International Journal of Social Relevance & Concern
ISSN No: 2347-9698 Volume 2 Issue 8, August

Procrastination: Rationality among Pre-service Teachers of Bukidnon State University

Oscar B. Cabañelez
Office of the Vice President for Academic Affairs (VPAA), Bukidnon State University
Malaybalay, Bukidnon PH
bsu_vpaa@hotmail.com

ABSTRACT

Procrastination is a behavioral tendency characterized by delaying the performance of a task at the later time. It is viewed as compensatory mechanism in coping up anxiety associated with completing and/or starting a task. One possible cause of procrastination among college students is the lack of self-regulating performance. The present work was undertaken to determine the level of procrastination among pre-service teachers. Specifically, it determined the procrastination tendency among science mathematics (SM) and non science mathematics (NSM) students. The results of the present undertaking showed that the pre-service teacher respondents are high procrastinators regardless of the course, gender and course program, except for the male non science freshmen students who are moderate procrastinators. The paired sample test on the level of procrastination between female senior SM/NSM showed significance at $p \leq .001$, while the freshmen female SM/NSM showed $p \leq .006$. Likewise, significance was determined between freshmen female NSM and freshmen male NSM at $p \leq .002$. Pearson Coefficient Correlation analyses showed no positive correlation across variables.
Recommendation: It is recommended that, the university adopts a program that will help and enhance the student's ability to cope up with the school work load; and develop a monitoring system that will help the students attain satisfactory academic performance.

Keywords
Procrastination, Science Mathematics Student,
Non Science Mathematics Student,
Pre- service Teachers

1. INTRODUCTION

Procrastination is a human behavior which has been characterized and viewed in varied perspective. Accordingly, it is a behavioral tendency to defer or delay task that need to be done to avoid decisions and responsibility (Tuckman and Sexton, 1990; Haycock et al., 1998). Likewise, it refers to putting off something to be done which is essential in attaining certain goals or objectives (Lay, 1986). In addition, procrastination refers to needlessly delaying the performance of a needed task which may result to a subjective negative consequence (Solomon and Rothblum, 1984). Procrastination recognizes a task that should be done and need to be done, yet, deficient of motivation to perform the required task within the limit or expected time (Senecal et al., 1995).

Implicitly, people who tend to procrastinate could be attributed to personality flaws such as being undisciplined, indolent and the inability to manage time efficiently (Burka and Yuen, 1982). These attributes are ways to protect their self-esteem through self-handicapping, the avoidance of aversive tasks and anxiety for fear of failure or their perfectionist tendency, because of their lack of self-regulation and self-management ability (Solomon and Rothblum, 1984).

The cause of procrastination is varied, but according to experts it may be due to low sense of self-worth, self-esteem and self-defeating intellect or reason (Burka, 2008). Maybe, it could also be due to a lower mental level of conscientiousness which lacks an appreciation of own potentialities (Strub, 1989). Although there are three components of procrastination: cognitive, behavioral and emotional, the most common tendency among college students is behavioral. Academician noted that the most prominent and common procrastination tendency observed in the university is the habit of waiting for the due date in the submission of papers and putting off the time to review for the examination until the last hour (Milgram, 1993). Likewise, there are the so called impulsive procrastinators. Seemingly, these people do not understand the things to be done and has no motivation to perform a certain tasks (Salizman, 1979).

Somehow, experts are looking into the influence of technology and how it affects the way of life of an individual and, its availability and accessibility make it easier for people to procrastinate. Nowadays, mails and communication could easily be accessed easily, news are available on line and many intervening factors that can cause an individual to procrastinate.

IJournals

Psychologists have been trying to assess and looking into other correlates for understanding procrastination. One aspect that was tried is self-efficacy. It refers to the belief of a person's ability to accomplish a task on hand (Zimmerman et al., 1992). Although self-efficacy has been shown to increase academic performance, it has no effect on procrastination. In addition, the effect of self-regulation has also been tried, yet of no avail.

Earlier report showed that more people admittedly have been procrastinating (Steel 2007). In the university, an estimate of about 95% among American students reported to have purposely delay completing a task and about 70% of the college students practiced frequently procrastination (Ellis and Knaus, 1977). It is becoming evident that procrastination has greatly affected the academic performance of the students even to the extent of withdrawing from school (Semb et al., 1979). It was reported that frequent academic procrastination has been reported across racial categories without regards to gender (Ferrai et al., 1995).

