

A Study Of The Relationship Between Procrastination And Big-Five Personality Domains Amongst College Students In Agra City

Prof. Kavita Varma
Amity Institute Of Education
Amity University, Lucknow

Abstract : *The purpose of this study is to see if any relationship exists between three groups of procrastinators (High, Average, low) and Big Five personality factors namely Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. It is assumed that there are factors of personality responsible for procrastination. Procrastination is a behavior that most, if not all, professional and non-professional in India fall prey to. Studies done by Vodanovich and Sieb(1997) on procrastination have shown that approximately 15-25% of the adult population procrastinate sometimes in their lives. What makes people from all walks of life procrastinate is a question which many researches have tried to investigate. In this study the researcher also tried to investigate some of the causes and relate them with personality factors.*

Keywords: Procrastination, Big five personality factors.

Introduction

The aim of the present study was to investigate whether any relationship exists between the three groups of procrastinators (high, average and, low) and big five personality factors such as Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness in the male and female of professional and non-professional courses.

To fulfill our aim four objectives and five hypotheses were framed related with these variables. The four objectives related with the study were the level of procrastination and the big five personality domains in the whole group of college students, female verses males and professional verses non- professionals the five hypothesis framed were related with the study of the relationship between the three groups of procrastinators (high, average, low) and big five personality factors such as Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to experience, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness in the male and female of professional and non-professional courses.

The following objectives and hypothesis were taken for our final study;

Objectives of the Study

1. To study the procrastination tendency in the students of professional and non-professional courses.
2. To see whether there is a difference in procrastination tendency amongst males and females.
3. To see whether there is a difference in the Big Five personality factors amongst males and females of professional courses.
4. To see whether there is a difference in the Big Five personality factors amongst males and females of non-professional courses.

Hypothesis

1. There will be no significant relationship between *neuroticism* (N) personality domains in the three groups (high, average, and low) of procrastinators.
2. There will be no significant relationship between *extraversion* (E) personality domain in the three groups (high, average, and low) of procrastinators.
3. There will be no significant relationship between *openness* (O) personality domain in the three groups (high, average, and low) of procrastinators.
4. There will be no significant relationship between *agreeableness* (A) personality domain in the three groups (high, average, and low) of procrastinators.
5. There will be no significant relationship between *conscientiousness* (C) personality domain in the three groups (high, average, and low) of procrastinators.

Sample

Purposive random sampling was done because our sample was taken from two different groups'- professional and non-professional courses of study in the various degree colleges of Agra City. The sample consisted of total 200 boys and girls between age group of 18-28 years taken randomly from different post-graduation and graduation courses from the Engineering, Management,

Education and Science streams from various colleges in Agra.

Tools

A brief description of the tools used for the purpose of measurement is being given as follows:

1- Procrastination Scale

The items of the procrastination scale have been self constructed by Dr. Amit Abraham based upon various research studies on procrastination for the student population (Lays, 1986; Ellis 1977; Ferrari, 2000; Hill 1978). This is a five point scale consisting total of 30 statements. Each statement describes an action which is related with procrastination in same manner or the other.

2-NEO PI-R Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI)

This is a personality inventory developed by Paul T. Costa, and Robert R. McCrae. The NEO-PI had well-researched scales to measure the factors of *Neuroticism* (N), *Extraversion* (E), and *Openness* (O) *Agreeableness* (A) and *Conscientiousness* (C). There are two versions of the NEO PI-R item booklets; a self-report item booklet (Form S) and observers report item booklet (Form R).

The Form S is an eight-page booklet which contains 240 statements comprising the NEO PI-R.

Design

Results

The statistical analysis of data done shows that following:

Table 3.1
Showing Z Scores for Neuroticism

ZN	Pro.	N	Mean	SD	Maximum	Minimum
	High	20	1.0290	.41063	.39	1.76
Avg.	171	1.0803	.70474	-3.07	5.64	
Low	9	1.0989	.53356	.22	2.01	
Total	200	1.0760	.67237	-3.07	5.64	

1-According to the table 3.1 mean ± SD and z scores of Neuroticism for whole group is 1.07 ± 06 .67 (N=200) which reveals that there is no significant difference between Neuroticism in the three classes of procrastinators (high, average, low) for whole group.

