Psychological Research and Intervention

Workload and propensity of academic procrastination in working students

Al Fatha Raudia[1]

[1]Universitas Mercu Buana
Jl. Wates Km. 1, 55753, Kulon Progo, Yogyakarta
46120110047@student.mercubuana.ac.id

Abstract
The phenomenon of the dual role of working students is widely encountered today. This dual role can affect the emergence of academic procrastination in students due to the workload they have. This research was conducted to determine the effect of workload on academic procrastination in working students. This research is a quantitative study with a purposive sampling technique. This study used the workload scale and the academic procrastination scale. Through survey on 118 students who were actively studying and working, based on a simple linear regression test on workload variables and academic procrastination, we found that there was no significant effect of workload on the academic procrastination of working students, $F_{(1,116)} = 4.75$, p. 05, $R^2 = .039$, R^2 adjusted $= .031$. The regression coefficient ($B = -.104$) indicates that a 1 point increase in workload will result in a decrease of approximately 0.104 points in academic procrastination behavior.

Keywords: *Academic Procrastination; Workload; Working Students*

Suggested citation

Introduction

The phenomenon of the dual role of students, namely studying while working has been found (Robert, 2012). The first role is as a student who has the responsibility of attending classes and doing college assignments in order to pass the courses taken in each semester. The second role is as a worker who has responsibilities due to the work he is engaged in. This dual role makes working students take on a heavier role than students who are not working. This is because in addition to their duties as students, they are also burdened with the responsibility of being able to complete tasks in their respective workplaces (Felix, et al., 2019).

Various problems are also often faced by students who work in their workplaces, one of which is the accumulation of workload (Owen, et al., 2018). According to Vanchapo (2020:1) workload is a process or activity that must be completed immediately by a worker within a certain period of time. If a worker is able to complete and adjust to a number of assigned tasks, then it does not become a workload. However, if the worker is unsuccessful then the tasks and activities become a workload. According to Munandar (2011), workload is the tasks assigned to the workforce or employees to be completed at a certain time by using the skills and potential of the workforce. Meanwhile, according to Sunarso and Kusdi (2010), workload is a set or number of activities that must be completed by an organizational unit or position holder within a certain period of time. Based on some of these expert opinions, we can conclude that the definition of workload is the demand for tasks given to a worker that must be completed within a certain period of time because of the responsibilities that workers have.

Then regarding the responsibilities that students must do in the form of doing assignments on time in order to pass the courses taken in each semester, to fulfill these responsibilities there are several inhibiting factors that may be experienced, one of which is academic procrastination. Academic procrastination according to Lay (1986) (in Ferrari et al, 1995: 74) is a habit or tendency in general to postpone or suspend something important in order to achieve some goal. Academic procrastination can also be understood as the act of delaying in working on academic tasks that are usually carried out by students and students (Schouwenburg, 1995; Solomon & Rothblum, 1984). Winata (2016) stated that procrastination behavior has a negative impact on the learning process, and learning achievement, and affects student activities in the campus environment.

Based on the description that has been revealed above, the author is interested in researching the effect of workload on academic procrastination in employee class students.

Method

This research uses quantitative methods with a type of regression analysis. This study aims to determine the effect of workload on academic procrastination in working students. The population of this study was students who were studying while working. The sampling technique used is purposive sampling. Data collection techniques using questionnaires and shared through Google Forms. The total number of subjects who filled out the questionnaire on the Google Form was 128 people. However, because 10 people did not qualify as research participants, namely students who were actively studying while working, the participants were not included in the study.

This study used 2 scales; Academic Procrastination Scale by Laurentius Vishnu Adi Kusuma (2010) to measure the behavioral tendency of academic procrastination consisting of 29 items with 4 alternative answers based on the Likert scale and Workload Scale by Putra (2012) for Measures a workload of 5 items with 4 alternative answers on a Likert scale. This hypothesis test uses simple linear regression treated using the SPSS Version 24 application. Data analysis begins with processing the data and then drawing conclusions.

