

**Research Paper**

## **Examining the Relationship between Procrastination, Self-Regulation and Locus of Control among Young Adults**

Shashank Gusain<sup>1</sup>, Saloni Arora<sup>2\*</sup>

### **ABSTRACT**

This study investigates the complex relationships between procrastination, self-regulation and locus of control among young adults aged 18 to 25, while also exploring potential gender differences in these variables. A sample of 100 participants, including 50 males and 50 females, was recruited using convenience sampling methods. Participants completed self-report measures assessing procrastination, self-regulation, and locus of control. The outcomes indicate weak negative correlation among procrastination and self-regulation, suggesting that as levels of self-regulation increase, procrastination tends to decrease slightly. Additionally, a significant positive correlation was found between procrastination and three dimensions of locus of control -Internal, Powerful others, and Chance. This suggests that individuals who have stronger beliefs about control orientations are more likely to exhibit higher levels of procrastination. It was also found that self-regulation and internal dimension of locus of control are positively correlated. However, gender differences in procrastination and self-regulation were not statistically significant. The study emphasizes the importance of enhancing self-regulation skills to diminish procrastination tendencies, particularly in educational contexts. While acknowledging limitations such as sample size and reliance on self-report measures, the implications of this research highlight the need for tailored interventions and further longitudinal investigations to deepen our understanding of these constructs.

**Keywords:** *Procrastination, Self-Regulation, Locus of Control, Young Adults*

### **1. Procrastination:**

Procrastination is the act of delaying or postponing work while being aware of the potential negative repercussions (Ferrari, Steel, Brothen, & Wambach). This conduct is a hot issue in today's culture, and it has been intensively examined for years; over 20% of adults agree to being regularly influenced by procrastination (Harriott & Ferrari 1996), while nearly half of students acknowledge consistently postponing tasks (Steel, 2007). According to research, procrastination can have a negative impact on our lives, resulting in lower levels of contentment and health (Tice & Baumeister, 1997; Balkis & Duru, 2016), economic challenges (Steel, 2007), decreased occupation accomplishment (Mehrabian, 2000), and improved well-being issues (Sirois, 2007).

<sup>1</sup>Project Research Scientist, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi. India.

<sup>2</sup>PhD Scholar, Discipline of Psychology, School of Social Sciences, Indira Gandhi National Open University (IGNOU), New Delhi

\*Corresponding Author

**Received: July 28, 2026; Revision Received: August 10, 2026; Accepted: August 14, 2026**

## **Examining the Relationship between Procrastination, Self-Regulation and Locus of Control among Young Adults**

To date scholars mostly relies on surveys using self-reporting to research procrastination and its underlying causes (Seo & Kim, 2015). Therefore, there's an assortment of survey instruments available to researchers that enable them to investigate individuals' inclinations towards procrastination while exploring various aspects of this behavior (Svartdal & Steel, 2017). Steel (2010) performed a research with more than 4,000 participants to develop the Pure Procrastination Scale [PPS], a simple 12-item questionnaire meant to measure an individual's overall procrastination tendencies. According to Rebetez et al. (2014), the PPS distinguishes between "voluntary delay" and "observed delay" when assessing procrastination. Voluntary delay is described as purposely deciding to delay specific decisions or actions, willingly delaying specific responsibilities, or preferring to do certain tasks subsequently while disregarding any negative outcomes. Observed delay, frequently referred to as "lateness" / "timeliness" (Svartdal & Steel, 2017), refers to the passive missing deadlines or run out of time (Rebetez et al., 2014).

### **2. Self-Regulation:**

Dr. Ponitz (2009) defined self-regulation as the capacity to control and guide one's own emotions, ideas, and behaviours. Self-regulation is becoming more widely recognized as a reliable indicator of a child's academic performance, even though it has long been understood to be a necessary component of a child's healthy emotional development. Proper self-regulation abilities are crucial for a child's social growth as well. According to McClelland (2009), "self-regulation helps children succeed in classroom contexts." Children who are adept at navigating various learning settings do better academically, have stronger connections with their instructors, and are more well-liked by their peers.

These abilities also give them greater motivation to succeed. According to Ponitz and McClelland (2009), parents and educators are vital to their children's development of self-control. As kids acquire self-control, parents and teachers serve as vital mentors and role models. Providing structure, regularity, and order both at home and in the school appears to be an important factor in predicting children's ability to self-regulate.

