

How Much Of A Procrastinator Are You? Looking Into Education Students' Performance In Submitting Outputs In The University

Sherlyn C. Cordova, Mariafe D. Reville

College of Education, Caraga State University, Ampayon, Butuan City, Philippines
College of Education, Caraga State University, Ampayon, Butuan City, Philippines

DOI: 10.29322/IJSRP.15.04.2025.p16021
<https://dx.doi.org/10.29322/IJSRP.15.04.2025.p16021>

Paper Received Date: 26th March 2025

Paper Acceptance Date: 24th April 2025

Paper Publication Date: 30th April 2025

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to determine the level of procrastination in the submission of course requirements in terms of timeliness or urgency and stress, the level of satisfaction in terms of the quality of work and efficiency of resources, and how it affects the academic performances of education students at Caraga State University. Moreover, the study also aimed to identify the relationship between the academic performance and students' level of satisfaction and timeliness and stress levels in the submission of course requirements. The results serve as a basis for crafting proposed intervention material that can lead to improved performance in submitting outputs and a reduction in procrastination tendencies. Results showed that students exhibit normal levels of procrastination and stress in meeting course requirements, emphasizing the importance of balance to mitigate their impact. However, satisfaction with the quality of work and efficiency of resources is moderately high, attributed to clear guidelines provided by instructors. Academic performance, reflected in GPA, achieved very satisfactory level, driven by students' desire for success. Moreover, there is no significant correlation between academic performance and satisfaction levels, timeliness, and stress, indicating that success of students cannot be solely attributed to these factors.

Keywords: *academic performance, level of procrastination, quality of work satisfaction, stress, timeliness*

I. Introduction

The issue of academic procrastination stands out as a significant challenge for students throughout their academic journey, exerting a prevalent influence on their mental well-being, academic accomplishments, and day-to-day activities. According to KS et al. (2023), students often think of doing one thing and end up doing nothing or something else. It is common among students to plan to study regularly, but at the end of the day, they realize that they have not done anything according to their plan. This phenomenon, commonly referred to as procrastination, extends its impact across various facets of academic performance, posing challenges to students in nearly every aspect of their educational pursuits (Goroshit, 2018).

The term procrastination was first coined by Brown and Oltman in 1967, this term is rooted in another language procrastination which means to delay until the next day. Students who delay doing their homework are more susceptible to stressors, and their response to them is more acute (N, 2020). According to various estimates, between half and 90% of college and university students are prone to this behavior and the prevalence of this phenomenon is rising (Chehrzad et al., 2017). Procrastination can have various negative consequences including missed classes, assignments, and result in lower grades. Also, the quality and accuracy of work can be reduced due to the pressure associated with completing an assignment on a crunched timeline (Kim & Seo, 2015). Additionally, procrastination tendencies are linked to poor goal achievement and lower achievements (Akran et al., 2019) and a high level of procrastination is linked to stress and academic failure (Kuftyak, 2021).

Procrastination appears to make university students postpone and delay their academic work becoming self-exclusive and ignoring their academic responsibilities during the entire course of studies. It seems a common practice that university students put off their academic work: they delay in preparing, 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 the learning and achievement of university students (Husain & Sultan, 2015).

This can have cascading effects, leading to missed classes, neglected assignments, and ultimately, lower grades. Moreover, the pressure associated with completing assignments within tight timelines can compromise the quality and accuracy of the work produced (Kim & Seo, 2015). Additionally, studies suggest that procrastination tendencies are correlated with poor goal achievement and lower overall academic performance (Akran et al., 2019). A heightened level of procrastination is further associated with increased stress and a greater likelihood of academic failure (Kuftyak, 2021). In essence, recognizing and addressing procrastination is imperative for fostering academic success and well-being among students.

There has been keen research interest in the concept of procrastination and its impact on student academic performance however, there are only a few studies that help us understand students' behavior and patterns associated with it (Goroshit, 2018; Vlachopanou et al., 2019). The present study aimed to identify the level of procrastination in the submission of course requirements among the education students and to further explore participants' behavior regarding these causes. Also, it sought to provide intervention material that can lead to improved performance in submitting outputs to the university and a reduction in procrastination tendencies.

II. Literature Review

A. Definition and Causes of Procrastination

Procrastination is unnecessarily delaying starting, completing, and maintaining a task, even when the person has the required tools, skills, or authority to conduct that task (Bozkus, 2020). It is one of the issues affecting more than half of the student population and is known to impact them negatively. Several studies reveal it is common among students to delay study and learning-related activities (Kim & Seo, 2015; Steel & Klingsieck, 2016) and one of the major reasons for failure and dropout (Garg & Rajendran, 2023).

The causes of procrastination are mainly fear of failure, task aversiveness or laziness, lack of assertiveness, resentment towards control from others, and a desire to take risks. Similarly, the reasons for graduate students pertained not only to fear of failure, but also lack of assertiveness or peer pressure, task aversiveness or laziness, a desire to take risks, and resentment towards control from others (Rahimi & Hall, 2021). Accordingly, it is possible that students' perceptions of what it means for procrastination to be problematic may have influenced their responses. For example, if students believe that they have control over their procrastination they may not perceive the behavior as problematic. Moreover, although academic procrastination tends to be negatively related to academic performance, this behavior may nevertheless persist if students perceive their academic outcomes to be sufficient despite having procrastinated (Kim & Seo, 2015).

Research over the past four decades has amply demonstrated that individual factors significantly contribute to the procrastination problem (Nordby et al., 2017). These individual factors vary from student to student; however, family and work obligations can often cause additional challenges (Kara et al., 2019).

Another reason why college students procrastinate may be due to an assignment's characteristics. Students are given many study-related tasks, which represent an important environmental context for student delay in submissions (Nordby et al., 2017). Task aversion (the degree of unpleasantness, perceptions of boring or uninteresting a student associates with a task), is a high predictor for student delay in starting, working on, and finishing assignments (Nordby et al., 2017). Additionally, the level of task difficulty is associated with procrastination. Interestingly enough, the level of difficulty on both ends of the spectrum (either too challenging or not challenging enough) can lead to procrastination. As Nordby et al. (2017) noted, the more difficult the task, the more students tend to procrastinate; at the same time, the easier a task was, the more likely students were to perceive the task to be boring or uninteresting. In addition, dispositional barriers, such as fear of failure and insecurities can often be linked to factors such as relationships with instructors (Osam et al., 2017 as cited in Santelli et al., 2020). Moreover, the guilt associated with avoiding necessary tasks can lead to individuals placing a greater importance on alternate activities, thus strengthening procrastination behaviors (Kaftan & Freund, 2019).

