Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research, 2022, Vol. 37, No. 1, 79-97

https://doi.org/10.33824/PJPR.2022.37.1.05

Procrastination Behavior and Self-efficacy Among Students: A Mixed Method Study

Bushra Bibi, Saliha Shabir, Noreena Kausar and Bushra Akram

University of Gujrat

The present research examined procrastination behavior and self-efficacy among postgraduate students by using mixed method research in two studies. Objective of this research was to measure procrastination, self-efficacy and further to explore the factors behind these behaviours through quantitative and qualitative research, respectively. For study-I, in quantitative research, sample of 282 students was selected by using stratified random sampling technique. To measure procrastination "Procrastination Scale" for student population (Lay, 1986) and for Self-efficacy "General Self-efficacy Scale" (Schwarzer & Jerusalem, 1995) were used. Descriptive statistics, correlation analysis and Chi-square were used to analyse the data. Results indicated that there is a significant negative correlation between procrastination behavior and self-efficacy. The level of procrastination was found at non-clinical level 5(1.5%), sub-clinical level 165(68.5%), clinical level 110(39.0) and 2(0.7%) reported the need to seek clinical attention. Findings of chi-square illustrate no association of procrastination with demographic of age, faculty and GPA. In study-II, through qualitative approach, a focus group discussion was conducted with eight participants. Data were recorded by a tape recorder which was transcribed and analysed by using thematic analysis. Results revealed four themes from qualitative discussion; 1) description of procrastination behavior, 2) casual and precipitating factors, 3) impact on life and 4) strategies to overcome/reduce procrastination behavior. Through the findings of both studies, it can be concluded that procrastination behaviour is prevalent among students and there is a need to implement strategies to reduce this behaviour.

Keyword. Procrastination, self-efficacy, students" behvaiour

Procrastination has become very common in student life that effect greatly on their daily and academic life. This behavior found as

Bushra Bibi, Saliha Shabir, Noreena Kausar, and Bushra Akram, Department of Psychology, University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Pakistan.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Noreena Kausar, Department of Psychology, University of Gujrat, Gujrat, Pakistan. Email: noreena.kausar@uog.edu.pk

a great block in people‟s life, due to it peoples find difficult to complete task, which resulted to more rejection in important work. Certain problems in people life aroused due to procrastination behavior. Almost every student became habituated to procrastinate in our society by delaying important academic work, assignment given from teachers and other activities that are compulsory to be done in their academics. In college setting academic procrastination is very common which is considering as intentional delay and problem in initiating and finishing a significant theoretical work (schouwenburg, 2004; Ziesat, Rosenthal & White, 1978). Academic procrastination by Steel (2007) is well-defined as "to voluntarily delay an intended course of action despite expecting to be worse-off for the delay," (p.66). Academic procrastination also occurs due to psychological pain in college and university students which are consider as maladaptive and persistent behaviour (Solomon & Rothblum, 1984). Chronic academic procrastination leads too many external consequences such as conceded performance, low learning and progress level, health problems and anxious relationship (Beswick, Rothblum, & Mann, 1988; Burka & Yuen, 1983; Moon & Illingworth, 2005; Tice & Baumeister, 1997).

Self-efficacy is defined as capability to observe a precise situation then we reply to this condition in batter way. Conferring to Bandura (1986) "Perceived self-efficacy is defined as; people‟s judgments of their capabilities to organize and executive courses of action required attaining designated types of performances" (P.391). Peoples who have low level of self-efficacy revenue assignment very difficult those consequences as depression, sickness and inadequate problem solving (Pajares, 2002). Students who persuaded to involve in difficult task, show greater effort, remain confident in their capabilities whereas those who have little self-efficacy tried to escape tasks by setting easy and manageable goals (Wäschle, Allgaier, Lachner, Fink, & Nückles, 2014). A relationship between procrastination and self-efficacy is better explained by self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1997) which reveals that our tasks, choices, effort and determinations are greatly influenced when a person believed on his/her own abilities to perform it in effective way. Ziegler and Opdenakker (2018) conducted a research on academic procrastination that was completed on secondary education students of 1st year class to understand its connection with predictors of meta-cognitive self-regulation, self-efficacy and effort regulation. Study demonstrated that effort regulation had solidest association with procrastination, whereas it demonstrates negative association with other predictors. Further, Afzal and Jami (2018) reported procrastination behaviour prevails

among students despite of their level of education. Not only undergraduate but even the students at graduate programs also indulge in procrastination. Lukas and Berking (2018) had done a research to find treatment for procrastination behavior by using a randomized control pilot study. For reduction of procrastination, a treatment that centres on a smartphone was best. Better decrease of procrastination was ended by means of a smart phone base treatment, relatively than contributing in control state. Grund and Fries (2018) understand procrastination by using a "motivational approach" wherein it was understood as a „self-regulatory failure". They examine that those peoples who show high achievement they possess procrastination less and students with greater achievement level prime to be higher procrastination. Most people found to be procrastinator generally that owed to low self-determination, which led to be less completion of daily task.

