



LINKING PROCRASTINATION BEHAVIOUR WITH PERCEIVED PSYCHOLOGICAL PERFORMANCE

Dr. Sandeep Singh¹

¹Assistant Professor, Punjabi University Regional Center for IT and Management, Mohali, Punjab, India, Email: banger.singh36@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

In order to improve the productivity, quality of products and services, organizations have to be on the toes to deal with challenges of constant change and competition. The previous studies evidently explained that organizational performance was affected by the various human behaviour elements. The goal of the study was to examine the impact of procrastination behaviour on psychological performance of hotel managers. The sample of the study consisted of 91 hotel managers. These employees were selected from the different 3 Star Hotels. The result revealed a significant influence of Procrastination behaviour on psychological performance.

KEYWORDS

Psychological Performance, Procrastination Behaviour, Manager

INTRODUCTION

Performance is a wide term. It is associated with various psychological and non-psychological aspects. According to Business Dictionary (2016) performance can be defined as "The accomplishment of a given task measured against preset known standards of accuracy, completeness, cost, and speed. In a contract, performance is deemed to be the fulfillment of an obligation, in a manner that releases the performer from all liabilities under the contract." Various psychological and non-psychological aspects are associated with the performance. As a psychological concept performance is a ratio of input behaviour and output of production. As performance is a multi-dimensional aspect of behaviour, performance of an individual depends upon various human elements like motivation, attitude, personality etc.

Procrastination has been the subject of research mainly in educational fields, whereas only a limited number of studies have been conducted in other organizations. It procrastination has a wider meaning. It is not just restricted to delay; the delay should be irrational (Steel, 2010). Hence, procrastination means an irrational delay of behaviour. Steel (2010) developed a scale and





discussed three types of procrastination viz. decisional, arousal and avoidant. Decisional Procrastination is related to delay in decision making, arousal procrastination related to starting work at the last moment and avoidant procrastination related to avoiding the task due to fear of failure.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND HYPOTHESIS

Baumeister & Scher (1988) explained that procrastination had a negative relationship with the performance. Ariely & Steel et al. (2001) revealed the significant impact of procrastination on the performance. Wertenbroch (2002) examined that deadline, control the procrastination behaviour, but not improving task performance. Lakshminarayan et al. (2013) revealed a negative relationship between procrastination and performance. Kim & Seo (2015) had conducted a meta-analysis and concluded that procrastination and academic performance had a negative relationship. Chandrasekar (2011) examined that poor work environment effect the performance of the employee. The study added that quality of the employee's workplace environment that had most impact on level of motivation and subsequent performance. Oswald et al. (2012) found the significant impact of work environment on the performance. Nazir, et al. (2012) investigated the relationship between leadership style, culture and organizational performance. Further, the classification of the result showed that innovative culture positively and significantly associated with performance. On the basis of previous literature the following hypothesis was made:

H1: There would be a significant impact of procrastination behaviour on psychological performance.

RESEARCH MEHODOLOGY AND SCALE RELIABILITY

The sample of the study consisted of ninety one middle level managers. These employees were selected by Judgment sampling technique from three Star Hotels of Chandigarh, Mohali and Patiala. The information regarding the performance of employees has been gathered by Self-Performance Appraisal Inventory (Dhaliwal, 2008). It has forty five items and twelve sub scales. The responses of the respondents were measured at 5- point Likert scale. The reliability of the scale was tested. Table 1 shows the range of Cronbach's alpha from 0.82 to 0.23.

Here, it was required to mention that some items were deleted to improve the reliability of the scale. Most of the dimensions were falling within the acceptable limit of Cronbach's alpha.



Further, a sub scale, viz., commitment and loyalty were not added in the analysis due to low level of reliability.

