

The Association Between Multidimensional Perfectionism and Occupational Burnout Among Young Workers: A Cross-Sectional Study

Phat Dat Huynh

huynhphatdatpsy@gmail.com

HCMUE <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-6205-6029>

Research Article

Keywords: Perfectionism, Occupational burnout, Young workers, Occupational psychology, Vietnam

Posted Date: October 19th, 2026

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-10926615/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Additional Declarations: The authors declare no competing interests.

Abstract

Background

Occupational burnout is a growing concern among young workers, while the role of multidimensional perfectionism in this phenomenon remains insufficiently studied in Vietnam. This study aimed to examine the associations between three dimensions of perfectionism and occupational burnout among young workers in Ho Chi Minh City.

Methods

A cross-sectional study was conducted among 546 workers aged 25 to under 40 years in Ho Chi Minh City. Multidimensional perfectionism and occupational burnout were assessed using self-report measures. Data were analyzed using Pearson correlation and hierarchical linear regression analyses.

Results

Socially prescribed perfectionism showed the strongest positive correlation with occupational burnout ($r = 0.429, p < 0.01$). The regression model explained 20.6% of the variance in burnout. Socially prescribed perfectionism had the strongest positive association with burnout ($\beta = 0.508, p < 0.001$), whereas self-oriented perfectionism was negatively associated with burnout ($\beta = -0.112, p = 0.021$). Other-oriented perfectionism was not significantly associated with burnout.

Conclusions

Socially prescribed perfectionism emerged as the dimension most strongly associated with occupational burnout among young workers. These findings suggest that both individual factors and perfectionistic pressures from the work environment should be considered in efforts to prevent burnout.

Background

Occupational burnout is an important issue in occupational health psychology because it is associated with employees' motivation, work performance, and work engagement. It is an occupational phenomenon resulting from chronic workplace stress that has not been successfully managed [1]. Traditionally, burnout has been described in terms of emotional exhaustion, cynicism or depersonalization, and reduced feelings of professional accomplishment [2]. More recently, burnout has been conceptualized as a work-related state comprising four core symptoms: exhaustion, mental distance, cognitive impairment, and emotional impairment [3]. This structure has been supported by cross-national studies and research conducted across diverse occupational groups [4]. In Vietnam, burnout has been studied primarily in the healthcare and education sectors, where high workloads,

prolonged work shifts, and limited organizational resources have often been associated with higher levels of burnout [5–7].

Perfectionism is a personality characteristic that may shape how workers respond to job demands. According to the multidimensional model, this construct comprises self-oriented perfectionism, other-oriented perfectionism, and socially prescribed perfectionism [8]. These dimensions have shown an increasing trend across younger generations, particularly socially prescribed perfectionism [9]. Among workers, socially prescribed perfectionism has generally been associated with higher levels of exhaustion and mental distance from work [10–12]. Findings regarding self-oriented perfectionism have been inconsistent: this dimension may be associated with lower levels of burnout, but it may also promote excessive working or workaholism, thereby indirectly contributing to greater exhaustion [12–14]. Other-oriented perfectionism has received comparatively less research attention and has not shown a consistent association with individuals' own burnout [10, 13].

The association between perfectionism and burnout may be explained by the Job Demands–Resources (JD-R) model and Conservation of Resources (COR) theory [15, 16]. When prolonged job demands are not adequately balanced by appropriate resources, continually imposing stringent standards, attempting to avoid mistakes, and worrying about being evaluated may deplete individuals' time, energy, and emotional resources, thereby increasing the risk of burnout [15–17]. This mechanism may be particularly relevant to socially prescribed perfectionism [11]. In contrast, self-oriented perfectionism may be associated with greater motivation and work engagement when accompanied by personal initiative and a sense of control [10, 14, 18].

