Academic Motivation and Academic Procrastination in relation to Personality Traits among Lunglei Government College.

Submitted in partial fulfilment of Bachelor of Social Work,2024

Submitted by

DEBORAH SAIRINPUII FANAI

BSW V-SEMESTER

Roll No.2223BSW002

Supervisor

RTC LALREMRUATA

Higher And Technical Institute Mizoram (HATIM)

Department of Social Work

Kawmzawl, Lunglei-796691

Department of Social Work, HATIM

November, 2024

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the research, **'Academic Motivation, and Academic Procrastination in Relation to Personality Trait among College Students at Lunglei Government College'** submitted by Ms. Deborah Sairinpuii Fanai for the partial fulfilment of the Bachelor of Social Work is carried out under my guidance and incorporates the student's bonafide research and this has not been submitted for any award, degree or for any other institution of learning.

(ROSANGLIANA KHIANGTE)
Head of Department
Department of Social Work
Higher and Technical Institute, Mizoram

(RTC LALREMRUATA)
Fieldwork Supervisor
Department of Social Work
Higher and Technical Institute, Mizoram

ACKNOWLEDGE

First and foremost, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Almighty God for granting me the strength, knowledge, and perseverance to complete this research.

I extend my sincere appreciation to my research supervisor, Sir Rtc Lalremruata, Assistant Professor, Department of Social Work, HATIM, for his continuous support, invaluable guidance, insightful feedback, and encouragement throughout the course of this study. Your expertise and advice have been crucial to the development of my research.

I am also grateful to the faculty and staff of Lunglei Government College for their assistance and cooperation in facilitating this research. Special thanks to the college administration for granting me permission to conduct my study among the students, as well as to the students who willingly participated in this research by providing essential data and insights.

Lastly, I would like to acknowledge my family and friends for their unwavering support, patience, and encouragement, which motivated me throughout this journey. Your faith in my abilities has been a constant source of inspiration.

Thank you all for your support and contribution to this research endeavor.

(Deborah Sairinpuii Fanai)

Table	List of Tables	PageNo

APPENDICS

i. References

- Akpu r, U. (2017). Predictive and Explanatory Relationship Model between Procrastination, Motivation, Anxiety and Academic Achievement. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com
- Andrasko, S., & et al. (2022). Procrastination of University Students in the context of Personality and Academic Motivation. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/363876474
- Cao, L. (2021). Differences in procrastination and motivation between undergraduate and graduate students. Retrieved from https://www.frontiersin.org
- Cerino, S. (2014). Relationships Between Academic Motivation, Self-Efficacy, and Academic Procrastination. Eastern Connecticut State University. Retrieved from https://www.easternct.edu
- Faruk, E. (2011). Academic procrastination among undergraduates attending school of physical education and sports: Role of general procrastination, academic motivation and academic self-efficacy. Selcuk University, Konya, Turkey. Retrieved from https://www.selcuk.edu.tr
- Himani, B. (2022). Academic Procrastination among Senior Secondary School Students in Relation to their Personality Traits, Parental Education and Academic Motivation. Maharshi Dayanand University, Rohtak. Retrieved from https://www.mdurohtak.ac.in
- Jensen, M. (2015). Personality Traits, Learning and Academic Achievements. Department of Applied Information Technology, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden. Retrieved from https://www.gu.se
- Karademir, E. (2022). The Relationship between Self-Control and General Procrastination in University Students: The Mediating Role of Optimism. The Universal Academic Research Journal. Retrieved from https://www.universalacademicresearch.com
- Karatas, H. (2015). Correlation among Academic Procrastination, Personality Traits, and Academic Achievement. Curriculum and Instruction Department, Yildiz Technical University, Istanbul, Turkey. Retrieved from https://www.ytu.edu.tr
- Khosla, A. (2021). Academic Procrastination and Personality Traits in College Students. The International Journal of Indian Psychology. Retrieved from http://ijip.in

- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1999). The Five-Factor Model of Personality: Implications for Research and Practice. The Annual Review of Psychology. Retrieved from https://www.annualreviews.org
- Nigam, R., & Srivastava, S. (2021). Relationship Between Personality Traits and Academic Procrastination Among College Students: A Correlational Study. Amity Institute of Behavioral and Allied Sciences, Amity University Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow Campus, India. Retrieved from https://www.amity.edu
- Ocansey, G., & et al. (2020). The Influence of Personality Types on Academic Procrastination Among Undergraduate Students. International Journal of School & Educational Psychology. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com
- Pathak, D. R. (2020). Relationship between personality traits and Academic Procrastination. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/343750198
- Rajapakshe, W. (2021). The Impact of Academic Procrastination, Self-Efficacy, and Motivation on Academic Performance: Among Undergraduates in Non-State Universities in Sri Lanka. SLIIT Business School, Sri Lanka Institute of Information Technology. Retrieved from https://www.sliit.lk
- Rovan, D. (2019). The role of personality in motivational regulation and academic procrastination. Educational Psychology: An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com
- Sprock, C., & Villalba-Condori, J. (2022). Relationship between Academic Procrastination and Attributions of Achievement Motivation. Retrieved from https://www.tandfonline.com
- Steel, P., & Klingsieck, K. (2016). Academic Procrastination: Psychological Antecedents Revisited. Haskayne School of Business, University of Calgary, and Psychology Department, University of Paderborn. Retrieved from https://www.springer.com
- Wang, H., & et al. (2023). The influences of the Big Five personality traits on academic achievements: Chain mediating effect based on major identity and self-efficacy. School of Business, China University of Political Science and Law. Retrieved from https://www.sciencedirect.com
- Yongme, C. (2024). Relationship between Personality Traits and Learning Burnout among Undergraduates: Mediating Effect of General Procrastination. Guangdong Medical University. Retrieved from https://www.gdmu.edu.cn

Schedule No.___

Academic Motivation and Academic Procrastination in relation to Personality trait among College students at Hnahthial

Researcher

Roseline Zorinsangi

Department of Social Work
Higher And Technical Institute, Mizoram

Research Supervisor

RTC Lalremruata

Department of Social Work

(The statements given below are confidential and will be used for research purposes only)

I. Profile of the respondents

Sl.no	**Particulars**	**Response**
1	Age	
2	Sex	1)Male 2)Female
3	Religion	1)Christian 2)Hindu 3)Muslim 4)Others
4	Family Type	1)Nuclear 2)Joint 3)Extended
5	Forms of Family	1)Stable 2)Dysfunction 3)Reconstitute 4)Other
6	Family Occupation	1)Gov't employee 2)Business 3)wage Labour 4)Farmers 5)Others
7	Socio-Economic status	1)APL2)BPL 3)AAY 4)PHH
8	Community	1)Rural 2)Urban
9	Last semester SGPA/percentage	
10	Department	

Please rate your opinion on the following statements.

