

**Academic Motivation and Academic Procrastination in relation to Personality Trait among
College students at Aizawl West College**

Submitted in partial fulfillment of Bachelor of Social Work, 2024

Submitted by

NAOMI LALRUATDIKI

BSW V-SEMESTER

Roll No.2223BSW007

Supervisor

RTC LALREMURATA

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 Aizawl West College’** submitted by Ms. Naomi Lalruatdiki 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 Aizawl West 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.

(NAOMI LALRUATDIKI)

Chapter	Content	Page No
	Certificate	i
	Acknowledgement	ii
	Content	iii
	List of Tables	iv
I	Introduction	1-2
II	Review of Literature	3-8
III	Methodology	9-12
IV	Result and Discussion	13-33
V	Conclusion	34-36
	Appendices	
	i. References	v-xi

Table	List of Tables	Page No
4.1	Profile of the respondents	15
4.2	Personality Trait	16
4.3	Gender and Personality traits	17
4.4	Community and Personality Traits	18
4.5	Socio-economic and Personality Traits	20
4.6	Academic Procrastination	20
4.7	Academic Procrastination across all Gender, Community, and Socio-Economic Status	21
4.8	Academic Motivation	23
4.9	Gender and Academic Motivation	25
4.10	T-test Gender and Academic Motivation	26
4.11	Community and Academic Motivation	28
4.12	T-test Community and Academic Motivation	28
4.13	Socio-Economic Status and Academic Motivation	31
4.14	T-test Socio-Economic Status and Academic Motivation	32
4.15	Personality Traits: Academic Motivation and Academic Procrastination (Spearman's rho)	33
4.16	Academic Motivation and Academic Procrastination (Spearman's rho)	33

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

This study investigates the relationship between academic motivation, procrastination, and personality traits among college students.

1.1 Personality Traits

Personality traits are consistent patterns of thoughts, emotions, and behaviours that influence how individuals interact with their environment. These traits are often classified using frameworks such as the Big Five Personality Traits, which include Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism. Each trait affects how people respond to challenges, manage their responsibilities, and pursue their goals. Understanding these traits is important for insights into academic behaviours, including motivation and procrastination.

Personality traits significantly influence academic motivation, affecting students' drive and persistence in achieving goals. High conscientiousness leads to discipline and organization, while neuroticism can decrease motivation due to anxiety and self-doubt. Open-minded students display higher intrinsic motivation as they explore new ideas and challenges. Academic procrastination is linked to certain traits, with low conscientiousness predicting procrastination due to time management issues. High neuroticism can lead to procrastination due to perfectionism and fear of failure. Extraverted students may be distracted by social activities, while agreeable students may overcommit to helping others.

1.2 Academic Procrastination

Academic procrastination is the tendency to delay or postpone academic tasks, often resulting in stress, guilt, and lower academic performance. It can be influenced by factors such as poor time management, fear of failure, or lack of motivation. The relationship between academic procrastination and academic motivation is crucial, as students with high levels of intrinsic motivation are less likely to procrastinate. Conversely, those with low motivation struggle to initiate or sustain academic efforts, leading to habitual procrastination.

Personality traits, such as conscientiousness, neuroticism, and openness, also play a role in explaining procrastination. Conscientiousness leads to discipline, organization, and task-

oriented behaviour, while neuroticism, characterized by anxiety and emotional instability, can increase procrastination due to fear of failure or avoidance of difficult tasks.

Understanding these traits concerning procrastination and motivation can help identify motivational gaps that contribute to procrastination behaviors.

1.3 Academic Motivation

Academic motivation refers to the internal and external factors that encourage students to engage in academic tasks, persist in their studies, and achieve their goals. It encompasses intrinsic motivation, where students are driven by a genuine interest in or enjoyment of learning, as well as extrinsic motivation, where external rewards such as grades, recognition, or career aspirations play a significant role. Academic motivation is essential in shaping how students approach their studies, influencing their effort, engagement, and overall academic performance.

Academic motivation significantly impacts students' task completion and punctuality. High intrinsic motivation leads to timely engagement, while low motivation often leads to procrastination. Understanding academic motivation is crucial for addressing procrastinatory behavior. Personality traits, such as conscientiousness, can shape students' habits and outcomes. Higher intrinsic motivation leads to better task completion, while neuroticism can lead to procrastination due to fear of failure or anxiety. This relationship helps explain students' procrastination and approach to academic tasks.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

The review of literature aims to explore the causes, correlates, and potential interventions for Academic Procrastination, Academic Motivation, and Personality traits. By synthesizing research across multiple theoretical perspectives and empirical findings, this review provides a detailed understanding of the topic's backgrounds, effects, and solutions.

2.1 Review of Literature on Academic Procrastination

Ferrari et al. (2005) with the topic, *“Prevalence of procrastination in the United States, United Kingdom, and Australia: Arousal and avoidance delays among adults”* found that 20% of college students were chronic procrastinators, while roughly 70% procrastinated to some extent. Academic contexts were more common, with students regularly postponing assignments and exam preparation. The study found little evidence of cultural variation in procrastination, indicating that it affects people everywhere, regardless of their social or geographic setting. It supported the notion that procrastination is a universal problem, not limited to any specific area or educational guidelines. It also established baseline data on procrastination prevalence, emphasizing that students often struggle with it, especially in academic settings.

Steel (2007) in his study, *“The nature of procrastination: A meta-analytic and theoretical review of quintessential self-regulatory failure”* conducted a comprehensive meta-analysis and theoretical review of procrastination, analysing data from over 691 articles. He identified procrastination as a self-regulatory failure influenced by impulsivity, low self-efficacy, and low conscientiousness. The Temporal Motivation Theory (TMT) was introduced to comprehensively understand procrastination. TMT posits that procrastination is influenced by an individual's sensitivity to delay and the temporal distance of a task. It highlights that procrastination is linked to lower academic attainment and higher stress levels. Steel's work is considered one of the most comprehensive analyses of procrastination, as it integrated various theoretical perspectives into the Temporal Motivation Theory. Numerous studies have used this model to explain why students delay assignments and develop intervention measures to reduce procrastination by addressing motivational issues.

Solomon and Rothblum's 1984 in their study, *“Academic Procrastination: Frequency and cognitive-behavioural correlates”* found that over half of students delay finishing reading

assignments, writing term papers, and preparing for tests due to perceived difficulty or lack of immediate benefits. They identified two types of procrastinators: "task-avoidant procrastinators" and "fear-driven procrastinators." The study also examined the impact of cognitive-behavioural aspects on procrastination, finding that procrastinating students often had worse time management skills and more trouble planning their assignments. This comprehensive study provided a framework for understanding the reasons behind procrastination, which has been used and improved upon in subsequent studies. Future research on the emotional and cognitive causes of procrastination will benefit from Solomon and Rothblum's focus on specific academic assignments and their accompanying feelings.