Baumeister and Vohs (2007) define self-regulation as the ability to modify one's own behaviour. These actions are altered in compliance with certain norms, values, or objectives derived from cultural or personal expectations (Baumeister & Vohs, 2007). These behaviors vary in quantity and quality according to an individual's views and motivations (Zimmerman, 2000). Shah and Kruglanski (2000) contend that pursuing a variety of objectives, norms, and values is a necessary part of daily self-regulation.

Self-regulation is important since it generally makes people more adaptable and flexible in their behaviour (Baumeister & Vohs, 2007). This adaptability enables individuals to respond to the requirements of society and their environment on a day-to-day basis (Baumeister & Vohs, 2007). In particular, self-regulation enables people to act morally rather than impulsively by putting their "social conscience" above their own desires (Baumeister & Bushman, 2008). Furthermore, even when there are immediate benefits, the self-regulatory system suppresses desires that may be detrimental to the person in the long run (Baumeister & Vohs, 2007).

Success or failure in a wide range of issues affecting society has been linked to the ability to regulate oneself (Worden et al., 1989, Vohs & Baumeister, 2004, 2007,). The following problems arise from a lack of self-regulation: Drug and alcohol misuse, addiction,

## Examining the Relationship between Procrastination, Self-Regulation and Locus of Control among Young Adults

unexpected pregnancies, STDs, gambling, violence, criminality, eating disorders, difficulty regulating one's anger, academic underperformance, poverty and bankruptcy, and other issues (Baumeister and Bushman, 2008). People with weak self-control also struggle in relationships, find it difficult to hold down a career, and may even turn to crime. Sayette (2004) distinguishes between two sorts of self-regulation failures: under regulation and misregulation. According to Sayette (2004), under regulation is the incapacity to apply self-control, whereas misregulation is the use of control in an inadequate manner to achieve the desired objective. On the other hand, Vohs & Baumeister (2007) discovered that people with strong self-control do well in relationships, the workplace, and in school in addition to having generally better mental health.

Traditionally, self-regulation has been broken down into three primary parts: strength, standards, and monitoring. But according to recent studies, motivation is now a fourth element.

**Standards:** As the definition of self-regulation above indicates, a person's behaviour change is typically driven by an ideal, aim, or demand that the individual perceives from society or inside themselves. When people believe they fall short of these expectations, change frequently follows (Baumeister & Bushman, 2008). According to Baumeister & Vohs (2007), these norms must be unambiguous in order for self-regulation to be effective. Self-regulation has been shown to be extremely challenging in situations where norms are unclear or contradicting (Baumeister & Vohs, 2007).

**Monitoring:** Effective self-regulation requires continuous monitoring of one's behaviour. Self-regulation is a cyclical process in which continuing efforts are guided and modified by feedback from prior performance. According to Zimmerman (2000), "the feedback from prior performance is used to make adjustments during current efforts." Because behavioral, environmental, and personal elements are always changing while doing tasks, such modifications are required (Zimmerman, 2000).

**Strength in self-regulation:** This concept is better known as "willpower". Research indicates that changing oneself is challenging and takes a certain level of fortitude (Baumeister & Vohs, 2007). Later research has revealed that blood glucose, the primary energy supply for the brain, has a significant role in influencing the strength of self-regulation (Baumeister & Vohs, 2007). Nonetheless, self-control actions lower blood glucose briefly by using it up (Baumeister & Vohs, 2007). Every person generally has a certain amount of willpower, and self-regulation is ineffective when that power is low (Schmeichel & Baumeister, 2004).

**Motivation:** Motivation, according to Baumeister and Vohs (2007), is the drive an individual has to achieve an objective or standard. It has been found that even when all the requisite components are available (e.g., the individual is fully capable, the standards are clear, and monitoring is occurring), a lack of motivation may result in an inability to self-regulate. Simply put, this failure stems from a lack of regard for the outcome.

According to Baumeister & Vohs (2007), for self-regulation to be successful, some combination of the four elements must exist. It is also proposed, nonetheless, that the elements may be somewhat substituted for one another. For instance, motivation might

## Examining the Relationship between Procrastination, Self-Regulation and Locus of Control among Young Adults

prove advantageous in offsetting a deficiency in self-regulatory capacity. (Baumeister & Vohs, 2007).

### 3. Locus of Control (LoC):

It is a psychological concept that describes individuals' views about why certain events occur in their lives. It is a multidimensional concept that describes how strongly individuals think they have influence over their lives and the events that occur to them.

