



Perceptiveness and Sense Impression of Procrastination across Correlates

Melanio Trillanes Olea and Akihiro Nohara Olea

College of Sciences and Environment, Mindanao State University at Naawan, PHILIPPINES

Available online at: www.isca.in, www.isca.me

Received 17th October 2014, revised 21st November 2014, accepted 20th December 2014

Abstract

Procrastination is complex behavioral conditions which occur across the societal milieu. It is defined as lack of self regulating performance and putting off task that can be controlled by the individual. From the three elements of procrastination identified, the most common academic procrastination is anxiety related and low conscientiousness. The present undertaken was conducted to determine the level of procrastination among pre-service teachers across correlate. The results of the study revealed that the level of procrastination among the student respondent regardless of the age, gender, course program matriculated in, the year level, and the school graduated from high school was moderate. Although, the study established a positive correlation between the level of procrastination and the gender ($p \leq 0.05$), it failed to establish significant difference and relationship between the level of procrastination and the other correlates.

Keywords: Procrastination, pre-service teacher, self-esteem.

Introduction

Procrastination is a human behavior characterized by deferment of tasks, job and/or actions for whatever reason for later time. There are three elements of procrastination namely; cognitive, emotional and behavioral. To many, the later component is regarded as a reinforced bad habit. Apparently, it is a way of concealing up an anxiety associated with starting up or completing the task and/or coming up a decision. It is a self-regulated behavior in delaying a task or action despite being aware of the negative repercussion of the delay¹.

Most frequently, students came across this problem in the course of their academic experience. The most common procrastination practices are waiting for the last day to hand in assignment and/or required papers, and/or waiting until the last to review for the Test².

Report revealed that procrastination is found to result from cognitive distortions and faulty thinking³. Procrastinators of this type lack self-efficacy and are self-critical, and self-conscious. Somehow, the fear to commit failure may lead to neurotic avoidance. Procrastination is shown by the propensity of delaying to perform a task so as to avoid the threat to self-esteem³. Studies have shown that procrastinators may have a low self-esteem and may lack the skills to succeed in their task which leads to the delay in the completion of any undertaking^{4,5}.

Impulsive procrastinators seem not to comprehend and have no ability to perceive the right perspectives that surround them⁴. These people lack self control, lack of motivation to perform or do the task and eventual achievement on target goal, and lack of organizational ability. Seemingly, procrastinators of this type

are resistant to change and such practice is perceived as a way of maintaining self control⁶.

Chronic procrastinators avoid revealing information about their abilities, prefer menial tasks, make poor time estimates, tend to focus on the past and do not act on their intentions. Apparently, these characteristics have some bearings on low self-esteem, self-control, self-confidence and, even depression and anxiety. Procrastinators are thought to have lower-than-normal level of conscientiousness, more based on wishes and dreams of achievement which is incongruous to the realistic appreciation of their obligations and potentials. Procrastination is an attribute rather than a task specific state characteristic and apparently if one procrastinates in one area, most likely the same will be done in another area².

The very reason why students indulge in procrastination is because of attributes such as poor time management, task aversiveness and fear of failure. Typically it is thought as a behavioral trait which thrives on blame shifting and avoidance. In turn, this behavior may result in stress, feeling of guilt, and loss of personal productivity.

Henceforth, as future teachers particularly in basic education who would be obliged to perform varied task that would entail much of their time in school such as accomplishing several reports which entail specific date of submission, scheduled activities that need prompt action and many tasks that have to be accomplished in a specific period of time then, it would be of interest to evaluate their behavior at the earliest stage of their career preparation.

Statement of the Problem: The main purpose of this study is to assess the level of procrastination among the Pre-service

Teachers when group according to their profile. Specifically, the study sought to answer the following questions.

What is the level of procrastination of the respondents according to the following correlates? i. Gender, ii. Age, iii. Course, iv. Year level (First and Fourth Year), v. School graduated from high school (Private or Public)

How do the respondents differ in procrastination when grouped according to the correlates under consideration?

Would there be a relationship between procrastination and the profile of the student respondents?