Table 3.2
Showing Z Scores for Extraversion

ZE	Pro.	N	Mean	SD	Maximum	Minimum
	High	20	-.6510	.67113	-2.24	1.02
Avg.	171	-.4943	.74128	-6.03	1.33	

It is a cross-sectional research of survey nature done by purposive random selection of respondents from the graduation professional and non-professional course of various colleges in Agra City, Uttar Pradesh, India. This type of study utilizes different groups of people who differ in the variable of interest, but share others characteristics such as socio-economic status educational background and ethnicity. The researcher selected groups of people who were remarkably similar in most areas, but differed only in age. By doing this, any differences between groups was presumably attributed to age differences rather than to other variables. Cross-sectional study was designed to look at a variable at a particular part in time and in our case during the course of college education. The data was only collected on the variables, nothing was controlled other than the sample and no variable was manipulated.

Procedure

The data was collected from the students of various colleges after seeking permission from the college authorities. The students were approached in their respective classrooms and given detailed instructions for each of two scales. One scale was administered at a time. All the doubts were cleared and sufficient time given to them for marking their responses.

After the data was collected the scales were manually scored and the raw data obtained in numeric scores. The data was then subjected to statistical analysis-mean, standard deviation, t- test, chi-square and ANOVA. Thereafter the obtained statistics analyzed and interpreted in term of relationship between the variables under investigation a per our hypothesis and objectives.

	Low	9	-.1756	.50354	-.84	.71
	Total	200	-.4956	.72779	-6.03	1.33

2-According to the **table 3.2** mean \pm SD and z scores of Extraversion for whole group is $-.49 \pm .73$ (N=200) which Reveals that there is no significant difference between z scores of Extraversion in the three classes of procrastinators (high, average, low) for whole group.

Table 3.3
Showing Z scores for Openness to Experience

	Pro.	N	Mean	SD	Maximum	Minimum
ZO	High	20	-.2700	.64154	-1.53	.94
	Avg.	171	-.0548	.70797	-3.91	1.71
	Low	9	.2344	.74872	-.47	1.55
	Total	200	-.0633	.70596	-3.91	1.71

3-According to the **table 3.3** mean \pm SD and z scores of Openness to Experience for whole group is $-.06 \pm .70$ (N=200). Which reveals that there is no significant difference between z scores of Openness to experience in the three classes of procrastinators (high, average, low) for whole group.

Table 3.4
Showing Z scores for Agreeableness

	Pro.	N	Mean	SD	Maximum	Minimum
ZA	High	20	-1.2090	.60379	-2.45	-.37
	Avg.	171	-1.4638	.56276	-3.16	-.47
	Low	9	-1.7356	.61045	-2.78	-.69
	Total	200	-1.4506	.57448	-3.16	-.37

4- According to the **table 3.4** mean \pm SD and z scores Agreeableness for whole group is $-1.5 \pm .57$ (N=200). Which Reveals that there is no significant difference between z scores of Agreeableness in the three classes of procrastinators (high, average, low) for whole group.

Table 3.5
Showing Z scores for Conscientiousness

	Pro.	N	Mean	SD	Maximum	Minimum
ZC	High	20	-1.9715	.46569	-2.63	-1.08
	Avg.	171	-1.8104	.66645	-3.95	-.12
	Low	9	-1.3511	.38657	-2.06	.90
	Total	200	-1.8058	.64674	-3.95	.12

5- According to the **table 3.5** mean \pm SD and z scores of Conscientiousness for whole group is $-1.8 \pm .65$ (N=200), which Reveals that there is no significant difference between z scores of Conscientiousness in the three classes of procrastinators (high, average, low) for whole group.

Table 3.12
ANOVA

ZN	Sum of Squares	df	Means Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	30.945	2	15.473	51.597	.000
Within Groups	59.075	197	.300		
Total	90.020	199			

6- ANOVA (table-3.12) shows that, there is a significant difference amongst the whole group of college students in the Neuroticism personality domain.

Table 3.14
ANOVA

ZE	Sum of Squares	df	Means Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	32.853	2	16.426	44.608	.000
Within Groups	72.543	197	.368		
Total	105.396	199			

7- ANOVA (table-3.14) shows that, there is a significant difference amongst the whole group of college students in the Extraversion personality domain.

