

**THE IMPACT OF ACADEMIC PROCRASTINATION AND
ACADEMIC SOCIAL ACTIVITY IN PREDICTING COLLEGE
PERFORMANCE**

BY

ABERA MOGES TESFAHUN

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY

July, 2010

**THE IMPACT OF ACADEMIC PROCRASTINATION AND
ACADEMIC SOCIAL ACTIVITY IN PREDICTING COLLEGE
PERFORMANCE**

BY

ABERA MOGES TESFAHUN



**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES OF
ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ART IN
MEASUREMENT AND EVALUATION**

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES
P.O. BOX 1176
ADDIS ABABA ETHIOPIA**

July 2010

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My deepest and heart felt gratitude is due to my advisor Dr. Ayele Meshesha for his constructive criticism, insightful comments and follow up until its completion.

My special thanks also goes to Ato Girma Gizaw, Dean of Bonga College of Teacher Education, and students and teachers of the college in general for their unreserved cooperation and genuine information in particular.

Also deserving of my deepest thank to Addis Ababa University School of Graduate Studies and Institutes of Psychology for funding this thesis.

Finally, my gratitude is due to my wife, Mulualem Kifle for her constant encouragement.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<u>CONTENTS</u>	<u>PAGES</u>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS -----	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS -----	ii
LIST OF TABLES -----	v
ACRONYMS -----	vi
ABSTRACT -----	vii
 CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION	
1.1. Background of the Problem-----	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem-----	2
1.3 Objective of the Study-----	5
1.4 Research Hypothesis-----	6
1.5 Significance of the Study-----	6
1.6 Delimitation of the study-----	6
1.7 Definition of Terms-----	6
 CHAPTER TWO: REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE	
2.1 Students' Academic Procrastination-----	8
2.2 Prevalence of Students' Academic Procrastination-----	10
2.3 Fields of Study, Academic Procrastination and academic Performance-----	11
2.4 The Relationship between Ability Level and Academic Procrastination-----	12
2.5 The Relation between Academic Procrastination and Academic Performance-----	13
2.6 Students' Academic Social Activity-----	16

2.7 Prevalence of Students Academic Social Activity-----	19
2.8 Fields of study, Academic Social Activity and Academic Performance-----	21
2.9 The Relationship between Academic Ability and academic Social Activity-----	23
2.10 Relation between Students' Academic Social Activity and Academic Performance-----	24

CHAPTER THREE: METHOD

3.1. Research Design-----	28
3.2 Participants-----	28
3.3 Sampling Method -----	29
3.4 Instruments-----	29
3.5 Procedure -----	30
3.4 Data Analysis-----	30

CHAPTER FOUR: RESULTS

4.1 Students' Field of Studies and Academic Performance-----	32
4.2 Prevalence of Students' Academic Procrastination and Academic Social Activity-----	34
4.3 Fields of Study, Academic Procrastination and Academic Social Activity-----	35
4.4 Relationship between Students' Academic Ability Levels, Academic Procrastination and Academic Social Activity -----	38
4.5 Relationship between Academic Procrastination and Academic Social Activity to Academic Performance -----	40

List of Tables

Table 1: Show Means, Standard Deviations, Average Number of Subjects and Credit Hours taken and Participants' Academic Performance (GPA)

Table 2: One-Way ANOVA showing Participants' Fields of Study and College GPA

Table 3: Multiple Comparisons of Students' Academic Performance

Table 4: Prevalence of Academic Procrastination and Academic Social Activity

Table 5: Fields of Study and Means of Academic Procrastination and Academic Social Activity

Table 6: Fields of Study, One-Way ANOVA of Academic Procrastination and Academic Social Activity

Table 7: Multiple Comparisons of Students' Academic Procrastination

Table 8: Students' Academic Ability, Academic Procrastination and Academic Social activity

Table 9: One-way ANOVA, Students' Academic ability, Academic Procrastination and Academic Social activity

Table 10: Multiple Comparison of Students' Ability Level and Academic Social Activity

Table 11: Table Intercorrelations between Academic Procrastination, Academic Social Activity and Students' Academic Performance

Table 12: Regression Analysis in Predicting Academic Performance

Acronyms

APE: Academic Performance

APR: Academic Procrastination

ASA: Academic Social Activity

LAPR-Language Academic Procrastination

LASA-Language Academic Social Activity

MAPR-Mathematics Academic Procrastination

MASA-Mathematics Academic Social Activity

NAPR-Natural Science Academic Procrastination

NASA-Natural Science Academic Social Activity

SAPR- Social Study Academic Procrastination

SASA-Social Study Academic Social Activity

Abstract

This study assesses the prevalence of academic procrastination and academic social activity, and the relationship of academic procrastination and academic social activity to academic performance in Bonga College of Teacher Education. The participants of the study were two hundred and twenty one first year diploma students. The findings of the study showed a significant difference in the mean academic procrastination rate among the four fields of study, and a significant difference in academic social activity between different levels of academic ability. Regarding the relationship between academic procrastination and academic performance, it has been found a statistically significant negative relationship between social study students' academic procrastination and academic performance. There was also a statistically significant positive relationship between language, natural science and social study students' academic social activity and academic performance. Finally it was found that academic social activity was a statistically significant positive predictor of language students' academic performance.

CHAPTER ONE

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background of the Study

The Ethiopian government in general and school communities, teachers, parents and school administrators in particular strive to improve students' learning and achievements in schools and colleges. Personal, social, political and socio-cultural factors affect students' learning.

Personal factors such as students' studying habits, emotional factors, motivations, interests, physical conditions and work habits; social factors such as mate selection, group activity, social communication; political factors such as school administration and policies; and socio-cultural factors such as parenting style, social value and norms of society all affect positively or negatively students' learning and performance.

Frequently we observe personal factors such as academic procrastination and social activity from college students. Academic procrastination is an absence of self-regulated performance of academic tasks, and it is the behavioral tendency to postpone academic tasks that are necessary to reach a goal

It is human nature to procrastinate; everyone does it to some degree. Flett, et al., (2004) stated that there is individual difference in procrastination behavior, and procrastination is a complex psychological behavior that affects everyone to some degree. With some it can be a minor problem; with others it is a source of considerable stress and anxiety.

Procrastination is related to time management, that is, procrastinators often know exactly what they should be doing, even if they cannot do it. It is also true that, as Rosário, et al., (2009) added, procrastination is a common

behavior, mainly in school settings. Thus procrastination is related to academic procrastination.

Students participate in various academic social activities such as group work, group discussion, peer tutorial class and group studying which have direct relation to college performance. Takahashi and Sakamoto (2000) stated that it is universal for human beings to need social interaction with others throughout their lives and there are diverse social relationships.

The famous learning psychologist Vygotsky defined learning as a social process and students advance by teaching others as they learn themselves. Vygotsky showed evidence for a classroom where students teach and learn from one another, through team building. In Vygotsky's notion all learning is socially derived development which is rooted in the Zone of Proximal Development that is typically defined as the space between getting help to solve problems and independent performances that follow capable guidance from capable peers (Weber, 2005).

College students participate in various academic activities such as group discussion, group studying, group project work, group assignment etc... which have an impact on college performance. In order to observe clear relationship between academic procrastination and academic social activity to academic performance it will be necessary to conduct a study in these areas.

1.2 Statement of the Problems

Students in colleges show different types of conduct and behavior. These conduct and behavior may be beneficial or harmful to students; and others may be related or unrelated to the students' academic progress. Some of these conduct and behavior are academic procrastination and academic social activity.

Students have different levels of academic procrastination and academic social activity in colleges. Do these different levels of academic procrastination and academic social activities have relationship to academic performance?

Scholars have different views about the relationship between academic procrastination and academic performance. Academic procrastination is viewed as negatively and positively.

According to Steinman, et al., (2004) the fallout from procrastination is grossly underestimated and its consequences range from academic underperformance to psychological maladjustment, and students who tended to procrastinate overall, and those who tended to procrastinate on writing, reading, and studying specifically, earned lower grades. Some students tend to blame themselves for bad academic outcome and they attribute for higher level of procrastination.

