	12.074
GSE	95	10	39	28.34	4.476

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

The above table presents the descriptive statistics of the two continuous variables, namely the total perfectionism score (PERFECTIONISM_SUM) and the general self-efficacy score (GSE_SUM). In both of the presented statistics, there were valid data points from all 95 participants (N = 95). For PERFECTIONISM, the lowest score was 12 and the highest was 76, with a mean of 51.92 and a standard deviation of 12.074. This shows that participants scored moderately high on average on the perfectionism scale, with fairly high variability around the mean. GSE had a mean score of 28.34 and a standard deviation of 4.476, ranging between a lowest score of 10 and a highest score of 39. The smaller standard deviation indicates that self-efficacy scores were more closely clustered around the mean than the perfectionism scores. Comprehensively, the table confirms that complete data were available for both constructs, providing a strong basis for further inferential analyses such as correlation.

6.3 Inferential Analysis on the Relationship of Testing Variables

Table-4: Correlation between Perfectionism and Self-efficacy

Category/ Variable	Correlation	Perfectionism sum	Sum of General Self-efficacy
PERFECTIONISM _SUM	Pearson Correlation	1	.025
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.812
	N	95	95
Sum of General Self Efficacy	Pearson Correlation	.025	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.812	
	N	95	95

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

Table-4 presents a Pearson correlation result of the total perfectionism score with the general self-efficacy score. The result found that Pearson correlation coefficient value ($r=0.025$) between perfectionism and self-efficacy for this sample, is not significant enough to conclude any linear relationship. Since $-value(0.812)$ is way larger than $-value(0.05)$ at 0.05 significance level, it fails to reject the null hypothesis, confirming there is no statistical correlation between the perfectionism total score and self-efficacy total score among the respondents in this sample.

Table-5: Chi-Square Test of Employment and Level of Perfectionism

Test	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.021 ^a	1	.884		
Continuity Correction ^b	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.021	1	.884		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.548
Linear-by-Linear Association	.021	1	.884		
N of Valid Cases	95				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 6.74.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

Interpretation of result: In table 5, Pearson Chi-Square value (0.021) with one degree of freedom is not significant as $-value(0.884)$ is larger than $-value(0.05)$ at 0.05 significance level. This result failed to reject the null hypothesis which means there is no statistical relationship between employment and level of perfectionism. The likelihood ratio ($\chi^2 = .021$, $p = .884$) and linear-by-linear association ($\chi^2 = .021$, $p = .884$) tests support this conclusion, showing no significant relationship or linear trend between the variables. In other words, a person's employment status does not appear to meaningfully predict or relate to their level of perfectionism in this dataset.

Table-6: Chi-Square Test of Employment and Level of Self-efficacy

Test	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	6.071 ^a	1	.014		
Continuity Correction ^b	5.050	1	.025		
Likelihood Ratio	6.066	1	.014		

Fisher's Exact Test				.018	.012
Linear-by-Linear Association	6.007	1	.014		
N of Valid Cases	95				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 14.32.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

The above table presents Pearson Chi-Square test statistics of employment status and level of self-efficacy. The result found that the Pearson Chi-Square value (6.071) with one degree of freedom is significant as χ^2 -value (0.014) is less than χ^2 -value (0.05) at 0.05 significance level. This suggests rejecting the null hypothesis and accepting the alternative hypothesis. This was further supported by the continuity-corrected chi-square ($\chi^2 = 5.050$, $p = .025$) and Fisher's Exact Test ($p = .018$, two-sided), both confirming the association. This indicates that there is a statistically significant association between employment status and level of self-efficacy. Which means, respondents' employment status is meaningfully related to their level of self-efficacy in this sample.

