



FORMAN CHRISTIAN COLLEGE

(A CHARTERED UNIVERSITY)

The impact of Phubbing practices on academic procrastination among FC College students

NOUMAN YOUNAS MASIH

Roll No: 241546187

BS Sociology Gender and Cultural Studies

Supervisor:

Sir Athar Azeem

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY
FORMAN CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
(A CHARTED UNIVERSITY LAHORE)

Session 2020-2024

Table of Contents

1. Abstract	3
2. Introduction	4
2.1 significance of the study	6
2.2 Aim of the study.....	6
2.3 Research question.....	7
3. Literature review	8
4. Theoretical framework.....	11
5. Methodology.....	12
5.1 Research Design.....	12
5.2 Universe.....	12
5.3 population.....	12
5.4 Sampling Technique.....	12
5.5 Sampling Size.....	12
5.6 Hypothesis.....	12
5.7 Tools of data collection.....	13
5.8 Variable.....	13
5.9 Conceptualization.....	13
5.10 Operationalization.....	14
5.11 Statistical Analysis.....	15
5.12 Research Ethics.....	15
6. Results	17
7. Discussion	33
8. Implication	36
9. Conclusion	37
10. References	38
11. Appendix A	41

12. Appendix B.....	43
13. Appendix C.....	44
14. Appendix D.....	46
15. Appendix E.....	48

1. Abstract

With the immense penetration of smartphones into our daily lives, concerns have emerged regarding phubbing and its influence on academic procrastination. This study aims to investigate the impact of phubbing on academic procrastination among the undergraduate students of FC College. The main objective of the research is to find out the relationship between phubbing and academic procrastination, exploring how excessive use of smartphones and distraction from the social context contribute to delayed academic tasks. For this research, an online Google survey has been conducted among the undergraduate students of FC College, and to collect the data from the respondents, an academic procrastination survey developed by Abu Gazal in 2012, and the scale for phubbing developed by Chopitayasunondh and Douglas in 2018 has been used. For this research, two hundred undergraduate students participated in the survey. To analyze the data linear regression has been used and its results illustrate that the p-value is less than the conventional significance level of 0.05, suggesting that the relationship is statistically significant. Therefore, there is strong evidence to support the idea that "Phubbing" has a significant impact on "Academic Procrastination." And coefficient B is 0.175 which indicates that One-unit increase in Phubbing behavior, expect a 0.175-unit increase in Procrastination. So, the results are

implemented as a guideline for creating efficient setups to lessen academic procrastination in the smartphone era.

2. Introduction

Mobile phones are becoming one of the fastest-growing communication technologies worldwide nowadays, including in Pakistan. Mobile phones immensely penetrate every field of life i.e. education, business, agriculture, entertainment, and many others (Khan N.A 2019). Because mobile phones with their sophisticated features have become a part of everyone's lifestyle (Rachman et al., 2019). With the rising accessibility and affordability of mobile phones, students in Pakistan are also progressively investing more time in their mobile phones.

Today's common usage of mobile phones has generated many terms, like "phubbing" a term that joins the words "phone" and "snubbing". Pubbing is the practice of using a phone while ignoring, dismissing, or avoiding others around us, as well as checking a phone while engaging in academic pursuits or having a discussion with others (Karadag et al., 2015). People possibly postpone their assignments, tasks, or responsibilities because phubbing makes students comfortable while playing with their mobile phones. This way of behaving leads to unessentially delaying tasks, known as academic procrastination (Rachman et al., 2019). It refers to the propensity to postpone or avoid tasks related to academic performance, like research, class activities, composing papers, or completing assignments (BALKIS, M, & Duru 2009). It is a typical issue among students around the world including Pakistan, and it all refers to the propensity to defer or delay academic tasks, which results in poor academic performance.

Commonly, mobile phones are being used in educational institutions including Forman Christian College University. Students stick to their mobile phones while walking on the ground, sitting in the cafe, hanging out with friends, having conversations with others, during lectures, classroom work or participation, lab work, doing assignments, and even when we are going to the bathroom.

In the contemporary digital age, the prevalence of smartphones and constant connectivity has given rise to the phenomenon of phubbing. This pervasive behavior, often seen in various social settings, has not only transformed interpersonal dynamics but has also begun to cast its shadow on academic realms. As students navigate the intricate landscape of academia, the impact of phubbing on academic procrastination has emerged as a compelling area of study (Rachman et al., 2019). This is a growing sociological phenomenon among students of FC College University. Research by Rachman & colleagues 2019 showed that phubbing can prompt interruption, diminish the ability to focus, and consequently lead to leading to academic procrastination among students. Phubbing can likewise increment feelings of anxiety and adversely influence emotional well-being, which can additionally add to academic procrastination. In addition, students who invest more time and energy in their mobile phones are less inclined to participate in useful academic activities, like studying, research, attending lectures, and class participation. This research proposes that phubbing has a very significant impact on student's academic procrastination in Forman Christian College students.

Students who constantly do phubbing have a big effect on putting off academic tasks. This is especially important in our modern, tech-filled world. This study looks closely at how using smartphones a lot can make it harder for students to finish their work on time and do well in school. Understanding this connection is crucial for teachers, students, and researchers. By figuring out how phubbing links to procrastination, we can create a better learning environment. This will help students stay focused and succeed in their studies in today's tech-heavy education world.

2.1 Significance of the Study:

Phubbing can cause negative consequences on academic procrastination, cutting across various academic levels. This study aims to explore the logical reasoning behind this phenomenon, focusing on educational institutions in Pakistan, particularly FC College. The goal is to contribute valuable insights into academia's role in societal intellectual development. By shedding light on the realities of phubbing and academic procrastination, this research can assist teachers, students, and parents in addressing these behavioral challenges. Furthermore, it will offer sociological insights, bridging the research gap on the impact of technology on diverse student behaviors, and benefiting educational policymakers and parents alike.

