

Academic Procrastination and Parenting Styles in Psychology Students

Reny Iriani Loa
Faculty of Psychology
Universitas Surabaya

The aim of this study is to test the correlation between academic procrastination and parenting styles (authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive). Subjects were all psychology students taking their final research paper on the 2011/2012 first semester, therefore the subjects ($N=157$) were from the 2004-2008 term students. Data collection was obtained from surveys, consisting of the Pure Procrastination Scale (PPS), EVID 2, and Parental Authority Questionnaire (PAQ). The non-parametric data was analysed with the Spearman correlation technique through the SPSS 16.0 program for Windows. Results show no correlation between academic procrastination and authoritarian parenting style, and also no correlation between academic procrastination and the permissive parenting style. The only positive correlation exists between academic procrastination and the authoritative parenting style. Another finding of this study was the negative correlation between parenting styles and need for achievement.

Keywords: academic procrastination, parenting styles

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menguji hubungan antara prokrastinasi akademik dan pola asuh orang tua (otoriter, otoritatif, dan permisif). Subjek penelitian ini adalah semua mahasiswa psikologi ($N=157$) yang sedang mengambil skripsi pada semester gasal 2011/2012, berarti berasal dari angkatan 2004–2008. data diperoleh melalui survei dengan angket *Pure Procrastination Scale* (PPS), EVID 2, dan Pola Asuh Orang Tua (PAQ). Data non-parametrik dianalisis dengan teknik korelasi Spearman menggunakan program *SPSS 16.0 for Windows*. Hasil menunjukkan tiga temuan, yakni: Pertama, tidak adanya korelasi antara prokrastinasi akademik dan pola asuh orang tua. Kedua, adanya hubungan antara prokrastinasi akademik dan pola asuh otoritatif orang tua. Ketiga, tidak adanya hubungan antara prokrastinasi akademik dan pola asuh permisif orang tua. Terdapat data penunjang dalam penelitian ini, yakni adanya hubungan negatif antara pola asuh orang tua dan kebutuhan berprestasi.

Kata kunci: prokrastinasi akademik, pola asuh orang tua

Every human is demanded to be able to use their time effectively, but until now there is still the lack of readiness to carry out the said demand. According to Lay (as cited in Gunawinata, Nanik, & Lasmono, 2008), procrastination is the behaviour of delaying the execution of a task. This delaying phenomenon can also happen in college assignments and other academic related tasks (Steel, 2011). The meaning of academic procrastination is the type of delaying often executed in formal tasks related to academic (Ferrari, Johnson, & McCown, 1995).

Noran (cited in Ahmaini, 2010) defined academic procrastination as a form of avoidance in performing

tasks individuals are supposed to be able to finish, final research paper included. Final research paper is the final assignment of college students in order to receive their college degree (Fibrianti, 2009). Besides that, there is a gap between the starting plan and the real activities executed, causing academic procrastination (Ferrari, et al., 1995). According to the results of the new statement magazine, February 26, 1999, more or less 20%-70% students procrastinate (Ghufron, 2003).

There are several negative effects of academic procrastination. Rizki (as cited in Cuan, Simon, & Nurhadyanto, 1999), stated that academic procrastination can cause individuals to have less opportunities to study, less motivation, lower graduate quality, and more funds needed. The delaying done by college students working on their final research paper can cause stagnation in the comple-

The author thanks Ide Bagus Siaputra and Nadia Sutanto for their helpful guidance on previous drafts of this article.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Nadia Sutanto, Faculty of Psychology Universitas Surabaya. Jalan Raya Kalirungkut, Surabaya 60293. E-mail: nadia@ubaya.ac.id

tion of the research paper, possibly causing them to be dropped out from their university (Kingofong, 2004).

This study relate the Temporal Motivation Theory (TMT) with academic procrastination because TMT is deemed to be adequate in explaining procrastination (Steel, 2007). Steel also stated that in the TMT there is a task utility aspect, usable in depicting the use of tasks being executed. Task utility will increase if the expectancy and value score increase, and will decrease if the impulsiveness and delay score increase (Steel & Konig, 2006; Steel, 2007).

Steel (2007) stated that there are four main dimensions of the TMT: expectancy, value, impulsiveness, and delay. Expectancy is the dimension related to the individual's hope in achieving something, often related to self-efficacy. The second dimension is value, related to the choice deemed to be the best, causing the feeling of satisfaction or the decrease in urge or impulse. The third dimension, impulsiveness is related to whether there is another object deemed to be more rewarding than the object that is supposed to be the focus at that moment. Meanwhile the fourth dimension, delay, is related to the timing of the task, having a similar effect to every individual with the same task.