In some cases academic procrastination is viewed as a positive contributor to academic performance. For example, Lafarge (2002) said that the positive consequence of procrastination is a temporary relief from stress and a strategic effect to better a bad mood temporarily. Steel (2007) stated that the more uncertain the outcome the greater may be the value of procrastination or can give insight in to the relationship of trait to performance and motivation. Thus there are two extreme contradicting views regarding the relation between academic procrastination and academic performance.

From our observation of students in colleges, many students do their academic tasks such as assignments group work and group projects close to academic deadlines and failed to make use of learning support services and resources earlier in the semester.

There are also students who do their academic tasks alone. There are also students who participate in social activities in colleges. These two extreme

behaviors have their own relation to college performance. Regarding this Elliott, et al., (2008) said that loneliness and dependency on others in the classroom and colleges are often accompanied by competing problem behaviors that interfere with the acquisition and performance of students; on the other hand, Robert (2005) stated that in order to succeed, students need to feel they “belong” in their school.

Panitz, and Pantiz (1998) said that cooperative learning techniques reduce conflict among students, promote better learning, improve students motivation and increase enjoyment of learning experience, and in cooperative learning students show competitive behavior.

However the impact of this competitive behavior on academic performance is viewed in different ways. For instance, Crystal, Wantanable and Chen (2002) stated that in academic context, social diversity and cooperative learning environment in using peers suggest greater competitiveness and promote mastery learning, but Roseth, Johnson, and Johnson (2008) said that cooperative goal structures will result in higher academic achievement than will competitive or individualistic goal structure.

Some students have high social motivation in which they do better when they compete and discuss with others. And some students are socially responsible to do academic activities in their group. Thus we observe these two extreme social behaviors in colleges.

Academic social activities such as , asking questions, doing group work, peer tutoring ,group studying and group discussion are widely used within a class and out side the class in colleges. But, Chen (2002) revealed that peer learning had a negative effect on lecture type of learning environment and learning computer concepts.

According to Mancini (2003) some countries or regions are well scheduled and organized, and they do not put a premium on socialization and many

managers view socialization as a major drain on their employees' productivity. Thus there are two extreme contradicting views regarding the relation between academic social activity and academic performance.

There is also lack of research literature in these areas that describe the relationships between academic procrastination and academic social activity to academic performance. Finally, this study will reduce the gap between the extreme contradicting views and will provide valuable information on the relation of academic procrastination and academic social activity to academic performance in college.

1.3 Objective of the Study

General objectives

The major objective of this study is to:

Examine the impact of academic procrastination and academic social activity in predicting college performance

Specific objectives

The specific objectives of this study are to:

- Assess the prevalence of academic procrastination and academic social activity of students.
- Compare the prevalence of academic procrastination and academic social activity due to different ability level of students.
- Examine the relation between academic procrastination and academic social activity to college performance.
- Investigate the role of academic procrastination and academic social activity in predicting college performance.

1.4 Research Hypothesis

The hypotheses of the study are:

- Academic procrastination and academic social activity negatively and positively, respectively, predict college performance.
- There are significance differences in students' academic procrastination among different academic ability level.
- There are significant differences in students' academic social activity among different academic ability.

1.5. Significance of the Study

Procrastination and social activity are some of students' behaviors observed in college. There are individuals who relate the number of courses and credit hours taken to academic procrastination, academic social activity and academic performance. This study will provide valuable information about the relations between academic procrastination and academic social activity to academic performance in various fields of study. Finally suggestions will be given regarding the ways to improve students' academic performance and how to deal with academic procrastination and academic social activities in colleges.

1.6. Delimitation of the Study

This study will be conducted in Bonga College of Teacher Education. The study focuses on first year first semester students. It will examine the relationship between academic procrastination and academic social activities to first year first semester academic performance.

1.7. Operational Definition of Terms

Academic procrastination: Academic procrastination is the habit putting off academic tasks such as writing a term paper, studying for examinations,

keeping up weekly reading assignments and performing academic tasks in general for later, waiting for last minutes to study for examinations, delaying in executing and submission of assignment and doing academic tasks as academic deadlines approaches.

Academic Social Activity: is students' activity where two or more students interact to one another to do academic tasks, which includes working together in small groups, sharing materials, and discussing academic tasks in and outside classes.

College Academic Performance: is first year first semester college GPAs of students in college.

Students' Academic Abilities: is the comparison of the students' college GPAs.

CHAPTER TWO

2. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Students Academic Procrastination

Scholars have described academic procrastination in different ways. For instance, Perera (2003) stated that procrastinators delay until the day after tomorrow what they know they should have done the day before yesterday; and Eerde (2003) has described academic procrastination as "a trait or behavioral disposition to postpone or delay performance tasks or decisions; and it is an intra individual process that is regulated by internal norms of delay, and the procrastination is not purposely planned.

Onsekiz (2009) added that procrastination was observed when students prefer to study for exams, do homework and term papers at late hours and just before exams and this has a meaningful correlation between procrastination and the number of activities done in later hours. Rabinowitz (1997) gives the following reasons of academic procrastinators that promote and maintain their procrastinating behaviors:

1. Overestimation of time left to perform tasks
2. Underestimation of time required to complete tasks
3. Overestimation of future motivational states
4. Belief that working when not in the mood to work is suboptimal.

Wolter (2003) stated that academic procrastination includes failing to perform an activity within the desired time frame or postponing until the last minutes; and high level of procrastination appear inconsistent with the behaviors typically attributed to self-regulated learner. Chu and Choi (2005) divided procrastinators into two and described them as:

"Active procrastinators prefer to work under pressure and make deliberate procrastination decisions. Non procrastinators and active procrastinators both tend to have higher levels of purposive use of time, time control, and self-efficacy than do passive procrastinators"(p.260).

Some procrastinators believe that they are able to perform better towards course end. Indeed, procrastinators do tend to work more than others as the deadline approaches. The effectiveness of this final-hour work procrastination largely depends upon procrastinators' degree of irrationality or amount of work completed, Steel, et al., (2001).

Onsekiz (2009) said that procrastinating students set unrealistic expectations for individual's performance, and the tendency to become faultless. Marano (2004) added that for procrastinators, procrastination is a lifestyle which is part of all domains of their life, and procrastinators tell lies to themselves by saying ' I will feel more like doing this tomorrow ' or ' I work best under pressure'. In fact they do not get the urge the next day.

According to Learning Guide (2009) there are two types of procrastinators; the first types are the relaxed type who may have negative feelings towards work (but not socialization) and the second types are anxious types who are worried about such issues as pressure, ability and fear of failure. Considering the studies in these fields as a whole, it can be inferred that the habit of studying at late hours and the day before the exams are related to procrastination behavior (Balkis and Duru, 2009).

Neville (2007) stated that a common form of procrastination was to delay starting an assignment beyond a scheduled start time and then have to work furiously to finish it on time; and Lafarge (2002) described the impact of procrastination as "the outcome of procrastination may only lead to time pressure and that for easy, boring or routine tasks, time pressure may simply create a challenge and may lead to finish a task faster". Thus academic procrastination is observed in different academic tasks in college.

2.2 Prevalence of Students' Academic Procrastination

Academic procrastination is a common behavior of students in colleges and universities. Different researchers had described the prevalence of academic procrastination in their studies in different ways. Among these, Neville (2007) said that in an academic context, some students deliberately leave course work tasks to the last minute, arguing that the resulting pressure makes them concentrate and gives them the 'buzz' they need to produce consistently good work.

According to Onsekiz, and Balkis and Duru (2009) nearly half of university students have different levels of academic procrastination behavior. The study from a number of education discipline of public universities in America reveals that procrastination was a common problem for the students and they "nearly always" or "always" procrastinated on writing a term paper, reading, and studying for examination and keeping up with weekly reading assignments (Young and Fritzsche, 2002; and Onwuegbuzie, 2004).