As elaborated in the study of Ojo in 2019, these are identified several key factors contributing to student procrastination. Firstly, a lack of clarity about assignment expectations leads to postponement, heighten by perfectionism and fear of failure. Secondly, overcommitment to various activities results in procrastination to carve out "free time," accompanied by guilt. Thirdly, forgetting assignments due to missed announcements or optimistic time estimates contributes to last-minute rushes. External and internal distractions, coupled with poor study habits, create further hurdles. Emotional regulation difficulties, where students seek short-term mood improvement through avoidance, and resistance to authority also fuel procrastination. Addressing these issues necessitates strategies for managing distractions, breaking tasks into smaller steps, establishing effective study routines, and improving emotional regulation.

B. Students' Procrastination and Academic Performance

Several studies show a correlation between student procrastination and academic performance (Nordby et al., 2017). Procrastination can lead to missed classes, and assignments, and result in lower grades. Additionally, the quality and accuracy of work can be reduced due to the pressure associated with completing an assignment on a crunched timeline (Kim & Seo, 2015). In addition, procrastination tendencies are linked to poor goal achievement and lower achievements (Akran et al., 2019). This occurs when people delay completing a task they intend to complete, potentially leading to lost productivity, poor performance, and increased stress. Engaging in procrastination in an academic setting brings negative outcomes such as stress, guilt, poor academic performance, and low self-esteem (Ahmed et al., 2023).

Procrastination can have a negative impact on students' learning more specifically their academic performance. Having a heavy workload of assignments and poor time management can lead to procrastination. When students receive too many assignments all at once, it can increase their tendency to procrastinate. However, it's important to note that simply having a lot of assignments doesn't always directly cause procrastination. There may be other individual factors that contribute to procrastination behavior in each student (Bhatt, 2023).

Students are more likely to experience frustration and dissatisfaction, as well as psychological stress, which manifests itself in nervousness, headaches, gastrointestinal disorders, exhaustion, fear, anxiety, anger, and a sense of guilt. In general, stress levels are significantly higher in the low-performing group (Kufiyak, 2021). When academic procrastination leads to increased negative emotions, it can also lead to increased stress at the same time. Similarly, when academic procrastination leads to increased stress, this can, in turn, lead to issues such as exhaustion, which increases the likelihood that people will procrastinate on academic tasks, and consequently suffer from worse academic performance (Shatz, 2023). Moreover, researchers and practitioners note that academic procrastination leads to negative consequences on student's academic progress and well-being (Kim & Seo, 2015).

According to Deb et al. in 2015; and Ziegler and Opdenakker in 2018, procrastination is a common issue among students that often leads to stress and limits their academic decision-making. This behavior, sometimes leading to avoidance, can result in students postponing activities or exams for various reasons such as immediate achievement from other tasks, inadequate information processing, or fear of failure.

However, procrastination often leads to distraction, poor time management, laziness, pressure to succeed, or too many obligations. This impacts a student's ability to prioritize their work or some important matter that needs to be done, thus affecting their education. The advent of social media, such as Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, and YouTube, often used to pass time, may also contribute to this disruption (Türel & Dokumaci, 2022). The negative implications of these procrastination behaviors are significant. They negatively predict academic achievement, aligning with previous meta-analytical reports that remark on the negative effect of procrastination on academic outcomes (Kim & Seo, 2015).

Moreover, procrastination has been seen as an impediment to academic success because it decreases the quality and quantity of learning (Abdulla et al., 2013; Hamid & Ali, 2015). Meta-analyses studies were conducted to test the relationship between procrastination and academic performance. These studies reported that students who procrastinate are more likely to perform poorly (Kim & Seo, 2015).

C. Procrastination Intervention

Time management, especially at university, is an important factor contributing to the academic achievement of students (Moonaghi & Beydokhti, 2017). In addition, according to the study, achievement goals and learning strategies appear to be relevant factors to help or encourage students to be engaged in their learning activities. For instance, minimization by teachers of the motivation to move towards negative events (i.e., Performance-avoidance and Mastery-avoidance goals) could help to encourage students to reduce their tendency to procrastinate. Valuing motivation to move towards positive events (i.e., Performance-approach and Mastery-approach goals) and valuing effort regulation management could help to reduce the tendency of some students to procrastinate and thus have positive effects on their academic performance. Moreover, the findings also highlight the potential benefits of screening students' academic motivational profiles at the initial stages of procrastination interventions to concentrate more intensely on their different strategies, which act on different motivational components (Martinie et al., 2022).

There are coping strategies that students can adopt. Motivation and procrastination, being malleable features, are open to intervention (Dunn, 2014; Eerde & Klingsieck, 2018). Several reports have suggested the benefit of enhancing academic performance through motivational interventions and promoting self-regulation via time-management and self-motivation (Hulleman et al., 2016; Grunschel et al., 2018). Training of self-regulatory skills aims to establish work habits that prevent procrastination. This includes techniques of goal definition, stimulus-control techniques to avoid distractions, and time management techniques such as setting deadlines and monitoring progress. These techniques focus on changing the behavioral pattern of procrastination using cognitive-behavioral interventions. Additionally, building self-efficacy by changing negative, unproductive, and inhibiting thoughts into positive, productive, and motivated thoughts also helps (Van Eerde & Klingsieck, 2018).

According to Ragusa et al., (2023) procrastination can negatively impact a student's academic performance. There are effective strategies and interventions available to manage and overcome this behavior. The key is for students to be metacognitively

aware, planful, and strategic throughout their academic life. Kuftyak (2021), on the other hand, conducted a study entitled “Procrastination, stress, and academic performance in students.” The findings showed that low-performing students are more prone to experiencing procrastination, laziness, and a lack of discipline, whereas high-performing students are capable of self-control or self-regulation and can organize and structure their activities.