According to Ferrari and Olivette (cited in Anggraeni, n.d.), there are two factors affecting academic procrastination, which are internal factors and external factors. Internal factors are the factors inside the individuals that affect procrastination, such as the individuals' physical and psychological condition. External factors are factors outside the individuals that affect procrastination, such as family or parenting style, the amount of tasks, peer group, economical status, environmental condition, and social support. This study focuses on correlating between academic procrastination and parenting style of the parents to their children that were in the emerging adulthood phase.

Arnett (2000) defined emerging adulthood as the phase where individuals are no longer teenagers but not yet young adults. In this phase, individuals have discarded their dependency in childhood, but are not fully responsible like adults. Based on earlier empirical studies, there was an effect of parental role and pride in the development of procrastination in children, and parenting style was one of the factors causing individuals to be procrastinators (Ferrari & Olivette, 1994; Ferrari & Olivette, as cited in Pychyl, Coplan, & Reid, 2002; Ghufron, 2003).

Parenting style, according to Besembun (cited in Darling & Steinberg, 1993), is a collection of attitude, practice, and nonverbal expression of parents. This definition was strengthened by Hurlock (1996) and Santrock (2002), stating that parenting style is the way parents act

towards their children. According to Baumrind (1971, in Hurlock, 1996; Santrock, 2002) parenting style is divided into three components: authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive parents. Permissive parental style is divided into permissive-indifferent and permissive-indulgent.

The study conducted by Ghufron (2003) stated that academic procrastination level depends on the children's perception of the implementation of discipline. There is a negative correlation between children's perception on authoritarian and authoritative implementation of discipline with academic procrastination. The more positive the children's perception, the lower the academic procrastination level will be. Meanwhile, there is a positive correlation between the children's perception to the implementation of permissive discipline with academic procrastination. The more positive the children's perception is, the higher the academic procrastination level will be.

The earlier statement was in opposite to Ferrari and Olivette's (1994) research results, where a father's implementation of the authoritarian parenting style can cause his daughter to procrastinate. Meanwhile there is a tendency that a father's implementation of the authoritative parenting style does not cause the tendency of his daughter procrastinating. Ferrari and Olivette explained further that authoritarian parenting style is often done rigidly, causing the child to develop chronic confusion tendencies. Rothblum, Solomon, & Murakami (cited in Pychyl, Coplan, & Reid, 2002) stated that parents, especially authoritative fathers tend to advise their daughters to avoid tasks rather than to experience failure.

Ferrari and Olivette (1993) stated that daughters can rebel against authoritarian parental style by delaying the execution of tasks. This statement was also supported by the study conducted by Pychyl, et al. (2002), that stated that authoritarian parents seem to have bigger effects towards their daughters than their sons ($\beta = .20$, $t = 2.01$, $p < .05$). Generally, the mother's authoritarian parenting style did not correlate significantly with academic procrastination, but it is possible for the two to correlate if mediated by pride. Meanwhile, the authoritative parenting style of both parents can cause a child to avoid being a procrastinator.

Ferrari and Olivette (1994) stated that the permissive parental style does not correlate significantly with the procrastination levels of daughters. A father's authoritarian parenting decisional: $r = .32$ and avoidant: $r = .31$) on the daughter. Authoritative parenting style of the father does not cause the daughter to be a procrastinator (decisional: $r = -.22$ and avoidant: $r = -.28$). A mother's authoritarian parental style does not have a significant correlation to the daughter's procrastination. Meanwhile an avoidant or procrastinating mother has the tendency

to cause the daughter to be avoidant or be a procrastinator as well.

Based Ferrari and Olivette's (1994) research, a father's authoritarian parental style causes the tendency to procrastinate. Parents with authoritative or democratic style will cause the children to have an assertive attitude. This is caused by the fact that the children feel that there is freedom in expressing themselves, developing confidence. An individual can be considered to be assertive if the individual is able to act sincerely and honestly in expressing feelings, thoughts, and views to another individual. The assertive attitude can be seen in children in the form of respecting another person, being able to accept critics from others, having high confidence, and being able to have responsibility towards the social life (Hurlock, 1996; Santrock, 2002).

