

Chapter Four

Finding and Discussion

This chapter provides findings of the data analysis and discussion about it. The findings in this chapter are the result from the data collected by the researcher and analyzed using SPSS. Moreover, the findings that relate to the research questions are discussed afterwards. Thus, it reveals whether the findings correspond or not with the hypothesis.

Finding

Entire questionnaire items descriptive statistic. After inputting the raw data into SPSS program version 22, the data computation and analysis to discover the descriptive statistic of the questionnaire items were done. Principally, the questionnaire items were encoded as follows:

Item Number	Coding	Statement
1	A1	I needlessly delay finishing jobs, even when they are important (<i>Saya menunda untuk menyelesaikan pekerjaan meskipun itu penting</i>).
2	A2	I postpone starting in on things I do not like to do (<i>Saya menunda untuk memulai suatu hal yang tidak saya sukai</i>).
3	A3	I delay main tough decision (<i>Saya menunda untuk memutuskan sesuatu meskipun itu penting</i>).
4	A4	I keep putting off improving my work habits (<i>Saya terus</i>

		<i>menunda untuk meningkatkan kinerja saya dalam bekerja).</i>
6	A6	I manage to find an excuse for not doing something (<i>Saya berusaha mencari alasan untuk tidak melakukan sesuatu</i>).
9	A9	I am and incurable time waster (<i>Saya selalu menyalahgunakan waktu</i>).
10	A10	I am a time waster now, but I cannot seem to do anything about it (<i>Saya selalu menyalahgunakan waktu dan saya tidak bisa mengendalikannya</i>).
15	A15	I still get stuck in neutral, even though I know how important it is to get started (<i>Saya tidak segera memulai pekerjaan meskipun pekerjaan tersebut penting</i>).
20	B4	To what degree is procrastination on studying for exam a problem for you? (<i>Seberapa sering menunda belajar untuk persiapan ujian menjadi masalah untuk anda?</i>)
23	B7	To what degree do you procrastinate on registering for classes? (<i>Seberapa sering anda menunda-nunda "key-in"?</i>)
24	B8	To what degree is procrastination on registering for classes a problem for you? (<i>Seberapa sering menunda "key-in" menjadi masalah untuk anda?</i>)
25	B9	To what degree do you procrastinate on meeting with your lecturer? (<i>Seberapa sering anda menunda-nunda untuk menemui dosen anda?</i>)

26	B10	To what degree is procrastination on meeting with your lecturer a problem for you? (<i>Seberapa sering menunda untuk menemui dosen menjadi masalah untuk anda?</i>)
27	B11	To what degree do you procrastinate on campus activity in general? (<i>Seberapa sering anda menunda-nunda kegiatan kampus secara umum?</i>)
28	B12	To what degree is procrastination on campus activity a problem for you? (<i>Seberapa sering menunda kegiatan kampus secara umum menjadi masalah untuk anda?</i>)

Here, the descriptive statistic from the data after being analyzed by the researcher using SPSS is depicted. The table below is the result of questionnaire items that was spread to EED UMY students. The result was gained from 336 students from batch 2012, 2013, and 2014 on the academic year 2015/2016.

Table 7. The Descriptive Statistics of Questionnaire Items

	N	Sum	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	
	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Statistic	Std. Error
A1	336	899	2.68	.817	-.429	.133
A2	336	1110	3.30	.838	-.069	.133

A3	336	775	2.31	.856	.285	.133
A4	336	772	2.30	.901	.189	.133
A6	336	854	2.54	.893	-.252	.133
A9	336	844	2.51	.937	-.090	.133
A10	336	820	2.44	.944	.066	.133
A15	336	880	2.62	.866	-.122	.133
B4	336	944	2.81	.989	.018	.133
B7	336	717	2.13	1.129	.786	.133
B8	336	724	2.15	1.084	.607	.133
B9	336	820	2.44	.957	.109	.133
B10	336	851	2.53	1.022	.156	.133
B11	336	879	2.62	.926	-.071	.133
B12	336	866	2.58	.911	-.303	.133
Valid N (listwise)	336					

The table above indicates that all questionnaire items are valid based on the skewness. The normality of items can be seen from the skewness value which the range is in between -1 and $+1$. It is proven that there is no skewness value which is less than -1 and more than $+1$.

