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Abstract. Two of indicators to be succeed in learning are high self-efficacy and low procrastination behavior. In order to create these conditions, teachers have to contribute actively not only by giving order relating to the teaching materials, but also to conduct certain strategy in order to help their students for improving their psychological ability which will support accomplishment academic goal eventually. One of the skills advantages learning process is an emotion regulation. In achieving emotion regulation, three aspects have to be considered: awareness, execution, and evaluation. Through emotional positive state, students are ready to engage with their tasks. Improving emotion can be implemented through individual or group exercise. The aim of this study measured the difference of self-efficacy and procrastination between experiment group and control group. The experiment group was given individual emotion training and the control group experienced regular class without specific treatment. This research used an experimental method with nonrandomized two groups posttest only design. A group of 91 students from a nursing school was involved in this research. Two adaptation scales, namely Students’ self-efficacy and procrastination were used for measurement. The result revealed only one hypothesis was accepted, procrastination difference level between two groups. However, the effect size showed a small contribution from emotion regulation on it. It indicated that individual emotion exercise for five weeks decreasing procrastination. For the more effective strategy, this exercise should be accompanied by other treatments such as short training and specific emotion target.
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INTRODUCTION

In college, the primary obligation of a student is to learn based on several studies that have been done by Duff, Boyle, Dunleavy, and Ferguson (2004) predictor of academic success is Grade Point Average (GPA). GPA is used to evaluate performance of the student in a particular semester (Singh, Malik & Singh, 2016). Conard’s research (2005) also utilizes GPA as a measure of academic performance.

There are several factors that affect the academic performance; one of them is Academic Procrastination (Hassanbeigi, Askari, Nahjavani, Shirkhoda, Barzegar, Mozayyan & Fallahzadeh, 2011). Rothblum, Solomon, and Murakami (in Kandemir, 2014) define academic procrastination as delaying academic tasks on a continuous or occasional basis. Academic procrastination is a conscious behavior undertaken to delay the completion of its academic duties within a certain period, even though he knows that it may have a negative impact on him (Steel in Tan, Ang, Klassen, Yeo, Wong, Huang, and Chong; 2008).

In education process, students have to cope with some assignments, term papers most of the time and also understanding the subject. Procrastination leads to lower achievement (Tice and Baumeister 1997), higher stress levels, and higher anxiety levels (Ferrari et al 2005; Sirois 2004). Research shows that 80-95% of students do procrastination, and nearly 50% of students procrastinate on an ongoing basis (Steel, 2007). Variable which impacts academic procrastination is academic self-efficacy beliefs, when an individual’s self-efficacy level increases he decreases procrastination behavior, it increases determination in order to complete duties (Bandura in Kandemir & Ilhan, 2014).

Self-efficacy determines how an individual can be feeling, thinking, motivating himself to act (Gaulao, 2014). Self-efficacy is defined as a confidence in executing behaviors that will achieve the desired outcome (Bandura in Katz, Eilot, & Nevo 2014). Self-efficacy is described as a motivational factor that is capable in encouraging or inhibiting action based on individual perceptions of their ability to control over life events (Bandura in Drysdale & Mebeath, 2014).

Mbeath (2014) revealed that academic self-efficacy is associated with positive academic performance. Kiamarsia (2014) shows that procrastination and self-efficacy are related to psychological vulnerability in students. Regarding the relation between the academic procrastination and self-efficacy on student, positive emotions take a role in coping with this case. Positive emotions are a state of continuous fun with variable intensity and with calm behavior reactions, that including happiness, gratitude, joy, excitement, pride, optimism, kindness, emotional release, and strength. (Andries, 2011). Research in psychology shows that people who live in emotionally emotional states are positive-oriented people. They are more empathetic, tolerant and willing to help the people around (Lelord & André in Andries, 2011).

On the other hand, some evidences about emotions have defined that it can speed up cognitive conflict processing when a target is emotional (Kanske & Kotz, 2011 in Zinchenko, 2017). Furthermore, positive emotions are capable on interceding stress recovery (Ong, Bergeman, Bisconti, & Wallace in Sirois & Tosti, 2012), and influence physical health (Kok et al. in Sirois & Tosti, 2012).

Based on the explanation, the researcher will conduct research to find out more about positive emotional exercise to improve academic performance in this case is academic procrastination and self-efficacy to support academic success.

METHOD

Participants

A group consisted 91 nursing students which were divided into experimental group (N=50, age mean=18.92) and control group (N=41, age mean=17.59). Both groups were dominated by female students (90%) with number of male students only eight and two for experiment group and control group respectively. All of participants were freshmen in the nursing school.