In Vietnam, several studies have shown that burnout is associated with personality and sociodemographic characteristics [19, 20] whereas research on perfectionism has primarily focused on students or adults and outcomes such as self-acceptance, depression, and life satisfaction [21, 22]. Therefore, direct evidence remains limited regarding the associations between the three dimensions of perfectionism and the four core symptoms of burnout among young workers. This cross-sectional study aimed to examine the association between multidimensional perfectionism and occupational burnout among workers aged 25 to under 40 years in Ho Chi Minh City, while also assessing the unique statistical contribution of each perfectionism dimension after controlling for relevant sociodemographic characteristics. It was hypothesized that socially prescribed perfectionism would show the strongest positive association with occupational burnout, whereas the other two dimensions would demonstrate weaker or different patterns of association.

Methods

Participants

This cross-sectional study was conducted among workers aged 25 to under 40 years who were working in Ho Chi Minh City. Participants were recruited using convenience sampling. Inclusion criteria included

being currently employed, being within the target age range, and agreeing to participate in the survey. Of the 623 responses obtained, 77 were excluded because respondents did not meet the age criterion, were not working in Ho Chi Minh City, or exhibited invalid response patterns. The final analytical sample comprised 546 workers ($\text{Mean}_{\text{age}} = 29.76 \pm 4.675$; 61.7% female). Detailed characteristics of the participants are presented in Table 1.

Measures

Demographic Characteristics

Participants self-reported their age, gender, marital status, work tenure, occupation, type of employing organization, current job position or managerial level, and type of employment contract.

Perfectionism

The 45-item Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale developed by Hewitt and Flett [8] was used to assess three dimensions of perfectionism. Following screening based on corrected item–total correlations (CITCs), 16 items with CITC values below 0.30 were removed. Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) subsequently supported the 21-item structure used in the main analyses, comprising eight items measuring self-oriented perfectionism, five items measuring other-oriented perfectionism, and eight items measuring socially prescribed perfectionism, as presented in Table 2. These three dimensions respectively reflect high standards for oneself, perfectionistic expectations of others, and the perception that the social environment requires the individual to be perfect. Internal consistency coefficients are presented in Table 3.

Burnout

The 23-item Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT) [23] was used to assess four core dimensions of occupational burnout. Following CFA, Item 2 from the exhaustion dimension was removed. The resulting 22-item structure was used in the main analyses, comprising seven items measuring exhaustion, five items measuring mental distance, five items measuring cognitive impairment, and five items measuring emotional impairment. These four dimensions respectively reflect reduced physical and mental energy, psychological withdrawal from work, difficulties with concentration and memory, and difficulties regulating emotions in the workplace. Items were rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always), with higher scores indicating higher levels of burnout. CFA results are presented in Table 2, while internal consistency coefficients are presented in Table 3.

Procedure

Participants were recruited through online channels using convenience sampling. Before completing the questionnaire, participants were provided with information about the study objectives, the voluntary nature of participation, their right to discontinue the survey at any time, and data confidentiality. Continuing with and submitting the questionnaire was considered to constitute electronic informed consent. Data were collected anonymously via Google Forms from February to May 2026. A total of 623 responses were received, of which 77 were excluded: 43 participants did not meet the age criterion, 12 were not working in Ho Chi Minh City, and 22 exhibited invalid response patterns. The final analytical sample consisted of 546 participants. The research proposal was reviewed and approved by the committee responsible for reviewing master's thesis proposals in Psychology at Ho Chi Minh City University of Education prior to data collection.

Statistical Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to characterize the study sample; frequencies and percentages were reported for categorical variables, whereas means and standard deviations were reported for continuous variables. The internal consistency of the HMPS and BAT was assessed using Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega [24]. Analyses were conducted using continuous scores for the three dimensions of perfectionism, the four dimensions of burnout, and the overall occupational burnout score.

Confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to examine the three-factor structure of the HMPS [8] and the four-factor structure of the BAT [23]. Because the HMPS and BAT items used seven- and five-point response scales, respectively, they were treated as continuous variables, and the models were estimated using maximum likelihood estimation [25]. Model fit was evaluated using the χ^2 statistic and its degrees of freedom, the comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker–Lewis index (TLI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA) with its 95% confidence interval, and standardized root mean square residual (SRMR). CFI and TLI values of 0.90 or higher, together with RMSEA and SRMR values not exceeding 0.08, were considered indicative of acceptable model fit; more stringent criteria were also considered when evaluating good model fit [26, 27]. Items with standardized factor loadings below 0.50 were considered for sequential removal based on both statistical evidence and content coverage. Residual correlations were added only when the two items belonged to the same factor, had relatively large modification indices, and showed clear similarity in content [28].