Despite the negative effect reported and the growing concern about procrastination, it remains a relatively incomprehensible phenomenon (Burka and Yuen, 1983; Haycock et al., 1998).

Nevertheless, procrastination is not a task specific attribute; instead, it is an innate or inherent characteristic. Assumingly, if one procrastinates in a certain aspect or area of life, most likely it could be repeated in similar circumstances (Milgram et al., 1993).

Statement of the Problem

The present undertaking purports to assess and evaluate the level of procrastination of the pre-service teachers of the College of Education, Bukidnon State University.

Specifically, the study seeks an answer to the following questions;

1. What is the level of procrastination of the following?

    a. freshmen and senior students

    b. Science-Mathematics (SM) and Non Science-Mathematics NSM) Students

2. What is the procrastination level of the respondents according to gender?

Hypothesis

The study establishes a significant relationship in the state of procrastination between:

A. Male and Female students
B. Science-Mathematics and Non Science-Mathematics students
C. Freshmen and senior students

Significance of the Study

As future teachers, their behavior in the fulfillment of their professional duties and responsibilities will have an enormous impact on the future characters of their students. In addition, the responsibility of the teachers is surmountable that procrastination behavior may affect their efficiency. Henceforth, it could be of value to determine their behavior at the present state of their preparation as future mentors.

Materials and Methods

A. Respondents

The respondents of the study were purposively selected from the College of Education, Bukidnon State University, Malaybalay, who were classified as freshmen and senior, and majoring in science-mathematics and non science-mathematics, enrolled first semester, academic year, 2014-2015.

B. Research Design

The study adopted the descriptive correlation research design to determine and establish significant correlation among the variables under consideration.

C. Instrument

The study made use of the standardized scoring instrument to determine the level of procrastination which was developed by Bruce Tuckman (1991). It consists of 35 items inventory. The scoring will follow the 5-point scale; where 5 are considered very high while 1 is very low. The following scale was used for the interpretation of the results of the study.

4.5 – 5.00 Very high procrastinators
3.5 – 4.45 High procrastinators
2.5 – 3.45 Moderate procrastinators
1.5 – 2.45 Low procrastinators
1.0 – 1.45 Very low procrastinators

D. Statistical Analysis

The significance of the study was established using the following statistical tools:

IJournals

1. Student's t-test
2. Pearson Coefficient Correlations

Results

Table 1 The number of Respondents according to Gender (Science Mathematics Students)

Science Mathematics-Senior			Science Mathematics-Freshmen		
Gender	F	%	Gender	F	%
Female	27	65.85%	Female	28	62.22%
Male	14	34.15%	Male	17	37.78%
Total	41	100%	Total	45	100%

Table 1 reflects the total population of student respondents in the study. As shown, a total of forty-one senior students participated in and from the total twenty-seven were female which comprised about sixty-five and eighty-five hundredths per cent (65.85%). Meanwhile, thirty-four and fifteen hundredths per cent (34.15%) were the male respondents which account for about 14 students.

Table 2 The number of Respondents according to Gender (Non Science Mathematics Students)

Non Science Math -Senior			Non Science Math-Freshmen		
Gender	F	%	Gender	F	%
Female	42	67.74%	Female	28	62.22%
Male	20	32.26%	Male	17	37.78%
Total	62	100%	Total	45	100%

As show in Table 2, there were sixty-two senior non-science mathematics students who joined the study, sixty-seven and seventy-four hundredths (67.74%) were female, while the remaining thirty-two and twenty-six hundredths (32.26%) were male respondents. Whereas, there were forty-five non-science mathematics freshmen; sixty-two and twenty-two hundredths (62.22%) were female (28 students) and thirty-seven and seventy-eight hundredths (37.78%), a total of 17 student respondents.

