Introduction

Scenarios of procrastination are very common in a student’s day to day life that they never realize. The last minute rushing has become a popular phenomenon among them. It is a common scene to observe college library being filled with students borrowing books just before final exams and number of students thronging the photocopy shops to get ready with the needed notes. Such procrastination in the academic arena (academic procrastination) is regarded as a widespread problem in academic setting and it has received more research and professional interest than other kinds of procrastination.

Procrastination is wide spread in academic contexts, where students are required to meet deadlines for assignment completion in an environment full of events and activities which compete for the students’ time and attention. Student syndrome refers to the phenomenon that many students will begin to engage themselves in a task just before a deadline (Ariely and Wertenbroch, 2002).

Academic Procrastination is referred as the irrational tendency to delay tasks until an individual experiences discomfort (Solomon and Rothblum 1984). Other experts define it as an action in which an individual voluntarily delays an intended course of action despite expecting consequences resulting from that delay (Day, Mensink, and O’Sullivan, 2000; Steel 2007).

Academic procrastination can negatively impact learning, achievement, academic self-efficacy and over-all quality of life (Clark and Hill, 1994). College students who procrastinate have also claimed that their procrastination has a significant impact on their academic standing, ability to understand class material and their well-being (Ferrari, 2001). Studies conducted in academic environments found that procrastination affects 46 per cent to 95 per cent of undergraduate students (Gallagher, Borg, Golin and Kelleher, 1992).

Despite these literatures on procrastination and its impact on academic performance, some people report procrastination as performance enhancing strategy, as it helps them to marshal their resources in coping with an oncoming deadline (Chissom and Iran-Nejad, 1992; Tice and Baumeister, 1997). Hence, Steel (2007) stresses on the need for examining the causes of procrastination. Also several other researches had recommended for further studies that could examine the affective implications of academic procrastination and its outcomes (Fee and Tangney, 2000; Ferrari, Keane, Wolfe and Beck, 1998). Consequently this study aimed to contribute to the existing literature by apprais-
the respondents as per their perception and lower the score
the greater is the severity of procrastination. A total score
for each of the respondent were obtained by summing up
the score and were compared for further analysis.

- **Likert scale on academic performance** - The academic per-
formances of the selected students were rated with four
point rating scale. The scale ranged from one to four where
one represented below average and four represented excel-
lent performance. The total marks of the respondents in
all the four semesters were converted into percentage and
were categorized and rated into below average - less than or
equal to 40 per cent; average – 40 to 60 per cent; good – 60
to 80 per cent and excellent – above 80 percent.

The data was collected with the above said tools and the col-
lected data was coded, classified and tabulated. It was then sub-
jected to statistical analysis.

**KEY FINDINGS**

**General Profile**

Among the total number of respondents, 54 per cent of them
were female and 46 per cent were male.

**Procrastination pattern of the selected respondents**

The Table – 1 and Figure – 1 depicts the percentile representa-
tion of procrastination pattern based on the scores procured by
the respondents on the modified version of Lay's procrastination
scale.

**Table – 1 Categorisation based on the procrastination pat-
tern**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procrastination pattern</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Severe (20-40)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate procrastinator (40-60)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare procrastinator (80-100)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure – 1 Procrastination pattern of male and female stu-
dents**

Among the identified engineering graduates, none of them were
found to possess the qualities of a severe procrastinator. Nearly
64 per cent of the graduates identified for the study claimed
themselves to be in between the pattern of moderate and rare
procrastination pattern (i.e) not a systematic procrastinator or
mild procrastinator. However an overall percentage of 33 per-
cent are found to be moderate procrastinators. For the favour-
able pattern of procrastination namely rare procrastinator, only
six per cent of female respondents got it into it.

**Effect of gender on procrastination score**

To find out the effect of gender on the pattern of procrastina-
tion, t’ test was done with the mean scores of the respondents
procured on the procrastination scale and shown in Figure -2.

**Figure – 2 Gender – wise distribution of procrastination
mean score**

**Procrastination and academic performance**

The Table – 2 portrays the distribution of the respondents’ as per
their academic performance in relation to the procrastination
mean score and also brings out its association.

**Table – 2 Procrastination and academic performance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic score</th>
<th>Procrastination Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-60 (Average)</td>
<td>60.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-80 (Good)</td>
<td>64.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80-100 (Excell lent)</td>
<td>64.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>63.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F’ value 0.487**

**NS- Not significant**

The ANOVA value of 0.487 calculated to find the association be-
tween academic performance and procrastination mean score
was not significant. In other words the pattern of procrastina-
tion does not influence the academic performance of the select-
ed engineering graduates.

