The International Journal of Indian Psychology
ISSN 2348-5396 (Online) | ISSN: 2349-3429 (Print)
Volume 11, Issue 2, April- June, 2023
DIP: 18.01.185.20231102, DOI: 10.25215/1102.185
https://www.ijip.in

Research Paper

Correlation Between Procrastination and Self-Efficacy in Relation to Creativity Amongst Young Adults

Jessica Madaan[1]* Dr. Kakul Hai[2]

ABSTRACT

The research aimed towards studying the relationship between procrastination and self-efficacy in relation to creativity among young adults. The ability to view things differently, uncover hidden patterns, draw connections between seemingly unconnected phenomena, and develop innovative and practical solutions is what we call creativity and the act of putting off completing a task until later is known as procrastination, while the psychological concept of self-efficacy describes a person's confidence in their ability to accomplish a particular goal or complete a particular task. A sample size of 120 individuals were used for the study. Kaufman Domains of Creativity Scale (2012), General Self-efficacy Scale (GSE) (Schwarzer et al., 1995), and Tuckman Scale for Procrastination (Tuckman, 1991) were used in the research. Pearson's correlation and regression were used in the present study. The study found a significant relationship and effect between self-efficacy and domains of creativity, but no significant relationship and effect between procrastination and all domains of creativity.

Keywords: *Creativity, Procrastination, Self-Efficacy*

The connection between young people's procrastination, self-efficacy, and creativity has drawn more attention in recent years. Procrastination refers to the tendency to delay or postpone tasks, often leading to missed opportunities and delayed achievement. Furthermore, A person's confidence in their ability to successfully complete tasks is known as self-efficacy. Finally, creativity is the ability to come up with novel concepts or solutions to problems.

Research has shown that procrastination and self-efficacy are important predictors of creativity among young people. Specifically, procrastination has been found to have a negative correlation with creativity, suggesting that it is a significant barrier to creative achievement. This is because individuals who procrastinate often miss out on opportunities to engage in creative activities and may struggle to complete creative tasks due to time constraints and lack of focus. On the other hand, self-efficacy has been found to have a positive correlation with creativity, suggesting that confidence and belief in one's ability to accomplish creative tasks is a key factor in promoting creative achievement. Individuals

[1]Student, Amity institute of psychology and allied sciences, Amity University, Noida, India
[2]Assistant Professor, Amity institute of psychology and allied sciences, Amity University, Noida, India
*Corresponding Author

Received: May 19, 2023; Revision Received: June 01, 2023; Accepted: June 5, 2023

who are profoundly self-efficient are more disposed to take part in imaginative undertakings and continue despite troubles, which brings about more elevated levels of creative result.

Creativity

The idea of creativity is multifaceted and has enticed the admiration of intellectuals, experts, and laypeople alike. Frequently connected with imagination, invention, and novelty, creativity has been acknowledged as an essential engine for advancement and development in various domains including artistry, sciences, and commerce. Despite the long-standing discussion about the concept of creativity across centuries; this enigmatic wonder remains intricate without one conclusive explanation or definition that aptly encompasses its core nature.

Despite the challenges in defining and measuring creativity, there are numerous definitions of creativity, each emphasizing different aspects of the phenomenon. For example, according to (**Sternberg, 2003 p. 87-88**) "creativity is the ability to generate original and useful ideas, products, or solutions that meet a particular need or challenge." For (**Robinson, 2011**) it is the ability to see things in new ways, to find hidden patterns, to make connections between seemingly unrelated phenomena, and to generate solutions that are innovative and effective. While (**Csikszentmihalyi, 1999**) defined creativity as a phenomenon that occurs when a person, group, or organization produces a work that is both novel (i.e., original, or unusual) and useful (i.e., adaptive, or effective). Some definitions emphasize the originality or novelty of creative ideas, while others highlight their usefulness or practicality. Some definitions emphasize the personal qualities that foster creativity, such as curiosity, risk-taking, and divergent thinking, while others place more emphasis on the social and cultural contexts that influence creative expression. Despite the wide range of definitions, most people concur that creativity involves the creation of original and worthwhile ideas or products. Creativity differs from randomness or eccentricity, as well as from mundane or conventional ideas that lack originality or impact, by combining novelty and value.

Theories related to Creativity.

Individual, social, and environmental factors, such as cognitive abilities, personality traits, emotional states, social and cultural norms, and organizational structures, have been shown to have an impact on creativity Numerous models and theories attempt to explain creativity.

Psychodynamic theory, a branch of psychology, places a special emphasis on the ways in which people's behaviors and perception of the world are influenced by unconscious mechanisms. It offers a comprehensive framework for comprehending the intricate interaction between conscious and unconscious creative processes. Cognitive theory gives another perspective that focuses on how mental processes like perception, attention, memory, and problem-solving affect how people act and perceive the world. Cognitive theory provides a solid foundation for comprehending the mental processes that enable creative expression. The social learning theory places an emphasis on how human experience and behavior are influenced by social factors like modelling, reinforcement, and observational learning. According to social learning theory, people can express their creativity by observing and imitating other people and receiving validation from their social environments. As per the system's model of creativity, collaboration between different layers of frameworks, including those at the individual, bunch, and ecological levels, brings about innovativeness. Individual, social group, and environmental factors interact to produce creative expression, according to this paradigm. At the individual level, aspects include

personality traits, knowledge, and skills. Groups are influenced by collaboration and social interaction.