Table-7: Chi-Square Test of Gender and Level of Perfectionism

Test	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	0.51 ^a	1	.821		
Continuity Correction ^b	.000	1	1.000		
Likelihood Ratio	.051	1	.821		
Fisher's Exact Test				1.000	.521
Linear-by-Linear Association	.050	1	.822		
N of Valid Cases	95				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 7.41.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

The above table presents the Chi-Square test of gender and level of perfectionism. From the result, it is confirmed that the Pearson Chi-Square value (0.051) with one degree of freedom is not significant as χ^2 -value (0.821) is larger than χ^2 -value (0.05) at 0.05 significance level. This fails to reject the null hypothesis which means there is no statistical relationship between the tested variables. The likelihood ratio ($\chi^2 = 0.051$, $p = .821$) and linear-by-linear association ($\chi^2 = 0.050$, $p = .822$) tests support this conclusion, showing no significant relationship or linear trend between the variables. In other words, the gender of a person does not appear to meaningfully predict or relate to their level of perfectionism in this dataset.

Table-8: Chi-Square Test of Gender and Level of Self-efficacy

Test	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.587 ^a	1	.108		
Continuity Correction ^b	1.943	1	.163		
Likelihood Ratio	2.616	1	.106		
Fisher's Exact Test				.135	.081
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.560	1	.110		
N of Valid Cases	95				

a. 0 cells (0.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 15.75.

b. Computed only for a 2x2 table

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

The above table presents Chi-Square test between gender and level of self-efficacy. The Pearson Chi-Square value (2.587) with one degree of freedom is not significant as its χ^2 -value (0.108) is larger than χ^2 -value (0.05) at 0.05 significance level. So, the null hypothesis fails to reject and confirms that there is no statistical association between gender and level of self-efficacy. The likelihood ratio ($\chi^2 = 1.616$, $p = .106$) and linear-by-linear association ($\chi^2 = 2.560$, $p = .110$) tests support this conclusion, showing no significant relationship or linear trend between the variables. In other words, gender of a person does not appear to meaningfully predict or relate to their level of self-efficacy in this dataset.

Table-9: Chi-Square Test of Education and Level of Perfectionism

Test	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.287 ^a	2	.866
Likelihood Ratio	.312	2	.856
Linear-by-Linear Association	.050	1	.823
N of Valid Cases	95		

a. 2 cells (33.3%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 1.18.

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

The above table presents the Chi-Square test statistics between education and level of perfectionism. From the result, it is confirmed that Pearson Chi-Square value (0.287) with two degrees of freedom is not significant as its χ^2 -value (0.866) is larger than χ^2 -value (0.05) at 0.05 significance level. So, this also fails to reject null hypothesis which means there is no statistical association between education and level of perfectionism. The likelihood ratio ($\chi^2 = 0.312$, $p = .856$) and linear-

by-linear association ($\chi^2 = 0.050$, $p = .823$) tests support this conclusion, showing no significant relationship or linear trend between the variables. In other words, a person's level of education does not appear to meaningfully predict or relate to their level of perfectionism in this dataset.

Table-10: Chi-Square Test of Education and Level of Self-Efficacy

Test	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	.535a	2	.765
Likelihood Ratio	.523	2	.770
Linear-by-Linear Association	.022	1	.883
N of Valid Cases	95		

a. 3 cells (50.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is 2.51.

Source: Field Survey, 2026.

Finally, the above table presents the Chi-Square test statistics between education and level of self-efficacy. The result found that Pearson Chi-Square value (0.535) is not significant as its p -value (0.765) is larger than p -value (0.05) at 0.05 significance level. This also fails to reject the null hypothesis and confirms that there is no statistical association between education and level of self-efficacy. This means the two variables are independent of one another in this sample. The likelihood ratio ($\chi^2 = 0.523$, $p = .770$) and linear-by-linear association ($\chi^2 = 0.022$,

tests support this conclusion, showing no significant relationship or linear trend between the variables. In other words, a person's level of education does not appear to meaningfully predict or relate to their level of self-efficacy in this dataset.