Pychyl and Sirois' (2016) study on "*Procrastination, health, and well-being*" reveals its emotional and health implications, particularly on students' well-being. They found that students often avoid academic assignments to avoid unpleasant feelings like boredom, worry, or dissatisfaction, leading to increased tension and anxiety. Procrastination also has negative health effects, such as poor diet, sleep difficulties, and an increased risk of stress-related disorders. Regular procrastination leads to worse mental and physical health compared to non-procrastinating peers. The study also highlighted the role of guilt and shame in the procrastination cycle, with students often feeling guilty after putting off assignments to avoid feeling guilty. The study has contributed to understanding how students manage the emotional strain of academic assignments and has been instrumental in directing programs to enhance emotional control abilities to decrease procrastination.

Rozental and Carlbring's 2014 study on "*Internet-based cognitive behaviour therapy for procrastination: A randomized controlled trial*" found that it significantly reduced university students' procrastination. The study, one of the first to examine the effectiveness of an online program designed to help students become less procrastinators, found that participants reported fewer delays in completing academic assignments and increased time management skills after completing the online therapy program. The key element of CBT is cognitive restructuring, which helps students challenge and alter their maladaptive beliefs about their academic performance. The program also included behavioural strategies such as goal-setting and self-monitoring. The study suggests that internet-based therapy could be an affordable and practical solution for students who may not have access to in-person therapy. The innovative approach to using technology to combat procrastination opens up new ways to provide psychological therapies and suggests remote, self-guided therapy as a useful strategy for addressing procrastination.

2.2 Review of Literature on Academic Motivation

Deci and Ryan's (1985) study on "*Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour*" developed Self-Determination Theory (SDT) which is a significant framework for studying human motivation and personality. It distinguishes between internal and extrinsic motivation, focusing on the causes or objectives that prompt action. SDT is crucial in understanding students' learning habits and outcomes, particularly in academic contexts. Intrinsic motivation, which brings happiness, is the most effective type for academic success, leading to higher persistence, improved learning outcomes, and deeper engagement. Extrinsic motivation, on the other hand, is driven by external demands like acceptance or grades but has less internalized and long-lasting learning consequences. SDT emphasizes the importance of three psychological needs: autonomy, competence, and relatedness, which must be satisfied for intrinsic motivation to occur. Students are more likely to be intrinsically driven in academic settings when they have control over their education, confidence in their ability to succeed, and a sense of belonging in their learning community.

Eccles and Wigfield (2002) on "*Motivational beliefs, values, and goals*" developed Expectancy-Value Theory which suggests that students' motivation is influenced by their expectations for success and the value they place on a task. This theory is often applied in educational settings to understand motivation. The theory reveals that when students believe they can succeed and perceive the task as valuable, they are more likely to participate in academic activities. The total value of a task can be divided into interest, utility, and attainment values. Task values reveal gender inequalities, with boys often placing a higher value on math and science, and girls on language arts and reading. Societal and cultural norms also impact these disparities. Cost, which refers to perceived drawbacks of an activity, also impacts motivation. The Expectancy-Value Theory provides a comprehensive framework for understanding how students' motivation and accomplishment are influenced by their perceptions of their talents and the value they place on assignments.

Pintrich (2004) in his study "*A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and self-regulated learning in college students*" developed a framework for self-regulated learning (SRL) which highlights the importance of motivation in students' learning processes. It combines cognitive, metacognitive, and motivational factors. Motivated students are more likely to practice self-regulated learning, which involves goal-setting, progress monitoring, and strategy modification. Motivation occurs both before and after self-regulated learning. Key

motivating factors include task value, achievement goals, and self-efficacy beliefs. Performance goals are more valuable than mastery goals, which focus on learning and competence. Students who set and achieve mastery goals are more likely to succeed academically, have better tenacity, and engage in more effective self-regulation. Pintrich's framework has significantly influenced the understanding of motivation and self-regulated learning, providing a clear model for educators and researchers to assess how motivational factors influence students' ability to manage their learning processes.

Dweck and Leggett's (1988) study on *“A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality”* emphasized the impact of students' perceptions of their intelligence on their motivation, goal-setting, and classroom behaviour. They found that students with a fixed mindset, believing intelligence is constant, tend to focus on achieving performance targets and avoid difficulties. Conversely, those with a growth mindset, believing intelligence can be developed through effort and learning, are more likely to pursue mastery objectives, embrace difficulties, and persevere despite failures. Feedback also played a significant role in shaping students' conceptions of intelligence. A development mindset is influenced by praise that emphasizes effort, while a fixed mindset may be reinforced by praise that emphasizes ability. This study has significantly influenced academic motivation and has led to the development of treatments to support growth mindsets, which have been widely integrated into educational practices.

Wolters' 2004 study on *“Advancing Achievement Goal Theory: Using Goal Structures and Goal Orientations to Predict Students' Motivation, Cognition, and Achievement”* explored the impact of goal orientations (mastery vs. performance) on students' academic motivation, cognitive strategies, and achievement. He found that mastery goals, which focus on competence and comprehension, led to more intrinsic motivation and deep learning techniques, while performance goals focused on proving abilities, and emphasized surface learning techniques. The study also examined the role of goal frameworks in classrooms. Mastery goals, which prioritize learning and improvement, promote more motivation and better learning outcomes. Wolters' work improved the Achievement Goal Theory and highlighted the importance of classroom goal frameworks in influencing students' motivation. This has influenced educational practices and policies, encouraging teachers to design learning environments prioritizing mastery over performance objectives.

2.3 Review of Literature on Big 5 Personality Traits

Costa and McCrae's (1992) work on "*Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*" significantly contributed to the development of the Big Five model. The study provided empirical evidence supporting the Big Five as a reliable framework for understanding personality in various age, gender, and cultural contexts. The NEO-PI-R is a widely used personality assessment instrument with good reliability and validity. Costa and McCrae highlighted the importance of each of the five traits in forecasting life events, such as neuroticism causing emotional states and poor mental health, and conscientiousness predicting academic and occupational success. Their work has influenced decades of research in fields like professional development, mental health, and interpersonal relationships.

John, Naumann, and Soto (2008) in their work "*Paradigm shift to the integrative Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues*" reviewed the history and development of the Big Five model, which became the dominant framework in personality psychology. The model originated from lexical hypothesis research, which suggested that language contained the most significant personality qualities. The authors highlighted the use of tools like the NEO-PI-R and the Big Five Inventory (BFI) to measure these attributes, and discussed the challenges and limitations of assessing personality traits. The study also addressed conceptual concerns, such as the number of variables and the influence of culture on personality structure. This review provides a comprehensive understanding of the Big Five model's historical and theoretical context, outlining its strengths and limitations, offering a roadmap for future research and underscoring its enduring significance in personality assessment.

Roberts, Walton, and Viechtbauer (2006) in their study "*Patterns of mean-level change in personality traits across the life course: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies*" conducted a meta-analysis that examined the Big Five personality traits over the lifespan. The study found that while personality traits change systematically during adulthood, they are often stable. As people age, agreeableness and conscientiousness tend to rise, while neuroticism tends to fall. Young adulthood, marked by significant life transformations like career or long-term relationships, is when personality changes most. The study also highlighted the influence of social roles and life events on personality traits, such as increased responsibilities. This research refutes the idea that personality traits are unchangeable and suggests that characteristics can

adapt to life experiences and growth phases, impacting treatments for constructive personality development.