Sl.no	Particulars	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Neutral	Slightly Agree	Agree
1	I usually allocate time to review and proofread my work.					
2	I put off project until the last minute.					
3	I have found myself waiting until the day before to start a big project					
4	I know I should work on school work, but I just don't do it.					
5	When working on school work, I usually get distracted by other things.					
6	I waste a lot of time on unimportant things.					
7	I get distracted by other, more fun, when I am supported to work on schoolwork.					
8	I concentrate on school work instead of other distraction.					
9	I can't focus on school work or projects for more than an hour until I get distracted.					
10	My attention span for school work is very short.					
11	Tests are mean to be studied for just the night before.					
12	I feel prepared well in advance for most tests.					
13	"Cramming" and last minute studying is the best way that I study for a big test.					
14	I allocate time so I don't have to "cram" at the end of the semester.					
15	I only study the night before exams.					
16	If an0 assignment is due at midnight, I will work on it until 11:59.					
17	When given an assignment, I usually put it away and forget about it until it is almost due.					
18	Friends usually distract me from school work					
19	I find myself talking to friends or family instead of working on school work.					
20	On the weekend, I make plans to do homework and projects, but I get distracted and hang out with friends.					
21	I tend to put off things for the next day.					
22	I don't spend much time studying school material until the end of the semester.					
23	I frequently find myself putting important deadlines off.					
24	If I don't understand something, I'll usually waits until the night before a test to figure it out.					
25	I read the textbook and look over note before coming to class and listening to a lecture or teacher.					

Please rate your opinion on the following statements.

Sl.no	Particulars	Disagree	Slightly disagree	Neutral	Slightly agree	Agree
1	Am the life of the party.					
2	Feel little concern for others.					
3	Am always prepared.					
4	Get stressed out easily.					
5	Have a rich vocabulary.					
6	Don't talk a lot.					
7	Am interested in people.					
8	Leave my belongings around.					
9	Am relaxed most of the time.					
10	Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.					
11	Feel comfortable around people.					
12	Insult people.					
13	Pay attention to details.					
14	Worry about things.					
15	Have a vivid imagination.					
16	Keep in the background.					
17	Sympathize with others' feelings.					
18	Make a mess of things.					
19	Seldom feel blue.					
20	Am not interested in abstract ideas.					
21	Start conversations.					
22	Am not interested in abstract ideas.					
23	Get chores done right away.					
24	Am easily disturbed.					
25	Have excellent ideas.					
26	Have little to say.					
27	Have a soft heart.					
28	Often forget to put things back in their proper place.					
29	Get upset easily.					
30	Do not have a good imagination.					
31	Talk to a lot of different people at parties					
32	Am not really interested in others.					
33	Like order.					
34	Change my mood a lot.					
35	Am quick to understand things.					
36	Don't like to draw attention to myself.					
37	Take time out for others.					

38	Shirk my duties.					
39	Have frequent mood swings.					
40	Use difficult words.					
41	Don’t mind being the centre of attention.					
42	Feel others’ emotions.					
43	Follow a schedule.					
44	Get irritated easily.					
45	Spend time reflecting on things.					
46	Am quiet around strangers.					
47	Make people feel at ease.					
48	Am exacting in my work.					
49	Often feel blue.					
50	Am full of ideas.					

Academic Motivation Scale (AMS-C 28)

On a scale of 1-7, 1 being strongly disagree and 7 being strongly agree please rate your opinion

Sl.No.	**Particulars**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1	Because with only a high-school degree I would not find a high-paying job later on.							
2	Because I experience pleasure and satisfaction while learning new things.							
3	Because I think that a college education will help me better prepare for the career I have chosen.							
4	For the intense feelings I experience when I am communicating my own ideas to others.							
5	Honestly, I don't know; I really feel that I am wasting my time in school.							
6	For the pleasure I experience while surpassing myself in my studies.							
7	To prove to myself that I am capable of completing my college degree.							
8	In order to obtain a more prestigious job later on.							
9	For the pleasure I experience when I discover new things never seen before.							
10	Because eventually it will enable me to enter the job market in a field that I like.							
11	For the pleasure that I experience when I read interesting authors.							
12	I once had good reasons for going to college; however, now I wonder whether I should continue.							
13	For the pleasure that I experience while I am surpassing myself in one of my personal accomplishments.							
14	Because of the fact that when I succeed in college I feel important.							
15	Because I want to have "the good life" later on.							
16	For the pleasure that I experience in broadening my knowledge about subjects which appeal to me.							
17	Because this will help me make a better choice regarding my career orientation.							
18	For the pleasure that I experience when I feel completely absorbed by what certain authors have written.							
19	I can't see why I go to college and frankly, I couldn't care less.							
20	For the satisfaction I feel when I am in the process of accomplishing difficult academic activities.							
21	To show myself that I am an intelligent person.							
22	In order to have a better salary later on.							
23	Because my studies allow me to continue to learn about many things that interest me.							
24	Because I believe that a few additional years of education will improve my competence as a worker.							
25	For the "high" feeling that I experience while reading about various interesting subjects.							
26	I don't know; I can't understand what I am doing in school.							

27	Because college allows me to experience a personal satisfaction in my quest for excellence in my studies.							
28	Because I want to show myself that I can succeed in my studies.							

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study aims to explore the intricate relationships between academic motivation and academic procrastination, examining how these behavioral patterns correlate with specific personality traits among college students.

1.1 Academic motivation

Academic motivation, which refers to the intrinsic and extrinsic factors driving students towards educational success, plays a crucial role in determining academic outcomes, while academic procrastination, characterized by the intentional delay of academic tasks despite potential negative consequences, often acts as a barrier to achieving those outcomes.

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation

Motivation in the context of education can be divided into two main categories: intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. These terms refer to the different reasons or driving forces behind why students engage in academic tasks, such as studying, completing assignments, or attending classes.

