Journal of Hospitality Research Article
ISSN 2643-0924 (online) 2022, 4(1-2), 1-14

Self-Efficacy and Academic Procrastination among Tourism and Hospitality Students in the New Normal of Education

Aladin M. Ibrahim[1], Shyla F. Belarga[1], Mikhail Erika E. Causing[1], Shane Anne D. Pandaraoan[1] and Ella Marie Gonzaga[1]

[1] Joji Ilagan International School of Hotel and Tourism Management, General Santos City, South Cotabato, Philippines

E-mail: aladin.ibrahim@jojiilagancareercenter.com

Abstract

This study aimed to analyze the relationship between self-efficacy and academic procrastination among tourism and hospitality programs in the new normal setting. Survey-questionnaires served as the primary instrument for data collection. It utilized frequency, percentage, and weighted mean to analyze the collected data. The findings revealed that the level of self-efficacy is very high and the level of academic procrastination is very low. Moreover, the result shows that there is a weak negative correlation between two variables. Hence, as the level of self-efficacy increases, the level of academic procrastination decreases.

Keywords: Academic procrastination; Self-efficacy; New normal of education

1. Introduction

As the world took a massive turn from the normal cycle of life, people from all over the world were left with the choice of adapting to the new normal flow of everything; from businesses, work, and even school-related activities. In early January 2020, scientists identified a new infectious disease caused by a novel coronavirus; because of this, schools were faced with the challenge of shifting the delivery of education immediately through the new normal of learning through full online classes. According to United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (2020), more than 188 nations have enacted statewide school and university closures as of April 2020, impacting over 91% of the student population all over the globe.

Evidently, the tourism and hospitality industry have no exemption from this turmoil. World Tourism Organization (2020) stated that foreign visitors will drop by over 70%, with a resumption to pre-crisis scales not projected until 2023. Locally, international visitor sales fell to PHP 85 billion in the first quarter of the year, down 36% from the same period last year, according to the PricewaterhouseCoopers Philippines (2020). This has been a great challenge for the industry due to the travel restrictions made across the globe. Moreover, it has also been a concern for the academe of the sector. It affected the students' learning performance, affecting their proficiency and performance at work in the future. A study from Busser et al. (2021) stated that the ongoing pandemic has wreaked havoc on the tourism and hospitality education areas – numerous classes, job engagement activities regarded as necessary by students, and other academic activities were either temporarily suspended or shifted to online

modality. Hence, as future industry professionals, tourism and hospitality students are experiencing the terrible impacts of the pandemic on the industry. Thus, it may have affected their confidence and dedication to their academic degree and future professional careers.

Several studies claimed that because of the COVID-19 pandemic, most institutions worldwide were forced to shut down face-to-face classes and turn them into online learning instead (Ali, 2020; Lalani & Li, 2020; Ballard et al., 2020). In line with this, students have been challenged to face education at the four corners of their homes; specifically, they have been forced to turn to distance learning (Buladaco et al., 2021). In a recent study, online learning activities impair students' ability to comprehend the lecturer's material, make learning tedious, and exacerbate anxiety. Students' anxiety about lessons during the COVID-19 pandemic may result in academic procrastination (Jia et al., 2021).

Locally, the physical opening of classes in the Philippines were determined by the risk severity level or grading assigned to a particular community by the Department of Health (DOH), the Inter-Agency Task Force (IATF) for the Management of Emerging Infectious Diseases in the Philippines, and the President's Office (OP). This tendency becomes troublesome as it encourages students to procrastinate more and, eventually, to develop a procrastination habit (Buladaco et al., 2021). That is why researchers continued to look deeper into this issue to share and expose students' attitudes on academic procrastination in this new normal setting. People tend to put things off even when they are aware of the numerous adverse effects. This type of behavior becomes ingrained in everyone. As a result of their neglect of urgent tasks, people develop this habit of cramming, rooted in procrastination. Such unreasonable behavior can have a significant impact on students' self-efficacy.

Furthermore, a recent study conducted by Araya et al. (2020) stated that a decrease in the allotted time for studying and a relevant increase in procrastination, especially in academics, has been conveyed in the studies examining the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic. More elements boost a student's urge to procrastinate because other than the high challenge of self-control and motivation to focus learning, students must also fight the interference at home (Drumm & Jong, 2020). To sum this all up, these studies provide strong evidence that procrastination faced an elevated average during the pandemic.