People identify themselves as chronic procrastinators (specifically, students had severe problems with procrastination which impact on their studies, academic performance and their level of stress, (Marano, 2004); 23 % and 27 % of pre-service teachers exhibited high and medium level of procrastinating behavior respectively, which is significantly differed by gender, time preference for studying courses and exams (Learning Guide, 2009).

Xiao-hua (2007) stated that the practical problems all students may face at some point in the college life are procrastination and time management. Most of the first year college students with language learning lack time management skills. And many college students did not have to manage their time efficiently when they were in high school because their life usually was managed by their parents and teachers and the situation often changes in

Students procrastinate when they are uncertain in their academic tasks. Steel (2007) stated that the more uncertain the outcome the greater may be the procrastination; however, the positive form of procrastination is secondary in usage. Ariely and Wertenbroch (2002) added that if people impulsively procrastinate and if they also aware of their procrastination problem self imposing costly deadlines can be strategic and reasonable.

Academic procrastination is also related to time management. The relation between time management and procrastination is described as follow. Consejero, et al., (2006) stated that a student's academic performance is largely dependent on the proper management and organization of study time; and Mancini (2003) added that good time management should include finding the time to pursue work related goals, the one that you believe will bring you satisfaction, and productivity is not merely a function of hard work and time to involve a psychological commitment to your work as well.

There are mediating factor that influence the relationship between academic procrastination and academic performance. Procrastination was strongly linked to a variety of performance criteria, confirming that those who procrastinate perform poorer; and also, correlations indicate that the procrastination is not only a consistent predictor of academic performance, Steel, et al., (2001).

Eerde, (2003:) stated that:

The relation between procrastination and performance could be moderated by ability, and task characteristics such as autonomy, difficulty and the degree to which one should be flexible and adaptable; and delay should not have the same effect on all performance measures, that is missing a deadline and using less time to prepare are directly related to procrastination, but other moderating factors may play a role, such as individual difference are concerned with the fact that they procrastinated, they may not give full attention to the task, possibly affecting performance negatively (pp.1409-1410).

Finally, as we mentioned earlier, there are two types of procrastinators (active procrastinators and passive procrastinators). These different kinds of procrastination have different consequences on performance. Chu & Choi, (2005) stated that:

Nonprocrastinators and active procrastinators will experience less stress and higher GPAs than will passive procrastinators, and we found no significant differences between nonprocrastinators and active procrastinators indicating that these two groups achieved positive outcomes to a comparable degree; in contrast to this, passive procrastinators were significantly different from both nonprocrastinators and active procrastinators reporting greater stress, more feelings of depression, and lower GPAs(pp.247-248).

Thus we can say that different studies show different views regarding the relation between academic procrastination and academic performance.

2.6 Students' Academic Social Activity

Teachers use different teaching methods in their class and also students use different strategies to improve their performance. One of these strategies is academic social activity. There are different areas of academic social activities. These areas of academic activities are broadly mentioned in different studies. For instance, Miller, et al., (2009) mentioned the following areas of students' social activities inside and outside schools.

1. Gone to movie, concerts, plays or sporting events
2. Attending meetings, and appointments
3. Gone to church or temple
4. Played cards, bingos etc with others
5. Gone to family /friends, homes for a meal
6. Participated in active sports or swimming
7. Participated in community or volunteer work,

others, and showing kindness to others; and social tasks may include such things as entering a peer group, having a conversation, making friends, or playing a game with peers.

In order to succeed, students need to feel they “belong” in their school. People call that sense of belonging may mean many things. Some researchers study “school engagement” while others study “school attachment,” and still others analyze “school bonding” in a variety of disciplines in education, health, psychology and sociology (Robert, 2005).

Boer, Baalen and Kumar (2002) added that sociality for understanding knowledge sharing processes have their own implications for understanding and supporting the knowledge sharing process, and added that in general people seek to create, sustain, and repair social relationships because the relationships themselves are subjectively imperative, intrinsically satisfying, and significant. People are fundamentally sociable; they generally organize their social life in terms of their relations with other people; Knowledge sharing is considered to be a fundamentally social process.

Arendale (2007) stated the variety of social activities in education at the elementary, secondary and postsecondary level as:

Peer collaborative learning has been popular in education, as both pedagogy and learning strategy. Postsecondary Peer Cooperative Learning Programs are (a) Accelerated Learning Groups (b) Emerging Scholars Program (c) Peer-Led Team Learning (d) Structured Learning Assistance (e) Supplemental Instruction ; The programs have been divided into two groups. The first groups are those that provide adjunct support through outside-of-class activities; the second groups of peer cooperative programs are those that share a common characteristic of a transformed classroom learning environment by all enrolled students(p.6).

Positive social learning within social setting takes place by engaging in successful teamwork, etiquette and manner, building friendships, choosing

Gebeyehu Teshager (2007) confirmed that teacher educators in colleges prominently employed group project and group discussion, group based cooperative learning, which is used for work reducing purpose, mainly for the purpose of assigning marks; and Terefe Tize (2005) added that instruction in half of the classes in the college is group based cooperative learning such as group work, project method, micro teaching, team teaching and buss group discussion.

Counselors also give training on small group (3 to 5) discussion and group leadership for student for half-day peer-coaching sessions by sharing ideas about implementing the project, and discuss academic achievement and school success behavior, and Brigman and Campbell (2003) elaborated that:

The counselors group training provided focused upon three areas: topics on School Social Behavior in which the group plans followed a structured format and stressed goal setting, progress monitoring, and active learning through a variety of activities; structured group format such as conflict resolution, social problem solving, and team work skills; and group leadership skills (group discussion and leadership skills which included lecture, discussion, demonstration, and practice with feedback) (p.93).

Skiba & Peterson (2002) stated that students within a given class are assigned to four- or five member learning teams, each of which has representatives of both sexes, various racial or ethnic groups, and high, average, and low achievers team members help each other learn the material through tutoring, quizzing one another, or carrying on team discussions.

Teachers facilitate students' peer relationship for various reasons. Librera (2004) said that:

Students recognize the importance of peer relationships in creating a climate of learning, and teachers engage in activities to maintain a learning community in which students assume responsibility for themselves and one another, participate in decision-making and work collaboratively and independently; create a safe effective

listening and group facilitation skills which is socially, emotionally and physically safe; prepare students for group work that allows for full and varied participation of all individuals (p.14).

Center for Teaching and Learning (1998) added that the teacher's role can be to provide training not just in what to acquire, but in how to find and master knowledge outside the classroom, and in independent projects students who recognize that their failure may be due to lack of effort or insufficient learning strategies and need help in altering their attitude toward academic work.

Students in colleges have different perceptions for college environment interaction and this will influence their preference in academic areas, in other words, Inkelas & Weisman (2003) described that:

Students used critical thinking skills in class assignments, discussed academic issues with faculty member, met socially with faculty member, discussed academic issues outside of class with peers, discussed socio cultural issues with peers, and studied in groups residence environment is academically supportive. Thus, it would appear that the type of discussions that students partake in with their peers is influential in shaping their preference for engagement in challenging academic pursuits (p.51).

Thus we can say that different studies in our country and abroad show the prevalence of academic social activities in the class and outside the class.

2.8 Fields of Study, Academic Social Activity and Academic Performance

Teachers in different subjects use varieties of academic activities in a class. These academic activities are related to academic performance. For instance,

Seng (2006) stated that teachers use of cooperative learning (small, heterogeneous groups of students working together to reach a common goal) as a teaching method to increase students' achievement in learning English acquisition; in an English literature class cooperative learning enhances students' achievement in learning English literature; and Barakat, et al., (2003) suggested that higher verbal and nonverbal functioning were associated with improved social skills.

Jiang (2009) reported that well organized group work is an efficient means to improve language teaching, especially, English teaching; and in discussion, students develop a more profound understanding of knowledge and students language competency in reading, writing, listening and speaking and the ability to make use of new knowledge will be strengthened and by means of group work.