Prasetya (2011) also tested the correlation between parenting style and academic procrastination. Academic procrastination is divided into three aspects: value, expectancy, and impulsiveness. The subjects of Prasetya's study were 115 psychology students from the 2010 generation. Three findings were obtained: a positive correlation between the authoritarian parenting style and the value aspect in academic procrastination ($r_{father} = .303$ and $r_{mother} = .348$). The second finding was a positive correlation between authoritative parenting style and the expectancy aspect in academic procrastination ($r_{father} = .306$ and $r_{mother} = .328$). The third finding was that there was no correlation between the permissive parenting style of both parents and any of the aspects of academic procrastination.

A supportive data to strengthen the correlation between procrastination and parenting style was the first author's personal experience in procrastination. She often procrastinates in executing tasks like revising the final research paper. At home, her parents implement the authoritarian parenting style. Her parents would always decide her pace in her studies, hoping for a fast completion of her college term, giving pressure to her. Parenting style was chosen as one of the variables because there had not been any studies regarding parenting style and academic procrastination in college students that were working on their final research paper. Parental role has a significant role in determining children's development, as supported by the empirical data.

The first survey was conducted to 30 students from the 2007-2010 generation using the Steel's Pure Procrastination Scale (2010), revealing that 3.3% of the respondents having low procrastination scores, 46.7% having medium procrastination scores, and 50% having high procrastination scores. The reliability testing resulted in $\alpha_{cronbach} = .878$, $r = .358$ to $.811$ and $p > .3$.

Based on the survey related to parenting style using Parental Authority Questionnaire's result (Buri, as cited in Prasetya, 2011), 38.9% of the respondents stated that their mothers implemented authoritative parenting style, 32% implemented the permissive parenting style, and 29.1% implemented the authoritarian parenting style. Their fathers, 37.89% implemented authoritative parenting style, 31.35% implemented permissive parenting style, and 30.76% implemented authoritative parenting style.

Academic Procrastination

Etymologically, procrastination comes from the Latin words "pro" and "cratinus". "Pro" or forward, means moving ahead or continuing; and "cratinus" or tomorrow, means the day after. Based on these meanings, procrastination means continuing something tomorrow (Steel, 2011).

Procrastination, according to Burka and Yuen (1983), was defined as a form of delaying done by individuals in life. Individuals who are consciously aware about the negative consequences of delaying but conduct it anyway, are considered to have the tendency to procrastinate (Steel, 2002). Procrastination also happens in the academic area, which is the focus of this study. According to Solomon and Rothblum (1984), procrastination that happens in the areas related to academic matters can potentially cause individuals to feel discomfort with themselves.

According to Lay (cited in Gunawinata, Nanik, & Lasmono, 2008), procrastination is delaying the activities needed to be executed in achieving a goal. Academic procrastination is the type of delaying done in activities related to academic subjects or goals, for example college assignments or course assignments (Ferrari, Johnson, & McCown, 1995). Noran (cited in Ahmaini, 2010) defined academic procrastination as a form of avoidance to an assignment that is supposed to be executed by an individual.

Based on those definitions, it can be concluded that academic procrastination is the delaying of the execution of assignments supposed to be done by an individual. The delaying was done by consciously avoiding academic assignments because they are deemed to be hard to do, boring, or uninteresting.

In this study, the aspect of procrastination being used was the aspect from the PPS, which is a fusion of three inventories, which are DPQ (Decisional Procrastination Questionnaire) by Mann's (cited in Steel, 2010), GPS (General Procrastination Scale) by Lay's (cited in Steel, 2010), and AIP (Adult Inventory of Procrastination) by McCown and Johnson's (cited in Steel, 2010). The aspect in PPS was used because it is deemed to be able to measure the level of procrastination.

The factors affecting academic procrastination according to Ferrari, Johnson, & McCown (1995) can be categorized into internal and external factors. Internal factor consists of factors like physical and psychological conditions, while external factor consist of factors like the environmental condition and parenting style.

Parenting Style

The definition of parenting style is the interaction between children and their parents. The interaction pattern consists of the satisfaction of physical needs, psychological needs, and society norms in order to adapt the children to the environment where they live (Gunarsa as cited in Pratiwi, 2007). Parenting style according to VandenBos & Gary (2007) is how parents interact with their children in different classifications, such as the emotional warmth dimension (warm vs cool) and the control dimension (high control vs low control). Parenting style according to Besembun (cited in Darling & Steinberg, 1993) is the collection of attitude, practice, and nonverbal expression of parents. The collection is the natural state of the parents' interaction with their children, developing with time. Based on the earlier definition, it can be concluded that parenting style is the interaction pattern between parents with their children. The interaction happen all the time and cover physical needs, psychological needs, norms, and all forms of natural parent-children interaction.