6.4 Identifying Socio-demographic Predictors: Binary Logistic Regression

A binary logistic regression is conducted to test if the socio-demographic predictors (Age, Gender, Employment, and Education) together, simultaneously predicts perfectionism level and self-efficacy level

Table- 11: Variables in the Equation Predicting Perfectionism Level

Variable		S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp ()	95% C.I. for EXP()	
							Lower	Upper
Age	.034	.168	.042	1	.838	1.035	.744	1.440
Edu			.274	2	.872			
Edu(1)	-.579	1.110	.272	1	.602	.561	.064	4.940
Edu(2)	-.480	1.610	.089	1	.765	.619	.026	14.513
Gender(1)	-.158	.588	.072	1	.788	.854	.270	2.703

Emp_01(1)	.160	.597	.072	1	.788	1.174	.365	3.782
Constant	1.349	4.069	.110	1	.740	3.854		

Note: Hosmer and Lemeshow Test statistics: Chi-square (2.559), df 7 and sig. 0.923

A binary logistic regression was conducted to examine whether Age, Education, Gender, and Employment status predicted perfectionism level (adaptive vs. maladaptive). The Hosmer and Lemeshow test indicated good model fit, $\chi^2 = 2.559$, $p = .923$, showing no significant difference between observed and predicted classifications and confirming the model adequately fits the data. However, none of the four predictors reached statistical significance. Age was not a significant predictor ($\beta = 0.838$ and Odd Ratio [OR] = 1.035 > 1). Similarly, education showed no overall effect ($\beta = .872$), nor did either dummy comparison, Edu(1) ($\beta = .602$, OR = 0.561) or Edu(2) ($\beta = .765$, OR = 0.619), both with very wide confidence intervals reflecting instability from small subgroup sizes. Other predictors Gender and Employment status also found not significant ($\beta = .788$, OR = 0.854), and ($\beta = .788$, OR = 1.174) respectively. All confidence intervals for the odds ratios crossed 1.0, reinforcing that none of these variables meaningfully predicted perfectionism level in this sample. Taken together, these findings indicate that age, education, gender, and employment status do not significantly predict perfectionism level (either individually or jointly).

Table- 12: Variables in the Equation Predicting Self-Efficacy Level

Variable		S.E.	Wald	df	Sig.	Exp ()	95% C.I. for EXP ()	
							Lower	Upper
Age	.091	.136	.450	1	.502	1.095	.839	1.430
Edu			.507	2	.776			
Edu(1)	-.129	.787	.027	1	.870	.879	.188	4.114
Edu(2)	.552	1.205	.210	1	.647	1.737	.164	18.421
Gender(1)	1.206	.530	5.174	1	.023	3.339	1.182	9.438
Emp_01(1)	-1.267	.509	6.201	1	.013	.282	.104	.764
Constant	-2.541	3.321	.586	1	.444	.079		

Note: Hosmer and Lemeshow Test statistics: Chi-square (7.429), df (8), sig. (0.491)

A binary logistic regression was conducted to examine whether Age, Education, Gender, and Employment status predicted self-efficacy level (low/high) among working young adults. The Hosmer and Lemeshow test indicated good model fit, $\chi^2 = 7.429$, $p = .491$, showing no significant difference between observed and model-predicted classifications. Among the predictors, Gender was a significant predictor of self-efficacy ($\beta = 1.206$, Wald = 5.174, $p = .023$, OR = 3.339), indicating that being female was associated with 3.34 times higher odds of high self-efficacy compared to males, holding other variables constant.

Employment status (Emp_01) also significantly predicted self-efficacy ($\beta = -1.267$, Wald = 6.201, $p = .013$, OR = 0.282), indicating that part-time employees had approximately 72% lower odds of high self-efficacy compared to full-time employees, the reference category. In contrast, Age ($\beta = .502$, OR = 1.095) and Education (overall $\beta = .776$) were not significant predictors, with confidence intervals for Exp(β) crossing 1.0, confirming no reliable association. Overall, these results suggest that gender and employment status, but not age or education, meaningfully predict self-efficacy in this sample.