Hu & Kuh (2003) added that interactional diversity experiences had the largest effects on diversity competence sum of gain, and gain in general education; some what the weakest effects on gains in vocational preparation and science and technology.

Zakaria and Iksan, (2006) stated that cooperative learning has the potential in science classroom because of the following factors:

- (a) Science students always work in group during science experiment in the laboratory therefore what they need is the skill to work in group
- (b) Science laboratory is spacious with intact desk and chairs.
- (c) Science classes are usually two periods with 40 minutes each, enough time for cooperative learning and
- (d) During experiment many values can be inculcated e.g. cleanliness, trustworthy.

Most students in Environment Integrated Context (EIC) such as self motivated learning, team teaching and interrelationship significantly improve students performance in reading, writing, math, science and social studies,

however, students learned through and traditional method scored equally in science (Lieberman and Hood, 1998). From these studies it can be said that teachers and students in various studies use academic social activity in the teaching learning process for different reasons.

2.9 The Relationship between Academic Ability and academic Social Activity

Studies show the existence of different academic social activity level in different students' academic ability level. For instance, when performance is the same, students are more involved and more interested in the material in the cooperative learning setting (Hanze and Berger, 2007).

Because of the lower level of medium and low ability students, high-ability group members sometimes spend more time on helping medium and low ability students; self-esteem boosting for high-level students and promotion of inter-group relations, and gifted students can gain self-esteem by interacting with mixed ability groups (Huang, 2009).

Arendale (2007) stated that sometimes the students who could most benefit from the positive effects of peer learning are the ones least likely to participate due to fear of exposing their academic weaknesses to others or even to themselves.

Regarding the individual students' behavior during the relationship among the students (Coil, 2009) stated that some gifted students are competitive and do not want to share their work or knowledge.

Slavin (1995) added that in preparation for cooperative learning, and processing or group self-evaluation during and after group activities high achievers are the students who benefit most from cooperative learning because they give the most frequent elaborated explanations.

Crystal, Wantanable, and Chen (2002) stated that in academic context, social diversity and cooperative learning environment in using peers suggest greater competitiveness and promote mastery learning, and students thought diversity in the hope of interaction with peers who are more energetic, outgoing, and engaging than themselves and peers who may show them new things to do or introduce them to new ideas and the desired for upward comparison with superior individuals is a primary motives.

Kruger and Dunning (1999) added that highly competent individuals, performed so well, because their peers must have performed well, this would have led participants to underestimate their comparative abilities (i.e., how their general ability and test performance compare with that of their peers), but not their absolute abilities (i.e., their raw score on the test). Once participants learned how poorly their peers had performed, they raised their self-appraisals to more accurate levels.

2.10 Relation between Students' Social Activities and Academic Performance

Regarding the relationship between social activity and academic performance. Bauer & Liang (2003) stated that pre-college academic-related activities were positively and statistically significantly related to end of- first-year GPA, and Panitz and Panitz (1998) added that cooperative learning techniques reduce conflict among students, promote better learning, improves students motivation and increase enjoyment of learning experience.

Johnson and Johnson (1998) stated that all cooperative learning methods had a significant positive impact on student achievement, and when the impact of cooperative lessons were compared with individualistic learning, learning together promotes the greatest effect.

Roseth, Johnson, and Johnson (2008) added that cooperative goal structures (positive peer relationship) tend to result in promotive interaction (thus providing the assistance, information, and resources needed to achieve their mutual goals), whereas competitive and individualistic goal structures result in oppositional or no interaction, respectively, and the result show that cooperative goal structures will result in higher academic achievement than will competitive or individualistic goal structure.

Brown and Adler (2008) said that one of the strongest determinant of student success in higher education-more important than the details of the instructors' teaching styles- was their ability to form or participate in small study groups and students studied in groups, even only once a week, were better prepared for class, and learned significantly more than students who worked on their own.

Howard, and Boetticher (2005) added that the ability of learners to project themselves socially and actively in to community of inquiry group dialogue, student engagement and problem solving facilitate optimum performance and make a difference in the quality of out comes of the groups produced.

Pike (2003) stated that Greek students, including first-year students, tended to be slightly more involved in educationally purposeful activities than their non-Greek counterparts and reported making greater gains in learning than independent students did.

In order to succeed, students need to feel they "belong" in their school. School attachments or school bondings in varieties of disciplines in education, health, psychology and sociology, which are measured in different ways, are highly predictive of success in school (Robert, 2005).

Hall (2000) added that cooperative learning methods had a significant positive impact on student achievement, and when the impact of cooperative lessons was compared with individualistic learning, learning together

promotes the greatest effect. And knowing that cooperative learning can significantly increase student achievement (compared with competitive and individualistic learning) when properly implemented.

Eronen (2000) stated that achievement and social strategies developed on the basis of the feed back people receive about their own success in dealing with academic challenge, contributed to individual's success in education (Faith-Ashtaini, et al., 2007) stated also that cooperative learning model has a significant effect on academic achievement in that cooperative learning can enable the learner to receive positive feed back from the process of thinking, problem solving and comprehension of educational concepts as well as task sharing.

Ragozzino, et al., (2003) added that cooperative learning groups, academic choice periods, peer tutoring and service-learning can improve students' social-emotional competence and academic performance. The relation between tutorial class and college performance has been state by Wondeye Kebede (2007) in that students who participate in the tutorial class registered satisfactory average score.

There are mediating factor in the relationship between academic social activities and college performance. Among these, Slavin (1995) stated that cooperative learning on achievement are strongly mediated by the cohesiveness of the group, in essence that students will help one another learn because they care about one another and want one another to succeed. Students help their group mates learn because they care about the group social cohesion perspective in teambuilding activities.

Tateyama-Sniezek (1990) said that students in cooperative learning groups can achieve their learning goal if, and only if, the other students with whom they are cooperatively linked achieve their learning goal; and Putniņa (2008) added that the most prevailing cause of failure in students' answers was other people, but as regards success internal causes prevailed. The category

of interaction still remained a rather important factor in both the case of success and the case of failure.

Chen (2002) revealed that effort regulation had a positive effect and peer learning had a negative effect on lecture type of learning environment and learning computer concepts. When studying computer and information system concepts, students who could handle distractions and could maintain concentration achieved higher test scores. On the other hand, students who studied computer concepts with peers achieved lower test scores.

Isik and Tarim (2000) stated also that students' group work activities helped them a) to improve their friendship, b) to know more about a friend who he had not known very well before, c) to establish support, d) to develop mutual assistance, e) to learn how to share, f) to learn to support each other in the group work, g) to be effective in group work, h) share materials.

Next to this chapter, the research method will be dealt in chapter three of the study.

CHAPTER THREE

3. RESEARCH METHOD

3.1 Research Design

This research was intended to examine the relation between academic procrastination and academic social activity to college performance. Academic procrastination such as delaying academic tasks like writing a term paper, studying for examinations, keeping up with weekly reading assignments, performing academic administrative tasks, attending academic tasks with instructors and performing general academic tasks such as filling out forms, registering for classes, getting ID Card.

Academic social activities such as working together in small group, cooperative learning , peer tutoring, small group studying, discussing academic issues with faculty members, students' social interaction experiences in the classroom and belongingness in a group constituted the independent variables. The dependent variable was college GPAs.

3.2 Participants

The participants of the study were first year diploma students of Bonga College of Teacher Education in the Southern Peoples Regional State. Two hundred and twenty one students (among these eighty eight females and one hundred thirty three males) were selected from population size of five hundred and three first year students (Sarantakos, 2005) of the current year. Among these students one hundred sixty four students were females and three hundred thirty nine were males.

Spearman-Brown Prophecy). Regarding the validity of the items, initially, there were 18 academic procrastination items which were finally reduced to 12 items which were representative and more relevant to the topic (to determine content and face validity). Initially there were 54 items for academic social activity scale, however, 26 items were found to be more relevant to the study.