Creativity is highly prized in almost every human endeavor, from the arts and sciences to business and everyday life. Creativity is essential for innovation and progress in almost every field. Without the use of creativity, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to develop novel products, services, or ideas that could improve our lives.

Procrastination

The act of putting off completing a task until later is known as procrastination, and it can be caused by a lack of motivation, the desire for something else, or the belief that one is unable to complete the task. According to Mish (1994), the word "procrastination" originates from Latin, where "pro" means "forward" and "crustiness" means "tomorrow".

According to Ferrari (1992, p. 315), it is "delaying task completion to the point of experiencing subjective discomfort." Various definitions of procrastination are provided to comprehend its complexity and concept. “Procrastination is not waiting, and it is more than delaying. It is a decision to not act.” (Ferrari, 2010). “Voluntarily delaying an intended course of action despite the negative consequences of that delay.” (Klingsiek, 2013). When we use the term "procrastination," we are essentially thinking of two things: willfully delaying something that has to do with postponing, delaying, or deferring it, and negatively impacting something that has to do with unintentional loss.

Theories related to procrastination.

The problem of procrastination is the subject of several psychological theories. Some of these include- arousal theory according to which, people procrastinate when they become overwhelmed by a task's emotional arousal. They might put off starting the task because they can't control their emotions. Another Theory of procrastination is that of Self-Regulation; procrastination, according to this theory, is a failure of self-regulation. People who battle with stalling might experience issues controlling their considerations, feelings, and ways of behaving to accomplish their objectives. Additionally, Goal-setting theory, according to which, people procrastinate when they set goals that are too lofty or vague. At the point when individuals are unsure about what they need to accomplish or how to accomplish it, they might try not to begin the errand by and large. Apart from these is the theory of temporal motivation, which says that people procrastinate when they put short-term pleasure ahead of long-term benefits. They might put off tasks that are hard or uncomfortable in favor of things that are more rewarding right away.

Correspond are the theory of Cognitive Behavior and Personality Theory according to which Procrastination is linked to negative thoughts or beliefs about oneself or the task, accordingly avoidance is a response to feelings of anxiety, inadequacy, or overwhelm and procrastination may be exacerbated by personality traits like impulsivity and lack of diligence. It's possible that people with these traits are more likely to put off starting work respectively. In general, these theories shed light on the intricate factors that encourage procrastination and can assist in the development of interventions to combat this behavior.

Self-Efficacy

Self-efficacy is a psychological term that describes a person's self-confidence in their capacity to carry out a particular action or achieve a particular result. It is a vital idea in

friendly mental hypothesis and has a great deal to do with the mental ideas of inspiration, confidence, and fearlessness.

Self-efficacy is the belief that one is capable of completing a task or achieving a goal. It was first brought up by psychologist Albert Bandura in the 1970s as a component of his social cognitive theory. A person's past experiences, other people's opinions, as well as their own bodily and emotional responses, form the basis of their self-efficacy beliefs. A person with stronger self-efficacy is more likely to establish challenging goals, put in effort, endure through difficulties, and ultimately succeed. Numerous studies have looked at the effects of self-efficacy on numerous aspects of human functioning, with a vast body of study on the topic.

Theories related to self-efficacy.

Self-efficacy is the subject of several theories, including, Social Cognitive Theory; a theory, developed by psychologist Albert Bandura, that places an emphasis on the roles that social modelling and observational learning play in the formation of self-efficacy beliefs. According to this theory, observing others who are successful in domains or tasks like their own can boost self-efficacy. Self-Regulation Theory: according to this theory, individuals use a variety of cognitive and behavioral strategies to control their own behavior and motivation. This self-regulatory process is thought to be influenced in part by beliefs about one's own self-efficacy. Additionally, Expectancy-Value Theory suggests that an individual's expectation of success and the importance they place on the task influence their motivation to complete it. It is believed that one factor that influences an individual's expectation of success is self-efficacy beliefs. Further the theory of self-determination emphasizes the significance of autonomy, competence, and correlation in promoting well-being and motivation. Self-efficacy beliefs are thought to have an impact on an individual's sense of competence in a particular field or task. Beside these theories attribution theory also lays some light on the self-efficacy beliefs, they are shaped by causal attributions, according to this theory. For instance, those who attribute success to internal variables (such as effort or talent) tend to have stronger self-efficacy beliefs than those who attribute success to external causes (such as luck or support from others). All these theories together shed light on the complex and multi-layered nature of self-viability convictions and show that they are influenced by a variety of elements, including as prior experiences, bodily and emotional states, as well as social and cultural variables.

Procrastination has been the subject of a lot of research in the past, although these research have the drawback of mostly focusing on students (Van Eerde, 2015). Therefore, the goal of this research is to determine how procrastination and self-efficacy among young people relate to creativity.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Orakci. (2023). conducted a study to examine how academic motivation and academic self-efficacy are related to each other. The findings revealed that academic motivation had a significant and direct impact on the ability to think creatively, as did academic self-efficacy and problem-solving skills had a significant and direct impact on both creative thinking and critical thinking skills, and that creative thinking had a significant and direct impact on critical thinking skills.

Bai et al. (2023). intended to investigate the relationship between creative thinking and active procrastination, together with the serial mediation impact of creative self-concept and personal mastery. The findings demonstrated that the correlation between creative thinking and active procrastination was moderated by creative self-concept.

