



Exploring of Academic Procrastination Among Students at University Level and Its Relationship with Their Academic Performance

Aleena Chaudhry

MS in Education, Department of Education
Foundation University, Rawalpindi Campus, Pakistan

Article History:

Received: 11-March-2017, Accepted: 18-May -2017

Abstract

The study was carried out with aim to explore the procrastination among students at university level and its relationship with the academic achievement of the students. By employing random sampling technique study was delimited to 150 students out of which 75 students were of undergraduates and 75 students were graduate. These students were selected from Foundation University, Rawalpindi, Pakistan. The study was conducted by employing two scales of uniformity "Procrastination Scale" and "Academic Achievement Scale" having validity .85 and reliability 0.83. procrastination Predisposition and academic performance level among students was explored with the help of statistics: on the other, procrastination keeping in view the degree level was checked by employing independent t-test. Moreover, to find out the procrastination and academic performance relationship; bivariate Pearson correlation „r“ was applied. The research explored that more than half of students are the victim of procrastination and among these the students of undergraduate level were more inclined towards procrastination at work on university level. Procrastination had a negative correlation with academic performance of students that depicts if procrastination get higher the academic performance decreases among students. Therefore, it is concluded that procrastination has a significant relationship with academics' performance of students. The study may be helpful for the university level stake holders to draw their attention on devastating phenomenon of procrastination and to work upon those areas that mediate and moderate the negative relationship between procrastination and academic performance of students.

Keywords: Academic Procrastination, Students, University, Academic Performance.

Introduction

Academic procrastination can be comprehended as the willful postponement of the fulfillment of a scholarly undertaking inside the normal or sought time span regardless of hoping to be more regrettable off for the deferral (Senécal et al. 1995; Steel 2007). It intends to put off, deferral, drag out, concede, slow down or delay playing out an assignment. procrastination is a typical conduct in contemporary social orders. It can likewise be portrayed as postponing the begin of an assignment that one inevitably means to finish until he or she encounters passionate distress about not having played out the movement before (Lay and Schouwenburg, 1993). Solomon and Rothblum (1984) defined procrastination as "the act of needlessly delaying tasks to the point of experiencing subjective discomfort." It is a tendency to put off, avoid or delay activities. It has also been characterized as "delaying task completion to the point of experiencing subjective discomfort" by (Ferrari, 1992) and "intentional delay of an intended course of action" by (Klassen, Krawchuk & Rajani, 2008).

It is not shocking that procrastination is firmly identified with inspiration factors, for example, self-viability for self-controlled adapting; a few specialists have conceptualized hesitation as a type of self-administrative disappointment (Chu

and Choi 2005; Steel 2007). In addition, as indicated by Zimmerman (1989, 1990), self-controlled learners show a high feeling of self-adequacy in their capacities, which impacts the information and aptitude objectives they set for themselves and their dedication to satisfy these difficulties. Conversely, non-self-managed learners may show low assignment tirelessness, exertion and premium, which look like behavioral attributes of delaying. In his exploration, Wolters (2003) looked to comprehend scholastic procrastination from a self-controlled learning point of view. In a progression of two reviews utilizing undergrad tests, he found that dawdling was emphatically and contrarily identified with self-viability, and to a lesser degree, the utilization of meta psychological systems. Zimmerman et al. (1992) additionally got self-viability for self-controlled figuring out how to be essentially connected with understudies' review objectives ($r=.30, p<.05$). Zimmerman et al. (1992) finding was in accordance with past research thinks about: the higher the apparent self-viability, the higher the objectives understudies set for themselves (Bandura and Wood 1989; Locke and Latham 1990). All things considered, there gives off an impression of being steady observational proof proposing a negative relationship between self-viability for self-controlled learning and procrastination.

It is realized that reviews on academic procrastination statistic contrasts are lacking in the writing; moreover, contemplates on the relationship of the timeframe for exams and lessons with academic procrastination are few. The normal discoveries of these reviews demonstrate that the propensity for considering lessons in the late hours and at last are identified with procrastination behavior. When it is viewed as that academic procrastination conduct is identified with not leaving deeds to the latest possible time and considering frequently, it might be normal that understudies who leave their scholarly assignments to the most recent day and an hour ago keep an eye on procrastination more.

Objectives

The study has an objective to explore the academic procrastination among students at University level and its relationship with their academic performance. In this study, the procrastination was treated as independent variable and academic performance was treated as dependent variable among whom the relationship was measure by the researcher.

