Today, procrastination is a more common phenomenon among students than ever. Because they have lots of things to do but they have limited time. When the literature concerning procrastination is reviewed, it can be easily made out that reasons for procrastination behaviours are various. Because of these reasons, sometimes, we do not go into action until the very last minute, sometimes, we go into action after the scheduled time is over or we never go into action. Especially, undergraduates frequently exhibit procrastination behaviour toward their academic tasks such as preparing homework, studying and preparing for exams. Researches on this subject clearly show that it is impossible to explain procrastination behaviour with only one variable. So the aim of this study was to investigate whether general procrastination, academic motivation and academic self-efficacy can act as predictors of academic procrastination among undergraduates attending different departments (physical education and sport teaching, trainer education, sport management and recreation) at school of physical education and sports. In addition, their academic procrastination was examined in terms of gender, department and grade variables. The study group consisted of 774 students attending school of physical education and sports at Selçuk University, Samsun University, and Niğde University in Turkey. The academic procrastination scale, general procrastination scale, academic motivation scale, academic self-efficacy scale and a personal data form were used as scaling instruments. Pearson’s correlation coefficient, multiple regression analysis, independent samples t-test and one-way ANOVA were used to analyze the data collected. The results show a significant positive correlation between academic procrastination and general procrastination, while the relationship between academic procrastination and, academic motivation, academic self-efficacy was not statistically significant. Furthermore, general procrastination was determined to be a significant predictor of academic procrastination. The results also show a significant difference in academic procrastination in terms of students' departments and grade though levels of academic procrastination did not differ in terms of gender. These findings are discussed in the light of the relevant literature and some new directions for further studies are suggested.
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INTRODUCTION

Procrastination has typically been defined as a trait or behavioural disposition to postpone or delay performing a task or making decisions (Milgram et al., 1998; Haycock et al., 1998; Kachgal et al., 2001). Although procrastination is a common phenomenon among students and, is thought to be an unfavourable personality trait, it seems hard to find a conventional definition on which all the researches agree. However, procrastination is stated to be a personality trait intended to put off an existing work, a behavioural tendency or an irrational delay.
This complex phenomenon is examined under five headings: (1) General procrastination; (2) Academic procrastination; (3) Decision-making procrastination; (4) Neurotic procrastination, and (5) Non-obsessional or non-functional procrastination. While general and academic procrastination is related to avoidance of task, other procrastination behaviours seem to be connected with decision making (Ellis and Knaus, 1977). General procrastination behaviour is described as difficulties in performing daily tasks due to incapability to organize time and management effectively (Ferrari et al., 1995). Academic procrastination involves academic tasks and can be described as postponing academic tasks due to some reasons. Solomon and Rothblum (1984) have simply described academic procrastination as postponing primary academic tasks such as preparing for exams, preparing term papers, administrative affairs related to school and duty of attendance. In consideration of these descriptions, academic procrastination means delaying academic tasks and trouble experienced because of this delay.

Procrastination tendency is a general problem (Harriot and Ferrari, 1996) and it is stated that particularly everybody tends to exhibit procrastination behaviour (Senecal et al., 1995). When the literature is reviewed, it is obvious that most of the researches concerning procrastination are studied on undergraduates. As a sub-heading of procrastination, academic procrastination has been reported to be highly prevailing among undergraduates (Rothblum et al., 1986; Clark and Hill, 1994; Day et al., 2000; O’Brien, 2002; Ozer, 2005). As for academic procrastination, when the literature is reviewed, following findings are found. Bridges and Roig (1997) have asserted that when the irrational thinking rate of undergraduates increase, their academic procrastination behaviour also increases. Beswick et al. (1988), Tuckman (1990), and Klassen et al. (2007) have found out that the lower self-esteem the undergraduates got, the more academic procrastination they have. Flett et al. (1995), Saddler and Sacks (1993), Busko (1998), Park and Kwon (1998), Seo (2008), and Capan (2010) have suggested that a relationship exists between perfectionism and academic procrastination. That is, the more perfectionism rate the undergraduates got the lower level of academic procrastination they have. Onwuegbuzie (2000) conducted a study regarding academic procrastination and perfectionism in graduate students, who may have an even greater tendency than undergraduates to procrastinate on academic tasks. McKean (1990, 1994) asserted that there is a positive relationship between learned helplessness and academic procrastination of undergraduates. Milgram et al. (1995) also stated that undergraduates who are bad at time management exhibit more procrastination behaviour. Burns et al. (2000) and Onwuegbuzie (2004) stated that undergraduates who use avoidance defence mechanism have more procrastination tendency. Finally, Solomon and Rothblum (1984), Schouwenburg (1992) and Onwuegbuzie (2004) examined the relationship between undergraduates’ fear of failure and their academic procrastination behaviour. As a result of this study, they found out that there is an inverse significant relationship between academic procrastination behaviour and fear of failure. In the light of the researches aforementioned, it is obvious that procrastination is a common problem among undergraduates and it is influential on their personality, psychologically going well and academic achievement.

