



## ORIGINAL RESEARCH PAPER

Education

## EXPLORING THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SELF REGULATION AND ACADEMIC PROCRASTINATION

**KEY WORDS:** self regulation, academic procrastination, procrastination,

Dr. Anjum Ahmed\*

Assistant Professor Department Of Education Aligarh Muslim University Aligarh  
\*Corresponding Author

Ms. Shumaim

M.Ed Student Department Of Education Aligarh Muslim University Aligarh

## ABSTRACT

This study provides information on the phenomenon of Academic Procrastination, its prevalence, deep understanding of the nature of the relationship between the Academic Procrastination and self-regulation, and positive repercussions on the educational process. The sample of the study consisted of 200 senior secondary students (100 girls and 100 boys) from CBSE and AMU Board. Tools that were used in the study were Academic Procrastination Scale and Self-Regulation Scale. Pearson correlation and t-test statistical technique were used for the analysis of the data. The major findings are that AMU board students are more Self-regulated than the CBSE students, their Academic Procrastination is less in comparison to CBSE students. Senior secondary students of both AMU and CBSE boards showed less procrastination in co-curricular activities. Girls procrastinate more in homework dimension in comparison to other dimensions of academic procrastination. The implications of the study are discussed in the paper.

## Introduction

In the stages of education, senior secondary stage is considered as the most important stage because it provides the base for future education. Therefore better academic performance especially at the senior secondary stage is needed for a better future but there are some problems in students' academic life that prevent them from overcoming their educational responsibilities. One of these problems that restrain students' educational potential is Academic Procrastination. Procrastination is a common behaviour in contemporary societies. Procrastination means to put off, delay, prolong, or postpone performing a task. Despite the fact that procrastination occurs in all kinds of daily tasks, academic procrastination is highly frequent in students and regarded as detrimental to academic progress and success.

Ellis and Knaus (2002) described procrastination as the desire to avoid an activity, the promise to get it late, and the use of excuse making to justify the delay and avoid blame.

Procrastination has internal and external negative effects. Internal negative effects include tension, regret and self-blame. External negative effects include hinder the vocational and academic progress, the loss of opportunities, and strained relations. Hence, the academic achievement of those students who have a strong tendency to procrastinate is low.

Procrastination makes students postpone and delay their academic work becoming self excusive and ignoring their academic responsibilities. It seems a common practice that students put off their academic work: they delay in preparing and submitting their assignments and presentations, completing projects, and even preparing for the examinations. In education and training, the term Academic Procrastination is commonly used to denote the delay in academic activities. It may be intentional, incidental and/or habitual but significantly affects learning and achievement of university students. It is not gender restricted or gender-based trait rather works across the gender and affects both the sexes.

Procrastination, in the shape of delaying completion of an assignment or putting off studying for an examination, is quite common among the worldwide student population. According to O'Brien (2002), 80-95% of college students or at least half of all students (Ozer, Demir, & Ferrari, 2009; Solomon & Rothblum, 1984) engage in procrastination and the prevalence of the phenomenon appears to be growing (Steel, 2007). It has been seen that procrastination negatively effects learning and achievement, such as lower grades and course withdrawals.

## Self-Regulation

The term self-regulation is often described as the ability to develop, implement, and maintain planned behaviour in order to achieve

one's goals. Self - regulation is the ability to manage disruptive emotions and impulses, and to think before you react. It makes up one of the five elements of emotional intelligence, a concept developed by psychologist Daniel Goleman, and it helps us stop unhelpful behaviour, and keep calm under pressure. Research consistently shows that self-regulation skill is necessary for reliable emotional well being. Behaviourally, self-regulation is the ability to act in your long-term best interest, consistent with your deepest values.

According to Zimmerman (2008), "self-regulation refers to the way individuals make use of internal and external cues to determine when to initiate, when to maintain, and when to terminate their goal-directed behaviours. It is regarded as self-generated thoughts, feelings, and behaviours that are oriented toward the attainment of personal objectives". From academic realm, Zimmerman (2008) further offered that self-regulation involves the degree to which students are metacognitively, motivationally, and behaviourally active participants in their own learning process.