3.5 Procedure

The instruments were administered by the researcher in each classroom. The data for the academic procrastination and academic social activity were collected in each class within a period (50 minutes). Students' College GPAs were taken from the students' information sheet in the registrar.

3.6 Data Analysis

The thirteen sections were categorized into four fields of study (streams) by grouping the sections in to related fields of study. Then for each fields of study (streams) descriptive statistics, one-way ANOVA (to test the difference in the level of academic procrastination, social activity and academic ability, where, students' academic performance was categorize in to low, average and high performance (Huang, 2009; Karademir and Uçak, 2009; Mattern, Burrus and Shaw (2010), and McCoach and Siegle, 2001 and appendix II).

Academic procrastination was divided into never procrastinate (those students who responded as "I nearly always do it on time and I always do it on time for instruction one and almost never a problem and not at all a problem for instruction two), sometimes procrastinate and always procrastinate (for those who responded 'I never do it on time' and 'I never almost do it on time' for instruction one and 'procrastination is always a problem' and 'nearly always a problem', for instruction two). Academic social activity was categorized again in to low social activity (those responded 'A' and 'B'), medium social activity those responded 'C' and High social activity

those responded 'D' and 'E'. Scheffe's multiple comparison test, Pearson correlation coefficients and linear multiple regression analysis were carried out using SPSS 15.

In Chapter 4 the results of the study are presented.

CHAPTER FOUR

4. RESULTS

In this section of the study students' fields of study, a comparison of students' ability level to academic procrastination and social activity, the relation of academic procrastination and academic social activity to college performance, and impact of academic procrastination and academic social activity in predicting academic performance has been statistically analyzed.

4.1 Students' Fields of Study and Academic Performance

Table1 shows participants' college means GPAs in terms of their fields of study, average number of subjects and credit hours taken. The finding shows that $M=2.41$ for language, $M=2.42$ for natural science, $M=2.27$ for mathematics, $M=2.59$ for social study students, and $M=2.45$ for all fields of study combined, respectively.

Language, natural and mathematics students took equal number of subjects, and that is, the three fields of study took nine subjects and social study students took eight subjects for the semester. The average number of course taken by the four fields was nine. Language students took 21 credit hours; natural science 20 credit hours, and both mathematics and social study took 19 credit hours. The average credit hours taken in the semester was 20.

Table 1: Show Means, Standard Deviations, Average Number of Subjects and Credit Hours taken and Participants' Academic Performance (GPA)

Field of study	M	SD	N	Average No. of Subjects taken	Average No. of Cr. Hrs. taken
Language study	2.41	0.41	54	9	21
Natural science	2.42	0.49	56	9	20
Mathematics	2.27	0.39	37	9	19
Social studies	2.59	0.52	74	8	19
Total	2.45	0.48	221	9	20

Table 2, below shows, a statistically significant difference in means college GPAs at $[F(3,217)=4.20, p<.01]$. The four fields of study have different mean college GPAs.

Table 2: One-Way ANOVA showing Participants' Fields of Study and College GPA

	SS	df	MS	F	Sig
Between Groups	2.809	3	0.936	4.20	0.007(**)
Within Groups	48.447	217	0.223		
Total	51.257	220			

** Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3, below shows Scheffe's post hoc comparison of students' academic performance. From the table we can say that there is a statistically significant difference in the mean academic performance of mathematics and social study students at $p<0.05$. That is social study students' academic performance is greater than mathematics students' academic performance.

Table 3: Scheffe's Multiple Comparisons of Students' Academic Performance

Fields of Study (I)	Fields of Study (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Language Study	Natural science	-.007	.09	1.000
	Mathematics	.14	.10	.567
	Social Study	-.18	.08	.220
Natural science	Language Study	.01	.09	1.000
	Mathematics	.15	.10	.518
	Social Study	-.17	.08	.246
Mathematics	Language Study	-.14	.10	.567
	Natural science	-.15	.10	.518
	Social study	-.32(*)	.10	.011
Social Study	Language Study	.18	.09	.220
	Natural science	.17	.08	.246
	Mathematics	.32(*)	.10	.011

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

4.2 Prevalence of Students' Academic Procrastination and Academic Social Activity

Table 4, below shows level of students' academic procrastination and academic social activity in the college. As the table illustrates students in the different fields of study had different level of procrastination and academic social activity. Among these 51.85 and 64.66 percent of language study students and mathematics students respectively, responded that they have no procrastination in doing their academic tasks, and 69.64 and 52.70 percent of natural science and social study students respectively, responded that they sometimes procrastinate in doing academic tasks in the college. On average, 51.40 percent of the college students sometimes procrastinate in doing academic tasks.

Besides this 79.63 percent of language study students, 51.35 percent of mathematics students and 63.51 percent of social study students had

medium level of academic social activity, where as 50 percent of natural science students had high level of academic social activity. On average, 60.23 percent of the college students have medium level of academic social activity.

Table 4: Prevalence of Academic Procrastination and Academic Social Activity

Fields of study	Frequency of Academic procrastination in percent			Level of Academic Social Activity in percent		
	Never Procrastinate	Sometimes Procrastinate	Always Procrastinate	Low social activity	Medium social activity	High social activity
Language study	51.85	48.14	-	1.85	79.63	18.52
Natural science	30.36	69.64	-	3.57	46.43	50.00
Mathematics	64.86	35.14	-	10.81	51.35	37.84
Social study	45.94	52.70	1.35	10.81	63.51	25.68
Total	48.24	51.40	1.35	6.76	60.23	33.01

4.3 Fields of Study, Academic Procrastination and Academic Social Activity

Table 5, below shows students' mean academic procrastination and social activity in the respective fields of study. Language students had academic procrastination rate of $M=30.52$ and social activity rate of $M=84.04$, and natural science students had academic procrastination of $M=33.09$ and academic social activity of $M=87.82$.

Similarly Mathematics students had academic procrastination rate of $M=31.27$ and academic social activity rate of $M=85.32$, and social study students had academic procrastination rate of 30.47 and academic social

activity rate of 83.19. The college students have $M=31.28$ for academic procrastination and $M=84.93$ for academic social activity.

Table 5: Fields of Study and Means of Academic Procrastination and Academic Social Activity

Fields of study	Mean(M)	Std. Deviations (SD)
Language Students' Academic Procrastination	30.52	4.48
Natural Science Students' Academic Procrastination	33.09	4.29
Mathematics Students' Academic Procrastination	31.27	4.68
Social Study Students' Academic Procrastination	30.47	4.93
Total	31.28	4.72
Language Students' Academic Social Activity	84.04	11.37
Natural Science Students' Academic Social Activity	87.82	12.77
Mathematics Students' Academic Social Activity	85.32	14.72
Social Study Students' Academic Social Activity	83.19	14.66
Total	84.93	13.49

Table 6, below shows a statistically significant difference in the mean academic procrastination (APR) rate among the four fields of study [$F(3, 217) = 4.097, p < .01$] that is the students in the four fields of study had different mean academic procrastination rate; however, there was no a significant difference in the mean academic social activity (ASA) rate among the different fields of study, that is no significant different in the mean academic social activity rate of students in the different fields of study.

Table 6: Fields of Study, One-Way ANOVA of Academic Procrastination and Academic Social Activity

Variables		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
APR	Between Groups	262.83	3	87.61	4.10	.007**
	Within Groups	4639.78	217	21.38		
	Total	4902.61	220			
ASA	Between Groups	741.24	3	247.08	1.36	.255
	Within Groups	39311.60	217	181.16		
	Total	40052.84	220			

**Significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 7, below shows the comparison made between the fields of study through Scheffe's post hoc test of significance in the students' academic procrastination.