Intrinsic Motivation

Intrinsic motivation arises from within the individual and is driven by personal satisfaction, interest, or enjoyment in the task itself. When a student is intrinsically motivated, they perform academic tasks because they find them inherently rewarding. For instance, a student may study biology because they are fascinated by the subject and want to learn more about living organisms, not because they are being rewarded with good grades or recognition. Intrinsic motivation is often associated with deeper learning and higher levels of engagement. It is self-driven, meaning students who are intrinsically motivated tend to pursue knowledge for its own sake and are more likely to persist in learning activities even when faced with challenges.

Extrinsic Motivation

On the other hand, extrinsic motivation is driven by external factors or rewards that are separate from the activity itself. Students who are extrinsically motivated perform tasks to earn rewards or avoid negative consequences. For example, a student might study hard for an exam to get a good grade, receive praise from parents or teachers, or avoid failing the course.

Unlike intrinsic motivation, where the activity is the reward, extrinsic motivation focuses on the outcome of the activity. While extrinsic motivation can be effective, especially in achieving short-term goals, it may not foster a long-lasting commitment to learning in the same way that intrinsic motivation does.

1.2 Academic Procrastination

Academic procrastination is defined as the act of delaying or postponing academic tasks, such as studying, completing assignments, or preparing for exams, despite knowing that such delays may lead to negative consequences.

According to Steel (2007), procrastination is “the voluntary delay of an intended action despite expecting to be worse off for the delay.” This behavior is often driven by factors like fear of failure, perfectionism, lack of motivation, and poor time management skills.

Research indicates that procrastination is common among students and can have significant adverse effects, including increased stress, anxiety, and a decline in academic performance. For instance, a study by van Eerde (2003) found that procrastination is significantly correlated with lower academic achievement and higher levels of stress. To combat academic procrastination, various strategies can be employed, such as setting specific and achievable goals, breaking tasks into smaller, manageable parts, creating structured schedules, and utilizing self-regulation techniques to maintain motivation and accountability. By addressing the underlying causes and implementing effective time management strategies, students can reduce procrastination and enhance their academic success.

1.3 Personality Traits

The Big Five personality traits are a widely accepted model used to describe human personality. These five traits are conscientiousness, openness to experience, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism are thought to influence various behaviors, including academic motivation and procrastination.

Conscientiousness

Conscientious individuals tend to be organized, disciplined, and goal-oriented. They are more likely to be intrinsically motivated because they take pride in their work and find

satisfaction in completing tasks efficiently. These individuals are less likely to procrastinate because they value responsibility and strive to achieve their academic goals.

Openness to Experience

This trait is characterized by curiosity, imagination, and a willingness to explore new ideas. Students high in openness are often intrinsically motivated because they find academic tasks exciting and intellectually stimulating. They enjoy learning for the sake of knowledge and personal growth, making them less reliant on external rewards.

Extroversion

Extroverts are typically outgoing, energetic, and enjoy social interaction. They may be motivated by extrinsic factors such as recognition from others or the desire to achieve social success. In an academic setting, extraverts may perform well when tasks involve collaboration or public recognition, but they may struggle with solitary or monotonous tasks, leading to procrastination.

Agreeableness

Individuals high in agreeableness are cooperative, empathetic, and eager to please others. Their motivation can be both intrinsic and extrinsic, depending on the situation. For example, an agreeable student may be intrinsically motivated to help classmates in group projects, but they may also be extrinsically motivated to avoid conflict or meet the expectations of others.

Neuroticism

Neuroticism is associated with emotional instability, anxiety, and a tendency to experience negative emotions. Students high in neuroticism are more likely to experience stress and fear of failure, which can lead to academic procrastination. They may avoid tasks that they perceive as difficult or stressful, even though they know this avoidance will have negative consequences.

1.4 Interactions Between Motivation, Procrastination, and Personality

The interaction between these various personality traits and types of motivation is complex. For example, a highly conscientious student may use both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation to complete tasks on time, avoiding procrastination entirely. Conversely, a student high in neuroticism may struggle with procrastination, even if they are motivated by external factors, due to overwhelming anxiety or fear of failure.

Understanding how intrinsic and extrinsic motivations align with the Big Five personality traits can provide educators with valuable insights. For instance, teachers might design curricula that cater to different personality types, offering both intrinsic rewards (like intellectually stimulating material) and extrinsic rewards (like grades or recognition) to engage a wide range of students. Additionally, strategies to reduce procrastination can be tailored to students' personality traits, helping them overcome barriers to academic success.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Cerino S (2014) in his study *"Relationships Between Academic Motivation, Self-Efficacy, and Academic Procrastination"* reported that people put off work in schools and jobs, even though they know it's bad. This is happening more because rules are looser and there are more distractions at work. This leads to missed goals, disappointment, and problems with others. It mentions that procrastination is linked to age, gender, stress, and personality. People who are more organized tend to procrastinate less, especially college students. The article also explains that students who are motivated by personal satisfaction or rewards do better at completing tasks.

Andrasko et.al (2022) conducted a study on "*Procrastination of University Students in the context of Personality and Academic Motivation."* It was reported that putting off schoolwork is common and causes a lot of stress, bad sleep, guilt, and feeling like you can't do things well. Even when students want to stop procrastinating, they often keep doing it, choosing fun activities over studying. This behavior is influenced by personality traits, like being anxious, organized, or outgoing, and motivation, whether it's from personal goals or wanting recognition from others. Tasks that seem boring or have deadlines far away are more likely to be delayed. Research shows that understanding personality and motivation is key to solving this problem.

Karatas (2015) Conducted a study on Turkey "*Correlation among Academic Procrastination, Personality Traits, and Academic Achievement*" shows that many students do other things instead of studying, leading to poor grades and stress. This behavior is related to personality traits, where being anxious makes procrastination worse, but being organized helps avoid it. Motivation, confidence in one's abilities, and personality traits are important to improve performance in school. Procrastination harms learning, self-esteem, and grades, so it's important to understand how it relates to personality and school success. This study will look at how procrastination, personality, and grades are connected, considering factors like gender and grade level.

Karademir conducted a study on "The *Relationship between Self-Control and General Procrastination in University Students: The Mediating Role of Optimism"* which examines the relationship between self-control, procrastination, and optimism among university students. It finds that higher self-control is linked to lower procrastination, and higher optimism is associated with both increased self-control and reduced procrastination. Additionally, optimism partially mediates the relationship between self-control and procrastination.

Khosla (2021) studied *"Academic Procrastination and Personality Traits in College Students"* and reported that students often delay their academic work, which can become a serious problem affecting their success. Studies show that around 75% of students struggle with procrastination, impacting their ability to complete tasks despite their skills looking at differences based on gender and education level. With 100 participants aged 18-25, this study aims to address gaps in research, particularly those focused on Western cultures.