Hypothesis

H₁: There is a significant relationship between academic procrastination and academic performance of university level students.

Material and Methods

Design of Research

Quantitative research design was used because the respondents were easily available.

Sample and sampling technique: The study was comprised of 150 randomly selected participants from undergraduate and graduate level courses (75 undergraduate and 75 graduate) who were involved in various discipline under the head of faculty of social sciences from Foundation University, Rawalpindi. The involvement of the students was high as the participation rate was almost 93 percent and the average age of students were range from 21 to 25 with standard deviation 2.05. Before going to the exploration and questions to students the aim of the study was explained to them and if they agreed to participate the researcher explored what she has in her tool. Participation of the students was purely on voluntary based. Participants' responses were anonymous. The questionnaire was in English and the communication for the questions between researcher and participants was in Urdu where the participant reluctant to give information or asked that what does it means.

Tools: Two scales (procrastination scale and academic performance) for the study have been developed by the researcher. A scale comprised of twenty questions having close ended questions each containing five categories to answer was procrastination scale designed for the students to collect data about the procrastination behavior of students. Secondly for the measurement of the Academic performance of the students a scale comprised of five questions having seven categories have been selected. Data Analysis

Delimitation of the Study: Study was delimited to 150 participants and further the study was categorized into undergraduate and graduate level students of university and due to time and resource constraints the study was further delimited to foundation university Rawalpindi and its social sciences faculty.

Analysis and Results

Exploration of facts on procrastination revealed the out of 150 participants, 65 (43.3%) were low procrastinator and 85 (57.7%) were high procrastinator. It revealed that majority students show procrastinate behavior for their work at university level.

Table 1: Procrastination level among university students

Levels of Procrastination	Frequency	Percentage
Low procrastination	65	43.3
High prevarication	85	57.7
Total	150	100

Table 2: Separation of procrastination behavior at course level

Course Level	Low procrastination		High procrastination		Total
	Frequency	Percentage	Frequency	Percentage	
Undergraduate	33	44	42	56	75 (50%)
Graduate	32	42.7	43	57.3	75 (50%)
Total	65	43.3	85	57.7	150 (100%)

Table 2 indicates the procrastination behavior among undergraduate and graduate level university students. Distribution of frequency indicates out of 75 undergraduate students 33 (44%) were low procrastinators and 42 (56%) were high procrastinators. While out of 75 graduate students 32 (42.7%) were low procrastinators and 43 (57.3%) were higher procrastinator.

Table 3: Difference in procrastination behavior on course level

Course Level	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		T-Test for Equality of Mean		
Undergraduate	75	1.4965	.49909	F	Sig.	T	df	Sig.
Postgraduate	75	1.4695	.49956	2.238	.169	.839	195	.578

Table 4 revealed about the Levene's test for equality of variance insignificant due to the fact that p is less than 0.05. So, by assuming the equal variance results reflected that on average undergraduate student among participants was showing higher procrastinate behavior ($M = 1.4965$, $SE = .49909$) to that of graduate students ($M = 1.4695$, $SE = .49956$). Nevertheless, there was insignificant difference between both level students at $(t=195) = .839$, $p > 0.05$. Hence, one can conclude that there was no significant difference between the means of two groups. Both undergraduate and graduate level students have equal tendency to procrastinate their work at university level.

Table 4: Degree of Students' Academic Achievement

Description	Frequency	Percentage
Extremely dissatisfied	5	3.3
Dissatisfied	21	14
Slightly dissatisfied	24	16
Neutral	7	4.7
Slightly satisfied	35	23.4
Satisfied	41	27.3
Extremely satisfied	17	11.3
Total	150	100

Table 4 indicated the level of students' academic performance, categorized into seven categories. Out of one fifty respondents table shows that 5 (3.3%) were extremely dissatisfied, 21 (14%) were dissatisfied, 24 (16%) were slightly dissatisfied, 7 (4.7%) were neutral, 35 (23.4%) were slightly satisfied, 41 (27.3%) were satisfied and 17 (11.3%) were extremely satisfied. Major portion of percentage falls in the category of "satisfied" that is 27.3%. If the scores on the three categories of "dissatisfaction" were combined it shows that 33.3% students were dissatisfied with their lives while the combination of the three categories of "satisfaction" indicates that 62.3% students were satisfied with their academic that are almost double of dissatisfaction categories. So, the results reflected that almost two third of the participants were satisfied with academic performance.