III. Methods

The study was quantitative in nature. It utilized a descriptive–correlational research design. It is descriptive because it assessed the connection between the submission of course requirements in terms of timeliness and stress, the level of satisfaction with the quality of work and efficiency of resources, and the academic performance of education students. It was a correlational design because it investigated the relationship between the academic performance and students’ level of satisfaction and timeliness and stress levels in the submission of course requirements. In this study, the chosen design was appropriate because no variables were manipulated. The researchers only aimed to identify the level of procrastination by looking into their academic performance in submitting their outputs.

A. Participants

The participants of the study were bonafide students at Caraga State University, from the 2nd and 3rd year levels in the College of Education, taking up the Bachelor of Elementary Education (BEEd). Sixty-nine (69) 2nd year and sixty-eight (68) 3rd year who were enrolled in the program in A.Y 2023-2024. There were one hundred thirty-seven (137) research participants under study.

B. Data Collection

The researchers crafted an instrument to facilitate the collection of the necessary data. It was submitted to the thesis adviser for content validation and thoroughly validated by three more experts. After retrieving the comments and suggestions from the poll of experts, the questionnaire was revised. It was tried out with thirty (30) students from the College of Education. The instrument was very reliable since the value of Cronbach’s Alpha is 0.888. It consists of four (3) parts. Part one contained information about the participant, which includes their name (optional), their respective programs, and their GPA (1st semester). Part two included the items to identify the level of procrastination regarding timeliness and stress levels in the submission of students' course requirements. Part three, the last part, consisted of the student’s level of satisfaction regarding the quality of work and efficiency of resources in the submission of course requirements. The GPA as part of the profile was collected with the education students’ permission as the study strictly observes the Data Privacy Act of 2012.

The researchers secured a letter of permission from the college dean and college chairperson. After their approval, the researchers oriented the participants about the purpose of the study and the ethical considerations in maintaining the confidentiality of their responses. The researchers administered the distribution of the questionnaire through Google Forms and kept the filling-in of the participants updated. This is to ensure that the responses are personally from the participants and for the participants to ask for help through Messenger chat if further clarifications are needed and other extraneous variables may arise. After gathering their responses, they tabulated the data and subjected them to statistical treatment for interpretation to draw conclusions from the results.

Scoring and Quantification of Data

The following quantification of the score was used in the study for the purpose of interpretation of the data:

Scales assigned to the responses on the extent of the level of procrastination in the submission of students' course requirements:

| Responses | Scale | Rating | Interpretation |
|-----------------|-------|-------------|--|
| Very Frequently | 5 | 4.50 – 5.00 | The level of procrastination is extreme. |
| Frequently | 4 | 3.50 – 4.49 | The level of procrastination is moderately high. |
| Occasionally | 3 | 2.50 – 3.49 | The level of procrastination is normal |
| Rarely | 2 | 1.50 – 2.49 | The level of procrastination is minimal. |

Once or Never 1 1.00-1.49 The level of procrastination is very minimal.

Scales assigned to the responses on the level of satisfaction in submission of course requirements.

| Responses | Scale | Rating | Interpretation |
|-----------------|-------|-------------|---|
| Very Frequently | 5 | 4.50 – 5.00 | The level of satisfaction is extreme. |
| Frequently | 4 | 3.50 – 4.49 | The level of satisfaction is moderately high. |
| Occasionally | 3 | 2.50 – 3.49 | The level of satisfaction is normal |
| Rarely | 2 | 1.50 – 2.49 | The level of satisfaction is minimal. |
| Once or Never | 1 | 1.00-1.49 | The level of satisfaction is very minimal. |

Scales assigned to the level of students’ performance based on Grade Point Average.

| Responses | Range | Interpretation |
|-------------------|-------------|---|
| Outstanding | 1.00 – 1.50 | Extra-ordinary level of achievement |
| Very Satisfactory | 1.51 – 2.00 | Exceeded job expectations |
| Satisfactory | 2.01 – 2.50 | Met expectations |
| Fair | 2.51 – 3.00 | Failed to meet expectations |
| Poor | 3.01 below | Progress has not made/ needs intervention |

IV. Results

Problem 1. Students Submission on their Course Requirements in terms of:

1.1. Timeliness or Urgency

Table 1 shows the level of timeliness or urgency of the submission of students’ course requirements. The indicator number five (5), in which the students find themselves in situations where they have to rush due to procrastinating on time-sensitive tasks, got the highest mean of 3.32, which means that education students occasionally procrastinate and is interpreted as normal. Meanwhile, indicator number nine (9) which states that postponing urgent tasks is something they did without much hesitation gained the lowest mean of 2.57, with an equivalent verbal interpretation that students occasionally procrastinate and are normal.

The overall weighted mean on the level of procrastination of education students in terms of timeliness or urgency in the submission of students’ course requirements is 2.99 which denotes that students occasionally procrastinate and is described as normal. Thus, occasional procrastination may be normal, students need to strike a balance between timeliness and urgency in completing their course requirements without causing undue stress or compromising the quality of their work.

Table 1
Mean distribution of the students' timeliness or urgency in the submission of their course requirements

| | Indicators | Level of Timeliness | | Interpretation |
|----|--|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| | | Mean | Description | |
| 1 | I find myself delaying tasks that have tight deadlines. | 2.89 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| 2 | I experience stress due to not completing time-sensitive activities on time. | 3.31 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| 3 | I tend to relax while others are doing their course requirements. | 2.73 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| 4 | I struggle with managing my time effectively, especially with urgent tasks. | 3.12 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| 5 | I find myself in situations where I have to rush due to procrastinating on time-sensitive tasks. | 3.32 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| 6 | I experience a sense of urgency due to not starting tasks promptly. | 3.31 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| 7 | I delay taking action on important matters until they become critical. | 2.90 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| 8 | I underestimated the time required to finish time-sensitive assignments. | 2.96 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| 9 | Postponing urgent tasks is something I do without much hesitation. | 2.57 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| 10 | Procrastinating on urgent matters is a regular occurrence in my routine. | 2.78 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| | Overall Weighted Mean | 2.99 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 Once or Never; 1.50-2.49 Rarely; 2.50-3.49 Occasionally; 3.50-4.49 Frequently; 4.50-5.00 Very Frequently

In the study conducted by Kim and Seo (2015) entitled “The relationship between procrastination and academic performance: A meta-analysis. Personality and Individual Differences,” stated that the quality and accuracy of work can be reduced due to the pressure associated with completing an assignment on a crunched timeline. This is also supported by Kara (2015) in her study “Challenges faced by adult learners in online distance education: A literature review.” The study revealed that self-regulation is a crucial attribute observed in successful learners, as it enables them to effectively manage and control their learning process.