Table 1 : Self-Performance Appraisal Inventory Reliability Analysis

Sub Scales	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
Commitment and loyalty	0.23	4
Sociability	0.59	6
Decision making	0.64	3
Creativity and innovation	0.63	4
Judgmental skills	0.61	4
Organizing ability	0.73	4
Attitude	0.74	5
Job knowledge and clarity	0.76	4
Leadership skills	0.78	5
Communication skills	0.80	3
Integrity and dependability	0.81	7
Target achievement	0.82	3

Procrastination was measured by the Pure Procrastination Scale (**Steel, 2010**). The scale has three sub scales, viz. decisional, arousal and avoidant procrastination. The responses of the respondents were measured at 5- point Likert scale. Overall scale has twelve items. The reliability of the scale was tested. Table 2 shows all the dimensions showed a satisfied range of reliability.

Table 2: Pure Procrastination Scale Reliability Analysis

Sub Scales	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
Decisional Procrastination	0.69	3
Arousal Procrastination	0.80	5
Avoidant Procrastination	0.87	4

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION



The data was analyzed by regression methods on SPSS. The overall index of the performance and procrastination exhibited a significant relationship (R = -0.253, P < 0.05). The value of R square was 0.06 which explained the 6 per cent variance of the performance index was explained by the procrastination score. The overall model of regression was highly significant as value of F = 6.073 and p = 0.01 (Table 3).

Table 3: Model Summary for Psychological Performance and Procrastination Behaviour

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std.	Error	of	the
				Estim	ate		
1	.253 ^a	.064	.053	12.13	832		
a. Predictors: (Constant), Procrastination Behaviour							

Table 4: ANOVA^a for Psychological Performance and Procrastination Behaviour

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	894.800	1	894.800	6.073	.016 ^b
	Residual	13113.156	89	147.339		
	Total	14007.956	90			

a. Dependent Variable: Psychological Performance

The unstandardized coefficient beta was found -0.468 (Table 5) which clearly indicated that with the increase of one unit of procrastination, performance will be decreased by 0.46 units reversely. The standardized beta coefficient was found -0.25. It reflected that a change of one standard deviation in procrastination will lead change 0.25 standard deviation in the performance score adversely.

Table 5: Coefficients for Psychological Performance and Procrastination Behaviour

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
		В	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	170.179	6.128		27.771	.000	
	P	468	.190	253	-2.464	.016	
a. Dependent Variable: Psychological Performance							

b. Predictors: (Constant), Procrastination Behaviour



In sum, the results clearly indicated that the procrastination behaviour of the managers had a significant impact on the psychological performance of the managers. The results were matched with Steel (2001) and Baumeister & Scher (1988) who depicted that procrastination was self-indulgent behaviour which affected the performance negatively because one ended up with less time to work. Hence, the hypothesis "There would be a significant impact of procrastination on performance" was supported by empirical evidence.

CONCLUSION

The performance of an employee contributes to the overall performance of an organization. The behaviour aspects of human beings are as important as other aspects of performance. The previous literature, evidently explained that the performance of an employee depends upon a number of other factors like motivation, work environment, personality, leadership, etc. The results clearly indicated that procrastination behaviour also affects the performance of employees. The results depicted that procrastination was a significant predictor of performance. Hence, it was concluded that procrastination behaviour had an impact on psychological performance of Hotel managers.

PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS OF RESEARCH

The study will be helpful to control the procrastination and improve performance of employees. The management can make advance plans to handle procrastination and performance. The effect of procrastination on performance leads to identify the training needs. Thus, management of hotels can identify the core areas quickly for training by using this model.

LIMITATION OF THE STUDY AND SCOPE OF FUTURE RESEARCH

There are a number of variables which might be mediating the relationship between procrastination and performance. The information creates a scope of research related to moderation and mediation studies between procrastination and performance. Study can be replicated in other industries. The sample was not representing any particular city, area etc. The appropriation of sampling size was not determined. Further, demographic data was not analyzed in the study.