A key idea in psychology, locus of control was first presented by Julian B. Rotter in 1954 as a component of his Social Learning Theory. It relates to a person's perception of how much control they have over the things that happen in their lives. The Latin word locus, which means "place" or "location," refers to the place where people believe they have influence over life's occurrences.

Rotter postulated two primary orientations of locus of control: **internal** and **external**. Individuals who have an **internal locus of control** consider that outcomes of life are largely influenced by their own actions, efforts, and decisions. As a result, they are typically more self-motivated, independent, and proactive in reaching their objectives and take accountability for both their achievements and mistakes. For instance, a student who has an internal locus of control credits their effort and preparation for their academic success.

On the other hand, individuals who have an **external locus of control** think that outside forces like fate, luck, chance, or influential people have the most impact over life's occurrences. They are more inclined to blame events outside of their control for both achievements and setbacks. For example, a student may blame tough questions or an unfair examiner for their bad exam scores rather than their own preparation.

Levenson (1973) created the Multidimensional Locus of Control Scale, which expands on Rotter's unidimensional paradigm and conceptualizes locus of control across three dimensions: **Internal, Powerful others, and Chance**. The idea that one's own actions dictate the course of one's life is reflected in the internal dimension. The idea that powerful people, whether parents, professors, bosses, or other authority figures, have a lot of influence over a person's life is known as the "Powerful Others" dimension. The dimension of Chance corresponds to the belief that outcomes are determined by luck, fate, or other unpredictable forces. Instead of being categorized as either internally or outwardly oriented, people can score differently on any of these characteristics because they are independent of one other.

In general, locus of control affects how people react to difficulties, understand life events, and govern their behavior.

## METHOD

### *Aim*

The study aims to investigate the relationship between procrastination, self-regulation and locus of control in individuals ranging from 18-25 years of age, as well as to examine potential gender differences in these variables.

### *Objectives*

1. To examine the association between procrastination and self-regulation.

## **Examining the Relationship between Procrastination, Self-Regulation and Locus of Control among Young Adults**

2. To examine the association between procrastination and the internal dimension of locus of control.
3. To examine the association between procrastination and the Powerful Others dimension of locus of control
4. To examine the association between procrastination and the Chance dimension of locus of control.
5. To examine the association between self-regulation and the Internal dimension of locus of control.
6. To examine the association between self-regulation and the Powerful Others dimension of locus of control
7. To examine the association between self-regulation and the Chance dimension of locus of control.
8. To examine differences in procrastination based on gender.
9. To examine differences in self-regulation based on gender.

### ***Hypothesis***

1. There will be a significant association between procrastination and self-regulation.
2. There will be a significant association between procrastination and the Internal dimension of locus of control.
3. There will be a significant association between procrastination and the Powerful Others dimension of locus of control.
4. There will be a significant association between procrastination and the Chance dimension of locus of control.
5. There will be a significant association between self-regulation and the Internal dimension of locus of control.
6. There will be a significant association between self-regulation and the Powerful Others dimension of locus of control.
7. There will be a significant association between self-regulation and the Chance dimension of locus of control.
8. There will be a significant gender difference in procrastination.
9. There will be a significant gender difference in self-regulation.

### ***Research Design***

The current quantitative study uses a cross-sectional research approach. Cross-sectional study design is an observational method in which participants are chosen based on predetermined inclusion and exclusion criteria. This design allows for the assessment of variables of interest to capture both exposure and outcomes.

### ***Sample***

The study focused upon the young adults residing in India. Non-random sampling techniques of purposive and convenience sampling were employed. Purposive sampling refers to when the researcher chooses and emphasizes upon the specific characteristics of the individual. Convenience sampling, also called haphazard sampling or accidental sampling, refers to when samples are selected solely on the grounds of availability. These are based upon chance and accessibility of the sample (APA, 2018). The sample included 100 participants (n=100) between the ages of 18 to 25. Out of the overall sample, 50 young adults are male and 50 are female.

## Examining the Relationship between Procrastination, Self-Regulation and Locus of Control among Young Adults

### Inclusion Criteria:

1. Participants must be between 18 and 25 years old at the time of the research.
2. Both males and females are eligible to participate.
3. Participants must have a strong command of the English language in order to effectively interpret and reply to study materials.
4. To participate in the study, participants must be willing to give their informed permission.