Hypothesis: H₀: There is a relationship in the state and level of procrastination between: i. Male and Female respondents, ii. Students in Science and Non Science Programs, iii. Freshmen and Senior Students and, iv. Students who received secondary education in Public and Private High School

Significance of the Study: As future teachers, task ahead of them seems surmountable and responsibilities are huge. Hence, it would be worthwhile to know the level of their procrastination of the pre-service teachers at the present state. Such that, as early as in their formative years, they may be made aware and realize the consequence of over indulgence to procrastination.

Materials and Methods

Respondents: The respondents were purposively selected from among freshmen and senior students of the College of Education, RTU, 1st Semester, Academic Year, 2013-2014.

Research Design: The present undertaking adopted the descriptive Correlation research design to establish significance among the variance as stated in the preceding paragraph.

Instruments: The study utilized the standard scoring instrument developed for procrastination. It is a General Behavioral Procrastination (GP) Scale which contains a 20-item unidimensional inventory survey instrument⁷. The responses by the student respondents are summed to come up with a unit score. The scale has a reliability of Cronbach's alpha of .82⁷ and a retest reliability of .80⁸. The 5-point item (1 = low, 5 = high) version of the scale was utilized because of its higher item variance. A higher score reflects higher procrastination. The following scale was used for the interpretation of the result.

4.5 – 5.00	Very high procrastinators
3.5 – 4.45	High procrastinators
2.5 – 3.45	Moderate procrastinators
1.5 – 2.45	Low procrastinators
1.0 – 1.45	Very low procrastinators

Statistical Analysis of the Data: The results of the present work were analyzed for its significance using the following statistical tools: i. Student's t-test, ii. ANOVA

Results and Discussion

Generally, procrastination refers to an act of putting off important task at later time intentionally or habitually and most often than not, non essential tasks are done in favor of the most important things.

In the context of Psychology, for the behavior to be classified as procrastination, it must be needless, delaying and counterproductive⁹. Procrastination is a type of behavior which is characterized by deferment of tasks or action to later time. It is a delayed performance of a task that was planned ahead although aware of the worst effect of the delay¹⁰. Psychologists often refer to such behavior as a mechanism of coping up with anxiety associated with starting or completing any tasks or decision. The psychological causes of procrastination vary greatly, but the common cause surrounds on issues such as anxiety, low sense of self-worth and self-defeating mentality¹¹. Procrastinations are also thought to have a lower than normal level of conscientiousness which is based more on the "dream and wishes" of perfection on achievement rather than to a realistic appreciation of their potential and obligation¹².

Table - 1
Respondents According to Gender

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	26	28.9%
Female	64	71.1%
Total	90	100%

Table 1 illustrates the gender of the respondents. Almost three fourths of the respondents (71.1% or 64) are female and more or less than one fourth (28.9% or 26) respondents are male. This could only mean that education course is dominated by female respondents. Furthermore, it also shows that there are more female who would prefer to be in teaching profession.

Table-1A
Procrastination Level When Group According to Gender

Gender	Male		Female		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
High Procrastinators	3	11.5%	0	0%	3	3.3%
Moderate Procrastinators	18	69.2%	50	78.1%	68	75.6%
Low Procrastinators	5	19.2%	14	21.9%	19	21.1%
Total	26	28.9%	64	71.1%	90	100%

Table 1A illustrates that out of 26 male respondents, three (11.5%) are high procrastinators, 18 (69.2) are moderate procrastinators, and five (19.2%) are low procrastinators. While among the female respondents, more than two thirds (50 or 78.1%) are moderate procrastinators, and less than one third (14 or 21.9%) are low procrastinators. A significant relationship was established between the level of procrastination and the gender of the student respondents. Similar result was also noted between freshmen non-science male and female students¹³. Somehow, male procrastinate slightly than female, however, the correlation maybe weak. Maybe, it could be attributed to the self-control among women^{10, 14}. In contrast; a study has shown that frequent academic procrastinations were also observed among students across race regardless of gender⁸. A study revealed that girls showed higher percentage as far as self-concept is concerned, regardless of socio-demographic variable¹⁵. Incidentally, a study showed that female teachers were more effective than male teachers in fostering student's self-esteem¹⁶.