7. Discussion

This study investigated 95 young adults who worked in Kathmandu and looked at both perfectionism and self-efficacy amidst that sample. The descriptive results indicated that there is a higher percentage of maladaptive perfectionists (83.2%), while 64.2% reported low self-efficacy. Similarly, the mean score for perfectionism was 51.92 and the mean score for self-efficacy was 28.34, which suggests a moderate level of perfectionist tendencies while self-efficacy scores are more tightly distributed. Further, this study offers a fresh insight into the limited body of research associated with the negative sides of perfectionism and the impact it has on the levels of self-efficacy of people. There were no variations in the self-efficacy of perfectionists in the Nepali sample in relation to non-perfectionists, which corresponds to the Locicero and Ashby (2000) study. The result is similar to a study by Locicero and Ashby (2000) on Western college students, which found no significant difference in self-efficacy of maladaptive perfectionists and non-perfectionists. The relationship of perfectionism and self-efficacy in the current research was negligible ($r = 0.025$, $p = 0.812$) and insignificant. Thus, the very existence of perfectionism issues does not necessarily destroy the trust of individuals in their capabilities.

The main theories used within the context of these empirical comparisons are Multidimensional Theory of Perfectionism and the Social Cognitive Theory. According to the Multidimensional Theory of Perfectionism, socially dictated perfectionism is a mechanism that destroys confidence under the impact of external influences. Socially prescribed perfectionism is considered to be an element that is applicable to collectivist societies, such as Nepal, where the demands of others can make the levels of self-criticism even greater and, consequently, the sense of personal failure. According to the findings, the adverse impact of socially prescribed perfectionism could be mitigated by protective factors including cohesive families, and supportive communities.

Furthermore, the Social Cognitive Theory also offers more explanation as to why the levels of self-efficacy remained relatively steady even in the presence of maladaptive perfectionism. Self-efficacy is ascertained through a bidirectional relationship among individual (personal) traits, social behaviours witnessed, and the environment (Bandura, 1986). In particular, within the community of

individuals residing in Kathmandu, community-based peer support, workplace mentoring, and culturally-based coping patterns could have alleviated the impact of perfectionistic rumination, allowing them to maintain their own level of self-efficacy, further reinforced under reciprocal determinism. Although Western literature tends to suggest that these negative relationships are stronger and mediated by culture, in the Nepali case, it seems that the direct effect may instead be mediated by intermediate variables such as social support or family expectations, indicating that culturally-specific intervention is necessary.

Further, this current study did not find any correlation between perfectionism total score and self-efficacy total score. This lack of association may be explained by several factors. Perfectionism is theoretically multidimensional, encompassing both adaptive strivings (high personal standards) and maladaptive concerns (fear of failure, excessive self-criticism), which may relate to self-efficacy in opposing directions; combining these dimensions into a single composite sum score may have masked meaningful relationships that exist at the subscale level. Additionally, the relatively homogeneous nature of the sample ($N = 95$) may have restricted the range of scores on one or both variables, attenuating the observed correlation. It is also possible that the relationship between perfectionism and self-efficacy is not strictly linear in nature, or that it is influenced by other variables (such as coping style, social support, or employment status) that were not accounted for in this bivariate analysis. Future research using perfectionism subscales and controlling for potential moderating variables may help clarify this relationship.

Hendra *et al.* (2025) noted several factors might influence self-efficacy and perfectionism in different ways including personality traits (such as neuroticism, conscientiousness, openness or agreeableness), emotional instability, academic burnout and cognitive difficulties (anxiety, depression, anger, hostility or fear). This study also did not find any significant association between perfectionism level and self-efficacy level. In relation to Social Role Theory applied to perfectionism, this would suggest that socially prescribed perfectionism, the dimension most tied to external evaluation, may affect self-efficacy differently across genders, since men and women are socialized to internalize outside judgment in different ways. Social Role Theory offers a plausible mechanism behind such findings and suggests that future research in the Nepali context should examine whether socially prescribed perfectionism erodes self-efficacy more strongly in one gender than the other, particularly given Nepal's distinct gender-role expectations around work and family obligation.