The formulated hypothesis posits that:

- The higher the frequency of phubbing practices, the higher will be the tendency of academic procrastination among students of FC College.

2.2 Aims of the study:

This study has the following objectives

- To find out phubbing practices among FC College students.
- To see the impact of academic procrastination among the students of FC College.
- To investigate the strength of association between two variables.

The above discussion proposes that there is an auspicious association between phubbing practices and student's academic procrastination and the following research questions have been composed.

2.3 Research questions:

- a. Is there any auspicious association between phubbing practices among FC College students and their academic procrastination?
- b. Are pubbing practices among the FC College students causing academic procrastination?

3. Literature Review

Technology-related behavioral issues include impulsive behaviors when people act without considering the consequences of their actions. Students who are engaged in phubbing behavior might thus continue to operate in this manner during their academic activities, delaying the completion of their academic obligations. (Parmaksız, İ. 2023). Also, students may find it harder and harder to concentrate and think about a subject without having their attention diverted due to the growth in connectivity and the regular development of personal digital devices (mobile phones) (Dontre, A. J. 2021).

According to research, students usually underestimate the effects of phubbing during lectures on their ability to learn. Using a phone during class has a negative correlation with paying attention visually (Abramova et al., 2017). And become a cause of phubbing which is a behavioral issue that creates disruptions and delays in our academic pursuits. It is a form of distraction from work that makes people less likely to concentrate on their academic obligations. People may put off completing their academic duties in favor of using their phones as a result, which can lead to procrastination (Parmaksız, İ. 2023).

According to a review study by Jacobsen and Forste on Academic and social outcomes of electronic media use among universities, it was found that 62% of students admitted that they have used electronic media for non-academic reasons while looking through, browsing, or organizing their assignments, this may manifest as a disdain for obligations (Jacobsen and Forste., 2011). Additionally, disrupting daily schedules and delaying academic work have been observed due to this kind of abusive mobile phone use. (Tangmunkongvorakul et al., 2019).

Studies have perceived that students' academic duties may also be affected by phubbing behavior. According to a recent Time Mobility Poll, 84% of people in 2012 "couldn't spend their day without their mobile phones." This trend of rising mobile phone addiction is also seen in other countries. As per 206 widely disseminated survey findings, 50% of children and 27% of parents believe that they are reliant on their mobile devices. Recent research has revealed that increasing reliance on mobile devices may lead to a rise in internet addiction. In 2016, there were about seven billion and above mobile phone users worldwide. Between 2000 and 2015 this percentage of people using the internet climbed globally sevenfold from 6.5% to 43%. Furthermore, the proportion of households having access to an internet connection rose from 18% in 2005 to 46% in 2015 (Facts, I. C. T. 2016)

In the current digital age, snubbing or phubbing someone for using their phone has become an inescapable behavior. Even while it can seem innocuous, the constant interruption and distraction caused by mobile phones might lead to academic procrastination overall. According to this study, phubbing can lead to less productivity, more interruptions, and worse academic and mental performance (Rosen et al., 2013). It may result in an endless loop of procrastination because students may use their phones as a distraction from their academic obligations, which leads to more procrastination. This study found that among undergraduates, phubbing was substantially linked to higher degrees of procrastination (Dursun and Esen., 2019).

Completing Academic tasks should be the priority of the student, guidance and counseling department students at the University of Lambung Mangkurat stated that they typically complete tasks and activities using a mobile phone. They also stated that when they expected to use their phones to look for materials for a task, they might be distracted by news and online entertainment (Rachman et al., 2019). Thus, excessive cell phone use keeps

students from effectively reaching their academic and developmental goals and may result in academic life adjustment issues (Han et al., 2022).

Procrastination, low achievement, attention disruption, loss of relational contact, loss of social cooperation, and social closure are all effects of phubbing behavior (Afdal et al., 2018).

The above-cited literature insights that phubbing practices and academic procrastination are very important and research-based phenomena all over the world and this specific area of social research has tremendous potential to be addressed. The sum of all the above-cited research indicates that the research assumption “Higher frequency of phubbing practices, higher will be the tendency of academic procrastination among students of FC College” is a researchable statement and needs to be put into the process of research.

4. Theoretical framework

Social Learning Theory, proposed by Albert Bandura, provides a lens through which we can understand the impact of phubbing on academic procrastination. According to this theory, individuals learn by observing the behaviors of others and the consequences of those behaviors. In the context of phubbing and academic procrastination, students may observe their peers engaging in phubbing behaviors, such as constantly using smartphones during study sessions. (Nabavi 2012).

Through social learning, students might internalize these behaviors as acceptable or normal. If they witness their peers procrastinating on academic tasks due to phubbing, they may adopt similar tendencies. Additionally, Social Learning Theory highlights the role of modeling, where individuals imitate the behaviors of those they perceive as influential or desirable. If influential figures, such as classmates or even teachers, engage in phubbing, students may be more likely to follow suit. In the realm of academic procrastination, this modeling effect can have a profound impact. Students may procrastinate on their studies by engaging in phubbing, influenced by the perceived benefits or acceptance of such behavior within their social context. This theoretical perspective underscores the interconnectedness of social dynamics and individual behaviors, shedding light on how observing and imitating phubbing practices can contribute to academic procrastination in educational settings.

5. Methodology

5.1. Research design:

A quantitative research technique has been adopted in this study to find out the relationship and strength between phubbing (phone snubbing) and academic procrastination.

Numerical data has been gathered through the use of an online Google survey. This entails counting how often people engage in phubbing behavior and how much they procrastinate on their academic responsibilities, then SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences) has been used to analyze the data.