Table 3 The number of Respondents according to Age (Science Mathematics Students)

Gender	Science Mathematics Senior				Science Mathematics Freshmen			
	Female		Male		Female		Male	
Age Group	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Above 25	1	4.76	1	7.14	0	0	0	0
25 - 23	3	14.29	0	0	0	0	0	0
22 - 20	10	47.62	9	64.29	2	6.6	3	21.4
19 - 17	7	33.33	4	28.57	18	60	10	71.4
16 below	0	0	0	0	10	33.3	1	7.14
Total	21	100	14	100	30	100	14	100

Table 3 reflects the age-group of the science mathematics respondents. Majority of the senior female respondents were at the 22 – 20 age bracket which comprised forty-seven and sixty-two hundredths per cent (47.62%), followed by the students in the 19 – 17 age group with seven students (33.33%), three (3) respondents in 25 – 23 age group and the least was recorded in above 25 age group (4.76%) with 1 respondent. Among the male senior student respondents, sixty-four and twenty-nine hundredths (9 students) were in the 22 – 20 age bracket, four (4) students were in the 19 – 17 age group which comprised twenty-eight and fifty-seven hundredths of the total population. Among the science mathematics female freshmen respondents, eighteen were in the 19 – 17 age group which comprised 60% and about 10 students were in the 16 and below years old. Similarly, among the male freshmen respondents a total of 10 students (71.43%) were in the 19 – 17 age group.

Table 4 The number of Respondents according to Age (Non Science Mathematics Students)

Gender	Non Science Mathematics Senior				Non Science Mathematics Freshmen			
	Female		Male		Female		Male	
Age Group	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Above 25	0	0	3	15	0	0	0	0
25 - 23	3	7.5	2	10	0	0	0	0
22 - 20	9	22.5	5	25	2	8	1	4
19 - 17	28	70	10	50	8	32	20	80
16 below	0	0	0	0	15	60	4	16
Total	40	100	20	100	25	100	25	100

Table 4 shows the distribution of both the female and male respondents according to age. As reflected, seventy per cent (70%) of the female Non Science Mathematics Senior students were at age group between 19 - 17 (28 students), followed by those within the 22 – 20 age group which comprised twenty-two and five hundredths (22.5%) and about three respondents were at the age bracket between 25 – 23 (7.5%). Similarly, fifty per cent (50%) of the male senior students are within the age group of 19 – 17 (10 students), followed by 2 students in 25 – 23 (10%) and 3 students in above 25 age group (15%). On the other hand, among the Non Science Mathematics Freshmen female students, sixty

IJournals

per cent (60%), about 15 of them are below 16 years old, followed by 8 students (32%) and 2 students (8%). Twenty NSMF male students are within the 19 -17 age group which comprised eighty per cent (80%), followed by 4 students below 16 years old (16%) and 1 student (4%) in 22 – 20 age bracket.

Table 5 The Level of Procrastination According to Course Program and Year Level

Course	Gender	Mean	Adjectival Interpretation
Science Math Senior	Female	3.69	High
	Male	3.55	High
Science Math Freshmen	Female	3.46	High
	Male	3.53	High
Non Science Math Senior	Female	3.45	High
	Male	3.53	High
Non Science Math Freshmen	Female	3.64	High
	Male	3.39	Moderate
Over-all		3.53	High

Table 5 reflects the level of procrastination across the course program and the year level of the student respondents. As shown, regardless of the gender, senior science and mathematics students obtained a mean of 3.69 and 3.55 which has an adjectival interpretation of moderate procrastinators, respectively. In contrast, the science mathematics freshmen students obtained a mean of 3.46 for the female and 3.53 for the male which has the same adjectival interpretation which is high procrastinators. The non science mathematics freshmen recorded a mean of 3.64 and 3.39 for female and male, respectively and with adjectival interpretation of moderate. Interestingly, the non science mathematics senior recorded a different level of procrastination, wherein the female were moderate procrastinators (Mean=3.45) while the male were high procrastinators (Mean=3.53). Despite the difference in the level of procrastinators across the student respondents, the overall mean recorded a 3.53 which means that the general level of the procrastination is high.

