Organizational Culture and Psychological Factors as Predictors of Indulgence in Procastination Among Civil Servants in Oyo State, Nigeria

Richard A. Adu and ***Nyitor A. Shenge**

Department of Psychology, University of Ibadan, Ibadan, Nigeria

The study investigated the influence of organizational culture, self-esteem, self-efficacy and self-regulation on indulgence in procrastination. It utilized a correlational survey design involving two hundred and forty two sampled male (114) and female (128) civil servants in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. Data were collected from the sample using five scales. All the scales were re-validated. Four hypotheses were tested. The results of correlation analyses showed both age and marital status had significant negative relationship with procrastination. Likewise, significant negative relationship existed between marital status and indulgence in procrastination and between work experience and indulgence in procrastination. Further, the results of multiple regression analysis revealed that organizational culture, self-esteem, self-efficacy and self-regulation jointly predicted indulgence in procrastination and that only self-esteem independently predicted procrastination. The results of analyses of variance showed that both self-esteem and self-regulation had significant independent main effect on indulgence in procrastination. The t-test analysis result indicated that organizational culture had significant influence on indulgence in procrastination. The findings imply that organizational culture, self-esteem, self-efficacy, and self-regulation are significant predictors of indulgence in procrastinating behaviour among civil servants in Oyo state. The paper recommends that employers of labour should take cognizance of these predictors in their intervention programs to boost employees' productivity and reduce indulgence in procrastination.

Key words: Organizational culture, self-esteem, self-efficacy, self-regulation, indulgence in procrastination

Introduction

Organizations depend on employees to accomplish its goals. However, employees' productivity could be hampered in some ways, including through procrastination (Steel, 2003). Procrastination is one of the numerous social phenomena that have since received diminished attention of researchers in work organization. Much of the work on motivation theories have not been able to lay hold on why people push forward what they planned to do now to another time (Van Eerde, 2000). The study of procrastination can enhance our understanding of why employees put off tasks they ought to accomplish now to a more ''convenient time'' (Van Eerde, 2000).

Procrastination is extremely common, and it quite often affects individual and organizational efficiency and productivity adversely. Although virtually all of us have at least one time or other postponed what we have planned to do to a later day, some have made it a way of life. Estimates indicate that 80%–95% of university students in Canada engage in procrastination (Ellis & Knaus, 1977; O'Brien, 2002), approximately 75% consider themselves procrastinators (Potts, 1987), and almost 50% procrastinate consistently and problematically (Day,Mensink,& O'Sullivan, 2000; Haycock, 1993; Micek, 1982; Onwuegbuzie, 2000a; Solomon & Rothblum, 1984). Beside being endemic among college students, procrastination is also prevalent in the general

population, recurrently affecting some 15%–20% of adults (Harriott & Ferrari, 1996). In fact, many adults report problems with procrastination (Hammer & Ferrari, 2002). Procrastination makes the individuals postpone responsibilities, duties, and decisions (Dilmac, 2009). Procrastination seems to be a disturbing occurrence. People most strongly portray it as being bad, harmful, and foolish. Justifying this viewpoint, several studies have linked it to individual performance, with the procrastinator performing more poorly overall, and to individual well-being, with the procrastinator being more miserable in the long term. At larger levels of analysis, procrastination has been linked to several organizational and societal issues (Steel, 2003). Based on what is found in literature, little or no serious research has been done on procrastination in Nigeria. There is need to fill this research gap.

Theoretical Explanations

A number of theoretical explanations have been proposed for procrastination. Temporal motivation theory has it that, people are generally troubled with making decisions among various courses of action. For instance, people could be faced with challenges to go to shop or watch TV. The same also applies to employees in the work organization in which they are always bombarded with varieties of work tasks which they must as a matter of necessity perform. According to the theory, employees are more likely to pursue goals or tasks that are pleasurable and that they are likely to attain. Accordingly, and based on empirical evidence (Silver and Sabini, 1981), they are more likely to put off, to procrastinate, difficult tasks with unpleasurable qualities. Self-efficacy is therefore very critical in understanding procrastination (Ferrari, Parker, & Ware, 1992; Klassen & Kuzucu, 2009; Tuckman, 1991), since it reflects beliefs about individuals' ability to successfully achieve a desired outcome (Bandura, 1977).

Action control theory provides a useful guide to understanding why employees indulge in procrastinating behaviour in the workplace. According to the theory, employees may have the motivation and skills to complete a task, but various forces, both internal and external, provide competing alternatives to the ones that would lead to accomplishing the task. Mental processes naturally allow for the individual to address these alternatives, and maintain motivation towards the completion of a task (Kuhl, 1984). In procrastinators, however, these mental processes, more often than not, are not working properly. To action control theory, self-regulation plays a significant role in procrastinating behaviour.

It be can be inferred from action control theory that, self regulatory failure creates deficiency in an individual's ability to choose causes of action and maintain behaviour and this deficiency in turn makes such individual to push forward or completely avoid task which he/she is suppose to perform. The findings of Anderson (2001); Ferrari & Tice (2000) and Wolters (2003) argue that self-regulation is one of the strongest behavioural predictors of procrastination. These findings support action control theory. Indeed, every individual engages in self regulated thinking, not every individual can do with the amount of success (Faber & Vohs, 2004).

Appraisal-anxiety theory proposes that procrastination is a function of cognitive evaluation of task by the procrastinators (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984). According to the theory, when an individual is presented with challenging task (say writing an ''award winning'' research proposal or methodology), the individual first evaluates whether she/he has the capability to cope with the task. If the individual perceives that she/he cannot successfully deal with the task, then the outcome is feelings of anxiety, and the behavioural response of escape or avoidance behaviours (that is procrastination) (Lazarus and Folkman, 1984). Appraisal-anxiety theory emphasizes the role of self-efficacy in procrastination. According to the theory, employees will indulge in procrastinating behaviour when they perceive that they lack the requisite skills to get task at hand to be accomplished. For example, an employee may be well talented and always willing to do his/her work but do not believe in his/her ability to successfully perform the job and as a result of this, he/or she kept postponing doing the job. The assertion of appraisal-anxiety theory is in line with the findings of Steel (2007) who found that low self-efficacy and low self-esteem are associated with procrastination. According to the theory, employees procrastinate when they perceived that they lack the required skills to perform needed tasks they ought to perform.