Role Strain Theory offers further insight when reconsidered alongside the regression results: rather than full-time employment generating strain that lowers self-efficacy, it was part-time employees who reported lower self-efficacy in this sample (25.5% high efficacy) compared to full-time employees (50% high efficacy). This pattern may instead be explained through Bandura's concept of mastery experiences: full-time roles may offer more consistent, structured

opportunities to complete tasks successfully and build a stable sense of competence, whereas part-time work may involve greater job insecurity, income instability, and fewer opportunities for skill development, all of which could constrain the mastery experiences that support self-efficacy.

The binary logistic regression added further nuance to these bivariate findings. While employment status remained a significant independent predictor of self-efficacy after adjusting for other variables ($OR = 0.282$, $p = .013$) with part-time employees showing lower odds of high self-efficacy than full-time employees, consistent with the chi-square result. The Gender emerged as a significant predictor only in the multivariate model ($OR = 3.339$, $p = .023$), despite showing no association in the bivariate analysis ($p = .108$), suggesting that employment status may have masked the true relationship between gender and self-efficacy when tested alone. In contrast, none of these socio-demographic variables significantly predicted perfectionism level in either analysis, reinforcing that perfectionism in this sample is likely shaped by factors beyond simple demographic characteristics.

A key limitation of this study is the relatively low response rate: of the 356 individuals invited to participate, only 95 (26.7%) completed the survey. This low response rate raises the possibility of non-response bias, as individuals who chose to respond may differ systematically from those who did not, potentially in ways related to perfectionism, self-efficacy, or employment status. Additionally, the smaller-than-intended sample size limits statistical power, particularly for the multivariate logistic regression models, as reflected in the wide confidence intervals observed for several predictors

8. Conclusion

This study examined perfectionism and self-efficacy among 95 working young adults in Kathmandu, Nepal, along with their associations with employment status, gender, and education level. Maladaptive perfectionism (83.2%) and low self-efficacy (64.2%) were both highly prevalent, yet contrary to expectations, no significant linear relationship was found between the two constructs ($r = .025$, $p = .812$). Employment status was the only variable significantly associated with self-efficacy ($\chi^2 = 6.071$, $p = .014$), with part-time employees reporting lower self-efficacy than full-time employees; gender and education showed no significant bivariate associations with either construct. A binary logistic regression further confirmed employment status as a significant independent predictor of self-efficacy ($OR = 0.282$, $p = .013$), with part-time employees showing lower odds of high self-efficacy, and additionally revealed gender as a significant predictor once other variables were controlled for ($OR = 3.339$, $p = .023$), a relationship not detected in the bivariate analysis alone; none of these socio-demographic variables, however, significantly predicted perfectionism level in either analysis. These findings suggest that perfectionism and self-efficacy, while both common in this

population, do not directly predict one another, and are likely shaped instead by mediating factors such as social support, coping style, and occupational role strain.

Future research should examine adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism separately, employ longitudinal designs, and explore mediating variables such as social support and coping strategies. Practically, given the significant role of employment status, workplace-based interventions addressing job insecurity, skill development, and income instability among part-time employees, alongside culturally grounded, collectivist-sensitive mental health approaches, may offer more effective starting points than perfectionism-focused interventions alone.