Questionnaire items frequency analysis. The next following paragraph describes the frequency table of entire questionnaire items in sequence. Explicit

explanations follow each table. Thus, 15 valid items is portrayed in tables and numbers.

Table 8 shows the frequency of questionnaire item number 1: I needlessly delay finishing jobs, even when they are important (*Saya menunda untuk menyelesaikan pekerjaan meskipun itu penting*).

Table 8. Item A1

A1	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	37	11.0	11.0	11.0
Almost Never	69	20.5	20.5	31.5
Sometimes	200	59.5	59.5	91.1
Nearly Always	26	7.7	7.7	98.8
Always	4	1.2	1.2	100.0
Total	336	100.0	100.0	

The table above depicts that there are 200 respondents (59.5%) from the total 336 respondents who procrastinate important task occasionally. Besides, 69 respondents (20.5%) are seldom to procrastinate on important task. In addition, 37 respondents (11%) never procrastinate on important task. Moreover, 26 respondents (7.7%) are

often to procrastinate on important task and 4 respondents (1.2%) always procrastinate on important task.

Table 9 illustrates the result of frequency of the questionnaire item number 2: I postpone starting in on things I do not like to do (*Saya menunda untuk memulai suatu hal yang tidak saya sukai*).

Table 9. Item A2

A2	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	8	2.4	2.4	2.4
Almost Never	32	9.5	9.5	11.9
Sometimes	172	51.2	51.2	63.1
Nearly Always	98	29.2	29.2	92.3
Always	26	7.7	7.7	100.0
Total	336	100.0	100.0	

The table above shows that 8 out of 336 (2.4%) respondents never postpone starting unlovable task. Then, 9.5% of respondents are seldom to postpone starting unlovable task. Besides, 51.2% of respondents sometimes postpone starting unlovable task. Moreover, 29.2% and 7.7% of respondents consecutively often and always procrastinate to start unlovable task.

Table 10 demonstrates the result of frequency of the questionnaire item number 3: I delay main tough decision (*Saya menunda untuk memutuskan sesuatu meskipun itu penting*).

Table 10. Item A3

A3	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	58	17.3	17.3	17.3
Almost Never	143	42.6	42.6	59.8
Sometimes	112	33.3	33.3	93.2
Nearly Always	20	6.0	6.0	99.1
Always	3	.9	.9	100.0
Total	336	100.0	100.0	

The table above depicts that 17.3% of respondents never delay to decide important thing and 42% of respondents are seldom to delay deciding important thing. Meanwhile, 33.3% of respondents sometimes delay to decide important thing. Moreover, 6% and 0.9% of respondents sequentially often and always delay to decide important thing.

Table 11 portrays the result of frequency of questionnaire item number 4: I keep putting off improving my work habits (*Saya terus menunda untuk meningkatkan kinerja saya dalam bekerja*).

Table 11. Item A4

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	69	20.5	20.5	20.5
Almost Never	129	38.4	38.4	58.9
Sometimes	108	32.1	32.1	91.1
Nearly Always	29	8.6	8.6	99.7
Always	1	.3	.3	100.0
Total	336	100.0	100.0	

The table above indicates that 20.5% of respondents never postpone improving work performance. Besides, 38.4% of respondents are seldom to postpone improving work performance. Moreover, 32.1% of respondents sometimes postpone improving work performance. While 8.6% of respondents often postpone improving work performance, 0.3% of respondents always postpone improving work performance.

Table 12 depicts the result of frequency of questionnaire item number 6: I manage to find an excuse for not doing something (*Saya berusaha mencari alasan untuk tidak melakukan sesuatu*).

Table 12. Item A6

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	53	15.8	15.8	15.8
Almost Never	85	25.3	25.3	41.1
Sometimes	163	48.5	48.5	89.6
Nearly Always	33	9.8	9.8	99.4
Always	2	.6	.6	100.0
Total	336	100.0	100.0	

The table above points out that 15.8% of respondents never find an excuse to left the task whereas 25.3% of respondents seldom find an excuse to left the task.

Furthermore, 48.5% of respondents often find an excuse to left the task. As well, 9.8% and 0.6% of respondents, in order, often and always find an excuse to left the task.

Table 13 shows the result of frequency of questionnaire item number 9: I am an incurable time waster (*Saya selalu menya-nyiakan waktu*).

