FACTORS INFLUENCING PROCRASTINATION AMONG MILLENNIALS AND ITS RELATION TO ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE

Dr. Maria Consuelo B. Santos[1] and Prof. Juan Carlos M. Reyes

Abstract

Procrastination poses a significant challenge to individuals' work attitudes and behaviors, subsequently impacting organizations and their constituents. This study examines the demographic characteristics influencing procrastination among selected employees within a higher education institution in Central Luzon, Philippines. Employing a descriptive-correlational design, the research employs an adapted questionnaire from McCkloskey (2011). Seventy individuals participated in the survey, utilizing convenience sampling. Findings reveal equal representation of administrative office and faculty respondents, aged 21-30, predominantly male, and single with 1-5 years of service. Respondents acknowledge frequent engagement in procrastination. Additionally, an indirect association between procrastination and civil status emerges. Regression analysis identifies age and civil status as significant predictors of procrastination. The study concludes that specific demographic profiles correlate with employee procrastination. Recommendations are provided to benefit both employees and the organization.

Introduction:

Efficiency and productivity in the workplace are crucial for organizational success, but the persistent challenge of employee procrastination poses a hindrance to achieving optimal outcomes. Procrastination not only impedes individual performance but also detrimentally affects organizational processes and service delivery. Khattak and Ilyas (2017) and McCkloskey (2011) have explored the causes and manifestations of procrastination, emphasizing its adverse impact on organizational functions. Despite attempts to mitigate procrastination, such as the interventions proposed by Richardson (2018) and Teng (2019), its prevalence persists in various work settings. While the study of workplace procrastination has gained attention, Uysal and Yilmaz (2020) shed light on the specific link between Hierarchical Career Plateau (HCP) and Workplace Procrastination (WP). In parallel, the

---

[1] College of Education, Arts and Sciences, Gordon College, Olongapo City, Philippines

work of Hen, Goroshit, and Viengarten (2021) highlighted personality-oriented procrastination types as predictors of procrastination at work. The multifaceted nature of procrastination is further evidenced by its negative correlation with performance (Klingsieck, 2013) and its association with internet addiction among millennials in the workplace (Kastiya and Sharma, 2020).

As technology shapes contemporary work environments, understanding the intricate dynamics of procrastination becomes imperative. This is underscored by the varying perspectives on procrastination's impact on workplace relationships, as seen in the studies by Metin et al. (2018), Lin et al. (2018), and the negative correlation found by van Eerde and Venus (2018) between procrastination and sleep quality. Procrastination also extends beyond the professional realm, as evidenced by its association with academic challenges among researchers in psychology (Vargas, 2017) and the need for interventions like Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT) to alleviate work procrastination (Salehi, 2020).

The study of procrastination encompasses diverse aspects, from leadership styles (Bala, Sood, & Singh, 2021) to its impact on burnout (Hall, Lee, & Rahimi, 2019) and the crucial role of inclusive leadership (Lin et al., 2018). The importance of self-efficacy in understanding procrastination is highlighted by Hicks and Storey (2015), while the concept of work characteristics influencing procrastination is explored by Prem et al. (2018). Additionally, the global phenomenon of procrastination is intertwined with personal aspects, as demonstrated by Ferrari and Landreth (2014) in rural settings.

Despite the wealth of international literature, the local perspective on employee procrastination in academic settings remains underexplored in the Philippines. Existing studies indirectly touch upon procrastination, either as part of research instruments or within the context of academic procrastination among students. The absence of dedicated research on the degree of procrastination among employees in an academic setting prompted the present study.

This research aims to fill the gap in the literature by examining the demographic profiles and extent of procrastination among employees in a higher education institution. By exploring the relationship between these variables and identifying predictors of procrastination, this study seeks to contribute valuable insights to both employees and the organization. The research hypotheses guide this investigation, questioning the significance of demographic profiles in relation to employee procrastination. Ultimately, the study aspires to provide practical recommendations for improving organizational relationships and enhancing productivity within the academic setting.

Literature Review:

Procrastination, a global phenomenon affecting organizations, defies a singular characterization. Uyar (2019) offers contrasting definitions, highlighting the diversity of its causes and pervasiveness (Dutta & Truax, 2018; Sarirah & Chaq, 2019). This phenomenon intersects with various human resource concepts, with Chauhan et al. (2020) suggesting that procrastination can be both dysfunctional and strategically valuable.