Motivation which is one of the variables in this study is defined as tending a purposeful behaviour and sustaining it (Schunk, 1990) or the power which enables an individual to deal with an activity (Chu and Choi, 2005). Pintich and Schunk (2002) defined motivation as an individual’s effort, insistency and skill management while performing a task. As for academic motivation, it is briefly defined as “producing energy required for academic tasks” (Bozanoglu, 2004). Motivation is also considered as a key for education. Experiencing a productive learning of an individual is closely related to his/her motivation level and researches on this subject show that motivation has a significant and strong impact on academic output (Vallerand and Bissonnette, 1992; Vallerand et al., 1992, 1993; Wolters et al., 2005). In other words, an individual having high level motivation may experience a more successful process in carrying out tasks (preparing for exams, preparing term paper, doing homework) during his/her academic life. So motivation occupies an important place in academic life.

It has been stated in the literature that there is an inverse relation between motivation and procrastination. That is, as motivation level decreases, tendency for procrastination increases (Senecal et al., 1995; Orpen, 1998; Lee, 2005; Balkis, 2006; Lekich, 2006; Klassen et al., 2007; Rakes, and Dunn, 2010). Senécal et al. (1995) considered academic procrastination as a motivational problem rather than lack of effective time management skill or characteristic laziness. According to Tuckman and Sexton (1992) and Díaz-Morales et al. (2008), procrastination arises from lack of motivation or shortage of motivation. In his another research, Tuckman (1998) asserted that it is hard to motivate an individual who exhibits procrastination behaviour and insists on exhibiting procrastination behaviour until the last minute. After all, it can be easily understood that motivation has a significant influence on procrastination. However, there has been no research in Turkey concerning the relationship between academic motivation and academic procrastination. Therefore, we determined academic motivation as a variable in this study.

Self-efficacy which is the last variable of this study is generally described as “an individual’s belief regarding his/her own ability in exhibiting certain behaviours successfully” (Bandura, 1997). According to Bandura (1977), self-efficacy belief is an important determinant in achieving a behavioural change. While low self-efficacy
belief may cause avoiding behaviour, high self-efficacy belief is a driving force to initiate and sustain behaviour. Academic self-efficacy is a belief regarding the student's ability about completing an academic task successfully (Solberg et al., 1993; Zimmerman, 1995; Chu and Choi, 2005; Tsai and Tsai, 2010). Therefore individuals who have high self-efficacy are more eager to learn activities, redouble their efforts toward activities and may develop more effective strategies against difficulties they encounter (Eggen and Kauchak, 1999). Bandura has been the first researcher who put forward the relationship between academic procrastination and self-efficacy in 1986. There are lots of research findings in the literature suggesting that as the students’ beliefs in achieving something decrease, their tendency for procrastination increases (Tuckman, 1991; Tuckman and Sexton, 1992; Ferrari et al., 1992; Loebenstein, 1996; Haycock et al., 1998; Wolters, 2003; Klassen et al., 2007; Steel, 2007; Seo, 2008; Odaci, 2011).

Although there have been a lot of researches concerning the relationship between procrastination and individual differences, number of researches concerning the relationship between procrastination and demographic variables seems inadequate. Therefore, another aim of this study was to contribute literature by determining the relationship between procrastination and some demographic variables. When the researches concerning the relationship between procrastination and demographic variables were examined, an inverse relationship between age and procrastination was determined (McCown and Robert, 1994; O'Donoghue and Rabin, 1999; Prohaska et al., 2000; Watson, 2001; Balkis and Duru, 2009).