Bandura (1986) viewed Self-Regulation as the process of influencing the external environment by engaging in the functions of self observation, self-judgement, and self reaction. Pintrich (2004) viewed self-regulation as students' monitoring, controlling, and regulating their own cognitive activities and actual behaviour. In other words, self-regulatory activities can mediate the relationships between individuals and the context, and their overall achievement. Furthermore, from self-regulated learning perspective, procrastination is now seen as failure in self-regulation; or lack of self-regulated performance which involves cognitive, affective and behavioural components.

## Definitions of the key terms:

**Academic Procrastination:** Academic Procrastination as the "tendency to (a) always or nearly always putt of academic tasks and (b)always or nearly always experience problematic anxiety associated with this procrastination."(Rothblum, Solomon & Murakami, 1986).

**Self-Regulation:** Self-regulation is viewed as students' monitoring, controlling, and regulating their own cognitive activities and actual behaviour (Pintrich,2004).

## Objectives

The objectives formulated for the study are:

1. To identify the relationship between Academic Procrastination and self-regulation among senior secondary students.
2. To find out the significant difference in the mean scores of Academic Procrastination between boys and girls.

- To find out the significant difference in the mean scores of Academic Procrastination between A.M.U and CBSE board students.
- To find out the significant difference in the mean scores of self-regulation between boys and girls.
- To find out the significant difference in the mean scores of self-regulation between A.M.U and CBSE board students.

**Hypotheses**

The hypotheses formulated for the study are:

- There will be no significant relationship between Academic Procrastination and self-regulation.
- There will be no significant difference in the mean scores of Academic Procrastination between boys and girls.
- There will be no significant difference in the mean scores of Academic Procrastination between A.M.U and CBSE board students.
- There will be no significant difference in the mean scores of self-regulation between boys and girls.
- There will be no significant difference in the mean scores of self-regulation between A.M.U and CBSE board students.

**Methodology**

The present study is quantitative in nature. Survey method was used by the researcher for the collection of data. The sampling section deals with the sample selection procedures. The instrument section presents the scales utilised in the collection of data.

**Sample**

The sample of the study consisted of 200 students (100 girls and 100 boys), in which 100 students (50 boys and 50 girls) from CBSE Board schools and 100 students (50 boys and 50 girls) from Aligarh Muslim University (AMU) Board schools. The sample was selected through proportionate stratified random sampling technique from different schools in Aligarh District at Senior Secondary Level students.

**Tools**

In order to collect data for the present research, following tools were used:

- Academic Procrastination Scale (2015), constructed by Dr. Ashok K. Kalia and Manju Yadav.
- Self-Regulation Scale (1999), constructed by J.M Brown, W.R Miller and Lawendowski.

**Statistical Techniques**

Following Statistical techniques were used by the researcher:

- Mean
- Standard Deviation
- t-test
- Correlation

The data has been analysed as per the objectives of the study.

**Objective No. 1:**

To identify the relationship between Academic Procrastination and self-regulation among senior secondary students.

**Hypothesis 1:**

There will be no significant relationship between Academic Procrastination and self-regulation.

**Table 1 Showing relationship between Academic Procrastination and Self Regulation**

Group	N	MEAN	S.D	df	Pearson Correlation (r)
Academic Procrastination	100	65.11	13.67	98	-0.452**
Self Regulation	100	208.34	19.53		

\*\*Correlation significant at 0.01 level

**Interpretation**

Here, the correlation between Academic Procrastination and Self-Regulation is found to be significant at 0.01 level and the value is negative which shows that the relationship between Academic Procrastination and Self-Regulation is inverse which means that lower Self-Regulation results in higher Academic Procrastination. In other words, it can be that students who procrastinate more have low Self-Regulation skills.

**Objective No.2:**

To find out the significant difference in the mean scores of Academic Procrastination between boys and girls.

**Hypothesis 2:**

There will be no significant difference in the mean scores of Academic Procrastination between boys and girls.

**Table 2 Showing the Academic Procrastination scores of boys and girls**

Group	N	Mean	S.D	df	Calculated t-value	Tabulated t-value	L.O.S (A/R)
Boys	100	68.19	13.20	198	3.26	1.96	0.05 R
Girls	100	62.03	13.51			2.58	0.01 R

**Interpretation**

It is depicted from the table-2 that the calculated value of 't' (3.26) is higher than the tabulated value of 't' (1.96 & 2.58) at both the level of significance (0.05 & 0.01) respectively. So the null hypothesis is rejected and it shows that there is significant difference between the Academic Procrastination of boys and girls at Senior Secondary Level.

