## Editorial (100)

Procrastination is a past, present, and future issue faced by the human race. The huge expenses, either material or immaterial really are unimaginable, however its prevention and control seems to have been procrastinated all the time.

According to acquired literatures, scientific studies of procrastination was pioneered by Blatt and Quinlan (1967). To date, procrastination is a research field/area of many science disciplines, spanning from psychology until neuro-economics (Steel, 2011). Scientists, especially in psychology tried to establish a nomological network to convey relationship between procrastination and many other variables, starting from demographic profiles, performances, and personalities. Meta-analysis of Van Eerde (2003) and Steel (2007) are two major foundations in building these network.

There have been at least four major theoretical approaches which were already proposed to frame all those findings in order to acquire a firm theoretical framework (Ferrari, Johnson, & McCown, 1995, Gröpel & Steel, 2008, Steel & König, 2006). Finally, at 2006, Temporal Motivation Theory was proposed as a supreme theoretical foundation of procrastination. This claim was supported by more than 800 studies (Steel, 2007, 2011).

The emerging of temporal motavation theory (TMT) since 2006 as a derivation of subjective utility theory has given many promises in the understanding and controlling procrastination. This motivational theory proposed that any task would always be procrastinated when its temporal utility is low. It would only been taken care of when the deadline approaches, which eventually will increase its utility. TMT propose three main components of procrastination (i.e. expectancy, value, and sensitivity to delay/impulsiveness). This theoretical framework received many support from latest researches on procrastination, whether in everyday live or in the academic setting.

There are five criteria to recommend a behavior/task as an indicator of procrastination. First, it should be legitimate. Second, there should be a noticeable schedule to start and finish it. Third, the delay should produce worse result. Fourth, the result should be able to predict earlier. Fifth, there delay should be frequent/repetitive. A person would only be considered as procrastinator when her/his delay was done repetitively.

One area which was considered as a procrastination heaven is the academic setting. In there, procrastination was often recognized, starting from class attendance, paper writing, until online courses (Elvers, Polzella, & Graetz., 2003; Steel, 2003; Tuckman, 1996, McKean, 1990; Muszynski & Akamatsu, 1991). When the students or faculties faced to many legitimate tasks, procrastination appears to be a standard action rather than an abnormal behavior. In the academic setting, a task would often be done when the external deadline approaches. This was surely problematic, because a task which has no external deadline would almost always be procrastinated.

The threat of procrastination did not exclude researchers, writers, and journal editors, even ones who studied procrastination as their expertise area. Many people have been procrastinating in writing, commenting, and revising journal articles. They would only start their work when they were repetitively reminded by peers, reviewers, and/or their colleagues. In these last minute periods, the latent threats of plagiarism often surges and erodes academic integrity, whether students or theirs professors. Internal and external pressures to "publish or perish" make some people took dishonorable shortcuts.

Steel (2007) and Van Eerde (2003) stressed the importance of a comprehensive theoretical framework to comprehend procrastination studies. At the moment, TMT is still the best option to create coherence among theoretical and empirical findings on this topic. Future researchers should continue evaluating its external validities. On the other hand, the development of theoretical based approach treatment is a must which should not be procrastinated any longer.

The editor