Recent studies present diverse perspectives on the reasons behind procrastination. Hen (2018) identifies professional role, ambiguity, and situational determinants as primary instigators. Self-control and conscientiousness emerge as significant predictors in the study by Alblwi et al. (2021). Management styles also play a role, as Bala, Sood, and Singh (2021) reveal that management by exemption passive and Laissez-Faire leadership impact perceived procrastination among leaders. Gender differences are evident, with female employees exhibiting a greater inclination towards procrastination (Ahmad & Hussain, 2020). Siedlecki (2020) identifies causes and remedies for workplace procrastination, emphasizing the deleterious effects of abusive supervision (Hen et al., 2021). Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT) present a promising intervention for reducing work procrastination among university employees (Salehi, 2020).

Hicks and Storey (2015) associate self-efficacy with both passive and active procrastination, while work characteristics influence workplace procrastination through cognitive appraisal and self-regulation (Prem et al., 2018). Inclusive leadership impacts employee procrastination positively (Lin et al., 2018), contrasting with the

negative relationship found between transformational leadership, organizational citizenship, and workplace procrastination (Metin et al., 2018). Hall, Lee, and Rahimi (2019) establish a connection between procrastination and burnout, further complicated by the negative correlation with sleep quality (van Eerde & Venus, 2018). Procrastination extends beyond the workplace to personal aspects, as Ferrari and Landreth (2014) highlight rural procrastinators' challenges in home, family, and work settings. Pearlman-Avnion and Zibenberg (2018) reveal an association between workplace procrastination, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism. Cadena et al. (2011) experiment with interventions to combat procrastination, resulting in improved worker satisfaction and reduced stress levels. Vargas (2017) notes academic procrastination among researchers in psychology.

Efforts to reduce or prevent procrastination are explored by Teng (2019), who devises an application for this purpose, and Richardson (2018), who advocates for balanced scheduling. Metin et al. (2018) stress the importance of a suitable fit between employment settings and employees. In the local context, limited literature indirectly discusses employee procrastination, either as part of research instruments or within the context of academic procrastination among students. The dearth of dedicated studies on employee procrastination in academic settings in the Philippines underscores the need for the present research.

The complexity of procrastination's impact on employees and organizations is evident in the contrasting perspectives within the literature. Procrastination is neither uniformly beneficial nor detrimental, and its correlation with various demographic profiles adds another layer of complexity. Despite the extensive international literature, the local perspective on employee procrastination in academic settings remains underexplored in the Philippines, presenting an opportunity for this study to contribute baseline information for future research in this field.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

This study used a descriptive-correlational research design with the survey questionnaire as the principal instrument in gathering valuable data. According to Siedlecki (2020) the purpose of descriptive research is for the researcher to describe a sample and/or variable. On the other hand, Lau (2017) wrote that a correlational study defines a set of variables then examines the hypothesized relations among the variables. Since this study is concerned with analysis of the employee's demographic profile and procrastination level and at the same time, examine any existing relationships, the said research design is suitable. The researchers would like to describe the phenomena to generate substantial information regarding the topic thus, a descriptive method is suitable for the job.

Respondents

In this study, the researchers considered the population of a local higher education institution which provides job to more than 100 administrative staffs and employees. The study used the convenience sampling technique to gather respondents. Convenience sampling technique is a non-probability method which is widely used and applicable. It is also quick, inexpensive and convenient (Elfil & Negida, 2017). In addition, Etikan, Musa, and Alkassim (2016) discussed further that convenience sampling is a nonrandom selection of respondents which is researcher dependent in choosing subjects for the study. Since both the researchers work in the same institution, using convenience sampling is practical because it is quick, inexpensive and very convenient. 70 respondents took part in the survey out of the more than 100 survey questionnaires distributed. This number is sufficient because a good maximum sample size is usually 10% of the estimated population. Some respondents failed to return the survey questionnaires due to business, not interested to participate, forgot to return, lost the survey questionnaires, and many more. Inclusion criteria for the survey: the respondent should be a bona fide employee from the higher education institution in Central Luzon, Philippines. He or she should be a regular, casual, or contract of service in terms of employment status. And also, he or she should be working in the institution for at least a year before the administration of the survey.