Pearson correlation coefficients were used to examine the associations between the dimensions of perfectionism and overall occupational burnout as well as the four burnout dimensions. Hierarchical linear regression was conducted with overall occupational burnout as the outcome variable. Marital status was entered in Step 1, and the three dimensions of perfectionism were added in Step 2. The coefficient of determination at each step and the change in model explanatory power were examined to assess the additional proportion of variance in burnout explained by perfectionism.

Assumptions of linearity, residual normality, homoscedasticity, independence of errors, and multicollinearity were evaluated using residual plots, Q–Q plots, the Durbin–Watson statistic, tolerance values, and variance inflation factors (VIFs). All tests were two-tailed, with statistical significance set at

$p < 0.05$. Analyses were performed using jamovi version 2.7.30; CFA was conducted using the SEMLj module, which is based on the *lavaan* package in R.

Use of generative artificial intelligence

During manuscript preparation, ChatGPT (OpenAI) was used to assist with English translation and language editing. The author reviewed, revised, and verified the resulting text and takes full responsibility for the final content of the manuscript.

Results

Table 1 presents the demographic and occupational characteristics of the study sample. Of the 623 responses obtained, 546 met the eligibility criteria and were included in the analysis. Participants had a mean age ($\text{Mean}_{\text{age}} = 29.76 \pm 4.675$); 61.7% were women and 59.9% were single.

Table 1 Participant Characteristics

Variable	Statistic
	Mean (SD)
Age	29.76 (4.67)
	n (%)
Age group	
25 to under 30 years	295 (54.0)
30 to under 35 years	142 (26.0)
35 to 40 years	109 (20.0)
Marital status	
Single	327 (59.9)
Married	219 (40.1)
Work tenure	
Under 1 year	39 (7.1)
1 to 3 years	150 (27.5)
3 to 5 years	166 (30.4)
5 to 10 years	127 (23.3)
Over 10 years	64 (11.7)
Occupational field	
Education	180 (33.0)
Healthcare	27 (4.9)
Business – marketing	77 (14.1)
Administration – HR	48 (8.8)
Engineering – technology	73 (13.4)
Finance – accounting	40 (7.3)
Manufacturing – logistics	59 (10.8)
Services	42 (7.7)
Type of workplace	
State-owned enterprise	69 (12.6)
Private enterprise	299 (54.8)
Public administration/civil service	55 (10.1)

Foreign-invested enterprise	73 (13.4)
NGO/NPO	5 (0.9)
Other (household business, self-employed...)	45 (8.2)
Current position/rank	
Staff/Teacher	373 (68.3)
Team/group leader	116 (21.2)
Department head	36 (6.6)
Unit/company director	21 (3.8)
Contract type	
Probationary	14 (2.6)
Fixed-term labor contract	235 (43.0)
Indefinite-term labor contract	205 (37.5)
Freelance/service contract	92 (16.8)

CFA results are presented in Table 2. For the HMPS, the initial 29-item model did not demonstrate the desired level of model fit. After considering factor loadings, item content, and modification indices, the 21-item model showed improved fit, with CFI = 0.927, TLI = 0.916, RMSEA = 0.051, and SRMR = 0.050. For the BAT, both the initial 23-item model and the final 22-item model demonstrated acceptable fit; the final model yielded CFI = 0.955, TLI = 0.949, RMSEA = 0.050, and SRMR = 0.039.

Table 2 Fit Indices of the Initial and Final CFA Models

	Items	χ^2 (df)	CFI	TLI	RMSEA (95% CI)	SRMR
HMPS	29	1151 (374)	0.839	0.825	0.062 (0.058 – 0.066)	0.063
	21	443 (184)	0.927	0.916	0.051 (0.045 – 0.057)	0.050
BAT	23	539 (224)	0.949	0.943	0.051 (0.045 – 0.056)	0.043
	22	478 (203)	0.955	0.949	0.050 (0.044 – 0.056)	0.039

Note. HMPS = Hewitt-Flett Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale; BAT = Burnout Assessment Tool; χ^2 = chi-square; df = degrees of freedom; CFI = comparative fit index; TLI = Tucker–Lewis index; RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; CI = confidence interval; SRMR = standardized root mean square residual.