Hence, various researchers have suggested a further analysis of students' academic procrastination. This study emphasized the lack of studies regarding academic procrastination during the new normal setting in the Philippines, whether there is an increase or decrease. This current issue has not yet been answered or studied locally. Arifiana et al. (2020) said that academic procrastination has increased during the COVID-19 pandemic, which requires attention. Although no precise figure for the increase in academic procrastination among students exists, efforts at prevention must continue. One of them is through the description of studies on the effect of procrastination on self-efficacy.

Also, this emphasized a further analysis of students' self-efficacy in the new normal setting. The study of Alasmari and Amri (2021) stated that most literature reviews regarding self-efficacy are related to the traditional setting since online learning is still new. With regards to that, it may have affected students' responses because they were surveyed too early. Their responses might have been merely an instant reaction to a situation they just recently experienced, which may change over time. As a result, it is suggested to analyze the study in a later year further to have a more validated outcome. Furthermore, they also stated in the study that even though self-efficacy has been proven to contribute to a student's academic success. It is still essential to investigate self-efficacy in the new normal setting considering the closure of schools due to the unprecedented condition brought by the COVID-19 pandemic.

Another gap in research emphasized in this study is the lack of analysis regarding the relationship between academic procrastination and self-efficacy. Da Silva et al. (2020) said that previous researchers had found a negative relation between the two, and some have also found a positive relationship between the two. Hence, no exact findings have been presented regarding it. With this, the present study attempted to bridge this gap of finding out whether there is a relationship between academic procrastination and self-efficacy.

This study aimed to determine the relationship between self-efficacy and academic procrastination in the new normal of education. Self-efficacy refers to the belief in the capacity to attain specific tasks, whereas academic procrastination is the delay in achieving particular tasks. In significance, this study will benefit students in designing procrastination interventions in the uncertain climate of the pandemic and "the new normal.".

2. Literature Review

2.1 Social Cognitive Theory

Bandura proposed the social cognitive theory as a psychological framework of human learning and development, which is presented as the theoretical basis of this study. The idea of social cognitive theory explains that student learning results from a combination of behavior, cognitive processes, and the environment. Bandura thought that as students self-regulate their learning, they progress based on their self-efficacy, or self-perception of their ability to deal with their problems. In the current situation, students who can self-regulate should track or monitor their behaviors, assess the success of their efforts, and adjust to their behavior by rewarding it (Jackson, 2012).

Behaviors like procrastination demonstrate an absence of self-control or self-regulation and could be associated with lower academic self-efficacy. The social cognitive theory stated that students who possess frequent procrastination can also have lower levels of academic self-efficacy (Jackson, 2012). A study by Dullas (2018) stated that the concepts of self-regulated learning, persistence, and competence are components of self-efficacy. Additionally, the perceived control, or locus of control, is substantially connected and has a major effect on students' academic self-efficacy.

2.2 Temporal Motivation Theory

The most valid theory of procrastination is the temporal motivation theory. It encompasses the self-regulatory and self-efficacy theories and accounts for task aversiveness and hyperbolic discounting of time (Konig & Steel, 2006). According to Steel (2007), procrastination in temporal motivation theory is linked to personality factors that encourage disregards, such as lack of self-regulation. Not being a procrastinator implies certain positive features such as high self-efficacy and self-esteem. The study of procrastination has been limited in terms of variables associated with self-regulation. The current study examined a personal characteristic variable: mastery avoidance, mastery approach, performance avoidance, and performance approach.).

2.3 Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy refers to an individual's identity that is centered on being productive and competent in his given activities. It is concerned with the accomplishment of certain activities in response to a particular situation and environment that an individual has prioritized (Tus, 2020).

In the context of academics, Bandura's theory stated that academic self-efficacy is a subset of self-efficacy that relates to learners' assessment of their own capacity and the ability of the established learning goals to be implemented and accomplished to be executed and achieved. On the one hand, high self-efficacy increases individuals' optimistic expectations for task outcomes; on the other hand, it decreases individuals' negative perceptions of the task process, hence decreasing procrastination. Self-efficacy affects or dictates not just people's behavior choices but also their tenacity and efforts (Cheng et al., 2020).

While in recent times, such self-efficacy is becoming increasingly crucial, especially during the COVID-19 pandemic, which has led educational institutions to shift their learning resources online immediately. Instructors have attempted to deploy various technology-based tools as an alternative for regular classrooms. Hence, this demands to focus more on self-efficacy as school suspensions have become necessary due to the unprecedented condition brought by the pandemic (Alasmari & Amri, 2021). On that note, Ajlouni and Jaradat (2020) stated that it is evident that students' self-efficacy in online learning settings differs from their self-efficacy in face-to-face learning environments and is regarded as a vital component for successful online learning.