Literature and Empirical Reviews

Based on available literature, it can be concluded that procrastination research is a recent endeavour. According to Knaus (2000), ''prior to 1979, procrastination received limited attention in the United States''. As late as 2005, Ferrari, O'Callaghan and Newbegin wrote that ''no systematic study has examined global prevalence of chronic procrastination-purposeful delay in starting or completing tasks''. Evidently, everyone indulges in procrastination on occasion. An individual may put forward doing something he/she doesn't finds pleasant or that he/she feels forced by others to do (a form of mini-rebellion against authority). But, such delays do not make such individual a chronic procrastinator. According

to Ferrari (2010), the chronic procrastinator, accepts delay as a maladaptive way of life across a variety of settings. Chronic procrastinators delay at home, school, work, in relationships with family and friends, in how they decide to do (or not do) tasks.

Some scholars noted that procrastination as a problem extends far beyond academic institutional settings: they admitted that procrastination chronically affects 15-20% of adults (Harriott & Ferrari, 1996; Steel, 2007). And it predicts decreased work (Ellis & Knaus, in press; Robb, 1998, as cited in Knaus, 2000) and academic performance (Owens & Newbegin, 1977, as cited in Knaus, 2000). Ferrari, O'Callaghan and Newbegin (2005) found that it is more likely to be reported by white collar as compared to blue collar workers (Hammer and Ferrari, 2002, as cited in Ferrari, O'Callaghan and Newbegin, 2005). Wohl, Pychyl & Bennett (2010) posited that self-control and self-regulation are essential aspects in the postponement of the direct impulses of the limbic system. Eminent scholars reported that independent of fear of failure, self-efficacy and self-esteem are directly linked to procrastination and performance (Bandura, 1997; Burka & Yuen, 1983; Judge & Bono, 2001).

Research has also shown that cultural practices within an organization could be a source of procrastination for employees working in such organization. For instance, an organization culture may promote norms that encourage employees to be punctual, nevertheless may also encourage procrastinating behaviour. Ashforth and Lee (1990) stressed that cultures under threat may give rise to defensive behaviour. Defensive behaviour may be seen as including both "reactive and protective actions intended to reduce a perceived threat to or avoid an unwanted demand of an individual or group" (Ashforth and Lee, 1990, p.622). Although Ashforth and Lee do not consider procrastination explicitly, they do describe behaviour such as stalling in which the aim is to appear active and supportive publicly, but to do nothing or very little privately. The present study, therefore, represents the first empirical study to be carried out in the area of organizational culture in relation to procrastinating behaviour.

Numerous results of studies show that the core of procrastination is impulsiveness and related traits such as low self-esteem, poor self-control and distractibility (Steel, 2011). Self-regulation is to restrain the impulses to engage in behaviours that have known cost to the self (e.g. smoking, binge eating, purchasing behaviour, breaking laws or procrastinating) (Faber & Vohs, 2004; Metcalfe & Mischel, 1999). Self-regulation includes the people regulating their thoughts, emotions, impulses, and task performances (Vohs,

2004). Self-regulation and self-control are used interchangeably by different authors (Anderson, 2001). It has generally been seen as an essential behavioural mediating variable (Bandura, 1986; Fitzsimons & Bargh, 2004; Howell & Watson, 2007).

Researchers (e.g., Anderson, 2001; Ferrari & Tice, 2000; Wolters, 2003) exploring procrastinator's relationship to self-regulation argued that self-regulation is one of the strongest behavioural predictorr of procrastination. Although every individual engages in self regulated thinking, not every individual can do with the amount of success (Faber & Vohs, 2004). Baumeister, Heatherton, and Tice (1993) categorize self-regulation failure as underregulation and misregulation. Underregulation has been described as the failure to exert control over oneself. Misregulation, on the other hand, refers to exerting control in a way that fails to bring about the desired or alternative results.

The researchers (e.g., Klassen, et al., 2008; Senecal, et al., 1995; Van Eerde, 2000; Howell & Watson, 2007) believed that procrastinators have problems in regulating their behaviours and they are engaging in underregulation. Individuals with high self-control level are more likely to delay immediate gratification for the sake of future consequences and they are likely to tolerate for frustration for deferred outcomes (Rosenbaum & Smira, 1986). Hence, low resourceful individuals have difficulty in delaying immediate gratifications and are likely to procrastinate (Milgram et al., 1988). In this respect, the results of the research studies have provided evidence regarding an inverse relationship between self-control and procrastination. Milgram, et al. (1988), for example, found that low resourceful/poor self-control individuals procrastinate more since they have difficulties in delaying immediate gratifications.

Nevertheless, studies of procrastination associated with self control presents somewhat mixed picture. One study demonstrated that procrastinators tend to overestimate their control over their plans (Lay & Burns, 1991). On the contrary, in another study, Lay and Schouwenburg (1993) found that procrastinators showed a low perception of control at the end of the summer courses in a summer school. Whereas in Howell et al. (2006)'s study, a consistent relationship between academic procrastination and self-control was found. Milgram et al. (1991) found that students with low self-regulation procrastinated more than others.

Guindon (2010) suggested that what individuals choose to do and the way they do it depend on their self-esteem. The conceptualizations of self-esteem have been inconsistent. Countless of studies (Beck et al., 2000; Eggens,

van der Werf, & Bosker, 2008; Klassen et al., 2008), for example, suggested self-esteem as the antecedent of performance; while others view it as consequent component. Some of the recent studies, on the other hand, suggested that self-esteem is a mediator between the emotions and behaviours.