5.2. Universe:

Undergrad students of FC College are the universe of this study.

5.3. Population:

The population is the students of undergrad of FC College.

5.4. Sampling technique:

Convenience sampling technique has been used to get the data from the respondent. The researcher found himself limited to adopting any other sampling technique because of multiple limitations at this stage of research.

5.5. Sample size:

The study sample consisting of 200 students has been chosen through convenience sampling from undergraduate students of FCC University.

5.6. Hypothesis:

- The higher the frequency of phubbing practices, the higher will be the tendency of academic procrastination among students of FC College.

5.7. Tools of data collection:

Close end questionnaire has been designed to get the data from the respondents. Information related to socio-demographic characteristics and the following variables will be collected.

5.8.Variables:

- Independent variable: Phubbing practices among the students of FC College
- Dependent variable: Academic procrastination among the students of FC College.

5.9. Conceptualization:

Phubbing:

"Phubbing" is the act of ignoring someone in a social context by focusing on one's phone (Chotpitayasunondh & Douglas., 2018). The term "phubbing" is a combination of the terms "phone" and "snubbing" (Karadag et al., 2015). Phubbing can take several forms, including checking one's phone during a conversation (during lectures or class time) or simply ignoring someone in favor of scrolling through social media or replying to messages. Phubbing can adversely affect relationships and lead to academic procrastination by causing emotions of detachment, disrespect, and even addiction to technology.

Academic procrastination:

Academic procrastination refers to the propensity to postpone or avoid tasks related to academic performance in curricular activities like research, composing papers, or completing assignments (BALKIS, M, and Duru 2009). It can be a major issue for students, causing them to fall behind in their studies, miss deadlines, and feel stressed, anxious, and guilty (Rachman et al., 2019).

Phubbing, a tendency to choose other mobile activities over academic work, is one of the major reasons why students may delay academic tasks. Procrastination can be especially difficult in the academic setting, where there are frequently several assignments and deadlines to manage, and grades and performance are strongly linked to academic success. Putting off tasks till the last minute, avoiding tough or unpleasant projects, and feeling overwhelmed or worried by academic responsibilities are all classic indications of academic procrastination.

Furthermore, phubbing might be a distraction that consumes time that could be spent on academic tasks. A study of college students discovered that the mere presence of a smartphone, even while not in use, resulted in lower cognitive capacity and will affect academic tasks. By lowering the amount of time and mental energy available for academic work, this distraction might contribute to procrastination (Ward et al., 2017).

5.10. Operationalization:

The Generic Scale of Phubbing (GSP) was developed in 2018 by Chotpitayasunondh, V., and Douglas, K. M will be used to measure the phubbing behavior. The GSP is a self-report measure that assesses the amount to which people participate in phubbing behavior in various settings. The GSP consists of 15 items, each of which is rated on a 5-point Likert scale from 1

(never) to 5 (always). The items are intended to evaluate several aspects of phubbing behavior, such as checking one's phone during class time, and using one's phone while doing assignments and important academic tasks.

To measure academic procrastination, the APQ (Academic Procrastination Questionnaire) will be used it was developed by Abu Gazal in 2012. The APQ is a one-dimensional Likert-type survey with 21 items. Each item is assessed on a Likert scale of 1 to 5, with 1 representing a strongly disagree and 5 representing a strongly agree. High test scores indicate that the subjects have experienced severe academic procrastination. It is intended to assess four aspects of academic procrastination: postponing starting a task, postponing finishing a task, postponing turning in a task, and postponing studying for an exam. The questionnaire has also been found to have strong construct validity because it correlates positively with other academic procrastination measures and adversely with academic accomplishment.

5.11. Statistical Analysis:

SPSS V.25 has been used to check the descriptive statistics and normality first, then based on normality relevant parametric and non-parametric techniques have been used to test the data.

5.12. Research Ethics:

The study has been conducted under the guidelines of IBR. The study has obtained informed consent from the participants, and they have been made aware of the purpose of the study, its goals, the procedures involved, and their rights as participants. While conducting this research on the relationship between phubbing and academic procrastination, ethical considerations have ensured the well-being and autonomy of study participants. Informed

consent from participants has been taken into account, and protect their privacy and confidentiality by collecting and storing data securely. Any conflicts of interest have been avoided and it has already ensured that the study results are reported accurately and transparently. Additionally, it has been ensuring that this study does not cause any harm to participants. In particular, it should be careful to avoid stigmatizing or blaming individuals who engage in phubbing or procrastination behaviors and avoid making any assumptions or generalizations based on demographic factors.

6. Results

6.1. Descriptive analysis: frequency of control variable (N=200)

Table no.1

Socio-Demographics Characteristics:

1.1. Gender

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Male	100	50.0
Female	100	50.0

1.2. Age

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
<=22 years	130	65.0
>22	70	35.0

1.3. Academic Year

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Freshmen	36	18.0
Sophomore	28	14.0
Junior	44	22.0
Senior	92	46.0

1.4. Father's Mother's Guardian's profession

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Businessmen	54	27.0
Government employ	44	22.0
Private employ	57	28.5
Labor	14	7.0
Other	31	15.5

1.5. The family's monthly income is Rs.

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
50000-80000	71	25.5
80000-11000	44	22.0
110000-140000	32	16.0
140000+	53	26.5

1.6. Do you earn?

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	54	27
No	126	73

1.7. Pocket money in Rs.

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
15000-20000	149	74.5
20000-25000	24	12.0
25000-30000	9	4.5
300000+	18	9.0

1.8. Approximate monthly expense of mobile phone.

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
500-1000	107	53.5
1000-1500	53	26.5
1500-2000	22	11.0
2000+	18	9.0