According to Bandura's theory that was validated by Dullas (2018), there are four indicators of self-efficacy: perceived control, competence, persistence, and self-regulated learning. Perceived control helps to explain why some people assume rewards are the result of their own behavior (Dullas, 2018). Furthermore, perceived control, also known as locus of control, is classified as either internal or external. External locus of control refers to when individuals regard their acts as a result of chance, fate, or the actions of others, while the internal locus of control is when individuals perceive their actions as a result of their distinguishing characteristics (Kumaravelu, 2018; Akbay & Delibalta, 2020). Akbay and Delibalta (2020) added that academic perceived control or locus of control refers to the foundations upon which an individual builds control of their academic conduct. External academic perceived control or locus of control refers to how an individual views his or her academic experiences as having an external control (luck, fate, or other people), whereas internal academic perceived control or locus of control refers to how the individual views his or her academic experiences as having an internal control (their own behavior and characteristics).

In terms of self-efficacy, individuals with an internal locus of control share similar features, such as attributing failures and achievements to the self and believing they can change their behavior as desired (Dullas, 2018). Furthermore, Dullas (2018) added that perceived control is a component of self-efficacy in the same way as perceptions of ability, social comparison, attributions, available time, and perceived importance are all factors of perceived control that influence self-efficacy.

Competence refers to an individual's capacity to utilize knowledge and skills in an independent and self-directed manner (Holmes et al., 2021). It is one of the components of self-efficacy, in which Dullas (2018) pointed out that the expectation and ability beliefs represent the students' perception of their competence and self-efficacy. Both expectations and ability beliefs are composed of the aims and perceptions of their competence. Furthermore, Dullas (2018) also stated that students who have a high sense of self-efficacy place emphasis on developing their competencies and acquiring valuable skills—increased competence results in an increased ability to manage the future and assign situations to the self, indicating self-efficacy. As a result, students who have a high sense of self-efficacy focus on developing their competencies and acquiring valuable skills.

Persistence drives a significant impact on the decisions students make, the effort they put in, the level of their perseverance in the face of difficulties, and the level of anxiety they feel (Dullas 2018). Thus, Altman (2017) pointed out that persistence shows that students who exhibit high levels of conscientiousness and toughness are more likely to succeed in completing their education; hence, there is a strong correlation between persistence and

self-efficacy in which persistence is a part of self-efficacy's strategy in continuing to possess a goal-oriented behavior despite the difficulty and struggles obtained in academics (Dullas, 2018).

Self-Regulated learning refers to the self-governing processes and self-beliefs of a student that allow mental ability to be transformed into academic performance abilities (Dullas, 2018). According to Littlejohn (2016), the involvement of the learner and the attainment of personal learning objectives are both tied to self-regulated learning. That being the case, students who receive self-regulated learning help are more likely to succeed in their online studies. In a normal setting of education, students who excel in self-regulation are most likely to be the type of people who are well off independently in studying. Aside from the self-efficacy to learn, students are most likely to assess activities through self-judgment and self-evaluation. Consequently, in order for students to attain academic achievement in online contexts, this emphasizes the importance of self-regulated learning assistance in online learning (Baars et al., 2019).

In summary, self-efficacy is a concept by Albert Bandura which proposes the belief of a person in his capacity to carry out actions or behaviors that are necessary for attaining certain tasks. Academically, it is a student's assessment of his or her capacity to achieve academic success pertaining to how he or she executes specific behavior towards a given task. Furthermore, self-efficacy has four indicators, namely: perceived control, competence, persistence, and self-regulated learning. Perceived control refers to how a student's behavior is accountable for the result of a certain task or situation. Competence refers to how the students utilize their knowledge in achieving tasks successfully and efficiently. Persistence refers to how students persevere to accomplish tasks despite facing difficulties. Self-regulated learning refers to how a student controls and understands his or her learning behaviors. Moreover, self-efficacy in this time of COVID-19 pandemic is significant in every student as an immediate shifting of learning modality affects the students' beliefs and capacity with regards to achieving successful learning online.

2.4 Academic Procrastination

Academic procrastination was defined as when students voluntarily avoid and postpone their academic activities or given tasks (Arifiana et al., 2021; Dahl et al., 2020; and Hooda & Saini, 2016). Two studies stated that academic procrastination is ubiquitous in universities and colleges where students are challenged to face academic requirements such as writing a term paper, studying for examinations, finishing related assignments and readings that need to be done within the given time frame (Malkoc & Mutlu, 2018; Laili & Patria, 2021). A study conducted by Laili and Patria (2021) stated that approximately half of the undergraduate students procrastinate on given academic tasks. Fakhruddiana and Sari (2019) also added that there 95% of college students and 70% of university students procrastinate. On the other hand, Al-Zoubi et al. (2016) stated that 46% of undergraduate participants procrastinate when writing term papers, 27.6% when studying for examinations, and 30.1% when reading assignments.