Result and Discussion

Result

A. Descriptive Analysis Results

The subjects of this study were active students who studied while working throughout Indonesia. There were 118 participants who met the research inclusion criteria.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistic of Research Variables

Variable	Participants	
	Mean	**Std. Deviation**
Workload	2,8576	,48294
Academic Procrastination	2,3670	,25334

In the study, two variables were measured; workload and academic procrastination. The average score workload was 2.86 with the standard deviation is 0.48. The average score for procrastination academic was 2.37 with the standard deviation is 0.25.

Table 2. Research Subject Descriptive Statistics

Characteristics	Participants	
	N = 118	**%**
Age	Median = 21	42,4
	Range = 8 (28-20)	
Semester	Median = 5	44,9
	Range = 8 (9-1)	
Work		
PNS	9	7,6
Private Employees	62	52,5
Self employed	9	7,6
Freelance	38	32,2

Based on Table 1, it can be seen that the median of age is 21 years with 42.4% and has a range of 8. Then the median of the semester being taken is semester 5 with 44.9% and has a range of 8.

B. Assumption Test Results

1. Normality Test

Normality tests are carried out to determine whether the distribution of data can be said to be normal or not (Santoso, 2010). Normality testing in this study used the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Based on the results of the normality test conducted by researchers, the academic procrastination and workload data both have a significance of 0.035. Residuals are normally distributed when the significance level is greater than 0.05 or 5%. Because the significance value

obtained is 0.035 < 0.05, the data is not normally distributed. Researchers addressed the abnormally distributed data by conducting the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of the Monte Carlo method. The results of the Kolmogorov Normality test-Smirnov Monte Carlo method got a sig value of 0.342 > 0.05, then the data were normally distributed.

2. Homogeneity Test

The homogeneity test aims to convince that the set of data to be measured does come from a homogeneous (same) population. The calculation of homogeneity is carried out by researchers when they want to compare an attitude, intention, or behavior (variance) in two population groups (Widhiarso, 2011). These population groups have their own characteristics and characteristics such as age, gender, education, and others.

A significance value (p. value) of > 0.05 indicates that the data group comes from a population with the same (homogeneous) variance. On the other hand, a significance value (p. value) of < 0.05 indicates that the data group comes from a population with a different (heterogeneous) variance.

In the homogeneity test conducted by researchers, the significance value was 0.002 < 0.05 which indicates that the data group came from an inhomogeneous (heterogeneous) population. There are several causes of inhomogeneous data, including:
   a. Incorrect sampling process
   b. Poor deployment (division of experimental and control groups)
   c. Usually researchers perform random sampling techniques or use purposive sampling without paying attention to stratification and variants in the group.

There are several solutions that can be done to overcome inhomogeneous data, including:
   a. Using the HC correction method. Usually what is used is HC 5, but for a small number of samples (<250) it is better to use HC 3.
   b. Using the Welch's F or Brown-Forsythe F correlation method

In this case, the researcher chose to use the second solution, which is to use the Welch's F or Brown-Forsythe F correlation method. In the second homogeneity test conducted by researchers, the significance value was 0.000 < 0.05 which indicates that the data group came from an inhomogeneous (heterogeneous) population.

3. Multicollinearity Test

This multicollinearity test is intended to test whether or not there is a high or perfect correlation between free variables in the regression model. To detect the existence of a high correlation between independent variables can be done in several ways, one of which is by using Tolerance and Variance Inflation Factor (VIF). According to Ghazali (2017: 36), tolerance measures the variability of selected independent variables that are not explained by other independent variables. So, a low tolerance equals a high VIF value.

If the VIF number is high, it means that the variance described by that variable can be explained by other variables present in the model. The lower the VIF, the better. The VIF indicator is at less than 10 and Tolerance is above 0.1.

Basis for decision making:
   a. Tolerance
      If the tolerance value > 0.1 then the tolerance is good and fulfilled.
      If the tolerance value < 0.1 then the tolerance is not good and is not met.
   b. BRIGHT
      If the VIF value < 10 then the VIF is good and fulfilled
      If the value of the VIF is > 10 then the VIF is not good and is not met.