According to Baumrind (cited in Santrock, 2002), parenting style is divided into three major parts, which are authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive.

Authoritarian parenting. Authoritarian parenting is the style of limiting and punishing, demanding children to follow the rules made by their parents. This parenting style can affect the children's character, making them introverted, unenthusiastic, shy (in females), aggressive (in males), have low achievement need, low need for competition, and low motivation (Baumrind, as cited in Dacey & Travers, 2004; Santrock, 2002; Buri, 1991).

Authoritative parenting. This is the parenting style that supports the children to be independent and self-sufficient, but with certain limits to control the children's behaviour. This can affect the children's characteristics by making them assertive, independent, friendly, cooperative, have high achievement motivation, high need for competition, psychological maturity, learning success, and overall good working relation between the children and their parents (Baumrind, as cited in Dacey & Travers, 2004; Santrock, 2002; Hurlock, 1996).

Permissive parenting. According to Maccoby & Martin (as cited in Santrock, 2002), permissive parenting can be differentiated into two forms: (a)

Permissive-indifferent. A parenting style where the parents have no involvement with their children's lives at all. (b) Permissive-indulgent. A parenting style where the parents are very involved in their children's lives but with little to no control or limit over them. Parents using this style tend to spoil their children, causing them to become very spoiled and egoistical. This parenting style can cause the children to be impulsive, lacking confidence and self-control, childish, immature, aggressive, and having low responsibilities (Baumrind, as cited in Dacey & Travers, 2004).

The measurement of parenting style was done using the PAQ by Buri (1991), translated into Indonesian by Prasetya (2011). The inventory is divided into three aspects: authoritarian, authoritative, and permissive parenting style.

Emerging Adulthood

Emerging adulthood is the development phase focusing on 18-25 years of age. Arnett (2000) defined emerging adulthood as a phase when the individual is no longer a teenager but not yet a young adult, leaving their dependence as a child but not yet having the responsibilities of a young adult. Arnett further explained that in the emerging adulthood phase, individuals experience uncertainty, change, and the pressure to be mature and to have responsibilities. This phase also pushes the individuals to learn to understand and acknowledge people around them.

TMT (Temporal Motivation Theory)

There are several aspects in TMT that affect the utility of a task. Utility can be defined as the use of the related task or activity that is going to be executed. High utility score is the result of high expectancy and value score, while low utility score is the result of high impulsiveness and delay score.

There are four basic aspects or elements in TMT (Steel, 2007): (a) Expectancy (E) is the individuals' faith in successfully achieving the goals. This faith or hope is often represented by self-efficacy and has negative correlation with procrastination. It is also explained as how confident individuals are in their abilities to execute tasks. (b) Value (V) is a score given by individuals to the tasks. Tasks with high score will be executed by individuals immediately, giving them particular satisfaction in executing it. Value is represented by three main variables: task aversiveness, need for achievement, and boredom proneness. Task aversiveness is explained to be tasks that are uncomfortable, having a positive correlation with procrastination. Need for achievement has negative correlation with procrastination, making indi-

viduals comfortable with their tasks. Boredom proneness have a positive with correlation, making individuals with it feel uninterested with the tasks. (c) Impulsiveness is related to how individuals delay their tasks because of other objects or tasks. Steel and König (2006) stated that impulsiveness is affected by the environment, having positive correlation with procrastination. (d) Delay (D) is the time delay of the task. Individuals' motivation decrease when the delay is increased, making the value score decrease as well. Variables related to delay are timing of rewards and punishment, organization, and intention-action gap. Delay can be directly related to the rewards and punishment time. A procrastinator must work very hard, though only before the deadline. Specific goal-setting can represent organization and can lower delay so the work effort is increased. Intention-action gap has a positive correlation with procrastination.

TMT is a motivational theory that was developed based on several main theories. Those theories are pico-economics, expectancy theory, cumulative prospect theory (CPT), and need theory. TMT itself is used to explain the motivation in doing a task or assignment, otherwise known as the task utility concept. There are several aspects that affects the task utility, those aspects are the aspects of TMT, which are expectancy, value, impulsiveness, and delay. Expectancy and value has a positive correlation with task utility, meaning that an increase in the two aspects will result in an increase in the task utility score as well. On the other hand, impulsiveness and delay has a negative correlation with task utility, meaning that an increase in the two aspects will result in a decrease in the task utility score.