Table-2
Age of the Respondents

Age	Frequency	Percentage
Above 25 yrs. old	3	3.3%
25-23 yrs. old	3	3.3%
22-20 yrs. old	14	15.6%
19-17 yrs. old	45	50.0%
16 years old below	25	27.8%
Total	90	100%

Table -2 presents the age of the respondent. The age group 17 – 19 years has the largest number which is 45 (50%), followed by the age group of 16 years below, 25 in number (27.8%), age group of 20-22 years are 14 (15.6%), Three (3.3%) of the respondents are from the age group of 23 – 25 years and another three respondents (3.3%) belong to the age group of 25 and above. It indicates that majority of the respondents are relatively teens (below 20 years old) because more than half of the respondents are first year students.

Table-2B
Procrastination Level When Group According to Age

Age	Below 16	17-19	20-22	23-25	Above 25	Total
Level of Procrastination	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)	F (%)
High Procrastinators	0 (0%)	1 (2.2%)	2 (14.3%)	0 (0%)	0 (0 %)	3 (3.3%)
Moderate Procrastinators	22 (88.0%)	34 (75.6%)	7 (50.0%)	3 (100.0%)	2 (66.7%)	68 (75.6%)
Low Procrastinators	3 (12.0%)	10 (22.2%)	5 (35.7%)	0 (0 %)	1 (33.3 %)	19 (21.1 %)
Total	25 (15.6%)	45 (50.0%)	14 (27.8%)	3 (3.3%)	3 (3.3%)	90 (100.0%)

Table-3
Procrastination Level When Group According to Age

	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	.047	4	.012	.085	.987
Within Groups	11.783	85	.139		
Total	11.830	89			

Table-4
Respondents According to the School Graduated from High School

School	Frequency	Percentage
Private	8	8.9%
Public	82	91.1%
Total	90	100%

Table-4A
Procrastination Level when Group According to School Graduated from High School

Level of Procrastination	Private		Public		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
High Procrastinators	0	0%	3	3.6%	3	3.3%
Moderate Procrastinators	6	75.0%	62	75.6%	68	75.6%
Low Procrastinators	2	25.0%	17	20.7%	19	21.1%
Total	8	8.9%	82	91.1%	90	100%

Table -2B reveals that one out of 3 high procrastinators belongs to the age group of 17-19, while two out of three belong to the age group of 20 – 22. From the total of 68 moderate procrastinators: 34 belong to age group 17 – 19; 22 belong to age group below 16; seven students belong to age group 20-22; three from the age group of 23-25 and two are from above 25 years old. For the low procrastinators group: 10 belong to age group 17 – 19; three belong to age group below 16; five belong to age group 20-22; and only one from above 25.

Table - 3 reflects the result of Analysis of Variance between the level of procrastination of the respondents and their ages. As shown, $F = 0.085$ and $p = 0.987 > 0.05$, no significant difference was arrived at.

Table - 4 indicates the school graduated from high school by the respondents. Most of the respondents 82 (91.1%) graduated from public school and a very small number of 8 (8.9%) graduated from private school.

Table-4A reflects that there are six moderate procrastinators out of eight respondents and two are low procrastinators among the

respondents who graduated from private school. Among the respondents who graduated from public school: three are high procrastinators, 62 are moderate procrastinators and 17 are low procrastinators.

There is a standard norm that would equate a behavior of a high school student, particularly the type or kind of high school attended to. Such, this study would like to affirm such contention. The results showed that regardless of the kind of high school they graduated from, the respondents procrastinate. However, the study was not able to establish significance as far as this correlate is concerned.

The values that could have been gained by the students may have an influence on such behavior. Thus, the behavior of the students is dependent on which values structure they have; either modern or postmodern values. Such that, those students with modern values plan for their future and plan out their daily routine to meet their goals, while those of the postmodern values would spontaneously decide the activities to be undertaken during the day which leads to the higher possibility of delaying tasks and little immediate pleasure¹⁷.