1.2 Level of Stress

Table 2 entails the level of stress in the submission of the students' course requirements. As presented in the table, indicator number one (1) which states that education students' submission of course requirements at the last-minute leads to high levels of stress garnered the highest weighted mean of 3.32 which has an equivalent verbal description of “occasionally” and is interpreted as normal. On the other hand, indicator number nine (9) which states that hesitation to submit assignments on time, causing additional stress obtained the lowest weighted mean of 2.85, which signifies they occasionally experienced stress.

The overall weighted mean is 3.11 which means the participants occasionally experienced stress in submitting course requirements and signified as normal. The findings imply that while occasional stress may be normal, educators should remain vigilant to prevent excessive stress levels that could negatively impact student health and academic performance. Early identification of students experiencing high levels of stress allows for timely intervention and support.

Table 2

Mean distribution of the students' level of stress in the submission of their course requirements

| | Indicators | Level of Stress | | Interpretation |
|----|--|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| | | Mean | Description | |
| 1 | Submitting course requirements at the last-minute leads to high levels of stress for me. | 3.32 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| 2 | I find myself stressed due to delaying the submission of my assignments. | 3.23 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| 3 | Procrastinating on completing course tasks is a common source of stress in my academic life. | 3.27 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| 4 | I experience stress because I wait until the deadline to submit my coursework. | 2.90 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| 5 | I feel stressed because I struggle to start working on assignments well in advance. | 3.15 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| 6 | Submission of course requirements stresses me out. | 2.98 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| 7 | Struggling to manage time effectively for submitting assignments contributes to my stress. | 3.16 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| 8 | Submitting coursework at the last minute leads to stress as I rush to meet deadlines. | 3.28 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| 9 | I hesitate to submit assignments on time, causing additional stress. | 2.85 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| 10 | Stress related to submitting coursework is a regular part of my academic routine. | 2.96 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |
| | Overall Weighted Mean | 3.11 | Occasionally | The level of procrastination is normal. |

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 Once or Never; 1.50-2.49 Rarely; 2.50-3.49 Occasionally; 3.50-4.49 Frequently; 4.50-5.00 Very Frequently

This follows Akanpaadgi et al. (2023) on their study about “The Impact of Stress on Students’ Academic Performance.” The study revealed that the guidance and counseling department of the university should be strengthened to make it more effective in supporting students to overcome stress. In addition, guidance programs such as seminars and public lectures on stress awareness should be organized periodically for students so that they can be adequately equipped with the needed skills to handle issues related to academic stress better.

Problem 2. Students’ Level of Satisfaction in Submitting their Course Requirements in terms of:

2.1 Quality of Work

Table 3 shows the level of satisfaction in submission of students’ course requirements in terms of quality of work. As noticed, indicator number eight (8), in which education students fully aware of the importance of timely submission for producing quality work, got the highest mean of 4.04, which means they frequently give consideration of the quality of work in submission of course requirements and is interpreted as the level of satisfaction is moderately high. Meanwhile, indicator number three (3), which states they struggled to manage time efficiently for completing coursework gained the lowest mean of 2.57, with an equivalent verbal description that students occasionally acknowledge the quality of work and interpreted as normal.

The overall weighted mean on the level of satisfaction as appreciated by education students in terms of quality of work in the submission of students’ course requirements is 3.55 which denotes that student frequently acknowledged the quality of work and interpreted as the level of satisfaction is moderately high. The fact that students frequently acknowledge the quality of work suggests that instructors should continue to engage with students and provide support to ensure that they understand the requirements and expectations for their submissions. Clear communication and guidance can contribute to higher levels of satisfaction.

Table 3

Mean distribution of the student's level of satisfaction in submitting their course requirements in terms of quality of work

| Indicators | Level of Satisfaction | Interpretation |
|------------|-----------------------|----------------|
|------------|-----------------------|----------------|

| | | Mean | Description | |
|------------------------------|--|-------------|-------------------|--|
| 1 | I start working on my assignments well in advance of the deadline. | 3.45 | Occasionally | The level of satisfaction is normal. |
| 2 | I feel confident in my ability to manage my time effectively for coursework. | 3.36 | Occasionally | The level of satisfaction is normal. |
| 3 | I struggle to manage my time efficiently for completing coursework. | 3.12 | Occasionally | The level of satisfaction is normal. |
| 4 | I put effort into avoiding procrastination and meeting deadlines. | 3.46 | Occasionally | The level of satisfaction is normal. |
| 5 | Procrastination negatively impacts the overall quality of my work. | 3.68 | Frequently | The level of satisfaction is moderately high. |
| 6 | I am motivated to complete assignments promptly and avoid delays. | 3.54 | Frequently | The level of satisfaction is moderately high. |
| 7 | Consequences of procrastination, such as rushed work, negatively affect me. | 3.70 | Frequently | The level of satisfaction is moderately high. |
| 8 | I am aware of the importance of timely submission for producing quality work. | 4.04 | Frequently | The level of satisfaction is moderately high. |
| 9 | Seeking assistance to overcome procrastination challenges is something I consider. | 3.55 | Frequently | The level of satisfaction is moderately high. |
| 10 | The negative influence of procrastination affects my overall academic experience. | 3.55 | Frequently | The level of satisfaction is moderately high. |
| Overall Weighted Mean | | 3.55 | Frequently | The level of satisfaction is moderately high. |

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 Once or Never; 1.50-2.49 Rarely; 2.50-3.49 Occasionally; 3.50-4.49 Frequently; 4.50-5.00 Very Frequently

The study of Nordby et al. (2017) entitled “Do procrastination-friendly environments make students delay unnecessarily?” highlights that teacher effectiveness, or lack thereof, can have a significant impact on timely assignment completion. They believed that instructors who set clear and fair deadlines reduced a student’s likelihood to procrastinate as opposed to students whose deadlines are self-imposed.