Self-esteem has been considered an important contributing factor to the explanation of procrastination. It refers to judgments of global self-worth (Rosenberg, 1965). Burka and Yuen (1983, as cited in Özer, 2010) suggested that individuals procrastinate to protect their fragile sense of self-esteem. In the study conducted by Beswick et al. (1988), self-esteem was one of the three possible explanations for procrastination along with irrational beliefs. Flett, Blankstein, and Martin (1995) suggested that procrastinators suffer from lower level of self-esteem which cause to a general tendency to turn it in behaviour like task delay or avoidance that protect self-presentation by providing an excuse for poor performance and negative outcomes. In this respect, numerous studies have found a significant inverse relationship between academic procrastination and self-esteem (e.g., Ferrari, 1994; Ferrari, 2001), whereby feelings of worthlessness cause to task avoidance that might results in failure (Ferrari, 2000).

The relationship between procrastination and self-esteem has received considerable attention in the procrastination literature (Beck et al., 2000; Effert & Ferrari, 1989; Ferrari, 2000; Solomon & Rothblum, 1984), with the results showing negative correlation with procrastination. On the contrary to general findings, Beck, et al. (2000) did not find significant correlation between self-esteem and procrastination.

Some researchers (e.g. Ferrari, et al., 1992; Klassen & Kuzucu, 2009; Tuckman, 1991) suggested that another key to understanding procrastination might be self-efficacy. Self-efficacy reflects beliefs about individuals' ability to successfully achieve a desired outcome (Bandura, 1977). Bandura (1977, 1986, and 1997) consistently suggested self-efficacy beliefs as the most powerful mediator of behaviour. It usually affects cognitive functioning (Bandura, 1989, 1997; Rothman, Baldwin, & Hertel, 2004). Bandura (1986) argues that when one's self-efficacy is weak, it reduces expectancy about success, damages motivation, and ultimately hinders task initiation and persistence which may cause procrastination. A person's belief of competence in a particular behaviour provides an important link between his/her self-beliefs about his/her work competencies and procrastination. In a similar vein, research findings revealed that

procrastinators tend to have a lower level of self-efficacy than non-procrastinators (Tuckman, 2007).

Self-efficacy seems to be related to self-esteem; Bandura (1986) argued that they are very different construct. Self-efficacy is personal judgment of how well one can perform certain behaviour in a specific situation (Bandura, 1997). According to Bandura, an individual's self of self-efficacy determines how to approach a task. If a person believes that they can perform a task satisfactorily, they then will be more likely to begin work and less likely to procrastinate. Self-efficacy has been studied in such previous procrastination studies, with results showing inverse relationship with procrastination (e.g., Aydoğan, 2008; Ferrari, et al., 1992; Lamba, 1999; Sirois, 2004; Steel, 2007).

There is some evidence to suggest that procrastination is a phenomenon that is wide in scope more than the way it had been traditionally discussed in the specific theories. The scope of procrastination should be expanded beyond the specifically focusing on anxiety, control, and motivation. Therefore, procrastination should be investigated by focusing on an approach which covers possibly all related constructs. In this respect, the present study focused on the multiple predictors of procrastination by approaching organizational culture, self-esteem, self-efficacy, and self-regulation to understand procrastination more comprehensively, using the following hypotheses as a guide.

Hypothesis 1: Organizational culture, self-esteem, self-efficacy, and self-regulation will jointly and independently predict civil servants' indulgence in procrastinating behaviour significantly.

Hypothesis 2: Employees who are low on self-regulation, low on organizational culture will indulge in procrastination more significantly than employees with high self-regulation, low organizational culture.

Hypothesis 3: Civil servants who are low on self-esteem, low on self-efficacy will indulge in procrastinating behaviour more significantly than civil servants with high self-esteem, high self-efficacy.

Hypothesis 4: Employees who are low on perceived organizational culture will indulge in procrastinating behaviour more significantly than employees who are high on perceived organizational culture.

Quite often, procrastination negatively affects individual and organizational efficiency and productivity. Therefore findings of this study will provide baseline data for organizational culture in relation to indulgence in procrastinating behaviour and facilitate the effective utilization of organizational culture as human resource development

tool. The study will also assist employees and researchers as well in fashioning out effective ways in surmounting impediments to performance, thus informing policy makers.

Method
Design and setting

This study utilized the correlational survey design; data on all variables were collected firsthand from respondents using standardized questionnaires. The aim was to understand the occurrence and nature of procrastination, which negatively impacts employees' performance and ultimately affects organizational productivity adversely. The independent variables under consideration were organizational culture, self-esteem, self-efficacy, and self-regulation. The dependent variable was indulgence in procrastination and this was measured based on each participant's score on Tuckman's (1991) 16-item procrastination scale.

The study was carried out among Oyo State civil servants working in the State Secretariat, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. The respondents were drawn from different cadres of civil servants - junior, intermediate and senior cadres.

The public sector (including the civil service) constitutes the largest single-sector employer of labour in Nigeria. In the past few decades, there have been negative perceptions of civil servants in Nigeria which have made many people to believe that Nigerian civil servants are not only corrupt, but also not so productive. It has being perceived that civil servants today are always guilty of pushing forward the task they ought to have accomplished before the deadline. There is no longer zeal to do the job anymore. The workers just sit doing nothing or move from one office to another, wasting away the whole day. Records are not properly kept, that is when they are kept at all, and as a result an incessant search for documents and files is a normal, everyday story. The foregoing explains the need the need to study the procrastination phenomenon.