### Exclusion Criteria:

1. Individuals outside the specified age range of 18 to 25 years old.
2. Participants who identify as neither male nor female.
3. Participants with limited proficiency in the English language, hindering their ability to understand and respond to study materials.
4. Participants unwilling or unable to provide informed consent.
5. Individuals with diagnosed severe mental health conditions (e.g., schizophrenia, severe bipolar disorder) or physical illness that could significantly affect their participation or understanding of the study.
6. Individuals identifying as queer or non-heterosexual.

### Data Collection

#### Tools

The study incorporates the use of three self-report scales to measure the following variables- Procrastination, Self-regulation and Locus of control.

- **Pure Procrastination Scale (PPS):** Pure Procrastination Scale (PPS) was developed by selecting the 12 most significant items from three existing procrastination assessments. Respondents evaluate their responses to these items using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (very rarely or not true of me) to 5 (very frequently true or true of me). The PPS has also been translated into different languages. The Pure Procrastination Scale (PPS) has been investigated for reliability across a range of demographics and situations. With a Cronbach's alpha of 0.91, the PPS was found to have strong internal consistency in a validation study conducted in Spanish, suggesting that the scale's items consistently assess the same construct. With a correlation value of 0.89, the PPS's test-retest reliability has been determined to be strong, suggesting that the scale has good long-term stability. It has also been discovered that the PPS has strong discriminant and convergent validity. Its strong correlation with other procrastination measures, such the Irrational Procrastination Scale (IPS), suggests that it has good convergent validity. Additionally, it has been discovered that the PPS has strong discriminant validity due to its low correlations with measures of positive dimensions including self-efficacy and life happiness
- **Short Form Self-Regulation Questionnaire (SSRQ):** The short form of the Self-Regulation Scale was created by Miller, Brown, and Lawendowski in 1999. Participants respond on a 5-point Likert scale (1-Strongly disapprove, 5-Strongly approve) to statements such "I am able to accomplish goals I set for myself" in order to evaluate self-regulation. Greater degrees of self-regulation are indicated by higher scores. The scale measures the following criteria: internal locus of control, goal focus, monitoring change, self-efficacy, and mindfulness. Its internal consistency reliability was evaluated to be .92 by Vosloo et al. (2013). Numerous studies have demonstrated that the Short Form Self-Regulation Questionnaire (SSRQ) has strong

## Examining the Relationship between Procrastination, Self-Regulation and Locus of Control among Young Adults

validity and reliability. Cronbach's alpha values vary from 0.81 to 0.91; the SSRQ has been determined to have strong internal consistency in terms of reliability. Additionally, it was discovered that the SSRQ has a good correlation score was 0.89, indicating test-retest reliability.

- **Levenson Multidimensional Locus of Control Scale:** The Levenson Multidimensional Locus of Control Scales (LMLCS) is a comprehensive locus of control assessment that examines people's perceptions of their ability to govern their life. Hanna Levenson developed the LMLCS in 1973, which is an adoption of Rotter's Internal-External Locus of Control Scale. It includes 24 items scored on a six-point Likert scale, with +3 indicating significant approval, and -3 indicates serious disapproval. The scale assesses three dimensions of the locus of control.
  - Internal (I) - the extent to which people feel they can influence their life via their own efforts and talents.
  - Powerful Others (P) - refers to an individual's belief that external factors, such as other people or institutions, govern their lives.
  - Chance (C) - the extent to which people feel that chance or luck governs their lives.

The scale's reliability was examined using both the split-half and odd-even methods. For the split-half method, the scale was divided into two parts, each containing 12 statements related to Powerful Others (P), Chance Control (C), and Individual Control (I). The split-half reliability coefficients, determined using the Spearman-Brown formula, were found to be 0.72 for P, 0.79 for C, and 0.65 for I. Additionally, the odd-even method was employed, yielding reliability coefficients of 0.69 for P, 0.72 for C, and 0.66 for I. These results indicate moderate to high levels of internal consistency, suggesting that the scale items within each subscale are highly correlated with each other.

In terms of validity, the scale proved concurrent validity by correlating with Rotter's Locus of Control (LOC) scale, a well-known measure of locus of control. The correlation coefficient between the current scale and Rotter's LOC scale was calculated to be 0.54, showing a moderate positive association. This shows that the current measure efficiently captures similar components to the Rotter's LOC scale, demonstrating its concurrent validity. Overall, the scale has acceptable reliability and validity, making it an effective instrument for examining attitudes about locus of control.