**Objective No.3**

To find out the significant difference in the mean scores of Academic Procrastination between A.M.U and CBSE board students.

**Hypothesis 3:**

There will be no significant difference in the mean scores of Academic Procrastination between A.M.U and CBSE board students.

**Table 3 Showing the Academic Procrastination scores of AMU and CBSE board students**

Group	N	Mean	S.D	df	Calculated t-value	Tabulated t-value	L.O.S (A/R)
AMU	100	62.55	14.11	198	2.68	1.96	0.05 R
CBSE	100	67.67	12.79			2.58	0.01 R

**Interpretation**

It is depicted from the table-3 that the calculated value of 't' (2.68) is higher than the tabulated value of 't' (1.96 & 2.58) at both the level of significance (0.05 & 0.01) respectively. So the null hypothesis is rejected and it shows that there is significant difference between the Academic Procrastination of AMU and CBSE board students at Senior Secondary Level. It further shows that CBSE board students procrastinate more than the AMU board students because the mean score of CBSE board students (67.67) is higher than the AMU board students (62.55).

**Objective No.4**

To find out the significant difference in the mean scores of self-regulation between boys and girls.

**Hypothesis 4:**

There will be no significant difference in the mean scores of self-regulation between boys and girls.

**Table 4 Showing the Self-Regulation scores of boys and girls**

Group	N	Mean	S.D	df	Calculated t-value	Tabulated t-value	L.O.S (A/R)
Boys	100	210.38	16.74	198	5.385	1.96	0.05 R
Girls	100	215.31	19.71			2.58	0.01 R

**Interpretation**

**Table 4** reveals that the calculated value of 't' (5.385) is greater than the tabulated 't' value (1.96 & 2.58) at both the levels of significance (0.01 & 0.05 respectively). So the null hypothesis is rejected and it shows that there is significant difference between the Self-Regulation of boys and girls at Senior Secondary Level. It further shows that girls self regulate more than the boys because the mean score of girls (215.31) is higher than the boys (201.38).

**Objective No.5**

To find out the significant difference in the mean scores of self-regulation between A.M.U and CBSE board students.

**Hypothesis 5:**

There will be no significant difference in the mean scores of self-regulation between A.M.U and CBSE board students.

**Table 5 Showing the Self-Regulation scores of AMU and CBSE board students**

Group	N	Mean	S.D	df	Calculated t-value	Tabulated t-value	L.O.S (A/R)
AMU	100	210.76	17.41	198	1.75	1.96	0.05 A
CBSE	100	205.93	21.25			2.58	0.01 A

**Interpretation**

**Table 5** reveals that the calculated value of 't' (1.75) is less than the tabulated 't' value (1.96 & 2.58) at both the levels of significance (0.01 & 0.05 respectively). So the null hypothesis is accepted and it shows that there is no significant difference between the Self-Regulation of AMU and CBSE board students at Senior Secondary Level. It shows that CBSE board students and AMU board students do not differ significantly in their Self Regulation. Therefore, hypotheses 8 stated earlier that there is no significant difference between CBSE board students and AMU board regarding Self-Regulation is retained.

**Discussion based on the findings**

- There is negative correlation between the Academic Procrastination and Self-Regulation in the total sample. It means that Self-Regulation directly affect the Academic Procrastination i.e. lower Self-Regulation skills will leads the students to procrastinate more. It can be said that the style adopted by the sample makes them 'Avoider Procrastinators' as given by Ferrari (2000).
- The findings highlighted that girls are more self-regulated than boys. Hence they procrastinate less than boys. The high degree of procrastination among boys is explained through the theory of rebelliousness, given by Steel (2007), according to which, rebelliousness, hostility, and disagreeableness are thought to be major motivations for procrastination and these traits are often used with this gender, as researches had proved. Therefore the Theory of Rebelliousness of Procrastination can be used in defence with these findings of the present study. It is essential to make both the girls and boys more self-regulated in order to avoid the various problems like- failure, fear of failure, stress, anxiety etc. It should be the duty of the parents, counsellors, teachers to help the students in making them more self-regulated through their positive attitude and helpful nature.
- AMU board students are more Self-regulated than the CBSE students. Their Academic Procrastination is less in comparison to CBSE students. It is essential for the CBSE students to become more self-regulated because Self-Regulation refers to the ability to develop, implement, and maintain planned behaviour in order to achieve one's goals, if the students are able to regulate their behaviour they will get success. So the school personnel and family members of the students should help them through regular monitoring their work and providing immediate formal and in formal feedback on their progress.
- Senior Secondary students of AMU and CBSE board procrastinate more in the homework dimension in comparison to other dimensions of academic procrastination. Findings also showed that senior secondary students procrastinate less in co-curricular activities.