1.9. For what purpose do you use your mobile phone extensively?

Variables	Frequency	Percentage
Friends and family	51	25.5
Social media	99	49.5
Study purpose	23	11.5
Girlfriend/boyfriend	9	4.5
Business	4	2.0
Online dating	4	2.0
Others	10	5.0

Interpretation of Socio-Demographics Characteristics:

In this research, the sample consisted of 200 respondents, with an equal distribution between males (50.0%) and females (50.0%) (Figure 1.1). In terms of age, 65.0% of the respondents were aged 22 years or younger, while 35.0% were above the age of 22 (figure 1.2). In academic year distribution, the majority of the respondents were seniors (46.0%), followed by freshmen (18.0%), juniors (22.0%), and sophomores (14.0%) (Figure 1.3). Regarding the profession of their father, mother, or guardian, a significant portion of the respondents had parents or guardians working in the private sector (28.5%), followed by businessmen (27.0%), government employees (22.0%), and laborers (7.0%). Other professions accounted for 15.5% of the respondents (Figure 1.4).

When considering family monthly income, 25.5% of respondents reported an income range of Rs. 50,000 to 80,000, 22.0% reported Rs. 80,000 to 110,000, 16.0% reported Rs. 110,000 to 140,000, and 26.5% reported a monthly income of over Rs. 140,000 (figure 1.5). In terms of earning status, 27.0% of respondents indicated that they earned an income, while 73.0% did not report any income (Figure 1.6).

For pocket money, most respondents (74.5%) received an allowance ranging from Rs. 15,000 to 20,000, while 12.0% received Rs. 20,000 to 25,000, 4.5% received Rs. 25,000 to 30,000, and 9.0% received over Rs. 30,000 (Figure 1.7). Regarding mobile phone expenses, 53.5% of respondents reported monthly expenses of mobile phones Rs. 500 to 1,000, 26.5% between Rs. 1,000 to 1,500, 11.0% spent Rs. 1,500 to 2,000, and 9.0% reported expenses exceeding Rs. 2,000 (Figure 1.8).

Finally, when it comes to the purpose of extensive mobile phone usage, the primary use was for social media (49.5%), followed by interactions with friends and family (25.5%). Study purposes accounted for 11.5%, while smaller percentages reported using their phones for girlfriend/boyfriend interactions (4.5%), business purposes (2.0%), online dating (2.0%), and other miscellaneous activities (5.0%) (Figure 1.9).

This descriptive analysis provides a comprehensive overview of the demographic characteristics and mobile phone usage patterns of the respondents in the sample.

6.2. Reliability test analysis:

Table no.2

The data encompasses a set of psychometric properties for items related to the construct of "Phubbing," which involves phone usage behavior and associated feelings of anxiety. The primary construct of Phubbing exhibits a high factor loading of 0.897, indicating a strong association between the items. Moreover, the construct demonstrates excellent internal consistency, as evidenced by a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.897. The mean score for this construct is 50.2, with a standard deviation of 17.4, suggesting a moderate level of Phubbing behavior among the respondents, as scores range from 16 to 102.

The individual items contributing to the Phubbing construct also exhibit varying factor loadings, which are indicative of their respective contributions to the underlying construct. Factor loadings range from 0.497 to 0.737, reflecting the extent to which each item is associated with the overall Phubbing construct. Items with higher factor loadings, such as "I pay attention to my phone for longer than I intend to do so" and "I find myself thinking 'just a few more minutes' when I am using my phone," hold more weight in shaping the Phubbing construct.

This analysis provides an initial understanding of the construct's reliability and the significance of individual items in contributing to the overall construct of Phubbing. Further factor analysis has been conducted to explore the underlying factors and dimensions related to phone usage behavior and the associated feelings of anxiety within this construct.

Table no.3

The construct of "Procrastination" demonstrates a robust and coherent structure, with a high factor loading of 0.800. This factor loading signifies a strong association among the included items, suggesting that they collectively measure the same underlying construct related to procrastination behavior. Furthermore, the construct exhibits good internal consistency, as reflected by a Cronbach's Alpha coefficient of 0.800. This high reliability indicates that the items used to assess procrastination consistently capture the construct they are intended to measure.

The mean score for the Procrastination construct is 57.2, with a standard deviation of 9.3. This information indicates that, on average, respondents in the study exhibit moderate levels of procrastination, with scores ranging from a minimum of 28 to a maximum of 91. The relatively small standard deviation suggests that the data is relatively clustered around the mean, indicating that most respondents fall within the moderate range of procrastination tendencies.

Examining the individual items contributing to the Procrastination construct, it is evident that they exhibit varying factor loadings, ranging from 0.469 to 0.708. These factor loadings indicate the extent to which each item is associated with the overarching Procrastination construct. Notably, items with higher factor loadings, such as "I put off doing my assignment without a good reason, even when it's crucial" and "Whether or whether my assignments are enjoyable, I put them off," hold substantial weight in shaping the Procrastination construct, emphasizing their importance in assessing procrastination tendencies.

The provided data points to a reliable and internally consistent Procrastination construct, with individual items effectively measuring procrastination behavior. The factor loadings of these items shed light on their relative importance in contributing to the overall construct.

Table no.4**6.3. Linear Regression**

Procrastination

Variables	R ²	B	95% CI	P-Value
Phubbing	.107	.175	.104-.245	<.001

Linear regression analysis with "Procrastination" as the dependent variable and "Phubbing" as the independent variable.