In short, procrastination found to be an extensive phenomenon that put a negative influence on student learning, quality of life and self-efficacy. Its prevalence also highlighted the need to examine and explore this area in postgraduate students particularly. Further the factors behind the procrastination behaviour also need to explore as this will be helpful to reduce this behaviour for more academic and life success as a student and in life as general. Keeping in view the prevalence of procrastination behaviour among student, current study was designed. It focused on students from three faculties at Public Sector University in Gujrat.

Hypotheses

Different hypothesis would be tested on further research that evident based on literature:

1. There would be a negative relationship between procrastination behavior and self-efficacy among students.
2. There will be no association among procrastination level and participants" age, faculty of study and GPA.

Method

A mixed method research consisted of (one qualitative & one quantitative research section) design was used in this study to examine procrastination behavior and self-efficacy among students. Quantitative research was done by using cross-sectional research, as well as focus group interview was applied on participants for collecting qualitative research. A basic assumption of this method is

helpful for considering a research problem by mixture of both quantitative and qualitative methods (Creswell, 2017). Focus on procrastination behavior and self-efficacy is becoming very common in Pakistan but following research is unique because it is applied on three faculties with different departments. Mixed method study also makes it unique from previous research.

Study I: Quantitative Research

Sample

In this phase, the sample (n = 282) include 48 male and 234 female students. Students were selected from three faculties which are Social Science (Economics, Education, Political Science & Psychology), Pure Science (Physics, Botany, Chemistry & Math) and Arts (English, Translation studies, Islamic studies, & Mass communication) by using a stratified- random sampling technique. At first stage each faculty was taken as stratum and at second stage, each department was taken as stratum. Based on equal allocation, sample of 94 students were selected from each stratum.

Inclusion/Exclusion criteria

In this study research students (MPhil & PhD) of University of Gujrat were included from faculty of Social Science, Pure Science and Arts. Students who have some physical or psychological problem were excluded from the study.

Measures

Procrastination Scale

To measure procrastination, Procrastination scale for student population developed by Lay (1986) was used. This scale consists of 20 items. Out of twenty, 10 items have reversed scoring. It mainly focuses on implemental delay, e.g. “Even jobs that require little else except sitting down and doing them, I find that they seldom get done for days”. Its scale Cronbach‟s alpha reliability is .82. According to Cronbach‟s alpha coefficient of 20-items, scale reliability is 0.82. Median split was used by Lay that describe procrastination among people low to high level. Its test-retest reliability is 0.80 (lay, 1986). In the current study, students were divided into two groups: Non-Procrastinators (scores ranges from 20-60) and Procrastinators (scores ranges from 61-100).

General Self-efficacy Scale

In present study a general self-efficacy scale, developed by Schwarzer and Jerusalem (1995) was used. It is a self-reported measure with 10-items. Its reliability is .80 through correlation and its standard reliability ranges from 0.5 to 0.9. Its internal consistency is .76 to .90.

Procedure

For the data collection, permission was taken from the relevant authority. Total 282 students were participated from 4 departments in each faculty. After obtaining the consent from the participants, data were collected through demographic form, Procrastination scale and General Self-efficacy scale in English language. After that participant's contribution was acknowledged with thanks. Finally, results were concluded on IBM-21.

Results

Descriptive analysis was done to find the frequency and percentage of every variable with sample of 282 by making categories of Procrastination behavior. Spearman Correlation coefficient was used to find the relationship between procrastination behavior and self-efficacy. Then Chai-square was applied on data to find percentage of procrastination behavior among students in respect to faculty, GPA and age by using SPSS 2.10.

Table 1

Procrastination Levels Among Students (N = 282)

Variable	***f***	**(%)**
Non-clinical		
20-40	5	1.8
Sub-clinical		
41-60	165	58.5
Clinical		
61-80	110	39.0
Need severely Clinical Attention		
81-100	2	0.7

Table 1 indicated 1.8% students with non-clinical procrastination level, 58.6% students with sub-clinical procrastination behavior, 39.0% students with clinical procrastination behavior and 0.7% students had the procrastination at the level where they need serious clinical attention.