Table 5 explained the correlation between students' academic procrastination scores and their academic performance scores ($r = -0.210$, $p < 0.05$), which represented significant but negative weak correlation between the variables under study. Therefore, it was revealed that when procrastination increases the academic decreases or vice versa.

Table 5: Correlation Between Students' Academic Procrastination and Their Academic Performance

		Procrastination Scores	Academic Performance
Procrastination Scores	Pearson correlation	1	-0.210
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.023
	N	150	150
Academic Performance	Pearson correlation	-0.210	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.023	
	N	150	150

DISCUSSION

The study observed the relationship between procrastination and its relationship to academic performance of students at university level among undergraduate and graduate students. Findings from correlation indicated that academic performance was strongly and negatively related to procrastination.

Students who see themselves as fit for directing and organizing their own learning (or self-managed learners) would take part in procrastination to a substantially lesser degree than different students. Past research has likewise connected seen self-adequacy to students' exertion and steadiness while occupied with scholastic undertakings, and to their class execution (Bandura 1997; Pajares 1996). Furthermore, past work has demonstrated that students who show a shallower engagement in scholarly work and who are less steady may get bring down evaluations contrasted with different students (Meece and Holt 1993; Urdan 1997). Wolters (2003) concluded these discoveries by giving three reasons why students who have self-adequacy for self-controlled learning would have the capacity to successfully saddle their insight and deal with their learning. Initially, these people have information concerning intellectual systems, and when utilized fittingly, increment and improve understudies' learning. Second, these people have meta intellectual abilities and can viably screen and control essential parts of their learning conduct. Third, these people show versatile motivational convictions and dispositions and an introduction toward authority objectives. With great control of their own learning procedure, students may have the certainty to anticipate doing admirably scholastically. Past scenes of achievement after help may likewise add to students having more prominent trust in foreseeing that they would acquire a decent evaluation toward the finish of the scholarly year. All things considered, both self-viability for self-managed learning and help-chasing conjointly anticipated students desire of doing great scholastically. The study also concluded that when procrastination increases the academic decreases or vice versa.

Future Vision

Future studies could include behavioral indicators of procrastination so as to explore in a more comprehensive manner the relationship between motivational and learning strategies variables and procrastination. Finally, the present study used a

sample of undergraduates and graduates it would be helpful for further research to establish the generalizability of these findings to other student populations.

References

- Bandura, A., & Wood, R. E. (1989). The perceived controllability and performance standards on self-regulation of complex decision-making. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 805–814.
- Chu, A. H. C., & Choi, J. N. (2005). Rethinking procrastination: Positive effects of “active” procrastination behavior on attitudes and performance. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 145, 245–264.
- Ferrari, J. R. (1992). Procrastinators and perfect behavior: An exploratory factor analysis of self-presentation, self-awareness, and self-handicapping components. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 26, 75–84.
- Journal of Social Psychology*, 135, 607–619.
- Klassen, R. M., Krawchuk, L. L., & Rajani, S. (2008). Academic procrastination of undergraduates: low self-efficacy to self-regulate predicts higher levels of procrastination. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 33, 915–931.
- Lay, C. H., & Schouwenburg, H. C. (1993). Trait procrastination, time management, and academic behavior. *Journal of Social Behavior & Personality*, 8, 647–662.
- Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal-setting and task performance*. Englewood, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Meece, J., & Holt, K. (1993). A pattern analysis of students’ achievement goals. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 85, 582–590.
- Rothblum, E. D., Solomon, L. J., & Murakami, J. (1986). Affective, cognitive, and behavioral differences between high and low procrastinators. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 33(3), 387–394.
- self-regulatory failure. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133, 65–94.
- Senécal, C., Koestner, R., & Vallerand, R. J. (1995). Self-regulation and academic procrastination. The
- Steel, P. (2007). The nature of procrastination: A meta-analytic and theoretical review of quintessential
- Wolters, C. A. (2003). Understanding procrastination from a self-regulated learning perspective. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 95, 179–187.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1989). A social cognitive view of self-regulated learning. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 81, 329–339.
- Zimmerman, B. J. (1990). Self-regulating academic learning and achievement: The emergence of a social cognitive perspective. *Educational Psychology Review*, 2, 173–201.
- Zimmerman, B. J., Bandura, A., & Martinez-Pons, M. (1992). Self-motivation for academic attainment: The role of self-efficacy beliefs and personal goal-setting. *American Educational Research Journal*, 29, 663–676.