1. R-squared (R²): The R-squared value is 0.107, which means that approximately 10.7% of the variance in the dependent variable "Procrastination" can be explained by the independent variable "Phubbing." In other words, the relationship between these two variables accounts for about 10.7% of the variability in procrastination scores.
2. Coefficient (B): The coefficient for "Phubbing" is 0.175. This value represents the change in the dependent variable ("Procrastination") for a one-unit change in the independent variable ("Phubbing"). In this case, for every one-unit increase in Phubbing behavior, we expect a 0.175-unit increase in Procrastination.
3. 95% Confidence Interval (CI): The 95% confidence interval for the "Phubbing" coefficient is from 0.104 to 0.245. This interval provides a range within which we can be

95% confident that the true population parameter lies. In this context, it means we can be 95% confident that the effect of Phubbing on Procrastination is between 0.104 and 0.245. This interval helps to understand the range of possible values for the true relationship.

4. P-Value: The p-value associated with "Phubbing" is less than 0.001 ($<.001$). The p-value indicates the statistical significance of the relationship between "Phubbing" and "Procrastination." In this case, the p-value is less than the conventional significance level of 0.05, suggesting that the relationship is statistically significant. Therefore, there is strong evidence to support the idea that "Phubbing" has a significant impact on "Procrastination."

The linear regression analysis indicates that "Phubbing" is a statistically significant predictor of "Procrastination." Specifically, a 1 unit increase in Phubbing behavior is associated with an increase of 0.175 in Procrastination, and the relationship is significant, accounting for approximately 10.7% of the variance in procrastination scores.

Table no.5

6.4. Independent Sample T-test

Variable	Means	P-value
Gender		.862
Male	57.26	
Female	57.03	
Earning		.853

yes	56.94
no	57.22

1. Gender (Male vs. Female):

Means: The mean age for males in the sample is 57.26 years, while the mean age for females is slightly lower at 57.03 years. This indicates a small numerical difference between the average ages of the two gender groups.

P-Value: The p-value associated with the t-test for gender comparison is relatively high, at 0.862. A p-value quantifies the evidence against the null hypothesis (the assumption that there is no difference). A p-value of 0.862 suggests that the observed difference in mean ages between males and females is not statistically significant at a conventional significance level of 0.05. In other words, the data does not provide enough evidence to conclude that there is a significant age difference between males and females in the sample.

2. Earning (Yes vs. No):

Means: The mean age for individuals who earn income is 56.94 years, while the mean age for those who do not earn income is 57.22 years. Again, there is a small numerical difference in the average ages between the two groups.

P-Value: The p-value for the t-test comparing earning status is 0.853, which is also quite high. This p-value indicates that the observed difference in mean ages between those who earn and those who do not earn is not statistically significant at the 0.05 significance level. In this case, as well, the data does not provide strong evidence to conclude that there is a significant age difference based on earning status in the sample.

In both comparisons, the p-values are greater than the significance level of 0.05, suggesting that the observed differences in mean ages for gender and earning status are likely due to random variation or noise in the data. Therefore, these results do not support the hypothesis that either gender or earning status has a significant impact on the age of individuals in your dataset.

Table no.6

6.5. Analysis of Variance for Procrastination:

6.1

	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between groups	233.354	3	77.785	.897	.444
Within groups	16993.441	196	86.701		
Total	17226.795	199			

The analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to explore potential differences in procrastination scores across distinct groups of academic year freshmen, sophomores, juniors, and seniors. The data revealed a total sum of squares of 17226.795 with 199 degrees of freedom. The variance within groups accounted for a sum of squares of 16993.441, utilizing 196 degrees of freedom, resulting in a mean square of 86.701. Conversely, the variance between groups was associated with a sum of squares of 233.354 and 3 degrees of freedom, yielding a mean square of 77.785. The F-ratio, a measure of the ratio of variability between groups to variability within groups, was calculated to be 0.897. Despite the seemingly small p-value of 0.444, this value is

greater than the conventional significance level of 0.05. Consequently, the findings do not show sufficient evidence to reject the null hypothesis. In practical terms, this suggests that there is no significant difference in procrastination scores among the groups under consideration.

In simple terms, after looking at the results, it seems that there isn't a big difference in procrastination scores between the academic groups in this study. So, there is not enough evidence to say that the groups are significantly different when it comes to procrastination. It's important to remember that these findings depend on the specific groups we looked at, and there might be more to explore in future studies.

6.2

	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between groups	270.658	3	123.553	1.437	.233
Within groups	16856.137	196	86.001		
Total	17226.795	199			

The analysis of procrastination scores using ANOVA indicates that there is no strong evidence for significant differences between the group's Father's/mother's/guardian's professions Businessmen, Government employ, Private employ, Labor, or other. The sum of squares between groups, a measure of variability among groups, was 370.658 with 3 degrees of freedom, resulting in a mean square of 123.553. The F-ratio, which compares the variance between groups to the variance within groups, was 1.437. However, the associated p-value of 0.233 is greater

than the conventional significance level of 0.05. Therefore, we lack statistical evidence to reject the null hypothesis. In simpler terms.

Looking at the procrastination scores, the numbers don't strongly show that the groups are different. The F-ratio is 1.437, but the p-value is 0.233, which is higher than 0.05. This means we don't have enough proof to say the groups are significantly different when it comes to procrastination. It's kind of like saying any differences we see could just be by chance. So, for now, we can't say the groups are really, truly different in terms of procrastination scores.

6.3

	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between groups	739.966	4	184.992	2.188	.072
Within groups	16486.829	195	84.548		
Total	17226.795	199			

The provided ANOVA table is a statistical analysis that helps us understand if there are significant differences in procrastination scores among different groups. The family's monthly income is Rs.50000-80000, 80000-110000, 110000-140000,140000+. The "Between Groups" part looks at the differences between these groups, suggesting that about 7.2% of the variation in procrastination scores could be explained by these differences. However, the p-value associated with this comparison is 0.072, which is a bit higher than the usual 0.05 threshold. This means that the differences observed might be due to chance, and we can't confidently say they're

significant. The "Within Groups" part looks at individual differences within each group, and the "Total" considers all the variations in procrastination scores. While the analysis hints at some differences, the results are not strong enough to be considered statistically significant. It's a bit like saying, "There might be some differences, but we're not sure if they're real or just random."