HIMANI (2022) conducted a study on "*Academic Procrastination among SR. SEC. School students in relation to their Personality Traits, Parental Education and Academic Motivation.*" The study reveals that academic success involves high grades and future job stability, supported by confidence and hard work. Emotional skills help manage stress, but violence and external pressures can impact academic performance, leading to increased dropouts and suicides. It's vital for families and schools to support students' mental health and guide them in overcoming procrastination and distractions. Addressing these issues can significantly enhance students' academic and personal development.

Sprock and Villalba-Condori (2022) in their study "*Relationship between Academic Procrastination and Attributions of Achievement Motivation"* explores how academic procrastination relates to students' views on their success. First, it adapted a motivation scale for secondary students and confirmed it was valid. Then, it found that procrastination is negatively related to how much students attribute their success to interest, ability, task features, and teacher feedback, and that age has little impact on procrastination.

Nigam and Srivastava () in their study "*Relationship Between Personality Traits and Academic Procrastination Among College Students: A Correlational Study"* examined the

link between personality traits and academic procrastination among 100 Indian undergraduates, aged 18 to 25, from various educational programs. Using the Procrastination Assessment Scale and the Big Five Inventory, it found that procrastination negatively correlates with extraversion but not with conscientiousness, agreeableness, openness, or neuroticism. This suggests that being more extroverted may reduce academic procrastination.

Yonge (2024) conducted study titled "*Relationship between Personality Traits and Learning Burnout among Undergraduates: Mediating Effect of General Procrastination."* The study looked at how personality traits, procrastination, and learning burnout are connected among 553 undergraduates from seven universities in Guangdong Province. It found that procrastination fully explains how personality traits like Psychoticism influence learning burnout, with procrastination accounting for 66.34% of this effect. This suggests that both procrastination and learning burnout are common issues, and improving personality traits and reducing procrastination could help lessen learning burnout.

Erkan Faruk (2011) in his work *"Academic procrastination among undergraduates attending school of physical education and sports: Role of general procrastination, academic motivation and academic self-efficacy"* reported that procrastination is a big problem for students with busy schedules. This study looked at whether general procrastination, motivation, and self-confidence affect how much students put off their academic work. It involved 774 students from three Turkish universities. The study found that general procrastination is strongly linked to putting off academic tasks, but motivation and self-confidence aren't. Procrastination varied by department and grade, but not by gender. The study discusses these findings and suggests ideas for future research.

Steel and Kling Sieck in their work "*Academic Procrastination: Psychological Antecedents Revisited*" shows that procrastination mainly comes from being less conscientious, but other personality traits affect how procrastination appears. In a group of 167 students in an online course, those who were less conscientious procrastinated more. While other traits didn't directly impact how much they procrastinated, they did influence why and how students procrastinated. So, understanding conscientiousness is crucial, but considering other traits helps in designing better ways to tackle procrastination.

Dr Pathak (2021) *"Relationship between personality traits and Academic Procrastination* "It discusses how procrastination, the act of delaying tasks or assignments, affects individuals in various areas of life, including mental, physical, and financial well-being. The focus is

primarily on academic procrastination, where students delay starting or completing academic tasks. It highlights that procrastination is a behavioral issue influenced by personality traits, which affect how individuals interact with their environment. Studies show that procrastination impacts both academic achievement and psychological well-being, with personality playing a key role. The research emphasizes the importance of understanding the relationship between personality and academic procrastination, suggesting the need for further studies on larger student populations across different educational levels.

McCrae & Costa (1999), in their study *"The Five-Factor Model of Personality: Implications for Research and Practice*" McCrae and Costa's work on the Five-Factor Model (FFM) of personality comprising openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism has become a dominant framework for understanding individual differences. Their research shows that conscientiousness is most strongly linked to academic success, with traits like self-discipline and organization leading to better outcomes. Openness is also associated with intellectual curiosity, contributing to a deeper engagement with learning. The study has broad implications for education, suggesting that understanding a student's personality profile can help tailor more effective learning strategies.

W Rajapakshe (2021) conducted a study titled *"The Impact of Academic Procrastination, Self-Efficacy, and Motivation on Academic Performance: Among Undergraduates in Non-State Universities in Sri Lanka"* which aims to explore the connection between academic procrastination and students' personality traits, specifically self-efficacy and motivation, in order to assess their influence on academic performance among undergraduates at non-state universities in Sri Lanka. The study analyzed data from a sample of 381 students from three non-state universities, selected through simple random sampling. To examine the relationships among self-efficacy, motivation, and academic performance, with academic procrastination acting as a mediator, a Structural Equation Model was utilized. The results showed that academic procrastination mediates the relationship between self-efficacy and motivation, directly affecting academic performance.

Cao L () conducted a study on *"Differences in procrastination and motivation between undergraduate and graduate students"*. It was reported that procrastination has become more widespread among students in recent years, but there is limited research directly comparing academic procrastination across different academic grade levels. This study utilized a self-regulated learning approach to examine procrastination types and related motivational factors

between undergraduate and graduate students. A total of 66 undergraduates and 68 graduate students completed questionnaires about their experiences in an educational psychology course. The findings indicated that students' perceptions of the usefulness of procrastination were a stronger predictor of academic procrastination than their self-efficacy beliefs or achievement goal orientations. Additionally, age was linked to the type of procrastination, with younger undergraduates more likely to engage in active procrastination, while older undergraduates tended to engage in passive procrastination. The study also discusses its implications and suggests future research directions.

Jensen M (2015) conducted a study in Sweden titled ***"****Personality Traits, Learning and Academic Achievements"* which indicates that personality traits affect learning and academic performance, often measured by Grade Point Average (GPA). This review highlights key factors linking personality traits to learning and achievement, such as motivation and learning goals. It concludes that: (1) intrinsic motivation and deep learning approaches, related to the trait of openness, enhance knowledge and test performance; (2) a mix of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, along with achieving learning strategies linked to conscientiousness, leads to higher grades. Openness relates to learning, while conscientiousness relates to academic success.