Ashton and Lee (2007) in their study *“Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure”* introduced the HEXACO model, an alternative to the Big Five model, which includes a sixth trait: Honesty-Humility. This model, which includes conscientiousness, extraversion, emotionality, honesty-humility, agreeableness, and openness to new experiences, offers a different perspective on personality structure. The HEXACO model reflects qualities that the Big Five do not adequately represent, such as fairness, honesty, and modesty. The study supports the unique and significant nature of the Honesty-Humility personality component, predicting less strongly related actions with the Big Five attributes, such as cooperation and ethical decision-making. The HEXACO model has influenced personality study, and gained popularity in fields like moral behaviour and interpersonal interactions, despite the Big Five being the most widely used model. The study emphasizes the ongoing development of personality theory and the importance of reevaluating how personality qualities are organized.

Ozer and Benet-Martínez’s (2006) *“Personality and the Prediction of Consequential Outcomes”* reviewed studies on the relationship between the Big Five personality traits and life outcomes like health, relationships, and work performance. They found that conscientiousness predicts positive life outcomes, such as good performance in school and workplace, healthy habits, and regular exercise. Neuroticism, on the other hand, is associated with negative consequences like marital troubles, reduced work satisfaction, and mental health issues. Openness to experience is linked to creativity and intellectual curiosity, while extraversion and agreeableness predict success in social relationships. The study also highlighted the relationship between personality traits and life events, suggesting that those with high neuroticism may have more unfavourable experiences, which may feed back into their neurotic tendencies.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

This chapter addresses the problem statement, objectives of the study, hypotheses, and methodology. It focuses on the methodological aspects, including research design, sampling, tools for data collection, and data processing and analysis.

3.1 Statement of the problem:

Academic motivation and procrastination serve as two critical factors influencing the academic success of college students. Motivation propels students to engage actively in learning activities and pursue academic achievement, whereas procrastination often leads to delays in task completion, adversely affecting academic performance. Both behaviors are believed to be shaped by personality traits, including conscientiousness, openness, neuroticism, extraversion, and agreeableness. These traits significantly influence how individuals manage their academic responsibilities, ultimately impacting their overall success.

Despite the increasing research in this area, a significant gap remains in understanding how specific personality traits relate to academic motivation and procrastination among college students. Determining whether certain personality traits are more favourable to fostering procrastination or enhancing motivation is imperative. Additionally, the interaction between these traits and students' academic behaviours warrants further investigation, as well as the implications these relationships have for academic success. Moreover, the extent to which personality traits mediate or moderate the interplay between motivation and procrastination has yet to be comprehensively examined.

This research seeks to fill existing gaps by examining the relationships among academic motivation, academic procrastination, and personality traits in college students. By analysing the interconnectedness of these factors, the study aims to yield insightful findings that can inform effective interventions to enhance academic performance and overall well-being among college students.

3.2 Objectives

- 1) To identify the level 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 level of academic procrastination between students belonging to poor and non-poor households.
- 4) There is a difference in the pattern of academic motivation between male and female.
- 5) There is a difference in the pattern of academic motivation between students from rural and urban communities.
- 6) There is a difference in the pattern of academic motivation between students belonging to poor and non-poor households.
- 7) There is a difference in the pattern of personality traits between male and female.
- 8) There is a difference in the pattern of personality traits between students from rural and urban communities.
- 9) There is a difference in the pattern of personality traits between students belonging to poor and non-poor households.

3.4 Methodology

3.4.1 Research design

The study employs a descriptive research design. The data mainly consists of primary data collected using quantitative methods.

3.4.2 Sampling

The study adopted systematic random sampling methods. A total number of 60 respondents were selected, and lists of students were collected, where every tenth was selected. The unit of study is individual, and all the students enrolled in Govt. Aizawl West College constituted the population of the study.

3.4.3 Tools of Data Collection

Primary data was collected using a quantitative method. A structured interview schedule was administered to 60 respondents, and standardized scales, such as the Academic Procrastination Scale, the Academic Motivation Scale and the Personality Trait Scale were utilized to assess the level of academic procrastination as well as the pattern of academic motivation and personality traits.

Personality traits scale

The Big Five Personality Test is a widely used framework for understanding personality through five core traits: Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism. Each trait exists on a spectrum, with individuals displaying varying degrees of creativity, organization, sociability, empathy, and emotional stability. In academic settings, these traits influence behaviours like motivation and procrastination. For example, conscientious students often display high motivation due to their discipline and goal-oriented nature, while those with high neuroticism may struggle with procrastination due to anxiety or self-doubt. This framework helps researchers and educators understand and address students' unique motivational challenges and academic habits.

Academic Procrastination Scale

The Academic Procrastination Scale (APS) is a psychometric tool developed to measure the tendency of students to delay or postpone academic tasks. Academic procrastination, which involves delaying academic activities despite knowing that it could lead to negative consequences, is a widespread phenomenon that impacts students' academic performance and psychological well-being. The APS aims to assess this behaviour by examining different dimensions of procrastination specific to academic contexts, such as delays in starting or completing assignments, studying for exams, and preparing for class projects.

The APS typically includes a series of statements or items that respondents rate on a Likert scale, ranging from strong agreement to strong disagreement. These items assess factors such as habitual task delay, task avoidance, time management issues, and lack of motivation or planning in academic settings. Higher scores on the scale indicate a stronger tendency toward procrastination. The APS also assists in exploring its relationship with other psychological and behavioral factors, such as academic motivation, self-regulation, anxiety, and personality traits.

Academic Motivation Scale

The Academic Motivation Scale (AMS) is a tool that assesses students' motivation for academic activities based on Self-Determination Theory. It measures three main types of motivation: intrinsic motivation (where students engage in learning for personal satisfaction), extrinsic motivation (where learning is driven by external rewards or pressures), and amotivation (where students lack motivation or purpose). Through Likert-scale responses, the AMS helps identify the dominant type of motivation in students, offering valuable insights into their academic engagement and persistence.

The AMS is frequently used to explore the connections between motivation, academic performance, personality, and self-efficacy. This understanding aids in tailoring interventions to boost students' motivation and engagement, support retention, and foster meaningful learning experiences.

3.4.4 Data Processing and Analysis

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

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter presents the findings and discussion, which are divided into sections such as the respondents' profiles, personality traits, academic procrastination, and academic motivation.

4.1 Profile of the respondent

The study sample included 60 college students from diverse sections of the student population. The profile of the respondents includes – Sex, Family type, Forms of family, Department, Community, Occupation of parents, and Socioeconomic status.

Sex

The sex distribution among the respondents indicates that over half of the total population (55%) were female, while 45% were male.

Family type

The family types were categorized as nuclear, joint, and extended. The results indicate that 36.7% of the respondents are from nuclear families, 53.3% are from joint families, and 10% belong to extended families.