6.4

	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between groups	201.299	3	67.100	.772	.511
Within groups	17025.496	196	86.865		
Total	17226.795	199			

The provided ANOVA table is a statistical analysis that helps us understand if there are significant differences in procrastination scores among different groups' approximate monthly expenses of mobile phones in Rs.500-1000, 1000-1500, 1500-2000, 2000+. The "Between Groups" part looks at the variation in procrastination that might be because of the differences between these groups. The F-statistic (0.772) is like a signal; it's not very strong. The p-value (0.511) is quite high, higher than our usual cutoff of 0.05. This suggests that the signal is not very reliable, and there might not be a significant difference in procrastination scores between the groups.

6.5

	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between groups	604.692	3	2013564	2.524	.059
Within groups	16586.103	196	86.623		
Total	17226.795	199			

The provided ANOVA table is a statistical analysis that helps us understand if there are significant differences in procrastination scores among different groups Pocket money monthly in Rs.15000-20000, 20000-25000, 25000-30000, 30000+. The "Between Groups" section looks at the variation in procrastination that could be because of differences between these groups. The F-statistic (2.524) is like a signal; it's somewhat strong. The p-value (0.059) is close to the conventional threshold of 0.05. This suggests that there might be a meaningful difference in procrastination scores between the groups, but it's not quite strong enough to be considered statistically significant.

6.6

	Sum of squares	Df	Mean square	F	Sig.
Between groups	604.692	3	2013564	2.524	.059
Within groups	16586.103	196	86.623		
Total	17226.795	199			

The provided ANOVA table is a statistical analysis that helps us understand if there are significant differences in procrastination scores among different groups. For what purpose do you use your mobile phone extensively: Friends and family, Social media, Study purpose, Girl/Boyfriend, Business, Online dating, and Other. The "Between Groups" section looks at the variation in procrastination linked to differences between these groups. The F-statistic (0.685) is not very high, indicating a weaker signal. The p-value (0.562) is higher than the typical threshold of 0.05, suggesting that the observed differences may likely be due to random chance rather than a significant distinction between the groups. In simpler terms, the evidence does not strongly support the idea that there's a meaningful difference in procrastination scores among the groups.

7. Discussion

The study's findings illuminate the pervasive nature of phubbing behavior among students at Forman Christian University students and its noteworthy association with academic procrastination. Phubbing, the act of using mobile phones while ignoring immediate physical surroundings, has become deeply ingrained in the daily lives of FC university students, affecting various aspects of their social and academic engagements.

The theoretical framework, integrating Media Multitasking Theory (Ophir et al., 2009) and Social Learning Theory (Nabavi, 2012), serves as a crucial analytical tool. Media Multitasking Theory highlights the negative impact of engaging in multiple media activities simultaneously on cognitive control. Applied to phubbing, this theory underscores how toggling between mobile phones and academic tasks can disrupt concentration and contribute to interruptions in academic tasks. Social Learning Theory emphasizes observational learning and the influence of social environments on individual behavior, suggesting that students may adopt phubbing practices based on observed behaviors of their peers, perpetuating the behavior within the student community.

By incorporating these theoretical frameworks, the study establishes a correlation between phubbing and academic procrastination. It delves into the underlying cognitive and social processes, providing a nuanced understanding of how phubbing becomes intertwined with academic behaviors. This comprehensive perspective is crucial for formulating targeted interventions and educational strategies to address the root causes of phubbing and mitigate its adverse effects on academic performance.

The demographic analysis revealed a diverse sample of students, encompassing various age groups, academic years, and family backgrounds. Such diversity ensures that the study's results are reflective of the broader student population at FC College. Additionally, the prevalence of phubbing behavior, as measured by the Generic Scale of Phubbing (GSP), underscores the ubiquity of this phenomenon among the participants.

The construct of phubbing demonstrated strong internal consistency, affirming the reliability of the measurement tool. The mean score of 50.2 suggests a moderate level of phubbing behavior, highlighting the need for interventions to address this prevalent issue among students. Furthermore, the association between phubbing and academic procrastination is substantiated by the linear regression analysis.

The linear regression results indicate a statistically significant relationship between phubbing and academic procrastination. The positive coefficient (0.175) suggests that an increase in phubbing behavior is associated with a corresponding increase in academic procrastination. This relationship is supported by the 95% confidence interval, which does not include zero, reinforcing the reliability of the findings. The substantial R-squared value (10.7%) indicates that phubbing accounts for a noteworthy proportion of the variability in academic procrastination scores.

The literature review aligns with the study's findings, emphasizing the adverse effects of phubbing on cognitive control, attention, and academic outcomes. Phubbing, as a form of media multitasking, disrupts academic success and contributes to procrastination. The interconnectedness between excessive mobile phone usage, internet addiction, and procrastination underscores the need for targeted interventions to address these behavioral challenges among students.

The study's significance lies in its contribution to understanding the sociological implications of phubbing practices and their impact on academic procrastination. By identifying the association between these variables, educators, policymakers, and parents can devise strategies to mitigate the negative consequences of phubbing on students' academic performance and well-being.

This study illuminates the detrimental relationship between phubbing and academic procrastination among Forman Christian College University students. The evidence presented underscores the urgency of addressing phubbing behavior through targeted interventions, educational programs, and awareness campaigns. Implementing strategies to foster a balanced approach to technology use and promoting mindful academic engagement is essential for cultivating a generation of students who are not only technologically savvy but also academically resilient.