Liu et al. (2022). directed a review to check the interceding job of imagination on the connection between numerical accomplishment and programming self-efficacy. Results demonstrated that numerical accomplishment decidedly affects programming self-efficacy, numerical accomplishment is emphatically connected with creativity, and creativity likewise impacts programming self-efficacy and creativity meaningfully affects the connection between numerical accomplishment and programming self-efficacy.

Qahir et al. (2022). carried out research to find out how self-efficacy, both directly and indirectly, affects employees' creativity. The research discovered a favorable connection between employee creativity and self-efficacy and emotional intelligence. Additionally, the study demonstrated that employees' creativity is positively correlated with self-efficacy. According to the findings, self-efficacy acted as a mediator between employee creativity and emotional intelligence.

Zal Jarchlou et al. (2021). conducted research to examine the impact of teaching self-regulation strategies on procrastinating students' academic vitality and creativity. The findings showed that for the academic imperativeness variable, there was a critical gathering impact, time impact, and gathering time communication, and for the creativity variable, there was a huge gathering impact, time impact, and gathering time interaction.

Cuncolkar & D'Silva (2020). conducted research on the connection between college students' procrastination, self-esteem, self-efficacy, and motivation. The outcomes reasoned that dawdling had a huge relationship with confidence, self-efficacy, and motivation.

Shin & Grant (2020). commissioned a study to investigate the curvilinear relationship between creativity and procrastination. The findings demonstrated that moderate procrastination, as opposed to low or high procrastination, resulted in participants coming up with more original ideas. The review presumed that the curvilinear impact was to some degree intervened by issue rebuilding and the enactment of new information.

Silva et al. (2020). conducted research to examine the connection between self-efficacy and procrastination. Self-efficacy was discovered to be favorably connected with active procrastination, was found to be negatively correlated with general procrastination. The study concluded that rather than engaging in maladaptive procrastination, students are bound to take part in dynamic types of lingering in spaces where they feel more skilled.

Chen & Zhang. (2019). conducted research to determine how employees' creativity is affected by creative self-efficacy. It was determined from the findings that promotional emphasis tempered the impact of feedback-seeking behavior on the relationship between creative self-efficacy and individual creativity.

Lee et al. (2019). did a study to track down a curvilinear relationship between workers' self-efficacy and creativity and to look at the directing impact of manager close observing on the

relationship. Supervisor close monitoring moderates the relationship between self-efficacy and creativity, according to the findings.

Kim et al. (2019). administered a study to examine at whenever reflected self-efficacy, contrasted with self-surveyed self-efficacy, is a more significant indicator of creative execution. Reflected self-efficacy had better incremental validity than self-assessed self-efficacy, and it increased personal creativity by acting as a mediator between proactive social engagement and reflection.

Warshaw (2018). carried out a study to find out the effects of self-compassion interventions on creativity. The outcomes reasoned that creativity scores were not altogether higher in the people who got self-empathy mediations and were as a matter of fact most elevated in the benchmark group, albeit not essentially so.

Walumbwa et al. (2018). conducted research to investigate creative performance as an underlying mechanism and creative self-efficacy. According to the findings, thriving at work somewhat modifies the relationship between creative self-efficacy and creative performance.

Liu et al. (2017). led a review to examine the function of creative self-efficacy (CSE) as an intervention in the correlation between active procrastination and creative ideation. According to the results, there is a positive correlation between CSE, active procrastination, and creative ideation. CSE, as indicated by various intervention examinations, interceded the connection between dynamic delaying and imaginative ideation.

Baezat et al. (2017). conducted research to investigate the connection between teachers' self-efficacy, creativity, and knowledge management. The discoveries showed that educators' self-efficacy and creativity were emphatically and altogether related with all parts of information the executives, including information creating, putting together, carrying out, and sharing.

Bakar et al. (2016). conducted research to investigate the connection between Malaysian university students' self-efficacy and their procrastination behaviors in the classroom. The results suggested that a student's academic success is influenced by more than just procrastination.

Tripathi et al. (2015). conducted research to investigate college students' procrastination behavior in the classroom. According to the findings, academic procrastination and self-efficacy for self-regulation are correlated in a predictable manner. The study concluded that procrastination decreased when hope levels were higher.

Hajloo (2014). conducted a study to find out how self-efficacy, self-esteem, and procrastination are linked. Compared to a model that used procrastination as a intermediary, the findings indicated that self-esteem acted as a intermediary. The mediation effect's significance was established. In conclusion, undergraduate psychology students discovered a connection between procrastination and self-esteem and self-efficacy.

Kiamarsi et al. (2014). controlled a review to decide the relationship of tarrying and self-viability with mental weakness in understudies. The findings demonstrated that students' psychological vulnerability is linked to self-efficacy and procrastination. The study

concluded that counseling and prevention for university students have significant repercussions.

Singh & Goel. (2014). carried out research to determine how gender affects creative professionals' self-efficacy and emotional intelligence. On the emotional intelligence scale, male creative professionals scored higher than female professionals. However, on the self-efficacy scale, there was no significant difference found between male and female creative professionals.

Rationale

The present research is aimed to accentuate how procrastination and self-efficacy are related to the level of creativity of young adults. Similar studies done in the past mainly concentrated on the relationship between procrastination and self-efficacy. The study is conducted mainly because of the reason that very little research has been done regarding the relationship between self- efficacy and procrastination and its relationship with level of creativity among young adults.