The first aspect, which is expectancy is related to someone's belief of the end result from finishing an assignment (Steel, 2007). Expectancy has a relation with self-efficacy. If related to procrastination, an individual with high self-efficacy will have the tendency of having low procrastination score ($\rho = -.46$).

The second aspect is value, related to how high the satisfaction received from an assignment (Steel & König, 2006). According to Steel (2007), value is related to task aversiveness, need for achievement, and boredom proneness. In relation to procrastination, the higher task aversiveness and boredom proneness, the higher procrastination will be. A task or assignment is considered to have a high value score if it has low task aversiveness and boredom proneness score, able to generate a high score of need for achievement.

The next aspect is impulsiveness, related to how dependent a task or assignment is to reward and deadline. The longer the time needed to receive reward and the longer the deadline, the finishing of a task or

assignment tend to be delayed. The timing of reward and deadline affects the value of a task or assignment. This concept of the timing of reward and deadline was known as delay by Steel (2007).

Method

Subjects of this study were 157 psychology students considered to be active and currently working on their final research paper from generation 2004-2008. The first author did a population study on the five term years and not using sampling, meaning that the author collected data from every active student from the five term years. All subjects agreed on having their data collected for the sake of the study and returning the survey on time. Subjects were chosen because of the nature of the subjects, being university students that have formal academic assignments to be done, with negative consequences if the assignments were not done properly on time.

The measuring techniques used in this study were open survey, psychological scale, and the total population sampling techniques. The open survey were given to the psychology students who fit the certain criterion for the study, mainly those who were currently working on their final research paper. The measurement of academic procrastination was conducted using the PPS inventory that was already tested for the reliability. For the parenting style, the inventory from Buri (1991) named PAQ that has been translated by Prasetya (2011) was used.

In this study, a reliability test was conducted on the TMT inventory. Variable measurement from TMT was done in order to find out the task utility level of an assignment, measured by using the four TMT aspects: expectancy, value, impulsiveness, and delay. EVID 2 (Siaputra & Ursia, 2011) was not tested for validity and reliability yet, consisting of five answer options (1-5) in order to help the measurement.

Frequency distribution test was conducted in order to find out the nature of the collected data, especially regarding the academic procrastination variable and the parenting style variable. Both variables can be grouped using the group norms, taken from the visual binning menu in the SPSS 16 for Windows program.

Reliability testing was used in order to show how significant the differences are from one individual to another in the test scores. The differences can be considered to be caused by the 'real' differences in the characteristics, and also how high is the possibility that the differences are caused by chance error (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997). The reliability testing that was used

was the alpha Cronbach coefficient. A scale is considered to be reliable if the alpha Cronbach score is $\geq .7$ (Nunnally, 1978).

Hypothesis testing was needed to find whether a correlation exists between academic procrastination and parenting style. Testing was conducted using the Kendall correlation test due to the non-parametric data. A hypothesis was accepted if the significance score is $< .05$ (Anastasi & Urbina, 1997) with the *r score of* $\geq .3$ (Hemphill, 2003).

Results

Reliability of Measurement Results

The reliability testing results showed that the procrastination scale, EVID 2, and parenting style scale was reliable. The significant reliability testing score meant that there is no need for the researcher to delete any item in any of the inventory being used.

Normality Test

Based on the normality test, it was found that the data distribution on PPS, the aspects of PAQ, the aspects of EVID 2 (expectancy, task aversiveness, impulsiveness, and delay) is not normal. Normal data was found on the aspects of low expectancy and need for achievement of the EVID 2.

Hypothesis Test

The results of this test showed that there is no significant correlation between academic procrastination and parenting styles, except between academic procrastination and the authoritative parenting style.

Extra Data

The data analysis reveals the correlation between each total score of the father and mother parenting style and the total score of each task utility. Aside from that, there was also a correlation between the total score of PPS and the total score of each aspect of EVID 2 (expectancy, low expectancy, task aversiveness, need for achievement, impulsiveness, and delay).

There was a correlation between academic procrastination and EVID 2, except the aspect of delay. The significant correlations between parenting style and EVID 2 were between the father's authoritative parenting style and the impulsiveness aspect, the

mother's authoritative parenting style and the need for achievement aspect, the mother's authoritative parenting style and the impulsiveness aspect, the mother's authoritarian parenting style and the need for achievement aspect, and the mother's permissive parenting style and the delay aspect.