Forms of Family

Families were classified into Stable, Dysfunctional, Reconstituted, and Others. The results revealed that 90% of the respondents belonged to stable families, and dysfunctional families contributed less than one-tenth of the respondents (1.7%). The same can be applied to reconstituted forms of families as well. The option of 'others' contributed 6.7%.

Department

Departments were classified into Education, English, History, Mizo, Public Administration, Political Science, and Psychology. It was seen that 11.7% of the respondents belonged to Education department and more than one-tenth (11.7%) belonged to English department. 13.3% were from History department, 15% to Mizo department, more than one-fourth of the respondents (26.7%) were from the Department of Public Administration, 20% to Political Science department, and 1.7% to Psychology department.

Previous Academic Performance

The analysis of previous academic performance reveals a mean SGPA score of 6.64 with a standard deviation of 0.792, indicating moderate variability in student performance

Community

The distribution of community among the respondents was divided into Rural and Urban. It indicated that less than half of the respondents (41.7%) were from rural communities and more than half of the respondents (58.3%) belonged to urban communities.

Parent's occupation

The occupations of parents were divided into four categories: government employee, Business, Wage labour, Agriculture farmer, and others. Agriculture farmers were the highest-represented group, with 36.7%. More than one-fourth (26.7%) were government employees, 13.3% did business, and 3.3% listed others.

Socio-economic status

The population is classified as AAY, Priority households, and non-NFSA. It was seen that one-tenth of the respondents (10%) belonged to AAY, half of the respondents (51.7%) were from priority households and more than one-third of the respondents (38.3%) were from non-NFSA households.

Table 4.1 Profile of the Respondents

Sl.No.	Particulars		Frequency	Percent
1	Sex	Male	27	45.0
		Female	33	55.0
2	Family type	Nuclear	22	36.7
		Joint	32	53.3
		Extended	6	10.0
3	Forms of family	Stable	54	90.0
		Dysfunctional	1	1.7
		Reconstituted	1	1.7
		Others	4	6.7
4	Parent's Occupation	Gov't employee	16	26.7
		Business	8	13.3
		Wage labour	2	3.3
		Agriculture farmer	22	36.7
		Others	12	20.0
5	Socio-eco stat	AAY	6	10.0
		Priority Household	31	51.7
		Non-NFSA	23	38.3
6	Department	Education	7	11.7
		English	7	11.7
		History	8	13.3
		Mizo	9	15.0
		P.A	16	26.7
		Political Science	12	20.0
		Psychology	1	1.7
7	Community	Rural	25	41.7
		Urban	35	58.3
8	Previous Academic Performance	SGPA	Mean = 6.64	SD= .792

Source: Computed

4.2 Personality traits

Personality traits are defined patterns of thoughts, feelings, and behaviours that shape an individual's identity. They play a crucial role in determining how a person reacts to various situations, engages with others, and views the world. While these traits are largely stable over time and across different scenarios, they can evolve through personal experiences and growth. They are fundamental in influencing behaviour, relationships, career choices, and overall life satisfaction. Every individual possesses a unique combination of traits, creating a distinctive personality that sets them apart.

The descriptive statistic for Extroversion reveals an overall mean of 2.61 (SD=0.57) which shows a moderate perception of Extroversion among the respondents. The descriptive statistic for Agreeableness reveals an overall mean of 3.35 (SD=0.50) which shows a high perception of agreeableness among the respondents. The descriptive statistic for Conscientiousness reveals an overall mean of 3.18 (SD=0.51) which shows a high perception of conscientiousness among the respondents. The descriptive statistic for Neuroticism reveals an overall mean of 2.74 (SD=0.59) which shows a moderate perception of neuroticism among the respondents. The descriptive statistic for Openness reveals an overall mean of 3.13 (SD=0.46) which shows a high perception of openness among the respondents.

Table 4.2 Personality Trait

Personality Traits	N	Mean	SD
Extroversion	60	2.61	0.57
Agreeableness	60	3.35	0.50
Conscientiousness	60	3.18	0.51
Neuroticism	60	2.74	0.59
Openness	60	3.13	0.46

Source: Computed

4.2.1 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 ($m=26.0$, $SD=5.8$) was lower than female ($m=26.1$, $SD=5.8$). There was no significant difference ($t=0.016$, $p=0.987$) in the perception of 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 ($m=33.1$, $SD=4.4$) which was lower than female ($m=33.8$, $SD=5.4$). There were no significant differences ($t=0.523$, $p=0.603$) in the perception of 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 ($m=31.0$, $SD=5.4$) which was lower than female ($m=32.5$, $SD=4.8$). There was insignificant difference ($t=1.141$, $p=0.258$) in the perception of 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 ($m=28.4$, $SD=5.5$) which was lower than female ($m=26.5$, $SD=6.1$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=1.289$, $p=0.203$) in the perception of 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 ($m=31.3$, $SD=3.8$) which was lower than female ($m=31.5$, $SD=5.2$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.031$, $p=0.976$) in the perception of Openness between male and female college students.

Table 4.3 Gender and Personality Traits

Personality Traits	Gender	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Extroversion	Male	27	26.0	5.8	-0.016	58	0.987
	Female	33	26.1	5.8			
Agreeableness	Male	27	33.1	4.4	-0.523	58	0.603
	Female	33	33.8	5.4			
Conscientiousness	Male	27	31.0	5.4	-1.141	58	0.258
	Female	33	32.5	4.8			
Neuroticism	Male	27	28.4	5.5	1.289	58	0.203
	Female	33	26.5	6.1			
Openness	Male	27	31.3	3.8	-0.031	58	0.976
	Female	33	31.3	5.2			

Source: Computed

4.2.2 Community and Personality Traits

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Extroversion in rural and urban communities among college students. The mean score for rural ($m=25.6$, $SD=5.2$) was higher than urban ($m=26.4$, $SD=6.1$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.512$ $p=0.61$) in the perception of the Extroversion between rural and urban communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Agreeableness in rural and urban communities among college students. The mean score for rural ($m=32.6$, $SD=4.5$) which was lower than urban ($m=34.1$, $SD=5.2$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=1.116$ $p=0.269$) in the perception of the Agreeableness between rural and urban communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Conscientiousness in rural and urban communities among college students. The mean score for rural ($m=31.1$, $SD=4.7$) was lower than urban ($m=32.3$, $SD=5.4$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.909$ $p=0.367$) in the perception of Conscientiousness between rural and urban communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Neuroticism in rural and urban communities among college students. The mean score for rural ($m=28.0$, $SD=5.5$) which was higher than urban ($m=26.9$, $SD=6.2$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.653$ $p=0.514$) in the perception of Neuroticism between rural and urban communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Openness in rural and urban communities among college students. The mean score for rural ($m=31.2$, $SD=3.6$) was lower than that for urban ($m=31.4$, $SD=5.3$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.108$, $p=0.915$) in the perception of Openness between rural and urban communities.

