

## The Role of Ethical Leadership in Reducing Workplace Procrastination: Evidence from Public Universities in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KRG).

### Bewar Ahmed Abdalla

Department of Business Administration, College of Human Science, University of Raparin, Rania, Kurdistan Region, Iraq

[bewar.abdalla@univsul.edu.iq](mailto:bewar.abdalla@univsul.edu.iq)

### Prof. Dr. Pirshing Salih Mohamad

Department of Business Administration, College of Business and Economics, University of Sulaimani, Sulaimani, Kurdistan Region, Iraq

[pirshing.mohammad@univsul.edu.iq](mailto:pirshing.mohammad@univsul.edu.iq)

#### ARTICLE INFO

##### Article History:

Received: 14/2/2023

Accepted: 30/4/2023

Published: Summer 2024

##### Keywords:

*Ethical leadership, Procrastination at work, public universities, The Kurdistan Region of Iraq (KRG).*

##### Doi:

10.25212/lfu.qzj.9.2.42

#### ABSTRACT

According to studies conducted over the past two decades, positive leadership styles have been linked to less procrastination among employees. However, it is unclear if this is also true for those who work in public universities in the KRG. There is a need to test the relationship between other leadership styles and procrastination in other settings for better theoretical validity and applicability, as the literature has explored the role of leadership styles such as (transformational, empowering) on procrastination behaviour in various settings. Even though there is some speculation that good leadership practices can reduce unfavourable behaviours from followers, empirical studies on this topic are limited. This study uses social learning theory and social exchange theory to investigate the impact of ethical leadership on work procrastination at public universities in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq. Data was collected from 451 workers across 14 public universities in the higher education sector after a review of ethical leadership and workplace procrastination and the development of hypotheses. Ethical leadership was found to have a negative correlation and impact with employees'

procrastination after a linear regression model was applied in SPSS to validate the study's constructs and test the research model. By examining the vital role leaders play in preventing procrastination at work, this paper makes a theoretical contribution to the growing fields of ethical leadership and procrastination theory. Implications for higher education are discussed, along with recommendations for improving current systems and practices aimed at decreasing procrastination.

### **1.1. Introduction**

With the rapid advancement of social development and information technology, procrastination is becoming a more common phenomenon. As we are currently living in a time where work is increasingly focused on technology, using the internet has a significant impact on procrastination (Pearlman-Avni & Zibenberg, 2018). The Ottawa Citizen (2008) reports that procrastination due to technology has increased from 5% to 25% in recent years. Procrastination at work is the deliberate postponement of an intended action despite expecting adverse effects from the action (Steel, 2007). Klingsieck (2013) asserts that procrastination reduces performance. Procrastination can also have impact on organization's operating costs, employees' productivity, pay, and general well-being (see for example, Rozental et al., 2018). Employees who procrastinate often wait until the last minute to complete tasks and projects in the workplace (Garg, 2021; Alharthi et al., 2021). According to two of the top experts in human resource management, procrastination is even regarded as the main cause of leading businesses failing (Caruth & Caruth, 2003). Thus, Managers are consequently showing a greater interest in trying to figure out how to decrease employees' procrastination. There have been studies on the causes of procrastination, but most of these studies have concentrated on internal employee factors including intrinsic motivation, task characteristics, workload, job stress, and so forth rather than external factors like leadership (Hen, 2018; Hoppe et al., 2018).

Since employees are integral part of the organization, their behavior ought to be influenced by the organization or leader.

According to studies, a leader's position remarkably influences how an organization conducts its business ethically (Zhu et al., 2019). To learn more about the connections between procrastination and empowering, truthful, and caring environment, this study imports ethical leadership. According to Greenbaum et al. (2020), When it comes to adapting to the complex management context, ethical leadership was seen as compatible and interactional leadership, which involves leaders interacting with followers (Greenbaum et al., 2020). The foundation of leadership is ethics (Ko et al., 2019). Ethics has always played a crucial role in governing how people interact with one another.

Ethical leadership style affects both organizational citizenship behavior and deviant behavior. Employing an ethical leadership approach gives managers a great chance to improve their organization while boosting work engagement, job satisfaction, and lowering disruptive behavior (e.g. Nmer & Liu, 2021; Ahmad & Gau, 2018). Leadership that upholds moral principles can inspire productive behavior at the office and reduce misconduct (De Wolde et al, 2014). Employee unethical behavior decreases in organizations with leaders who adopt an ethical leadership style and interact with employees in a manner consistent with ethical values (Mayer et al., 2009).

### **1.2. Research problem**

Researchers assert that an employee's behavior can be significantly influenced by their leadership style in addition to their personality. How ethical leadership affects employees' procrastination, however, is still unknown. Besides, a number of studies have postulated that particular some features of public sector organizations make procrastination in public organizations different from the private sector organizations (Saman & Wirawan, 2021). However, most empirical research related to procrastination at work has focused on private sector organizations with minimal attention to public sector organizations (He et al., 2021; Jones, 2020; Batabyal & Bhal 2020). For instance, Ahmad et al. (2021) argued that employees in the public and

private sectors behave differently in regard to procrastination. Employees in public sector organizations put off completing their assigned tasks more frequently than their counterparts in the private sector, which lowers productivity and gives the impression that public sector organizations are inefficient in general. Despite these differences, there is not much research available which looks at procrastination in public organizations.