Table-5
Course and Year Level of the Respondents

Course Year Level	Social Science		Physical Science		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
First Year	36	62.1%	19	59.4%	55	61.1%
Fourth Year	22	37.9%	13	40.6%	35	38.9%
Total	58	64.4%	32	35.6%	90	100%

Table-5A
Procrastination Level When Group According to Year Level

Course/Level of Procrastination	First Year		Fourth Year		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
High Procrastinators	2	3.6	1	2.8	3	3.3
Moderate Procrastinators	41	74.5	27	77.1	68	75.6
Low Procrastinators	12	21.8	7	20	19	21.1
Total	55	61.1	35	38.9	90	100

Table-6
Procrastination Level When Group According to the Course/Program

Course/Level of Procrastination	Social Science		Physical Science		Total	
	F	%	F	%	F	%
High Procrastinators	1	1.7%	2	6.2%	3	3.3%
Moderate Procrastinators	42	72.4%	26	81.2%	68	75.6%
Low Procrastinators	15	25.9%	4	12.5%	19	21.1%
Total	58	64.4%	32	35.6%	90	100%

Table -7
Procrastination Level When Group According to the Profile (df=88)

	Computed t - value	Computed p-value	Interpretation
Procrastination level and Gender	1.811	0.116	$P > .05$ Not Significant
Procrastination Level and Course	- 3.222	0.348	$P > .05$ Not Significant
Procrastination Level and Year Level	0.143	0.867	$P > .05$ Not Significant
Procrastination Level and School graduated from High School	0.246	0.611	$P > .05$ Not Significant

Table-8
Procrastination Level When Group According to the Profile

	Computed X^2	p - value	d.f.	Interpretation
Procrastination level and Gender	7.639	0.022	2	$p = 0.05$ Significant
Procrastination Level and Age	11.498	0.175	8	$p > 0.05$ Not Significant
Procrastination Level and Course	3.224	0.199	2	$p > 0.05$ Not Significant
Procrastination Level and Year Level	0.092	0.955	2	$p > 0.05$ Not Significant
Procrastination Level and School graduated from High School	0.356	0.837	2	$p > 0.05$ Not Significant

Table-5 reflects the courses and year level of the respondents. There are 58 out of 90 respondents (64.4%) taking the Social Science major of which 36 (62.1% of 58) are from the first year level and 22 (37.9%) are from the fourth year level. Thirty two (32) out of 90 respondents are majoring in Physical Science which is about 19 students. Fifty nine percent (59.4% of 32) are from the first year level and 13 students (40.6%) are on the fourth year level.

Table-5A depicts the level of procrastination among respondents by year level. From the results, it showed that there are two high procrastinators, 41 moderate procrastinators and 12 low procrastinators from the first year level. While among those in the fourth year level: there is one high procrastinator; 27 are moderate procrastinators and 7 are low procrastinators.

As seen in Table-6, among the fifty eight (58) students major in social sciences: one is high procrastinator; 42 are moderate procrastinators and 15 are low procrastinators. Whereas among the 32 students majoring in physical science: two are high procrastinators; 26 are moderate procrastinators and four are low procrastinators. Although it has not been established, there are some expectations that those in science program because of the level of difficulty of the courses are expected to indulge less in procrastination than those in social sciences. The result of the present study did not show such expectations.

Table -7 reveals the computed t- value and computed p-value between the procrastination level and the profile. There is no significant difference between male and female procrastination level (computed p -value = 0.116 > 0.05). Similarly the students who are majoring in social science and physical science showed no significant difference in their level of procrastination (computed p -value = 0.348 > 0.05). Likewise, the level of procrastination between the freshmen and the senior students showed no significant difference (computed p -value=0.867>0.05). When the level of procrastination among the respondents who graduated from public and private high school were compared, it showed no significant difference (computed p -value = 0.611 > 0.05).

Table-8 presents the computed X^2 between the procrastination level of the respondents and their profile. As shown, except for the level of procrastination and the gender of the respondents ($X^2 = 7.639$, $p = 0.022 < 0.05 =$ significant). No significant relationship was established with the other correlates.