### ***Methods of Statistical Analysis***

#### **Correlation**

Correlation analysis is a statistical method used to assess the degree and direction of relationships between two or more continuous variables. In this study, correlation analysis was applied to examine the relationships among three specific variables: procrastination, self-regulation, and locus of control.

#### **t-Test**

The *t*-test is a statistical method used to compare the means of two groups to determine whether a statistically significant difference exists between them. It is commonly used in hypothesis testing to evaluate the effect of an intervention or treatment or to examine differences between groups.

## Examining the Relationship between Procrastination, Self-Regulation and Locus of Control among Young Adults

### Procedure

Data for the current study were collected using Google Forms, and the results were analyzed using t-tests and correlation analysis. Participants were recruited via purposive and convenience sampling, with people chosen based on accessibility and presence of necessary attributes. They were asked to complete an online questionnaire delivered via Google Forms that included the Pure Procrastination Scale (PPS), Short Form Self-Regulation Questionnaire (SSRQ) and Levenson Multidimensional Locus of Control Scale. Following the data collection, statistical analysis such as correlation and t-tests were performed.

## RESULT

**Table 1: Correlation between procrastination and self-regulation**

|                             | Procrastination |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Self-regulation             | -0.064*         |
| *Significant at 0.05 level  |                 |
| **Significant at 0.01 level |                 |

Table 1 shows a correlation between procrastination and self-regulation. The obtained correlation coefficient of -0.064 suggests a weak negative correlation between these two variables.

**Table 2: Correlation between procrastination and locus of control**

|                             | Procrastination |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Internal LOC                | 0.199*          |
| Powerful                    | 0.285**         |
| Chance                      | 0.252*          |
| *Significant at 0.05 level  |                 |
| **Significant at 0.01 level |                 |

Table 2 shows a correlation between procrastination and locus of control. A correlation coefficient of 0.199 suggests a low positive relationship between procrastination with internal dimension of locus of control. A correlation coefficient of 0.285 suggests a moderate positive correlation between procrastination and the belief in Powerful Others dimension of locus of control. A correlation coefficient of 0.252 suggests a low to moderate positive correlation between procrastination and the belief in Chance dimension of locus of control.

**Table 3: Correlation between self-regulation and locus of control**

|                             | Self-regulation |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Internal LOC                | 0.437**         |
| Powerful                    | 0.009           |
| Chance                      | 0.14            |
| *Significant at 0.05 level  |                 |
| **Significant at 0.01 level |                 |

Table 3 shows a correlation among self-regulation and locus of control. A correlation coefficient of 0.437 indicates a moderate positive correlation among self-regulation and internal dimension of locus of control. However, for the correlation among self-regulation and the belief in Powerful Others (0.009) dimension of locus of control, and the correlation

## Examining the Relationship between Procrastination, Self-Regulation and Locus of Control among Young Adults

among self-regulation and the belief in chance (0.14) dimension of locus of control, both fall into the low range.

**Table 4: t-test with respect to the gender of the participant in procrastination**

|                 | Criterion | Mean | Std. Deviation | t    | p    | df |
|-----------------|-----------|------|----------------|------|------|----|
| Procrastination | Males     | 2.88 | 0.769          | 1.98 | 0.98 | 98 |
|                 | Females   | 2.88 | 0.882          |      |      |    |

Table 4 illustrates mean differences between men and women for procrastination. The value came out to be non-significant as  $p(0.98) > 0.05$ .

**Table 5: t-test with respect to the gender of the participant in self-regulation**

|                 | Criterion | Mean   | Std. Deviation | t     | p     | df |
|-----------------|-----------|--------|----------------|-------|-------|----|
| Self-regulation | Males     | 105.68 | 107.26         | 1.984 | 0.563 | 98 |
|                 | Females   | 15.93  | 15.93          |       |       |    |

Table 5 illustrates mean differences between men and women for procrastination. The value came out to be non-significant as  $p(0.563) > 0.05$ .

## DISCUSSION

This study examines the relationship among procrastination, self-regulation, and locus of control in young adults aged 18-25. The research also aims to investigate potential gender differences in these variables, shedding light on how procrastination tendencies and regulatory mechanisms vary across gender within this age group. A sample of 100 participants was recruited, comprising 50 male young adults and 50 female young adults, aged between 18 and 25 years. Participants were selected using purposive and convenience sampling techniques to ensure representation from diverse backgrounds and experiences. Self-report data were collected from participants through a Google Form comprising validated measures of procrastination, self-regulation, and locus of control. Following the data collection, statistical analysis was conducted.