Measures

We did evaluation by using two scales namely Self-Efficacy Scale and Procrastination Scale. Self-Efficacy Scale was adopted from Rowbotham & Schmitz (2013). This scale covers four areas: a) academic evaluation, b) skill and knowledge improvement, c) social interaction with school, and...
d) coping with academic stress. The example item for skill and knowledge development is: “I am convinced that I am able to successfully learn all relevant subject content even if it is difficult”. The scale is answered on a four-point response format: not at all true (1); hardly true (2); moderately true (3); exactly true (4). This scale consists of ten items. Thus, the resulting scores range from 10-40 with higher scores representing higher students’ self-efficacy. The internal consistency from Rowbotham & Schmitz’s study (2013) was $\alpha = .84$ ($n = 65$).

For procrastination, we used Academic Procrastination Scale from McCloskey and Scielzo (2015). This scale was developed by 6 main components of academic procrastination: a) psychological beliefs regarding abilities, b) distractions, c) social factors, d) time management, e) personal initiative and f) laziness. The number of items was a 25-items which has five Likert’s responses format from 1 = disagree to 5 = agree. Therefore, the minimum score was 25 and the maximum score was 125. There are five items unfavorable and the remains are favorable. The example of time management item: “I usually allocate time to review and proofread my work”. The reliability report from McCloskey and Scielzo (2015) revealed $\alpha = .94$ ($n = 681$).

Before both scales were used in the participants, we conducted forward translation to two capable translators. Afterwards, 20 students were asked to respond in these tools in language aspect to recheck the quality of translation. The response showed that all students understood the language and content clearly. It can be concluded both scales were adequate to measure self-efficacy and procrastination.

**Procedures**

We conducted experiment method with between subjects. We implemented non-randomized control group with posttest only design. First class was selected because one of the researchers taught there. Another class was chosen due to a permission from management. For experiment group, the students were informed for practicing individual emotion strategy to decrease negative emotion in their house (off campus). They were free to focus on which negative emotion and exercise will do in the certain week. Then, they reported individually including the situation or emotion (before exercise), the selected activity, and the result. Report format was determined by the researcher. In the early phase of this experiment, students were given informed consent. It was written that this exercise to increase concentration and motivation in the class. They were not informed relating the measurements. Thus, this research used single blind procedure to inhibit the bias (Shadish, Cook, and Campbell, 2002). This research was executed in three weeks. If the students absent, they still collected all the report. This effort to maintain the duration of intervention for all students. For control group, the teacher taught regularly without any intervention. After three weeks intervention completed, both classes were given Procrastination Scale and Self-Efficacy Scale to monitor the effect of individual emotion exercise.

**RESULT**

Firstly, we run Kolmogorov Smirnov to analyze data distribution and recognize the possibility of outliers. Based on normality plot and stem-leaf, procrastination had two outliers which relied on 48th and 82nd subjects. Therefore, we decided to cut these points from final measurement. Then, Shapiro-Wilk showed that self-efficacy .98, $p > .05$ and procrastination .98, $p > .05$. It meant both scales had normal distribution. Then we continued by independent t-test to compare the impact of intervention. First, self-efficacy revealed has no differences between experiment group ($M = 32.22$, $SD = 4.09$) and control group ($M = 33.43$, $SD = 3.07$), $t(87) = -.1536$, $p > .005$. However, procrastination showed different condition. An independent sample t-test indicated that scores were significantly higher for experiment group ($M = 65.12$, $SD = 12.71$) than for control group ($M = 57.33$, $SD = 12.1$) $t(87) = 2.94$, $p < .005$.

**DISCUSSION**

Only academic procrastination decreases due to individual positive emotion exercise, whereas self-efficacy do not perform similar result. When students experience positive emotion, they more engage with task and class activity. Therefore, their intention to procrastinate or delay task fulfillment will decrease. There is ample evidence that supports this explanation. Eckert, Ebert Lehr, Siciand, and Berkling (2016) mentioned, when students have sufficient emotion regulation skill, it will overcome their procrastination. Initially, procrastination gives the positive affect. However, lately, it increases panic and triggers negative emotion when students realize the deadline caught. Students who procrastinate seem that they fail in managing their emotion and cognition for fulfilling their tasks. Procrastination characterizes self-regulatory failure and increases possibility of stress and physical illness (Pychyl & Flett, 2012). Eventually, it will danger their affective well-being (Balkis, & Duru, 2016). Therefore, when they try to improve their emotion regulation, it will decrease the level of procrastination.

Pocnet, Dupuis, Congard, & Jopp (2017) said type of personality determines the effectiveness of emotion regulation in increasing self-efficacy. Unfortunately, we did not collect any information relating students’ trait or personality. Furthermore, we did not classify the kinds and the levels of problems. They choose their own problem and strategies. Therefore, there are various data that we did not analyze yet. It includes one of weaknesses in our research. Bandura said four sources of self-efficacy are experience of mastery, modelling, emotional and physical reaction. Because the various problems are explored, there are possibilities the problems were not temper enough and influence their self-efficacy.

We suggest, it is important to consider personality and the quality of problems to control the effect of the exercise. Then, the duration for intervention makes longer for comparing the result week by week. Researchers can ask participant not only identify one problem but also all of the problems they have. Then, they have to focus on the one type of problems as a strategy to monitor the constancy.
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