In the academic domain, procrastination may holds many negative effects such as lost time, poorer health, increased stress, decreased long term learning, lower grades and lower self-esteem¹⁸. However, despite of the negative consequences many college students still engage in such practice. Studies have shown that chronic procrastination is becoming worse and many have admittedly been chronically procrastinating¹⁹. Maybe, the modern technology is one of the many attributes why people are increasingly easier to procrastinate because everything seems to be available such that it became an intervening factor to the ordinary routine of an individual. For example, on line activity such as internet surfing, watching videos, checking mails and hanging out virtually on social network sites cause a deviation from the daily routine and unnecessarily cause delay on a schedule task.

Certainly, the students are aware of the things they want to accomplish, have the faculty to perform the task, plans ahead, but excessively delay the completion of such task. Although in most cases, they are ready to work and willing to accomplish certain tasks, but unfortunately ending up with non performance of the task.

Why do students procrastinate?

A study have shown that the most frequent answers the students will give if asked about it is as follows; poor time management, task aversiveness and fear of failure which the later comprised about 49.4%². Likewise, behavioral procrastination is also demonstrated by individuals to avoid threats to self-esteem. It appears that there exist a positive correlation between procrastination and low self-control and that procrastinators are interested on the desire for immediate pleasure. One negative correlate with procrastination is the frequency of self reinforcement and /or reward. Apparently, procrastinators do not reward themselves for an accomplished task as much as non-procrastinators⁴. Needless to say, procrastinators may have low self-esteem and believe that they lack the ability to accomplish tasks successfully which lead to eventual delay in completion of such responsibility^{4,5}.

As future teachers, there lies a great responsibility ahead and the burdens of the performance of huge task await them after finishing their studies. Such, it seems that behavioral procrastination is a thing that should never be a part of their daily routine while in the service. Hence, the study was conducted to determine the behavioral pattern of the pre service

teachers. Certainly, students procrastinate; the results of the present study affirmed such contention. However, the level of such behavior among the student respondents was just moderate regardless of the age, gender, course program, year level and experiences from high school graduated from. The results of the present work are consistent with previous works undertaken. Report showed that students were found to procrastinate and tend to increase in higher education. It was noted that such behavior was more prevalent among college students⁴. Reports have shown that the rates of procrastination among college students recorded between 46%¹⁸ and reached a peak as high as 95%³. The most common procrastination practices reported was more on written assignment rather than for tests or examination²⁰. The underlying negative effects of procrastination have been associated with missing the deadline for submission of assignment and reports, rescheduling of self-paced quizzes, and low cumulative Grade Point Average²¹.

Sociodemographic and personality traits have been thoroughly researched on pertaining to procrastination, however, it was noted that other key personality attributes should be considered in predicting procrastination such as impulsiveness and lack of self-control²² which are behavioral component pertaining to self-regulation²³.

Trial intervention and treatment of procrastination have been developed,²⁴ not to mention the recent study utilizing the cognitive behavior therapy²⁵ yet, it seems its efficacy it still far-fetched and intervention is scarce²⁶.

Whatever underlying reason/s why student procrastinates, maybe, it should not be undermined because it exists. It influences the behavior and undertakings of the individual. Likewise, procrastinators should be made to realize the negative consequence and/or impact of such practice if it remains unabated.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing and the result of the present study, the study established the level of procrastination as follows: i. The pre service teachers are moderately procrastinators, ii. It failed to establish significant difference when group according to age, course, year level and the school graduated from high school and, iii. Except for gender, it failed to establish significant relationship when group according to the other correlates.

Recommendation: From the light of the results of the present undertaking, it is hereby recommended that: i. The students are made aware of such psychological behavior and the consequence of its action through advocacy, ii. The Guidance Center formulates guidelines to avoid or minimize such behavioral practices and lastly, iii. The formulation of procrastination awareness program and activities in the university.