Table 6 Paired Sample Test on the Level of Procrastination

Pair	Mean	Std Dev	t	Sig (2-tailed)*
SMS/NSMS_Female	.23829	.38308	3.680	.001
SMS/NSMS_Male	.01757	.49080	.212	.834
SMF/NSMF_Female	-.17714	.35954	-2.915	.006
SMF/NSMF_Male	.13486	.51579	1.547	.131
NSMS_Female/NSMF_Male	-.07629	.38305	-1.178	.247
NSMF_Female/NSMF_Male	.244056	.41734	3.410	.002

*spss

Table 6 reflects the paired sample test (t-test) results. As shown, the procrastination level between female Science Mathematics Senior (SMS) and Non Science Mathematics Senior students computed a significant difference, $p \leq .001$. Likewise, a significant difference was also reflected between the female Science Mathematics Freshmen (SMF) and Non Science Mathematics Freshmen (NSMF) which was determined to be a $p \leq .006$. Interestingly, a significant difference in the procrastination level between the female Non Science Mathematics Freshmen (NSMF) and the male Non Science Mathematics Freshmen (NSMF) was arrived and reflected a value of $p \leq .002$.

Table 7 Pearson Correlation between Science Mathematics Seniors (SMS) and Science Mathematics Freshmen (SMF) Students

Pearson (r)		Female SMS	Male SMS	Female SMF	Male SMF
F_ SMS	r	1	.796**	.810**	.718**
M_SMS	r	.796**	1	.830**	.701**
F_SMF	r	.810**	.830**	1	.764**
M_SM F	r	.718**	.710**	.764**	1

***correlation is significant at 0.01 levels

It could be gleamed at Table 7 the result of Pearson Correlation analysis between the Science Mathematics Senior (SMS) and Science Mathematics Freshmen (SMF) student respondents. As shown no significant correlation on the level of procrastination exists between the two groups of respondents.

Table 8 Pearson Correlation between Non Science Mathematics Seniors (NSMS) and Non Science Mathematics Freshmen (NSMF) Students

Pearson (r)		Female SMS	Male SMS	Female SMF	Male SMF
F_SMS	r	1	.780**	.806**	.802**
M_SMS	r	.780**	1	.759**	.719**
F_SMF	r	.806**	.759**	1	.744**
M_SM F	r	.802**	.719**	.744**	1

***correlation is significant at 0.01 levels

Table 8 reflects the result of Pearson Correlation analysis between the Non Science Mathematics Senior (NSMS) and Non Science Freshmen (NSMF) respondents. Similarly, no significant correlation on the level of procrastination was established between the two groups of students.

Discussion

Whereas everyone in the course of his life experienced consciously or sub-consciously the tendency to procrastinate, the question lies on the frequency of occurrence and consequence of the act. Maybe, for some, it was just momentarily that no negative consequence became evident. However, how if procrastination tendency became a

IJournals

way of life? Maybe, it is at this point where one has to think and assess his socio-psychological behavior and tendencies.

Procrastination tendency is evident in every societal milieu and in all walks of life, that people seems not to notice the consequential implication of their action. According to experts, there two major psychological causes of procrastination at work and/or in daily life which are translated to anxiety. One is related to incidental task that interrupts the flow of things which has a low impact on work. Somehow, these are too small to cause worry. On the other hand, there are incidental things too big to control, tasks that cause fear and worry which has a negative implication on the person's life (David, 2014).

Procrastination is universal among college students, in fact, experts referred to it as a bad habit, however, because of its perpetual occurrence it may no longer be classified as such. Furthermore, some says that procrastination is a way of coping up things that they tend to avoid. For example, in the school, such avoidance may be translated to late submission of requirements, written reports and not to mention delaying in seeing a physician even if having an acute health problem (Glenn, 2002). The most common cognitive distortions which promote procrastination are: overestimation and/or underestimation of time left to perform and complete a task, overestimation of motivational states, dependence on emotional congruence to succeed and concept of the "mood" to perform a task (Ferrari et al, 1995). Hence, procrastinators know what the things to be done are and are equipped with the faculty to perform the task, yet excessively delay the completion of the tasks. In the end, what is done and accomplish are less important and most often prioritizes leisure or pleasant activity. An analysis of teacher's general tendency to procrastinate showed that the tendency is only related to sub-dimension of teacher altruism scale (Dilmac, 2009).