But in 1998, Haycock et al. have not determined a significant difference between age and procrastination in their research. When the literature concerning the relationship between procrastination and gender is reviewed, three different results are encountered: Some of them refer that procrastination does not differ in terms of gender (Solomon and Rothblum, 1984; Beswick et al., 1988; Effert and Ferrari, 1989; Ferrari, 1991, 1992; Milgram et al., 1993; McKean, 1994; Ferrari and Emmons, 1995; Johnson and Bloom, 1995; Haycock et al., 1998; Hess et al., 2000; Kachgal et al., 2001; Watson, 2001; Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Alexander and Onwuegbuzie, 2007, 2007), some of them refer that female students exhibit more procrastination behaviour than males (Solomon and Rothblum, 1984; Paludi and Frankel-Hauser, 1986; Dolye and Paludi, 1998; Washington, 2004), and some of them refer that male students exhibit more procrastination behaviour than females (Senecal et al., 1995; Prohaska et al., 2000; Gülebaglan, 2003; Van Eerde, 2003; Senecal et al., 2003; Balkis, 2006; Akinsola et al., 2007; Balkis and Duru, 2009). Considering this complex situation, gender was thought to be an important variable in this study. When the literature is reviewed, very few researches concerning the relationship between procrastination and grade of undergraduates are encountered.

McCown and Roberts (1994) studied dispersion of procrastination among undergraduates. 1543 undergraduates participated in the research and 19% of freshmen, 22% of sophomores, 27% of juniors and 31% of seniors have been reported to have thought academic procrastination as a source of stress. In addition to these, it is stated in some researches that procrastination behaviour of an individual increases, as his/her period of study gets longer. Moreover it increasingly goes on after they graduate (Beswick et al., 1988; Rosário et al., 2004; 2007; 2009; Ferrari, 2004). No research has been found concerning academic procrastination tendency of undergraduates attending school of physical education and sport.

Consequently, researches on this subject have been rather recent in Turkey and it is anticipated that determining basic factors influential on procrastination of undergraduates would clear up both theoretic framework and application study. Aim of this study was to examine academic procrastination, general procrastination, academic motivation and academic self-efficacy beliefs of undergraduates who are attending physical education and sport teaching, trainer education, sport management and recreation departments.

The results of this study is expected to better present nature of academic procrastination and the factors which are influential on undergraduates’ procrastination tendency. In addition, it is expected to bring a new perspective to failure problem of undergraduates attending physical education and sports departments and, to produce significant findings that will benefit literature. So, it is aimed to find actual answers for the following questions

1. Is there a significant relationship between academic procrastination, general procrastination, academic motivation and academic self-efficacy beliefs of undergraduates attending school of physical education and sports?
2. To what extent do general procrastination, academic motivation and academic self-efficacy beliefs of undergraduates attending school of physical education and sports predict academic procrastination?
3. Does level of academic procrastination tendency among undergraduates attending school of physical education and sports differ according to demographic variables?

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study group

The study group consisted of 774 students studying at the school of physical education and sports of Selcuk University, Samsun University, and Nigde University, Turkey. 276 (35.7%) were female and 498 (64.3%) male. Ages ranged between 17 and 27, with a mean of 21.43 (SD: 2.15).
Table 1. Correlation between academic procrastination and general procrastination and academic self-efficacy and academic motivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AP</th>
<th>GP</th>
<th>AM</th>
<th>AS</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.472**</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>55.42</td>
<td>10.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>50.98</td>
<td>10.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.220**</td>
<td>72.78</td>
<td>12.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.62</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.01; GE, General procrastination; AP, academic procrastination; AM, academic motivation; AS, academic self-efficacy.

Data collection

Academic procrastination scale (APS)

The APS was developed by Cakici (2003) with the aim of determining students' academic procrastination behaviour; the scale consists of 19 statements, 12 negative and 7 positive, involving tasks students have a responsibility to perform in their academic lives. The APS has a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of 0.92. Cronbach alpha coefficients calculated for the scale’s first and second factors are 0.89 and 0.84, respectively.