### **1.3. Research aim**

the aim of the study is, therefore, to reveal the nature of the relationship and impact between ethical leadership and work procrastination at public universities in the Kurdistan Region of Iraq.

### **1.4. Research question**

The aim of the study can be achieved through answering the research question “What is the relation between the ethical leadership and employee procrastination at work among employees in the public organizations in the KRG?”

### **1.5. The research hypotheses:**

*1.5.1. Hypothesis1 (H1): Ethical leadership is negatively related to Procrastination behavior among public university employees at the KRG.*

*1.5.2. Hypothesis2 (H2): Ethical leadership negatively impacts Procrastination behavior among public university employees at the KRG.*

### **1.6. The importance of the research**

In response to the call by Asio (2021) to study several academic institutions to achieve a broader perspective on procrastination. This research will focus on several public academic institutions of Iraqi Kurdistan. This paper will make a unique contribution in supporting the validity of earlier studies by taking into account the unique context of public organizations in Iraqi Kurdistan, where it is empirically understudied. The study adds to the growing body of knowledge about procrastination in non-Western

environments by shedding light on the prevalence of procrastination behaviour among public university employees and their perceptions of how closely their subject leader adheres to ethical leadership practices. Theoretical and empirical findings from this study are thus expected to add to the body of knowledge already in existence as well as the larger context of Iraqi Kurdistan.

## **2. Literature Review**

### **2.1. Ethical leadership**

Ethical leadership has now become an imperative trend due to the escalating and varied issues of recent times related to ethical scandals and fraud in various organizations (Brown & Treviño, 2006). Many authors considered the importance of ethics of leaders and the focus has begun on studying ethical leadership within the ethical components of other leadership patterns, such as authentic, engaging, spiritual, and transformational leadership (Kalshoven, 2011a, Den Hartog & De Hoogh, 2008; Brown & Treviño, 2006). However, in 2005, ethical leadership has been regarded as one of the leading methods. Brown et al. (2005) was among the first researchers to study ethical leadership and its perceptions as a separate leadership method. The author focused on ethical leadership from a social learning perspective and considered as the most widely used definition in the literature as states “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (Brown et al. 2005, p. 120). Many researchers have used this definition extensively in recent years (Kalshoven et al., 2011).

In this conceptualization, four essential behaviours that characterize ethical leadership are highlighted. First, moral leaders exhibit "normatively appropriate" behaviours that are suitable for the environment in which they operate, enhancing their reputation and credibility as role models. Second, by having ethical conversations with their followers, ethical leaders encourage their subordinates to bring up and discuss ethical issues at work with them (Brown et al., 2005). Third,

moral leaders set clear ethical expectations for their team members and enforce them through reward and punishment schemes. Last but not least, moral leaders make moral decisions that others can follow by carefully considering the moral consequences of their actions (Brown et al., 2005). The aforementioned definition was further expanded upon by Brown and Trevino (2006), who proposed two additional elements and suggested that an ethical leader has two primary roles: the moral person and the moral manager. Specifically, the moral manager aspect referred to the leader's attempt to influence their followers' ethical behaviours while the moral person aspect was defined as the leader's qualities, such as honesty and integrity (Nemr & Liu, 2021). Additionally, ethical leadership discourages employees from engaging in unethical or counterproductive work behaviour and instead promotes prosocial behaviour like OCB and work performance, according to meta-analytic evidence (Bedi et al., 2016; Ng & Feldman, 2015). As a result, the current study adopts Brown et al.'s (2005) viewpoint as the most suitable. Thus, drawing from the various perspectives in the literature Ethical leadership can be conceptualized of as “a type of leadership style that concerns with embracing moral principles as a baseline in making decisions regarding their personal and professional lives which in turn foster employee commitment and prevent employee involvement in counterproductive work behaviors”.

## **2.2. Workplace Procrastination**

Being productive at work is essential to the operation of the organization, and in today's increasingly globalized workplace, work procrastination is a crucial topic for businesses to consider (Van Eerde, 2003a). An employee may occasionally put off completing a task, however, procrastination at work will subsequently harm the outcomes of an organization because it will lead to making more mistakes and reducing productivity (Pychyl & Flett, 2012). Steel and Ferrari (2013) looked into the pervasiveness of procrastination in recent years as the number of people who admit to procrastinating to varying degrees has increased. Regarding the origin of procrastination, the source of this word is, on the one hand, from the Latin words "pro," meaning "forward, forth, or in favour of," and "crastinus," means belonging to

tomorrow "of tomorrow" (Ferrari, Johnson, & McCown, 1995). Regarding the explanation for the emergence of procrastination, On the other hand, it varies depending on the perspective scholars have. For instance, procrastination may be viewed as a personality trait by some academics (Steel, 2007; Kim et al., 2017), while others may view it as having an intentional or irrational nature (Steel, 2007, Steel & Klingsieck, 2016). Steel (2007, p. 66), who is regarded as one of the pioneers in this field, defines procrastination as a type of self-regulatory failure in which we "voluntarily delay an intended course of action despite expecting to be worse off for the delay,". The inability to get started on, and see through to completion of, a desired activity within a preverable or expected time frame is one example of a self-regulatory deficit (He et al., 2021). It is defined by Van Eerde (2000) as "the refusal to carry out one's intended purpose." Confronting one's own shortcomings in this way might cause feelings of shame and self-loathing. Nonetheless, modern perspectives on procrastination stress the importance of emotional regulation in this behavior. ( see for example, Suparna, 2021).