Discussion

Academic Procrastination and Authoritarian Parenting Style

There was no relation between academic procrastination and father's authoritarian parenting style ($r = .049$, $p = .544$) and mother's authoritarian parenting style ($r = -.019$, $p = .812$). Authoritarian parenting style has the tendency to limit or punish children if they do not act according to the set rules (Baumrind, as cited in Santrock, 2002). Individuals in the emerging adulthood phase tend to have difficulties in leaving the shadow of their childhood where they were always limited by their parents, while on the other hand, they are trying to prove that they are able to be responsible of themselves and have maturity (Arnett, 2000).

The non-existent relation between academic procrastination and authoritarian parenting style can be caused by several factors. One of them being the fact that academic procrastination can be caused by something inside the individuals themselves.

The first factor is the fact that academic procrastination and the expectancy aspect have a negative correlation, meaning the higher an individual's belief to succeed, the lower the procrastination level will be. This is similar to Steel's meta-analysis (2007) regarding the expectancy aspect, pictured using self-efficacy, having a negative correlation with academic procrastination. It can be said that the first factor that causes procrastination was because the individual has a low score in the individual's belief that he/she would be able to succeed.

The second factor was related to need for achievement. There was a negative correlation between academic procrastination and need for achievement. This is similar to Steel's meta-analysis that shows that there is a negative correlation between academic procrastination and need for achievement, meaning that the higher the score of academic procrastination in an individual, then there is a tendency of the individual having low need for achievement score.

The third internal factor was the impulsiveness level. There is a positive correlation between academic pro-

crastination and impulsiveness, similar to Steel's meta-analysis. This means that the higher the academic procrastination level, there is a tendency for the individual to have higher impulsiveness score as well.

The fourth factor was task aversiveness that has a positive correlation with academic procrastination, similar to Steel's meta-analysis. An individual tend to do academic procrastination because their assignment was not considered to be an interesting or fun assignment, making them delay the finishing of the assignment.

Based on the results, authoritarian parenting style prompts children to follow the set of rules made by the parents. This forms the lack of internal control on children's need for achievement when they mature, resulting in them having low levels of trust and belief in themselves regarding their need for achievement because they were used to following their parents' rules and expectations.

According to Baumrind (cited in Santrock, 2002), authoritarian parenting style can cause a decrease in children's need for achievement, resulting in them experiencing social incompetence because the children having the perception that the task they were doing was not important. Need for achievement is an internal need (Murray, cited in Feist & Feist, 2008), related to the need to achieve better results, finish difficult challenges, have higher scores than other people, and raise their pride by being able to achieve success using their talents. According to Arnett (2000), the emerging adulthood phase was the phase where individuals learn to be independent personalities, making their own decisions. Parents with authoritarian parenting style causes the children to experience social incompetence, affecting their need for achievement.

This parenting style made children have less freedom to make their own decisions, academic procrastination included. Because of this, there is no relation between academic procrastination and authoritarian parenting style. Academic procrastination performed by the subjects were caused by internal factors that were irrelevant to the authoritarian parenting style they were subjected to as children.

Academic Procrastination and Authoritative Parenting Style

There was a positive correlation between academic procrastination and authoritative parenting style. Both father and mother's authoritative parenting style have a positive correlation with academic procrastination ($r = .218, p = .006$ for mother's authoritative parenting style; $r = .173, p = .030$ for father's authoritative parenting

style). The low correlation score was tested using the Fisher test ($z = .772, p = .440$ for mother; $z = 1.183, p = .237$ for father) and revealed no significant difference and that the correlation had a significant positive score. The positive correlation showed that the higher the academic procrastination score, the higher the authoritative parenting style score.

This finding is in opposite to the findings from earlier studies. According to earlier studies, authoritative parenting style has a negative correlation with academic procrastination. Parents with authoritative parenting style gave their children the freedom to be independent, but within certain limits (Baumrind, as cited in Santrock, 2002). This allowed the children to have success in their studies and the chance for them to discuss with their parents if they are not satisfied with the set rules in the family (Hurlock, 1996; Santrock, 2002). Unfortunately, the chance for discussion can cause the children to have a wrong perception to what their parents originally want from them. Walgito (cited in Ghufron, 2003) stated that perception is the organizing and interpretation of a stimulus experienced by an individual, later pictured and shown by the individual. In the emerging adulthood phase, individuals tend to experience instability between obeying rules and limits and having responsibilities as adults (Arnett, 2000). Furthermore, Arnett explained that individuals in the emerging adulthood phase tend to experiment and explore whimsically according to their wishes because they are in a phase of transition.