Akpur (2017) in his study titled ***"****Predictive and Explanatory Relationship Model between Procrastination, Motivation, Anxiety and Academic Achievement"* aims to explore how procrastination, motivation, anxiety, and academic achievement are connected among university students. Using a causal research design with 211 participants, the researchers assessed motivation with the Academic Motivation Scale, anxiety with the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale, and procrastination with the Aitken Procrastination Inventory. Students' term grades were used to measure academic achievement. Data analysis through Structural Equation Modeling showed no significant link between anxiety and academic achievement. However, significant negative relationships were found between academic procrastination and motivation, as well as between procrastination and academic achievement. The study suggests a model to understand these relationships and highlights the importance of procrastination and motivation in predicting academic success, recommending future research on other related factors.

Wang H et.al (2023) in their work "*The influences of the Big Five personality traits on academic achievements: Chain mediating effect based on major identity and self-efficacy"* examined how personality traits influence students' academic achievements, focusing on business majors and the roles of major identity and self-efficacy as mediators. It found that extraversion and conscientiousness positively impact academic success mainly through self-efficacy, particularly in behavioral aspects. Openness also affects achievement through self-efficacy and major identity, but its impact is weak and not significant. In contrast, agreeableness negatively influences academic achievement primarily through direct effects. The results imply that academic success does not necessarily reflect students' teamwork abilities

Ocansey G et.al (2020) In their study "*The Influence of Personality Types on Academic Procrastination Among Undergraduate Students"* reported that academic procrastination is a widespread issue affecting university students worldwide, but its link to personality traits hasn't been studied in Ghana. This research involved 200 undergraduate students who completed the Academic Procrastination Scale and the Big Five Personality Inventory. The results showed that academic procrastination was linked to lower levels of openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, and agreeableness, and higher levels of neuroticism. Neuroticism was the strongest predictor of procrastination, followed by openness. The study suggests using these findings to create programs to help reduce procrastination based on these personality traits.

Lee et.al (2023) in their work "*Relationship between Personality and Academic Procrastination amongst Undergraduate Students in Selected Private Universities in Kuala Lumpur***"** examines the link between personality and academic procrastination among 150 undergraduate students at selected private universities in Kuala Lumpur, consisting of 106 females and 44 males. The findings indicate a significant relationship between personality and procrastination, with three out of five personality traits showing this connection at the 0.05 and 0.01 significance levels. Specifically, conscientiousness has a moderate negative relationship with procrastination ($r = .402$, $p < .01$), while neuroticism has a weak positive relationship ($r = .244$, $p < .01$), and agreeableness has a weak negative relationship ($r = -.161$, $p < .05$). However, openness to experience and extraversion showed no significant

correlations with procrastination. The study suggests that future research should explore these relationships in different countries and among diverse populations.

Rovan D(2019) in his work "*The role of personality in motivational regulation and academic procrastination"* examined how personality traits influence motivation and procrastination in students. It found that traits like conscientiousness, agreeableness, and intellect help students manage motivation better, especially through environmental control. This strategy, which reduces procrastination, can be taught, making it practically valuable. The Big Five personality traits explained 6% to 17% of differences in motivational regulation strategies, and both personality and motivation strategies were key predictors of procrastination.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

3.1 Statement of the problem

The purpose of this research is to understand how personality traits affect college students' motivation to study and their tendency to procrastinate. The goal is to help educators find better ways to encourage motivation, reduce procrastination, and improve students' academic performance based on their individual personalities.

The research is expected to uncover significant correlations between specific personality traits and academic outcomes, such as how higher conscientiousness relates to lower procrastination and increased motivation. These findings could inform targeted interventions aimed at enhancing academic performance by fostering positive personality traits and addressing procrastination. Ultimately, this research can help educators and counselors support students in overcoming procrastination and maximizing their academic success.

3.2 Objective

1. To identify the levels of academic procrastination among college students

2. To identify the pattern of academic motivation among college students

3. To identify the pattern of personality traits among college students

3.3 Hypotheses

1. There is a difference in the level of academic procrastination between male and female

2. There is a difference in the level of academic procrastination between students from rural and urban communities

3.There is a difference in the pattern of academic motivation between male and female

4. There is a difference in the pattern of academic motivation between students from rural and urban communities

5.There is a difference in the pattern of personality traits between male and female

6. There is a difference in the pattern of personality traits between students from rural and urban communities.

3.4 Methodology

Research design

The study employed descriptive research design. The data mainly consists of primary data collected using quantitative method.

Sampling

The study adopted disproportionate stratified random sampling. A total number of 60 respondent were selected where male and female constituted 30 each. The unit of study individual and all the student enrolled in Lunglei Government College constituted the population of the study.

Tools of Data collection

Primary data was collected using quantitative method. A structure interview schedule was administered to 60 respondent, standardized scale such as Big five personality traits scale, academic motivation scale, academic procrastination scale was utilized to assess the level of academic procrastination as well as the pattern of academic motivation and personality traits.

Data processing and analysis

Quantitative data were processed and analyzed using MS excel and SPSS. Descriptive statistics such as frequency, percentage, mean and standard deviation as well as inferential statistics i.e. t-test was utilized to compare the mean score of two independent groups.

CHAPTER IV

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Profile of the respondent:

The study consisted of 60 (male & female) college students representing diverse sections of the student population. The profile of the respondent is classified into sex, family types, form of family, department, community, previous academic performance, parents' occupation, and socio-economic status.

Sex

The distribution shows an equal number of respondents between males and females, with both groups representing 50.0% of the respondents, corresponding to 30 males and 30 females.

Family type

Half of the respondents (51.7%) come from joint families, followed by (40.0%) from nuclear families, and a smaller portion (8.3%) belonging to extended families.

Form of family

The vast majority of the respondents (95.0%) come from stable families, with 5.0%from dysfunctional families. There were no respondents from reconstituted or other family form, both accounting for 0.00%

Department

The majority of participants (63.3%) are from the geography department, History department (20.0%). Meanwhile (13.3%) are from Philosophy department, and (3.3%) belongs to English department.

Community

A majority of participants (55.0%) come from Rural areas, while (45.0%) reside in Urban communities.

Previous academic performance

The distribution of the respondents in terms of previous academic performance shows that (46.7%) of respondents achieved a first division, while (28.3%) obtained a second division, and (25.0%) secured a third division.

Parents occupation

Almost one third of the respondents' parents (31.7%) are government employees, followed by (26.7%) in business. Additionally, (21.7%) are agricultural farmers, (13.3%) are wage laborers and (6.7%) fall into other occupations.

Socio-economic status

The majority of respondents (60.0%) belongs to priority household, while (26.7%) are from non-NFSA household. A smaller portion (13.3%) falls under the AAY category.