Based on existing data, tolerance values of 1,000 > 0.1, and VIF values of 1,000 < 10, it can be concluded that the assumption of the multicollinearity test is met.

4. Autocorrelation Test

This assumption is tested by performing the Durbin-Watson test. Field et al., (2012) recommend values in the range 1-2 as indicators of the non-occurrence of autocorrelation.

Basis for decision making:

a. If the value of D-W is in the range 1-2, then no autocorrelation occurs

b. If the value of D-W is not in the range of 1-2, then autocorrelation occurs

Based on the existing data, the value of D-W is 2,037. Since 2,037 is outside the range of values 1-2, it can be concluded that autocorrelation occurs.

5. Outlier Test

Outliers are data that have values very far from their general value, or in other words have extreme values. The existence of these outliers can affect the results of assumption tests, such as normality tests, linearity, and homogeneity of variance.

The first way to determine the outlier:

a. If the Number on the SPSS is crossed out then there is an outlier

b. If the Number on the SPSS is not crossed out then there is no outlier

The second way to determine the outlier:

a. If the filter has no number 0 then there is no outlier

b. If the filter has a number 0 then there is an outlier

In this study, outliers were analyzed using ourlier mahalanobis, outlier cook and outlier leverage. Based on the data in the SPSS column, there is outlier data marked with strikethroughs on numbers 42, 43, and 96.

C. Hypothesis Test Results

To find out whether or not there is an influence between workload and academic procrastination behavior, the hypothesis test used is simple linear regression.

Table 3. Simple Linear Regression of Workload on Academic Procrastination

Variable	B	HERSELF
Constant	2.665***	.138
Workload	-.104***	.048
R^2	.039	

Note. N = 118 (p<.05)

Based on a simple linear regression test, researchers found that there was no significant effect of workload on the academic procrastination behavior of students studying while working F $(1,116) = 4.75$, p<.05, R^2=.039, R^2 adjusted=.031. The regression coefficient (B=-.104) indicates that a 1-point increase in workload will result in a decrease of approximately 0.104 points of academic procrastination behavior.

Discussion

The results of testing the hypothesis of the influence of workload and academic procrastination conducted by researchers showed that there was no significant influence of workload on academic procrastination behavior. This may be due to the presence of other variables that have been shown to have a significant effect on academic procrastination behavior. As research conducted by Kogoya & Jannah (2021) which revealed that academic procrastination behavior can be derived through emotional regulation. In the academic field, research shows that emotional regulation has a relationship with academic procrastination (Pratama, 2019) which shows that

emotional regulation and procrastination have a negative influence. So the higher the emotional regulation, the lower the level of academic procrastination and vice versa.

Research conducted by Jamila (2020) also found that one of the variables that influence procrastination is self-control (I. Handayani et al., 2015; Winkel & Hastuti, 2010). The lower the self-control, the higher the academic procrastination. According to Fauziah (2015), there are two factors that affect academic procrastination, namely internal factors such as students' understanding of lecture materials and assignments, lack of motivation in students, lack of time management skills, etc. There are also physical factors such as the difficulty of the task, available facilities, processing time, etc. The results of this study are supported by the results of Fitriani's research (2020) which shows that there is a negative correlation between self-control and academic procrastination. This shows that the lower the self-control value, the higher the academic procrastination value. Conversely the higher the self-control the lower the value of academic procrastination. The results of categorization in this study show that most of the students who work in Yogyakarta have high academic procrastination and low self-control.

Research conducted by Kristina Julia Ernita (2021) also shows another variable that can affect academic procrastination behavior, namely the variable academic stress. In the study, there was a positive and significant relationship between academic procrastination and academic stress. The higher the level of academic stress, the higher the academic procrastination of nomadic students. Conversely, the lower the academic stress then, the lower the academic procrastination in nomadic students.