Table 3.16
ANOVA

ZO	Sum of Squares	df	Means Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	61.394	2	30.697	160.112	.000
Within Groups	37.769	197	.192		
Total	99.163	199			

8- ANOVA (table-3.16) shows that, there is a significant difference amongst the whole group of college students in the Openness personality domain.

Table 3.18
ANOVA

ZA	Sum of Squares	Df	Means Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	11.881	1	11.881	43.687	.000
Within Groups	53.846	198	.272		
Total	65.727	199			

9- ANOVA (table-3.18) shows that, there is a significant difference amongst the whole group of college students in the Agreeableness personality domain.

Table 3.20
ANOVA

ZC	Sum of Squares	df	Means Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	8.846	2	4.423	11.705	.000
Within Groups	74.438	197	.378		
Total	83.284	199			

10- ANOVA (table-3.20) shows that, there is a significant difference amongst the whole group of college students in the Conscientiousness personality domain.

Table 3.23
T-Test for Comparing Z Scores of NEOAC and Proc. Of Male and Female In Professional Courses

Scores	Gender	N	Mean	SD.	Mean df.	t	df	P value																																															
ZN	Male	50	1.0970590	.5358758	.1395588	1.138	98	.258																																															
	female	50	.957500	.6819797					ZE	Male	50	-.223009	.5608334	.4593441	2.852	98	.005	female	50	-.682353	.9912398	ZO	Male	50	.006486	.6566967	.1151821	.936	98	.352	female	50	-.108696	.5710877	ZA	Male	50	-1.2262950	.4057571	.2878561	2.666	98	.009	female	50	-1.5141510	.6469003	ZC	Male	50	-1.4861110	.6107796	.5766228	4.635	98
ZE	Male	50	-.223009	.5608334	.4593441	2.852	98	.005																																															
	female	50	-.682353	.9912398					ZO	Male	50	.006486	.6566967	.1151821	.936	98	.352	female	50	-.108696	.5710877	ZA	Male	50	-1.2262950	.4057571	.2878561	2.666	98	.009	female	50	-1.5141510	.6469003	ZC	Male	50	-1.4861110	.6107796	.5766228	4.635	98	.000	female	50	-2.0627340	.6331552								
ZO	Male	50	.006486	.6566967	.1151821	.936	98	.352																																															
	female	50	-.108696	.5710877					ZA	Male	50	-1.2262950	.4057571	.2878561	2.666	98	.009	female	50	-1.5141510	.6469003	ZC	Male	50	-1.4861110	.6107796	.5766228	4.635	98	.000	female	50	-2.0627340	.6331552																					
ZA	Male	50	-1.2262950	.4057571	.2878561	2.666	98	.009																																															
	female	50	-1.5141510	.6469003					ZC	Male	50	-1.4861110	.6107796	.5766228	4.635	98	.000	female	50	-2.0627340	.6331552																																		
ZC	Male	50	-1.4861110	.6107796	.5766228	4.635	98	.000																																															
	female	50	-2.0627340	.6331552																																																			

PRO.	Male	50	93.82	12.422	-8.500	-3.362	98	.001
	female	50	102.32	12.853				

11-The **table-3.23** depicts that There is significant difference among male and female of professional courses in Conscientiousness personality domain and procrastination ($t=.000,.001$).

Table 3.24
T-Test for Comparing Z Scores of NEOAC and Proc. Of
Male and Female In Non-Professional Courses

Scores	Gender	N	Mean	SD.	Mean df.	t	df	P value
ZN	Male	50	1.2774510	.9372987	.3049510	2.137	98	.035
	female	50	.972500	.3731493				
ZE	Male	50	-.335398	.6060421	.4068478	3.557	98	.001
	female	50	-.742246	.5356143				
ZO	Male	50	-.055135	.9785365	.0426910	.269	98	.788
	female	50	-.097826	.5481443				
ZA	Male	50	-1.3888450	.5494696	.2809667	2.465	98	.015
	female	50	-1.6698110	.5898633				
ZC	Male	50	-1.7018520	.6690533	.2704886	2.262	98	.026
	female	50	-1.9723400	.5168391				
PRO.	Male	50	91.32	11.566	-1.900	-.701	98	.485
	female	50	93.22	15.296				

12-The **table-3.24** depicts that There is significant difference among male and female of non-professional courses in Extraversion personality domain ($t=.001$).

