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Abstract

The purpose of this research was to identify and analyze the prediction effects of perfectionism on the career decision self-efficacy and career indecision, career decision self-efficacy on the career indecision and the mediating effect of career decision self-efficacy on the relationship between perfectionism and career indecision. The sample involved 369 high school students selected using random cluster sampling. The research method used is a structural equation model. The results showed that self-oriented perfectionism positively predicted career decision self-efficacy while socially prescribed perfectionism negatively predicted career decision self-efficacy, as well as career decision self-efficacy to predict career indecision. Also, career decision self-efficacy has a mediating effect on the relationship of perfectionism with career indecisions. The implications of the findings of this study are discussed in the article.
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INTRODUCTION

The development, setting, and decisions of a career are complex because they contain a combination of various factors while including an important part in life planning is a developmental task that teens must face. By the Super career development theory, the career decision making process is an important development task that tends to be made more often by early and late teens (Hartung, Porfeli, and Vondracek, 2005).

A person’s career decision has a long-term impact because the decision can put someone into a particular career that can involve a long period of education and training before actually producing work. Also, the chosen career has a very long-term role in one’s life such as playing a role in determining financial, social and lifestyle abilities (Santrock, 2011).

However, making career decisions is not easy because it is necessary to understand how a person’s needs, values, and goals are before making a career decision. Some teenagers can make career decisions very easily, while some other teenagers have difficulties so often unable to make career decisions. In career counseling, the inability to make career decisions is known as career indecision. In the literature, career indecision constructs are used to state problems during the career decision making process. In general, career indecision is defined as the inability to make career decisions that are expected to be pursued by someone (Leong, and Chervinko, 1996).

Fouad and Tinsley in their study concluded that many adolescents have difficulty for making career decisions and facing career indecision before settling on a career (Creed, Patton, and Prideaux, 2006). It was reinforced by Dahlan research (2010), which showed that many students faced an inability to decide careers, such as found 3.77% of students stable, 56.17% doubtful, and 40.06% not yet solid about their future careers.

Another indication was found in the Lasan (2009) research, around 60% to 75% of science students did not take pure science in higher education. It was also found that 38 out of 71 or about 54% of Indonesian students who were undergoing education in Taiwan experienced career indiscretion (Peng, Johanson, and Chang, 2012).

Over the past few decades, career indecision has become the focus of vocational research. Even research on career indecision has long been a focus in the development literature (O’Brien, and Fassinger, 1993; Osipow, 1999). Nevertheless exploring its existence and stability over time is a crucial issue in research (Gati, Krausz, and Osipow, 1996). Also, understanding career development variables that have a role in the emergence of career indecision status and the use of appropriate techniques when dealing with students who faced career indecision is needed (Bullock-Yowell, McConnell, and Schedin, 2014).

Recently, research interest in career indecision is driven by researchers, practitioners, and counselors who care about: (a) how individuals make career choices, and (b) how the same individuals apply those choices (Beheshtifar, Esmaeli, and Hashemi-Nasab 2012). Based on Slone, and Hancock (2006), research carried out often involves antecedent variables and results related to career indecision (Beheshtifar, Esmaeli, and Hashemi-Nasab, 2012). On the other hand, researchers pay attention to recognizing, understanding and counteracting career indecision (Yates, et al., 2010).

To better understand the problem of career indecision that is often experienced by high school students and for the achievement of effective career counseling, it is important to know the factors that influence career decisions and the factors that lead to the emergence of career indecision. For this reason, some research needs to be done with the main topic of career indecision. Especially research to explore the root of the problem that enables career indecision in someone so that it is possible for counselors to provide more appropriate services.

Cognitive, social career theory reveals that there are three important factors which influence a person’s decision-making process to cause career indecision, namely; personal, cognitive,
and contextual factors. The cognitive factors include self-efficacy of career decisions and expectations result (Brown, 2002). Taylor, and Betz (1983) suggested that self-efficacy can be used as a mechanism in understanding career indecision. Their findings indicated that students who have career indecision were noted to be low on a measure of career self-efficacy. Self-efficacy reflects the self-confidence that a person has about his ability to carry out certain tasks or behaviors and is involved in choice, initiation, performance, and perseverance in the task (Bandura, and Wood 1989).

Previous research conducted by Taylor, and Popma (1990) to examine the relationship between career decision self-efficacy and career indecision resulted in the conclusion that career decision self-efficacy has a positive contribution in predicting career indecision. It is said that if one’s self-efficacy career decision was lower, the career indecision might cause rise higher. But longitudinal research conducted by Creed, Patton, and Prideaux (2006) suggested that were inversely proportional to the findings of Taylor, and Popma (1990). They showed that changes in the self-efficacy of career decisions have nothing to do with changes in career indecision. These findings were irrelevant to the relevance of career decision self-efficacy with career indecision where the higher the level of self-efficacy career decisions and the higher expectation of results would affect the decline in career indecision (Patton, 2004).

Salomone (1982) argued that students who faced career indecision were those who were unable to make decisions because of certain personality traits as explained earlier that in the theory of social cognitive careers, personal factors are referred to as one of the factors forming the birth of career indecision. Personality can be referred to as a personal factor.