References

- Bandura, A., "Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change", *Psychological Review*, 84(2), 1977a, 191-215. <https://educational-innovation.sydney.edu.au/news/pdfs/Bandura%201977.pdf>
-, *Social Learning Theory*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1977b.
-, *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Upper Saddle River, 1986.
-, *Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control*, New York, NY: W. H. Freeman and Company, 1997.
- Becker, G. S., *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964.
- Bulina, R., "Relations between adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism, self-efficacy, and subjective well-being", *Psychology Research*, 4(10), 2014, 835-842. <https://doi.org/10.17265/2159-5542/2014.10.008>
- Campbell, J., *Perfectionism (psychology)*, Massachusetts, United States: EBSCO Information Services, Inc., 2023. www.ebsco.com. <https://www.ebsco.com/research-starters/health-and-medicine/perfectionismpsychology#:~:text=Perfectionism%20in%20psychology%20refers%20to,stress%2C%20anxiety%2C%20and%20disappointment>
- Carey, M. P., & Forsyth, A. D., *Self-Efficacy Teaching Tip Sheet*, American Psychological Association, 2009. <https://www.apa.org/pi/aids/resources/education/self-efficacy>
- Eagly, A. H., *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*, Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1987.
- Enns, M. W., Cox, B. J., & Clara, I., "Adaptive and maladaptive perfectionism: Developmental origins and association with depression proneness", *Personality and individual differences*, 33(6), 2002, 921-935.
- Goode, W. J., "A theory of role strain", *American Sociological Review*, 25(4), 1960, 483-496.
- Hamachek, D. E., "Psychodynamics of normal and neurotic perfectionism", *Psychology: A Journal of Human Behavior*, 15(1), 1978, 27-33.
- Hendra, R., Habibi, A., Ridwan, A., Sembiring, D. A. E. P., Wijaya, T. T., Denmar, D., & Widana, I. W., "The impact of perfectionism, self-efficacy, academic stress and workload on academic fatigue and learning achievement: Indonesia perspective", *Open Education Studies*, 7(1), 2025, 20250071. <https://doi.org/10.1515/edu-2025-0071>
- Hewitt, P. L., & Flett, G. L., "Perfectionism in the self and social contexts: Conceptualization, assessment, and association with psychopathology", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(3), 1991, 456-470. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.60.3.456>

- Kyeon, Y., Cho, S., Hwang, H., & Lee, K., "The effects of perfectionism on academic achievement in medical students", *Korean Journal of Medical Education*, 22(3), 2010, 205-214. <https://doi.org/10.3946/kjme.2010.22.3.205>
- Locicero, K. A., & Ashby, J. S., "Multidimensional Perfectionism and Self-Reported Self-Efficacy in College Students", *Journal of College Student Psychotherapy*, 15(2), 2000, 47-56. https://doi.org/10.1300/J035v15n02_06
- Lippman, B. L., "Problematizing perfectionism: A closer look at the perfectionism construct", *Applied Psychology OPUS*, 2025. https://wp.nyu.edu/steinhardt-appsych_opus/problematizing-perfectionism-a-closer-look-at-the-perfectionism-construct/
- Psychology Today, "Perfectionism", *Psychology Today*, 2025. Retrieved August 6, 2025, from <https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/basics/perfectionism>
- Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M., "Generalized Self-Efficacy scale", J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston, *Measures in Health Psychology: A User's Portfolio. Causal and Control Beliefs*, Windsor, UK: NFER-NELSON, 1995, 35-37.
- Slaney, R. B., Mobley, M., Trippi, J., Ashby, J. S., & Johnson, D. G., *The Almost Perfect Scale-Revised*, Unpublished manuscript, University Park, Pennsylvania: The Pennsylvania State University, 1996.
- Stoeber, J., & Otto, K., "Positive conceptions of perfectionism: approaches, evidence, challenges", *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10(4), 2006, 295-319. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1004_2
- Wang, Y., & Zhang, B., "The dual model of perfectionism and depression among Chinese university students", *South African Journal of Psychiatry*, 23, 2017, a1025. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajpspsychiatry.v23i0.1025>
- Yang, W., Morita, N., Zuo, Z., Kawaida, K., Ogai, Y., Saito, T., & Hu, W., "Maladaptive Perfectionism and Internet Addiction among Chinese College Students: A Moderated Mediation Model of Depression and Gender", *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18(5), 2021, 2748. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18052748> ★