Table 13. Item A9

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	58	17.3	17.3	17.3
Almost Never	92	27.4	27.4	44.6
Sometimes	145	43.2	43.2	87.8
Nearly Always	38	11.3	11.3	99.1
Always	3	.9	.9	100.0
Total	336	100.0	100.0	

The table above portrays that 17.3% of respondents never waste time. Then, 27.4% of respondents seldom waste time. Besides, 43.2% of respondents sometimes waste time. Meanwhile, 11.3% of respondents often waste time and 0.9% of respondents always waste time.

Table 14 displays the result of frequency of questionnaire item number 10: I am a time waster now, but I cannot seem to do anything about it (*Saya selalu menyia-nyikan waktu dan saya tidak bisa mengendalikannya*).

Table 14. Item A10

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	63	18.8	18.8	18.8
Almost Never	103	30.7	30.7	49.4
Sometimes	133	39.6	39.6	89.0
Nearly Always	33	9.8	9.8	98.8
Always	4	1.2	1.2	100.0
Total	336	100.0	100.0	

The table above indicates that 18.8% of respondents are never able to control time wasting habit and 30.7% of respondents seldom are able to control time wasting habit. Then, 39.6% of respondents sometimes are able to control time wasting habit. As well, 9.8% of respondents are often able to control time wasting habit and 1.2% of respondents always are able to control time wasting habit.

Table 15 shows the result of frequency of questionnaire item number 15: I still get stuck in neutral, even though I know how important it is to get started (*Saya tidak segera memulai pekerjaan meskipun pekerjaan tersebut penting*).

Table 15. Item A15

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	38	11.3	11.3	11.3
Almost Never	96	28.6	28.6	39.9
Sometimes	162	48.2	48.2	88.1
Nearly Always	36	10.7	10.7	98.8
Always	4	1.2	1.2	100.0
Total	336	100.0	100.0	

The table above points out that 11.3% of respondents never put off to start important task. Besides, 28.6% of respondents seldom put off to start important task.

Meanwhile, 48.2% of respondents sometimes put off to start important task. In addition, 10.7% of respondents often put off to start important task. Then, there are 1.2% of respondents who always put off to start important task.

Table 16 portrays the result of frequency of questionnaire item number 20: To what degree is procrastination on studying for exam a problem for you? (*Seberapa sering menunda belajar untuk persiapan ujian menjadi masalah untuk anda?*)

Table 16. Item B4

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	34	10.1	10.1	10.1
Almost Never	86	25.6	25.6	35.7
Sometimes	140	41.7	41.7	77.4
Nearly Always	62	18.5	18.5	95.8
Always	14	4.2	4.2	100.0
Total	336	100.0	100.0	

The table above illustrates that 10.1% of respondents never have problem from procrastination on studying for exam. Then, 25.6% of respondents seldom have problem from procrastination on studying for exam. As well, 41.7% of respondents sometimes have problem from procrastination on studying for exam. Besides, 18.5% of respondents often have problem from procrastination on studying for exam. Furthermore, 4.2% of respondents always have problem from procrastination on studying for exam.

Table 17 depicts the result of frequency of questionnaire item number 23: To what degree do you procrastinate on registering for classes? (*Seberapa sering anda menunda-nunda "key-in"?*)

Table 17. Item B7

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	121	36.0	36.0	36.0
Almost Never	111	33.0	33.0	69.0
Sometimes	53	15.8	15.8	84.8
Nearly Always	40	11.9	11.9	96.7
Always	11	3.3	3.3	100.0
Total	336	100.0	100.0	

The table above shows that 36% of respondents never procrastinate on registering classes. Meanwhile, 33% of respondents seldom procrastinate on registering classes. Besides, 15.8% of respondents sometimes procrastinate on registering classes. Also, 11.9% of respondents often procrastinate on registering classes. Then, 3.3% of respondents always procrastinate on registering classes.

Table 18 illustrates the result of frequency of questionnaire item number 24:

To what degree is procrastination on registering for classes a problem for you?

(Seberapa sering menunda “key-in” menjadi masalah untuk anda?)