Table 3 Internal Consistency of the Scales and Dimensions

	Items	Cronbach's α	McDonald's ω
HMPS	21	0.821	0.839
SOP	8	0.847	0.848
OOP	5	0.715	0.717
SPP	8	0.832	0.835
BAT	22	0.939	0.940
EX	7	0.871	0.872
MD	5	0.844	0.845
CI	5	0.872	0.872
EI	5	0.856	0.856

Note. HMPS = Hewitt-Flett Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale; SOP = self-oriented perfectionism; OOP = other-oriented perfectionism; SPP = socially prescribed perfectionism; BAT = Burnout Assessment Tool; EX = exhaustion; MD = mental distance; CI = cognitive impairment; EI = emotional impairment; α = Cronbach's alpha coefficient; ω = McDonald's omega coefficient.

The correlations among the dimensions of perfectionism and occupational burnout are presented in Table 4.

Table 4 Correlation Matrix Among Perfectionism Dimensions and Occupational Burnout

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. SOP	1							
2. OOP	-0.175**	1						
3. SPP	0.606**	-0.169**	1					
4. EX	0.223**	-0.168**	0.386**	1				
5. MD	0.146**	-0.037	0.403**	0.633**	1			
6. CI	0.148**	-0.056	0.289**	0.611**	0.692**	1		
7. EI	0.140**	-0.007	0.371**	0.531**	0.637**	0.659**	1	
8. BAT	0.198**	-0.087*	0.429**	0.842**	0.867**	0.863**	0.820**	1

Note. $N = 546$. SOP = self-oriented perfectionism; OOP = other-oriented perfectionism; SPP = socially prescribed perfectionism; EX = exhaustion; MD = mental distance; CI = cognitive impairment; EI = emotional impairment; BAT = overall occupational burnout score; * $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$.

Socially prescribed perfectionism showed the strongest positive correlation with overall occupational burnout ($r = 0.429, p < 0.01$). Self-oriented perfectionism showed a weak positive correlation with occupational burnout ($r = 0.198, p < 0.01$), whereas other-oriented perfectionism showed a very weak negative correlation ($r = -0.087, p < 0.05$).

The results of the hierarchical linear regression analysis are presented in Table 5.

Table 5 Hierarchical Linear Regression Predicting Overall Occupational Burnout ($N = 546$)

	R^2	b	SE B	β	t	p	Partial	Part
Step 1	0.005							
Marital status		- 0.094	0.059	- 0.067	- 1.575	0.116	- 0.067	- 0.067
Step 2	0.206							
Marital status		- 0.169	0.054	- 0.122	- 3.150	0.002	- 0.134	- 0.121
SOP		- 0.071	0.031	- 0.112	- 2.312	0.021	- 0.099	- 0.089
OOP		- 0.011	0.025	- 0.018	- 0.457	0.648	- 0.020	- 0.018
SPP		0.316	0.030	0.508	10.409	0.000	0.408	0.399

Note. SOP = self-oriented perfectionism; OOP = other-oriented perfectionism; SPP = socially prescribed perfectionism.

In Step 1, marital status explained 0.5% of the variance in occupational burnout, and the model was not statistically significant, $R^2 = 0.005$, $F(1, 544) = 2.479$, $p = 0.116$. After the three dimensions of perfectionism were added in Step 2, the model explained 20.6% of the variance in occupational burnout, $R^2 = 0.206$, adjusted $R^2 = 0.200$, $F(4, 541) = 35.001$, $p < 0.001$. In the final model, socially prescribed perfectionism showed the strongest positive association with occupational burnout ($\beta = 0.508$, $p < 0.001$), whereas self-oriented perfectionism showed a negative association ($\beta = -0.112$, $p = 0.021$). Other-oriented perfectionism was not statistically significant ($\beta = -0.018$, $p = 0.648$).