Research Instrument

The study adapted and modified the General Procrastination Scale of McCkloskey (2011) which comprises 20 statements. The instrument underwent reliability and validity tests using Cronbach Alpha and the overall result of the reliability test was .81, which is better than the .70 benchmark score. The researcher also pretested the instrument to students who were not part of the study to test its accuracy and understandability of the items before the actual survey. Before administration, the researchers secured the consent of all the respondents for ethical consideration and confidentiality.

Data Analysis

In this study, the researchers used frequency and percentage for the demographic profile, mean for the procrastination of employees, Pearson-r for the relationship among the variables of the study, and Regression Analysis for the determinants of procrastination and productivity. Using Microsoft Excel, the researcher tallied, tabulated, and classified the gathered data. On the other hand, SPSS 20 analyzed and interpreted further the data of the study. The researcher also patterned the values assigned to describe the procrastination of the employees after a Likert Scale.

RESULTS

Since the purpose of the study is to determine the demographic profile and procrastination of the employees, the following tables indicate the organized, tabulated and computed data of the current study. The presentation also includes statistical inferences for the relationship and predictors of the study.

Table 1 *Demographic Profile of the Respondents*

	Frequency	Percentage
Department Administration	35	50
Faculty	35	50
Age		
21-30 years old	29	41
31-40 years old	15	21
41-50 years old	17	24
51 years and above	9	14
Sex Male	41	59
Female	29	41
Civil Status		
Single	42	60
Married	24	34
Others	4	6
Years in Service		
1-5 years	51	73
6-10 years	11	16
11 and above	8	11
Total	70	100

Table 1 shows the demographic profile of the respondents of the study. On the first item, the administrative personnel and the faculty have an equal number of respondents. On the second item, employees who belonged to the age bracket 21-30 years old dominated the other brackets. For the third item, the male-dominated female. For the fourth item, there are more single respondents than the married respondents and another status of civility. The last item considered, most of the respondents having 1-5 years of service in the institution. As presented in the table. This is a typical description of employees working in a tertiary education institution.

Table 2 *Procrastination Level of the Respondents*

Statement	Mean	Interpretation
I often find myself performing tasks that I had intended to do days before.	3.00	Often
I intend to do a task until just before they are to be handed in.	2.86	Often
When I am finished with a library book, I return it right away regardless of the date it's due.	3.06	Often
When it is time to get up in the morning I most often get right out of bed.	3.00	Often
A letter may sit for days after I write it before mailing it.	2.30	Sometimes
I generally return phone calls promptly.	2.89	Often
Even with jobs that require little else except sitting down and doing them, I find they seldom get done for days.	2.56	Often
I usually make decisions as soon as possible.	3.17	Often
I generally delay before starting on work I have to do.	2.29	Sometimes
I usually have to rush to complete a task on time.	2.44	Sometimes
When preparing to go out, I am seldom caught having to do something at the last minute.	2.40	Sometimes
In preparing for some deadlines, I often waste time by doing other things.	2.27	Sometimes
I prefer to leave early for an appointment.	2.86	Often
I usually start a job shortly after it is assigned.	2.81	Often
I often have a duty finished sooner than necessary.	2.84	Often
I always seem to end up shopping for birthday or Christmas gifts at the last minute.	2.53	Often
I usually buy even an essential item at the last minute.	2.47	Sometimes
I usually accomplish all the things I plan to do in a day.	2.96	Often
I am continually saying "I'll do it tomorrow".	2.20	Sometimes
I usually take care of all the tasks I have to do before I settle down and relax for the evening.	3.17	Often
Over-all Mean	2.70	Often

Legend: 1.00-1.49 = Seldom; 1.50-2.49 = Sometimes; 2.50-3.49 = Often; 3.50-4.00 = Always

Table 2 above shows the prevalence of procrastination among the respondents. As observed, statements number 8 and 20 got the highest mean score of 3.17 that has a corresponding interpretation of "often" on the Likert scale. Statement number 19 got the lowest mean score with 2.18, which means "sometimes" in the Likert Scale. The overall mean score is 2.70 and interpreted as "often" on the Likert scale. This only shows that the employees are guilty of procrastinating in their work.