The *first hypothesis* posited a significant negative correlation between procrastination and self-regulation. The computed correlation coefficient,  $r = -.064$ ,  $p < .05$ , point towards a statistically significant but very weak negative correlation between procrastination and self-regulation. This small negative correlation suggests that as self-regulation improves, procrastination decreases marginally. Therefore, the first hypothesis is accepted.

This finding aligns with previous literature suggesting an inverse relationship between procrastination and self-regulation (Steel, 2007; Sirois & Pychyl, 2013). It implies that individuals who are better able to regulate their behaviour and manage their time effectively are less likely to engage in procrastination behaviours. The study by Zarrin et al. (2020) supports the hypothesis that as levels of self-regulation increases, procrastination tends to decrease slightly. The study revealed a negative association among self-regulation and procrastination, suggesting that as self-regulation strategies increase, procrastination tends to decrease. The study also found that high levels of responsibility predict low procrastination, while low responsibility and high fear of failure predict high procrastination. This suggests that self-regulation plays a significant role in reducing procrastination.

## Examining the Relationship between Procrastination, Self-Regulation and Locus of Control among Young Adults

Bandura, Zimmerman, and Martinez-Pons (1992) found evidence to support the theory that lower levels of self-regulation are associated with higher levels of procrastination. The study discovered that self-efficacy, a powerful predictor of performance, had an adverse association with procrastination. This shows that those with better self-efficacy, or belief in their ability to perform the tasks required to complete a task, are less prone to delay. The study also discovered that a strong conviction in one's self-regulatory abilities offers the motivation to finish schoolwork and engage in class learning, demonstrating the relevance of self-regulation in minimising procrastination.

The *second hypothesis* stated that there will be a significant association between procrastination and the Internal dimension of locus of control. The correlation value of  $r = 0.199$ ,  $p < .05$  suggests a statistically significant positive relation among both variables. This means that people with internal locus of control are more prone to participate in procrastinating practices. The positive correlation observed in this study aligns with previous literature suggesting a link among internal locus of control and procrastination tendencies (Ferrari, 1992; Steel, 2007). It implies that individuals who think they have influence over the outcomes of their actions may delay tasks due to a perception that they can manage the consequences effectively. Other factors beyond locus of control, such as personality traits, motivational factors, or situational contexts, may also contribute to procrastination behaviors (Tice & Baumeister, 1997; Van Eerde, 2003).

The *third hypothesis* posited a correlation between procrastination and the belief in Powerful Others, dimension of locus of control. The correlation value of  $r = 0.285$ ,  $p < .05$  suggests a statistically significant difference positive correlation exists among the two variables. This finding suggests that individuals who perceive external forces or powerful individuals as having significant control over their outcomes are more likely to engage in procrastination behaviors.

The *fourth hypothesis* proposed a correlation between procrastination and the belief in Chance dimension of locus of control. The correlation value of  $r = 0.252$ ,  $p < .05$  suggests a statistically significant positive relationship between these two variables. This study indicates that those who ascribe outcomes to chance or luck are more likely to engage in procrastination behaviours. The study conducted by Kachgal, Hansen, and Nutter (1999) revealed that individuals with an external locus of control tend to exhibit higher levels of academic procrastination, indicating a positive connection among external locus of control and procrastination behaviors. This finding supports the hypothesis, which proposes a positive correlation among procrastination and an external locus of control. Similarly, Zarzycka, Liszewski, and Marzel (2021) found that religious individuals who relinquish control of their lives to God are less likely to procrastinate, suggesting that perceived control influences procrastination tendencies. Together, these studies provide compelling evidence supporting the notion of a positive relationship between external locus of control and procrastination.

Self-regulation and internal locus of control were proposed as having a correlation in the *fifth hypothesis*. The correlation coefficient of  $r = 0.437$ ,  $p < .01$  indicates a statistically significant positive association among these two variables. This research suggests that individuals with higher degree of self-regulation are more likely to possess an internal locus of control, reflecting a belief that individuals have influence over their own results and experiences. The findings are also supported by studies done by Nicholas (1994) and

## Examining the Relationship between Procrastination, Self-Regulation and Locus of Control among Young Adults

Suleiman Nejad (2000) which identified a strong and positive correlation among self-regulation and internal LOC supporting the idea that individuals with an internal locus of control often exhibit higher levels of self-regulation.