Table 18. Item B8

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	117	34.8	34.8	34.8
Almost Never	101	30.1	30.1	64.9
Sometimes	74	22.0	22.0	86.9
Nearly Always	37	11.0	11.0	97.9
Always	7	2.1	2.1	100.0
Total	336	100.0	100.0	

The table above displays that 34.8% of respondents never have problem from procrastination on registering classes whereas 30.1% of respondents seldom have problem from procrastination on registering classes. In addition, 22% of respondents sometimes have problem from procrastination on registering classes. While 11% of respondents often have problem from procrastination on registering classes, 2.1% of students always have problem from procrastination on registering classes.

Table 19 shows the result of frequency of questionnaire item number 25: To what degree do you procrastinate on meeting with your lecturer? (*Seberapa sering anda menunda-nunda untuk menemui dosen anda?*)

Table 19. Item B9

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	64	19.0	19.0	19.0
Almost Never	103	30.7	30.7	49.7
Sometimes	131	39.0	39.0	88.7
Nearly Always	33	9.8	9.8	98.5
Always	5	1.5	1.5	100.0
Total	336	100.0	100.0	

The table above points out that 19% of respondents never procrastinate on meeting with lecturer. Furthermore, 30.7% of respondents seldom procrastinate on meeting with lecturer. In addition, 39% of respondents sometimes procrastinate on meeting with lecturer. Besides, 9.8% of respondents often procrastinate on meeting with lecturer. As well, 1.5% of respondents always procrastinate on meeting with lecturer.

Table 20 portrays the result of frequency of questionnaire item number 26: To what degree is procrastination on meeting with your lecturer a problem for you? (*Seberapa sering menunda untuk menemui dosen menjadi masalah untuk anda?*)

Table 20. Item B10

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	62	18.5	18.5	18.5
Almost Never	94	28.0	28.0	46.4
Sometimes	129	38.4	38.4	84.8
Nearly Always	41	12.2	12.2	97.0
Always	10	3.0	3.0	100.0
Total	336	100.0	100.0	

The table above indicates that 18.5% of respondents never have problem from procrastination on meeting with lecturer and 28% of respondents seldom have problem from procrastination on meeting with lecturer. Then, 38.4% of respondents sometimes have problem from procrastination on meeting with lecturer. Furthermore, 12.2% of respondents often have problem from procrastination on meeting with lecturer and 3% of respondents always have problem from procrastination on meeting with lecturer.

Table 21 depicts the result of frequency of questionnaire item number 27: To what degree do you procrastinate on campus activity in general? (*Seberapa sering anda menunda-nunda kegiatan kampus secara umum?*)

Table 21. Item B11

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	47	14.0	14.0	14.0
Almost Never	85	25.3	25.3	39.3
Sometimes	161	47.9	47.9	87.2
Nearly Always	36	10.7	10.7	97.9
Always	7	2.1	2.1	100.0
Total	336	100.0	100.0	

The table above displays that 14% of respondents never procrastinate on campus activity in general. Besides, 25.3% of respondents seldom procrastinate on campus activity in general. In addition, 47% of respondents sometimes procrastinate on campus activity in general. Moreover, 10.7% and 2.1% of respondents consecutively often and always procrastinate on campus activity in general.

Table 22 illustrates the result of frequency of questionnaire item number 28: To what degree is procrastination on campus activity a problem for you? (*Seberapa sering menunda kegiatan kampus secara umum menjadi masalah untuk anda?*)

Table 22. Item B12

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid Never	54	16.1	16.1	16.1
Almost Never	76	22.6	22.6	38.7
Sometimes	166	49.4	49.4	88.1
Nearly Always	38	11.3	11.3	99.4
Always	2	.6	.6	100.0
Total	336	100.0	100.0	

The table above portrays that, in sequence, 16% and 22.6% of respondents never and seldom have problem from procrastination on campus activity in general. Meanwhile, 49.4% of respondents sometimes have problem from procrastination on campus activity in general. While 11.3% of respondents often have problem from procrastination on campus activity in general, 0.6% of respondents always have problem from procrastination on campus activity in general.

The EED UMY students' procrastination. After calculating all data, the researcher determined the mean of total procrastination score and divided into three levels based on the interval formula with SPSS. The result of frequency of total scores can be seen below.