METHODOLOGY

Aim- To study the correlation between procrastination and self-efficacy in relation to creativity among young adults.

Objective:

- To assess the relationship between procrastination and creativity amongst young adults.
- To assess the relationship between self-efficacy and creativity amongst young adults.
- To assess the effect of procrastination and creativity amongst young adults.
- To assess the effect of self-efficacy and creativity amongst young adults.

Hypothesis

- There will be a significant relationship between procrastination and different domains of creativity amongst young adults.
- There will be a significant relationship between self-efficacy and different domains of creativity among young adults.
- There will be a significant effect of procrastination on domains of creativity amongst young adults.
- There will be a significant effect of self-efficacy on domains of creativity amongst young adults.

Variables

Creativity, Self-Efficacy & Procrastination

Sample

The sample for this research mainly consisted of young adults. The age range for it was between 18 and 27. A sample of 120 made up the entire population for the study. 60 men and 60 women made up the group. The sampling method used for sample collection was convenience sampling. The data was fairly represented because the samples were approximately evenly distributed between males and females. The samples were drawn from several organizations, demonstrating the data’s diversity.

Descriptions of tools:

- **Kaufman Domains of Creativity Scale:** This scale was applied to assess the creative domains of the pupils. Kaufman (2012) designed the scale. It had 50 questions that asked participants to rank their level of creativity in relation to that of their colleagues. Five categories of creativity are measured on a scale: 1. Self/Everyday, 2. Academic, 3. Performance, 4. Mechanical/Scientific, and 5. Artistic. On a 5-point scale with 1 being "Much Less Creative" and 5 being "Much More Creative," the participants are asked to rate their own creativity. The scale's internal consistency reliabilities for the Self/Everyday, Scholarly, Performance, Mechanic/Scientific, and Artistic domains are.86,.86,.87,.86, and.83, respectively, and its two-week test-retest reliabilities for the Self/Everyday, Scholarly, Performance, Mechanic/Scientific, and Artistic subscales are.80,.76, .86, .78, and .81 for Self/Everyday, Scholarly, Performance, Mechanic/Scientific, and Artistic subscales respectively. At a significance level of 0.05, every item on the scale is significant, demonstrating high construct and criterion validity.
- **General Self-efficacy Scale (GSE)** (Schwarzer et al., 1995) A self-report measure consists of 10 items that are to be scored on a Likert scale with 1 being "not at all true," 2 "barely true," 3 "moderately true," and 4 being "exactly true" were used to measure the efficacy of the participants. The sum of the points for each item was used to compute the final score. Studies have reported good reliability for the GSE, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from 0.76 to 0.91. The GSE total score ranges from 10 to 40; the higher the score, the more self-efficacy.
- **Tuckman Scale for Procrastination (Tuckman, 1991).** Procrastination tendencies are measured using the 16-item Tuckman Procrastination Scale. On a 4-point Likert scale, respondents stated how much the items resembled them, going from 1 (That's definitely me) to 4 (That's not definitely me). For the first four items (items 7, 12, 14, and 16), reverse scoring was necessary, and a lower overall score indicated more procrastination. Higher scores indicated a greater predisposition towards procrastination, however we reverse-scored all the items to make interpretation easier. (Cronbach's alpha =.83) The scale was determined to have acceptable internal consistency.

Procedure

The convenient sampling method was utilized to get data since it assisted in gathering the data online using Google Forms.

The Kaufman Domains of Creativity Scale was used to assess creativity among various domains of the pupils. General self-efficacy scale was used to evaluate the efficacy level of participants, and Tuckman Scale for Procrastination was employed to gauge the procrastination tendencies among the participants.

The proportion of men and women was roughly equal in order to ensure that the data were accurately represented. 60 men and 60 women were present.

The responses were collected, and the data was arranged using a spreadsheet and statistically computed using Mean and Standard Deviation. The correlation between the using the Pearson's Product Moment Correlation Coefficient, the variables were determined. Regression was also depicted.

The findings were further examined and interpreted.

Research Design:

The research study aims to examine the descriptive statistics, correlation and regression between variables using correlational analysis as the research design.

RESULTS

Table 1. Descriptive statistics for procrastination scale, self-efficacy scale and domains of creativity scale among young adults.

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Procrastination	49.48	9.086	120
Self-Efficacy	29.01	4.920	120
Everyday Creativity	38.09	7.069	120
Scholarly Creativity	35.70	6.654	120
Performance Creativity	31.38	7.019	120
Mechanical Creativity	27.08	6.805	120
Artistic Creativity	30.68	7.128	120

Table 2. Correlation between procrastination and domains of creativity

	Procrastination	Everyday Creativity	Scholarly Creativity	Performance Creativity	Mechanical Creativity	Artistic Creativity
Procrastination	1					
Sig. (2-tailed)						
Everyday Creativity	.229*	1				
Sig. (2-tailed)	.012					
Scholarly Creativity	.103	.527**	1			
Sig. (2-tailed)	.261	<.001				
Performance Creativity	.089	.372**	.542**	1		
Sig. (2-tailed)	.335	<.001	<.001			
Mechanical Creativity	.007	.250**	.279**	.409**	1	
Sig. (2-tailed)	.937	.006	.002	<.001		
Artistic Creativity	.046	.518**	.564**	.427**	.299**	1
Sig. (2-tailed)	.618	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 3. Correlation between self-efficacy and domains of creativity

	Self-Efficacy	Everyday creativity	Scholarly creativity	Performance creativity	Mechanical creativity	Artistic creativity
Self- Efficacy	1					
Sig. (2-tailed)						
Everyday Creativity	.600**	1				
Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001					
Scholarly Creativity	.444**	.527**	1			
Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001				

Performance Creativity	.193*	.372**	.542**	1		
Sig. (2-tailed)	.035	<.001	<.001			
Mechanical Creativity	.165	.250**	.279**	.409**	1	
Sig. (2-tailed)	.072	.006	<.001	<.001		
Artistic Creativity	.410**	.518**	.564**	.427**	.299**	1
Sig. (2-tailed)	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	<.001	

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4. Effect of procrastination on everyday creativity amongst young adults.