2.2 Efficiency of Resources

Table 4 shows the level of satisfaction with the submission of students’ course requirements in terms of efficiency of resources. As observed, indicator number four (4), in which clear instructions from teachers improve students’ efficiency, got the highest mean of 4.30, which means they are frequently satisfied with the efficiency of resources in the submission of course requirements and is interpreted as the level of satisfaction is moderately high. Meanwhile, indicator number nine (9), which states that students are confident in fixing technical issues during submission, garnered the lowest mean of 3.52, with an equivalent verbal description that students are frequently satisfied with the efficiency of resources and interpreted as moderately high.

Holistically, the table has a composite mean of 4.00 which signifies that participants are frequently satisfied in terms of efficiency of resources and is shown as moderately high. Thus, it implies that the allocation of resources within the educational setting is perceived positively by participants. This could include resources such as textbooks, materials, facilities, technology, and faculty support. Educational institutions need to continue investing in and efficiently managing these resources to maintain satisfaction levels.

Table 4

Mean distribution of the student's level of satisfaction in submitting their course requirements in terms of efficiency of resources

| | Indicators | Level of Satisfaction | | Interpretation |
|---|---|-----------------------|--------------|---|
| | | Mean | Description | |
| 1 | I can easily use online platforms when submitting assignments. | 3.85 | Occasionally | The level of satisfaction is normal. |
| 2 | Reminders about deadlines help me submit on time. | 4.09 | Frequently | The level of satisfaction is moderately high. |
| 3 | Having technical resources like computers and the internet impacts my ability to submit work. | 4.11 | Frequently | The level of satisfaction is moderately high. |
| 4 | Clear instructions from teachers improve my efficiency. | 4.30 | Frequently | The level of satisfaction is moderately high. |

| | | | | |
|------------------------------|--|-------------|-------------------|--|
| 5 | The submission schedule suits my routine. | 3.79 | Frequently | The level of satisfaction is moderately high. |
| 6 | Well-organized course materials aid in completing my assignments. | 4.09 | Frequently | The level of satisfaction is moderately high. |
| 7 | Easy access to learning resources helps in my submission experience. | 4.16 | Frequently | The level of satisfaction is moderately high. |
| 8 | Clear submission guidelines influence my satisfaction. | 4.12 | Frequently | The level of satisfaction is moderately high. |
| 9 | I'm confident in fixing technical issues during submission. | 3.52 | Frequently | The level of satisfaction is moderately high. |
| 10 | Feedback on assignments helps me understand the requirements better. | 4.01 | Frequently | The level of satisfaction is moderately high. |
| Overall Weighted Mean | | 4.00 | Frequently | The level of satisfaction is moderately high. |

Range of means: 1.00-1.49 Once or Never; 1.50-2.49 Rarely; 2.50-3.49 Occasionally; 3.50-4.49 Frequently; 4.50-5.00 Very Frequently

The finding of the table is supported by the study of Cheung et al. (2020) entitled "Factors Affecting Direct and Transfer Enstrants' Active Coping and Satisfaction with the University ". The study provides evidence that investing in and efficiently managing resources such as textbooks, materials, facilities, technology, and faculty support positively impact the satisfaction levels of students in educational institutions.

Problem 3. Academic Performance of the Students Based on their Grade Point Average

Table 5 illustrates the academic performance of students categorized by their corresponding GPA ranges. In Table 5, the highest frequency of students is found within the GPA range of 1.51 to 2.00, where 87 students, constituting 63.50% of the total, achieved a very satisfactory level of performance. Conversely, the lowest frequency is observed in the GPA range of 3.01 below, indicating poor performance, with no students falling within this category. This data underscores strong academic achievements and indicates a high level of student engagement and participation in the learning process, which means that students are actively involved in their studies even when they occasionally procrastinate.

The findings imply that students tend to procrastinate, but because teachers impose strict deadlines, they are forced to meet the course requirements and submit them on time, so none of the activities are missed, which leads to a higher GPA. The presence of strict deadlines enforced by teachers compels students to adhere to course requirements and submit assignments punctually, thereby ensuring that no crucial activities are overlooked. Consequently, this adherence to deadlines fosters a higher GPA, as students consistently engage with course materials and complete assignments in a timely manner, ultimately contributing to their academic success and achievement.

Table 5
GPA ranges of the students' academic performance

| Variables | Frequency | Percentage |
|-------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1.00-1.50 (Outstanding) | 35 | 25.55% |
| 1.51-2.00 (Very Satisfactory) | 87 | 63.50% |
| 2.01-2.50 (Satisfactory) | 14 | 10.20% |
| 2.51-3.00 (Fair) | 1 | 0.70% |
| 3.01 below (Poor) | 0 | 0 |

This is supported by the study published by Miller and Schmidt (2020) entitled "The Effects of Online Assignments and Weekly Deadlines on Student Outcomes in a Macroeconomics Course" which highlighted that faculty-set deadlines (an external commitment device) may be necessary to overcome the self-control problems. Deadlines are commitment devices to help students overcome academic procrastination. In this context, deadlines can be either internally set (self-imposed) or externally set (instructor-imposed).

Problem 4. Significant Relationship Between Academic Performance, and Level of Satisfaction and Level of Stress

Table 6 shows the significant relationship between academic performance and level of satisfaction and level of stress. It was revealed in the data below that there is no significant relationship between the academic performance of education students and level of satisfaction (p-value:.254) and the level of timeliness and stress (p-value:.085). The R-values range from -.098 to .147,

indicating no correlations. The results indicate weak correlations between academic performance and both level of satisfaction and level of stress. Therefore, the data does not support the notion that either satisfaction or stress levels have a significant impact on academic performance.

The findings imply that the level of satisfaction and the level of stress experienced by the students in the submission of course requirements may not have a substantial influence on their academic achievement. Thus, it is important to consider other variables that may influence students' success.