Then in the research of Wardani and Nurwadani (2019) showed that there was a significant negative relationship between the variables of self-regulation and academic procrastination in students working at "X" University Yogyakarta as evidenced by the value of the Beta Coefficient - 0.251 with a significance value of 0.030. This shows that the higher the self-regulation in working students, the lower the academic procrastination. These results support the research of Rahmanillah and Qomariyah (2018) which showed the influence of variable self-regulated learning on academic procrastination by 34.9%, while the remaining 65.1% was another factor outside the study. This means that there is an influence of self-regulated learning on academic procrastination in working students. Likewise, it supports the research of Arumsari and Sugito (2016) which shows that academic procrastination in working students is experienced by students who are less able to carry out self-regulation. The way of handling that is considered appropriate is to carry out a process of self-regulation, namely planning, self-monitoring, control, and evaluation (Pintrich, 2000). The research "The Effect of Learning Motivation and Self-Regulation on Academic Procrastination on Students Working at University X Jakarta" by Aini (2022) also supports previous research that showed that self-regulation variables affect academic procrastination. The results showed that there was a significant negative influence of learning motivation and self-regulation on academic procrastination by contributing 43.7%. The influence provided by learning motivation and self-regulation is large enough that if students work they have learning motivation and good self-regulation skills, it will help students work at University X avoid or overcome academic procrastination behavior.

Another variable that has been shown to affect academic procrastination is self-efficacy. This is based on the results of the study "Self Efficacy and Academic Procrastination in Working Students" by Savitri (2020) which shows that there is a significant negative relationship between self-efficacy and academic procrastination. If self-efficacy is higher, it will be followed by lower academic procrastination behavior. However, if the self-efficacy is lower, the academic procrastination will be higher. As the results of the research of Yuliza, et al. (2022) which showed that there is an influence between time management variables and self-efficacy on procrastination, to a significant extent. This means that the better the student manages his time with discipline and order and high self-efficacy, the lower the final year worker student will do the procrastination, and vice versa, the more negative/unfavorable in doing undisciplined and irregular time management

and also low self-efficacy so that the higher the level of procrastination of final year working students in doing their final project or thesis.

Angga and Supriyadi's research (2017) also found that variables of self-control, workload, and peer social support together had a significant relationship with procrastination in Udayana University students who worked part-time. The three free variables together can explain the variant of academic procrastination in Udayana University students by 56.2%, while the rest are explained by other factors by 43.8%. The self-control variable independently has a negative relationship with academic procrastination in Udayana University students who work part time, the workload variable independently has a positive relationship with academic procrastination in Udayana University students who work part time, the peer social support variable independently has a negative relationship with academic procrastination in Udayana University students who work part time, Academic procrastination owned by Udayana University students who work part-time is mostly low.

Research by Mardelina and Muhson (2017) also shows that there is a significant influence of part-time work on variable learning activities and student academic achievement. This is indicated by the value of the Hotteling's trace multivariate test of 11.884 $p < 0.001$. Thus, due to the dual role that students have, it has an impact on their learning activities and achievements.

Research by Sari and Prianti (2022) also found another variable that affects academic procrastination behavior, namely burnout. The results of their study found the effect of burnout on academic procrastination. Burnout predicts academic procrastination of 15% which is positive or unidirectional, the remaining 85% is influenced by other factors. This means that students who work and experience burnout will have a tendency to academic procrastination.

Furthermore, research conducted by Jio (2022) found that the Grit variable has an influence on the behavior of Academic Procrastination in Employee Class Students of the Faculty of Psychology at University X. This is based on the results of a hypothesis test that shows a significance value of 0.000 where the number is smaller than 0.05 or $0.000 < 0.05$ which means that it can be concluded that Ha is accepted.

Then based on the results of the correlation analysis obtained in the study "The Relationship between Time Management and Academic Procrastination in Working Students" by Septiyani (2018) also obtained a correlation coefficient value of $r = -0.307$ and $p = (p<0.01)$, which showed that there was a negative correlation between time management and academic procrastination in students who worked and were studying at University X. That is, The higher the time management, the lower the tendency of academic procrastination in working students. Conversely, the lower the time management, the lower the tendency of academic procrastination in working students.