Participants of the Study

Two hundred and forty two (242) civil servants (male: 128 and female: 114) were conveniently sampled from five (5) different ministries (Trade, Investments and Cooperatives, Justice, Education, Women Affairs, Community Development and Social Welfare, and Lands and Housing) in Oyo State civil service, Nigeria. One of the inclusion criteria was that the participants must be above 18 years of age; this is simply because 18 is the constitutional adult age in Nigeria. Also participant must be able to read and write English, which is the official language in the country. One hundred and sixty

two (66.9%) of the respondents were married and 80 (33.1%) of them were single. The respondents' ages ranged from 19 to 59. Their mean age was 35.64 (SD = 10.66). Three (1.2%) of the respondent had primary school education, 22 (9.1%) had Ordinary National Diploma (OND), 130 (53.7%) had Higher National Diploma/Bachelor of Science Degree (HND/BSc.), and 17 (7.0%) had Masters of Science Degree/ Doctor of Philosophy (MSc./PhD). However, 3 (1.2%) of the respondents did not indicate their academic attainment. Forty seven (19.4%) of the respondents had spent less than one year in active service, 63 (26.0%) between one and five years, 39 (16.1%) between six and ten years, 22 (9.1%) between eleven and fifteen years, 64 (26.4%) sixteen years and more, finally, 7 (2.9%) of the respondents did not indicate the number of year (s) they have spent in active service.

Instruments

Five validated scales were used for data collection on the variables of interest.

Demographic data: The demographic information of the participants included sex, age, marital status, religion, educational qualification, and work experience.

Organizational Culture

To measure organizational culture, the 15-item scale developed by Tang et al. (2000) was used. The scale has four subscales: 1) family orientation and loyalty, 2) open communication and consensual decision-making, 3) the team approach and 4) knowledge of managers, which are not covered by previously developed scales. The scale also had an overall Cronbach's alpha of 0.92 and 0.88 Cronbach's alpha was obtained in the present research. It is a 5-point scale, anchored at "1" by "Strongly disagree", and at "5" by "Strongly agree" with a possible total of 75 (e.g. My company tries to create a unique 'family atmosphere'). An individual who scored within the mean or above the mean was considered as having high perceived organizational culture, while those who scored below the mean were considered to be low on perceived organizational culture.

Self-esteem

Self-esteem was measured with a 10-item self reported Likert Scale, developed by Rosenberg (1965). The scale has an alpha reliability of 0.90. A Cronbach's alpha of 0.68 was established with the present population. It is a 4-point scale, for items 1, 2, 4, 6, and 7: Strongly agree = 3, Agree = 2, Disagree = 1, Strongly disagree = 0, for items 3, 5, 8, 9, and 10 (which are reversed in valence): Strongly agree = 0, Agree

= 1, Disagree = 2, Strongly disagree = 3 with a possible total of 30 (e.g. all in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure). An individual who scored within the mean or above the mean was regarded as having high self-esteem, while those who scored below the mean were be considered to be low on self-esteem.

Self-efficacy

To measure self-efficacy, the 21-item scale developed by Schwarzer & Jerusalem, (1995) was employed. The scale assesses a general sense of perceived self-efficacy with the aim to predict coping with daily hassles as well as adaptation after experiencing all kinds of stressful life event. The scale is designed for the general adult population, including adolescents. Persons below the age of 12 are not tested with the test. In samples from 23 nations, Cronbach's alphas ranged from .76 to .90, with the majority in the high .80s and similarly, 0.87 Cronbach's alpha was obtained for the present research. Criterion-related validity for the test has been documented in numerous correlation studies. It is a 4-point scale, anchored at "1" by "Not at all true" and "5" by "Exactly true" with a possible total of 84 (e.g. I can always manage to solve difficult problems if I try hard enough). An individual who scored within the mean or above the mean was considered as having high self-efficacy, while those who scored below the mean were regarded to be low on self-efficacy.

Self-regulation

Schwarzer, Diehl, & Schmitz (1999) self-regulation scale was used to measure self-regulation. It is a 10-item scale rated on 4-point Likert scale and anchored at "1" by "Not at all true" and at "4" by "Exactly true" with a possible total of 40 (e.g. I can concentrate on one activity for a long time, if necessary). The scale has a Cronbach's alpha of 0.76 in a sample of 442 persons and a retest stability of 0.62 in a sample of 239 persons after six weeks. A Cronbach alpha of 0.50 was obtained for this present research. An individual who scored within the mean or above the mean was regarded as having high self- regulation, while those who scored below the mean were seen to be low on self-regulating behaviour.

Indulgence in procrastination

Tuckman (1991)'s procrastination scale (TPS16) was used to measure civil servants' tendency to indulge in procrastination. This scale is a 35-item originally, 4-point, Liker-type scale with a reliability coefficient of 0.90. Using factor analysis, Tuckman reduced this original 35-item scale to 16-item scale consisting of items that loaded 0.40 or higher with an alpha reliability of 0.86. Using the Tuckman's 16-item scale, a Cronbach's alpha of 0.69 was obtained for this current research. The 16-item takes lesser time to administer than the 35-item scale. The scale is anchored at "1" by "That's not me for sure" and at "4" by "That's me for sure" (e.g. I needlessly delay finishing jobs, even though they are important). The 16-item scale was used to determine civil servants' tendency to indulge in procrastinating behaviour. The scale ranged from 16-64. Participants who scored between 57-64 were said to be high on indulgence in procrastination, while those who scored 34-49 were regarded to be low on indulgence in procrastination.

Sampling Procedure

The study adopted a multistage sampling procedure. Different sampling technique was used at different points of the selection of participants and government ministries. The convenient sampling method was used to select the civil servants. A simple random sampling was used in selecting the government ministries and agencies.

Data Analysis

Pearson Product Moment Correlation was used to assess the relationship among the variables. The mean and standard deviation of each group were calculated to determine the level of difference between the groups in their level of indulgence in procrastination. In order to ascertain how significant the differences were, hypothesis one was tested using Multiple Regression Analysis, hypothesis two and three were tested using 2x2 analysis of variance (ANOVA) and finally, hypothesis four was tested using Independent T-test. All analyses were carried out using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 17.0.