Table 2

Correlation Between Procrastination Behavior and General Self-Efficacy Among Students (N =282)

Variables	General Self-efficacy
Procrastination	-.165**

Table 2 showed rank correlation between procrastination behavior and self-efficacy among students. It depicted a significant negative correlation between general self-efficacy and procrastination (0.006, $p < 0.001$) among university students.

Table 3

Procrastination Levels with Respect to Participants' Age (N = 282)

	Levels of Procrastination		
Age	Non-procrastinator	Procrastinator	Total
20-23	89.7% (92)	57.3% (55)	147% (147)
24-0wnward	82.3% (80)	52.7% (55)	135% (135)
Column total	172.0% (172)	110.0% (110)	100% (282)

$p < .0005$.

Chi-square test indicated an association between participants‟ age and levels of procrastination, χ^2 (1, n = 282) =.327, $p < .0005$, $p = .567$ (large effect). It indicated a non-significant association between age and procrastination. This means that proportion of procrastination in both age groups is different.

Table 4

Procrastination Levels with Respect to Participants' Faculty (N =282)

	Levels of Procrastination		
Faculty	Non-procrastinator	Procrastinator	Row Total
Social-Science	57.3% (59)	36.7% (35)	94% (94)
Pure Science	57.3% (50)	36.7% (31)	94% (94)
Arts	57.3% (172)	36.7% (44)	94% (94)
Column Total	172.0% (172)	110.0% (110)	100% (282)

Table 4 indicated a chi-square test for independence which described an association between faculty and procrastination, χ^2 (2, n = 282) = 3.865, $p < .0005$, $p = .138$ (large effect). It indicated a non-significant statistical association between participants‟ faculty and levels of procrastination.

Table 5

Procrastination Levels with Respect to Participants' GPA (N=282)

GPA	Levels of Procrastination		
	Non-procrastinator	Procrastinator	Row Total
2.75-3.0	71.4% (72)	45.6% (45)	117% (117)
3.1-4.0	100.6% (100)	64.4% (65)	165.0% (165)
Column total	172.0% (172)	110.0% (110)	100% (282)

$p < .0005$.

A chi-square test depicted an association between GPA and procrastination, χ^2 (1, n = 282) = 0.25, $p < .0005$, $p = .874$ (large effect) among students. This tells that there was a non-statically significant association between GPA and procrastination. This means that levels of procrastination in different GPA categories were different.

Discussion

Descriptive statistics of procrastination behavior showed that 1.8% students a non-clinical category of procrastination, 58.5% students with frequency of 165 fell in the sub-clinical category, 39.0% students with 110 frequency categorized as in clinical attention and 0.7% students with frequency of 2 needed severe clinical attention. Findings are in line with Baka and Khan (2016) who described four categories of procrastination in Malaysia. It further illustrated that 0% participant were non-procrastinator, 67% procrastinator, 12% serious procrastinator and 21% were not-serious procrastinator. Similarly, the ratio of procrastinators was investigated in King Saud University by Al-Qudah, Alsubhien, and Heila (2014). Their study demonstratesd that 9.7% students were low procrastinators, 83.6% moderate procrastinator and 6.7% students were high procrastinator. Forjaz (2018) found that in college students, 18.2% were low procrastinators, 9.1% moderate procrastinators and 72.7% were high procrastinators.

Findings of significant negative correlation between procrastination behavior and self-efficacy (p = 0.006, R = -.165**) supported the hypothesis of the study. According to Cerino (2014) the procrastination behavior showed negative significant relationship with self-efficacy. Ariani and Susilo (2018) also proved that academic procrastination was significantly negatively correlated with self-efficacy (r = -.188) with $p < 0.01$. On the other hand a low negative correlation between academic procrastination and self-efficacy among students from Malaysia university (r = -.186**) was reported by Baka and Khan, 2016. Second hypothesis of the study was that there will be no association between procrastination level and age of participants.