Table 3 *Correlation Matrix Between the Demographic Profile of the Respondents and Procrastination*

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1) Department	1					
2) Age	-.503* (.000)	1				
3) Sex	.203 (.092)	-.147 (.223)	1			
4) Civil Status	-.475* (.000)	.557* (.000)	-.012 (.919)	1		
5) Years in Service	-.147 (.226)	.304* (.010)	.035 (.776)	.336* (.004)	1	
6) Procrastination	.069 (.572)	.075 (.535)	-.157 (.196)	-.240* (.045)	-.007 (.953)	1

$p < .05$

Table 3 shows the relationships between the respondents' demographic profile, procrastination, and productivity. As seen from the table, the civil status provided evidence of a low-indirect relationship with procrastination ($r = .240$, $p = .045$). This could mean that being single, married, or other forms of civility can somehow influence the practice of procrastination. However, other demographic profiles did not yield a significant result for a correlation with procrastination since the r-values for the department (.069), age (.075), sex (-.157), and years in service (-.007) are not enough to show substantial findings.

Table 4 *Regression Analysis on the Demographic Profile Predictor for the Procrastination of Employees*

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients	Standardized Coefficients	t-value	p-value
Beta				
(Constant)	2.903	.310	9.367	.000
Department	.056 .120	.065	0.462	.646
Age	.122 .060	.308	2.020	.048*
Sex	-.114 .104	-.131	-1.9097	.277
Civil Status	-.287 .107	-.405	-2.675	.009*
Years in Service	.031 .078	.049	0.395	.694

Note: Constant = 2.903, F (5, 64) = 2.169, $p > .05$, $R^2 = .145$

Table 4 presents the descriptive statistics and analysis results of the regression analysis on procrastination and its potential demographic profile predictor. The researchers claim that civil status and age yielded B coefficients lower than the Alpha significance level of the set at .05. This means that civil status and age is a substantial predictor for the procrastination among employees.

The multiple regression model with all the five predictors produced $R^2 = .145$, $F(5, 64) = 2.169$, $p < .05$. As seen from the table, civil status produced a negative regression weight, showing that if you are single, there is a higher tendency to procrastinate. On the other hand, if you are married, the lesser the tendency to procrastinate because you have other significant individuals besides yourself that will take your time, efforts, and other resources. Age yielded a positive weight which entails that as an individual's age progress, so does the procrastinating. This is because the familiarity of the surrounding environment and work becomes a routine. Conversely, the younger the individual, the lesser the tendency to procrastinate because of their active behavior and eagerness to work. Other factors like department, sex, and years in service also correlated, but not to a significant extent statistically speaking. This is due to the result of their t- values and probability values which are higher than the benchmark score of Alpha .05 level of significance. This means that the demographic profiles, department, sex, and years in service also account for the prevalence of procrastination among the employees but not that remarkable.

DISCUSSION

The principal purpose of this study is to analyze the demographic profile and procrastination of employees from a higher education institution in Central Luzon, Philippines. The study also identified the relationships between the two variables and the predictors of procrastination of the employees.

As observed from the result of the survey, employees procrastinate in the workplace parallel to the concluding ideas of Wilson and Nguyen (2012) in their overview of procrastination regarding its presence and its implications. Zabelina, Chestyunina, Trushina, and Vedeneyeva (2018) also showed that test subjects with top procrastination rates are pessimistic and negative about past events. The result of the productivity survey confirms a positive review in which the results are in congruence with the ideas of Abbasi and Alghamdi (2015), procrastination is unavoidable and people suffer at changing degrees with adverse consequences. In relation, Kovacs et al. (2019) introduced that productivity behavior change systems help us decrease our time on unproductive activities.

The present study also subjected the data through statistical analysis and found some remarkable results. A deeper insight into the study includes the determining of the relationships among the demographic profile and procrastination of employees, and the current study provided substantial results. A relationship existed between the two variables. Related literature like Beutel et al. (2016) found out that procrastination is related to unemployment, which supports the study's result; Nomura and Ferrari (2018) also justified that being single is related to delaying tasks. However, Çetin and Kumkale (2017) showed that they found a negative relationship between procrastination and task performance. Further, Pearlman-Avnion and Zibenberg (2018) stated that personality traits and workplace procrastination are unstable.