Table 6

Significant relationship between the academic performance and level of satisfaction and timeliness and stress

| Variable 1 | Variables 2 | r-value | p-value | Decision | Significant |
|----------------------|----------------------------------|---------|---------|-------------------|-----------------|
| Academic Performance | • Level of Satisfaction | -.098 | .254 | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |
| | • Level of Timeliness and Stress | .147 | .085 | Fail to reject Ho | Not Significant |

Correlation is significant at 0.05 level (2-tailed)

The result of the table can be strongly supported by the study published by Molaudzi (2023) entitled “Factors Affecting Students’ Academic Performance: A Case Study of the University Context” which highlights that it is essential to consider a comprehensive range of factors when assessing students' academic achievement beyond just satisfaction and stress levels because additional variables such as study habits, time management skills, and personal motivation play also a crucial roles in determining students' academic outcomes.

Problem 5. Intervention Material Designed

It was shown that there is no significant relationship between academic performance, level of satisfaction, and level of stress. It suggests that intervening directly on satisfaction and stress levels in the submission of course requirements may not have a substantial impact on improving academic achievement. However, other variables can be considered to support students' success.

Hence, based on the findings of the study, the researchers designed a brochure containing tips that can lead to continuously improved academic performance and a reduction in procrastination tendencies in submitting outputs. There are a lot of colorful and bright pictures and elements utilized in the making of this brochure. There are sayings written for inspiration, and there is also a list of contact information where someone can reach out for further information.

Rationale:

From the data collected, the researchers developed a trifold brochure for students with the goal of reducing the procrastination level performance in submission of course requirements to support continuously improved students' academic performance.

Brochure Description:

The intervention material focuses on reducing students’ procrastination in submitting course requirements of education students. The material contains helpful strategies that would contribute to students’ success and productivity. Moreover, the intervention material is given to the students in the university that would serve as their guide to become motivated in daily academic routine.

General Objectives

In line with the proposed intervention material, the following objectives are derived:

- To foster students’ engagement and motivation in doing schoolwork to increase productivity.
- To provide tools to help students define clear, achievable goals for their academic endeavors.
- To equip students with strategies to effectively manage their time to keep track of assignments, deadlines, and priorities.
- To facilitate the formation of support systems such as peer mentoring and resource sharing.
- To provide techniques for managing stress and anxiety related to academic pressure fostering resilience.

V. Conclusions

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions were drawn.

Procrastination in the submission of course requirements in terms of timeliness or urgency and the stress level experienced is normalized by the students. However, they need to practice finding balance to minimize its impact and prevent it from escalating

This publication is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution CC BY.

further. To achieve the poor level of procrastination it is important to develop a sense of balance that can help students effectively manage their time and avoid excessive procrastination. The normalization of procrastination may contribute to increased stress levels among students. Delaying the submission of course requirements can lead to heightened anxiety, pressure, and last-minute scrambling to meet deadlines, which negatively impact students' mental well-being.

The students are satisfied with the quality of their work and the efficiency of their resources; it could be that instructors provide clear guidelines and expectations for assignments. With that, they are more likely to understand what is required of them, which can lead to higher satisfaction with their work. Also, a course requirement that allows students to demonstrate their skills and knowledge while also providing opportunities for growth and development and the availability of resources such as textbooks, online materials, and library resources can significantly impact students' ability to complete their assignments efficiently and effectively.

Even though students may tend to procrastinate, a high level of engagement and participation in the learning process indicates that they are actively involved in their studies. Many students have a strong desire to excel academically and achieve their academic goals. Even if they procrastinate at times, their desire for success drives them to actively engage in their studies, seeking to understand the material thoroughly, performing well on the assessments, and submitting the course requirements, making sure that no activities are missed.

Academic performance cannot be solely attributed to factors such as satisfaction, timeliness, or stress related to submission of course requirements. Other variables, such as study habits, engagement in class, and individual learning abilities, may also play significant roles in determining academic success.

The outcomes of this study paved the way to envision intervention material to continuously improved academic performance and a reduction in procrastination tendencies in submitting outputs in the university.

Moreover, this study reveals that academic success is influenced by more than just satisfaction, timeliness, and stress. Future research can consider factors like study habits, class engagement, and individual learning abilities to gain a more comprehensive understanding of students' academic performance.

Recommendations:

The following are the recommendations based on the findings and conclusions of the study conducted:

1. Students may set realistic goals, create a well-structured schedule that includes breaks that can help them stay organized and motivated to complete their course requirements on time, create supportive classroom environments, promote stress management techniques, and foster open communication channels/ seeking support from loved ones or professionals.
2. Teachers may use strategies to motivate students in their learning process; continuous feedback, effective communication, and acknowledging achievements foster active engagement and enthusiasm among students. Also, making sure that the learning materials, such as books and internet connectivity, are accessible to the learners, as well as the utilization of MASAOLMS, is well explained.
3. Teachers may continue to impose strict deadlines to help develop discipline and time management skills. Through this, it will avoid a last-minute rush, which often leads to poor work quality.
4. Implementing support systems for students to address any challenges they may face. Additionally, explore other factors that could influence academic success, such as study habits, motivation, time management, and the learning environment.
5. The school may use the designed intervention material to continuously improve academic performance and a reduction in procrastination tendencies.
6. Further research is needed due to the study's lack of significant findings. Exploring additional variables can provide a more comprehensive understanding of student success and inform evidence-based practices in education. Future studies could examine factors such as study skills, learning strategies, and socio-economic background to gain a more comprehensive understanding of academic performance determinants.

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Acknowledgment

The researchers would like to extend their deepest gratitude to the following people for the assistance they extended to them:

To their research adviser, Dr. Ariel U. Cubillas for his guidance, constant updates and messages in Messenger, corrections, and for giving them the drive and discipline to tackle a task with enthusiasm and determination.

Dr. Leo L. Codilla Jr, Dr. Trixie E. Cubillas, for their constructive comments and suggestions that greatly improved this study and Dr. Grace T. Flores, for her permission to collect the necessary data to make this study relevant and reliable. Also, to Ma'am Joy G. Torion, Sir Marlou Tagarao, and Ma'am Gladys L. Lagura who validated the survey questionnaire.