Discussion

This study examined the associations between three dimensions of perfectionism and occupational burnout among young workers in Ho Chi Minh City. The results showed that socially prescribed perfectionism had the clearest and strongest positive association with overall occupational burnout as well as with all four dimensions of burnout. Self-oriented perfectionism showed a weak positive correlation with burnout in the bivariate analysis, but this association became negative after simultaneously controlling for the other two perfectionism dimensions and marital status. In contrast, other-oriented perfectionism did not show a statistically significant unique association in the final regression model. The model including marital status and the three dimensions of perfectionism

explained 20.6% of the variance in occupational burnout, suggesting that perfectionism represents an important group of psychological factors related to burnout, although it is not the only factor involved.

The most notable finding was the positive association between socially prescribed perfectionism and occupational burnout. This finding is consistent with previous studies among workers, in which the perception that others expect an individual to be perfect has generally been associated with higher levels of burnout and lower levels of work engagement [10]. Longitudinal studies have also found that this dimension is associated with increases in stress and burnout over time [11]. Previous meta-analytic evidence further indicates that perfectionistic concerns are consistently positively associated with burnout, whereas perfectionistic strivings show a more complex pattern of associations [12]. The association between perfectionism and burnout has also been documented in contexts of occupational instability and public health challenges, suggesting that external pressures may further highlight the adverse role of perfectionistic concerns [29].

In the present study, socially prescribed perfectionism was positively correlated with exhaustion, mental distance, cognitive impairment, and emotional impairment. One possible explanation is that individuals with high levels of this dimension tend to perceive that others' acceptance and evaluation depend on their ability to meet very high standards. Continuously monitoring for mistakes, worrying about being evaluated, and striving to meet external expectations may increase the psychological demands individuals must manage at work. According to the Job Demands–Resources model, prolonged demands that are not adequately balanced by appropriate resources may be associated with exhaustion and psychological withdrawal from work [15, 17]. From the perspective of Conservation of Resources theory, continuously investing time, energy, and emotional resources to avoid mistakes or negative evaluations may contribute to a process of resource depletion [16]. However, this study did not directly assess job demands, organizational resources, or resource loss. Therefore, the mechanisms described above should be regarded as theoretical interpretations that require further examination in future research.

The findings for self-oriented perfectionism were more complex. At the bivariate level, this dimension showed a weak positive association with occupational burnout. However, when all three dimensions of perfectionism were entered simultaneously into the regression model, the coefficient for self-oriented perfectionism became negative. This change may be related to the relatively high correlation between self-oriented perfectionism and socially prescribed perfectionism in the study sample. After controlling for the shared variance associated with pressure, concerns over mistakes, and social evaluation, the remaining variance in self-oriented perfectionism may more clearly reflect self-imposed standards and achievement striving. This finding is consistent with evidence suggesting that perfectionistic strivings may show very small or negligible associations with burnout in initial analyses, but become negatively associated with burnout after perfectionistic concerns are controlled for [12]. Some studies among workers have also found that setting high personal standards may be associated with lower levels of burnout and higher levels of work engagement when not accompanied by excessive perfectionistic concerns [10].

Nevertheless, self-oriented perfectionism should not be viewed simply as a protective factor. This dimension may be directly associated with lower levels of exhaustion while also being indirectly associated with greater exhaustion through tendencies toward overwork or workaholism [13]. Therefore, the implications of setting high standards may depend on how individuals pursue those standards. Setting ambitious goals while maintaining a sense of control, personal initiative, and the ability to self-regulate may differ substantially from working compulsively, being unable to disengage from work, or basing one's self-worth entirely on achievement. This distinction between adaptive striving and the pursuit of standards under pressure is also consistent with approaches that view motivation, resources, and working conditions as important determinants of the outcomes associated with achievement striving [14, 17]. The cross-sectional design of the present study does not allow us to determine the mechanism underlying the change in the direction of the regression coefficient.

