Demographic Profiles and Procrastination of Employees: Relationships and Determinants

John Mark R. Asio*
College of Education, Arts and Sciences,
Gordon College, Olongapo City, Philippines

Erin E. Riego de Dios
College of Education, Arts and Sciences,
Gordon College, Olongapo City, Philippines

Abstract: Procrastination is a plague that affects an individual's working attitude and behavior. In relation, the organization will also suffer and its constituents along the way. This study assessed the demographic profile and the degree of procrastination among selected employees from a higher education institution in Central Luzon, Philippines. The study used a descriptive-correlational design with an adapted questionnaire from McCkloskey (2011) as an instrument. A total of 70 individuals took part in the survey wherein the researcher used convenience sampling. The study found that the respondents from the administrative office and faculty were equal in number; they belong to the age bracket of 21-30 years old; dominated by males and are single with 1-5 years in service. Also, based on their response, the respondents often subject themselves to procrastination. In addition, there was also an indirect relationship between procrastination and civil status. Furthermore, regression analysis determined that age and civil status is a significant predictor of procrastination. Based on the aforementioned results, the researcher concluded that certain demographic profiles determine the procrastination of an employee. Lastly, the study provided some pertinent recommendation which will benefit both the employees and the organization.

INTRODUCTION

Being productive in the workplace is an integral part of the business in the organization and some employees procrastinate on schedules set to them by their bosses. Procrastination hampers work results and yields are not good for the organization. At the end of the working hour, the employees should produce and deliver quality outputs. Studies like that of Khattak and Ilyas (2017) showed in their study the leading causes of procrastination. But what is procrastination? McCkloskey (2011) provided a simple definition of procrastination where it refers to a unique outlet of procrastinatory tendencies. It hampers organizational processes and the delivery of basic resources and services. Some studies try to ease the prevalence of procrastination like that of Richardson (2018) and Teng (2019). However, this process is unique in every setting where procrastination is adamant and flourishing. The organization also has its varied ways of serving the community, thus, productivity is an important aspect of the process. We must produce the output for the day to meet the daily quota of work for the day. As Uysal and Yilmaz (2020) introduced in their study that workplace procrastination affects a company's activity. Their study also showed the relationship between Hierarchical Career Plateau (HCP) with Workplace Procrastination (WP). To add, Hen, Goroshit, and Viengarten (2021) mentioned that procrastination is a common behavior with several negative outcomes. Thus, their group found that personality-oriented types of

---

*Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed John Mark R. Asio, College of Education, Arts and Sciences, Gordon College, Olongapo City, Philippines . E-mail: asio.johnmark@gmail.com

procrastination predict procrastination at work. Klingsieck (2013) mentioned that procrastination harms performance. Since we are now in the era of technology-based work orientation, the use of the internet also shares a significant impact to work. Kastiya and Sharma (2020) showed that anxious workplace procrastination among millennial employees correlates positively with internet addiction for social media. A lot of different perspectives and concepts played a role in the proliferation of procrastination in the workplace thus, the organization has to do something about it. We cannot argue more. This is the principal reason this study saw if such a notion also prevails in an academic setting. Since the current research is in a tertiary education institution, it would be beneficial for both the organization and the employees to see whether the variables involved in this study persist to some extent.

The purpose of this study is to determine the demographic profiles and the degree of procrastination among employees from a higher education institution. Furthermore, the study also aims to identify the relationship between the two variables and determine which demographic profile predicts procrastination from the employees as presented by the following research hypothesis:

- There is no significant relationship between the demographic profiles and procrastination of the employees.
- The demographic profiles of the employees do not predict their procrastination.

Finally, this study intends to benefit the employees and the organization since they have to work hand-in-hand to serve the community in terms of providing sound services for the students. At the same time, provide substantial information and data for researchers for the future endeavor of the same area or field of study. In the global aspect, the result from this study offers some ideas how employee procrastination works and affects an organizational environment in the academic setting. Furthermore, this study serves as basis for improving organizational relationship among employees and the institution in the local and global perspective.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Procrastination is a global phenomenon which plagues organization. To provide a better description regarding this subject, Uyar (2019) provided some contrasting definition. Its causes vary from one setting to another as well as its pervasiveness (Dutta & Truax, 2018; Sarirah & Chaq, 2019). We link this phenomenon to different human resource ideas and concepts. In the words of Chauhan et al. (2020), procrastination in the organization is dysfunctional but can be strategically valuable. Recent studies regarding procrastination showed contrasting perspectives. In the findings of Hen (2018), the author indicated that professional role, ambiguity and situational determinants were the primary reasons for procrastination. The group of Alblwi, McAlaney, Al Thani, Phalp, and Ali (2021) showed in their study that self-control and conscientiousness were significant predictors of procrastination. On the other hand, Bala, Sood, and Singh (2021) showed that management by exemption passive and Laissez-Faire style of leadership affect perceived procrastination among leaders. In terms of gender, female employees were more inclined to procrastination tendencies than males (Ahmad & Hussain, 2020). Besides, Siedlecki (2020) identified in their paper different causes and remedies of workplace procrastination. Furthermore, Hen et al. (2021) posited that abusive supervision affects the work procrastination behavior of employees. A study also concluded that procrastination among leaders is a distinct form of negative behavior which leads to job frustration among followers (Legood, Lee, Schwarz, & Newman, 2018). But in an experiment, Acceptance and Commitment Therapy (ACT) showed an effect on reducing work procrastination among university employees (Salehi, 2020).