Results

Preliminary statistical analysis using Pearson Product Moment correlation was carried out to determine the pattern and extent of relationship among the variables of the study. The pattern of relationship obtained in the present population is presented in table 1 below;

Table 1: Correlation Matrix Showing the Relationship among Variables of Study

Variables	N	SD	Age	Sex	MarSt.	WkExp.	Rel.	OC.	SE.	SEf.	SR.	Pro
Age	242	35.64 10.66	- —									
Sex	242	1.53 .50	.11	—								
MarSt.	242	1.67 .47	.62**	.08	—							
WkExp.	242	2.97 1.50	.76**	.11	.56**	—						
Rel.	242	1.33 .51	.03	-.08	.16*	.01	—					
OC.	242	54.46 11.34	.05	-.06	.02	-.05	-.02	—				
SE.	242	20.41 4.46	.01	.03	-.01	.05	.01	.21**	—			
SEF.	242	66.14 10.80	-.01	-.02	-.02	-.03	.04	.29**	.37**	—		
SR.	242	28.40 4.19	.01	.02	.02	.00	.07	.28**	.39**	.60**	—	
Pro.	242	33.06 7.27	-.15*	-.10	-.16*	-.15*	.03	-.18**	-.22**	-.14*	-.22**	—

*P<.05, **P<.01

Key:
MarSt.= Marital Status
WkExp.= Work Experience
Rel.=Religion
OC.= Organizational Culture
SE.= Self-esteem
SEf.= Self-efficacy
SR.= Self-regulation
Pro. = Procrastination

Table 1 above presents the mean scores, standard deviations, and Pearson's Product Moment correlations for the variables investigated in this research. Age was significantly and negatively related to indulgence in procrastination (r=-.15; P < .05). This implies that, the higher the age of the respondents the lower their indulgence in procrastination (vice versa). But participants' sex and religion were not significantly related to indulgence in procrastinating behaviour (r = -.10; P > .05) and (r = .03; P >.05) respectively. Furthermore, participants' marital status, and work experience that is, number of years spent by the participants in active service were significantly and negatively related to indulgence in procrastination (r = -.16; P < .05) and (r = -.15; P < .05) respectively. It means that, the less the number of years spent in active service by the respondents, the more they indulge in procrastinating behaviour (vice versa). The intercorrelations of all the main variables of this research also revealed significant negative relationships to indulgence in procrastination. Organizational culture was significantly and negatively related to indulgence in procrastination (r=-.18; P < .01). This means that, the higher the score of the respondents on organizational culture the lesser their indulgence in procrastination (vice versa). There was significant negative relationship between self-esteem and indulgence in procrastination (r = -.22; P < .01). It means that, as the respondents' self-esteem increases their indulgence in procrastinating behaviour decreases (vice versa). Again, there was significant negative relationship between self-efficacy and indulgence in procrastination (r = -.14; P < .05). This implies that, the higher the respondents self-efficacy the lower their indulgence in procrastination (vice versa). Finally, there was a significant negative relationship between self-regulation and indulgence in procrastination (r = -.22; P < -.01). It connotes that, as respondents' self-regulation decreases their indulgence in procrastinating behaviour increases (vice versa).

Table 2: Summary of Multiple Regression Analysis using Organizational Culture, Self-esteem, Self-efficacy and Self-regulation to predict Procrastination

Predictors	R	R^2	F	P	â	t	P
O C					-.113	-1.713	> .05
Self-esteem					-.157	-2.268	< .05
	.287	.082	5.313	< .001			
Self-efficacy					.045	.562	> .05
Self-regulation					-.153	-1.905	> .05

*p<.05, ***p<.001, OC = Organizational Culture

Hypothesis one that stated that, organizational culture, self-esteem, self-efficacy, and self-regulation will jointly and independently predict civil servants' indulgence in procrastinating behaviour significantly was supported {R^2= .082, F(4,237)=5.313; P<.001}. It implies that, organizational culture, self-esteem, self-efficacy and self-regulation jointly predicted indulgence in procrastinating behaviour. The results revealed further that 8.20% variability in participants' indulgence in procrastinating behaviour was jointly accounted for by the predictors.

Organizational culture did not independently influence respondents indulgence in procrastination {â = -.113; t= -1.713; P > .05}.

However, self-esteem of the respondents independently contributed significantly to variance in indulgence in procrastinating behaviour {â = -.157; t = -2.268; P < .05}. It implies that, self-esteem independently influenced indulgence in procrastination. Observation of the beta value (â = -.157) revealed that respondents that scored high on self-esteem indulged less in procrastinating behaviour.

Moreover, both self-efficacy and self-regulation did not independently influence respondents' indulgence in procrastinating behaviour {â = .045; t = .562; P > .05} and {â = -.153; t = - 1.906; P > .05} respectively.

Table 3: Summary of 2X2 ANOVA Showing Influence of Self-regulation and Organizational Culture on Indulgence in Procrastination

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P	Effect size
SR.	213.72	1	12746.07	4.15	< .05	.017
OC.	171.07	1	171.07	3.32	> .05	.014
SR*OC	53.06	1	53.06	1.03	> .05	.004
Error	12263.86	238	51.53			
Total	12746.07	241				

*p<.05, SR= Self-regulation, OC.= Organizational Culture

Hypothesis two that stated that, employees who are low on self-regulation, low on organizational culture will indulge in procrastination more significantly than employees with high self-regulation, low organizational culture was not confirmed {F(1,238)= 1.03; P>.05}. This means that self-regulation and organizational culture did not have significant interaction effect on indulgence in procrastinating behaviour.

Table 3 further revealed that, self-regulation had significant main effect on indulgence in procrastination {F (1, 238) = 4.15; P < .05} and with effect size of (1.7%). However, observation of the mean scores showed that respondents who scored low ($\overline{X}$ =34.33) on self-regulation significantly indulged in procrastination more than their counterparts that scored high (= 32.16) on self-regulation.

Table 4: Summary of 2X2 ANOVA Showing Influence of Self-esteem and Self-efficacy on Indulgence in Procrastination

Source	SS	df	MS	F	P	Effect size
SE.	257.98	1	257.98	4.94	< .05	.020
SEf.	.24	1	.242	.005	> .05	.000
SE*SEf	15.54	1	15.541	.30	> .05	.001
Error	12423.85	238	52.201			
Total	12746.07	241				

*p<.05, SE= Self-esteem, SEf.= Self-efficacy.