Regression Weights	**R^2**	**F**	**Sig.**
Pro – Everyday	.052	6.529	.012

Note* p <0.05. Pro: Procrastination; Everyday: Everyday creativity

	Unstandardized Coefficients		**Standardized Coefficients**		
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**
(Constant)	29.259	3.514		8.328	<.001
Procrastination	.178	.070	.229	2.555	.012

Note* p <0.05.

Table 5. Effect of procrastination on scholarly creativity amongst young adults.

Regression Weights	**R^2**	**F**	**Sig.**
Pro – Scholarly	.011	1.275	.261

Note* p <0.05. Pro: Procrastination; Scholarly: Scholarly creativity

	Unstandardized Coefficients		**Standardized Coefficients**		
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**
(Constant)	31.946	3.380		9.453	<.001
Procrastination	.076	.067	.103	1.129	.261

Note* p <0.05.

Table 6. Effect of procrastination on performance creativity amongst young adults.

Regression Weights	**R^2**	**F**	**Sig.**
Pro – Performance	.008	.937	.335

Note* p <0.05. Pro: Procrastination; Performance: Performance creativity

	Unstandardized Coefficients		**Standardized Coefficients**		
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**
(Constant)	27.976	3.570		7.837	<.001
Procrastination	.069	.071	.089	.968	.335

Note* p <0.05.

Table 7. Effect of procrastination on mechanical creativity amongst young adults.

Regression Weights	R^2	F	Sig.
Pro – Mechanical	.000	.006	.937

Note* p <0.05. Pro: Procrastination; Mechanical: Mechanical creativity

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**
(Constant)	26.814	3.475		7.717	<.001
Procrastination	.005	.069	.007	.079	.937

Note* p <0.05.

Table 8. Effect of procrastination on artistic creativity amongst young adults.

Regression Weights	R^2	F	Sig.
Pro – Artistic	.002	.250	.618

Note* p <0.05. Pro: Procrastination; Artistic: Artistic creativity

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**
(Constant)	28.886	3.636		7.945	<.001
Procrastination	.036	.072	.046	.500	.618

Note* p <0.05.

Table 9. Effect of self-efficacy on everyday creativity amongst young adults.

Regression Weights	R^2	F	Sig.
Self – Everyday	.360	66.423	.001

Note* p <0.05. Self: Self-efficacy; Everyday: Everyday creativity

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**
(Constant)	13.082	3.112		4.203	<.001
Procrastination	.862	.106	.600	8.150	<.001

Note* p <0.05.

Table 10. Effect of self-efficacy on scholarly creativity amongst young adults.

Regression Weights	R^2	F	Sig.
Self – Scholarly	.197	29.031	.001

Note* p <0.05. Self: Self-efficacy; Scholarly: Scholarly creativity

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**
(Constant)	18.268	3.281		5.567	<.001
Procrastination	.601	.112	.444	5.388	<.001

Note* p <0.05.

Table 11. Effect of self-efficacy on performance creativity amongst young adults.

Regression Weights	**R^2**	**F**	**Sig.**
Self – Performance	.037	4.547	.35

Note* p <0.05. Self: Self-efficacy; Performance: Performance creativity

	Unstandardized Coefficients		**Standardized Coefficients**		
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**
(Constant)	23.404	3.791		6.174	<.001
Procrastination	.275	.129	.193	2.132	.035

Note* p <0.05.

Table 12. Effect of self-efficacy on mechanical creativity amongst young adults.

Regression Weights	R^2	F	Sig.
Self – Mechanical	.027	4.547	.35

Note* p <0.05. Self: Self-efficacy; Mechanical: Mechanical creativity

	Unstandardized Coefficients		**Standardized Coefficients**		
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**
(Constant)	20.479	3.695		5.543	<.001
Procrastination	.228	.126	.165	1.813	.072

Note* p <0.05.

Table 13. Effect of self-efficacy on artistic creativity amongst young adults.

Regression Weights	**R^2**	**F**	**Sig.**
Self – Artistic	.168	23.815	.001

Note* p <0.05. Self: Self-efficacy; Artistic: Artistic creativity

	Unstandardized Coefficients		**Standardized Coefficients**		
	B	**Std. Error**	**Beta**	**t**	**Sig.**
(Constant)	13.454	3.579		3.759	<.001
Procrastination	.594	.122	.410	4.880	<.001

Note* p <0.05.