8. Implications

The future consequences of phubbing for academic procrastination among FC college students suggest potential difficulties in maintaining focus, managing time, and cultivating effective study habits. Phubbing, the act of being distracted by smartphones, could result in decreased productivity and compromised time management as students prioritize immediate phone-related satisfaction over academic responsibilities. The continuous exposure to social media through phubbing may lead to comparisons and self-esteem challenges, potentially fostering procrastination as a coping mechanism. Issues such as communication breakdowns, disturbances in sleep patterns, and a tendency towards short-term goals could also contribute to procrastination. While these outcomes are speculative and may vary individually, they emphasize the need to encourage healthy digital practices and effective time management to alleviate potential adverse effects on academic success.

9. Conclusion

In conclusion, the profound impact of phubbing on academic procrastination among FC college students is a matter of grave concern, as evidenced by the compelling statistical results. The revelation of a significant strong relationship between phubbing and academic procrastination underscores the urgency of addressing this pervasive issue within the academic community. The statistical findings further illuminate the extent to which the insidious habit of phubbing contributes to a moderate level of procrastination among students.

The implications of these results extend beyond mere statistical significance; which highlights a pressing need for intervention and awareness. As we navigate the digital age, where constant connectivity is both a blessing and a curse, it becomes imperative for educational institutions to recognize and combat the detrimental effects of phubbing on academic focus and productivity. The correlation identified in this study serves as a wake-up call for educators, policymakers, and students alike to foster an environment that promotes mindful technology use and cultivates a culture of academic diligence.

References

1. Abramova, O., Baumann, A., Krasnova, H., & Lessmann, S. (2017, June). To Phub or Not to Phub: Understanding off-Task Smartphone Usage and its Consequences in the Academic Environment. In *ECIS* (p. 127).
2. Afdal, A., Alizamar, A., Ifdil, I., Zadrian, A., Sukmawati, I., Zikra, Z., ... & Syahputra, Y. (2018). An Analysis of Phubbing Behaviour: Preliminary research from a counseling perspective.
3. BALKIS, M., & Erdiñç, D. U. R. U. (2009). Akademik Erteleme Davranişinin Öğretmen Adaylari Arasındaki Yayginliđi, Demografik Özellikler ve Bireysel Tercihlerle İlişki. *Eđitimde Kuram ve Uygulama*, 5(1), 18-32.
4. Chotpitayasunondh, V., & Douglas, K. M. (2018). The effects of “phubbing” on social interaction. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 48(6), 304-316.
5. Dontre, A. J. (2021). The influence of technology on academic distraction: A review. *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies*, 3(3), 379-390.
6. Dursun, Ö. Ö., & Esen, E. (2019). The relationship between phubbing and academic procrastination: The mediating role of self-regulation and attention control. *Educational Research and Reviews*, 14(15), 535-541.
7. Facts, I. C. T. (2016). Figures (2015, May) Retrieved from [https://www. itu. int/en/ITU/Statistics/Documents/facts](https://www.itu.int/en/ITU/Statistics/Documents/facts). *ICTFactsFigures2015. pdf*, on April, 20.
8. Han, J. H., Park, S. J., & Kim, Y. (2022). Phubbing as a millennial’s new addiction and relating factors among nursing students. *Psychiatry Investigation*, 19(2), 135.
9. Hechter, M., & Kanazawa, S. (1997). Sociological rational choice theory. *Annual review of sociology*, 23(1), 191-214.

10. Jacobsen, W. C., & Forste, R. (2011). The wired generation: Academic and social outcomes of electronic media use among university students. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, *14*(5), 275-280.
11. Karadağ, E., Tosuntaş, Ş. B., Erzen, E., Duru, P., Bostan, N., Şahin, B. M., ... & Babadağ, B. (2015). Determinants of phubbing, which is the sum of many virtual addictions: A structural equation model. *Journal of behavioral addictions*, *4*(2), 60-74.
12. Khan, N. A., Qijie, G., Ali, S., Shahbaz, B., & Shah, A. A. (2019). Farmers' use of mobile phones for accessing agricultural information in Pakistan. *Ciência Rural*, *49*.
13. Mahasneh, A. M., Bataineh, O. T., & Al-Zoubi, Z. H. (2016). The relationship between academic procrastination and parenting styles among Jordanian undergraduate university students. *The Open Psychology Journal*, *9*(1).
14. Nabavi, R. T. (2012). Bandura's social learning theory & social cognitive learning theory. *Theory of Developmental Psychology*, *1*, 24.
15. Ophir, E., Nass, C., & Wagner, A. D. (2009). Cognitive control in media multitaskers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *106*(37), 15583-15587.
16. Parmaksız, İ. (2023). The effect of phubbing, a behavioral problem, on academic procrastination: The mediating and moderating role of academic self-efficacy. *Psychology in the Schools*, *60*(1), 105-121.
17. Rachman, A., Rusandi, M. A., & Setiawan, M. A. (2019). The Effect Of Phubbing On Students' Academic Procrastination. *Jurnal Bimbingan dan Konseling*, *8*(1), 1-5.
18. Rosen, L. D., Carrier, L. M., & Cheever, N. A. (2013). Facebook and texting made me do it: Media-induced task-switching while studying. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *29*(3), 948-958.