Table 4.4 Community and Personality Traits

Personality Traits	Community	N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Extroversion	Rural	25	25.6	5.2	-0.512	58	0.61
	Urban	35	26.4	6.1			
Agreeableness	Rural	25	32.6	4.5	-1.116	58	0.269
	Urban	35	34.1	5.2			
Conscientiousness	Rural	25	31.1	4.7	-0.909	58	0.367
	Urban	35	32.3	5.4			
Neuroticism	Rural	25	28.0	5.5	0.656	58	0.514
	Urban	35	26.9	6.2			
Openness	Rural	25	31.2	3.6	-0.108	58	0.915
	Urban	35	31.4	5.3			

Source: Computed

4.2.3 Socio-economic Status and Personality traits

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Extroversion in poor and non-poor communities among college students. The mean score for poor ($m=25.9$, $SD=5.3$) which was higher than non-poor ($m=26.3$, $SD=6.4$). There was no significant difference ($t=0.224$, $p=0.824$) in the perception of Extroversion between poor and non-poor communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Agreeableness in poor and non-poor communities among college students. The mean score for poor ($m=33.6$, $SD=5.0$) which was higher than non-poor ($m=33.3$, $SD=5.0$). There was no significant difference ($t=0.165$, $p=0.869$) in the perception of Agreeableness between poor and non-poor communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Conscientiousness for poor and non-poor communities among college students. The mean score for poor ($m=30.5$, $SD=5.6$) which was higher than non-poor ($m=34.0$, $SD=3.4$). There was a significant difference ($t=2.654$, $p=0.01$) in the perception of Conscientiousness between poor and non-poor communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Neuroticism for poor and non-poor communities among college students. The mean score for poor ($m=28.1$, $SD=5.9$) which was higher than non-poor ($m=26.2$, $SD=5.9$). There was no significant difference ($t=1.242$ $p=0.219$) in the perception of Neuroticism between poor and non-poor communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Openness for poor and non-poor communities among college students. The mean score for poor ($m=30.8$, $SD=4.2$) was higher than non-poor ($m=32.1$, $SD=5.2$). There was no significant difference ($t=1.077$ $p=0.286$) in the perception of Openness between poor and non-poor communities.

Table 4.5 Socio-economic status and Personality traits

Personality Traits	Socio		N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Economic	status						
Extroversion	Poor	37	25.9	5.3	-0.224	58	0.824	
	Non-Poor	23	26.3	6.4				
Agreeableness	Poor	37	33.6	5.0	0.165	58	0.869	
	Non-Poor	23	33.3	5.0				
Conscientiousness	Poor	37	30.5	5.6	-2.654	58	0.01	
	Non-Poor	23	34.0	3.4				
Neuroticism	Poor	37	28.1	5.9	1.242	58	0.219	
	Non-Poor	23	26.2	5.9				
Openness	Poor	37	30.8	4.2	-1.077	58	0.286	
	Non-Poor	23	32.1	5.2				

Source: Computed

4.3 Academic Procrastination

Academic procrastination among college students is the tendency to delay or postpone academic tasks, such as studying, completing assignments, or preparing for exams, despite knowing the negative consequences of doing so. This behaviour is common in college settings and is associated with a variety of factors, such as stress, fear of failure, lack of motivation, poor time management, and perfectionism.

The descriptive statistic for Academic Procrastination reveals an overall mean of 2.74 ($SD=0.69$) which shows a moderate perception of academic procrastination among the respondents.

Table 4.6 Academic Procrastination

	N	Mean	SD
Academic Procrastination	60	2.74	0.69

Source Computed

4.3.1 Academic Procrastination across gender, community, and socio-economic status.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Academic procrastination among male and female college students. The mean score for male ($m=73.9$, $SD=16.6$) was higher than female ($m=64.2$, $SD=16.6$). There was a significant difference ($t=2.237$ $p=0.029$) in the perception of Academic Procrastination between male and female college students.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Academic procrastination in rural and urban communities among college students. The mean score for rural ($m=75.3$, $SD=14.4$) which was higher than urban ($m=63.8$, $SD=17.6$). There was a significant difference ($t=2.684$ $p=0.009$) in the perception of Academic Procrastination between rural and urban communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Academic procrastination in poor and non-poor communities among college students. The mean score for poor ($m=72.2$, $SD=16.0$) was higher than non-poor ($m=62.7$, $SD=17.7$). There was no significant difference ($t=2.158$ $p=0.035$) in the perception of Academic Procrastination between poor and non-poor communities.

Table 4.7 Academic Procrastination across Gender, Community and Socio-Economic Status

		N	Mean	SD	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Gender	Male	27	73.9	16.6	2.237	58	0.029
	Female	33	64.2	16.6			
Community	Rural	25	75.3	14.4	2.684	58	0.009
	Urban	35	63.8	17.6			
Socio Status	Economic						
	Poor	37	72.2	16.0	2.158	58	0.035
	Non poor	23	62.7	17.7			

Source Computed

4.4 Academic Motivation

Academic motivation in college students is the drive to succeed in their studies, influenced by both intrinsic (interest in learning) and extrinsic (grades, career goals) factors. Key influences include personal goals, social support, self-belief, and a positive learning environment. Higher motivation often leads to better academic performance and persistence, while low motivation can result in disengagement and academic challenges.

The descriptive statistic for Intrinsic to Know reveals an overall mean of 4.87 (SD=1.32) which shows a high perception of Intrinsic to Know among the respondents. The descriptive statistic for Intrinsic toward Accomplishment reveals an overall mean of 4.33 (SD=1.17) which shows a high perception of intrinsic toward accomplishment among the respondents. The descriptive statistic for Intrinsic to Experience reveals an overall mean of 4.74 (SD=2.83) which shows a high perception of intrinsic to experience among the respondents. The descriptive statistic for Intrinsic Overall reveals an overall mean of 4.64 (SD=1.41) which shows a high perception of intrinsic overall among the respondents.

The descriptive statistic for Extrinsic Identified reveals an overall mean of 4.96 (SD=1.26) which shows a high perception of extrinsic identified among the respondents. The descriptive statistic for Extrinsic Introjected reveals an overall mean of 4.68 (SD=1.26) which shows a high perception of extrinsic introjected among the respondents. The descriptive statistic for Extrinsic External Regulation reveals an overall mean of 4.95 (SD=1.35) which shows a high perception of extrinsic external regulation among the respondents. The descriptive statistic for Extrinsic Overall reveals an overall mean of 4.86 (SD=1.17) which shows a high perception of extrinsic overall among the respondents.

The descriptive statistic for Amotivation reveals an overall mean of 3.21 (SD=0.39) which shows a moderate perception of amotivation among the respondents.

The descriptive statistic for Academic Motivation reveals an overall mean of 4.53 (SD=1.00) which shows a high perception of academic procrastination among the respondents.

Table 4.8 Academic Motivation

Academic Motivation		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intrinsic Motivation	To know	60	4.87	1.32		
	Towards					
	Accomplishment	60	4.33	1.17	4.64	1.41
	Experience					
Extrinsic Motivation	Stimulation	60	4.74	2.83		
	Identified	60	4.96	1.26		
	Introjected	60	4.68	1.26	1.17	1.41
	External					
Amotivation	Regulation	60	4.95	1.35		
	Amotivation	60	3.21	0.39	3.21	0.39

Source Computed

4.4.1 Gender and Academic Motivation

An independent sample T-test was conducted to compare Intrinsic to Know for male and female college students. The mean score for male ($m=18.2$, $SD=5.3$) was lower than female ($m=20.5$, $SD=5.2$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=1.675$, $p=0.099$) in the perception of Intrinsic to Know between male and female college students.