General procrastination scale (GPS)

The GPS was developed by Çakıcı (2003) and consists of 18 items. It is a seven point likert-type scale. The GPS has a Cronbach alpha reliability coefficient of 0.91. Cronbach alpha coefficients calculated for the first and second factors of the scale are respectively 0.88 and 0.85. Spearman Brown split-half reliability total value was 0.85, while it was 0.86 for the first half with nine items and 0.84 for the second half with 9 items. Test retest reliability value was 0.83 for a single factor, 0.79 for the first factor, and 0.89 for the second factor (Cakici, 2003).

Academic self-efficacy scale (ASS)

The ASS was developed by Jerusalem and Schwarzer (1981) (Yilmaz et al., 2007) to measure undergraduates’ self-efficacy with regard to academic learning, the scale was adapted into Turkish by Yilmaz et al. (2007). The ASS is a one-dimensional Likert-type scale consisting of 7 items. Possible scores range from 7 to 28. High scores indicate that subjects have a high level of belief in their self-efficacy regarding learning. The original scale has a Cronbach alpha reliability value of 0.87, while that adapted into Turkish has a value of 0.79.

Academic motivation scale (AMS)

Academic motivation scale (AMS) was developed by Bozanoğlu (2004) in order to define individual differences in academic motivation levels. The AMS consists of 20 items and statements are administered with 5-point likert-type response categories ranging from absolutely not suitable (5) to absolutely suitable (1). Possible scores range from 20 to 100. High scores indicate higher level of motivation. It has only one reverse item (item 4). The reliability of the AMS was tested on 101 high school students by using test retest method. After the tests were conducted, correlation between two tests was found as 0.87. Cronbach alpha internal consistency coefficients were found as 0.77 to 0.85 for the same groups and 0.77 to 0.86 for different groups at different times (Bozanoğlu, 2004).

Data collection and analysis

Scales were administered to students in groups, in a class environment. Before administration of the scales, students were given the requisite information about the aim of the research and how the measurement scales should be answered. Firstly, the relations between students’ academic procrastination and general procrastination and academic motivation and academic self-efficacy were investigated. Then, it was investigated whether academic procrastination differed significantly according to the independent variables in the personal information form. Data were analyzed using SPSS 15.00. Pearson’s product moments correlation coefficient, multiple linear regression analysis, the independent t-test and one-way ANOVA were used for data analysis. Significance was set at a minimum of 0.05, while other significance levels (0.01 and 0.001) are also shown.

RESULTS

As shown in Table 1, there was a positive correlation (r = 0.47, p < 0.00) between academic procrastination and general procrastination, while no significant correlation was determined between academic procrastination and academic motivation, academic self-efficacy. According to the multiple linear regression analysis results, general procrastination and academic motivation and academic self-efficacy account for 22% of academic procrastination variance (F(3,770) = 73.88, p < 0.05) (Table 2). General procrastination made a positive contribution to the model (β = 0.47, p < 0.05) while academic motivation and academic self-efficacy made no significant contribution. The independent t-test showed that undergraduates’ academic procrastination scores did not differ significantly according to gender (t = -1.91, p > 0.05) (Table 3). At one-way ANOVA, undergraduate academic procrastination varied according to their departments (F(3,770) = 3.21, p < 0.05) (Table 4). According to the results of LSD test, performed in order to determine which groups these differences originate from, academic procrastination scores for recreation departments students were higher than those for undergraduates attending sport management departments. At one-way ANOVA, undergraduates’ academic procrastination varied according to their grade (F(3,770) = 2.68, p < 0.05) (Table 5). According to the results of LSD test, performed in order to determine which groups these differences originate from, academic procrastination scores for sophomores and juniors were higher than those for freshmen.

DISCUSSION

The data obtained from this investigation into the relations between academic procrastination and general procrastination show a significant positive correlation and
Table 2. Multiple linear regression analysis results for the prediction of academic procrastination.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>ΔR²</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fixed</td>
<td>32.601</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>12.564</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>73.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>0.489</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>14.883</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.027</td>
<td>-0.843</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AS</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.014</td>
<td>-0.431</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

GP, General procrastination; AM, academic motivation; AS, academic self-efficacy.

Table 3. Academic procrastination variations on the basis of gender.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Sd</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>54.456</td>
<td>10.50584</td>
<td>-1.91</td>
<td>0.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>498</td>
<td>55.9578</td>
<td>10.43290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Academic procrastination variations according to department.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>1048.437</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>349.479</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>83800.412</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>108.832</td>
<td>3.211</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84848.849</td>
<td>773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SS, Sum of squares; df, degree of freedom; MS, mean squares.