19. Tangmunkongvorakul, A., Musumari, P. M., Thongpibul, K., Srithanaviboonchai, K., Techasrivichien, T., Sugimoto, S. P., ... & Kihara, M. (2019). Association of excessive smartphone use with psychological well-being among university students in Chiang Mai, Thailand. *PloS one*, *14*(1), e0210294.
20. Ward, A. F., Duke, K., Gneezy, A., & Bos, M. W. (2017). Brain drain: The mere presence of one's smartphone reduces available cognitive capacity. *Journal of the Association for Consumer Research*, *2*(2), 140-154.
21. Winskel, H., Kim, T. H., Kardash, L., & Belic, I. (2019). Smartphone use and study behavior: A Korean and Australian comparison. *Heliyon*, *5*(7), e02158.

11. Appendix A

11.1. Informed Consent Letter

I am writing to ask for your voluntarily taking part in my thesis research project. This study aims to investigate the impact of phubbing practices on procrastination among the undergrad students of FC College. About 15 minutes of your time will be needed for your participation, during which you will be questioned. You are free to revoke your consent at any time. Your participation is 100% optional. You may be sure that all collected data will be kept private and used only for research. All personal information will be treated with the utmost care, and your anonymity will be rigorously safeguarded. Your involvement will make a significant contribution to the development of knowledge in this area. We appreciate your interest in participating in this study.

If you have any queries, you can email the researcher at 241546187@formanite.fccollege.edu.pk.

Thank you for taking the time out to participate in this survey.

11.2 Appendix B

Socio-Demographic Variables

Gender	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Male • Female
Age	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 18-20 • 20-22 • 22-24 • 24-26
Intended Major	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biology/Biotechnology • Business • Chemistry • Computer Science • Economic • Education • English • Environmental Sciences • Geography • History • Mass Communication • Mathematics • Pharmacy • Philosophy • Physics • Political Science • Psychology • Religious Studies • Sociology • Statistics • Urdu
Semester	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1st • 2nd • 3rd • 4th • 5th • 6th • 7th

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 8th
Hostelite or Day Scholar	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hostelite • Day Scholar
Secondary High School type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Public/Government School • Private School • Homeschool
Father's educational level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High school/Intermediate • Undergraduate • Postgraduate • PhD/Doctoral degree
Mother's educational level	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High school/Intermediate • Undergraduate • Postgraduate • PhD/Doctoral degree

11.3.Appendix C

Generic Scale of Phubbing (GSP) was developed in 2018 by Chotpitayasunondh, V., and

Douglas

Items	1 = Never	2 = Rarely	3 = Occasionally	4 = Sometimes	5 = Frequently	6 = Usually	7 = Always
1. I feel anxious if my phone is not nearby.							
2. I cannot stand leaving my phone alone.							
3. I place my phone where I can see it.							
4. I worry that I will miss something important if I do not check my phone.							
5. I have conflicts with others because I am using my phone.							
6. People tell me that I interact with my phone too much.							
7. I get irritated if others ask me to get off my phone and talk to them.							
8. I use my phone even though I know it irritates others.							
9. I would rather pay attention to my phone than talk to others.							
10. I feel content when I am paying attention to my phone instead of others.							
11. I feel good when I stop focusing on others and pay attention to my phone instead.							
12. I get rid of stress by ignoring others and paying attention to my phone instead.							
13. I pay attention to my phone for longer than I intend to do so.							
14. I know that I must miss opportunities to talk to others because I am using my phone.							
15. I find myself thinking "Just a few more minutes" when I am using my phone.							

11.4 Appendix D

APQ (Academic Procrastination Questionnaire) will be used it was developed by Abu Gazal in 2012

Items	1 = strongly disagree	2 = disagree	3 = neither agree	4 = agree	5 = strongly agree
1. I should finish my tasks right away to avoid being late for classes.					
2. As the exam day gets closer, I notice that I become distracted.					
3. I often work quickly to complete my academic assignments before the due date.					
4. I always tell myself that I'll finish my assignment tomorrow.					
5. I often get to work on the assigned duties as soon as I get home from school.					
6. I do my schoolwork before the due date.					
7. I put off doing my schoolwork until the very last.					
8. I look for justifications for why I haven't completed the necessary coursework.					
9. My time usage is excessive.					
10. I consistently do my assignments and have additional time.					
11. I promise myself that I will finish my assignment, but I break my word.					
12. I stuck to the plan I made to do my schoolwork.					
13. I think there should be a delay when I have challenging assignments.					
14. I put off doing my assignment without a good reason, even when it's crucial.					
15. Whether or whether my assignments are enjoyable, I put them off.					
16. Whenever I consider the necessity of finishing my homework, I feel uneasy.					
17. I don't put off doing any task that I believe ought to be done.					
18. I practice a lot of fun hobbies, which leaves me with little time for studying.					

19. I frequently believe that I will have enough time later. There is no need to start studying as a result.					
20. The continual suffering I experienced was caused by the academic obligations being postponed.					
21. I finish my homework early to pursue other enjoyable activities					

11.5 Appendix E



FORMAN CHRISTIAN COLLEGE
(A CHARTERED UNIVERSITY)

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD APPROVAL CERTIFICATE

IRB Ref: IRB-504/6-2023

Date: 22-06-2023

Project Title: The impact of Phubbing practices on academic procrastination among FC College students

Principal Investigator: Nouman Younis Masih

Supervisor: Athar Azeem

The Institutional review board has examined your project in IRB meeting held on 22-06-2023 and has approved the proposed study. If during the conduct of your research any changes occur related to participant risk, study design, confidentiality or consent or any other change then IRB must be notified immediately.

Please be sure to include IRB reference number in all correspondence.

Dr. Staroon Hancock
Convener - IRB
Chairperson, Department of Statistics
Forman Christian College
(A Chartered University)
Lahore

For Further Correspondence:
📍 Ferozpur Road, Lahore-54600
☎ 042-99231581-8 Ext: 504 & 531
✉ irb@fccollege.edu.pk
🌐 www.fccollege.edu.pk