Results in table 3 illustrated that association between procrastination and age is not statistically significant χ^2 (1, n = 282) = .32, p = .56. In both age groups non-procrastinators were more than procrastinators. So, hypothesis is accepted which showed no association between participants‟ age and procrastination levels. Current findings are contrary to the findings of Gabriel (2015) who reported a significant association between age groups and procrastination levels with χ2 (4) = 49.4 and $p < 0.05$. One of the possible reason for this contrary findings may be the cultural differences among both studies. Further, if a person is habitual of procrastinating his or her activities, it may experience in all his/her developmental levels. In third hypothesis, no association between procrastination levels and participants‟ faculty was studied. Result of chai-square in table 4 indicated that faculty and procrastination also showed a non-significant association with each other with χ^2 (2, n = 282) = 3.865, p = .138. Majority of students in all faculty fell in category of non-procrastinators with 172.0% (172) and 110.0% (110). So, the faculty generally did not effect on students‟ procrastination behaviors. Fourth hypothesis in current research was that "there will be no association between procrastination level and GPA of participants". Table 5 indicated a non-significant association between both χ^2 (1, n = 282) = 0.25, p <.0005, p = .874. In previous literature no studies had founded that there is no association between GPA and procrastination, so this hypothesis is accepted. Focusing the findings of Study- Ⅰ it can be concluded that a significant number of students fell in sub-clinical category for procrastination. Further, procrastination and self-efficacy had significant negative relationship with each other.

Study-II: Qualitative Research

Sample

In study-II, qualitative data were taken from 8 participants studying in PhD program in department of psychology, University of Gujrat. Participants in the focus group discussion were selected through homogeneous sampling techniques. Participants were selected from Post-graduate class (PhD in Psychology) and have in-depth knowledge of the topic of investigation. Data were collected through focus group discussion. Two participants were male and six were female. Married students were 62.5% and 37.5% were single. From sample, 62.5% students were living in nuclear family as compared to 37.5% of joint family.

Measures

Focus Group Interview

In the second phase of the study, questions were developed for focus group based on the findings of study-I. A guide was developed around the themes/factors related to procrastination behaviour and self-efficacy among students Semi-structured focus group interview was conducted. Some of the sample questions were: "What do you know about procrastination? Why people delay in different activities, related to their social, emotional and physical aspects? What are the casual and precipitating factors of procrastination? How procrastination behavior effect people‟s life (academically, personally & at achievement etc.)? How can procrastination behaviour can be reduced?

Procedure

To conduct study-II, permission was taken from the relevant authority of university of Gujrat, Gujrat, Pakistan. After taking permission, eight participants (PhD scholars) were approached for conducting focus-group discussion. Written consent and demographic information were taken from participants. By using the interview guide, questions were asked from participants and their discussion was recorded by using audio recorder. All participants gave their opinion and shared their ideas regarding the questions and a comprehensive discussion was made on each question. Interview time was around 90 minutes. After conducting interview, data were transcribed and analyzed by using thematic analysis.

Analysis

A thematic analysis by Maguire and Delahunt (2017) was used to analyze the data about procrastination behavior and self-efficacy conducted in focus group interview. In this analysis firstly, data were transcribe and initial notes were made. From initial notes, initial themes were derived from the data. Analyzing the initial themes, final themes were generated. Final four themes were generated based on data obtained through focus group discussion. Final themes were discussed with the narratives of the participants in the next section of results.

Result

The main objective of study-II was to explore the procrastination behavior among students through qualitative research method. Through thematic analysis of focus-group discussion, four themes

were derived: description of procrastination, causal and precipitating factors of procrastination, impact of procrastination on life, and strategies to overcome/reduce procrastination behaviour. These themes are explained as follows:

Theme 1: Description of Procrastination. It has been showed through the narratives of the participants that they have knowledge about procrastination behaviour. All the postgraduate students were from psychology department and it has been reflected by their recorded responses on the topic under study. According to participants "procrastination is a delaying process and a persistent behaviour". It was also revealed from the data that "procrastination behavior is an unhealthy life pattern" however, few of the participants reported it as a pleasure full activity. Participants reported it as an "intentional delaying process because one delay his/her work intentionally and used to finish it in the last minute". This is clearly depicting the definition of procrastination behaviour. As N1 reported in these words: „*Procrastination behavior is defined as to delay assignment, presentation, or other work. For example, if you want to attend a ceremony or perform a task you take it to the last minute some time it completes but some time not''* (N1, line 2-6).