Gracia et al. (2020) and Ojo (2019) studied that academic procrastination brings significant problems to students and affects them. Students may experience elevated stress, bad sleep, limited time to do assignments, uncertainty, blaming oneself, stunted self-esteem, unease, and sadness due to academic procrastination (Gracia et al., 2020), which would result in disruptive academic outcomes such as poor academic achievement and work quality; lack of knowledge; time; academic pressure; suspension or dropout; and longer course of study (Blankenship & Jones, 2021; Craig et al., 2019).

Various researchers stated that academic procrastination may occur everywhere - students in schools or students in universities (Insani et al., 2021; Jenisova et al., 2021). Montalvo (2021) has said that during these times of the

COVID-19 pandemic, many students see a decrease in productivity per hour of work that they put in. Since each person has different activities, there may be many reasons why productivity at home is down. Hence, academic procrastination is a growing concern in the educational sector, particularly in light of the current pandemic (Fagerstrom et al., 2021); it is a serious issue that is sometimes viewed as a personality attribute but must also be viewed contextually. In a vicious circle, procrastination has an effect on not only task execution but also on a person's sense of self-efficacy, which can result in additional procrastination (Montalvo, 2021).

Temporal motivation theory by Steel and Konig in 2006 stated that there are four indicators that summarize procrastination: mastery avoidance, mastery approach, performance avoidance , performance approach Mastery Avoidance pertains to students who strive to avoid learning academic tasks and skills as much as possible (Juned et al., 2020; Shi, 2018). Shi (2020) stated that mastery avoidance is linked with academic procrastination, and fear of academic failure is strongly associated with the category of mastery avoidance. Additionally, Juned et al. (2020) found out that students with mastery avoidance are afraid that they could not learn the academic lessons taught by their instructors in schools and might end up with academic failure. Juned et al. (2020) added that mastery avoidance had raised students' anxiety in school because they encountered the potential of not performing as expected and learning poorly.

Mastery Approach pertains to students who strive to learn and study the academic lessons without avoiding them (Gafoor 2015; Shi, 2018). Shi (2018) stated that students with a mastery approach have a lower tendency to procrastinate because they have the motivation to learn and study the lessons in schools. On the other hand, Mutiarawati and Simamora (2021) added that students with a mastery approach tend to be more optimistic when facing difficulties and view them as a challenge.

Performance Avoidance is the focus of students to evade ineffectiveness in their studies (Dullas, 2018). According to Jury et al. (2015), the purpose of performance avoidance is to avoid demonstrating incompetence among other students. Hence, students focus more on doing other unrelated activities to avoid failure rather than to do things that will help in striving for success. Jury et al. (2015) attributed these findings to the fact that the out-group environment made the dominant group's inferiority in the area more visible and posed a threat to their identity. Participants began to concentrate on avoiding failure as a result of this acuity. In this situation, upward mobility is one of the solutions; for example, a student strives to overcome the behavior and aim for a better social identity.

Performance Approach in which students focus on garnering a steady aptitude in their studies (Dullas, 2018). The term "approaches to learning," according to Benett and Bunce (2020), refers to the diversity in learning intents, motivations, and processing processes across students in a given setting. The goal to avoid failure by putting in the minimal amount of effort believed required to achieve task requirements motivates a surface approach. Shi (2018) added that the performance approach determines students who are working hard to achieve a goal of doing better than the others. It is driven by the desire to get the greatest scores possible (Benett & Bunce, 2020). Thus, delaying tasks intentionally or unintentionally can be worrisome for students who are performance-oriented (Shi, 2018).

3. Methodology

3.1 Sample and Procedure

This research is used a quantitative survey approach. The demographic characteristics of the students, their level of academic procrastination, and their level of self-efficacy were described using a descriptive method. The correlational analysis was utilized to determine and evaluate the statistical relationship between two variables:

academic procrastination and self-efficacy. Due to local restrictions related to the pandemic, there were only 197 students from General Santos City, Philippines have voluntarily participated in the research.