In determining whether the demographic profiles of the respondents affect the procrastination of the employees, the current study also yielded significant findings. The results, however, argued with the perspective of Zabelina et al. (2018) wherein they posited that negative attitude, fatalistic perception, and lack of orientation predicts procrastination. Also, in the experiment of Kovacs et al. (2019) they found a reduction in procrastination with the use of behavioral modification techniques and technology. Furthermore, Balkis and Duru (2019) showed the mediating effects of fear between self-doubt and procrastination. On the part of productivity, a study by Zabelina et al. (2018) found that time management has an inverse relationship with productivity in an organization and Kovacs et al. (2019) emphasized behavior change designers target individual productivity goals.

CONCLUSION

Based on the data and information gathered and treated, the researcher, therefore, concluded that: the respondents are from the administrative personnel and faculty; they are aged between 21-30 years, there are more males than females; most are still single, with 1-5 years in service. In terms of procrastination, the respondents revealed an over-all mean which is interpreted as often" in the Likert Scale. Civil status produced a significant result in procrastination. There is evidence of the relationship between civil status and procrastination. To predict the occurring procrastination, we considered age and civil status as positive and negative determinants of procrastination of the employees.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the information that was generated from the study, the researcher suggested the following implications for the study. The institution should explore and understand procrastination behavioral patterns and devise effective management methods to reduce their negative effects on the employees lives and work habits. It is also suggested to organize seminars, workshops, and training programs to reduce academic and personnel procrastination and increase the productivity of employees from time to time. The institution should also explore the possibility of shortening the working days in a week and longer working hours for the day to provide a longer time for rest and leisure. Another suggestion could work in a flexible time (flexi-time) if some faculty members or personnel can avail or intend to use it. Devise a method or policy of monitoring procrastination in the workplace and managing the negative effects and turning it into opportunity. The administration should also promote

organizational commitment, trust, and loyalty since every employee is guided by the organization's vision, mission, and goals. There should also be a plausible reward/ incentive system so that faculty and personnel can enjoy and see their significance in the organization. Last, future studies may also explore other potential roles of procrastination to the productivity of personnel.

Just like other studies, this one is no exception for its limitations. The first limitation of this study is the setting since it is only done in just one particular institution; it is highly advisable to do it in several academic institutions in a broader perspective. Second, the respondents, since the study was done in a brief amount of time, the number of respondents was not met. Some respondents did not return the survey because of their busy schedules and workload. Last, the method, it is suggested to triangulate the quantitative results with qualitative remarks of other respondents to strengthen the result of the study. Therefore, a mixed form of research design is suggested.

REFERENCES

Abbasi, I. S., & Alghamdi, N. G. (2015). The prevalence, predictors, causes, treatment, and implications of procrastination behaviors in general, academic, and work setting. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, *7*(1), 59–66. doi:https://doi.org/10.5539/ijps.v7n1p59

Ahmad, Z., & Hussain, M. M. (2020). Can gender moderate the relationship of mindfulness, procrastination and job performance among telecom employees? *Review of Economics and Development Studies*, *6*(3), 557–566. doi:https://doi.org/10.47067/reads.v6i3.246

Akbarnejhad, H., & Ghahari, S. (2017). Relationship between spirituality-based lifestyle and procrastination among employed women in iran. *Biology and Medicine*, *9*(1), 1-12.

Alblwi, A., McAlaney, J., Al Thani, D. A. S., Phalp, K., & Ali, R. (2021). Procrastination on social media: predictors of types, triggers and acceptance of countermeasures. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, *11*(1), 1–18.

Anuran, A., Buenviaje, M. G., Encio, H. A., & Refozar, R. F. G. (2016). Academic performance and application level of acquired learning and student outcomes from MBA courses towards the attainment of personal growth. *Asia Pacific Journal of Academic Research in Social Sciences*, *1*, 30–44.

Bacong, C. I. M., & Encio, H. A. (2017). Effect of employee relation to job performance in engineering, construction and manufacturing company. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education, Arts and Sciences*, *4*(2), 103–111.