According to Gupta et al. (2012), procrastinators may differentially focus their energy on short-term goals, frequently at the expense of completing important long-term tasks. Employees should aim to keep a balance between their personal energies so that they can maximize productivity, minimize inefficiency, and consequently optimize resources of organizations (Gupta, 2012). Additionally, procrastination was found to be a stable trait that is linked to impulsivity, where the needs of the present self are more pressing than the needs of the future self (Klingsieck, 2013). Instead of struggling with long-term, difficult goals, procrastinators may prefer to concentrate on short-term, doable objectives. Alternatively, they may choose to work towards a long-term, complex, or nebulous goal with no interim deadlines to gauge their progress. Ferrari & Díaz-Morales (2014), recognized Procrastination as a pattern of behavior that contributes to poor time management, poor performance, low frustration tolerance, persistent task avoidance, depleted self-esteem, rushed concessions, and an inability to control unpleasant emotions.

There is no doubt that procrastination is a problem that interferes with individuals' daily lives, however, the presumption that procrastination is solely a personality trait is a constrained perception. Instead, it seems to be a personal tendency that can be influenced by specific contexts (Codina et al., 2018b) particularly it concerns with contexts where procrastination is most likely to occur. Thus, based on the above arguments, procrastination can be defined as a bunch of counterproductive behaviors where individuals behaviorally and cognitively engage in postponing a work related actions whereby hinders the effectiveness of delivering resources and services in turn affects organizational performance.

### **2.3. The relationship between Ethical Leadership and Procrastination at Work among public university employees in the higher education sector (HIS).**

Bandura's (1977) and Blau's (1968) social exchange and social learning theories state that ethical leaders use a variety of ways to influence their followers, such as being role models and making themselves the focus of imitation and identification. Followers are compelled to repay the favour and act in accordance with the ethical leader's expectations when leaders show fairness and care for their needs. Following a moral leader is therefore thought to result in less disruptive behaviour (Kalshoven et al., 2016). Employees demonstrate more organizational citizenship behaviours (OCB) as they learn more about ethical leadership as a result (Nemr & Liu, 2021). Additionally, ethical leadership has been observed to have a decreasing effect on undesirable behaviours such as workplace bullying, emotional exhaustion, absenteeism, and health complaints (Dust et al., 2018; Ahmad et al., 2020). As a result, by fostering an ethical environment, ethical leaders tend to reduce the likelihood of unethical behaviour. Furthermore, Metin and Peteers (2016) defined workplace procrastination as a type of counterproductive behavior which may result in reducing organizational job satisfaction, work engagement, and burnout (Sigauke, 2020; Hall et al., 2019). Employees' unproductive work habits may be reduced by the presence of ethical leaders. While there hasn't been any research on the connection between ethical leadership and workplace procrastination (WP), other leadership styles have been examined in the literature on WP. For instance, Singh & Dhaliwal



(2015) and Metin et al. (2018) found that transformational leadership had a strong correlation and influence on procrastination, where it could be a more effective style for reducing employees' excessive non-work-related behaviours. This is because transformational leaders are thought of as a type of ethical leader because they uphold moral values like honesty, integrity, and fairness and refrain from any bullying or manipulative influence (Sharma et al., 2021). In contrast, Hen et al. (2021) proposed that abusive supervision influences employees' work procrastination behaviour because it makes them feel mistreated and makes them aware of interpersonal tension at work. Organizations should support high-quality leader-member exchange (LMX), according to Legood et al. (2018), in order to reduce the harmful effects of procrastination. According to research, ethical leadership aids in the formation of high-quality leader-member exchange (LMX) relationships, and a leadership style that promotes ethics, altruism, and empowerment is beneficial (Hu et al., 2018). Employees typically form deep connections with the individuals they interact with, and the more interactions there are, the closer the bond becomes, according to the social exchange theory (Blau, 1964). Employers who are dependable and honest will take care of their staff members and earn their respect, leading to more frequent interactions. This is an example of ethical leadership. Therefore, developing followers' trust is a higher priority for moral leaders. The Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) Model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) interacts to predict procrastination because having the right resources (such as a strong relationship with the leader) can help manage elevated job demands (such as a heavy workload or a stressful working environment), and as a result, engage in fewer counterproductive work behaviours. In light of this, the following hypotheses can be developed:

*Hypothesis1: Ethical leadership is negatively related to Procrastination behavior among public university employees at the KRG.*

*Hypothesis2: Ethical leadership negatively impacts the Procrastination behavior among public university employees at the KRG.*

### **3. Research Method**

#### **3.1. Sample and procedure**

14 public universities in Iraqi Kurdistan provided the data for this study. Due to the research data collection being quicker, easier, more accessible, and less expensive, an online questioner method was chosen. A total of 451 online surveys were gathered. The target employees were among employees who work in the administrative departments across 14 public universities. The majority of respondents were between the ages of 35 and 44. The majority of participants (69%) have bachelor's degrees in terms of educational level. Regarding work experience, 36% of respondents had between 11 and 15 years, while 30% had between 5 and 10 years. Males made up 71% of the respondents. In terms of marital status, the majority of participants—representing 83.4% of the sample population—were married, while the remainders were single.