Table 7: Scheffe's Multiple Comparisons of Students' Academic Procrastination

Fields of Study (I)	Fields of Study (J)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
Language Study	Natural science	-2.57(*)	.88	.039
	Mathematics	-.75	.99	.901
	Social Study	.046	.83	1.000
Natural science	Language Study	2.57(*)	.88	.039
	Mathematics	1.82	.98	.330
	Social Study	2.62(*)	.82	.019
Mathematics	Language Study	.75	.99	.901
	Natural science	-1.82	.98	.330
	Social Study	.80	.93	.865
Social Study	Language Study	-.05	.8	1.000
	Natural science	-2.62(*)	.82	.019
	Mathematics	-.80	.93	.865

* The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

However, there is a significant difference among students' mean academic social activity due to different academic ability level. That is students in different academic ability level have different academic social activity levels.

Table 9: One-way ANOVA, Students' Academic ability, Academic Procrastination and Academic Social activity

Variab les		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
APR	Between Groups	37.409	2	18.71	0.84	.434
	Within Groups	4865.20	218	22.32		
	Total	4902.61	220			
ASA	Between Groups	3143.26	2	1571.63	9.28	0.000**
	Within Groups	36909.57	218	169.31		
	Total	40052.84	220			

**Significant at the 0.001 level (2-tailed).

Table 9, shows a statistically significant difference between high and average performing students at $p < 0.05$ level; high performing and low performing at the $p < 0.001$ level, and average performing and low performing at $p < 0.05$ level in their academic social activity level. That is students who have high academic performance have high academic social activity level compared to average performing and low performing students, and students who have low academic performance have the lowest academic procrastination rates.

Table 10: Scheffe's Multiple Comparison of Students' Ability Level and Academic Social Activity

Ability level (i)	Ability level(j)	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
High performance	Average performance	6.37(*)	2.37	.028
	Low performance	13.04(**)	3.03	.000
Average performance	High performance	-6.37(*)	2.37	.028
	Low performance	6.67(*)	2.42	.024
Low performance	High performance	-13.04(**)	3.07	.000
	Average performance	-6.67(*)	2.42	.024

*.The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

** The mean difference is significant at the 0.001 level.

4.5 Relationship between Academic Procrastination, Academic Social Activities and Academic Performance

Table 10, below shows intercorrelations between academic procrastination, academic social activity and academic performance. As shown in the table, there was no a statistically significant negative relationship between language students' academic procrastination rate (APR) and their academic performance (APE) ($r = -0.147$) and academic procrastination and academic social activity ($r = -0.179$), but there was positive significant correlation between language students academic performance and academic social activity (ASA), with ($r = 0.491$, $p < 0.01$). Thus for language students the higher the academic social activity will be the higher their academic performance.

The correlation between natural science students' academic procrastination and academic performance was (-0.065); academic procrastination and

academic social activity was (-0.054) which were not significant, but the correlation between academic performance and academic social activity was statistically significant with ($r=0.246$, $p<0.05$); that is for natural science students the higher their social activity will be the higher their academic performance.

Table 11: Table Intercorrelations between Academic Procrastination, Academic Social Activity and Students' Academic Performance

Subscales	1	2	3
Language Study (n=54)			
1. APE	-	-0.147	0.491(**)
2. APR		-	-0.179
3. ASA			-
Natural Science (n=56)			
1. APE	-	-0.065	0.246(*)
2. APR		-	-0.054
3. ASA			-
Mathematics (n=37)			
1. APE	-	0.237	0.088
2. APR		-	-0.166
3. ASA			-
Social Study (n=74)			
1. APE	-	-0.312(**)	0.298(**)
2. APR		-	-0.392(**)
3. ASA			-

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

For mathematics students the correlation between academic performance and academic procrastination($r=0.237$), academic performance and academic social activity($r=0.088$) and academic procrastination and academic social activity ($r=-0.166$) which were not significant.

But there was a statistically significant negative relationship between social study students' academic procrastination and academic performance with

science students ($\beta=-0.052$); social study students ($\beta=-0.230$), and mathematics students ($\beta=0.259$), but academic procrastination was not a statistically significant predictor of academic performance for language, natural science, social study and mathematics students' academic performance ; this means academic procrastination alone does not explain the relation with college freshman students' first semester academic performance.

The relation between academic social activity academic performance for natural science students was ($\beta=0.243$), for mathematics students were ($\beta=0.131$), and social study students were ($\beta=0.208$), and academic social activity was not a statistically significant predictor of academic performance for natural, mathematics and social study students. Academic social activity was a statistically significant positive predictor ($\beta =0.480$, $t=3.885$, $p<0.001$) of language students' academic performance, that is for language students' academic social activity such as group discussion, tutorial classes, group works, small group study and group project activity contribute 24.11 percent (table 6) for their first year first semester academic performance.

Thus we can say that academic procrastination alone does not predict college performance for the entire fields of study. Except for language study students, academic social activity does not predict academic performance of natural, mathematics and social study students.

In chapter five of the study discussion will be dealt.

CHAPTER FIVE

5. DISCUSSION

5.1 Prevalence of Students' Academic Procrastination

The finding of the study indicates that 51.40 percent of the college students sometimes procrastinate in doing academic tasks. This was consistent with Onsekiz, and Balkis and Duru (2009) in which nearly half of university students have different levels of academic procrastination behavior.

In contrast to this, (Young and Fritzsche, 2002; and Onwuegbuzie, 2004) stated that university students “nearly always” or “always” procrastinated on writing a term paper, reading, and studying for examination and keeping up with weekly reading assignments. This shows us students in the college have relatively lower level of academic procrastination.

5.2 Prevalence of students' Academic Social Activity

As a result of the finding of the study 60.23 percent of the college students have medium level of academic social activity. This was confirmed by Terefe Tize (2005) in that instruction in half of the classes in the college is group based cooperative learning such as group work, project method, micro teaching, team teaching and buss group discussion,

In addition to this, Inkelas & Weisman (2003) stated that students discuss academic issues outside of class with staffs, met socially outside of class, discuss academic issues outside of class with peers, studied in groups residence environment. Thus it can be said that teachers and students use varieties of academic social activities in the class and outside the class, regardless of the difference in the degree of students' academic social activity in the different fields.

5.3 Fields of Study and Academic Procrastination

Another finding of the research was the varieties in academic procrastination rate among the respective fields of study. As it is mentioned earlier academic procrastination is prevalent regardless of fields of study. The students in the four fields of study had different mean academic procrastination rate, in which natural science students procrastinate more than language and social study students.

This is also evident in the study of Onsekiz (2009) in which procrastination behavior is higher in lessons involving greater number of assignments and lessons which have greater time pressure.

5.4 Fields of Study and Academic Social Activity

Another observation of the study was the difference in academic social activity among the respective fields of studies. There was no significant difference in the mean academic social activity rate among the students in the four field of study.

Students in different fields of study participate in academic social activities in similar level. This is also supported by Skiba & Peterson, 2002, and Lieberman and Hoody, 1998) in that the contribution of academic social activity such as self motivated learning, team teaching and interrelationship to the improvement of students' performance in reading, writing, math, science and social studies.

Thus we can say that students involve equally in academic social activities such as group discussion, studying in group, doing assignments together, participating in peer tutorial class and asking questions in the classroom and outside the classroom regardless of fields of study.

5.5 The Relation between Academic Ability Level and Academic Procrastination

There was no significant difference in academic procrastination rate among different academic ability levels. In a study of first year college students, Young and Fritzsche (2002) said that academic procrastination was not significantly associated with higher overall GPA, course grades, or paper grades. That is students in different academic ability level have similar academic procrastination rate

5.6 The Relation between Academic Ability Level and Academic Social Activity

Based on the finding of the study there is significant difference among students' mean academic social activity due to different academic ability level. That is students who have high academic performance have high academic social activity level compared to average performing and low performing students, and students who has low academic performance has the lowest academic procrastination rates.

Other study also supports this finding. High-ability group members sometimes spend more time on helping medium and low ability students and gifted students can gain self-esteem by interacting with mixed ability groups (Huang, 2009). Thus we can say that students who have high performance are more active in academic social activity than average and low performing students.

5.7 The Relation of Academic Procrastination to Academic Performance

Another finding of the research is the relationship of academic procrastination and academic social activity to academic performance. Academic procrastination was significantly negatively related to academic performance for social study.