Hypothesis three that stated that, civil servants who are low on self-esteem, low on self-efficacy will indulge in procrastinating behaviour more significantly than civil servants with high self-esteem, high self-efficacy was not supported as well $\{F(1, 238) = .30; P > .05\}$. It implies that self-esteem and self-efficacy did not have significant interaction effect on indulgence in procrastinating behaviour.

It is clearly revealed from the above table that, self-esteem had significant main effect on indulgence in procrastinating behaviour $\{F(1, 238) = 4.94; P < .05\}$ and with effect size of (2.0%). Observation of the mean scores further revealed that respondents who scored low ($\overline{X} = 34.45$) on self-esteem significantly indulged in procrastinating behaviour their counterparts that scored high (= 32.15) on self-esteem.

Table 5: Summary of Independent t-Test Showing Influence of Organizational Culture on Indulgence in Procrastination

OC.	N	$\overline{X}$	df	t	P
Low	102	34.22			
			208	2.10	< .05
High	140	32.22			

OC = Organizational Culture

Hypothesis four that stated that, employees who are low on perceived organizational culture will indulge in procrastinating behaviour more significantly than employees who are high on perceived organizational culture was confirmed $\{t(208) = 2.10; P < .05\}$. This revealed that respondents who scored low on organizational culture ($\overline{X} = 34.22$) significantly indulged in procrastination than their counterparts who scored high (= 32.22) on the same variable.

Discussion

This research examined influence of organizational culture, self-esteem, self-efficacy, and self-regulation on indulgence in procrastination.

From the analysis of results, the first hypothesis that stated that, organizational culture, self-esteem, self-efficacy, and self-regulation will jointly and independently predict civil servants' indulgence in procrastinating behaviour significantly was supported. These findings mean that shared values and beliefs (organizational culture) hold by individuals within organization and certain psychological factors (self-esteem, self-efficacy, and self-regulation) are significant in explaining indulgence in procrastinating behaviour. The findings of this study are line with the findings of Wohl, Pychyl & Bennett (2010) who posited that self-control and self-regulation are

critical aspects in the postponement of the direct impulses of the limbic system. Again, these findings are similar to the findings of some eminent scholars who reported that independent of fear of failure, self-efficacy and self-esteem are directly linked to procrastination and performance (Bandura, 1997; Burka & Yuen, 1983; Judge & Bono, 2001). The findings of this research are also alike with the work of Steel (2011) who emphasized that impulsiveness and related traits such as low self-esteem, poor self-control and distractibility are core to procrastinating behaviour.

Analysis of the results also re-echoed the findings of past studies by revealing that self-esteem had significant main effect on indulgence in procrastination and that employees who scored low on self-esteem significantly indulged in procrastination more than their counterparts that scored high on self-esteem. A possible explanation for this, may be that employees that scored high on self-esteem attached some level of worth and respect to themselves which they may not want to loss by postponing their work assignment which could earn them negative comments/remarks from their "superiors". This findings is in support of the findings that indicated that the lower the participants' academic self-efficacy, self-esteem and self-regulation level; the higher their engagement in procrastination Ozer (2010).

The hypothesis that stated that, employees who are low on perceived organizational culture will significantly indulge in procrastinating behaviour more than those who are high on perceived organizational culture was supported. The findings also revealed a significant influence of organizational culture on indulgence in procrastinating behaviour. It implies that, the shared values, beliefs and assumptions in work organizations are capable of making employees working in such organizations to either do what is expected of them at time appointed or postpone it to the time "more convenient" for them. For instance, the fact that employees depend on one another at work (a form of culture that exists in every work organization) may be a cause of social control that is missing in the self-regulation of the people that indulge in procrastination Van Eerde (2000). The findings of this research are also in-line with the study of Schriber & Gutek (1987) who reported that organizational culture, determines for example the degree to which an employee is punctual at work, and whether organization enforces sanctions when deadlines are not met. Again, findings of this research are consistent with finding of Diet, Hofer, &

Fries (2007) who proposed that culturally influenced values and value orientation significantly influence procrastination.

Conclusion

Despite its perceived influence on performance and productivity, procrastination among public employees has not been adequately studied, especially in Nigeria. There has not been any empirical research on the influence of organizational culture on indulgence in procrastination in the Nigerian workplace. This study filled in these gaps. Results of the present study indicated that procrastination is associated with low self-esteem, low self-efficacy, and low self-regulation or self regulatory failure. Thus, it is important for individuals within the purview of work organization to see themselves as worthy individuals and take a positive attitude towards themselves. Again, employee should learn to appreciate his/her ability to perform an assigned task within stipulated period of time. It is essential that employees be masters of their own behaviour, attention and emotion and be able to stay focused on their goals and not to allow anything to distract from plan of action. Results from the study also revealed a significant influence of organizational culture on indulgence in procrastinating behaviour. It is important that prevailing norms and values in an organization frown at delay or postponement of scheduled tasks in order to reduce procrastinating behaviour in the workplace and discourage employees from making it a way of life.

Limitations

This research is limited by its dependence on self-report survey as a medium of taping responses of limited respondents. Truly, the respondents have many things in common, there are differences in the respondents' job satisfaction and job commitment (which were not measured) but just assumed by the researcher and these make equivalence across the respondents difficult to gauge. As a result, the findings may not be well generalized to people working in other organizations.

Irrespective of the limitations of this research, the research provides useful initial data on indulgence in procrastination in relation to organizational culture. This study is recommended using experimental design method so that employees' indulgence in procrastination, organizational culture, self-esteem, self-efficacy, and self-regulation can be analyzed in order to determine if these findings can be replicated. Finally, a future research should investigate how job satisfaction and job commitment might influence indulgence in procrastinating behaviour in work organization.

References

Anderson, E. M. (2001). *The relationships among task characteristics, self-regulation and procrastination.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Loyola University of Chicago, Illinois.