Research conducted by Leong, and Chervinko (1996), showed the results that perfectionism correlates with career indecision. Two of three dimensions of perfectionism are predictive of career indecision. First is self-oriented perfectionism as a negative predictor of career indecision, socially prescribed perfectionism as a positive predictor while other-oriented perfectionism is not a predictor of career indecision.

These findings contradict the results of research conducted by Page, Bruch, and Haase (2008). Using the term maladaptive perfectionism and adaptive perfectionism as a substitute for self-oriented and socially prescribed perfectionism, these two variables are referred to as positive predictors of career indecision.

Looking at the results gap that occurred in previous studies, further research using these variables is reasonable enough to be done especially given that there is still a lack of research into career indecision carried out in Indonesia. Some studies (Fikry, and Rizal, 2018; Ali, and Mukhibat, 2016) examined the relevance of self-efficacy career decisions and career indecision. Other studies (Kesuma, Sugiharto, and Japar, 2019; Pambudi, Mulawarman, and Japar, 2019) examined the relationship of personality to the self-efficacy of career decisions and tested modeling techniques to improve self-efficacy of career decisions.

Whereas this study seeks to expand previous findings in different population contexts, in addition to adding to the literature variables that are related to career indecision especially in Indonesian culture. Furthermore, this study aims to determine the relationship between perfectionism, and self-efficacy of career decisions with career indecision.

METHODS

This research type was quantitative research with correlation research design. The sample in this study was the 12th grade of Senior High Schools students in Trenggalek Regency, East Java, which amounted to 369. The Cluster Sampling technique made the selection of samples.

The instrument used was the adaptation instruments result of English into Indonesian through back translate process carried out by an expert. The first step of the instrument in English was translated into Indonesian then the second step was re-translated from Indonesian into
English. The difference in the results of the two steps has been discussed again to get good Indonesian-language instruments.

To measure student perfectionism, the adaptation of Hewitt and Flett’s Multidimensional Perfectionism Short Form instrument (Stoeber, 2016) consisted of 15 items that measured self-oriented perfectionism, other-oriented perfectionism and socially prescribed perfectionism with five scale points from very inappropriate (1) to very suitable (5). Cronbach alpha for perfectionism instruments in this study was 0.81 with loading factors ranging from 0.64 to 0.82.

Forms from Taylor, and Betz (Hampton, 2005) consisted of 13 items that measure decision making, problem-solving, and information gathering with. Cronbach alpha for career decision self-efficacy instruments in this study was 0.90 with loading factors ranging from 0.64 to 0.73.

Career indecision was measured using the subscales Indecision Career Scale from Osipow (Kelly, and Lee, 2002) consisting of 16 items of questions. Cronbach alpha for career decision self-efficacy instruments in this study was 0.90 with loading factors ranging from 0.64 to 0.73.

The research process is carried out by collecting data from students who are participants. Respondents were asked to be willing to respond honestly to the instruments provided and each data collected from personal information was confidential. The collected data is then tabulated and analyzed.

There were several data analysis techniques used in this study, namely correlation to see the relationship between variables and sub-variables, then test the model to confirm the relationship between variables by using structural equation model (SEM).

**RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

Table 1 it is shown that perfectionism, self-efficacy of career decisions and career indecision correlate with each other. Self-oriented perfectionism has a positive correlation with career decision self-efficacy (decision making, problem-solving, and information gathering) and has a negative correlation with career indecision. Socially prescribed perfectionism has a negative correlation with career decision self-efficacy (decision making, problem-solving, and information gathering) and has a positive correlation with career indecision. While career decision self-efficacy (decision making, problem-solving, and information gathering) has a negative correlation with career indecision. Career indecision models with predictors of perfectionism and career decision self-efficacy (figure 1.) have good goodness of fit ($\chi^2 = 1342, 102; df = 878; \chi^2 / df = 1.529; CFI = 0.950; SRMR = 0.056; RMSEA = 0.038$).

| Table 1. Mean, Standard Deviation, Matrix Inter-Correlation |
|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
|                  | SO  | OO  | SP  | DM  | PS  | IG  | CI  |
| SO               | 0.04|     |     |     |     |     |     |
| OO               | 0.04| 0.03| 0.07|     |     |     |     |
| SP               | -0.57**| -0.04| -0.39**|     |     |     |     |
| DM               | -0.56**| -0.04| -0.38**| 0.52**| 0.65**| 0.54**|     |
| PS               | -0.55**| -0.06| -0.37**| 0.65**| 0.54**| 0.52**|     |
| IG               | 0.43**| 0.05| 0.38**| -0.54**| -0.47**| -0.53**| 0.57**|
| M                | 17.86| 17.53| 18.33| 13.98| 7.06| 9.21| 57.04|
| SD               | 4.05| 4.83| 4.46| 5.08| 2.26| 3.24| 12.10|