But for other studies for instance for mathematic Akinsola, Tell and Tell (2007) stated that there is significant correlation between mathematics achievement and procrastinating behavior that is students with low procrastination have high achievement in mathematics than students with moderate and high level of procrastination, but in this study although majority of the students have similar level of procrastination to other fields, academic procrastination had no significant effect on mathematic performance. Thus we can say that for social study students as the level of academic procrastination increases their academic performance will decrease.

5.8 The Relations of Academic Social Activity to Academic Performance

Considering the relationship of academic social activity and academic performance, academic social activity was a statistically significantly positively related to academic performance for natural science, language and social study students' college performance.

This was also supported by (Jiang, 2009), and Bauer and Liang, 2003) in that academic-related activities and well organized group work were positively and statistically significantly related to end of- first-year GPA and efficient means to improve students language competency in reading, writing, listening and speaking and the ability to make use of new knowledge.

Thus for language, natural and social study students the higher the academic social activities such as group discussion, studying in group, doing assignments together, participating in peer tutorial class and asking questions will be the higher their college performance.

5.9. The Effect of Academic Procrastination and Academic Social Activity in Predicting Academic Performance

Academic social activity was a statistically significant positive predictor to academic performance for language study alone, that is the more the students socially active the more would be their academic performance for language study; this was also supported Jiang, (2009) in that well-organized group work is an efficient means to improve language teaching, especially college English teaching, Seng (2006) added that the use of cooperative learning played an important role in acquiring English language, and in English literature class cooperative learning enhances students' achievement in learning English literature.

The findings show that, academic social activity does not necessarily predict academic performance in different fields of study. But language study students' academic social activity alone statistically positively predicted college performance. Thus we can say that, although the majority of students are under similar level of social activity, academic social activity has different impact on academic performance in different fields of study.

Summary, conclusions and recommendations have been provided in the sixth chapter.

- Bauer, K.W & Liang, Q.(2003). *The Effect of Personality and Precollege Characteristics on First-Year Activities and Academic Performance*. Journal of College Student Development, Vol. 44, No. 3, pp. 277-290.
- Boer, N.I, Baalen, P.J & Kumar, K. (2002). *The Importance of Sociality for Understanding Knowledge Sharing Processes in Organizational contexts*. Erasmus Research Institute of Management Report Series; Erasmus University Rotterdam. pp. 17-19.
- Brigman,G & Campbell.,C.(2003). *Helping Students Improve Academic Achievement and School Success Behavior*. College of Education, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Wilson Com. pp.91-95.
- Brown,J.S.& Adler,R. P. (2008). *Open Education, the Long Jail and Learning*. Cupertino,California. Retrieved in Jan, 2010,
<http://www.johnseelybrown.com>
- Center for Teaching and Learning (1998).*Capturing and Directing the Motivation to Learn*. Speaking of Teaching, Vol.10, No. 1, p. 4.
- Chen, C.S. (2002). *Self-regulated Learning Strategies and Achievement in an Introduction to Information Systems Course*. Information Technology, Learning, and Performance Journal, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp.1-15.
- Chu, A.H. & Choi, J. N. (2005).*Rethinking Procrastination: Positive Effects of "Active" Procrastination Behavior on Attitudes and Performance*. The Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 145, No.3, pp. 245-264.
- Coil, C. (2009). *Flexible Grouping: It is More Than Just Moving Their Seats*. Marion, Pieces of Learning Publishers, pp. 1-2.
- Collins, K.T., Onwuegbuzie, A.J. and Jiao, Q. (2008). Reading Ability as a Predictor of Academic Procrastination Among African American Graduate Students. Reading Psychology, Vol. 8, No. pp. 29:493-507

- Consejero, E.M., Ortega, F. H. & Garcia, C.P. (2006). *Virtual Resources for Effective Study Time Management. Research, Reflections and Innovations in Integrating ICT in Education*. University of Cadiz, Avda. República Árabe Saharaui.
- Crystal, D.S., Wantanable, H. & Chen, R.S. (2002). *Preference for Diversity in Competitive and Cooperative Context: A study of American and Japanese Children and Adolescent*. International Journal of Behavioral Development, Vol. 2, No 24, pp. 348-355.
- Elliott, S. N., Gresham, F. M., Frank,, J.L. & Beddow, P.A. (2008). *Intervention Validity of Social Behavior Rating Scales: Features of Assessments That Link Results to Treatment Plans*. Journal of Assessment for Effective Intervention, Vol. 34, No.1, pp. 15-24.
- Eerde,W.V.(2003). *A Meta-Analytically Derived Nomological Network of Procrastination*. Journal of Personality and Individual Difference, Vol, 3, No.5, pp. 1401-1418.
- Eronen,S. (2000). *Achievement and Social Strategies and the Communication of Positive and Negative Experiences during Young Adulthood*. Unpublished Academic Dissertation, Report, No. 22, University of Helsinki.
- Farran, B. (2004). *Predictor of Academic Procrastination in College Students*. Collection Paper, Fardham University, Retrieved, in Jan, 2010, <http://fardham.bepress.com/desertations.html>
- Fathi-Alshtiani, A., Salimi, S.H.,Ayubi, M.& Muhebbi, H. (2007). *A Comparison of the Cooperative Learning Model and Traditional Learning model On Academic Achievement*. Journal of Applied Science, Vol. 7, No. 1. pp. 137-140.

- Huang, C. (2009). *Pupil Differences and Cooperative Learning*. Unpublished MSC Thesis, University of Wisconsin-Platteville.
- Hu, S.& Kuh, G. D. (2003). *Diversity Experiences and College Student Learning and Personal Development*. Journal of Diversity and Personal Development Vol. 44, No.3, pp.320-333.
- Inkelas, K.K. & Weisman, J.L. (2003). *Different by Design: An Examination of Student Outcomes among Participants in Three Types of Living-Learning Programs*. Journal of College Student Development. Vol.44, No. 3, pp.335-368.
- Isik, D. & Tarim, K. (2000). *The Application of Cooperative Learning Method Supported by Multiple Intelligence Theory on Mathematics Course: An Investigation of the Students' Opinions*. Cukurova University, Adana, Turkey, p.4.-5.
- Jiang, Y. (2009). *Applying Group Work to Improve College Students' Oral English*. International Education Studies, Vol.2,No.3, pp.136-139.
- Johnson, D.W. & Johnson, R.T. (1998). *Cooperative Learning and Social Interdependence Theory*. Publishers Inc. New York. Retrived, in Nov, 2009, <http://www.clcrc.com/papers/cl.methods.html>
- Jonson,D.W.& Johnson, R. (2002). *Meaningful Assessment: A Manageable and Cooperative Process*. A Pearson Product Com, Boston.
- Johnson, D.W., Johnson, R.T.& Stanne, M.B.(1998).*Method of Cooperative Learning: what We can Prove Works*. Publishers Inc. New York. Retrieved, Nov, 2008, <http://www.clcrc.com/papers/cl.methods.html>

Karademir, C.A. & Uçak, E. (2009). *The Effect of Between Class Ability Grouping on 7th Grade Students' Academic Achievement on the Unit "If there were no pressure?"* In *Science and Technology Education*. Eurasian Journal of Physics, Chemistry and Education, Vol.1, No.1, pp.:32-44.

Kruger, J. & Dunning, D. (1999). *Unskilled and Unaware of It: How Difficulties in Recognizing One's Own Incompetence Lead to Inflated Self-Assessments*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Vol.77, No.6. Pp. 121-134.

Lafarge, M.C. (2002). *Applying Explanatory Approach to Academic Performance*. Journal of Business Management, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp, 68-74.

Learning Guide (2009). *Procrastination and How to Beat it*. Center for Learning and Professional Development. Australia, University of Adelaide, Adelaide.

Lema Dadi (2006). *Application of Learner –Centered Methods in Government Second Cycle Primary Schools of Eastern Shewa Zone*. Unpublished MA Thesis, AAU, AA.