The *sixth hypothesis* posited a correlation between self-regulation and the belief in Powerful Others, dimension of locus of control. The obtained correlation coefficient of  $r = 0.009$  indicates a statistically non-significant weak positive correlation between these two variables. This result implies that people's capacity for self-regulation and their conviction that Powerful Others determines outcomes are not significantly correlated.

The *seventh hypothesis* proposed a correlation between self-regulation and the belief in Chance, dimension of locus of control. The obtained correlation coefficient of  $r = 0.14$  indicates a statistically non-significant weak positive correlation between these two variables. This finding suggests that there is no significant relationship between individuals' self-regulation abilities and their belief in chance as determinants of outcomes. Once again, the lack of a substantial association highlights the diverse nature of individual beliefs and behaviors. Independent of their belief in chance, other factors may play a larger role in molding people's self-regulation abilities. The study's non-significant weak positive correlation between self-regulation and belief in chance raises the possibility that variables other than belief in chance may have a greater impact on people's capacity for self-regulation.

The *eighth hypothesis* sought to determine if males and females differed significantly in their procrastinating tendencies. However, there were no statistically significant variations in procrastination between the two genders. This conclusion may come as a surprise, given that gender differences in procrastination have been observed in prior research (Steel, 2007). However, these findings must be interpreted in light of the current study's sample size and methods. This suggests that factors other than gender may be more influential in determining levels of procrastination among individuals.

The *ninth hypothesis* aimed to investigate whether there were significant differences among males and females concerning self-regulation abilities. However, the obtained p-value of 0.563 suggests that there were no statistically significant differences found between the two genders in terms of self-regulation. Similarly, for the ninth hypothesis, the non-significant p-value suggests that gender does not significantly affect individuals' self-regulation abilities. This implies that both males and females may possess similar levels of self-regulation, and gender alone may not be a reliable predictor of self-regulatory behaviors.

## CONCLUSION

In conclusion, this study aimed to investigate the relationships between procrastination, self-regulation, and locus of control among young adults aged 18-25, while also exploring potential gender differences in these variables. Through a comprehensive analysis of the obtained data, several key findings have emerged.

Firstly, the investigation revealed a weak negative correlation between procrastination and self-regulation, implying that individuals with better self-regulation skills tend to procrastinate less. Additionally, positive correlations were found between procrastination and Internal, the Powerful Others and Chance dimension of Locus of Control. Furthermore, a significant positive correlation was identified between self-regulation and internal locus of

## Examining the Relationship between Procrastination, Self-Regulation and Locus of Control among Young Adults

control, suggesting that individuals with stronger self-regulation abilities are more likely to believe in their ability to control outcomes. However, no significant relationships were found between self-regulation and beliefs in Powerful Others or Chance dimension of locus of Control.

Regarding gender differences, the study found there are no significant difference between males and females in terms of procrastination tendencies or self-regulation abilities. These findings underscore the complexity of individual differences and highlight the need for further research to elucidate the interplay between gender and psychological variables.

In summary, this study contributes valuable insights into the psychological dynamics of procrastination, self-regulation, and locus of control among young adults, illuminating the variables that affect behavior and the processes involved in making decisions.

### **Limitations and implication**

While the study provides useful insights into the connection between procrastination, self-regulation, and locus of control in young adults aged 18 to 25, some limitations should be considered. The sample size of 100 individuals obtained through convenience sampling may restrict the findings' generalizability. Furthermore, relying on self-report measures for characteristics like procrastination and locus of control creates potential biases, and the cross-sectional design makes proving causal correlations impossible. Despite these limitations, the findings of the study have important implications. The findings might guide therapies that emphasise self-regulation abilities to reduce procrastinating tendencies, particularly in educational contexts where procrastination affects academic achievement. Individualised support techniques can be devised based on understanding individual variances in regulatory processes. Further study using longitudinal designs and bigger, more varied samples might help us better understand these dimensions across age groups and cultural settings, improving the efficacy of treatments and support systems.