- Girls also procrastinate more in homework dimension in comparison to other dimensions of academic procrastination. The reason may be explained through 'self handicapping theory' of procrastination, given by Steel (2007) which says that individuals procrastinate often to protect self esteem by giving people an external reason, an "out", if they fail to do well. Self-handicappers appear to be acting in their own self-interest, thinking they are protecting themselves from shame and humiliation. Therefore this theory holds more applicable for girls.
- Senior secondary students of both AMU and CBSE boards (boys and girls) showed less procrastination in co-curricular activities. The reason for this type of procrastination behaviour could be that the students find the co-curricular activities more interesting, enjoyable and satisfying than their academic work. That is why they prioritize their co-curricular activities and hold back and delay in their academic work (homework, assignments, projects etc).

Even more important regarding procrastination is the effects of delay. One likes their rewards not only to be large but also to be immediate. Consequently, one will more likely procrastinate in any tasks that are unpleasant in the present and offer rewards only in the distant future. In other words, one would be more likely to put off higher priority tasks if there are options available that are immediately pleasurable (even if they have sizeable but delayed costs). Such options are called temptations.

**Educational Implications of the study**

- Self-Regulation helps the students to become self-directed because Self-Regulation refers to the ability to develop, implement, and maintain planned behaviour in order to achieve one's goals.
- Academic procrastination and the Self-Regulation of the students are negatively related to each other i.e. lower the Self Regulation, higher the chances of academic procrastination.
- This study provides the opportunity to the parents, teachers, counsellors, and school administrators to check the Self-Regulation and procrastination level of their students and treat them accordingly.
- It will also help the parents, teachers, counsellors, and school administrators to identify, in which dimension of academic work students procrastinate more.
- It will provide knowledge to the teacher regarding the importance of their student's Self-Regulation skills in their performance.

**REFERENCES**

1. Bandura, A (1986). Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood cliffs, NJ: prentice- Hall.
2. Brown, J. M., Miller, W. R., & Lawendowski, L. A. (1999). The Self-Regulation Questionnaire. In L. VandeCreek & T. L. Jackson (Eds.), Innovations in clinical practice: A source book (Vol. 17, pp. 281-289). Sarasota, FL: Professional Resource Press.
3. Klein, E. (1971). A comprehensive etymological dictionary of the English language. New York: Elsevier.
4. O'Brien, W. K. (2002). Applying the transtheoretical model to Academic Procrastination. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston.
5. Ozer, B. U., Demir, A., & Ferrari, J. R. (2009). Exploring Academic Procrastination among Turkish students: Possible gender differences in prevalence and reasons. Journal of Social Psychology, 149, 241-257. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.149.2.241-257>.
6. Pintrich, P. R. (2004). A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and self-regulated learning in college students. Educational Psychology Review, 16, 385-407.
7. Rothblum, E.D., Solomon, L.J., & Mukrmi, J. (1986). Affective, cognitive, and behavioural differences between high and low procrastinators. Journal of Counselling Psychology, 33, 387-394.
8. Solomon, L. J., & Rothblum, E. D. (1984). Academic Procrastination: Frequency and Cognitive-behavioral correlates. Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31, 503-509.
9. Steel, P. (2007). The nature of procrastination: A meta analytic and theoretical review of quintessential self-regulatory failure. American Psychological Association 33, 65-94.
10. Weiner, N. (1948). Cybernetics: control and communication in the animal and the machine. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
11. Zimmerman, B. J. (2000). Attainment of self-regulation: A social cognitive perspective. In M. Boekaerts, P. Pintrich, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), Handbook of self-regulation, research, and applications (pp. 13-39). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.