Table 3.25
Whole Group of Prof. Vs Non Prof

Scores	profession	N	Mean	SD.	Mean df.	t	df	P value
ZN	Prof.	100	1.0272790	.6142057	-.0976961	-1.027	198	.306
	Non-Prof.	100	1.1249750	.7261047				
ZE	Prof.	100	-.452681	.8338323	.0861412	.836	198	.404
	Non-Prof.	100	-.538822	.6046323				
ZO	Prof.	100	-.051105	.6149967	.0253760	.254	198	.800
	Non-Prof.	100	-.076481	.7893698				
ZA	Prof.	100	-1.3702230	.5563622	.1591051	1.972	198	.050
	Non-Prof.	100	-1.5293280	.5844489				

ZC	Prof.	100	-1.7744230	.6833908	.0626736	.684	198	.495
	Non-Prof.	100	-1.8370960	.6101175				
PRO.	Prof.	100	98.07	13.281	5.800	3.060	198	.003
	Non-Prof.	100	92.27	13.525				

13-The table-3.25 depicts that there is significant difference found in procrastination in between professional and non-professional. ($t=.003$).

Table 3.26
Whole Group of Male Vs Female

Scores	Gender	N	Mean	SD.	Mean df.	t	Df	P value
ZN	Male	100	1.1872550	.7649680	.2222549	2.363	198	.019
	Female	100	.965000	.5469670				
ZE	Male	100	-.279204	.5836581	.4330959	4.398	198	.000
	Female	100	-.712299	.7932302				
ZO	Male	100	-.024324	.8296608	.0789365	.790	198	.430
	Female	100	-.103261	.5569263				
ZA	Male	100	-1.3075700	.4874359	.2844114	3.603	198	.000
	Female	100	-1.59198100	.6208520				
ZC	Male	100	-1.59398100	.6464911	.4235557	4.889	198	.000
	Female	100	-2.01753700	.5767961				
PRO.	Male	100	92.57	12.007	-5.200	-2.731	198	.007
	Female	100	97.77	14.781				

14-The table-3.26 depicts that. There is significant difference found in Extraversion Conscientiousness and Agreeableness personality domains between males and females of the whole group ($t=.000,.000,.000$).

Conclusion

On the basis of the obtained results, which were in accordance with our hypothesis, the researcher comes to the following conclusions;

1-80% college students are reacting and tend to respond to most situations in an alert, sensitive, concerned, attention, excitable or expressive way. Under stress they may appear anxious, tense, temperamental or worried. 19% college students are responsive and tend normal circumstance. Where as 2% reflects stress face. Quilt face and urge-resistant. They may be uncaring, lethargic, insensitive or unaware of problems. But there is no significant relationship between the Neuroticism and the three groups of procrastinators (high, average and low).

2-Mostly college students are Ambivert, they tend to move easily from working with others to working alone. They have a moderate threshold for sensory stimulation and may tire of it after a while. Only 4% Students are Extraversion and 40% are introverts. According to the present study, Extraversion has no relationship with procrastinators in the three groups (high, average, low).

3-60% college students are innovative and appreciate efficiency and creativity. 34% college students approach for the work with efficiency and comfortable with repetitive activities. They may view as conservative, narrow in their thinking, set in their own ways or even rigid. Only 7% are Explorers, who tend to have many broad interests and like to be cutting edge. But on the whole

procrastinators (high, average, low) are not affected/ related with this personality domain.

4-91% college students are less likely to show positive behaviors, such as tolerance, kindness, trust, and sensitivity. Only 9% are kind, warm, and helpful people at work consistently. But, according to the present study, the personality domain Agreeableness and three classes of procrastination (High, Average, low) have no significant relationship.

5-97% college students from the whole group tend to approach goals in a relaxed, spontaneous, open-ended way, whereas only 2% tend to keep work demands and personal needs in balance. They can switch from focused activities to spontaneous divisions. Only 1% is conscientious, Purposeful, strong side. High conscientiousness is associated with academic and occupational achievement, on the negative side; it may lead to annoying fastidiousness, compulsive neatness or workaholic behavior. Somehow conscientiousness affects the procrastination trait but there is no significant difference between its three classes (High, Average and Low) and conscientiousness.