To the education students particularly Bachelor of Secondary Education-Major in Science and Bachelor of Elementary Education who never hesitated to answer the survey questionnaire.

To Quiao family, who provided them with the necessary things such as laptop and printer in order the researchers to accomplish the study.

Authors' Biography

First Author: Sherlyn Cordova, Undergraduate Student, Caraga State University, sherlyncordova849@gmail.com

Second Author: Mariafe Reville, Undergraduate Student, Caraga State University, revillemariafe@gmail.com

References

- [1] Abdulla, A.M., Asharaf A., Sherit, Mourad A. Eissa, and Amaal A., Mostafa (2013). Academic procrastination among college students with learning disabilities: The role of positive and negative self-oriented perfectionism in terms of gender, specialty and grade. *International Journal of Psycho-Educational Sciences*, 2 (1), 2-12.
- [2] Ahmed, I., Bernhardt, G. V., Shivappa, P. (2023). Prevalence of Academic Procrastination and Its Negative Impact on Students. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/385682460_Prevalence_of_Academic_Procrastination_and_Its_Negative_Impact_on_Students
- [3] Akanpaadgi, E., Binpimbu, F., Kuuyelleh, E. N. (2023). The impact of stress on students'academic performance. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371797547_The_Impact_of_Stress_on_Students'_AcademicPerformance
- [4] Akpur, U. (n.d.). The Effect of Procrastination on Academic Achievement: A Meta-Analysis Study. Retrieved from <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=Level+of+procras+ tination+&id=EJ1278346>
- [5] Akran, A., Fu, C., Li, Y., Javed, M. Y., Lin, R., Jiang, Y., & Tang, Y. (2019). Predicting students'academic procrastination in blended learning course using homework submission data. *IEEE Access*, Access, IEEE, 7,102487–102498. <https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2019.2930867>
- [6] Bhatt, T. (2023). Understanding the factors influencing academic procrastination: A Comprehensive review. ResearchGate. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/374556550_Understanding_The_Factors_Influencing_Academic_Procrastination_A_Comprehensive_Review
- [7] Bozkus, K. (n.d.). Procrastination, workload, and managerial resourcefulness of schoolprincipals. <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=Reasons+that+causes+Procrastination+&id=ED610139>
- [8] Chehrzad, M., Ghanbari, A., Rahmatpour, P., Barari, F., Pourrajabi, A., & Alipour, Z. (2017). Academic procrastination and related factors in students of Guilan University of Medical Science. *Journal of Medical Education Development*, 11, 352-362.
- [9] Cheung, K., NG, J., Tsang, H., Pang, K., Wan, C., & Moser, K. (2020). Factors affecting direct and transfer entrants' active coping and satisfaction with the university. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7215749/?need_sec_link=1&sec_link_scene=im
- [10] Deb S., Strodl E., Sun H. (2015). Academic stress, parental pressure, anxiety and mental health among Indian high school students. *Int. J. Psychol. Behav. Sci.* 5, 26–34. doi: 10.5923/j.ijpbs.20150501.04
- [11] Duckworth AL, Taxer JL, Eskreis-Winkler L, Galla BM, Gross JJ. (2019). Self-Control and Academic Achievement. *Annu Rev Psychol.* Jan 4;70:373-399. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-103230. PMID: 30609915.
- [12] Dunn, K. (2014). Why wait? The influence of academic self-regulation, intrinsic motivation, and statistics anxiety on procrastination in online statistics. *Innovative Higher Education*, 39(1), 33–44. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-013-9256->
- [13] Garg, A., & Rajendran, R. (2023). Investigating behavioral patterns of procrastinators in a Wiki-based activity. *Education and Information Technologies*, 28(12), 16705–16721. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-023-11893-4>
- [14] Goroshit, M. (2018). Academic procrastination and academic performance: An initial basis for intervention. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 46(2), 131–142. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10852352.2016.1198157>
- [15] Gökalp ZŞ, Saritepeci M, Durak HY. (2022). The relationship between self-control and procrastination among adolescent: The mediating role of multi screen addiction. *Curr Psychol.* Jan 12:1-12. doi: 10.1007/s12144-021-02472-2. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 35035199; PMCID: PMC8752182.
- [16] Grunschel, C., Patrzek, J., Klingsieck, K. B., & Fries, S. (2018). “I’ll stop. Procrastinating now!” Fostering specific processes of self-regulated learning to reduce academic procrastination. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community*, 46(2), 143–157.
- [17] Hamid, F.A., Kader and Ali, M.E., (2015). Academic Procrastination and Five Factor Personality Traits among College Students. *International Journal of Psycho-Educational Sciences* , 4(2), 10-15.
- [18] Hulleman, C. S., Barron, K. E., Kosovich, J. J., & Lazowski, R. A. (2016). Student motivation: Current theories, constructs, and interventions within an expectancy -value framework. *Psychosocial skills and school systems in the 21st century* (pp. 241–278). Springer
- [19] Hussain, I., & Sultan, S. (2015). Analysis of procrastination among university students. *Procedia: Social & Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 1897–1904. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.07.385>
- [20] Kaftan, O. J., & Freund, A. M. (2019). A motivational perspective on academic procrastination: Goal focus affects how students perceive activities while procrastinating. *Motivation Science*, 5(2), 135–156. <https://psycnet.apa.org.lopes.idm.oclc.org/record/2018-32060-001?doi=1>