An independent sample T-test was conducted to compare Intrinsic Toward Accomplishment for male and female college students. The mean score for male ($m=17.9$, $SD=5.1$) was higher than female ($m=16.8$, $SD=4.3$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.882$, $p=0.381$) in the perception of Intrinsic Toward Accomplishment between male and female college students.

An independent sample T-test was conducted to compare Intrinsic to Experience of male and female college students. The mean score for male ($m=20.0$, $SD=15.8$) was higher than for female ($m=18.1$, $SD=5.6$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.646$, $p=0.521$) in the perception of Intrinsic to Experience between male and female college students.

An independent sample T-test was conducted to compare Intrinsic overall for male and female college students. The mean score for male ($m=56.1$, $SD=21.7$) was higher than female ($m=55.4$, $SD=12.1$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.162$, $p=0.872$) in the perception of Intrinsic overall 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 ($m=19.1$, $SD=5.1$) was lower than female ($m=20.5$, $SD=5.0$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=1.077$, $p=0.286$) in the perception of Extrinsic 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 ($m=18.6$, $SD=5.1$) was lower than female ($m=18.8$, $SD=5.1$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.143$, $p=0.886$) in the perception of 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 ($m=19.1$, $SD=5.3$) was lower than female ($m=20.4$, $SD=5.4$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.867$, $p=0.389$) in the perception of Extrinsic External Regulation between male and female college students.

An independent sample T-test was conducted to compare Extrinsic overall for male and female college students. The mean score for male ($m=56.6$, $SD=14.4$) was lower than female ($m=59.7$, $SD=13.8$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.867$, $p=0.39$) in the perception of Extrinsic overall 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 ($m=14.0$, $SD=4.9$) was lower than female ($m=11.8$, $SD=4.3$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=1.828$, $p=0.073$) in the perception of Amotivation between male and female college students.

An independent sample T-test was conducted to compare Academic Motivation for male and female college students. The mean score for male ($m=126.7$, $SD=32.9$) was lower than female ($m=127.0$, $SD=23.9$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.036$, $p=0.971$) in the perception of Academic Motivation between male and female college students.

Table 4.9 Gender and Academic Motivation

Academic Motivation			N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intrinsic Motivation	To know	Male	27	18.2	5.3
		Female	33	20.5	5.2
	Towards Accomplishment	Male	27	17.9	5.1
		Female	33	16.8	4.3
	Experience Stimulation	Male	27	20.0	15.8
		Female	33	18.1	5.6
	Overall intrinsic Motivation	Male	27	56.1	21.7
		Female	33	55.4	12.1
	Identified	Male	27	19.1	5.1
		Female	33	20.5	5.0
Extrinsic Motivation	Introjected	Male	27	18.6	5.1
		Female	33	18.8	5.1
	External Regulation	Male	27	19.1	5.3
		Female	33	20.4	5.4
	Overall Extrinsic Motivation	Male	27	56.6	14.4
		Female	33	59.7	13.8
Amotivation	Amotivation	Male	27	14.0	4.9
		Female	33	11.8	4.3

Source: Computed

Table 4.10 T-test Gender and Academic Motivation

		t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)	t	df	Sig. (2- tailed)
Academic Motivation										
Intrinsic Motivation	To know	- 1.675	58	0.099						
	Towards Accomplishment	0.882	58	0.381	0.16	58	0.872			
	Experience Stimulation	0.646	58	0.521						
	Identified	- 1.077	58	0.286				-.036	58	.971
Extrinsic Motivation	Introjected	- 0.143	58	0.886	- 0.87	58	0.39			
	External Regulation	- 0.867	58	0.389						
Amotivation	Amotivation	1.828	58	0.073	1.83	58	0.073			

Source: Computed

4.4.2 Community and Academic Motivation

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Intrinsic to Know for rural and urban communities among college students. The mean score for rural ($m=19.0$, $SD=5.4$) was lower than urban ($m=19.8$, $SD=5.3$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.625$ $p=0.535$) in the perception of the Intrinsic to Know between rural and urban communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Intrinsic toward Accomplishment for rural and urban communities among college students. The mean score for rural ($m=18.0$, $SD=4.2$) was higher than urban ($m=16.8$, $SD=5.0$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.924$ $p=0.359$) in the perception of the Intrinsic toward Accomplishment between rural and urban communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Intrinsic to Experience in rural and urban communities among college students. The mean score for rural ($m=20.3$, $SD=16.4$) was higher than urban ($m=18.0$, $SD=5.6$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.789$ $p=0.433$) in the perception of the Intrinsic to Experience between rural and urban communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Intrinsic overall in rural and urban communities among college students. The mean score for rural ($m=57.2$, $SD=21.2$) was higher than urban ($m=54.6$, $SD=13.4$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.585$ $p=0.561$) in the perception of Intrinsic overall between rural and urban communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Extrinsic Identified in rural and urban communities among college students. The mean score for rural ($m=19.6$, $SD=5.4$) was lower than urban ($m=20.0$, $SD=4.9$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.27$ $p=0.788$) in the perception of Extrinsic Identified between rural and urban communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Extrinsic Introjected in rural and urban communities among college students. The mean score for rural ($m=18.4$, $SD=4.9$) was lower than urban ($m=19.0$, $SD=5.1$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.484$ $p=0.631$) in the perception of Extrinsic Introjected between rural and urban communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Extrinsic External Regulation in rural and urban communities among college students. The mean score for rural ($m=18.4$, $SD=5.7$) was lower than urban ($m=20.8$, $SD=5.0$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=1.699$ $p=0.095$) in the perception of Extrinsic External Regulation between rural and urban communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Extrinsic overall in rural and urban communities among college students. The mean score for rural ($m=55.8$, $SD=14.5$) was lower than urban ($m=60.1$, $SD=13.7$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=1.186$ $p=0.241$) in the perception of Extrinsic overall between rural and urban communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Amotivation in rural and urban communities among college students. The mean score for rural ($m=13.3$, $SD=4.5$) was higher than urban ($m=12.5$, $SD=4.9$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.674$ $p=0.503$) in the perception of Amotivation between rural and urban communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Academic Motivation in rural and urban communities among college students. The mean score for rural ($m=126.3$, $SD=32.3$) was lower than urban ($m=127.2$, $SD=25.0$). There was an insignificant difference ($t=0.123$ $p=0.903$) in the perception of Academic Motivation between rural and urban communities.