**Discussion**

**General profile**

Though the boys outnumber girls in taking up engineering
course, the higher percentage of girls responding to the study
owes to the verity that many of the boys identified through
probability sampling had exhibited their procrastination attitude
in not returning the filled up tools.

Procrastination pattern of the selected respondents

Out of the 91 respondents no one reported to be in the thresh-
hold of severe procrastination, which in turn reflects a positive
notion towards today’s student community. The threshold score
for the respondents being labelled as not a systematic procrasti-
inator or mild procrastinator (i.e) procrastinates now and then
was between the mean score of 60 and 80. Looking deep into
the table it was found that the major contribution to this overall
high percentage of 64 per cent in this category was from female
population (69%) against 57 per cent from male population.

Also looking into the other favourable pattern of procrastina-
tion namely rare procrastinator (the threshold score is between
80-100) an overall three per cent of the respondents, contributed
only from the female population of six per cent were found to be
an interesting reading. Consequently, the magnitude of procras-
tination among the selected graduates was found to be high par-
ticularly with the male students over the female lot. The above
observation is also made evident in the category of moderate
procrastination (within the mean score of 40-60). Wherein 43
per cent of the male graduates were found to be procrastinating
at a greater level compared to only 25 per cent of their counter-
part.

Effect of gender on procrastination score

A study done by Özer, B.U. and Ferrari (2011) on 115 females,
99 males, found no significant difference between female and
male students’ on academic procrastination rates. On the other
hand, another group of studies report that it is frequently seen
in male students. Hence, in order to contribute to the research
literature by exploring the effect of gender on the pattern of pro-
crastination, ‘t’ test was done. The ‘t’ test applied to find whether
the procrastination score differs significantly at 1 per cent level
between male and female presented a finding in contradiction
to the study of Washington (2004) who observed that procras-
tination is found more common among female students. How-
ever a study worth supporting the present study is the study of
Balkis and Duru (2009) on a sample comprising of 580 students
(329 girls, 251 boys) of teaching course in Pamukkale University
showed that men are more intended to procrastinate.

Tuckman (2002) studied procrastination in undergraduate stu-
dents enrolled in a web-based course. He found that procrasti-
nators used rationalization rather than self regulation, which
resulted in lower course grades. This phenomenon occurred in
spite of the fact that the course was highly structured and en-
forced frequent deadlines throughout the duration of the course.
In another study, Tuckman compared high, moderate and low
procrastinators in undergraduate students on their reported
degree of self-regulation. He found that the more self-regulation
was used, the less procrastination resulted (Tuckman, 2002).

The academic performance grades of the engineering gradu-
ates were assessed from their semester marks sheet using the
Likert’s scale of academic performance. The total marks scored
in a semester are converted into percentage. The average of the
percentages of all the result declared semesters were calculated.

Then the average was categorised into four divisions as speci-
fied in the methodology. The mean procrastination score of the
individuals who score under each division of average mark was
analyzed and the table vividly depicts the association between
academic performance and procrastination mean score.

As evident from the characteristics of procrastinators, the possi-
bility of not returning the filled up forms could be well realized.
Consequently only five respondents were found to be average in
their academic performance scoring within the range of 40 to 60
with a mean score on procrastination approximately at 60. In
other words it is their procrastination attitude that leads to aver-
age academic performance.

Procrastination and academic performance

A research study done by Seo (2011) has shown that students
who procrastinate actually have more or less equal success in
academic achievement, comparing to non procrastinating stu-
dents. Hence, it was concluded that procrastinator are delaying
themselves thinking procrastination has little impact on aca-
demic achievements. However Psychyl et al. (2000) has observed
that it is still possible that procrastination can cause individual
to fail. The table 2 lucidly explains the augmentation in the pro-
crastination mean score from average performance to good
and excellent academic performance of the selected sample. This
finding undoubtedly demonstrates that less the attitude of
procrastinating more the academic performance. However
the insignificant ‘t’ value does not establish an association be-
tween the pattern of procrastination and academic performance
among the selected lot. Hence the hypothesis is strongly accept-
ed. The reason owing to this data is that most of the procrasti-
nators did not return the filled up forms, which becomes a limi-
tation for the study.
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