Information:
SO = self-oriented perfectionism
OO = other-oriented perfectionism
SP = socially prescribed perfectionism
DM = decision making
PS = problem solving
IG = information gathering
CI = career indecision
** < 0.01 (n = 369)
Based on Figure 1 it is known that self-oriented perfectionism predicts positively decision making ($\beta = 0.70; p = 0.01$), and information gathering ($\beta = 0.54; p = 0.00$) and positively predicts career indecision ($\beta = 0.98; p = 0.00$). Similarly, socially prescribed perfectionism predicts negatively decision making ($\beta = -0.21; p = 0.00$), problem solving ($\beta = -0.58; p = 0.00$) and information gathering ($\beta = -0.50; p = 0.00$). While decision making negatively predicts career indecision ($\beta = -0.18; p = 0.04$) so problem solving negatively predicts career indecision ($\beta = -0.24; p = 0.04$) and information gathering negatively predicts career indecision ($\beta = -0.21; p = 0.01$).

These results support the findings of Ganske, and Ashby (2007) that adaptive perfectionism (self-oriented perfectionism) predicts high self-efficacy of career decisions while maladaptive perfectionism (socially prescribed) predicts low self-efficacy of career decisions. Along with the statement of Slaney, Ashby, and Trippi (1995) that perfectionism is related to career choice, career achievement, productivity, and satisfaction.

The results of career decision self-efficacy as predictors of career indecision are explained by Brown et al. (2012) that someone with strong career self-efficacy decisions will be able to say to themselves "I know what I am good at, I know I can with my strength." Having a high level of self-efficacy career decisions will make individuals feel better prepared to make career decisions.

Table 2 it is shown that career decision self-efficacy has a mediating effect on relations of perfectionism with career indecision. Further explained that decision making mediates negatively to self-oriented perfectionism with career indecision ($\beta = -0.15; p < 0.05$), decision making mediates positively socially prescribed perfectionism with career indecision ($\beta = 0.06; p < 0.05$). Problem solving has a mediating effect on the relationship of self-oriented perfectionism with career indecision ($\beta = -0.16; p < 0.01$) and socially prescribed perfectionism with career indecision ($\beta = 0.14; p < 0.01$). In addition,
information gathering also mediates self-oriented perfectionism with career indecision ($\beta = -0.06; p < 0.05$) and socially prescribed perfectionism with career indecision ($\beta = 0.08; p < 0.05$) and overall, career decision self-efficacy had a mediating effect on the relationship of perfectionism with career indecision ($\beta = 0.41; p < 0.01$).

### Table 2. Mediating Effect of Career Decision Self-Efficacy on the Relation of Perfectionism to Career Indecision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Path</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>BC 95% Lower</th>
<th>BC 95% Upper</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SO $\rightarrow$ DM $\rightarrow$ CI</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.87</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP $\rightarrow$ DM $\rightarrow$ CI</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO $\rightarrow$ PS $\rightarrow$ CI</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.66</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP $\rightarrow$ PS $\rightarrow$ CI</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO $\rightarrow$ IG $\rightarrow$ CI</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP $\rightarrow$ IG $\rightarrow$ CI</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>&lt; 0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total effect: P $\rightarrow$ CDSE $\rightarrow$ CI</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>&lt; 0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Information:**
- SO = Self-Oriented Perfectionism
- SP = Socially Prescribed Perfectionism
- DM = Decision Making
- PS = Problem Solving
- IG = Information Gathering
- CI = Career Indecision
- P = Perfectionism
- CDSE = Career Decision Self Efficacy

The results of these studies strengthen the research of Guay, Senecal, Gauthier, and Fernet (2003) which stated that excessive parental intervention (authoritarian parents and imposing perfection) and the environment could cause career indecision through mediating career decision self-efficacy. Also, research conducted by Santos, Wang, and Lewis (2018) concluded that emotional intelligence has an indirect relationship with career indecision through mediating career self-efficacy, which also stated that not being too perfectionism is a feature of emotional intelligence. These results are also consistent with the research of Lent et al. (2003) which showed that social support has an indirect correlation with career choices through mediating career decision self-efficacy.

**CONCLUSION**

The results of the study showed that perfectionism, self-efficacy of career decisions and career indecision correlated with each other. There is a negative correlation in the relationship between self-oriented perfectionism and career indecision through self-efficacy of career decisions, and positive correlation occurs in the relationship between socially prescribed perfectionism and career indecision through self-efficacy of career decisions. On the contrary, it decreased socially prescribed perfectionism and maintained the stability of self-oriented perfectionism.

Therefore, school counselors were advised to help students who need to improve their career decision self-efficacy, which can be more effective in reducing career indecision.

Respondents in this study were only limited to 12th grade of high school students even though career developments were mutually integrated. And knowing the conditions of career indecision as early as possible will be more profitable. So that it is expected for further researchers to research with more diverse respondents, moreover, the demographic data in this study are not reported, for the next study, it is expected to report demographic data so that differences in career indecision on gender and diversity of different ages can be identified.

This study has more theoretical contributions than practical, so it is expected that in the future research can be carried out with approach activities or further intervention or longitudinal research to confirm the results of further research.
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