The respondents' identities were guaranteed to be strictly confidential throughout the study. Primary data gathered, respondents' response, for example, were held with great concealment, and all of the parties' interests were protected and valued. As for the participation of the respondents, the process was voluntary. The respondents were not forced and held accountable for not taking part in the process of answering. The data collected was only limited to the access of the researchers. It was given with clear instruction that the activity was only between the researchers and the respondents and that their identity and answers were unspecified.

3.2 Instrument

The questionnaire was divided into three sections by the researchers. The first section collected demographic data about respondents, the second section evaluated the level of academic procrastination, and the third section assessed the level of self-efficacy.

Items for academic procrastination and self-efficacy were adapted from various literature that was critically examined by the researchers to capture measurements of the variables. For the academic procrastination scale, constructs such as mastery avoidance, mastery approach, performance avoidance, and performance approach was adopted from Steel and Konig (2006), which was based on their Temporal Motivation Theory. All constructs were measured with a 7-point, Likert-type, anchored with very untrue of me (1) to very true of me (7) responses. Items for self-efficacy were also adapted. The items for perceived control, competence, persistence, and self-regulated learning was adapted from Dullas (2018), which was based on Bandura's social cognitive theory. All of the aforementioned measures used 7-point Likert-type scales with response anchors ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (7).

3.3 Sample and Procedure

This research is used a quantitative survey approach. The demographic characteristics of the students, their level of academic procrastination, and their level of self-efficacy were described using a descriptive method. The correlational analysis was utilized to determine and evaluate the statistical relationship between two variables: academic procrastination and self-efficacy. Due to local restrictions related to the pandemic, there were only 197 students from General Santos City, Philippines have voluntarily participated in the research.

4. Results and Discussions

4.1 Level of students' self-efficacy

Table 1 shows the level of self-efficacy. In terms of perceived control, it is rated with a mean of 5.37 which is very high; this means that the students highly believe that they will succeed because they can improve their study habit, they highly believe that the future depends on what they do now, and that they can successfully control the outcome of their performance tasks. In terms of competence, it is rated with a mean of 5.29 which is very high; this means that the students are very confident that they can pass the test with high marks, get good grades in written works, and they are very convinced that they can master the concepts and topics taught in their class. In terms of persistence, it is rated with a mean of 5.39 which is very high; this means that the students are highly persistent in continuing to study hard despite the obstacles and discouragements from other people, and maintain good grades in school. In terms of self-regulated learning, it is rated with a mean of 5.49 which is very high; this means that the students are very welcome to changes whenever there are suggestions with regards to their negative

study habits, they can highly monitor their learning development, organize school works, submit requirements before the deadline, and can highly focus on studying. Hence, this implies that the students appear to have very high self-efficacy towards their academics in the new normal of education. Basically, it shows that the students tend to be very productive and competent in any given activity. Moreover, this implication supports the study from the review of related literature where instructors tend to focus more on self-efficacy of the students as school suspensions have become necessary due to the unprecedented condition brought by the pandemic (Alasmari & Amri, 2021). Hence, according to Ajlouni and Jaradat (2020), students' self-efficacy in online learning settings is regarded as a critical component for successful online learning.

Table 1. Level of Students' Self-efficacy

Constructs	Mean	Interpretation
Perceived Control	5.37	Very High
Competence	5.29	Very High
Persistence	5.39	Very High
Self-Regulated Learning	5.49	Very High
Overall Level of Self-Efficacy	**5.39**	**Very High**

4.2 Level of students' academic procrastination

As shown in Table 2, in terms of performance approach, it is rated with a mean of 2.33 which is very low; this means that the respondents have the goal of getting a better grade than most of the other students in class. In terms of mastery avoidance, it is rated with a mean of 2.65 which is very low; this indicates that the respondents are very concerned that they might not learn all that there is to learn in class. In terms of mastery approach, it is rated with a mean of 2.30 which is very low; this means that the respondents are very interested to learn as much as possible in class. In terms of performance avoidance, it is rated with a mean of 2.25 which is very low; this means that the respondents are very anxious of performing poorly in class. Hence, this implies that the respondents appear to have very high discipline towards their academics to avoid procrastination. Hence, this result contradicts the study from the review of related literature that states many students see a drop in productivity per hour of work during the COVID-19 pandemic. Because everyone's activities are different, there could be a variety of reasons why household productivity is low (Montalvo, 2021).