#### **3.2. Measures**

All measurements were made using a 5 Likert scale with a range of 1 to 5, with 5 being the strongest agreement. Use of previously validated scales ensured that all variables were measured accurately. All questions were initially in English at first, but the surveys were given to employees in their native language (Kurdish ).

#### **3.3. Control Variables**

This study has made use of a number of control variables, including the employee's place of employment, gender, age, experience, financial situation, and educational level. Previous studies (e.g., Nguyen et al., 2013; Garg, 2021) found a correlation between these variables and procrastination behavior

#### **3.4. Ethical Leadership:**

Ten items from Brown et al. (2005) were used to measure the variable. A sample item is “My supervisor has the best interest of employees in mind”. The validity and the reliability of the scale have already been proved with the Cronbach’s alpha (0.94).

### 3.5. Workplace procrastination

to measure this variable 12 items from (Metin et al, 2016) was used, a study that focuses on procrastination behaviours in the modern workplace. Eight items assess **soldiering** (i.e., "When I have too much work to do, I put off planning my tasks and end up doing something completely irrelevant"), and four items assess **cyber-slacking** (such as "I do online shopping during working hours"). The Cronbach's alpha is (0.91)

## 4. Results

### 4.1 validity and reliability test of the questionnaire (Cronbach's Alpha test):

Cronbach's alpha was used to measure the reliability of the questionnaire, and the values of (Cronbach's alpha) are considered statistically acceptable when these values are equal to or greater than (0.60) in questionnaire research.

Table No. (1): Cronbach's alpha coefficient to measure the reliability of the questionnaire

Variables	Number of Items	Cronbach's alpha	coefficient validity
Ethical leadership	10	0.942	0.971
Procrastination	12	0.915	0.957
Total	22	0.656	0.810

Table (1) shows the value of the reliability coefficient (Cronbach's alpha) and the validity coefficient. It is clear from the table that the value of the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was high for all variables, and it is equal to (0.942, and 0.915) for (Ethical leadership, and Procrastination) variables respectively, as well as the value of the coefficient of Cronbach's alpha for overall questionnaire is (0.66), and this means that the reliability coefficient of the questionnaire is high and is considered acceptable at a very good level from the statistical perspectives, as well as the value of validity was high for each of the variable of the questionnaire Separately, is equal to (0.971, and 0.957) for (Ethical leadership, and Procrastination) variables respectively, as well as the validity value of the overall questionnaire variable is (0.810), which means that

the validity coefficient of the questionnaire is high and is considered acceptable at a high level.

#### **4.2 Data analysis and interpretation of research results**

##### **4.2.1. Presentation, analysis, and discussion of information related to the sections of the questionnaire**

For the purpose of evaluating the section's overall strength and the significance of its individual items, we computed frequency and percentage distributions and determined the relative importance of the replies of the study sample. In addition to calculating the weighted mean to establish a trend, we also determined the standard deviation to show how far apart the research sample's answers were for each item. If the item's relative importance is greater than 60% and the weighted mean is greater than the hypothetical means of 3, then the item is positive, meaning (that the sample members agree on its content), and if the relative importance is less than 60% and the weighted mean is less than the hypothetical mean of 3, then the item is negative, meaning (that the sample members do not agree with its content). Thus, this part deals with a presentation or analysis of the information related to the research sections of the questioner, they are:

##### **4.2.1.1. Presentation, analysis, and discussion of the results related to the items of the variable (Ethical leadership):**

Table (2): Means, SD and RI for Ethical leadership

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	S.D	C.V	R.I
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.				
	%	%	%	%	%				
1	10.00	75.00	116.00	200.00	50.00	3.45	0.97	28.00	69.09
	2.2	16.6	25.7	44.4	11.1				
2	46.00	235.00	55.00	91.00	24.00	2.58	1.08	41.87	51.66
	10.2	52.1	12.2	20.2	5.3				
3	129.00	193.00	35.00	59.00	35.00	2.29	1.23	53.64	45.72

	28.6	42.8	7.8	13.1	7.8				
4	96.00	199.00	59.00	74.00	23.00	2.40	1.14	47.52	47.98
	21.3	44.1	13.1	16.4	5.1				
5	83.00	208.00	59.00	73.00	28.00	2.46	1.15	46.63	49.14
	18.4	46.1	13.1	16.2	6.2				
6	53.00	125.00	117.00	127.00	29.00	2.90	1.13	38.97	57.96
	11.8	27.7	25.9	28.2	6.4				
7	83.00	229.00	39.00	62.00	38.00	2.43	1.18	48.58	48.60
	18.4	50.8	8.6	13.7	8.4				
8	86.00	242.00	44.00	52.00	27.00	2.32	1.09	47.03	46.34
	19.1	53.7	9.8	11.5	6.0				
9	139.00	192.00	24.00	64.00	32.00	2.24	1.23	54.80	44.83
	30.8	42.6	5.3	14.2	7.1				
10	113.00	197.00	38.00	70.00	33.00	2.36	1.22	51.50	47.27
	25.1	43.7	8.4	15.5	7.3				
Total	838.0	1895.0	586.0	872.0	319.0	2.54	0.93	36.57	50.86
	18.6	42.0	13.0	19.3	7.1				