6- My Sample is Average procrastinator, which means that they sometimes delay their work but not intentionally, their procrastination is not out of a tendency to procrastinate as compared to chronic procrastinators.

7-There is no significant difference between male and female of professional courses in the Neuroticism, Extraversion, openness to experience and Agreeableness, whereas there is a significant difference in conscientiousness and procrastination, which depicts that professional course's female students are more conscientious than males.

8-There is no significant difference in neuroticism, openness, agreeableness, conscientiousness and procrastination. But in Extraversion personality domain a significant difference is there. That can be the basic nature difference of male and female, as males are extroverts and females are introverts.

9-Amongst the whole group of professional and non-professional courses' students there is a significant difference in procrastination trait. It can be due to the nature and demand of the professional and non-professional courses.

10- There is a significant difference in the personality domains of extraversion, Agreeableness

and conscientiousness. Males are extroverts, assertive, active and talkative on the other hand females are introverts, reserved and shy; males are more eager to help others and always ready to fight for one's own interests. They are fundamentally altruistic on the contrast females are antagonistic, ego-centric. As females are more able to manage their desires and have the ability to resist impulses and temptations, but males on the other hand are often not able to manage their desires and unable to control their impulses. Whereas, there is no significant difference in neuroticism, openness and procrastination in males and females from the whole group.

Limitations Of The Present Study

1-The first limitations were the participants. It is hard to get an honest answer out of an individual and especially students studying in college who do not want to indulge or participate in activities related with academic development and research work.

2-The second limitation involves the scales the researcher has used for the measurement of procrastination. Though she tried her level best to do the same to her best but still the scale lacks component of a validated measure.

3-At the time of data collection some students were confused with certain statements in the scales that might have led them to answer incorrectly or inappropriately.

Suggestions For Further Work

1-Future research can be done separately by taking more variables at a time and studying their relationship and interdependence at length and in depth.

2-Future research can be done on a sample better distributed and taken from various colleges in India.

3-Future research can be done on professionals like doctors, engineers, scientists, executives etc.

References

1. Ariely, Dan; Wertenbroch, Klaus (2002): Procrastination, Deadlines And Performance: Self-Control By Precommitment; Psychological Science 13(3).
2. Barrick Murray R, Mount Michal K (1991): The Big Five Personality Dimensions And Job Performance: A Meta-Analysis.

3. Erde Wendelien VAN: Procrastination In Academic Settings And The Big Five Model Of Personality: A Meta Analysis
4. Ferrari, J.R. Johnson, J.L. And MC COWN, W.G. (1995): Procrastination And Task Avoidance Theory Research And Treatment New York ;Plenum Press.
5. Ferrari, J.R. (2001): Procrastination And Attention: Factor Analysis Of Attention, Deficit Boredomness, Intelligence, Self-Esteem, And Task Delay Frequencies, Journal Of Social Behavior And Personality.
6. Guilford J.P. (1950): Fundamentals Statistics In Psychology And Education; Mcgraw-Hill, Kogakusha, Japan.
7. Johnson L Judith (1995): An Analysis Of The Contribution Of The Five Factors Of Personality Two Variance In Academic Procrastination: Personality And Individual Differences
8. Lay CH (1986) : At Last My Research Article On Procrastination .Journal Of Research Of Personality 20 ,474– 495
9. Mccown ,W (1986): An Empirical Investigation Of The Behavior Of The Procrastination, Social And Behavioural Science Document, 16,1-89.
10. Poropat E Arthur (2009): A Meta Analysis Of The Five Factor Model Of Personality And Academic Performance Psychological Bulletin.
11. Pychyl A Timothy (2008): Personality A Risk And Resilience Factor For Procrastination , Journal Of Psychology Today.
12. Srivastava S (2007): Measuring The Big Five Personality Factors, From <http://www.VoegonEdusanjaybigFive>.
13. Sirois, F (2003): Procrastination And Intentions To Perform Health Behaviours: The Role Of Self-Efficacy And Consideration Of Future Consequences. Presented At American Psychological Association Conference In Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
14. Walker D (2002): Forgiveness Within The Big Five Personality Model, Personality And Individual Differences.