DISCUSSION

According to the first hypothesis, there will be a significant relationship between procrastination and different domains of creativity amongst young adults. Table 2 shows this correlation. The results analysis found to have significant but weak positive correlation between procrastination with everyday creativity with (r =0.229, p = 0.012, n = 120). This means that as procrastination improves, there tends to be a minor increase in everyday creativity as well. The correlation coefficient (r) value between procrastination and scholarly creativity is 0.103, p = .261, which shows there is no statistically significant correlation. Procrastination and performance creativity were not statistically correlated in our study (r = 0.089, p = 0.335, n = 120). This suggests that the two variables have a weak positive correlation. Procrastination and mechanical creativity were not found to be correlated in our study (r = 0.007, p = 0.937, n = 120). This suggests that the two variables barely have any

link. The correlation coefficient (r = 0.046) and p-value (p = 0.618), in a study investigating the relationship between procrastination and artistic creativity do not suggest a significant positive correlation between the two variables. The findings of the present research thus reject the first hypothesis, according to which there is significant relationship between procrastination and different domains of creativity. These variables have not been culminated together into research before. As per the author's knowledge, this study is first to analyze the connection between these factors However, it is fundamental for remember that connection doesn't be guaranteed to suggest causation and that the noticed affiliation might be affected by extra factors that were not estimated in our investigation.

The second hypothesis states that there will be a significant relationship between self-efficacy and different domains of creativity amongst young adults. Table 3 shows this correlation. The results depicted a significant positive correlation between self-efficacy likewise everyday creativity (r = 0.600, p = 0.001, n = 120) indicating a strong positive correlation between the variables. This indicates that as individuals have higher levels of self-efficacy, they incline to also have higher levels of everyday creativity. Study also found a significant positive correlation between self-efficacy and scholarly creativity (r = .444, p = 0.001, n = 120) indicate that there is a moderate positive correlation between the variables. It suggests that as self-efficacy increases, everyday creativity also tends to increase to a certain extent. There was also a significant but weak correlation between self-efficacy and performance creativity (r = .193, p = 0.035, n = 120). This states that there is a significant relationship between the two variables but is relatively weak. This means that as self-efficacy increases there tends to be a slight increase in performance creativity as well. There was a non-significant, weak positive correlation between self-efficacy and mechanical creativity (r= .165, p=.072, n=120), this states that there may be a positive relationship between the two variables, but it is not strong enough to be significant. Finally, the study found that there is a significant positive correlation between self-efficacy and artistic creativity (r=.410, p=.001, n=120), this states that there is a positive significant relationship between the variables, i.e., higher the level of self-efficacy, higher the artistic creativity. Overall, the findings of the present study the second hypothesis is accepted according to which there is a significant relationship between self-efficacy and different domains of creativity amongst young adults. The findings of the study are consistent with other extant literature. Baezat et al. (2017) carried out research to study the relationship of knowledge management, teachers' self-efficacy and creativity. A sample of 66 teachers were utilized for the review. The findings demonstrated that teachers' self-efficacy and creativity were significantly correlated with all aspects of knowledge management, including knowledge creation, organization, implementation, and sharing.

The third hypothesis tests if procrastination carries a significant effect on domains of creativity amongst young adults. The first domain is everyday creativity, for the purpose the dependent variable, i.e., everyday creativity was regressed upon the predicting variable procrastination to test the hypothesis. According to table 4 procrastination significantly predicts everyday creativity. F (1,118) = 6.529, p = .012, t= 2.555 which indicates that the procrastination can play a significant role in effecting everyday creativity. (b= .229, p =.012). These results indicate a positive effect of procrastination. Moreover, the R square = .052, which depicts that the simulation explains 5.2% of variance in everyday creativity.

The second domain is scholarly creativity. In Table 5, scholarly creativity was regressed upon the predicting variable procrastination to test the hypothesis. F (1,118) = 1.275, p =

.261, t= 1.129 which indicates that there is no significant relationship between procrastination and scholarly creativity since the p-value is greater than the conventional threshold of 0.05. The beta coefficient is 0.103, which indicates that scholarly creativity is anticipated to ascent by an average of 0.103 units for every unit increase in procrastination. However, as the p-value is not significant, we cannot draw the conclusion that this coefficient is a valid indicator of the population's actual association between procrastination and scholarly creativity. Additionally, the R square = .011 which indicates that only 1.1% of the variation in scholarly creativity can be described by procrastination.

Performance creativity is the third domain. Performance creativity was regressed upon the predicting variable procrastination to test the hypothesis Table 6, states, F (1,118) = .937, p = .335, t= .968, which indicates that there is no significant relationship between procrastination and scholarly creativity since the p-value is greater than the conventional threshold of 0.05. The beta coefficient is 0.089, which indicates that performance creativity is anticipated to rise by an average of 0.103 units for every unit increase in procrastination. However, as the p-value is not significant, we cannot draw the conclusion that this coefficient is a valid indicator of the population's actual association between procrastination and performance creativity. Furthermore, the R square = .008 which indicates that only 0.8% of the alternative in performance creativity can be supported by procrastination.

Fourth domain is mechanical creativity, which was regressed upon the predicting variable procrastination to test the hypothesis. F (1,118) = .006, p = .937, t= .079, which indicates that there is no significant relationship between procrastination and mechanical creativity with $p > 0.05$. The beta coefficient is 0.007, which suggests that mechanical creativity, on average, rise by 0.007 units for every one unit increase in procrastination. This coefficient is not a trustworthy measure of the real relationship as the p-value is not significant as seen in Table 7. Moreover, the R square = .000 which indicates the no variation in mechanical creativity can be explained by procrastination.