Table 23. Frequency Table of**Total Score**

Procrastination Total Score

N	Valid	336
	Missing	0
Mean		2.5310
Std. Deviation		.52515
Skewness		-.073
Std. Error of Skewness		.133
Sum		850.40
Percentiles	33.33333333	2.3300
	66.66666667	2.8000

As the result from the table above, the quartiles show that the students who got the score below 2.33 are considered as having low level of procrastination whereas the students who got the score between 2.33 and 2.80 are considered as having moderate level of procrastination. On the other hand, students who got more than 2.80 are considered as having high level of procrastination. Those classifications can be seen clearer in the table 5. Moreover, the table also indicates that the average score of EED UMY students' procrastination is 2.531, or, if it is converted into percentage, the tendency of EED UMY students to procrastinate is 51%. Thus, the number indicates

that EED UMY students' procrastination level is moderate based on the categorization in the table 5 before.

Afterwards, the researcher decided which students belong to which level by using Microsoft Excel. It is revealed that 120 out of 336 students (36%) are considered as having low level of procrastination whereas 118 out of 336 students (35%) are considered as having moderate level of procrastination. Besides, 98 students (29%) are considered as having high level of procrastination. The distribution of each level can be seen clearer below.

Table 24. EED UMY Students' Procrastination Level Distribution

Level		Number of Students	Percentage
Valid	Low	120	36.0
	Moderate	118	35.0
	High	98	29.0
	Total	336	100.0

The EED UMY students' achievement. Based on UMY academic guideline book, there are three level of students' CGPA. They are very good, good, and satisfactory. However, after the researcher analyzed, there are some students who are not belong into those three levels, or their score is below satisfactory. Thus, the researcher decided to have one more level of CGPA (bad) to accommodate those students.

The researcher categorizes EED UMY students' CGPA into four levels. The result shows that 135 out of 336 students (40%) have very good CGPA. Then, 178 out of 336 students (53%) have good CGPA. Besides, 16 out of 336 students (5%) have satisfying CGPA. In addition, 7 students (2%) have bad CGPA. The distribution of each level is illustrated below.

Table 25. The Students' Achievement Category (CGPA)

Students' CGPA Category	Frequency	Percentage
Very Good : 3.51 – 4.00	135	40.0
Good : 2.76 – 3.50	178	53.0
Satisfactory : 2.00 – 2.76	16	5.0
Bad : 2.75 – below	7	2.0
Total	336	100.0

The researcher also calculated the average of EED UMY students' achievement using Microsoft Excel. It turns out that the average of EED UMY students' achievement is 3.33 or the accomplishment of EED UMY students in their academic is 83%. This number proves that EED UMY students' achievement is good based on the category above.

The relationship between EED students' procrastination and their achievement at UMY. After knowing the result of procrastination score and EED UMY students' achievement, the researcher intertwines both result to find out whether both are correlated or not. The finding is attained by activating Pearson Product Moment on SPSS version 22.0. When the probability value is ≤ 0.05 , H_a

(alternative hypothesis) is accepted. The result shows that the probability value is 0.000 which means that H_a is accepted, or there is correlation.

Furthermore, the strength and weakness of correlation can be known by the significance correlation value. The finding indicates that the value of significance correlation is -0.199 . It means that the correlation level between procrastination and EED UMY students' achievement is very low as depicted in table 6. The negative value means that both variables have negative correlation. It means that the increase of one point at one variable will be followed by the slight decrease at another variable. Therefore, when the procrastination level is high, the students' achievement is low. The correlational table is portrayed below.

Table 26. The Correlations between Procrastination and EED UMY Students' Achievement

		CGPA	Procrastination
CGPA	Pearson Correlation	1	-.199**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	336	336
Procrastination	Pearson Correlation	-.199**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	336	336

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

Discussion

The EED UMY students' procrastination. This research discovers that EED UMY students' procrastination is moderate as the average score of procrastination is 2.531. 36% and 35% of students, in sequence, are low and moderate procrastinator. Meanwhile, there are 29% of students who are high procrastinator. On the other word, EED UMY students' procrastination tendency is 51%.

The procrastination variances that occur in EED UMY students are two types. It can be seen from the result that 59.5% of students occasionally procrastinate on important thing which reflects on personal traits procrastination type. Meanwhile, 51.2% of students postpone doing something hated which refers to conditional procrastination type. As Babadogan (2010) stated, procrastination has two different types, they are personal traits and conditional procrastination. Hence, the result discovers that EED UMY students suffer both types of procrastination.