Table 2. Level of Students' Academic Procrastination

Constructs	Mean	Interpretation
Performance Approach	2.33	Very Low
Mastery Avoidance	2.65	Very Low

Mastery Approach	2.30	Very Low
Performance Avoidance	2.25	Very Low
Overall Level of Academic Procrastination	**2.38**	**Very Low**

4.3 Relationship between Self-Efficacy and Academic Procrastination

In Table 3, the Pearson correlation coefficient between self-efficacy and academic procrastination is -0.359. This corresponds to a weak negative correlation. In simple terms, as the level of self-efficacy increases, the level of academic procrastination decreases. This means that, the more the students feel or perceive that they are productive and competent, the less likely they have habits of postponing or delaying achievement of school work. Further, the p-value of the correlation is 0.000 which is less than the 5% level of significance.

Table 3. Relationship between Self-efficacy and Academic Procrastination

	Academic Procrastination			
	Pearson Correlation Coefficient	**P-Value**	**Interpretation**	
Self-Efficacy	-0.359	0.000	Significant Correlation	Negative

4.1 Practical Implications

Students may consider monitoring what triggers their focus during each online class so that they can have a basis for how to distribute and manage their time doing activities at home. Hence, prevent postponing completing tasks. They may enhance their self-discipline, so that they can focus solely on one thing. In addition, they may also develop good study habits by delaying short-term gratification and focusing on the completion of more important tasks.

The academic institutions may provide students a clear plan for how to work on an assignment instead of just setting them free to avoid compromising their productivity, and may conduct self-assessments at the end of every grading period during school terms in order for the students to know the level of their productivity and competence towards online class. They may consider being consistent in giving feedback to students in order to help students assess their performance and at the same time understand the behavior of the students in terms of online learning.

4.2 Limitations and Future Research Recommendations

Further research and analysis on the relationship between self-efficacy and academic procrastination among tourism and hospitality students in the new normal of education should be conducted specifically using Regression Analysis to explain the predictive value of each variable of self-efficacy on students' academic procrastination. It

is also recommended to consider having comparative study on academic procrastination on the new normal of education and traditional way of learning. To increase the generalizability of the study, further study may be conducted including more schools within General Santos City or consider having a larger sample size in doing a study. Since the study is only limited to the students taking up Tourism and Hospitality courses, a similar study may be conducted to other courses experiencing the new normal of education.

5. Conclusions

This study concludes that there is high level of self-efficacy among the tourism and hospitality management students, and very low level of academic procrastination. There is a significant negative relationship between self-efficacy and academic procrastination among tourism and hospitality students in the new normal of education. This means that a student with a better self-efficacy tends to avoid academic procrastination.

REFERENCES

Ajlouni, A.O., & Jaradat, S.A. (2020). Social presence and self-efficacy in relation to student satisfaction in online learning setting: A predictive study. *International Journal of Education and Practice, 8*(4), 758-773. https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.61.2020.84.759.773.

Akbay, S.E., & Delibalta, A. (2020). Academic risk-taking behavior in university students: Academic procrastination, academic locus of control, and academic perfectionism. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research, 89,* 159-178. https://doi.org/10.14689/ejer.2020.89.8.

Alasmari, N., & Amri, Z. (2021). Self-efficacy of saudi english majors after the emergent transition to online learning and online assessment during the covid-19 pandemic. *International Journal of Higher Education, 10*(3), 127-137. https://doi.org/10.5430/ijhe.v10n3p127.

Ali, W. (2020). Online and remote learning in higher education institutes: A necessity in light of covid-19 pandemic. *Canadian Center of Science and Education, 10*(3), 16-25. https://doi.org/10.5539/hes.v10n3p16.

Altman, R.L. (2017). *Persistence and achievement in academics* [Doctoral dissertation, Georgia Southern University]. Jack N. Averitt College of Graduate Studies. https://digitalcommons.georgiasouthern.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article =2688&context=etd.

Al-Zoubi, Z., Bataineh, O., and Mahasneh A. (2016). The relationship between academic procrastination and parenting styles among jordanian undergraduate university students. *The Open Psychology Journal, 9*, 25-34. https://doi.org/10.2174/1874350101609010025.

Araya, M.P.U., Aucejo, E.M., French, J., & Zafar, B. (2020). The impact of covid-19 on student experiences and expectations: Evidence from a survey. *Journal of Public Economics, 191*, 1-15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2020.104271.

Arifiana, I.Y., Eva, N., Hanurawan, F., Rahmawati, H., & Suhadianto. (2021). Stop academic procrastination during covid-19: Academic procrastination reduces subjective well-being. *KnE Social Sciences, International Conference of Psychology*, *4*(15), 312-325. https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v4i15.8220.

Baars, M., Davis, D., Houben, G., Paas, F., Wong, J., & Zee, T. (2019). Supporting self-regulated learning in online learning environments and moocs: A systematic review. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction, 35*(4-5), 356-373. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2018.1543084.