Ashforth, B.E., & Lee, R.T. (1990). Defensive behaviour in organizations: A preliminary model. Human Relations, 43, 621—648.

Aydogan D (2008). Academic procrastination's with self-esteem, selfefficacy and state anxiety will predict. Unpublished MA Thesis. Gazi University Institute of Education Sciences, Department of Educational Sciences, Ankara.

Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliff s, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thoughts and action.* Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control.* New York: Freeman.

Baumeister, R. F., Heatherton, T. F., & Tice, D. M. (1993). When ego threats lead to self-regulation failure: Negative consequences of high self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 64*(1), 141-156.

Beck, B. L., Koons, S. R., & Milgrim, D. L. (2000). Correlates and consequences of behavioural procrastination: The effects of academic procrastination, self-consciousness, self-esteem and self-handicapping. *Journal of Social Behaviour & Personality, 15*(5), 3-13.

Beswick, G, Rothblum, E. D., & Mann, L. (1988). Psychological antecedents of student procrastination. *Australian Psychologist, 23*(2), 207-217.

Burka, J. B., & Yuen, L. M. (1983). *Procrastination: Why you do it, what to do about it.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Day, V., Mensink, D., & O'Sullivan, M. (2000). Patterns of academic procrastination. *Journal of College Reading and Learning, 30,* 120–134.

Dietz, F., Hofer, M., & Fries, S. (2007). Individual values, learning routines and academic procrastination. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 77,*893-906.

Dilmac, B., 2009. "An Analysis of Teachers' General Tendency to Procrastinate, Perception of Professional Efficiency/Self Efficiency and Altruism". Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology. &(3), P. 1328.

Effert, B. R., & Ferrari, J. R. (1989). Decisional Procrastination - Examining Personality-Correlates. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality, 4*(1)151-156.

Eggens, L., van der Werf, M. P. C., & Bosker, R. J. (2008). The influence of personal networks and social support on study attainment of students in university education. *Higher Education, 55*(5), 553-573.

Ellis, A., & Knaus, W. J. (1977). Overcoming procrastination. New York: Signet Books.

Faber, R. J., & Vohs, K. D. (2004). To buy or not to buy? Self control and self-regulation failure in purchase behaviour. In R. F. Baumesister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory and applications.* NY: The Guilford Press.

Ferrari, J. R. (1994). Dysfunctional procrastination and Its relationship with self-esteem, interpersonal dependency, and self-defeating behaviours. *Personality and Individual Differences, 17*(5), 673-679.

Ferrari, J. R. (2001). Procrastination and attention: Factor analysis of attention deficit, boredomness, intelligence, self-esteem, and task delay frequencies. *Journal of Social Behaviour & Personality, 16,* 185-196.

Ferrari, J. R., & Tice, D. M. (2000). Procrastination as a self-handicap for men and women: A task-avoidance strategy in a laboratory setting. *Journal of Research in Personality, 34*(1), 73-83.

Ferrari, J. R., O'Callaghan, J. & Newbegin, I. (2005). Prevalence of procrastination in the United States, United Kingdom, and Australia: Arousal and avoidance delays among adults. *North American Journal of Psychology, 7(1)*, 1-6.

Ferrari, J.F. (2000). Procrastination and attention: Factor analysis of attention deficit, boredomness, intelligence, self-esteem, and task delay frequencies. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality, 15, 185-196.*

Ferrari, Parker, J. T., & Ware, C. B. (1992). Academic procrastination: Personality-correlates with Myers-Briggs Types, self-efficacy, and academic locus of control. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality, 7*(3), 495-502.

Ferrari, Parker, J. T., & Ware, C. B. (1992). Academic procrastination: Personality-correlates with Myers-Briggs Types, self-efficacy, and academic locus of control. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality, 7*(3), 495-502.

Fitzsimons, G. M., & Bargh, J. A. (2004). Automatic self-regulation. In R. F. Baumesister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory and applications.* NY: The Guilford Press.

Flett, G. L., Blankstein, K. R., & Martin, T. R. (1995). Procrastination, negative self-evaluation, and depression: A review and preliminary model. In J. Ferrari, J. Johnson & W. McCown (Eds.), *Procrastination and task avoidance: Theory, research, and treatment* (pp. 137-167). NY: Plenum Press.

Guindon, M. H. (2010). What is self-esteem? In M. H. Guindon (Ed.), *Self-esteem: Across the life span.*

Hammer, C. A., & Ferrari, J. R. (2002). Differential incidence of procrastination between blue- and white-collar workers. *Current Psychology: Developmental, Learning, Personality, Social, 21*(4), 333-338.

Harriott, J., & Ferrari, J. R. (1996). Prevalence of procrastination among samples of adults. Psychological Reports, 78(2), 611-616.

Haycock, L. A. (1993). The cognitive mediation of procrastination: An investigation of the relationship between procrastination and self-efficacy beliefs. Unpublished Ph.D., University of Minnesota.

Howell, A. J., & Watson, D. C. (2007). Procrastination: associations with achievement goal orientation and learning strategies. Personality and Individual Differences, 43, 167-178.

Howell, A. J., Watson, D. C., Powell, R. A., & Buro, K. (2006). Academic procrastination: The pattern and correlates of behavioural postponement. *Personality and Individual Differences, 40*(8), 1519-1530.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits – self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability – with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 80-92.

Klassen, R. M., & Kuzucu, E. (2009). Academic procrastination and motivation of adolescents in Turkey. *Educational Psychology, 29*(1), 69-81.

Klassen, R., Krawchuk, L. & Rajani, S. (2008). Academic procrastination of undergraduates: Low self-efficacy to self-regulate predicts higher levels of procrastination. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 33*, 915-931.

Knaus, W. J. (2000). Procrastination, blame, and change. *Journal of Social Behaviour & Personality, 15(5)*, 153-166.