Some participants explained it as a persistent pattern of behavior because it occurs in each aspect of their life. This process occurs in every domain of life and occur in every minutes of life. According to the participants, procrastination behaviour is part of the personality and it can practiced in all aspects of an individual‟s life. Some participant says that they have tried to delay their work by having in the mind to improve the quality of work. As S2 says in these words: *'I think procrastination is related to a typical study, according to my perception I think delay to do work at tomorrow not today, it might be possible to delay it, not work at time by saying I will do it tomorrow. But according to further study if you are not doing your work, teacher gives you assignment and says you must submit it within 5 days, then you say ok to do it tomorrow but cannot fulfil it at the end'*(S2, lines 12-18).

Theme 2: Causal and Precipitating Factors of Procrastination. Participants reported that lack of setting priorities, social demand, external factors, and mental capabilities of the individuals were casual factors of procrastination behavior. Upbringing role model/ less structured environment, time management, perfectionism, learned habit, cultural norms/ acceptance and priorities of life further described as the precipitating factors of procrastination behavior. Some precipitating factors of procrastination narrated as culture and society, role playing, contradictory feedback

response, family responsibilities, emotional response and defence mechanism that extracted from the data. Participants explained that most of us ignore our important work by saying "let‟s see we should do it or not". Data showed that sometimes people ignore their important work to keep their relationships and social circle strong. At some other occasion‟s sometime peoples avoid their task to escape from it and put more focus to enjoy extracurricular activities. In some other cases, there is also the issue of time management and lack of priority setting. As S2 reported in these words: *'A student only opens a book before night of exam by thinking before it that lets see work is going on and let continued it as it is working'* (S2 Line 101-103).

Social demands and pressures are the other causes that helps individuals to procrastinate. People delay their important work for the sake of entertainment for others. It was found that when one becomes dependent upon other people, it spoils regular routine of life. As N1 reported in these words: *'As you see you delay accidentally in your social life. Today I was ready to attend my class at 2'O clock. When I was in school, some peoples were sitting with me, so I was delaying for them. At one side I was entertaining to them while on the other side I was spoiling my regular life. If I would be tried to manage it then would be reached at class within time'* (N1 Line 61-68). Some external factors such as mental capabilities of people were main cause of delaying activities in the life of individual. As one of the participants shared her experience that she always preferred to do work at the end and she always have satisfied with the results produced. Even from student life to her professional life her mental capability was developed for completing work at last day. She had done every task, assignment at the last days of submission date. As P5 reported in these words: *'As peoples who done their work in one weak, I have done it in one day. I continued my work until it is finished, while other people say do a few works today and remaining after two days later. But I do work within one day, rest of time enjoy and do work later'.* (P5, Line 312-315).

Theme 3: Impact of Procrastination on Life. With discussion of participant, it was found that procrastination put adverse impact on individual‟s life. As data revealed that it produces emotional and physical response on human body. Self-blaming, mental pressure, demanding, incomplete task, personal reinforcement, societal attitude, disturbed relationship and attitude shift toward procrastination put great impact on individual‟s life. Sometime conscious use of procrastination behavior also impact on people life. Participants explained these concepts as follows: Procrastination impact emotionally in their life in the form of stress and frustration. A mental

torture and pressure from others stressed and frustrate individual as he/she cannot relax because of incomplete status of task. Tension might occur when work was not completed in proper time. Due to procrastination, anxiety about task occur and one can show aggressive behavior toward other. Peoples becomes emotionally stressed due to not completion of work in time. When one‟s family member insists to delay important activities then one‟s mind drives to blasting situation. Procrastination behvior put a mental pressure in people life, due to delaying individual remain tense until he has done his work properly. As P5 reported in these lines: *'As we delay a work, then we have to do it. It put a mental pressure on individual that to do it, yes I had to do it and we cannot remain relax until we finished our work'* (P5, Line 75-78). Lack of belief in yourself also impact on people life. According to a participant when you show less satisfaction toward your work when you have done it at the last minute while some time you delay your work with less satisfaction. As MO8 reported in these lines: *'I think its cause is lack of belief in yourself, you think I am not doing batter this work as it should be then you put it into delay'* (MO8, Line 119-121).

Participant in this data tells that procrastination behavior was greatly affected on physical health of students when work was not finished in proper time and they do not meet to deadlines. As M3 reported in these lines: *'Adverse effect of it, especially in semester system. In annual system delaying is your habit, you only read at the time of paper but in semester system you cannot delay you work. if you do not work on time then you had to study lot at the end, you become frustrated and problem in your physical health also occur* (M3, Line 39-46).