Bala, R., Sood, S., & Singh, S. (2021). Passive leadership styles and perceived procrastination in leaders: A PLS-SEM approach. *World Review of Entrepreneurship, Management and Sustainable Development*, *17*(1), 20-28. doi:https://doi.org/10.1504/wremsd.2021.10034244

Balkis, M., & Duru, E. (2019). Procrastination and rational/irrational beliefs: A moderated mediation model. *Journal of Rational-Emotive & Cognitive-Behavior Therapy*, *37*(3), 299–315. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/s10942-019-00314-6

Beutel, M. E., Klein, E. M., Aufenanger, S., Brähler, E., Dreier, M., Müller, K. W., ... Stark, B. (2016). Procrastination, distress and life satisfaction across the age range–a german representative community study. *PloS one*, *11*(2), 14-18. doi:https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0148054

Cadena, X., Schoar, A., Cristea, A., & Delgado-Medrano, H. M. (2011). *Fighting procrastination in the workplace: An experiment* (Tech. Rep.). Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Çetin, O. I., & Kumkale, ˙I. (2017). The relation between procrastination and task performance. *Journal of Current Researches on Business and Economics*, *7*(2), 193–206. doi:https://doi.org/10.26579/jocrebe-7.2.11

Chauhan, R. S., MacDougall, A. E., Buckley, M. R., Howe, D. C., Crisostomo, M. E., & Zeni, T. (2020). Better late than early? Reviewing procrastination in organizations. *Management Research Review*, *43*(10), 1289-1308. doi:https://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-09-2019-0413

De Castro, E. L., Prenda, M. T. B., Laguador, J. M., & Pesigan, M. (2015). Mental ability, work behavior and trait survey of high and low performing first year computer engineering students. *Asian Journal of Educational Research*, *3*(4), 1-9.

Dutta, R., & Truax, J. (2018). How pervasive are procrastination and delay behaviors in young adults and what is the role of perceived parenting? *North American Journal of Psychology*, *20*(2), 355-382.

Elfil, M., & Negida, A. (2017). Sampling methods in clinical research; An educational review. *Emergency*, *5*(1), e52-e54.

Etikan, I., Musa, S., & Alkassim, R. (2016). Comparison of convenience sampling and purposive sampling. *American Journal of Theoretical and Applied Statistics*, *5*(1), 1-4. doi:https://doi.org/10.11648/j.ajtas.20160501.11

Ferrari, J. R., & Landreth, N. (2014). "Guess I am a procrastinator": Self and other perceptions among rural US citizens. *North American Journal of Psychology*, *16*(1), 1-10.

Fuertes, M. C. M., Jose, B. M. D., Nem Singh, M. A. A., Rubio, P. E. P., & de Guzman, A. B. (2020). The moderating effects of information overload and academic procrastination on the information avoidance behavior among Filipino undergraduate thesis writers. *Journal of Librarianship and Information Science*, *52*(3), 694–712. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/0961000619871608

Hall, N. C., Lee, S. Y., & Rahimi, S. (2019). Self-efficacy, procrastination, and burnout in post-secondary faculty: An international longitudinal analysis. *PloS One*, *14*(12), 16-26. doi:https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0226716

Hen, M. (2018). Causes for procrastination in a unique educational workplace. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, *46*(3), 215–227. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/10852352.2018.1470144

Hen, M., Goroshit, M., & Viengarten, S. (2021). How decisional and general procrastination relate to procrastination at work: An investigation of office and non-office workers. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *172*, 1-6. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110581

Hicks, R. E., & Storey, J. (2015). Can procrastination be effective? A study of white-collar employees and university students. *International Journal of Business Research*, *15*(1), 39–48. doi:https://doi.org/10.18374/IJBR-15-1.4

Kastiya, S., & Sharma, A. (2020). Impact of internet addiction on workplace procrastination: An empirical study on millennial employees. *Prabandhan: Indian Journal of Management*, *13*(1), 45–58. doi:https://doi.org/10.17010/ pijom/2020/v13i1/149947

Khattak, A. N., & Ilyas, M. (2017). Task procrastination: Overcoming through re-establishment of psychological association. *Journal of Business Strategies*, *11*(2), 73–88.

Klingsieck, K. B. (2013). Procrastination: When good things dont come to those who wait. *European Psychologist*, *8*(1), 2434. doi:https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000138

Kovacs, G., Gregory, D. M., Ma, Z., Wu, Z., Emami, G., Ray, J., & Bernstein, M. S. (2019). Conservation of procrastination: Do productivity interventions save time or just redistribute it? In *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems,* New York, NY (pp. 1–12).