The final domain is artistic creativity, which was regressed upon the predicting variable procrastination to test the hypothesis. According to Table 8, F (1,118) = .250, p= .648, t= .500, which indicates that there is no significant relationship between procrastination and artistic creativity with $p > 0.05$. The beta coefficient is 0.046, which signifies that mechanical creativity, on average, rise by 0.007 units for every one unit increase in procrastination that is there is a .046 standard deviation increase in artistic creativity, after monitoring for the effects of other variables in the model.

The findings of the current study thus reject the third hypothesis, according to which there is a significant effect of procrastination and domains of creativity amongst young adults, as seen in the results the variance between all the domains with procrastination lies between the range 0% - 5.2%, suggesting that there is a very slight or no significant relationship between the variables. These variables have not been culminated together into research before. As far as the author’s are aware, this study is the first to examine the relationship between these variables.

The fourth hypothesis tests if self-efficacy carries a significant effect on domains of creativity amongst young adults. The first domain is everyday creativity, for the purpose the dependent variable, i.e., everyday creativity was regressed upon the predicting variable self-efficacy to test the hypothesis. According to Table 9, self-efficacy significantly predicts

everyday creativity. F (1,118) = 66.423, p = .001, t = 8.150, which implies that self-efficacy can play a significant function in affecting everyday creativity. (b= .600, p = .00. These findings reveal that self-efficacy is a key predictor of everyday creativity and that everyday creativity levels rise along with self-efficacy levels. Moreover, the R square = .360, which suggests that 36% of the variance in everyday creativity can be explained by self-efficacy, and that self-efficacy may be an important predictor of everyday creativity.

Scholarly domain when regressed upon self-efficacy to tests the hypothesis suggested that self-efficacy and scholarly creativity are significantly linked. According to Table 10, F (1,118) = 29.031, p = .001, t= 5.388, indicates that higher levels of self-efficacy are linked to greater levels of scholarly creativity. This finding is in line with previous studies that have emphasized the importance of self-efficacy in fostering creativity and academic creativity. (e.g., Karwowski & Beghetto, 2019). Further, the R square = .197, which suggests that self-efficacy explains approximately 19.7% of the variance in scholarly creativity making it a significant predictor.

The third domain i.e., performance creativity when regressed with self-efficacy indicated a F (1,118) = 4.547, p= 0.35, t= 2.132 (Table 11), which specifies that there a weak relationship between the two variables this directs that the claim that self-efficacy is linked to performance inventiveness is not sufficiently supported by the available data. The direction and magnitude of the association between self-efficacy and performance creativity are indicated by the coefficient (b) of 0.193. According to this positive coefficient, performance creativity tends to rise along with self-efficacy. This finding should be interpreted with care, though, as the regression model is not statistically significant. Additionally, the R-square value = .037, indicating that self-efficacy explains only a small proportion of the variance in performance creativity.

Mechanical domain of creativity when regressed with self-efficacy indicated that the regression model for the link between self-efficacy and mechanical creativity is not statistically significant at conventional levels of significance (i.e., p .05), according to the F-value of 3.286 and the corresponding p-value of 0.072 and a t value = 1.813. This indicates that the claim that self-efficacy is connected to mechanical creativity is not sufficiently supported by the available data. The direction and magnitude of the association between self-efficacy and mechanical inventiveness are indicated by the coefficient (b) of 0.165 (Table 12). This encouraging correlation shows that mechanical creativity tends to rise along with self-efficacy. This finding should be interpreted with care, though, as the regression model is not statistically significant. Further, the results of the regression analysis showed that the coefficient of determination (R-squared) between self-efficacy and mechanical creativity was 0.027. This reveals that only 2.7% of the variance in mechanical creativity can be supported by the variance in self-efficacy. Thus, based on these findings, we cannot draw the conclusion that self-efficacy and mechanical creativity are significantly correlated. The positive coefficient, however, shows that there might be a connection between these variables that needs to be investigated further in subsequent studies.

The last domain, i.e., artistic domain when regressed with self-efficacy indicated F (1,118) = 23.815, p = 0.001, t= 4.880. (Table 13) which shows that the regression model for the association between self-efficacy and artistic creativity is statistically significant. This proves that self-efficacy and creative creativity have a strong beneficial link. According to the coefficient (b), which is 0.168, artistic creativity tends to rise along with self-efficacy.

This result is statistically significant, proving that there is no chance that the association exists. Further, with an R square value of 0.168 proposes that self-efficacy reports for approximately 16.8% of the variability in artistic creativity scores. The effect size is moderate, indicating that self-efficacy is a moderately important predictor of artistic creativity. Previous research that found a connection between self-efficacy and creativity is consistent with these findings. By focusing on the connection between self-efficacy and artistic creativity, our study adds to the body of literature by underlining the significance of self-belief in creative domains.

Based on the findings of our current study we partially accept our hypothesis according to which there is a significant effect of self-efficacy on domains of creativity amongst young adults. As we see in the results self-efficacy has a significant effect on most of the domains of creativity namely everyday domain, scholarly domain, performance domain and the artistic domain of creativity. The study's results are consistent with the other extant literature e.g., Qahir et al. (2022) in their study concluded that self-efficacy had a positive impact on creativity.

REFERENCES

Baezat, S., Aflakifard, H., & Shahidi, N. (2017). The Relationship of knowledge management, teachers' self-efficacy and creativity in Shiraz preschool centers. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Administration, 7*(28), 169-184.