Ballard, J. D., Blader, I. J., and Coyne, C., (2020). Recommendations for future university pandemic responses: what the first covid-19 shutdown taught us. *PLoS Biol*, *18*(8), 1-6. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3000889.

Benett, M., & Bunce, L. (2021). A degree of studying? Approaches to learning and academic performance among student consumers. *Active Learning in Higher Education 2021, 22*(3) 203–214. https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787419860204.

Blankenship, D., and Jones, S. (2021). Year two: Effect of procrastination on academic performance of undergraduate online students. *Research in Higher Education Journal, 39*, 1-11. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1293903.pdf

Buladaco, M.V., Decano, R., & Tiboron, G.M. (2021). Procrastination attitude of the senior high school students in modular distance learning modality. *International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science (IJRISS), 5*(6), 303-308. https://www.rsisinternational.org/journals/ijriss/Digital-Library/volume-5issue-6/303-308.pdf.

Busser, J., Murphy, K., Shapoval, V., & Zhong, Y. (2021). Hospitality and tourism student engagement and hope during the covid-19 pandemic. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education, 33*(3), 194-206. https://doi.org/10.1080/10963758.2021.1907197.

Cheng, G., Hu, J., Liu, G., Pan, Y., & Zhao, S. (2020). Academic self-efficacy and postgraduate procrastination: A moderated mediation model. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 1-9. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01752.

Craig, M., Duncan, M., & Korstange, R. (2019). Understanding and addressing student procrastination in college. *National College Learning Center Association, 24*(1), 57-70. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1234437.pdf

Da Silva, S., Facciolo, M., & Smith, A. (2020). Relations between self-efficacy and procrastination types in college students. *Modern Psychological Studies, 25*(2), 1-24. https://scholar.utc.edu/mps/vol25/iss2/6.

Dahl, T., Klingsieck, K., Klaussen, T., Koppenborg, M., and Svartdal, F. (2020). How study environments foster academic procrastination: Overview and recommendations. *Frontiers in Psychology, 11*, 1-13. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.540910.

Drumm, B. T., and Jong, A. S. (2020). A semester like no other: a student and lecturer perspective on the impact of covid-19 on 3rd level academic life. *All Ireland Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher*

Education (AISHE-J), 12(3), 1–14. https://ojs.aishe.org/index.php/aishej/article/download/487/833/2627.

Dullas, A.R. (2018). The development of academic self-efficacy scale for filipino junior high school students. *Frontiers in Education, 3,* 1-14. https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2018.00019.

Fagerstrom, A., Lasrado, L.A., Melgaard, J., & Monir, R. (2021). Academic procrastination and online learning during the covid-19 pandemic. *Procedia Computer Science, 196,* 117-124. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2021.11.080.

Fakhruddiana, F., & Sari, W.L. (2019). Internal locus of control, social support, and academic procrastination among students in completing the thesis. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education, 8*(2), 363-368. http://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v8i2.17043.

Gafoor, A.K. and Kurukkan A. (2015). Development of academic goal orientation inventory for senior secondary school students in kerala. *Guru Journal of Behavioral and Social Sciences, 3*(1), 352-360. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED560056.pdf.

Gracia, E., Paixão, M.P., and Zarrin S.A. (2020). Prediction of academic procrastination by fear of failure and self-regulation. *Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice, 20*(3), 34-43. https://doi.org/10.12738/jestp.2020.3.003.

Holmes, A.G.D., Tuin, M.P., & Turner S.L. (2021). Competence and competency in higher education, simple terms yet with complex meanings: Theoretical and practical issues for university teachers and assessors implementing competency-based education (cbe). *Educational Process International Journal, 10*(3), 39-52. https://dx.doi.org/10.22521/edupij.2021.103.3.

Hood, N., Littlejohn, A., Milligan, C., & Mustain, P. (2016) Learning in moocs: Motivations and self-regulated learning. *The Internet and Higher Education, 29,* 40-48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.12.003.

Hooda, M., & Saini, A. (2016). Academic procrastination: A critical issue for consideration. *Indian Journal of Applied Research, 6*(8), 98-99. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/327337740_Academic_Procrastination_A_Critical_Issue_for_Consideration.

Insani, F.D., Kistoro, H.C.A., & Latipah, E. (2021). Academic procrastination of high school students during the covid-19 pandemic: Review from selfregulated learning and the intensity of social media. *Dinamika Ilmu, 21*(2), 293-308. https://doi.org/10.21093/di.v21i2.3444.