Table 4.1 Profile of the respondents

Particulars		**Frequency**	**Percent**
Sex	Male	30	**Sex**
	Female	30	50.0
Family type	Nuclear	24	**Family type**
	Joint	31	51.7
	Extended	5	8.3
Forms of family	Stable	57	**Forms of family**
	Dysfunctional	3	5.0
	Reconstituted	0	0.00
	Others	0	0.00
Parent's Occupation	Gov't employee	19	**Parent's Occupation**
	Business	16	26.7
	Wage labor	8	13.3
	Agriculture farmer	13	21.7
	Others	4	6.7
Socio-economic status	AAY	8	**Socio-economic status**
	Priority Household	36	60.0
	Non-NFSA	16	26.7
Department	English	2	**Department**
	Geography	38	63.3
	History	12	20.0
	Philosophy	8	13.3
Community	Rural	33	**Community**
	Urban	27	45.0
Previous Academic	1DIV	28	**Previous**

Performance			**Academic Performance**
	2DIV	17	28.3
	3DIV	15	25.0

Source: Computed

4.2 Academic Procrastination

The descriptives statistics for Academic Procrastination reveal an overall mean of 3.1 (SD=0.4). This shows a moderate perception of Academic Procrastination amongst the respondents.

Table 4.2 Academic Procrastination

	N	Mean	SD
Academic Procrastination	60	3.1	0.4

Source: Computed

An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Overall Academic Procrastination for male and female college students. The mean score for male (m=77.0, SD=9.9) which was lower than and female (m= 77.1, sd =12.3). There were no significant differences (t =.035, df = 58, *p*=.972) in the perception on the overall Academic Procrastination between male and female college students.

An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Academic procrastination compile for rural and urban community among college students. The mean score for rural (m=75.8182, SD=11.32876) which was lower than and urban (m= 78.4815, sd =10.73589). There were no significant differences (t =.927, df = 58, *p*=.358) in the perception on the Academic procrastination between rural and urban students.

Table 4.3 T test: Academic Procrastination

	N	Mean	SD	T	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)

Gender	Male	30	77.0	9.9	-.035	58	.972
	Female	30	77.1	12.3			
Community	rural	33	75.8182	11.32876	-.927	58	.358
	urban	27	78.4815	10.73589			

Source: Computed

4.3 Academic Motivation

The descriptives statistics for Intrinsic to know reveal an overall mean of 2.8 (SD=0.7). This shows a moderate perception of Intrinsic to know amongst the respondents. The descriptives statistics for Intrinsic towards accomplishment reveal an overall mean of 2.8 (SD=0.7). This shows a moderate perception of Intrinsic towards accomplished amongst the respondents. The descriptives statistics for Intrinsic to experience reveal an overall mean of 2.8 (SD=0.7). This shows a moderate perception of Intrinsic to experience amongst the respondents. The descriptives statistics for Extrinsic identified reveal an overall mean of 2.9 (SD=0.7). This shows a moderate perception of Extrinsic identified amongst the respondents. The descriptives statistics for Extrinsic introjected reveal an overall mean of 3.1 (SD=0.8). This shows a moderate perception of Extrinsic introjected amongst the respondents. The descriptives statistics for Extrinsic Ext regulation reveal an overall mean of 2.9 (SD=0.7). This shows a moderate perception of Extrinsic regulation amongst the respondents. The descriptives statistics for Amotivation reveal an overall mean of 3.0 (SD=0.8). This shows a moderate perception of Amotivation amongst the respondents.

Table 4.4 Academic Motivation

Academic Motivation		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intrinsic Motivation	To know	60	2.8	0.7	2.8	0.6
	Towards Accomplishment	60	2.8	0.7		
	Experience Stimulation	60	2.8	0.7		

Extrinsic Motivation	Identified	60	2.9	0.7	2.9	0.6
	Introjected	60	3.1	0.8		
	External Regulation	60	2.9	0.7		
Amotivation	Amotivation	60	3.0	0.8	2.9	0.6

Source: Computed

4.3.1 Academic Motivation across gender

An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Intrinsic to know for male and female college students. The mean score for male (m=11.3, SD=3.1) which was lower than and female (m= 10.8, sd =2.7). There were no significant differences (t =.573, df = 58, *p*=.569) in the perception on the Intrinsic to know between male and female college students. An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Intrinsic towards accomplishment for male and female college students. The mean score for male (m=11.4, SD=1.9) which was lower than and female (m= 11.2, sd =3.4). There were no significant differences (t =.234, df = 58, *p*=.816) in the perception on the Intrinsic towards accomplishment between male and female college students. An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Intrinsic to experience for male and female college students. The mean score for male (m=10.9, SD=1.8) which was lower than and female (m= 11.4, sd =3.5). There were no significant differences (t =.648, df = 58, *p*=.520) in the perception on the Intrinsic to experience between male and female college students. An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Overall Intrinsic for male and female college students. The mean score for male (m=33.6, SD=4.4) which was lower than and female (m= 33.4, sd =8.4). There were no significant differences (t =.077, df = 58, *p*=.939) in the perception on the Overall Intrinsic between male and female college students.

An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Extrinsic Identified for male and female college students. The mean score for male (m=11.7, SD=2.2) which was lower than and female (m= 11.3, sd =3.1). There were no significant differences (t =.526, df = 58, *p*=.601) in the perception on the Extrintic Identified between male and female college students. An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Extrinsic Introjected for male and female college students. The mean score for male (m=12.4, SD=2.7) which was lower than and female (m= 12.0, sd =3.3). There were no significant differences (t =.591, df = 58, *p*=.557) in the perception on the Extrinsic Introjected between male and female college students. An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Extrinsic External regulation for male and female college students. The mean score for male (m=11.8, SD=2.6) which was lower than and female (m= 11.3, sd =3.4). There were no significant differences (t =.599, df = 58, *p*=.551) in the perception on the Extrinsic Ext regulation between male and female college students. An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Overall Extrinsic for male and female college students. The mean score for male (m=35.9, SD=5.2) which was lower than and female (m= 34.6, sd =8.6). There were no significant differences (t =.710, df = 58, *p*=.481) in the perception on the Overall Extrinsic between male and female college students.

An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Amotivation for male and female college students. The mean score for male (m=12.5, SD=3.0) which was lower than and female (m= 11.3, sd =3.4). There were no significant differences (t =1.480, df = 58, *p*=.144) in the perception on the Amotivation between male and female college students.