Theme 4: Strategies to Overcome/Reduce Procrastination. Data revealed that procrastination can be reduced by improving societal structure/norms. Time management is compulsory. Conscious training in educational settings can reduce procrastination. Law-enforcement, structured life, improvement of self-efficacy, up-bringing of parents, improvement of societal norms, value the time, sense of self responsibility, altering cognitive dissonance and faulty thoughts can be helpful in reducing procrastination behavior.

Participants demonstrated that improvement of social norms/structure is compulsory because we learn everything from our society. A firmed pattern of rules should be made that make you ambitious for doing a work. You had to be strict to follow rules. As B4 reported in these words: *'In society your rigid pattern makes you ambitious for doing work'* (B4, Line531-532).

Conscious training of individuals is very compulsory. In Pakistani culture, generally only academic base teaching is focused which children used to forgot in later life. They should be trained cognitively, emotionally and behaviorly. An educational level training of students should be started in schools. Start to teach learning strategies at school level first. Teach students from low to high level. To realize people how emotional burden impact cognitive behaviour and later life. Make people aware about demerits of procrastination behavior. Up-bringing of parents should be reduced because most of children learn their procrastination behavior from parents. Parents show irresponsibility toward their children, so make rule for parents when they pick and drop their children in school late. Participants reported that procrastination occur due to lack of self-responsibilities that occurs in childhood. So, learning about personal sense of responsibility is very important. As well as family environment should be improved by making some firmed rules. As B4 reported in these words: *'In our society, our supportive environment makes us procrastinator. Self-responsibilities are not taught from childhood. Most people leave procrastination when they move in some other culture'* (B4, Line 450-455).

Time management was considered as important component for the reduction of procrastination behavior. As participants reported in this data that there should be check and balance in everything. Peoples should be given awareness about time and regularity. Learning should be based on reaching in school at proper time. There should be punctuality and regularity for doing work in time. Those people who have a structured life have less chance of procrastination, because they have to do job, family and other responsibilities at a same time. As SA6 reported in these words. *'There should be check and balance in everything. We have to learn time management for reduction of procrastination behavior'* (SA6, Line 492-493).

Discussion

First theme illustrates that procrastination is unhealthy life pattern and persistent behavior of student. This is intentional delaying process in which students take important work at the end. Many peoples became habituated to this and some peoples delay work which become pleasure full activity for them. Many peoples suppressed their feeling of procrastination to keep their relationship with others. In research of Abramowski (2018) Sixty percent participants described procrastination as a phenomenon that takes all task at the end, 20% students stated procrastination as divergent statement, they reported it

beneficial when they take work to the end, it proved beneficial for them. Van Eerde (2003) demonstrated procrastination as a damaging and self-handicapping, negative, and self-overwhelming approach that weakens people‟s ability to perform a task. Another research by Hannok (2011) supports this theme. It was described that procrastination was described as delaying task or to put your important activities on delaying. Some participants demonstrated procrastination as "suppose that we have to do something today, but we wait to do it later because we think that we still have many days left to do it. It‟s like we keep putting it off". Procrastination was also described as that when someone does not show willingness toward a work then he thinks to wait for batter doing it next time. Female participant explained about procrastination as delaying work due to laziness.

Second theme focus on causal and precipitating factors of procrastination which are lack of opportunities and social demands. Some peoples learn this habit and procrastinate to meet cultural/ societal norm and priorities of life. Due having good mental abilities, students procrastinate greater. Role-playing, family responsibilities, emotional responses, contradictory feedback from other peoples and using defence mechanism are causes of procrastination behavior. Hussain and Sultan (2010) studied procrastination among student in which they took a survey to get relevant information from students and teachers about procrastination behavior. Opinion about different area of procrastination was taken that consist of themes: Assignment, presentation, group work, activities, display, initiative, and library work. Opinions about reasons behind procrastination from teacher and students were takeout which includes social problems, illness, lack of motivation, inability to do work, overconfidence, teacher attitude, laziness, negative comment, lack of feedback, communication gap, lack of independency, home based activities involvement and student company. Asri, Setyosari, Hitipew and Chusniyah (2017) supported the findings as concluding different factors such as reporting boredom of work, less knowledge about work, delay work for getting perfectionism, immoral learning management, less social support, culture, less self-regulation and less supportive teachers playing role in procrastination behavior. As well as Abramowski (2018) found theme about reason of procrastination that were fear about task, lack of motivation, task aversiveness, emotional intolerance and less management of activities. Klingsiek, Grund and Fries (2013) reported task competence and social affiliation as source of procrastination in their work by using qualitative approach in a sample of 29 students.