Bai, H., Li, X., Wang, X., Tong, W., Li, Y., & Hu, W. (2023). Active procrastination incubates more creative thinking: The sequential mediating effect of personal mastery and creative self-concept. *Creativity Research Journal*, 1-13.

Bakar, Z. A., & Khan, M. U. (2016). Relationships between self-efficacy and the academic procrastination behaviour among university students in Malaysia: A general perspective. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn), 10*(3), 265-274.

Chen, Y., & Zhang, L. (2019). Be creative as proactive? The impact of creative self-efficacy on employee creativity: A proactive perspective. Current Psychology, 38, 589-598.

Csikszentmihalyi, M. (1999). Implications of a systems perspective for the study of creativity. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), Handbook of creativity (313-335).

Cuncolkar, S., & D'Silva, C. (2020). Relationship between Procrastination, Self-Esteem, Self-Efficacy and Motivation among College Students. International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR). ISSN: 2319-7064

Ferrari, J. R. (2010). Procrastination. In J. C. Chrisler & D. R. McCreary (Eds.), Handbook of Gender Research in Psychology (173-190)

Hajloo N. Relationships between self-efficacy, self-esteem, and procrastination in undergraduate psychology students. Iran J Psychiatry Behav Sci. 2014 Fall;8(3):42-9. PMID: 25780374; PMCID: PMC4359724.

Kaufman, J. C. (2012). Counting the muses: Development of the Kaufman Domains of Creativity Scale (K-DOCS). Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, 6(4), 298–308.

Kiamarsi, A. & Abolghasemi, Abbas. (2014). The Relationship of Procrastination and Self-efficacy with Psychological Vulnerability in Students. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences. 114. 858-862. 10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.797

Kim, H. H., Choi, J. N., & Butt, A. N. (2019). Reflected self-efficacy and creativity: The power of being recognized by others toward individual creative performance. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal, 47*(8), 1–13.

Klingsiek, K. (2013). Procrastination: When good things don't come to those who wait. In R. M. Kowalski (Ed.), Behaving Badly: Aversive Behaviors in Interpersonal Relationships (65-81).

Lee, J., Yun, S., Lee, S., & Lee, J.H. (2019). The Curvilinear Relationship between Self-efficacy and Creativity: The Moderating Role of Supervisor Close Monitoring. Journal of Business and Psychology, 34, 377-388.

Liu, J., Sun, M., Dong, Y., Xu, F., Sun, X., & Zhou, Y. (2022). The mediating effect of creativity on the relationship between mathematical achievement and programming self-efficacy. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*, 6243.

Orakci, Ş. (2023). Structural relationship among academic motivation, academic self-efficacy, problem solving skills, creative thinking skills, and critical thinking skills. *Psychology in Schools*. 132-138. ISSN:2828 -4925

Qahir, A., Karim, J., & Kakar, A. S. (2022). The Mediating Role of Self-Efficacy Between Emotional Intelligence and Employees' Creativity. *Pakistan Social Sciences Review*, *6*(2), 209-220.

Robinson, K. (2011). Out of our minds: Learning to be creative. John Wiley & Sons.

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

Shin, J., & Grant, A. M. (2020). When Putting Work Off Pays Off: The Curvilinear Relationship Between Procrastination and Creativity. *Academy of Management Journal.64, 772–798.*

Silva,S., Smith, A., Fcciolo, M. (2020). Relations between Self-Efficacy and Procrastination Types in College Students. 25 (6).

Singh, N., & Goel, A. (2014). Self-efficacy and emotional intelligence among creative professionals: A study on gender differences. *Learning Community-An International Journal of Educational and Social Development*, *5*(1), 23-31.

Sternberg, R. J. (2003). Wisdom, intelligence, and creativity synthesized. Cambridge University Press, 87-88

Tripathi, S. R., Kochar, A., & Dara, P. (2015). Role of self-efficacy and hope in academic procrastination among undergraduate students. *Indian Journal of Positive Psychology*, *6*(4), 376.

Tuckman, B. W. (1991). The development and concurrent validity of the Procrastination Scale. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 51(2), 473–480.

Walumbwa, Fred & Christensen, Amanda & Hsu, I-Chieh & Misati, Everlyne. (2018). Creative self-efficacy and creative performance: Understanding the underlying mechanisms. *Academy of Management Proceedings. 2018*. 10208. 10.5465/AMBPP.2018.75.

Warshaw, R. (2018). Redeeming procrastination: Self-compassion and creativity.

Wenling, L., Yangu, P., Xiaoman, L., Lixia, W., Weiguo, P.(2017). Active procrastination and creative ideation: The mediating role of creative self-efficacy,Personality and Individual Differences. 119. 227-229.ISSN 0191-8869

Zal Jarchlou, S., Entesar Foumani, G., Kiani, Q., & Hejazi, M. (2021). Effectiveness of Teaching Self-Regulatory Strategies on Academic Buoyancy and Creativity of Procrastinating Students. *Women and Family Studies*, *14*(53), 73-90.

Acknowledgement

The author(s) appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interest
The author(s) declared no conflict of interest.

How to cite this article: Madaan, J. & Hai, K. (2023). Correlation Between Procrastination and Self-Efficacy in Relation to Creativity Amongst Young Adults. *International Journal of Indian Psychology, 11(2),* 1805-1822. DIP:18.01.185.20231102, DOI:10.25215/1102.185