Table 5. Academic procrastination variations according to grade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>877.752</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>292.584</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>83971.097</td>
<td>770</td>
<td>109.053</td>
<td>2.683</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>84848.849</td>
<td>773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SS, Sum of squares; df, degree of freedom; MS, mean squares.

academic procrastination and academic motivation and academic self-efficacy show a significant inverse correlation between academic procrastination and general procrastination, but no significant correlation between academic procrastination and academic motivation and academic self-efficacy. In addition, we concluded that general procrastination could account for academic procrastination but that academic motivation and academic self-efficacy made no significant contribution to academic procrastination.

A moderate, positive and significant relationship has been found between academic procrastination and general procrastination among undergraduates attending school of physical education and sports. These findings show that academic procrastination and general procrastination associates with each other. Literature on procrastination also supports these findings. That is, individuals who postpone their academic tasks also postpone their daily routine such as cleaning their house and phone calls etc. (Milgram et al., 1998; Ferrari and Scher, 2000). Researchers divide procrastination into two branches, general procrastination (procrastination as a personality trait) and situational procrastination (academic procrastination). Findings of this study may contribute literature on situational procrastination and procrastination as a personality trait. Number of researches on this subject is limited; however they present similar findings that general procrastination and academic procrastination associate with each other (Kagan, 2009).

In other words, an individual exhibiting general procrastination behaviours, exhibits academic procrastination; or reverse, an individual exhibiting academic procrastination behaviours, exhibits general procrastination behaviours. Concordantly, researchers emphasize that procrastination is mostly a personality trait (Milgram et al., 1998; Ferrari and Scher, 2000). In addition to this, Atkinson et al. (1990) stated that both personality trait and situational factors play an effective role on behaviours.

Among the studied variables, general procrastination has been the most important predictor of academic procrastination. And this finding is supported by findings of previous researches. Milgram et al. (1998) stated that there is a medium level positive relationship between general procrastination and academic procrastination. Yorulmaz (2003) and Gulebaglan (2003) found similar findings in their researches. In a research participants of which were high school students and undergraduates, a similar finding has been found out again; there is a moderate positive relationship between general procrastination and academic procrastination (Cakici, 2003).

The results of this study also indicated that there is no relationship between academic motivation and academic procrastination. And academic motivation does not predict academic procrastination. In addition, although it is not significant, there is an inverse relationship between academic motivation and academic procrastination. There are lots of factors influential on this situation in Turkey. For example, because of economic and educational policies, it is hard to be appointed as a teacher (state worker) after graduating from these departments (physical education and sport teaching, trainer education, sport management and recreation) so undergraduates might experience lack of motivation and concentration on
their academic tasks. Furthermore, they may have difficulties in setting their targets for their future life. This may be an answer to the question, why their academic motivation has not been a significant predictor of their academic procrastination.

Another finding of this study was that there is no relationship between academic self-efficacy and academic procrastination and academic self-efficacy does not predict academic procrastination. In addition, an inverse nonsignificant relationship between academic self-efficacy and academic procrastination was found. In this study, the reason why academic self-efficacy did not predict academic procrastination may be because participants strongly believed that they would be able to graduate from their departments. Researches have put forward that there is an inverse significant relationship between procrastination and self-efficacy belief (Haycock et al., 1998), and it is stated that lacking self-efficacy belief causes procrastination (Tuckman and Sexton, 1992). Bandura has been the first researcher who put forward the relationship between academic procrastination and self-efficacy in 1986. Lots of research findings indicate that as students’ beliefs toward achieving something decreases, their tendency for procrastination behaviours increase (Tuckman, 1991; Tuckman and Sexton, 1992; Ferrari et al., 1992; Loebenstein, 1996; Haycock et al., 1998; Wolters, 2003; Klassen et al., 2007; Steel, 2007; Seo, 2008). But only one research on which academic procrastination and academic self-efficacy was studied together has been found in Turkey. In this research, Aydogan (2008) stated that there was no significant relationship between academic procrastination and self-efficacy belief.