Other-oriented perfectionism showed a very weak negative correlation with overall occupational burnout but did not demonstrate a statistically significant unique association in the regression model. This finding suggests that expecting others to meet high standards may not be directly related to an individual's own burnout after accounting for self-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism. Previous findings regarding this dimension have also been inconsistent. Some studies have found that other-oriented perfectionism is associated with lower levels of burnout or higher levels of work engagement, whereas others suggest that it may be indirectly associated with exhaustion through overwork [10, 13]. This association may depend on occupational position, level of authority, teamwork demands, and the extent to which individuals are held responsible when others fail to meet expectations. These conditions were not examined in the present study.

Marital status did not explain a significant proportion of the variance in burnout when entered into the model alone, but became significantly associated with burnout after the three dimensions of perfectionism were added. This finding should be interpreted cautiously because the study classified only marital status and did not assess relationship quality, caregiving responsibilities, family support, or work and family conflict. Therefore, it cannot be concluded that marital status itself constitutes either a risk or protective factor for burnout. At the same time, the fact that the final model explained approximately one-fifth of the variance suggests that much of the variability in burnout may be attributable to factors not included in the present study, such as workload, working hours, job autonomy, supervisor support, organizational justice, and opportunities for recovery. From a practical perspective, the findings suggest that burnout prevention should not focus solely on workload but should also consider how perfectionistic standards are established and reinforced in the workplace. Ambiguous demands, a culture that punishes mistakes, feedback focused primarily on shortcomings, or expectations of consistently flawless performance may intensify employees' perceptions that others require them to be perfect. Organizations may reduce such pressure by clarifying job expectations, providing developmental feedback, creating a psychologically safe environment in which mistakes can be discussed, and ensuring that employees have sufficient resources and opportunities for recovery. At the individual level, support programs may focus on identifying unrealistic standards, reducing the extent to which self-worth depends on external evaluation, and developing more flexible coping strategies.

However, these implications are inferred from the present findings and should not be interpreted as intervention effects that have been directly tested.

The study has several strengths, including a sample of 546 workers, the inclusion of participants from diverse occupational groups, and the simultaneous examination of the three dimensions of perfectionism and the four core symptoms of occupational burnout. However, several limitations should be acknowledged. First, the cross-sectional design does not allow the temporal sequence of the associations to be established or support the conclusion that perfectionism leads to burnout; reverse-direction effects are also possible. Second, the use of convenience sampling and the restriction of the sample to Ho Chi Minh City limit the generalizability of the findings to other age groups, regions, and working conditions. Third, all data were collected using self-report questionnaires at a single time point; therefore, the findings may be affected by common method bias and socially desirable responding. Fourth, several HMPS and BAT items were removed during the CFA process. Although the final models demonstrated acceptable fit and internal consistency, these modifications may limit direct comparability with studies using the full versions of the instruments. Finally, the model did not control for several job demands and job resources that may be relevant to burnout. Future studies should employ longitudinal designs, recruit more diverse samples, test measurement invariance, and examine potential mediating mechanisms such as workaholism, concerns over mistakes, coping, job demands, and organizational resources.

Conclusions

In summary, socially prescribed perfectionism was the dimension most consistently and strongly associated with occupational burnout among young workers in this study. Self-oriented perfectionism showed a more complex pattern of associations, whereas other-oriented perfectionism made no statistically significant unique contribution in the final model. These findings highlight the importance of distinguishing between the voluntary pursuit of high standards and the perception of being pressured by the social environment to be perfect. At the same time, the study suggests that burnout prevention should combine individual-level support with efforts to modify organizational conditions that may reinforce perfectionistic pressure.

Abbreviations

BAT
Burnout Assessment Tool
CFA
Confirmatory factor analysis
CFI
Comparative fit index
CITC
Corrected item–total correlation

COR
Conservation of Resources
EI
Emotional impairment
EX
Exhaustion
HMPS
Hewitt–Flett Multidimensional Perfectionism Scale
JD-R
Job Demands–Resources
MD
Mental distance
OOP
Other-oriented perfectionism
RMSEA
Root mean square error of approximation
SOP
Self-oriented perfectionism
SPP
Socially prescribed perfectionism
SRMR
Standardized root mean square residual
TLI
Tucker–Lewis index
VIF
Variance inflation factor.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki and the ethical principles of the American Psychological Association (APA) regarding research involving human participants. Ethical approval was obtained from the Research Ethics Committee for Social Sciences and Humanities of Ho Chi Minh City University of Education (approval number: ECSH-2026-029). Before participation, all participants were provided with written information about the purpose and procedures of the study, the voluntary nature of participation, their right to discontinue participation at any time, and the confidentiality of their data. All participants were adults aged 25 years or older and provided electronic informed consent before completing the anonymous online questionnaire.