Hicks and Storey (2015) associated self-efficacy with passive and active procrastination. A study also showed that work characteristics link to workplace procrastination via individual processes of cognitive appraisal and self-regulation (Prem, Scheel, Weigelt, Hoffmann, & Korunka, 2018). Inclusive leadership also affect the employees procrastination in the workplace (Lin et al., 2018). Transformational leadership and organizational citizenship however related negatively with workplace procrastination (Metin, Peeters, & Taris, 2018). Hall, Lee, and Rahimi (2019) showed the relationship between procrastination and burnout. But another study stated that work procrastination negatively relates to the sleep quality of respondents (van Eerde & Venus, 2018). Another group of researchers also found some significant findings regarding the relevance of sleep and circadian misalignment for procrastination among shift workers (Kühnel, Sonnentag, Bledow, & Melchers, 2018). Procrastination relates also to personal aspects of life like the study of Ferrari and Landreth (2014), wherein they exposed rural procrastinators' reports of life challenges in their home, family lives, and in their work settings. Pearlman-Avnion and Zibenberg (2018) set a distinct point of perspective in their study, which showed an association between procrastination, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neuroticism in the workplace. While procrastination has negative effects on unique aspects of the organizational process, Cadena,

Schoar, Cristea, and Delgado-Medrano (2011), experimented to fight procrastination and exposed improved worker satisfaction and reduced stress levels. As mentioned earlier procrastination has a delimiting effect which leads to performance decline (Akbarnejhad & Ghahari, 2017). For example, a study by Vargas (2017) indicated that researchers in psychology procrastinate academically. Organizations try to devise ways of decreasing or preventing procrastination like what Teng (2019) did wherein they devised an application for such a goal. Richardson (2018) also tried to reduce procrastination by balancing the schedule. Metin et al. (2018) emphasized the importance of having a suitable fit between employment settings and employees.

In the local Philippine context, the researchers found that there were a few pieces of works of literature that indirectly discuss the concept of employee procrastination. It is either just part of a research instrument (Anuran, Buenviaje, Encio, & Refozar, 2016; Bacong & Encio, 2017), part of the discussion (De Castro, Prenda, Laguador, & Pesigan, 2015; Mariano & Janio, 2018) or focuses on academic procrastination of students (Fuertes, Jose, Nem Singh, Rubio, & de Guzman, 2020; Nartea, Gabriel, Samala, & Javier, 2020). But there is no particular study that pertains to the actual degree of procrastination among employees in an academic setting. Thus, this implored the researcher to pursue the study to provide a brief assessment and analysis.

Based on the different reviews of literature from both international and local aspects, the researchers found that there is no singular result that would point out procrastination as either helpful or debilitating to an employee and the organization. Also, procrastination relates negatively and positively to different variables including demographic profiles of respondents. Here lies the research gap for this study. More importantly, the researchers also discovered that there is not much study or literature about procrastination in the local perspective therefore, this is a good opportunity to establish baseline information for future researches.

METHODOLOGY

Research Design

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

Respondents

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

Research Instrument

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

survey. Before administration, the researchers secured the consent of all the respondents for ethical consideration and confidentiality.

Data Analysis

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

RESULTS

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

Table 1 *Demographic Profile of the Respondents*

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

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

Table 2 *Procrastination Level of the Respondents*

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

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

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

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

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

$p < .05$

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

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

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

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

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

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

DISCUSSION

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

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

The present study also subjected the data through statistical analysis and found some remarkable results. A deeper insight into the study includes the determining of the relationships among the demographic profile and procrastination

of employees, and the current study provided substantial results. A relationship existed between the two variables. Related literature like Beutel et al. (2016) found out that procrastination is related to unemployment, which supports the study's result; Nomura and Ferrari (2018) also justified that being single is related to delaying tasks. However, Çetin and Kumkale (2017) showed that they found a negative relationship between procrastination and task performance. Further, Pearlman-Avnion and Zibenberg (2018) stated that personality traits and workplace procrastination are unstable.

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

CONCLUSION

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

RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the information that was generated from the study, the researcher suggested the following implications for the study. The institution should explore and understand procrastination behavioral patterns and devise effective management methods to reduce their negative effects on the employees lives and work habits. It is also suggested to organize seminars, workshops, and training programs to reduce academic and personnel procrastination and increase the productivity of employees from time to time. The institution should also explore the possibility of shortening the working days in a week and longer working hours for the day to provide a longer time for rest and leisure. Another suggestion could work in a flexible time (flexi-time) if some faculty members or personnel can avail or intend to use it. Devise a method or policy of monitoring procrastination in the workplace and managing the negative effects and turning it into opportunity. The administration should also promote organizational commitment, trust, and loyalty since every employee is guided by the organization's vision, mission, and goals. There should also be a plausible reward/incentive system so that faculty and personnel can enjoy and see their significance in the organization. Last, future studies may also explore other potential roles of procrastination to the productivity of personnel.

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

REFERENCES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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