Then in the study "The Relationship between Achievement Motivation and Academic Procrastination in Working Students" by Perdani (2015) it was found that the variable motivation for achievement has a relationship with academic procrastination in working students who are at a moderate correlation stage. The direction of the relationship between the two variables is negative, which means that if the motivation for high-achieving students to work is high, the level of academic procrastination is low, and vice versa.

The research "The Role of Self-Regulation and Academic Self-Confidence in Academic Procrastination of Students Who Are Active in Campus Organizations" by Amamlansyah and Ruseno (2021) also found the role of variable self-regulation and academic confidence in academic procrastination. The results of their research show that there is a positive relationship between the role of self-regulation and the academic procrastination of student organizers, so that the higher the self-regulation, the lower the level of academic procrastination. The research also found a negative relationship between the role of academic self-confidence and the academic procrastination of student organizers, so that the higher the academic self-confidence that student organizers have, the lower the level of procrastination akademic.

Based on the results of the studies that have been carried out above we concluded that there are many more variables outside of this study that affect academic procrastination behavior on working students.

Conclusion

From the analysis that has been carried out, it can be concluded that the workload owned by students who study while working does not have a significant influence on academic procrastination behavior. So Hypothesis 1 in this study was rejected, namely that there was no significant influence of workload on the academic procrastination behavior of students studying while working. Based on the results of the studies that have been carried out above we concluded that there are many more variables outside of this study that affect academic procrastination behavior on working students such as self efficacy, self regulation, motivation to excel, academic activity, and so on.

Suggestion

The hypothesis we put forward in this study was not accepted. Workload has no significant effect on academic procrastination in employee-class students. And can also be caused by improper selection of measuring instruments. The dependent variable used in this study is academic procrastination. We speculate that there are other variables that have a significant influence on academic procrastination. So that in the next study can add or use variables that have been proven in previous studies to have a significant effect on academic procrastination in working students such as self-regulation, self-control, self-efficacy, motivation to excel, emotional regulation, academic stress, etc. The independent variable used in this study is workload. For subsequent research can add other variables that have been shown to be affected by workload variables such as academic activity, learning motivation, self-regulation, etc.

References

Azwar, S. (2005). *Human Attitudes: Their Theory and Measurement.* Yogyakarta: Student Library 51

Azwar, S. (2007). *Research Methods.* Yogyakarta: Student Library

Creswell, W.J. (1994), *Research design: qualitative & quantitative approaches*, California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Danang, Sunyoto. (2012). *Human Resource Management.* Jakarta: PT Buku Seru.

Elma Mardelina & Ali Muhson. (2017). *Student Work And Its Impact On Learning Activities And Academic Achievement.* Yogyakarta State University, Indonesia.

Ferdinand. (2006). *Management Research Methods.* Semarang: Diponegoro University Publishing Agency.

Ferrari, Joseph R., Johnson, J. & McCown, W. (1995). *Procrastination and Task Avoidance.* New York, USA: Plenum Press.

Hart, S. G., Staveland, L. E. (1988). Development of NASA-TLX (Task Load Index): Results of Empirical and Theoretical Research, *Advances in Psychology*, 52, 139-183. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0166-4115(08)62386-9.

Risma Adelina Simanjuntak. (2010). *Mental Workload Analysis With Nasa-Task Load Index Method.* Department of Industrial Engineering, AKPRIND Institute of Science and Technology Yogyakarta, 3(1).

Robert, P. & Saar, E. (2012). Learning and Working: The Impact of the 'Double Status Position' on the Labour Market Entry Process of Graduates in CEE Countries. *European Sociological Review*, 28(6), 742-754.

Senecal, C., Koestner, R., & Vallerand, R. J. (1995). Self-regulation and Academic Procrastination. *The journal of social psychology*, 135(5), 607-619. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1995.9712234

Solomon, L.. J., & Rothblum, E. D. (1984). Academic Procrastination: Frequency And Cognitive Behavioral Correlates. *Journal of Counseling Psychology.* 31(4), 503. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.31.4.503

Sugiyono, 2014. *Quantitative Approach Educational Research Methods. Qualitative. and R&D.* Bandung: Alfabeta.