Table 4.11 Community and Academic Motivation

Academic Motivation			N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intrinsic Motivation	To know	rural	25	19.0	5.4
		urban	35	19.8	5.3
	Towards Accomplishment	rural	25	18.0	4.2
		urban	35	16.8	5.0
	Experience Stimulation	rural	25	20.3	16.4
		urban	35	18.0	5.6
	Overall intrinsic Motivation	rural	25	57.2	21.2
		urban	35	54.6	13.4
	Extrinsic Motivation	Identified	rural	19.6	5.4
		urban	35	20.0	4.9
		Introjected	rural	18.4	4.9
		urban	35	19.0	5.1
		External Regulation	rural	18.4	5.7
		urban	35	20.8	5.0
	Overall Extrinsic Motivation	rural	25	55.8	14.5
		urban	35	60.1	13.7
Amotivation	Amotivation	rural	25	13.3	4.5
		urban	35	12.5	4.9

Source: Computed

Table 4.12 t-test 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	-0.625	58	0.535	0.59	58	0.561	-1.120	58	.903
	Towards Accomplishment	0.924	58	0.359						
	Experience Stimulation	0.789	58	0.433						
	Identified	-0.27	58	0.788						
Extrinsic Motivation	Introjected	-0.484	58	0.631	-1.19	58	0.241	-1.120	58	.903
	External Regulation	-1.699	58	0.095						
Amotivation	Amotivation	0.674	58	0.503	0.67	58	0.503	-1.120	58	.903

Source: Computed

4.4.3 Socio-economic Background and Academic Motivation

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Intrinsic to Know among college students in poor and non-poor communities. The mean score for poor ($m=18.8$, $SD=5.4$) was higher than that for non-poor ($m=62.7$, $SD=17.7$). There was no significant difference ($t=2.158$, $p=0.035$) in the perception of Academic Procrastination between poor and non-poor communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Intrinsic toward Accomplishment in poor and non-poor communities among college students. The mean score for poor ($m=17.2$, $SD=4.8$) was higher than that for non-poor ($m=17.4$, $SD=4.6$). There was no significant difference ($t=0.175$, $p=0.862$) in the perception of Intrinsic toward Accomplishment between poor and non-poor communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Intrinsic to Experience in poor and non-poor communities among college students. The mean score for poor ($m=19.0$, $SD=13.8$) was higher than non-poor ($m=18.8$, $SD=5.7$). There was no significant difference ($t=0.066$, $p=0.947$) in the perception of Intrinsic to Experience between poor and non-poor communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Intrinsic overall in poor and non-poor communities among college students. The mean score for poor ($m=55.1$, $SD=19.5$) was higher than non-poor ($m=56.8$, $SD=12.1$). There was no significant difference ($t=0.381$, $p=0.704$) in the perception of Intrinsic overall between poor and non-poor communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Extrinsic Identified in poor and non-poor communities among college students. The mean score for poor ($m=19.2$, $SD=5.1$) was lower than non-poor ($m=20.9$, $SD=4.9$). There was no significant difference ($t=1.237$, $p=0.221$) in the perception of Extrinsic Identified between poor and non-poor communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Extrinsic Introjected in poor and non-poor communities among college students. The mean score for poor ($m=18.4$, $SD=5.1$) was lower than non-poor ($m=19.3$, $SD=5.0$). There was no significant difference ($t=0.638$, $p=0.526$) in the perception of Extrinsic Introjected between poor and non-poor communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Extrinsic External Regulation in poor and non-poor communities among college students. The mean score for poor ($m=19.0$, $SD=5.6$) was lower than non-poor ($m=21.2$, $SD=4.9$). There was no significant difference ($t=1.557$ $p=0.125$) in the perception of Extrinsic External Regulation between poor and non-poor communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Extrinsic overall in poor and non-poor communities among college students. The mean score for poor ($m=56.3$, $SD=14.2$) was lower than non-poor ($m=61.5$, $SD=13.6$). There was no significant difference ($t=1.41$ $p=0.164$) in the perception of Extrinsic overall between poor and non-poor communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Amotivation in poor and non-poor communities among college students. The mean score for poor ($m=12.7$, $SD=4.6$) was lower than non-poor ($m=13.0$, $SD=5.0$). There was no significant difference ($t=1.828$ $p=0.073$) in the perception of Amotivation between poor and non-poor communities.

An independent sample t-test was conducted to compare Academic Motivation in poor and non-poor communities among college students. The mean score for poor ($m=124.1$, $SD=30.6$) was lower than non-poor ($m=131.3$, $SD=23.3$). There was no significant difference ($t=0.971$ $p=0.336$) in the perception of Academic Motivation between poor and non-poor communities.

Table 4.13 Socio-economic Status and Academic Motivation

Academic Motivation			N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Intrinsic Motivation	To know	Poor	37	18.8	5.4
		Non-poor	23	20.5	5.1
	Towards Accomplishment	Poor	37	17.2	4.8
		Non-poor	23	17.4	4.6
	Experience Stimulation	Poor	37	19.0	13.8
		Non-poor	23	18.8	5.7
	Overall intrinsic Motivation	Poor	37	55.1	19.5
		Non-poor	23	56.8	12.1
Extrinsic Motivation	Identified	Poor	37	19.2	5.1
		Non-poor	23	20.9	4.9
	Introjected	Poor	37	18.4	5.1
		Non-poor	23	19.3	5.0
	External Regulation	Poor	37	19.0	5.6
		Non-poor	23	21.2	4.9
	Overall Extrinsic Motivation	Poor	37	56.3	14.2
		Non-poor	23	61.5	13.6
Amotivation	Amotivation	Poor	37	12.7	4.6
		Non-poor	23	13.0	5.0

Source: Computed

Table 4.14 t-test Socio-economic Status and Academic Motivation

Academic Motivation		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Intrinsic Motivation	To know	-1.225	58	0.226	-0.38	58	0.704	-.971	58	.336
	Towards Accomplishment	-0.175	58	0.862						
	Experience Stimulation	0.066	58	0.947						
Extrinsic Motivation	Identified	-1.237	58	0.221	-1.41	58	0.164			
	Introjected	-0.638	58	0.526						
	External Regulation	-1.557	58	0.125						
Amotivation	Amotivation	-0.215	58	0.831	-0.22	58	0.831			

Source: Computed

4.5 Relationship between Personality Traits, Academic Motivation and Academic Procrastination

A correlation matrix shows the relationships between variables, with each cell displaying how strongly two variables are associated. The matrix reveals how personality traits relate to motivation and procrastination, identifies patterns across variables, and reveals which traits predict academic behaviours. This helps to understand and target traits that influence academic outcomes.

The correlation matrix reveals a positive correlation of 0.460 between Openness and Academic Motivation, suggesting a low positive relationship which is significant at 0.05 level. Thus, higher levels of openness are linked to increased academic motivation among students.

The correlation matrix shows a negative correlation of -0.368 between Conscientiousness and Academic Procrastination, indicating a low negative relationship which is significant at 0.05 level where higher levels of conscientiousness are linked to lower levels of academic procrastination among students.

Table 4.15 Personality Traits: Academic motivation and academic procrastination (Spearman's rho)

	Academic motivation	Academic Procrastination
extroversion	-0.174	0.036
Agreeableness	0.219	0.087
Conscientiousness	0.188	-.368**
Neuroticism	-0.246	0.019
Openness	.460**	-0.199
Source: Computed		

The correlation matrix indicates a negative correlation of -0.261 between Academic Motivation and Academic Procrastination, suggesting a very low negative association which is significant at 0.01 level where higher academic motivation is linked to reduced academic procrastination among students.