C.V: Coefficient of Variance, S.D: Standard Deviation, R.I: Relative Importance, Means description: (1 – 1.8 very low, 1.81 – 2.6 low, 2.61 – 3.40 moderate, 3.41 – 4.20 high, and 4.21 – 5 very high)

Table (2) shows weighted mean and standard deviation of each item of variable (Ethical leadership), the overall weighted mean for this variable is equal to (2.54) with standard deviation is equal to (0.93), the general direction of this variable toward to disagree. And the overall weighted mean of this variable is less than the theoretical mean (3), which is indicate to the population responders disagree with that the effect of the Ethical leadership which has a significant role in the study, whereas the (26.4%) with level of strongly agree and agree, but (13.0%) amount of neutral level, the (60.6%) with level of strongly disagree and disagree. For each item individually can be summarized as follows: The first item (X1 which represents “My manager conducts his/her personal life in an ethical manner”) has a highest weighted mean among the statements being rated by the study sample, which is equal to (3.45), and that is greater than the theoretical mean (3), with standard deviation is equal to (0.97), this

item indicates to (55.5%) with level of strongly agree and agree, but (25.7%) amount of neutral level, the (18.8%) with level of strongly disagree and disagree. After that the item (X6 which represents “My manager can be trusted”) has a highest weighted mean after item (X1) that is equal to (2.90) which is greater than the theoretical mean (3) with standard deviation (1.13), also this item indicates to (34.6%) with level of strongly agree and agree, but (25.9 %) amount of neutral level, the (39.5%) with level of strongly disagree and disagree. However, item (X9 which represents “My manager has the best interests of employees in mind”) has the lowest weighted mean among the responses which is equal to (2.24, and that is smaller than the theoretical mean (3) with standard deviation is equal to (1.23). it further indicate that (42%) of respondents disagree with this statement and (14% ) agreed upon it.

**4.2.1.2. Analyzing the items of Procrastination at work**

Table (3) Means, SD and MI for Procrastination at work

Items	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	Mean	S.D	C.V	R.I
	No.	No.	No.	No.	No.				
	%	%	%	%	%				
1	31.00	99.00	26.00	212.00	83.00	3.48	1.21	34.82	69.62
	6.9	22.0	5.8	47.0	18.4				
2	35.00	162.00	90.00	121.00	43.00	2.94	1.15	38.96	58.89
	7.8	35.9	20.0	26.8	9.5				
3	40.00	91.00	53.00	142.00	125.00	3.49	1.32	37.80	69.80
	8.9	20.2	11.8	31.5	27.7				
4	25.00	61.00	39.00	144.00	182.00	3.88	1.23	31.73	77.61
	5.5	13.5	8.6	31.9	40.5				
5	32.00	60.00	29.00	142.00	188.00	3.87	1.28	33.02	77.47
	7.1	13.3	6.4	31.5	41.7				
6	48.00	133.00	95.00	85.00	90.00	3.08	1.30	42.35	61.60
	10.6	29.5	21.1	18.8	20.0				

7	47.00	305.00	63.00	26.00	10.00	2.22	0.79	35.71	44.35
	10.4	67.6	14.0	5.8	2.2				
8	32.00	71.00	21.00	117.00	210.00	3.89	1.33	34.18	77.83
	7.1	15.7	4.7	25.9	46.6				
9	27.00	65.00	58.00	172.00	129.00	3.69	1.20	32.45	73.79
	6.0	14.4	12.9	38.1	28.6				
10	35.00	63.00	14.00	166.00	173.00	3.84	1.28	33.41	76.81
	7.8	14.0	3.1	36.8	38.4				
11	34.00	51.00	26.00	171.00	169.00	3.86	1.24	32.16	77.29
	7.5	11.3	5.8	37.9	37.5				
12	63.00	300.00	29.00	51.00	8.00	2.20	0.88	39.93	44.08
	14.0	66.5	6.4	11.3	1.8				
Total	449.0	1461.0	543.0	1549.0	1410.0	3.37	0.86	25.51	67.43
	8.3	27.0	10.0	28.6	26.1				

C.V: Coefficient of Variance, S.D: Standard Deviation, R.I: Relative Importance, Means description: (1 – 1.8 very low, 1.81 – 2.6 low, 2.61 – 3.40 moderate, 3.41 – 4.20 high, and 4.21 – 5 very high)