References

1. Klingsieck K.B., Procrastination, When Good Things Don't Come to Those Who Wait. *European Psychologist*, **18**, 24-34 (2013)
2. Milgram N., Batori B and Mowrer D., Correlates of Academic Procrastination, *J School of Psyche*, **31**, 487-500 (1993)
3. Ellis A. and Knaus W.J., Overcoming procrastination. New York: Signet Books (1977)
4. Ferrari J and Emmons R., Methods of Procrastination and their Relation to Self Control and Self Reinforcement, *J Soc Behav Pers.*, **10**,135-141 (1995)
5. Tuckman B., The development of Concurrent Validity of the Procrastination Scale, *Educ Psychol Meas.*, **51**, 473-480 (1991)
6. Salizman L., Psychotherapy of the obsessional, *Am. Psychotherapy*, **33**, 32-40 (1979)
7. Lay C.H., The relationship of procrastination and optimism to judgments of time to complete an essay and anticipation of setbacks, *J Soc Behav Pers*, **8**, 647-662 (1988)
8. Ferrari J.R., Reliability of academic and dispositional measures of procrastination, *Psych Rep*, **64**, 1057-1058 (1989)
9. Schraw G., Wadkin T. and Olafson L., Doing the things we do: A grounded theory of academic procrastination. *J Educ Psych.* **99**(1), 12-25 (2007)
10. Van Eerde W., A Meta-Analytically Derived Nomological Network of Procrastination, *Personality and Individual Differences*, **35**, 1401-1418 (2003)
11. Burka Y., Procrastination, why you do it, what to do about it now, New York: De Capo Lifelong Book, (2008)
12. Strub P.L. Frontal lobe syndrome in a patient with bilateral globus pallid lesions, *Arch Neurol*, **46**,1024-1027 (1989)
13. Cabañez O. Procrastination: Rationality among pre-service teachers of Bukidnon State University, *Int. J Social Rel Con.*, **2**, 41-45 (2014)
14. Else-Quest N.M., Hyde J.S., Goldsmith H. H. and Van Hulle C.A., Gender Differences in Temperament: A Meta-Analysis, *Psychol Bull*, **132**, 33-72 (2006)
15. Mahaswari K. and Singh J.G., Study on self-concept among rural girl students, *Int Res J Social Sci*, **3**(7), 2014
16. Ghazi S., Shabbir M.N., Batoool J. and Khan I., The role of teacher's attitude and attributes in fostering student's self-esteem, *Int. Res. J Social Sci.*, **3**(3), (2014)
17. Dietz F., Hofer M and Frias S., Individual values, learning routines and academic procrastination, *British J Educ Psych.*, **77**(4), 893-906 (2007)

18. Hoover E., Tomorrow I Love Ya!. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, **52(16)**, A30-A32 (2005)
19. Rothblum E.D., Solomon L.J. and Murakami J., Affective, cognitive and behavioral differences between high and low procrastinators, *J Couns Psych*, **33**, 387-394 (1986)
20. Clark J.L. and Hill O.W., Academic procrastination among African-American college students, *Psychol Rep*, **75**, 931-36 (1994)
21. Steel, Piers. *The Procrastination Equation: How to Stop Putting Things Off and Start Getting Stuff Done*. New York: HarperCollins (2010)
22. Wesley J.C., Effects of ability, high school achievement, and procrastinatory behavior on college performance, *Educ Psychol Meas*, **54**, 404-40 (1994)
23. Moffitt T.E., Arseneault L., Belsky D., Dickson N., Hancox R.J., Harrington H.L., Houts R., Poulton R., Roberts B.W., Ross S., Sears M.R., Thomson W.M., and Caspi A., A Gradient of Childhood Self-Control Predicts Health, Wealth, and Public Safety, *P National Acad. Sci.USA*, **108**, 2693-2698, (2011)
24. Rozentel A., and Carlbring P., Internet-Based Cognitive Behavior Therapy for Procrastination: Study Protocol for a Randomized Controlled Trial, *JMIR Res Protoc*, **2**, e46 (2013a)
25. Rozentel A. and Carlbring P., Understanding and treating procrastination: A review of a common self-regulatory failure, *Psychology*. **5**, 1488-1502 (2014b)
26. Pychyl T.A. and Flett G.L., Procrastination and self-regulatory failure: An introduction to the special issue, *J Rat-Emo Cognitive Behav Ther*, **30**, 203-212 (2012)