Table 4.16 Academic motivation and academic procrastination (Spearman's rho)

	Academic Procrastination
Academic motivation	-.261*
Source: Computed	

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

This chapter presents the major findings, conclusion, and suggestions. It further summarizes the major findings, which are broken into three major sections. It concludes that there is a nuanced relationship between college students' Academic Procrastination, Academic Motivation, and Personality traits.

5.1 Major findings:

The demographic data reveals that there is a notably higher representation of female students, primarily from nuclear families and stable family backgrounds. Their parents are predominantly engaged in agriculture and government employment, with the majority of students benefiting from some form of socioeconomic support. Academically, these students are focused on fields such as Education, English, History, Public Administration, Political Science, Psychology, and Mizo. Moreover, all students share a common religious background in Christianity. These findings are crucial for interpreting the study's results and highlighting the backgrounds that shape the student's academic and personal experiences.

The findings indicate that both male and female students exhibit certain levels of academic procrastination, with females demonstrating slightly higher levels. It further indicated that Academic procrastination was more relevant among urban communities and significantly higher among non-poor communities.

The findings indicate that both male and female students exhibit similar levels of the Big Five personality traits, with females demonstrating higher levels in all traits. It showed that extroversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness were more relevant among urban communities. While neuroticism was more relevant in rural communities. It also revealed that openness was significantly similar in both rural and urban communities. The findings also indicated that extroversion, conscientiousness, and openness were higher in non-poor communities while agreeableness and neuroticism were higher among poor communities.

The findings reveal that both male and female students exhibit significant intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, with males generally demonstrating slightly higher levels of motivation across various categories. It also revealed that the levels of amotivation were higher among males. The findings indicated an overall higher motivation level in all categories among rural communities. It also showed that the levels of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation were higher

among poor communities while the levels of amotivation were higher among non-poor communities.

The correlation matrix revealed a low positive relationship between Openness and Academic Motivation. It also indicated that there was a low negative relationship association between Conscientiousness and Academic Procrastination. The findings also revealed that there was a very low negative association between Academic Motivation and Academic Procrastination.

The majority findings underline the importance of understanding both personality and motivation in addressing academic procrastination among college students, suggesting that tailored support and interventions can help mitigate procrastination and enhance academic success.

5.2 Conclusion

This research study has explored the intricate relationships between academic motivation, academic procrastination, and personality traits among college students, revealing significant insights into how these factors interact to influence academic outcomes. The findings highlight the importance of understanding individual differences in personality traits—such as conscientiousness, neuroticism, agreeableness, extroversion, and openness—and their effects on students' motivation levels and procrastination tendencies.

The study confirmed that conscientiousness is a critical predictor of high academic motivation and low academic procrastination. Students exhibiting high levels of conscientiousness tend to be more organized, disciplined, and goal-oriented, which fosters greater engagement in their academic work. This aligns with existing literature suggesting that conscientious individuals are less likely to procrastinate due to their strong commitment to achieving their goals. Conversely, students with higher levels of neuroticism demonstrated increased procrastination and lower motivation, as anxiety and emotional instability can hinder focus and productivity. These findings are particularly relevant in educational settings, where understanding the role of personality traits can lead to more tailored academic support and interventions.

Moreover, the study revealed that extroversion and agreeableness had positive correlations with academic motivation, indicating that socially active and cooperative students may find greater joy and satisfaction in their academic endeavours, reducing the likelihood of

procrastination. In contrast, students exhibiting lower levels of these traits may benefit from strategies aimed at enhancing their social engagement and collaborative learning experiences.

The implications of these findings are substantial for educators and academic counsellors. By recognizing the influence of personality traits on academic behaviour, institutions can implement targeted interventions that foster motivation and reduce procrastination. This might include personalized academic advising, workshops focused on time management and self-regulation, and initiatives designed to enhance social connections among students.

In summary, this research underscores the relevance of personality traits in shaping academic motivation and procrastination behaviours among college students. By integrating insights from personality psychology into educational practices, colleges can better support students in achieving their academic potential, ultimately contributing to improved educational outcomes and student well-being. Future research should continue exploring these dynamics, considering other contextual factors such as cultural background and educational environment, to further enhance our understanding of cultivating motivation and mitigating procrastination in diverse student populations.

5.3 Suggestion

Based on the findings presented, several recommendations for future research are put forth to further investigate the relationships among academic procrastination, motivation, and personality traits in college students.

1) Focus Groups:

Conduct focus groups with students to gain deeper insights into their perspectives on procrastination, their motivations for academic engagement, and how personality traits might influence their academic behaviours.

2) Using Personality-Tailored Study Techniques:

Social workers can introduce study techniques that align with different personality traits. For instance, highly conscientious students may prefer detailed planning and structured learning, while more extroverted students may benefit from group study sessions or collaborative projects to stay motivated.

APPENDICS

i. References

- Ashton, M. C., & Lee, K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 11(2), 150-166. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868306294907>
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R) and NEO Five-Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) professional manual*. Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review*, 95(2), 256-273.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.95.2.256>
- Eccles, J. S., & Wigfield, A. (2002). Motivational beliefs, values, and goals. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53, 109-132.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135153>
- 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.
- John, O. P., Naumann, L. P., & Soto, C. J. (2008). Paradigm shift to the integrative Big Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and conceptual issues. In O. P. John, R. W. Robins, & L. A. Pervin (Eds.), *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (pp. 114-158). Guilford Press.
- Ozer, D. J., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2006). Personality and the prediction of consequential outcomes. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57, 401-421.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190127>
- Pintrich, P. R. (2004). A conceptual framework for assessing motivation and self-regulated learning in college students. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(4), 385-407.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-004-0006-x>
- Pychyl, T. A., & Sirois, F. M. (2016). *Procrastination, health, and well-being*. Academic Press.
- Roberts, B. W., Walton, K. E., & Viechtbauer, W. (2006). Patterns of mean-level change in personality traits across the life course: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(1), 1-25. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.132.1.1>
- Rozental, A., & Carlbring, P. (2014). Internet-based cognitive behavior therapy for procrastination: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 82(2), 208-217. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035085>

- Solomon, L. J., & Rothblum, E. D. (1984). Academic procrastination: Frequency and cognitive-behavioral correlates. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 31(4), 503-509.
- <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0167.31.4.503>
- 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>
- Wolters, C. A. (2004). Advancing achievement goal theory: Using goal structures and goal orientations to predict students' motivation, cognition, and achievement. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 96(2), 236-250.
- <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.96.2.236>

Schedule No.____

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

Researcher
Naomi Lalruatdiki

Research Supervisor
RTC Lalremruata

Department of Social Work
Higher And Technical Institute, Mizoram

Department of Social

(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)APL 2)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 supposed 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 meant 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 an 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 wait until the night before a test to figure it out.					
25	I read the textbook and look over notes 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.							