Academic Procrastination and Permissive Parenting Style

There is no relation between academic procrastination and permissive parenting style ($r = .052, p = .516$ for father; $r = .076, p = .346$ for mother). Parents with permissive parenting style do not have a huge amount of involvement in the children's lives, prompting the children to act as they wish (Baumrind, 1971, cited in Santrock, 2002). Arnett (2000) explained that individuals in the emerging adulthood phase tend to experiment and explore around with their wishes because of the transition phase. This is supported by Ferrari & Olivette's findings (1994) that stated that permissive parenting style does not have a correlation with procrastination. Prasetya (2011) also found that there was no relation between academic procrastination and permissive parenting style.

The non-existent correlation between academic procrastination and permissive parenting style can be explained using other factors that were related to academic

procrastination. Those factors were internal factors from the individuals, causing the academic procrastination performed by the individuals to have no relation with permissive parenting style that they receive. Academic procrastinations by these individuals were performed because of their low expectancy level, low need for achievement level, high task aversiveness level, and high impulsiveness level.

Based on the results, permissive parenting style causes children to have low levels of attachment with their parents, resulting in their attitude towards academic assignments. Parents with this parenting style never demand their children to be successful in school, and the children themselves have low need for achievement because they are never demanded to be successful. This is supportive of the study results that states that there is no relation between permissive parenting style and the children's desire to succeed, causing the academic procrastination to be caused by internal factors.

According to the hypothesis, there is a correlation between academic procrastination and authoritative parenting style of both father and mother. Authoritarian parenting style has no effect in making someone a procrastinator, but the demand from parents using this parenting style will affect the children's need for achievement. The results of this study regarding authoritarian parenting style was in opposite to the results from earlier studies. Academic procrastination performed by the subjects of this study was mainly caused by internal factors of the subject individuals.

Conclusion, Limitations, and Directions for Further Research

As was revealed earlier there was no correlation between academic procrastination and authoritarian parenting style. Academic procrastination performed by the subjects was mainly caused by internal factors of the subjects. Those internal factors were the low expectancy level, the low need for achievement level, the high task aversiveness level, and the high impulsiveness level. A positive correlation exists between academic procrastination and authoritative parenting style, due to the misperception of what both parents want and children's behaviour. Again there is no correlation between academic procrastination and permissive parenting style. This is shown in the results where the significant correlation between the two variables were non-existent. The academic procrastination performed by the subjects was mainly caused by internal factors, such as low expectancy level, low need for achievement level, high task aversiveness level,

and high impulsiveness level.

A limitation in this study was the similarity between definition and explanation used in the authoritative parenting style and permissive parenting style. This caused the study subjects to misinterpret any of the two parenting styles. In a next study there should be a need for a factor analysis test to be conducted on the PAQ inventory in order to be able to test the validity of the PAQ inventory. It was also in the authors' concern that there was a misunderstanding or misinterpretation on some of the items of PAQ, especially between the authoritative parenting style and the permissive parenting style. There should also be a need for a more detailed explanation regarding the parenting styles used nowadays or in the past. Authors should also advise parents to be able to adapt their parenting style to their children's situation, such as the children's condition, abilities, and need in the family.

References

- Ahmainsi, D. (2010). *Perbedaan prokrastinasi akademik antara mahasiswa yang aktif dengan yang tidak aktif dalam organisasi kemahasiswaan pema USU*. Retrieved from <http://repository.usu.ac.id/bitstream/123456789/14520/1/10E00258.pdf>.
- Anastasi, A., & Urbina, S. (1998). *Tes psikologi* (R. H. Imam, Pengalih bhs.). Jakarta: PT Prenhallindo.
- Anggraeni, P. D. (n. d.). *Prokrastinasi pada mahasiswa dalam penyelesaian skripsi*. Retrieved from http://www.gunadarma.ac.id/library/articles/graduate/psychology/2008/Artikel_10504135.pdf.
- Arnett, J.J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from late teens through the twenties. *American Psychological Association*, 55(5), 469-480.
- Buri, J. R. (1991). Parental authority questionnaire. *Journal of Personality Assessment* 57(1), 110-119.
- Burka, J., & Yuen, L. (1983). *Procrastination: Why you do it and what to do about it*. Reading, PA: Addison- Wesley.
- Cuan, S., Simon, N., & Nurhadyanto (1999). Efektivitas pelatihan TOC (task-oriented cognitions) untuk mengurangi kecenderungan prokrastinasi akademik mahasiswa. *Buletin Penalaran Mahasiswa UGM*, 6(2), 11-13.
- Dacey, J. S., & Travers, J. F. (2004). *Human development across the lifespan* (Update 5th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Darling, N., & Steinberg, L. (1993). Parenting style as context: An integrative model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 113, 487-496
- Fibrianti, I. D. (2009). *Hubungan antara dukungan sosial orangtua dengan prokrastinasi akademik dalam menyelesaikan skripsi pada mahasiswa Fakultas*