Kuhl, J. (1984). Volitional aspects of achievement motivation and learned helplessness: Toward a comprehensive theory of action control. In B. A. Maher & W. B. Maher (Eds.), *Progress in Experimental Personality Research* (pp. 101-171). Orlando: Academic Press.

Lamba, G (1999). *Effects of gender-role and self-efficacy on academic procrastination in college students.* Unpublished Master's Thesis, Truman State University, Missouri.

Lay, C. H., & Burns, P. (1991). Intentions and behaviour in studying for an examination: The role of trait procrastination and its interaction with optimism. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality, 6*(3), 605-617.

Lay, C. H., & Schouwenburg, H. C. (1993). Trait Procrastination, time management, and academic behavior. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 8*(4), 647-662.

Lazarus, R.S., & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal, and coping. New York: Springer.

Metcalfe, J., & Mischel, W. (1999). A hot/cool-system analysis of delay of gratification: Dynamics of willpower. *Psychological Review, 106,* 3–19.

Micek, L. (1982). Nktere´ proble´my autoregulace volni´ch procescu¨uvysokos¡kola˚ku˚ z hlediska upenve¡nei´ jeejcicj dus¡eveni´ho zdravi [Some problems of self-autoregulation of volitional processes in university students from the point of view of their mental health]. *Sbornik Praci Filosoficke Fakulty Brnenske University, 31,* 51–70.

Milgram, N.A., Dangour, W., & Raviv, A. (1991). Situational and personal determinants of academic procrastination. *The Journal of General Psychology, 119*(2), 123-133.

Milgram, N. A., Sroloff, B., & Rosebaum, M. (1988). The procrastination of everyday life. *Journal of Research in Personality, 22*(197-212).

O'Brian, W. K. (2002). *Applying the transtheoretical model to academic procrastination.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Houston.

Onwuegbuzie, A. J. (2000a). Academic procrastinators and perfectionistic tendencies among graduate students. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality, 15*(5), 103-109.

Ozer, B. U. (2010). A path analytic model of procrastination: testing cognitive, affective, and behavioural components. An unpolished doctorate degree thesis, Middle East Technical University.

Potts, T. J. (1987). Predicting procrastination on academic tasks with self-report personality measures. (Doctoral dissertation, Hofstra University, 1987). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 48,* 1543.

Rosenbaum, M., & Smira, K. B. A. (1986). Cognitive and personality: Factors in the delay of gratification of hemodialysis patients. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51*(2), 357-364.

Rosenberg, M. J. (1965). When dissonance fails: On eliminating evaluation apprehension from attitude measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1, 28–43.*

Rothman, A. J., Baldwin, A., & Hertel, A. (2004). Self-regulation and behaviour change: Disentangling behavioural initiation and behavioural maintenance. In K. Vohs & R. Baumeister (Eds.), *The handbook of self-regulation* (pp. 130-148). New York: Guilford Press.

Schriber, J.B., & Gutek, B.A. (1987). Some time dimensions of work: Measurement of an underlying aspect of organizational culture. Journal of Applied Psychology, 72, 642-650.

Schwarzer, R., & Jerusalem, M. (1995). Generalized Self-Efficacy scale. In J. Weinman, S. Wright, & M. Johnston (Eds.), *Measures in health psychology: A user's portfolio. Causal and control beliefs* (pp. 35-37). Windsor, UK: NFER-NELSON.

Schwarzer, R., Diehl, M., & Schmitz, G.S. (1999). *Self-Regulation Scale.* Retrieved October 28, 2006, from http://www.fu-berlin.de/gesund/skalen.

Senecal, C., Koestner, R., & Vallerand, R. J. (1995). Self-regulation and academic procrastination. *Journal of Social Psychology, 135*(5), 607-619.

Silver, M., & Sabini, J. (1981). Procrastinating. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour, 11,* 207–221.

Sirois, F. M. (2004a). Procrastination and counterfactual thinking: Avoiding what might have been. *British Journal of Social Psychology 43*, 269-286.

Sirois, F. M., Melia-Gordon, M. L., & Pychyl, T. A. (2003). "I'll look after my health, later": An investigation of procrastination and health. *Personality and Individual Differences, 35*(5), 1167-1184.

Solomon, L. & Rothblum, E. (1984). Academic procrastination: Frequency and cognitive behavioural correlates. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 31*(4), 503-509.

Steel, P. (2011). *Uitstel gedrag: waarom we lastige dingen voor ons uit schuiven en hoe we hiervan afkomen [The Procrastination Equation: How to Stop Putting Things Off and Start Getting Stuff Done]*. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Ten Have.

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., 2003. "The Nature of Procrastination". University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada T2N 1N4. P. 3.

Tang T.L.P., Kim J.K. and O'Donald D.A. (2000). ''Perception of Japanese organizational culture: Employees in non-unionized Japanese owned and unionized US-owned automobile plants'', *Journal of Managerial Psychology, Vol. 15, No. 6, 535-559.*

Tuckman, B. W. (1991). The development and concurrent validity of the Procrastination Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 51*, 473-480.

Tuckman, B. W. (2007). The effect of motivational scaffolding on procrastinators' distance learning outcomes. *Computers & Education, 49*(2), 414-422.

Van Eerde, W. (2000). Procrastination: Self-regulation in initiating aversive goals. *Applied Psychology: An International Review, 49*, 372-389.

Vohs, K. D., Baumeister, R. F. (2004). Understanding self-regulation. In R. F. Baumesister & K. D. Vohs (Eds.), *Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory and applications*. NY: The Guilford Press.

Whol M. J.A., Pychyl, T. A., Bennett S.H. (2010). I forgive myself, now I can study: How self-   forgiveness for procrastinating can reduce future procrastination. *Personality and Individual Differences, 48,* 803-808.

Wolters, C. A. (2003). Understanding procrastination from a self-regulated learning perspective. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 95*(1), 179-187.

Biographical Note

Nyitor A. Shenge holds a Ph.D (Psychology) degree and teaches Psychology in the Department of Psychology, Faculty of the Social Sciences, University of Ibadan.