REFERENCES



- 1. Ariely, D., & Wertenbroch, K. (2002). Procrastination, deadlines, and performance: Self-control by precommitment. *Psychological science*, *13*(3), 219-224.
- 2. Ashtari, Z., Farhady, Y., & Khodaee, M. R. (2009). Relationship between job burnout and work performance in a sample of Iranian mental health staff. *African Journal of Psychiatry*, 12(1), 71-74. Retrieved on March 3, 2014 from http://www.ajol.info/index.php/ajpsy/article/view/30282/30493
- 3. Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? . *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9(1-2), 9-30.
- 4. Baumeister, R. F. & Scher, S. J. (1988). Self-defeating behaviour patterns among normal individuals: Review and analysis of common self-destructive tendencies. *Psychological bulletin*, 104(1), 3. doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.104.1.3
- 5. Brownlow, S., & Reasinger, R. D. (2000). Putting off until tomorrow what is better done today: Academic procrastination as a function of motivation toward college work. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality*, 15(5), 15.
- 6. Business Dictionary (2016) Retrieved from http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/performance.html#ixzz4KgDtytyK
- 7. Chan, A. O., & Huak, C. Y. (2004). Influence of work environment on emotional health in a health care setting. *Occupational Medicine*, *54*(3), 207-212.
- 8. Chandrasekar, K. (2011). Workplace environment and its impact on organisational performance in public sector organisations. *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems*, *I*(1), 1-16.
- 9. Dhaliwal R.S. (2008). Performance of marketing managers in relation to their burnout experience, work environment and management oriented styles (Unpublished Doctoral Thesis), School of Management Studies, Punjabi University Patiala.
- 10. Gana, A.B., & Bababe, B.F. (2011). The effects of motivation on workers performance. *Continantal Journal For Social Sciences*, 4,8-13.
- 11. Gordon, G. G. & Di Tomaso, N. (1992). Predicting corporate performance from organizational culture. *Journal of management studies*, 29(6), 783-798.
- 12. http://info.shine.com/industry/hotels-hospitality/12.html
- 13. Jain, R., & Kaur, S. (2014). Impact of work environment on job satisfaction. *International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications*, 4(1), 1-8.



- 14. Kahai, S.S., Sosik., J.J., & Avolio, B.J. (2000). *Effects of leadership styles, anonymity and rewards in an electronic meeting system environment*. Working paper centre for leadership Studies. Binghamton University.
- 15. Kim, K. R., & Seo, E. H. (2015). The relationship between procrastination and academic performance: A meta-analysis. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 82, 26-33.
- 16. Klein, E. (1971). A comprehensive etymological dictionary of the English language. New York: Elsevier
- 17. Lakshminarayan, N., Potdar, S., & Reddy, S. G. (2013). Relationship between procrastination and academic performance among a group of undergraduate dental students in India. *Journal of dental education*, 77(4), 524-528.
- 18. Likert, R. (1961). New patterns of management. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 19. Moos, R. H. (1994). Work Environment Scale Manual (3nd ed.). California: Consulting Psychologists Press Inc.
- 20. Nazir, A.N., Lone, M.A., Shah, P.A., and Azeem S.M (2012). *Leadership styles, organizational culture and perceived performance in service sector*. Paper presented at the 3rd International Conference on Business and Economic Research, Proceeding12 13 March 2012. Golden Flower Hotel, Bandung, Indonesia
- 21. Oswald, A. J., Proto, E., & Sgroi, D. (2009). Happiness and productivity. Retrived from https://scholar.google.co.in/scholar?hl=en&q=happyness+and+productvity&btnG=
- 22. Schneider, B., Hanges, P. J., Smith, D. B., & Salvaggio, A. N. (2003). Which comes first: employee attitudes or organizational financial and market performance? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 836.
- 23. Steel, P. (2010). Arousal, avoidant and decisional procrastinators: Do they exist?. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48(8), 926-934.
- 24. Steel, P., Brothen, T., & Wambach, C. (2001). Procrastination and personality, performance, and mood. *Personality and individual differences*, *30*(1), 95-106.
- 25. Tufail, S. & Sajid, M. (2015). An empirical study of relationship between compensation, working environment and motivation of employees in banking sector of Pakistan. Retrieved on April 16, 2015 from www.iiste.org/Journals/index.php/JMCR/article/download/.../18150)