Consent for publication

Not applicable. The article does not contain images, individual case reports, or any information that could identify participants.

Competing interests

The author declares no competing interests.

Funding

This study received no funding.

Authors' contributions

PDH was responsible for the conceptualization of the study, study design, data collection and processing, statistical analysis, interpretation of the findings, and preparation of the manuscript. The author read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable.

Availability of data and materials

The dataset used and analyzed in this study is not publicly available in order to protect participant confidentiality. Anonymized data may be made available by the corresponding author upon reasonable request and in accordance with the applicable regulations of the academic institution.

References

1. WHO. Burn-out an (2019) occupational phenomenon: International Classification of Diseases. <https://www.who.int/news/item/28-05-2019-burn-out-an-occupational-phenomenon-international-classification-of-diseases>. Accessed 6 Nov 2025
2. Maslach C, Jackson SE (1981) The measurement of experienced burnout. *J Organ Behav* 2:99–113. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JOB.4030020205>
3. Schaufeli W, De Witte H, Desart S (2020) Manual Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT): Version 2.0
4. de Beer LT, Schaufeli WB, De Witte H, Hakanen JJ, Shimazu A, Glaser J et al (2020) Measurement Invariance of the Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT) Across Seven Cross-National Representative

- Samples. *Int J Environ Res Public Health* 2020 17(5604):17:5604.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17155604>
5. Lê Thị Thanh Nguyễn (2022) Kiệt sức nghề nghiệp ở điều dưỡng Bệnh viện Chấn thương Chỉnh hình thành phố Hồ Chí Minh và yếu tố liên quan. *Tạp chí Nghiên cứu Y học*. 155:177–186.
<https://doi.org/10.52852/TCNCYH.V155I7.897>
 6. Nguyễn Thị Hương Thu, Kitaoka K, Sukigara M (2018) Anh Lan Thái. Burnout Study of Clinical Nurses in Vietnam: Development of Job Burnout Model Based on Leiter and Maslach's Theory. *Asian Nurs Res (Korean Soc Nurs Sci)* 12:42–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anr.2018.01.003>
 7. Trần Thị Minh Đức (2021) Ngô Thị Thùy, Nguyễn Thành Đức, Phạm Thị Anh Đào. Suy kiệt ở giáo viên và ảnh hưởng của nó tới trầm cảm, lo âu và căng thẳng. *Tạp chí Tâm lý học*. ;260
 8. Hewitt PL, Flett GL (1991) Perfectionism in the self and social contexts: conceptualization, assessment, and association with psychopathology. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 60:456–470.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.60.3.456>
 9. Curran T, Hill AP (2019) Perfectionism is increasing over time: A meta-analysis of birth cohort differences from 1989 to 2016. *Psychol Bull* 145:410–429. <https://doi.org/10.1037/BUL0000138>
 10. Childs JH, Stoeber J, Self-Oriented (2010) Other-Oriented, and Socially Prescribed Perfectionism in Employees: Relationships with Burnout and Engagement. *J Workplace Behav Health* 25:269–281.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15555240.2010.518486>
 11. Childs JH, Stoeber J (2012) Do you want me to be perfect? Two longitudinal studies on socially prescribed perfectionism, stress and burnout in the workplace. *Work Stress* 26:347–364.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2012.737547>
 12. Hill AP, Curran T (2016) Multidimensional Perfectionism and Burnout: A Meta-Analysis. *Personality Social Psychol Rev* 20:269–288. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868315596286>
 13. Falco A, Piccirelli A, Girardi D, Di Sipio A, De Carlo NA (2014) The best or nothing: The mediating role of workaholism in the relationship between Perfectionism and Burnout. *TPM Test Psychom Methodol Appl Psychol* 21:213–232. <https://doi.org/10.4473/TPM21.2.7>
 14. Stoeber J, Damian LE (2015) Perfectionism in employees: Work engagement, workaholism, and burnout. *Perfectionism, Health, and Well-Being*. ;265–83. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-18582-8_12
 15. Demerouti E, Nachreiner F, Bakker AB, Schaufeli WB (2001) The job demands-resources model of burnout. *J Appl Psychol* 86:499–512. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.3.499>
 16. Hobfoll SE (1989) Conservation of resources. A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. *Am Psychol* 44:513–524. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.44.3.513>
 17. Bakker AB, Demerouti E (2017) Job demands-resources theory: Taking stock and looking forward. *J Occup Health Psychol* 22:273–285. <https://doi.org/10.1037/OCP0000056>
 18. Ozbilir T, Day A, Catano VM (2015) Perfectionism at Work: An Investigation of Adaptive and Maladaptive Perfectionism in the Workplace among Canadian and Turkish Employees. *Appl Psychol* 64:252–280. <https://doi.org/10.1111/APPS.12032>