Third theme focus on impact of procrastination behavior on life of peoples. It put a physical and mental pressure on their life that create a great hurdle in completing important life activities. Demands of task, incomplete task, negative societal attitude and lack of self-belief create great impact on people‟s life. Hannok (2011) research participants demonstrated procrastination as functional and dysfunctional delay, and a maladaptive behavior that put negative impact on grades and academic performance of students. Students take stress which later proved good for them. Some participant mentioned that procrastination impact negatively on their performance that resulted in low grades. Most of participants narrated the results in form of poor grades because of late completion and submission of task. Due to the negative evaluation and low grading became a source of stress for students.

Fourth theme demonstrated that how procrastination behavior can be reduced. Participants reported as: Reduction of procrastination behavior can be occur by conscious training of students to realize their duties and using their emotional and psychomotor abilities. By improving societal rules, and training the skill of time management is very important in reducing the procrastination behavior. Training in educational settings and implementation of strict deadlines in different academic tasks increases the sense of responsibility among students. Parents can also train their children to control their procrastination behaviour through their up upbringing patterns. Improvement of social rules, sense of self-responsibility to do a work in time, management of stress and removing the cognitive dissonance can reduce it. Enhancement of self-efficacy can aid to improve procrastination behavior, increase in self-efficacy can be helpful for reduction of procrastination behavior. A structured life and to give value to other time can be beneficial. Voge (2007) demonstrated that procrastination can be reduced by time management, motivation to be stay active and to be engaged in some activities.

Ethical Consideration

Data were collected after taking the written permission from relevant authorities. Written consent was taken from participants. Standardized scales were used with the permission of authors. Confidentiality of participants was maintained and all data were used only for research purpose.

Strengths and Limitations

This is the first study in district Gujrat to measure the procrastination behaviour and self- efficacy among university

students. Further, the use of mixed method approach enhance results consistency. One of the limitation of the study is the difference in gender ratio of participants. Female participants were greater in number as compared to girls. Sample was taken from only one university so, generalizability of results is very low.

Implications of the Study

Educational institutes, counsellors, educational psychologists, and academicians can use the findings of current study in order to improve students‟ academic efficacy by controlling the procrastination behaviors among students. Awareness based seminars could be arranged for students in order to give them batter understanding about the skills to improve their academic performance. Time management skill based training workshops can be designed for students based on the findings of the current study.

Conclusion

It is concluded that procrastination behaviour negatively effects students‟ academic performance and reduce their sense of self-efficacy. It interferes in students‟ academic productivity. Hence, it need to be controlled. Through the findings of the qualitative study, it can be concluded that procrastination is a negative and unhealthy pattern experienced by students which hinder in their productivity. It effects students‟ emotional, behavioural and social aspects of lives. Further, culture, society, family patterns, parental role, contradictory feedback from surroundings, faulty thought process and emotional and behavioral responses are main causes of procrastination among students. However, conscious efforts and training can reduce this unhealthy pattern and improve students‟ sense of self-efficacy.

References

Abramowski, A. (2018). Is procrastination all that “bad”? A qualitative study of academic procrastination and self-worth in postgraduate university students. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community, 46*(2), 158-170. doi:10.1080/10852352.2016.1198168

Afzal, S., & Jami, H. (2018). Prevalence of academic procrastination and reasons for academic procrastination in university students. *Journal of Behavioural Sciences, 28*(1), 51-69.

Al-Qudah, F. M., Alsubhien, M. A., & Heilat, Q. M. (2014). The relationship between the academic procrastination and self-efficacy among sample of King Saud university students. *Journal of Education and Practice 5,* 101-111.

Ariani, D., & Susilo, Y. (2018). Why do it later? Goal orientation, self-efficacy, test anxiety, on procrastination. *ECPS - Educational Cultural and Psychological Studies*, (17). doi:10.7358/ecps-2018-017-wahy

Asri, D. N., Setyosari, P., Hitipeuw, I., & Chusniyah, T. (2017). The influence of project-based learning strategy and self-regulated learning on academic procrastination of junior high school students‟ mathematics learning. *American Journal of Educational Research*, *5*(1), 88-96.

Baka, A. Z., & Khan, U. M., (2016). Relationships between self-efficacy and the academic procrastination behaviour among university students in Malaysia: A General Perspective. *Journal of Education and Learning, 10,*265-274

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-Efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review, 84,* 191-215. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.2.191

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Beswick, G., Rothblum, E., & Mann, L. (1988). Psychological antecedents to student procrastination. *Australian Psychologist*, *23*, 207-217.