The result of this study also showed that procrastination tendency does not differ according to gender. The gender differences concerning procrastination behaviour are considerably difficult to envisage (Steel, 2007). When the issue is relationship between procrastination behaviour and gender, cultural structure is the key word. For example, according to Burk and Yuen (1983), in a male-dominant society, role of success is put on men, and women stay in background. Women who think that being successful may have the risk of expelling from society postpone their work which may lead to success. Besides, women tend to connect their success with factor of chance and their failure with lack of ability. On the contrary, men connect their success with their abilities (Hackett and Campbell, 1987; Meyer, 2000). Jackson (2002) stated that men perceive academic tasks womanish so they postpone their academic tasks. Gender is always thought to be an important variable so there are lots of research in the literature concerning the relationship between academic procrastination and gender. The researches which were conducted on different study groups have inconsistent results. For example, while some of them put forward that female students’ level of academic procrastination tendency is lower than male’s (Senecal et al., 1995; Prohaska et al., 2000; Senecal et al., 2003; Van Eerde, 2003; Ozer, 2005), some of them asserted contrary; male students’ level of academic procrastination tendency is lower than female’s (Solomon and Rothblum, 1984; Paludi and Frankel-Hauser, 1986; Dolye and Paludi, 1998; Washington, 2004). Further more, some of them also put forward that there is no significant relationship between procrastination and gender. In other words, it was put forward in these researches, participant of which were undergraduates, that there is no difference between males and females in terms of procrastination tendency (Solomon and Rothblum, 1984; Rothblum et al., 1986; Beswick et al., 1988; Effert and Ferrari, 1989; Ferrari, 1991; Ferrari, 1992; Milgram et al., 1993; McKean, 1994; Ferrari and Emmons 1995; Johnson and Bloom, 1995; Haycock et al., 1998; Hess et al., 2000; Ferrari, 2000; Kachgal et al., 2001; Watson 2001; Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Alexander and Onwuegbuzie, 2007). Considering the results of the aforementioned studies, it is obvious that there is a lack of clear information on this subject. More research is needed to explain the relationship between procrastination and gender.

The analysis which was carried out to determine whether undergraduates’ procrastination tendency differs according to their departments revealed following findings; Academic procrastination tendency level of undergraduates attending recreation department is higher than undergraduates attending Sport Management Department. In addition, procrastination tendency level of undergraduates attending physical education teaching and coach training departments is lower than undergraduates attending sport management and recreation departments. In the light of the aforementioned findings, it can be asserted that undergraduates attending recreation department are more likely to postpone their academic tasks. In Turkey, there are four departments with in the scope of schools of physical education and sports. While three of them (physical education and sport teaching, trainer education, and sport management) have been active for many years, recreation department is more recent. So undergraduates attending recreation department have some more difficulties than the others. For example, after graduating from their department, they can not be a teacher at a public school in Turkey. So this situation may have negatively influenced their future plans and cause nonchalance towards their academic and daily tasks.

The result of this study indicated that academic procrastination tendency of undergraduates attending school of physical education and sports differs significantly according to their grade. Academic procrastination tendency level of freshmen is lower than sophomores. According to these findings, freshmen postpone their academic tasks less often than sophomores. McCown and Roberts (1994) studied dispersion of procrastination among undergraduates.
participated in that research; 19% of freshmen, 22% of sophomores, 27% of juniors and 31% of seniors have been reported to have thought academic procrastination as a source of stress. Moreover, 23% of freshmen, 27% of sophomores, 32% of juniors and 37% of seniors have been reported to have believed that their procrastination tendency effect their academic achievement. The findings of this research show parallelism with McCown and Roberts’ (1994) findings. As their social environment expands, the amount of time they spend at university increases and they become more experienced, that is, they become sophomores, their academic procrastination tendency may increase. On the other hand, they may not find the acquisition they expected from university education and this may cause lack of motivation and concentration.

Briefly, regression results indicated that: general procrastination, academic motivation and academic self-efficacy accounted for 22% of variance in academic procrastination. Academic procrastination behaviour of undergraduates attending school of physical education and sports does not differ according to gender. Academic procrastination behaviour of undergraduates attending school of physical education and sports differs according to their departments and grades. Academic procrastination tendency level of undergraduates attending recreation department is higher than academic procrastination tendency level of undergraduates attending sport management department. And academic procrastination tendency level of freshmen attending school of physical education and sports is lower than academic procrastination tendency level of sophomores and juniors attending school of physical education and sports.
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