Jackson, D.M.H. (2012). *Role of academic procrastination, academic selfefficacy beliefs, and prior academic skills on course outcomes for college students in developmental education* [Doctoral Dissertation, The University of Georgia]. Semantic Scholar. https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Role-of-academicprocrastination%2C-academic-beliefs%2C-Jackson/52bff8ea540053e280836633468ab874f1f2fc66.

Jenisova, Z., Kralik, R., Maturkanic, P., Pavlikova, M., & Tkacova, H. (2021). Social media and students' wellbeing: An empirical analysis during the covid-19 pandemic. *Sustainability 2021, 13,* 1-19. https://doi.org/10.3390/su131810442.

Jia, J., Jiang, Q., Lin, X., Wang, L., Xu, J., & Zhang, B. (2021). Self-Handicapping in chinese medical students during the covid-19 pandemic: The role of academic anxiety, procrastination, and hardiness. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 1-12. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.741821.

Juned, A.M., Majid, F., and Mustafa S.M.S. (2020). Performance approach, mastery approach, performance avoidance, and mastery avoidance as predictors of students' academic achievement in english, mathematics, and science subjects. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, 10*(11), 1150-1159. https://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v10-i11/8190.

Jury, M., Smeding, A., Court, M, & Darnon, C. (2015). When first-generation students succeed at university: On the link between social class, academic performance, and performance avoidance goals. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 41*, 25-36. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2014.11.001.

Konig, C. J., & Steel, P. (2006). Integrating theories of motivation. *The Academy of Management Review, 31*(4), 889-913. http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/AMR.2006.22527462.

Kumaravelu, G. (2018). Locus of control in school students and its relationship with academic achievement. *I-manager's Journal on School Educational Technology*, *13*(4), 61-66. https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1184267.pdf.

Laili, L., & Patria, B. (2021). Writing group program reduces academic procrastination: A quasi-experimental study. *BMC Psychology, 9*(157), 1-7. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-021-00665-9.

Lalani, F. & Li, C. (2020). The covid-19 pandemic: Has changed education forever. https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/04/coronavirus-education-global-covid19-online-digital-learning.

Malkoc, A., & Mutlu, A.K. (2018). Academic self-efficacy and academic procrastination: Exploring the mediating role of academic motivation in Turkish university students. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 6*(10), 2087-2093. https://doi.org/10.13189/ujer.2018.061005.

Montalvo, G.O.G. (2021). Academic procrastination in university and covid-19. *International Journal of Latest Research in Humanities and Social Science (IJLRHSS), 4*(2), 142-143. http://www.ijlrhss.com/paper/volume-4-issue-2/20-HSS-953.pdf.

Mutiarawati, E.V. and Simamora, B. (2021). Achievement goals model validation: Is the 2x2 better than the trichotomous?. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education, 10*(1), 142-149. http://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v10i1.20869.

Ojo, A.A. (2019). The impact of procrastination on students' academic performance in secondary schools. *International Journal of Sociology and Anthropology Research, 5*(1), 17-22. https://www.eajournals.org/wp-content/uploads/The-Impact-ofProcrastination-on-Students-Academic-Performance-in-Secondary-Schools.pdf.

PricewaterhouseCoopers Philippines. (2020). Impact of covid-19 on the Philippine tourism industry. https://www.pwc.com/ph/en/publications/tourism-pwcphilippines/tourism-covid-19.html.

Shi, Y.R. (2018). The relationship between academic procrastination and future-orientation: An investigation among a mid-sized international school in China. *Advances in Social Sciences, Education and Humanities Research, 234*, 113-121. https://doi.org/10.2991/iced-18.2018.15.

Steel, P. (2007). The nature of procrastination: A meta-analytic and theoretical review of quintessential self-regulatory failure. *Psychological Bulletin*, *133*, 65–94. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/6598646_The_nature_of_procrastination_a_metaanalytic_and_theoretical_review_of_quintessential_selfregulatory_failure_Psychol_Bull_133_65-94.

Tus, J. (2020). Self-efficacy and its influence on the academic performance of the senior high school students. *Journal of Global Research in Education and Social Science*, *13*(6), 213-218. https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.12250355.v1.

United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. (2021). Covid-19 educational disruption and response. http://www.iiep.unesco.org/en/covid-19-educational-disruption-andresponse-1336.

World Tourism Organization. (2020). International travel plunges 70% in the first eight months of 2020. *World tourism barometer*, *18*(6), 1-36. https://www.eunwto.org/doi/epdf/10.18111/wtobarometereng.2020.18.1.6.