### **REFERENCES**

- Bembenutty, H., & Zimmerman, B. J. (2003). *The relation of motivational beliefs and self-regulatory processes to homework completion and academic achievement*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, IL, United States. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED477449.pdf>
- Chen, Y., & Lin, Y. (2018). Validation of the short self-regulation questionnaire for Taiwanese College Students (TSSRQ). *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 259. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00259>
- EdInstruments. (n.d.). *Pure Procrastination Scale (PPS)*. <https://edinstruments.org/instruments/pure-procrastination-scale-pps>
- 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.
- Gafni, R., & Geri, N. (2010). Time management: Procrastination tendency in individual and collaborative tasks. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Information, Knowledge, and Management*, 5, 115–125. <https://doi.org/10.28945/1127>
- Guilera, G., López-Martínez, M. D., Barrios, M., Hidalgo, M. D., Steel, P., & Gómez-Benito, J. (2024). Spanish validation of the Pure Procrastination Scale: Dimensional structure, internal consistency, temporal stability, gender invariance, and relationships with

## Examining the Relationship between Procrastination, Self-Regulation and Locus of Control among Young Adults

- personality and satisfaction with life. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, Article 1268855. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1268855>
- Kourmoussi, N., Xythali, V., & Koutras, V. (2015). Reliability and validity of the Multidimensional Locus of Control IPC scale in a sample of 3668 Greek educators. *Social Sciences*, 4(4), 1067–1078. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci4041067>
- Levenson, H. (1973). Multidimensional locus of control in psychiatric patients. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 41(3), 397–404. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0035357>
- Levenson, H. (n.d.). *Reliability and validity of the I, P, and C scales: A multidimensional view of locus of control*. ERIC. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED087791>
- Ros, R. G., Pérez-González, F., Tomás, J. M., & Sancho, P. (2022). Effects of self-regulated learning and procrastination on academic stress, subjective well-being, and academic achievement in secondary education. *Current Psychology*, 42(30), 26602–26616. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-03759-8>
- Rozental, A., Forsell, E., Svensson, A., Andersson, G., Carlbring, P., & Persson, A. (2014). Psychometric evaluation of the Swedish version of the Pure Procrastination Scale, the Irrational Procrastination Scale, and the Susceptibility to Temptation Scale in a clinical population. *BMC Psychology*, 2, Article 54. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-014-0054-z>
- Salguero-Pazos, M. R., & De Cózar, S. R. (2023). Interventions to reduce academic procrastination: A systematic review. *International Journal of Educational Research*, 121, 102228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2023.102228>
- Sari, W. L., & Fakhruddiana, F. (2019). Internal locus of control, social support and academic procrastination among students in completing the thesis. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 8(2), 363. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v8i2.17043>
- Sénécal, C., Julien, É., & Guay, F. (2003). Role conflict and academic procrastination: A self-determination perspective. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33(1), 135–145. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.144>
- Siaputra, I. B. (2010). Temporal motivation theory: Best theory (yet) to explain procrastination. *Anima Indonesian Psychological Journal*, 25(3), 206–214. [http://repository.ubaya.ac.id/23844/1/V\\_025\\_N\\_003\\_A\\_007.pdf](http://repository.ubaya.ac.id/23844/1/V_025_N_003_A_007.pdf)
- Sirois, F. M., & Pychyl, T. A. (2013). Procrastination and the priority of short-term mood regulation: Consequences for future self. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 7(2), 115–127. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12011>
- Steel, P. (2007). The nature of procrastination: A meta-analytic and theoretical review of quintessential self-regulatory failure. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(1), 65–94. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.133.1.65>
- Svartdal, F., & Steel, P. (2017). Irrational delay revisited: Examining five procrastination scales in a global sample. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01927>
- Zarzycka, B., Liszewski, T., & Marzel, M. (2019). Religion and behavioral procrastination: Mediating effects of locus of control and content of prayer. *Current Psychology*, 40(7), 3216–3225. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-00251-8>
- Zuber, S., Cauvin, S., Haas, M., Daviet, A. S., Da Silva Coelho, C., & Kliegel, M. (2020). Do self-reports of procrastination predict actual behavior? *International Journal of Methods in Psychiatric Research*, 29(4), Article e1843. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mpr.1843>

## Examining the Relationship between Procrastination, Self-Regulation and Locus of Control among Young Adults

### ***Acknowledgment***

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:*** Gusain, S. & Arora, S. (2026). Examining the Relationship between Procrastination, Self-Regulation and Locus of Control among Young Adults. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 14(3), 1085-1098. DIP:18.01.093.20261403, DOI:10.25215/1403.093