Librera, W. L. (2004). *New Jersey Professional Standards for Teachers and School Leaders*. New Jersey State Board of Education, Trenton, New Jersey, p.14 Retrieved in Jan. 2010.
<http://www.state.nj.us/education>

Lieberman, G.A. & Hoody, L.L. (1998). *Closing the Achievement Gap: Using Environment as Integrating Context for Learning*. State Education and Environment Roundtable, Science Wizards, Santiago. pp. 4-7.

- Mancini, M. (2003). *Time Management*. New York, McGraw-Hill com. ✓
- Marano, H. (2004). *Tomorrow....Tomorrow: Why we Procrastinate*. Center for Academic Success, Coates Hall, Retrieved, in Sept, 2009, <http://www.cas.lsu.edu>
- Marques, J. C. & Harn, R. V. (2000). *Interpersonal Relationship in Brazilian Adolescents*. International Journal of Behavioral Development, Vol. 2, No. 24.Pp. 199-203.
- Mattern, K.D., Burrus, J. and Shaw,E.(2010). *When Both the Skilled and Unskilled are Unaware: Consequences for Academic Performance*. Educational Testing Service, Self and Identity, Vol.9, No.12, pp. 129-141.
- McCoach,D.B & Siegle,D.(2001). *A Comparison of High Achievers' and Low Achievers' Attitude, Perceptions and Motivations*. Academic Exchange of Educational Psychology, University of Connecticut.
- Miller,R.R., Ballew,S,H, Ballew, S.H., Shardell, M.D., Hicks, G.E., Hawkes, W.G., Rasaick, B.& Magaziner, J. (2009). *Repeat Falls and the Recovery of Social Participation in the Year Post-hip Fracture*. Journal of Age and Aging, Vol.3, No.8, pp. 570-575.
- Neville, C. (2006). *Time Management*. Effective Learning Service, University of Branford, Retrieved in Jan. 2010, <http://www.support4learningcenter.org.uk/education/-skills.htm> ✓
- Neville, C. (2007). *Procrastination: What it is, Why we do it and What we can do about it*. University of Bradford, School of Management, Effective Learning Service. ✓
- Nowinski, L. A, Furlong M, J, Rahban,R. & Smith S.R. (2008). *Initial Reliability and Validity of the BASC-2, SRP, College Version*. Journal of Psycho educational Assessment, Vol. 26, No. 2, pp.156-167.

- Onsekiz, C. (2009). *Prevalence of Academic Procrastination Behavior Among Pre-service Teachers*. Journal of Theory and Practice in Education, Vol.5, No. 1, pp. 19-24.
- Onwuegbuzie, A.J. (2004). *Academic Procrastination and Statistics Anxiety Assessment and Evaluation in Higher Education*, Vol. 29, No.1, pp.1-9.
- Panitz, T. & Panitz, P. (1998). *Ways to Encourage Collaborative Teaching in Higher Education*. New York. Garland Publishers Inc.
- Passarello, A, (2009). *Procrastination*. Academic Success Center. Oregon State University.
- Perera, K, (2003). *Procrastination and Self Esteem*. Retrieved, in Sept, 2009, <http://www.moreselfesteem.com/newsletter11>
- Pike, G. R. (2003). *Membership in a Fraternity or Sorority, Student Engagement, and Educational Outcomes at AAU Public Research Universities*. Journal of College Student Development, Vol. 44, No. 3, pp. 370-382.
- Putniņa, M. (2008). *Do culture and its social environment determine humans' perception of their Achievement related behavior?* Informācijas Mokslai, Jelgava, Latvia; pp. 35-44.
- Rabinowitz, A.(1997). *Are You A Procrastinator? The to do Institute and Morita Therapy*. Retrieved, in Jan, 2010, <http://http-server.caleton.ca/>
- Ragozzino, K. , Resnik, H., Brien, M.U.& Wessbberg, R.P.(2003). *Promoting Academic Achievement through Social and Emotional Learning*. Educational Horizons, pp.169-171.

Xiao- hua, Y. (2007). *Developing Time Management Skills in the Foreign Language Classroom*. Sino-US English Teaching, Vol.4, No.6, pp.1-4.

Young , B. R.& Fritzsche, B.A.(2002) *Writing Center Users Procrastinate Less: The Relationship between Individual Differences in Procrastination, Peer Feedback, and Student Writing Success*. The Writing Center Journal, Vol. 23, No.1, pp. 45-58.

Zakaria, E & Iksan, Z. (2006). *Promoting Cooperative Learning in Science and Mathematics Education: A Malaysian Perspective*. Eurasia Journal of Mathematics, Science & Technology Education. Vol. 3 No.1, pp. 35-39.

Appendix-I

**ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY**

The purpose of this questionnaire is to gather relevant information about students' academic procrastination and social activities in the college. Your participation is voluntary. Please read each question carefully, and answer it honestly. Your participation is greatly appreciated.

**Name _____ Sex: Male _____ Female _____
Department/ Stream _____**

Part I: For each of the following activities, please rate the degree to which you delay or procrastinate. Rate each item on a five point (on A to E) scale. Mark your answers by writing the letter on the space to the left of each statement.

Instruction I: Rate each of the following questions according to how often you wait to do the activities given.

- A. I never do it on time
- B. I never almost do it on time
- C. I sometimes do it on time
- D. I nearly always do it on time
- E. I always do it on time

- ___ 9. To what degree do you ask an instructor for information related to a course?
- ___ 10. To what extent do you discuss personal problems or concerns with an instructor?
- ___ 11. To what extent do you discuss something learned in class with peers?
- ___ 12. To what extent do you hold discussions with students whose personal values were very different from your own ?
- ___ 13. To what extent do you discuss ideas from your reading with others?
- ___ 14. To what extent do you have good friends within school?
- ___ 15. To what extent do you participate in a class discussion?
- ___ 16. To what extent do you answer a question in a class?
- ___ 17. To what extent do you explain a concept to another student?
- ___ 18. To what extent do you ask an instructor in class to review a concept you don't understand?
- ___ 19. To what extent do you challenge an instructor's opinion in class?
- ___ 20. To what extent do you play an active role in group projects?
- ___ 21. To what extent do you participate in a role play in a class?
- ___ 22. To what extent do you lead the group discussion?
- ___ 23. To what extent do you enjoy collaborative activities?
- ___ 24. To what extent do you become a good group member?
- ___ 25. To what extent do you get others involved?
- ___ 26. To what extent do you give advice to others?

Appendix II

Academic Ability of students

Category	Mean	N	Std. Deviation
language study	2.4096	54	.43092
natural science	2.4170	56	.49380
Mathematics	2.2659	37	.38723
social study	2.5880	74	.52075
Total	2.4471	221	.48269

General formula for academic ability based on college GPA

Average performance = Mean score $\pm$ 1std.deviation

High performance = above mean score + 1std.deviation

Low performance =below mean score - 1std.deviation

Language study: Average= $2.4096 \pm .4309 = 1.9787 - 2.8405$

High=above 2.84

Low=below 1.98

Natural Science: Average $2.4170 \pm .4938 = 1.9232 - 2.9108$

High=above 2.91

Low= 1.92

Mathematics: Average $2.2659 \pm .3872 = 1.8787 - 2.6531$

High above 2.66

Low below 1.88

Social study: Average $2.5880 \pm .5208 = 2.0672-3.1088$

High above 3.11

Low below 2.07

DECLARATION

This thesis is my original work and has not been presented for a degree in any university and that all sources of material used for the thesis has been fully acknowledged.

Name :Abera Moges Tesfahun

Sign. AH

Date. 8/08/2010

This thesis has been submitted for examination with my approval as university advisor.

Dr. Ayele Meshesha

Sign. Ayele Meshesha

Date. 8/08/2010

ADDIS ABABA UNIVERSITY
LIBRARIES
J.O.ECX 1178
ADDIS ABABA ETHIOPIA