19. Nguyễn Hải Uyên (2022) Mối quan hệ giữa biểu hiện kiệt sức nghề nghiệp và đặc điểm nhân cách của người lao động. Trường Đại học Sư phạm Thành. phố Hồ Chí Minh
20. Nguyễn Hoàng Anh Vũ (2022) Kiệt sức nghề nghiệp ở giảng viên đại học Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh trong đại dịch Covid – 19. Tạp chí Tâm lý học. ;275
21. Nguyễn Thành Đạt (2024) Mối liên hệ giữa chủ nghĩa hoàn hảo và chấp nhận bản thân vô điều kiện của sinh viên: Luận văn Thạc sĩ Tâm lý học chuyên ngành Tâm lý học. Trường Đại học Sư phạm Thành. phố Hồ Chí Minh
22. Nguyễn Thị, Tứ et al (2025) Huỳnh Văn Sơn, Nguyễn Thanh Huân, Lê Trúc Vy, Lưu Thị Thư Kỳ, Trương Tuấn Khải,. Mối quan hệ giữa trải nghiệm bất lợi thời thơ ấu, tính cầu toàn, trầm cảm và sự hài lòng trong cuộc sống của người trưởng thành. Tạp chí Khoa học Trường Đại học Sư phạm Thành phố Hồ Chí Minh. ;22:2015–26. <https://doi.org/10.54607/hcmue.js.22.11.5271>(2025)
23. Schaufeli WB, Desart S, De Witte H (2020) Burnout Assessment Tool (BAT)-Development, Validity, and Reliability. Int J Environ Res Public Health 17:1–21. <https://doi.org/10.3390/IJERPH17249495>
24. Dunn TJ, Baguley T, Brunsden V (2014) From alpha to omega: a practical solution to the pervasive problem of internal consistency estimation. Br J Psychol 105:399–412. <https://doi.org/10.1111/BJOP.12046>
25. Rhemtulla M, Brosseau-Liard PÉ, Savalei V (2012) When can categorical variables be treated as continuous? A comparison of robust continuous and categorical SEM estimation methods under suboptimal conditions. Psychol Methods 17:354–373. <https://doi.org/10.1037/A0029315>
26. Joseph F, Hair WC, Black BJ, Babin, Ralph E, Anderson S (2018) Multivariate data analysis. Pearson Education Limited
27. Hu LT, Bentler PM (1999) Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. Struct Equ Model 6:1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
28. Saris WE, Satorra A, van der Veld WM (2009) Testing Structural Equation Models or Detection of Misspecifications? Struct Equ Model 16:561–582. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705510903203433>
29. Spagnoli P, Buono C, Kovalchuk LS, Cordasco G, Esposito A (2021) Perfectionism and Burnout During the COVID-19 Crisis: A Two-Wave Cross-Lagged Study. Front Psychol 11. <https://doi.org/10.3389/FPSYG.2020.631994>