Table (3) shows weighted mean and standard deviation of each item of second variable (Procrastination at work), the overall weighted mean for this variable is equal to (3.37) with standard deviation is equal to (0.86), the general direction of this variable toward to agree. And the overall weighted mean of this variable is greater than the theoretical mean (3), which is indicate to the population responders agree with the questioner statements that employees Procrastinate at work which has a significant role in the study, whereas the (54.7%) with level of strongly agree and agree, but (10.0%) amount of neutral level, the (35.3%) with level of strongly disagree and disagree. For each item individually can be summarized as follows: The item (X8 which represents I delay some of my tasks just because I do not enjoy doing them has a highest weighted mean among the statements being rated by the study sample, which is equal to (3.89), and that is greater than the theoretical mean (3), with standard deviation is equal to (1.33), this item indicates to (72.5%) with level of strongly agree and agree, but (4.7%) amount of neutral level, the (22.8%) with level

of strongly disagree and disagree. After that the item (X4 which represents “When a work task is tedious, again and again I find myself pleasantly daydreaming rather than focusing”) has a highest weighted mean after item (X8) that is equal to (3.88) which is greater than the theoretical mean (3) with standard deviation (1.23), also this item indicates to (72.4%) with level of strongly agree and agree, but (8.6%) amount of neutral level, the (19.0%) with level of strongly disagree and disagree. However, item (X12 which represents “I do online shopping during working hours” has the lowest weighted mean, which is equal to (2.20) with standard deviation (0.88), also this item indicated to (13.1%) with level of strongly agree and agree, but (10.0%) amount of neutral level, the (80.5%) with level of strongly disagree and disagree.

### 4.3. Test of Hypotheses

The study hypotheses were tested by using correlation and regression analysis, which is stated that “H1: *Ethical leadership is negatively related to Procrastination behavior among public university employees at the KRG*” and “H2: *Ethical leadership negatively impacts the Procrastination behavior among public university employees at the KRG*”.

The results for the first hypothesis are shown in the table below:

Table (4): Correlation result between Ethical leadership and Procrastination at work

Variable	Correlation value	P-value
Ethical leadership and Procrastination at work	-0.580	0.000

If one looks at Table (4), which displays the value of correlation and p-value between Ethical leadership and Procrastination at work, one will see that the value of correlation is equal to (-0.580) and the p-value is equal to (0.000), both of which are smaller than the acceptable statistically significant level (Alpha) that is equal to ( $\alpha = 0.05$ ), indicating a negative and strong relationship between the two variables. This interpretation confirms the first hypothesis that states “*Ethical leadership is*



*negatively related to Procrastination behavior among public university employees at the KRG”*

Then based on the results of the regression analysis that confirmed there is a significant effect between the Ethical leadership and Procrastination at work as shown in the table below:

Table (5): Regression results of Ethical leadership on Procrastination at work

Variable	Procrastination at work					
Ethical leadership	R-square	t-test		F-test		Beta
		t-test	P-value	F-test	P-value	
	0.34	-15.10	0.000	228.09	0.000	-0.540

From table (5) can be determine change in (Procrastination at work) according to (Ethical leadership), The results indicate that there is a statistically significant relationship between ethical leadership and procrastination at work, with the R2 (0.34) indicating that ethical leadership accounts for 34% of the change in the variable procrastination at work and the F-test confirming this relationship as equal to (228.09) with a p-value (0.000), which is below the acceptable statistical level (0.05), thats to accept the alternative hypothesis, "The model is significant" and reject the null hypothesis. The t-test is used to evaluate the effect of Ethical leadership on Procrastination at work, note that the value of calculated (t) for the mentioned variable is (-15.10) with the p value is (0.000), this means that there is a significant effect of the variable Ethical leadership on Procrastination at work by amount (-0.540) which is shown in the table above under column name (Beta), which means wherever Ethical leadership increases by one unit the Procrastination at work decreased by (54.0%). Finally, from the above results the second research hypothesis is confirmed which states *"Ethical leadership negatively impacts Procrastination behavior among public university employees at the KRG”*.

#### **4. Discussion and Conclusion**

The purpose of this study was to investigate the relationship and effects between procrastination at work and ethical leadership. The results of the empirical testing of the relationships demonstrated that public organizations can adopt ethical leadership as a beneficial leadership style to address the problem of employee procrastination. The findings showed that public university administrators did a poor job of adhering to moral leadership principles like consideration of employees following ethical ways to achieve goals, caring and consideration for employees' voices in the decision-making process. This indicates that managers at public universities lack ethical standards at work, which has led to employees' procrastination at work. These findings concur with those of other researchers who have examined how unethical leadership practices in the workplace can exacerbate undesirable behaviours (see, e.g., Dust et al., 2018; Lin & Liu, 2017).

In addition, the results also revealed that procrastination behaviour is prevalent among employees in public universities, as employees generally postpone working on their tasks at work, even after starting to work on them. Unenjoyable tasks and a lack of time management were also identified as major factors for procrastination. Besides, technology played a significant role in turning employees into procrastinators, as the majority were using the internet for their personal use during working hours. This result is consistent with the findings of both authors (Legood et al., 2018; Hu et al., 2018), who claim that a leadership approach that promotes ethics, altruism, and empowerment is beneficial for the formation of high-quality LMX relationships and that ethical leadership helps to form high-quality leader-member exchange (LMX). Besides, Miao et al. (2020) stated that a lack of ethical leadership practices at work may result in an increase in unethical behaviours. As a result, our explanation is that employees procrastinate due to a lack of proper fit between their task and their personal goals, as well as a lack of care and consideration for employees in the decision-making process by their manager or leader, which causes them to postpone their tasks and waste time on personal internet use.