The results of the study showed that almost all the respondents were high procrastinators, except for male freshmen non science mathematics students. Could this behavior be an overlaid tendency from high school? The reason why the respondents were chosen among the science mathematics major and non science mathematics major is to elucidate the procrastination level, regardless of the major or course being taking. University students should be able to perform well academically. Although data is not evident, students who decide to take science and mathematics course are expected to be more focused, disciplined and conscientious. Hence, they are expected not to procrastinate heavily, considering the difficulty of the course program being undertaken. The results of the present work seem not able to substantiate such perception. Maybe, there are other factors that have to be considered such as the family background, socio-economic status and the ethnic background of the students. It should be noted that the respondents of the present work came from various ethnic and tribal group in the region.

Henceforth, if procrastination tendency will not be corrected or keep unabated in the university, particularly on career path that entails a lot of responsibilities to be accomplished within a framework of time, maybe, it would be a challenge to the system and organization where these graduates will finally find its way.

Conclusion: The results of the present undertaking showed that the pre-service teacher respondents are high procrastinators regardless of the course, gender and major, except for the male non science freshmen students who are moderate procrastinators. The paired sample test on the level of procrastination between female senior SM/NSM showed significance at $p \leq .001$, while the freshmen female SM/NSM showed $p \leq .006$ and lastly, significance was determined between female freshmen NSM and male freshmen NSM at $p \leq .002$. Pearson Coefficient Correlation analyses showed no positive correlation across variables.

Recommendation

It is hereby recommended that;

1. The University Guidance Center formulate a program that will enhance students' ability to cope up with the school work load effectively; and

2. Develop a system of monitoring the academic performance of the student population, in collaboration with the different colleges and the student council.

REFERENCES

[1] Burka, Y (2008) Procrastination: why you do it, what to do about it now. New York: De Capo Lifelong Book.

[2] Burka, J and Yuen, L (1982) Mind games procrastinators play. Psychology Today. 54(2):316-322

[3] David, A (2014) Getting Started. www.gettingthingsdone. Com

[4] Dilmac, B (2009). An analysis of teachers' general tendency to procrastinate, perception of professional efficiency/self efficiency and altruism. Electronic J Research Educational Psych 7(3):1323-1338

[5] Ellis, A and Knaus, W J (1977) Overcoming procrastination. New York: New American Library.

[6] Ferrari, J R, Johnson, J L and McCown, W G (1995) Procrastination and task avoidance. New York, New York: Plenum Press.

[7] Glenn, D (2002). Procrastination in college student is a marker for unhealthy behaviors, study indicates. The Chronicle of Higher Education.

[8] Haycock, L A, McCarthy, P and Skay, C L (1998) Procrastination in college students: the role of self-efficacy and anxiety. J Counseling Develop. 76:17-324.

[9] Lay, C (1986) At last, my research article on procrastination. J Res Psych. 20:474-495.

[10] Milgram, N, Batori, B and Mower, D (193) Correlates of academic procrastination. J School Psych. 31:647-662

[11] Salizman, L (1979) Psychotherapy of the obsessional. American J Psychotherapy. 33:32-40

IJournals

[12] Semb, G, Glick, D M, and Spencer, R E (1979) Student withdrawals and delayed work patters in self-paced psychology courses. Teaching of Psychology. 6:23-25

[13] Senecal, C, Koestner, R and Vallerand, R J (1995) Self-regulation and academic procrastination. J Soc Psych 135:607

[14] Steel, P. (2007). The nature of procrastination: A meta-analytic and theoretical review of quintessential self-regulatory failure. Psychological Bulletin. 133 (1):65-94

[15] Strub, P L (1989) Frontal lobe syndrome in a patient with bilateral globus pallidus lesions. Archives of Neurology. 46:1024-1027

[16] Solomon, I J and Rothblum, E D (1984) Academic procrastination: frequency and cognitive behavioral correlates. J Counseling Psych. 31:503-509.

[17] Tuckman, B (1991) The development and concurrent validity of the procrastination scale. Educational and Psychological Measurement. 51:473-480

[18] Tuckman, B W and Sexton, T L (1990) The relation between self-beliefs and self-regulated performance. J Soc Behavior. 5:465-435.

[19] Zimmerman, B J, Bandura, A and Martinez-Pons, M. (1992) Self-motivation for academic attainment: The role of self-efficacy beliefs and personal goal-setting. American Educational Res J. 29:663-676.

IJournals