Table:4.5 Gender and Academic Motivation

Academic Motivation			N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intrinsic Motivation	To know	Male	30	11.3	3.1
		Female	30	10.8	2.7
	Towards Accomplishment	Male	30	11.4	1.9
		Female	30	11.2	3.4
	Experience Stimulation	Male	30	10.9	1.8
		Female	30	11.4	3.5
	Overall intrinsic Motivation	Male	30	33.6	4.4
		Female	30	33.4	8.4
Extrinsic Motivation	Identified	Male	30	11.7	2.2
		Female	30	11.3	3.1
	Introjected	Male	30	12.4	2.7

	External Regulation	Female	30	12.0	3.3
		Male	30	11.8	2.6
	Overall Extrinsic Motivation	Female	30	11.3	3.4
		Male	30	35.9	5.2
		Female	30	34.6	8.6
Amotivation	Amotivation	Male	30	12.5	3.0
		Female	30	11.3	3.4

Source: Computed

Table t test 4.6: Gender and Academic Motivation

Academic Motivation		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Intrinsic Motivation	To know	.573	58	.569						
	Towards Accomplishment	.234	58	.816	.077	58	.939			
	Experience Stimulation	-.648	58	.520						
Extrinsic Motivation	Identified	.526	58	.601				.719	58	.475
	Introjected	.591	58	.557	0.710	58	.481			
	External Regulation	.599	58	.551						
Amotivation	Amotivation	1.480	58	.144	1.480	58	.144			

Source: Computed

4.3.2 Academic Motivation and Community

An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Intrinsic to know for rural and urban community among college students. The mean score for rural (m=11.1818, SD=2.67459) which was lower than and urban (m= 10.8889, sd =3.22649). There were no significant differences (t =.385, df = 58, *p*=.702) in the perception on the Intrinsic to know between rural and urban college students. An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Intrinsic towards accomplishment for rural and urban community among college students. The mean

score for rural (m=11.1818, SD=2.2.67459) which was lower than and urban (m= 11.4815, sd =2.86048). There were no significant differences (t =.418, df = 58, *p*=.677) in the perception on the Intrinsic towards accomplishment between rural and urban college students. An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Intrinsic to experience for rural and urban community among college students. The mean score for rural (m=11.2121, SD=2.59516) which was lower than and urban (m= 11.0370, sd =3.03165). There were no significant differences (t =.241, df = 58, *p*=.810) in the perception on the Intrinsic to experience between rural and urban college students. An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Intrinsic Compile for rural and urban community among college students. The mean score for rural (m=33.5758, SD=6.02095) which was lower than and urban (m= 33.4047, sd =7.50005). There were no significant differences (t =.0.96, df = 58, *p*=.923) in the perception on the Intrinsic Compile between rural and urban college students.

An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Extrinsic identified for rural and urban community among college students. The mean score for rural (m=11.8788, SD=2.49697) which was lower than and urban (m= 11.0741, sd =2.88132). There were no significant differences (t =.1.159, df = 58, *p*=.251) in the perception on the Extrinsic identified between rural and urban college students. An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Extrinsic introjected for rural and urban community among college students. The mean score for rural (m=12.5152, SD=2.37330) which was lower than and urban (m= 11.8148, sd =3.71108). There were no significant differences (t =.886, df = 58, *p*=.379) in the perception on the Extrinsic introjected between rural and urban college students. An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Extrinsic extended regulation for rural and urban community among college students. The mean score for rural (m=11.5455, SD=3.16318) which was lower than and urban (m= 11.8148, sd =3.71108). There were no significant differences (t =.060, df = 58, *p*=.952) in the perception on the Extrinsic extended regulation between rural and urban college students. An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Extrinsic compile for rural and urban community among college students. The mean score for rural (m=35.9394, SD=5.93159) which was lower than and urban (m= 34.4815, sd =8.28980). There were no significant differences (t =.793, df = 58, *p*=.431) in the perception on the Extrinsic compile between rural and urban college students.

An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Amotivation for rural and urban community among college students. The mean score for rural (m=11.9394, SD=3.31605) which was lower than and urban (m= 11.8889, sd =3.25025). There were no significant differences (t =.059, df = 58, *p*=.953) in the perception on the Amotivation between rural and urban college students.

Table:4.7 Community and Academic Motivation

Academic Motivation			N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intrinsic Motivation	To know	rural	33	11.1818	2.67459
		urban	27	10.8889	3.22649
	Towards Accomplishment	rural	33	11.181	2.67459

		urban	27	8 11.4815	2.86048
	Experience Stimulation	rural	33	11.2121	2.59516
		urban	27	11.0370	3.03165
	Overall intrinsic Motivation	rural	33	33.5758	6.02095
		urban	27	33.4074	7.50005
Extrinsic Motivation	Identified	rural	33	11.8788	2.49697
		urban	27	11.0741	2.88132
	Introjected	rural	33	12.5152	2.37330
		urban	27	11.8148	3.71108
	External Regulation	rural	33	11.5455	3.16318
		urban	27	11.5926	2.84550
	Overall Extrinsic Motivation	rural	33	35.9394	5.93159
		urban	27	34.4815	8.28980
Amotivation	Amotivation	rural	33	11.9394	3.31605
		urban	27	11.8889	3.25025

Source: Computed

Table t test 4.8: Community and Academic Motivation

Academic Motivation		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Intrinsic Motivation	To know	.385	58	.702						
	Towards Accomplishment	-.418	58	.677	.096	58	.923			
	Experience Stimulation	.241	58	.810						
Extrinsic Motivation	Identified	1.159	58	.251				.449	58	.655
	Introjected	.886	58	.379	0.793	58	.431			
	External Regulation	-.060	58	.952						
Amotivation	Amotivation	.059	58	.953	.059	58	.953			

Source: Computed

4.4 Personality Traits

The descriptives statistics for Extroversion reveal an overall mean of 3.1 (SD=0.5). This shows a moderate perception of Extroversion amongst the respondents. The descriptives statistics for Agreeableness reveal an overall mean of 3.1 (SD=0.5). This shows a moderate perception of Agreeableness amongst the respondents. The descriptives statistics for Conscientiousness reveal an overall mean of 3.0 (SD=0.4). This shows a moderate perception of Conscientiousness amongst the respondents. The descriptives statistics for Neuroticism reveal an overall mean of 3.0 (SD=0.4). This shows a moderate perception of Neuroticism amongst the respondents. The descriptives statistics for Openness reveal an overall mean of 3.1 (SD=0.5). This shows a moderate perception of Openness amongst the respondents.