## **6. Implications for practice and recommendation**

This research was conducted among employees at public universities in the Kurdistan region of Iraq, an emerging economy where the concept of procrastination in the workplace has rarely been explored. Furthermore, the study's findings provide novel practical insights for managers interested in addressing the issue of procrastination and its effects, as well as methods for managers to reduce employee procrastination in the academic setting. Given the importance of higher education to national and international economies, this research has indirect implications for the improvement of the KRG's higher education system and, by extension, for the growth of the Kurdistan Regional Government. The recommendations for practice are as bellow:

- 1- The findings of this study should encourage managers to place more emphasis on cultivating leadership behaviours that employees may perceive as ethical.
- 2- The findings also encourage more emphasize on the managerial practices that enhance positive work relationships such as (empowering employees and better communication), that in turn decrease negative behaviours (like procrastination).
- 3- The findings suggest improving the fit between the goals of employees and organizations. For instance, direct managers could receive instruction on how to show empathy for each employee and make decisions that are fair and balanced. Besides, highly focusing on high quality of relationship between managers/leaders and their subject employees. This would help combat employees' tendency to become bored at work and boost productivity.
- 4- Last but not least, increasing employee awareness through the importance of time management and task organization at work through regular training courses by administrators in the public universities.
- 5- Lastly, administrators, managers, or leaders, must pay more attention to the importance of the job description and job specification, as each employee must be enrolled to a task that fits with their abilities and interests. This can highly decrease the workplace procrastination as majority of the respondents that they don't enjoy the task that they are enrolled in

**References:**

1. Ahmad, A. B., Butt, A. S., Chen, D., & Liu, B. (2020). A mediated model of the effect of organizational culture on the intentions to engage in change-supportive behaviors: Insights from the theory of planned behavior. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 1-21.
2. Ahmad, I., & Gao, Y. (2018). Ethical leadership and work engagement: The roles of psychological empowerment and power distance orientation. *Management Decision*, 56(9), 1991-2005.
3. Ahmad, S., Sohal, A. S., & Wolfram Cox, J. (2020). Leading well is not enough: A new insight from the ethical leadership, workplace bullying and employee well-being relationships. *European Business Review*, 32(2), 159-180.
4. Alharthi, S., Levy, Y., Wang, L., & Hur, I. (2021). Employees' mobile cyberslacking and their commitment to the organization. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 61(2), 141-153.
5. Asio, J. M. R. (2021). Procrastination and Work Productivity of Academic Staff: Implications to the Institution. *Online Submission*, 9(1), 46-53.
6. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of managerial psychology*, 22(3), 309-328.
7. Bandura, A., Adams, N. E., & Beyer, J. (1977). Cognitive processes mediating behavioral change. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 35(3), 125.
8. Batabyal, S. K., & Bhal, K. T. (2020). Traditional cyberloafing, mobile cyberloafing and personal mobile-internet loafing in business organizations: exploring cognitive ethical logics. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*, 18(4), 631-647.
9. Bavik, Y. L., Tang, P. M., Shao, R., & Lam, L. W. (2018). Ethical leadership and employee knowledge sharing: Exploring dual-mediation paths. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(2), 322-332.
10. Bedi, A., Alpaslan, C. M., & Green, S. (2016). A meta-analytic review of ethical leadership outcomes and moderators. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 139, 517-536.
11. Blau, P. M. (1968). Social exchange. *International encyclopedia of the social sciences*, 7(4), 452-457.
12. Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The leadership quarterly*, 17(6), 595-616.

13. Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 97(2), 117-134.
14. Caruth, D., & Caruth, G. (2003). A company's number one killer: Procrastination. *Innovative Leader#* 577, 12(5).
15. Codina, N., Castillo, I., Pestana, J. V., & Balaguer, I. (2020). Preventing procrastination behaviours: Teaching styles and competence in university students. *Sustainability*, 12(6), 2448.
16. De Hoogh, A. H., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study. *The leadership quarterly*, 19(3), 297-311.
17. De Wolde, A., Groenendaal, J., Helsloot, I., & Schmidt, A. (2014). An explorative study on the connection between ethical leadership, prototypicality and organizational misbehavior in a Dutch Fire Service.
18. Dust, S. B., Resick, C. J., Margolis, J. A., Mawritz, M. B., & Greenbaum, R. L. (2018). Ethical leadership and employee success: Examining the roles of psychological empowerment and emotional exhaustion. *The leadership quarterly*, 29(5), 570-583.
19. Ferrari, J. R., & Díaz-Morales, J. F. (2014). Procrastination and mental health coping: A brief report related to students. *Individual differences research*, 12(1), 8-11.
20. Ferrari, J. R., Johnson, J. L., & McCown, W. G. (1995). *Procrastination and task avoidance: Theory, research, and treatment*. Springer Science & Business Media.
21. Garg, N. (2021) study of procrastination pattern amongst the educated males and females. *PIMT Journal of Research*, 13(2), 109-112.
22. Greenbaum, R., Bonner, J., Gray, T., & Mawritz, M. (2020). Moral emotions: A review and research agenda for management scholarship. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 41(2), 95-114.
23. Gupta, R., Hershey, D. A., & Gaur, J. (2012). Time perspective and procrastination in the workplace: An empirical investigation. *Current psychology*, 31, 195-211.
24. Hall, N. C., Lee, S. Y., & Rahimi, S. (2019). Self-efficacy, procrastination, and burnout in post-secondary faculty: An international longitudinal analysis. *PloS one*, 14(12), e0226716.