The arousal factor of EED UMY students' procrastination is dominantly from impulsive. The finding points out that 48.5% of students sometimes find excuse for not doing something and this happens because of their impulsiveness. It corresponds to Steel's (2007) and Steel's (2010) statement which emphasizes the main reason of procrastination is impulsive.

Although EED UMY students' procrastination level, in average, is moderate, the procrastination epidemic among EED UMY students is something to be worried about. It is based on the outcome which 43.2% of students confessed that the habit of putting off something is like incurable, even though they are aware that the habit is not good. It seems that the students just postpone the task only for a short pleasure

because they can escape from the duty even if just for a while. This proves Ingleheart's theory about postmodern value. He stated that for the last thirty years, Western society is infiltrated by postmodern values (as cited in Thakkar, 2009). As Indonesian people nowadays try to imitate Western society life style, the result is coherent with Ingleheart's theory.

The EED UMY students' achievement. The result shows that EED UMY students' achievement is good. This is based on the average score of the students' CGPA that reveals 3.33 or 83%. It indicates that even though various factors affect the achievement, the students still persist to pursue to get the best result. Therefore, the students may have good motivation to accomplish the entire task and it should weaken the possibility of procrastination. Heyningen confirmed that motivation has significant influence toward students' achievement and can predict academic success (as cited in Pritchard & Wilson, 2003).

However, still there are 7 out of 336 students (2%) who got bad CGPA (below 2.00). This happens because the procrastination existence in EED UMY. Although it is only 2% students who got bad CGPA, the procrastination in EED UMY should be concern about as 16 out of 336 students (5%) got satisfying CGPA (between 2.00 – 2.75). This result matches with Semb, Glick, and Spencer (1979) and Ozer and Sackes (2011) who highlighted that procrastination in academic setting often brings many negative results. Furthermore, Hasheminasab, Zarandi, Azizi, and Zadeh (2014) stated that there are some important factors impact student's achievement such as gender, self-efficacy, achievement motivation, and academic procrastination. Thus,

EED UMY students' achievement is in the middle range because of some bad factors like lack of motivation and academic procrastination.

The relationship between EED students' procrastination and their achievement at UMY. This research result reveals that there is relationship between procrastination and EED students' achievement at UMY. The correlation number is 0.000 Sig (2 tailed) signifying that the correlation is significant and the correlation value is -0.199 which represents that it is very low level. The result also shows that the correlation is negative. It is when one variable increases one point, the other variable slightly decreases. So, when procrastination level increases, students' achievement decreases a little.

In order to see the relationship between procrastination and students' achievement (GPA) obviously, the researcher generates cross tabulation. The frequency and the percentage illustrates as follow.

Table 27. The Cross Tabulation between Procrastination and EED Students'**Achievement (GPA) at UMY**

Procrastination		GPA	GPA				Total
		Very Good	Good	Satisfying	Bad		
Procrastination	Low	Frequency	60	54	4	2	120
		Percentage	18%	16%	1%	1%	36%
	Moderate	Frequency	52	59	5	2	118
		Percentage	15%	18%	1%	1%	35%
	High	Frequency	23	65	7	3	98
		Percentage	7%	19%	2%	1%	29%
Total		Frequency	135	178	16	7	336
		Percentage	40%	53%	5%	2%	100%

The table above indicates that students with low level of procrastination achieve high achievement. It can be seen from the table that students with low level of procrastination 18% have very good GPA and 16% get good GPA. As the result of procrastination level is moderate with 51% and students' achievement is good with 83%, there are students with moderate level of procrastination 15% attaining very good GPA and 18% obtaining good GPA. Meanwhile, students with high level of procrastination 7% have very good GPA and 19% have good GPA.

Procrastination has relationship with students' achievement. It is because procrastinator students often fail in examination and they are lack of motivation in studying which results in low students' achievement and the further impact is that students quit from school and stop learning (Hussain & Sultan, 2010). Amusingly, academic achievement could predict procrastination and vice versa (Kandemir, 2014). So, when students have high academic achievement, it can envisage that the procrastination level is low and vice versa. The result is linear with previous research which was conducted in Nigeria (Akinsola, Tella, & Tella, 2007) and in India (Lakshminarayan, Potdar, & Reddy, 2013). Those researches discovered that there is correlation between procrastination and students' achievement.