Table:4.9 Personality Traits

Personality Traits	N	Mean	SD
Extroversion	60	3.1	0.5
Agreeableness	60	3.1	0.5
Conscientiousness	60	3.0	0.4
Neuroticism	60	3.0	0.4
Openness	60	3.1	0.5

Source: Computed

4.4.1 Gender and personality traits

An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Extroversion for male and female college students. The mean score for male (m=30.7, SD=4.8) which was lower than and female (m= 31.9, sd =5.6). There were no significant differences (t =.940, df = 58, *p*=.351) in the perception on the Extroversion between male and female college students.

An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Agreeableness for male and female college students. The mean score for male (m=31.4, SD=4.7) which was lower than and female (m= 30.2, sd =5.3). There were no significant differences (t =.956, df = 58, *p*=.343) in the perception on the Agreeableness between male and female college students.

An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Conscientiousness for male and female college students. The mean score for male (m=29.7, SD=3.9) which was lower than and female (m= 29.7, sd =3.8). There were no significant differences (t =.033, df = 58, *p*=.973) in the perception on the Conscientiousness between male and female college students

An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Neuroticism for male and female college students. The mean score for male (m=29.8, SD=4.7) which was lower than and female (m= 30.2, sd =3.7). There were no significant differences (t =.400, df = 58, *p*=.691) in the perception on the Neuroticism between male and female college students

An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Openness for male and female college students. The mean score for male (m=31.9, SD=5.7) which was lower than and female (m= 30.1, sd =4.2). There were no significant differences (t =1.392, df = 58, *p*=.169) in the perception on the Openness between male and female college students.

Table:4.10 Personality Traits and Gender

Personality Traits	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
yExtroversion	Male	30	30.7	4.8	-.940	58	.351
	Female	30	31.9	5.6			
Agreeableness	Male	30	31.4	4.7	.956	58	.343
	Female	30	30.2	5.3			
Conscientiousness	Male	30	29.7	3.9	-.033	58	.973
	Female	30	29.7	3.8			
Neuroticism	Male	30	29.8	4.7	-.400	58	.691
	Female	30	30.2	3.7			
Openness	Male	30	31.9	5.7	1.392	58	.169
	Female	30	30.1	4.2			

Source: Computed

4.4.2 Community and personality traits

An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Extroversion for rural and urban community among college students. The mean score for rural (m=31.8182, SD=4.59928) which was lower than and urban (m= 30.6667, sd =5.90306). There were no significant differences (t =.849, df = 58, *p*=.399) in the perception on the Extroversion between rural and urban college students.

An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Agreeableness for rural and urban community among college students. The mean score for rural (m=31.4848, SD=4.69122) which was lower than and urban (m= 30.0000, sd =5.31326). There were no significant differences (t =1.149, df = 58, *p*=.255) in the perception on the Agreeableness between rural and urban college students.

An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Conscientiousness for rural and urban community among college students. The mean score for rural (m=30.0909, SD=3.93989) which was lower than and urban (m= 29.2593, sd =3.71683). There were no significant differences (t =.834, df = 58, *p*=.408) in the perception on the Conscientiousness between rural and urban college students.

An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Neuroticism for rural and urban community among college students. The mean score for rural (m=30.0606, SD=4.45771) which was lower than and urban (m= 29.8889, sd =3.86636). There were no significant differences (t =.157, df = 58, *p*=.875) in the perception on the Neuroticism between rural and urban college students.

An independent sample t test was conducted to compare Openness for rural and urban community among college students. The mean score for rural (m=30.5758, SD=5.12366) which was lower than and urban (m= 31.5926, sd =4.99430). There were no significant differences (t =.773, df = 58, *p*=.442) in the perception on the Openness between rural and urban college students.

Table Personality:4.11 Traits and Community Development

Personality Traits	Community	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Extroversion	Rural	33	31.8	4.6	.849	58	.399
	Urban	27	30.7	5.9			
Agreeableness	Rural	33	31.5	4.7	1.149	58	.255
	Urban	27	30.0	5.3			
Conscientiousness	Rural	33	30.1	3.9	.834	58	.408
	Urban	27	29.3	3.7			
Neuroticism	Rural	33	30.1	4.5	.157	58	.875
	Urban	27	29.9	3.9			
Openness	Rural	33	30.6	5.1	-.773	58	.442
	Urban	27	31.6	5.0			

Source: Computed

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSION

This chapter presents the Major Findings, Conclusion, and suggestion from the research.

5.1 Major Findings

The study revealed a diverse group of college students in terms of demographic and economic characteristics. The sample consisted of an equal number of males and females, with participants from joint, nuclear, and extended families where majority of the respondent are from joint family. Most students came from stable family backgrounds, with only a small portion reporting dysfunctional family settings. In terms of academic backgrounds, students were primarily from the geography department, followed by those from History, Philosophy, and English. The majority of students resided in rural areas, and their previous academic performance varied, with almost half of the respondent achieving a first division, while others secured second and third divisions.

Regarding economic characteristics, a significant number of students' parents worked in government jobs, business, and agriculture, with a smaller portion engaged in wage labor or other occupations. In terms of socio-economic status, most participants were from priority households, with fewer coming from Non-NFSA and AAY households. This diverse economic and demographic background highlights the varied experiences and conditions influencing the student population in the study.

The findings suggest that academic procrastination is prevalent among the participants. Openness stands out as the most prominent personality trait, while neuroticism appears to be the least emphasized. There is a balance between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, indicating that students are driven by both internal and external factors. However, there is considerable variation in academic motivation levels across the sample, highlighting diverse motivational experiences among the students.

5.2 Conclusion

In conclusion, this study shows how academic motivation, procrastination, and personality traits are all connected and influence how college students handle their studies. Both intrinsic motivation, which comes from personal interest, and extrinsic motivation, driven by external rewards, play key roles in why students either engage in or delay their academic tasks. Intrinsic motivation leads to more focus and long-term learning, while extrinsic motivation often focuses on short-term rewards. Procrastination, which can be caused by fear of failure, poor time management, or low motivation, creates barriers to academic success.

The Big Five personality traits—conscientiousness, openness, extraversion, agreeableness, and neuroticism—also shape how students approach their academic work. Students who are more conscientious and open tend to be more motivated and less likely to procrastinate, while those high in neuroticism may procrastinate due to anxiety and fear of failure. Understanding how personality traits and motivation interact helps educators create strategies to improve motivation, reduce procrastination, and support better academic outcomes for students.