Kühnel, J., Sonnentag, S., Bledow, R., & Melchers, K. G. (2018). The relevance of sleep and circadian misalignment for procrastination among shift workers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *91*(1), 110–133. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12191

Lau, F. (2017). Methods for correlational studies. In *Handbook of ehealth evaluation: An evidence-based approach [internet].* Victoria, Canada: University of Victoria.

Legood, A., Lee, A., Schwarz, G., & Newman, A. (2018). From self-defeating to other defeating: Examining the effects of leader procrastination on follower work outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *91*(2), 430–439. doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12205

Lin, H., et al. (2018). The effect of inclusive leadership on employees procrastination. *Psychology*, *9*(4), 714-720. doi:https://doi.org/10.4236/psych.2018.94045

Mariano, A. B. C., & Janio, R. V. (2018). Above and beyond: A look at library clients past regular hours. *PAARL Research Journal*, *5*(98-111), 98-106.

McCkloskey, J. D. (2011). *Finally, my thesis on academic procrastination* (Tech. Rep.). The University of Texas, Austin, TX.

Metin, U. B., Peeters, M. C., & Taris, T. W. (2018). Correlates of procrastination and performance at work: The role of having good fit. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, *46*(3), 228–244. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/10852352.2018.1470187

Nartea, M., Gabriel, M., Samala, H. R., & Javier, R. (2020). Millenials procrastination: Factors and its relation to academic performance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, *8*(3), 107-114.

Nomura, M., & Ferrari, J. R. (2018). Factor structure of a japanese version of the adult inventory of procrastination scale: Delay is not culture specifics. *North American Journal of Psychology*, *20*(1), 223-238.

Pearlman-Avnion, S., & Zibenberg, A. (2018). Prediction and job-related outcomes of procrastination in the workplace. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, *46*(3), 263–278. doi:https://doi.org/10.1080/10852352.2018.1470418

Prem, R., Scheel, T. E., Weigelt, O., Hoffmann, K., & Korunka, C. (2018). Procrastination in daily working life: A diary study on within-person processes that link work characteristics to workplace procrastination. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*, 10-11. doi:https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01087

Richardson, A. (2018). Balanced scheduling to reduce procrastination. *Student Research Proceedings*, *3*(1), 1-10.

Salehi, R. (2020). Effect of ACT on work procrastination and work performance. *Preventive Counseling*, *1*(1), 33-46.

Sarirah, T., & Chaq, S. A. (2019). Academic self-efficacy as a predictor toward decisional procrastination among college students preparing a thesis in Indonesia. *Journal of Advanced Research in Social Sciences and Humanities*, *4*(1), 23-28. doi:https://doi.org/10.26500/jarssh-04-2019-0104

Siedlecki, S. L. (2020). Understanding descriptive research designs and methods. *Clinical Nurse Specialist*, *34*(1), 8–12. doi:https://doi.org/10.1097/nur.0000000000000493

Teng, F. (2019). Devising an application to decrease procrastination. *Journal of Computers*, *14*(3), 152–160. doi:https://doi.org/10.17706/jcp.14.3.152-160

Uyar, S. (2019). Delaying behavior in institutions: Procrastination. *Journal of Academic Perspective on Social Studies*, *1*, 40–43. doi:https://doi.org/10.35344/japss.529729

Uysal, H. T., & Yilmaz, F. (2020). Procrastination in the workplace: The role of hierarchical career plateau. *Upravlenets*, *11*(3), 82–101. doi:https://doi.org/10.29141/2218-5003-2020-11-3-7

van Eerde, W., & Venus, M. (2018). A daily diary study on sleep quality and procrastination at work: The moderating role of trait self-control. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*, 20-29. doi:https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02029

Vargas, M. A. P. (2017). Academic procrastination: The case of mexican researchers in psychology. *American Journal of Education and Learning*, *2*(2), 103–120. doi:https://doi.org/10.20448/804.2.2.103.120

Wilson, B. A., & Nguyen, T. D. (2012). Belonging to tomorrow: An overview of procrastination. *International Journal of Psychological Studies*, *4*(1), 211-217. doi:https://doi.org/10.5539/ijps.v4n1p211

Zabelina, E., Chestyunina, Y., Trushina, I., & Vedeneyeva, E. (2018). Time perspective as a predictor of procrastination. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *238*, 87–93. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2018.03.011