- Psikologi Universitas Diponegoro Semarang*. Retrieved from <http://eprints.undip.ac.id/10517/1/SKRIPSI.pdf>.
- Feist, J., & Feist, G.J. (2008). *Theories of personality* (6th ed., Y. Santoso, Pengalih bhs.). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Ferrari, J.R., & Olivette, M.J. (1993). Perception of parental control and the development of indecision among late adolescent females. *Adolescence*, 28(112), 963-970.
- Ferrari, J.R. & Olivette, M.J. (1994). Parental authority and the development of female dysfunctional procrastination. *Journal of Research in Personality* 28, 87-100.
- Ferrari, J.R., Johnson, J.L., & McCown, W.G. (1995). *Procrastination and task avoidance: Theory, research and treatment*. New York: Platinum Press.
- Ghufron, M.N. (2003). *Hubungan kontrol diri dengan persepsi remaja terhadap penerapan disiplin orangtua dengan prokrastinasi akademik* (Unpublished thesis). Fakultas Psikologi Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta.
- Gunawinata, V. A. R., Nanik, & Lasmono, H. K. (2008). Perfeksionisme, prokrastinasi akademik, dan penyelesaian skripsi mahasiswa. *Anima*, 23(3), 256-276.
- Hemphill, J.F. (2003). Interpreting the magnitudes of correlation coefficients. *American Psychologist*, 58(1), 78-80.
- Hurlock, E.B. (1996). *Psikologi perkembangan: Suatu pendekatan sepanjang rentang kehidupan*. (Istiwidayanti & Soedjaewo, Pengalih bhs.). Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Kingofong, S. M. (2004). *Penghambat pada pengerjaan skripsi*. (Unpublished script). Universitas Surabaya.
- Moore, G. C., & Benbasat, I. (2001). Development of an instrument to measure the perceptions of adopting an information technology innovation. *Information System Research*, 2(3), 192-222.
- Pychyl, T. A., Coplan, R. J., & Reid. A. M. (2002). Parenting and procrastination: Gender differences in the relations between procrastination, parenting style and self-worth in early adolescence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 33,271-285.
- Prasetya, Y. (2011). *Hubungan antara pola asuh orangtua dan prokrastinasi akademik* (Unpublished script). Universitas Surabaya.
- Pratiwi, N. I. (2007). *Pola asuh anak pada pernikahan beda agama*. (Unpublished script). Retrieved from http://www.gunadarma.ac.id/library/articles/graduate/psychology/2007/Artikel_10500279.pdf.
- Santrock, J. W. (2002). *Life span development: Perkembangan masa hidup* (5th ed.,Vol.1, Chusairi & Damanik, Pengalih bhs). Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Siaputra, I.B. (2011). *Uji reliabilitas (1.11)*. Surabaya: Center for Lifelong Learning, Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Surabaya.
- Siaputra, I. B. & Ursia, N. R. (2011). *Angket EVID 2*. (Unpublished research report). Center for Lifelong Learning, Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Surabaya.
- Steel, P. & Gröpel, P. (2008). A mega-trial investigation of goal setting, interest enhancement, and energy on procrastination. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 45, 406-411.
- Steel, P., & König, C.J. (2006). Integrating theories of motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(4), 889-913.
- Steel, P.D.G. (2002). *The measurement and nature of procrastination* (Unpublished doctoral dissertaion). The University of Minnesota.
- Steel, P. (2007). The nature of procrastination: A meta-analytic and theoretical review of quintessential self-regulatory failure. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(1), 65-94.
- Steel, P. (2010). Arousal, avoidant and decisional procrastinators: Do they exist? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 48, 926-934.
- Steel, P. (2011). *The procrastination equation: How to stop putting things off and start getting stuff done*. New York: Harper Collins Publisher.
- Solomon, L.J., & Rothblum, E.D. (1984). Academic procrastination: Frequency and cognitive-behavioral correlates. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 31(4), 503-509.
- VandenBos, G. R. (Ed. in Chief) (2007). *APA Dictionary of psychology*. Washington: American Psychological Association.