Burka, J. B., & Yuen, L. M. (1983). Procrastination: Why do you do it, what to do about it. CA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company. *Journal of Counselling Psychology*, *31*, 503-509.

Cerino, E. (2014). Relationships between academic motivation, self-efficacy, and academic procrastination. *Psi Chi Journal of Psychological Research, 19*(4), 156-163. doi:10.24839/2164-8204.jn19.4.156

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches. Sage publications.

Forjaz, P. (2018). Academic Procrastination: The relationship between academic procrastination and multidimension perfectionism, motivation and self-efficacy. *Undergraduate thesis, Dublin, National College of Ireland.* Retrieved from http://trap.ncirl.ie/id/eprint/3281

Gabriel, C. K. (2015). Impact of birth order on procrastination among college students in eldoret town. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *6*(22), 106-111.

Grund, A., & Fries, S. (2018). Understanding procrastination: A motivational approach. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *121*, 120-130.

Klingsiek, K. B., Grund, A., Schmid, S., & Fries S. (2013). Why students procrastinate: A qualitative approach. *Journal of College Student Development, 54*, 397-412.

Hannok, W. (2011). Procrastination and motivation beliefs of adolescents: *A Cross-cultural study,* (Unpublished Doctor of Philosophy Dissertation). University of Alberta.

Hussain, I., & Sultan, S. (2010). Analysis of procrastination among university students. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 5*, 1897-1904. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.385

Lay, C. (1986). At last, my research article on procrastination. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *20*, 474-495

Lukas, C. A., & Berking, M. (2018). Reducing procrastination using a smart phone-based treatment program: A randomized controlled pilot study. *Internet interventions*, *12*, 83-90.

Maguire, M., & Delahunt, B. (2017). Doing a thematic analysis: A practical, step-by-step guide for learning and teaching scholars. *All Ireland Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education, 8*(3), 3351-3360. http://ojs.aishe.org/index.php/aishe-j/article/view/335

Moon, S. M., & Illingworth, A. J. (2005). Exploring the dynamic nature of procrastination: A latent growth curve analysis of academic procrastination. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *38*, 297-309.

Pajares, F. (2002). Gender and perceived self-efficacy in self-regulated learning. *Theory into Practice*, *41*(2), 116-125.

Schouwenburg, H. C. (2004). Academic procrastination: Theoretical notions, measurement, and research. In H. C. Schouwenburg, C. H. Lay, T. A. Pychyl, & J. R. Ferrari (Eds.), *Counselling the procrastinator in academic settings* (pp. 3-17). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. *In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston, Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs,* (pp. 35-37). Windsor, UK: NFER-NELSON

Solomon, L. J., & Rothblum, E. D. (1984). Academic procrastination: Frequency and cognitive-behavioral correlates. *Journal of Counselling Psychology, 31*(4), 503-509. doi:10.1037/0022-0167.31.4.503

Steel, P. (2007). The nature of procrastination: a meta-analytic and theoretical review of quintessential self-regulatory failure. *Psychological Bulletin, 133*(1), 65-94. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.133.1.65

Tice, D. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (1997). Longitudinal study of procrastination, performance, stress and health: The costs and benefits of dawdling. *Psychological Science, 8,* 454-458. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1997.tb00460.x

Van Eerde, W. (2003). A meta-analytically derived nomological network of procrastination. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *35,* 1401-1418. doi:10.1016/s0191-8869(02)00358-6

Voge, J. (2007). Classroom resources for addressing procrastination. *Research and Teaching in Developmental Education, 23*(2), 88-96.

Wäschle, K., Allgaier, A., Lachner, A., Fink, S., & Nückles, M. (2014). Procrastination and self-efficacy: Tracing vicious and virtuous circles in self-regulated learning. *Learning and Instruction, 29*, 103-114. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2013.09.005.

Ziegler, N., & Opdenakker, M. C. (2018). The development of academic procrastination in first-year secondary education students: The link with metacognitive self-regulation, self-efficacy, and effort regulation. *Learning and Individual Differences*, *64*, 71-82.

Ziesat, H. A., Rosenthal, T. L., & White, G. M. (1978). Behavioral self-control in treating procrastination of studying. *Psychological Reports*, *42*, 56-69.

Received 4 November 2019

Revision received 30 December 2021