- [21] Kara, M., Erdogdu, F., & Cagiltay, K. (2019). Challenges faced by adult learners in online distance education: A literature review. https://www.semantic-scholar.org/paper/Challenges-Faced-by-Adult-Learners-in-Online-A-KaraErdo%C4%9Fdu/7d78985a6609c4cbe252ea101bf834328b4d98fe?need_sec_link=1&sec_link_scene=im
- [22] Katz, I., Eilot, K., & Nevo, N. (2014). "I'll do it later": Type of motivation, self-Efficacy and homework procrastination. *Motivation and Emotion*, 38(1), 1–119. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-013-9366-1>
- [23] Kim, K. R., & Seo, E. H. (2015). The relationship between procrastination and academic performance: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 82, 26–33. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/lopes.idm.oclc.org/science/article/pii/S0191886915001610?via%3Dihub>
- [24] KS, V. M., Rajkumar, E., Rao, L., John, R., Sunny, S. M. N. A., George, A. J., Pawar, S., & Abraham, J. (2023b). Influence of decision-making styles and affective styles on academic procrastination among students. *Cogent Education*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186x.2023.2203598>
- [25] Kuftyak, E. (2022). Procrastination, stress and academic performance in students. *ARPHA Proceedings*, 1, 965–974. <https://doi.org/10.3897/ap.5.e0965>
- [26] Martinie, M., Potocki, A., Broc, L., & Larigauderie, P. (2022). Predictors of procrastination in first-year university students: role of achievement goals and learning strategies. *Social Psychology of Education*, 26(2), 309–331. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-022-09743-1>
- [27] Miller, L. A., & Schmidt, J. (2020). The effects of online assignments and weekly deadlines on student outcomes in a macroeconomics course. *The American Economist*, 66(1), 46–60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0569434520968250>
- [28] Moonaghi, H. K., & Beydokhti, T. B. (2017). Academic procrastination and its characteristics: A Narrative Review. *Future of Medical Education Journal*, 7(2), 43–50. <https://doi.org/10.22038/fmej.2017.9049>
- [29] Mulaudzi, I. C. (2023). Factors Affecting Students' Academic Performance: A Case Study of the University Context. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/378709144_Factors_Affecting_Students'_Academic_Performance_A_Case_Study_of_the_University_Context
- [30] N, D. F. (2020). Academic procrastination of students. *Abjadia*, 5(2), 132–141. <https://doi.org/10.18860/abj.v5i2.9458>
- [31] Noor, S., Tajik, O., & Golzar, J. (2022). Simple Random Sampling. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/366390022_Simple_Random_Sampling
- [32] Nordby, K., Klingsieck, K., & Svartdal, F. (2017). Do procrastination-friendly environments make students delay unnecessarily? *Social Psychology of*
- [33] Ojo, A. A. (2019). The impact of procrastination on students' academic performance in secondary schools. www.eajournals.org/Procrastination-on-Students-Academic-Performance-in-Secondary-Schools.pdf *Education: An International Journal*, 20(3), 491–512. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11218-017-9386-x>
- [34] Pychyl, T. A., & Sirois, F. M. (2016). Procrastination, Emotion Regulation, and Well-Being. In Elsevier eBooks (pp. 163–188). <https://doi.org/10.1016/b978-0-12-802862-9.00008-6>
- [35] Ragusa, A., González-Bernal, J., Trigueros, R., Caggiano, V., Navarro, N., Minguez-Minguez, L. A., Obregón, A. I., & Fernandez-Ortega, C. (2023). Effects of academic self-regulation on procrastination, academic stress and anxiety, resilience and academic performance in a sample of Spanish secondary school students. *Frontiers in psychology*, 14, 1073529. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1073529>
- [36] Rahimi, S., & Hall, N. C. (2021). Why are you waiting? Procrastination on academic tasks among undergraduate and graduate students. *Innovative Higher Education*, 46(6), 759–776. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10755-021-09563-9>
- [37] Santelli, B., Robertson, S., Larson, E. K., & Humphrey, S. (2020). Procrastination and delayed assignment Submissions: Student and faculty perceptions of late point policy and grace. *Online Learning*, 24(3). <https://doi.org/10.24059/olj.v24i3.2302>
- [38] Sepiadou, I. (n.d.). Academic Hardiness as a Moderator of the Relation between Perfectionism and Academic Procrastination in University Students. <https://eric.ed.gov/?q=Level+of+stress+in+procrastination&id=EJ1390404>
- [39] Steel, P., Svartdal, F., Thundiyil, T., & Brothen, T. (2018). Examining Procrastination across multiple goal stages: A Longitudinal Study of Temporal Motivation Theory. *Frontiers in Psychology*, <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00327>
- [40] Steel, P., & Klingsieck, K. B. (2016). Academic Procrastination: Psychological Antecedents revisited. *Australian Psychologist*, 51(1), 36–46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ap.12173>
- [41] Svartdal, F., Sæle, R. G., Dahl, T. I., Nemtcan, E., & Gamst-Klaussen, T. (2021). Study Habits and Procrastination: The Role of Academic Self-Efficacy. *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 66(7), 1141–1160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00313831.2021.1959393>
- [42] Türel, Y. K., & Dokumaci, O. (2022). Use of media and technology, academic procrastination, and academic achievement in adolescence. *Participatory Educational Research*, 9(2), 481–497. <https://doi.org/10.17275/per.22.50.9.2>
- [43] Van Eerde, W., & Klingsieck, K. B. (2018). Overcoming procrastination? Meta-analysis of intervention studies. *Educational Research Review*, 25, 73–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.edurev.2018.09.002>
- [44] Vashishtha, S. (2023, June 27). Understanding Temporal Motivation Theory for increased Productivity. <https://www.linkedin.com/pulse/understanding-temporal-motivation-theory-increased-shivam-kumar>
- [45] Vlachopanou, P., Karagiannopoulou, E., & Tsiampalis, T. (2019). Association among defense mechanisms, causes of procrastination and well-being Gender differences. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/337237859_Association_among_defense_mechanisms_causes_of_procrastination_and_well-being_Gender_differences

- [46] Zhang S. M., Liu P. W., Feng T. Y. (2019). To do it now or later: the cognitive mechanisms and neural substrates underlying procrastination. *Wiley Interdiscip. Rev. Cogn. Sci.* 10:e1492. 10.1002/wcs.1492
- [47] Ziegler N., Opdenakker M. C. (2018). The development of academic Procrastination in first-year secondary education students: the link with metacognitive self-regulation, self-efficacy, and effort regulation. *Learn. Individ. Differ.* 64, 71–82. doi: 10.1016/j.lindif.2018.04.009

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Sherlyn C. Cordova and Mariafe D. Reville collaborated in the planning and development of each chapter. Both authors contributed equally to the writing, editing, and finalization of the manuscript.