25. He, Q., Wu, M., Wu, W., & Fu, J. (2021). The effect of abusive supervision on employees' work procrastination behavior. *Frontiers in psychology, 12*, 596704.
26. Hen, M. (2018). Causes for procrastination in a unique educational workplace. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community, 46*(3), 215-227.
27. Hen, M., Goroshit, M., & Viengarten, S. (2021). How decisional and general procrastination relate to procrastination at work: An investigation of office and non-office workers. *Personality and Individual Differences, 172*, 110581.
28. Hoppe, J. D., Prokop, P., & Rau, R. (2018). Empower, not impose!—Preventing academic procrastination. *Journal of prevention & intervention in the community, 46*(2), 184-198.
29. Hu, Y., Zhu, L., Zhou, M., Li, J., Maguire, P., Sun, H., & Wang, D. (2018). Exploring the influence of ethical leadership on voice behavior: how leader-member exchange, psychological safety and psychological empowerment influence employees' willingness to speak out. *Frontiers in psychology, 9*, 1718.
30. Jones, R. P. (2020). Passion meets procrastination: comparative study of negative sales associate behaviours. *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management, 48*(10), 1077-1098.
31. Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D. N., & De Hoogh, A. H. (2011). Ethical leadership at work questionnaire (ELW): Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *The leadership quarterly, 22*(1), 51-69.
32. Kalshoven, K., Van Dijk, H., & Boon, C. (2016). Why and when does ethical leadership evoke unethical follower behavior?. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 31*(2), 500-515.
33. Kim, S., Fernandez, S., & Terrier, L. (2017). Procrastination, personality traits, and academic performance: When active and passive procrastination tell a different story. *Personality and Individual differences, 108*, 154-157.
34. Klingsieck, K. B. (2013). Procrastination in different life-domains: Is procrastination domain specific?. *Current Psychology, 32*, 175-185.
35. Klingsieck, K. B. (2013). Procrastination in different life-domains: Is procrastination domain specific?. *Current Psychology, 32*, 175-185.
36. Ko, C., Ma, J., Kang, M., Haney, M. H., Bartnik, R., Hwang, D. W., & Lee, D. Y. (2019). The effect of ethical leadership on purchasers' unethical behavior in China: The moderating role of ethical ideology. *Journal of Purchasing and Supply Management, 25*(4), 100528.

37. Legood, A., Lee, A., Schwarz, G., & Newman, A. (2018). From self-defeating to other defeating: Examining the effects of leader procrastination on follower work outcomes. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 91*(2), 430-439.
38. Lin, C. P., & Liu, M. L. (2017). Examining the effects of corporate social responsibility and ethical leadership on turnover intention. *Personnel Review, 46*(3), 526-550.
39. Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R., Bardes, M., & Salvador, R. B. (2009). How low does ethical leadership flow? Test of a trickle-down model. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes, 108*(1), 1-13.
40. Metin, U. B., Taris, T. W., & Peeters, M. C. (2016). Measuring procrastination at work and its associated workplace aspects. *Personality and Individual Differences, 101*, 254-263.
41. Miao, Q., Eva, N., Newman, A., Nielsen, I., & Herbert, K. (2020). Ethical leadership and unethical pro-organisational behaviour: The mediating mechanism of reflective moral attentiveness. *Applied Psychology, 69*(3), 834-853.
42. Nemr, M. A. A., & Liu, Y. (2021). The impact of ethical leadership on organizational citizenship behaviors: Moderating role of organizational cynicism. *Cogent Business & Management, 8*(1), 1865860.
43. Ng, T. W., & Feldman, D. C. (2015). Ethical leadership: meta-analytic evidence of criterion-related and incremental validity. *Journal of applied psychology, 100*(3), 948.
44. Pearlman-Avni, S., & Zibenberg, A. (2018). Prediction and job-related outcomes of procrastination in the workplace. *Journal of Prevention & Intervention in the Community, 46*(3), 263-278.
45. Pychyl, T. A., & Flett, G. L. (2012). Procrastination and self-regulatory failure: An introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Rational-Emotive & Cognitive-Behavior Therapy, 30*, 203-212.
46. Rozental, A., Bennett, S., Forsström, D., Ebert, D. D., Shafran, R., Andersson, G., & Carlbring, P. (2018). Targeting procrastination using psychological treatments: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Frontiers in psychology, 9*, 1588.
47. Saman, A., & Wirawan, H. (2021). Examining the impact of psychological capital on academic achievement and work performance: The roles of procrastination and conscientiousness. *Cogent Psychology, 8*(1), 1938853.



48. Sharma, S., Scafide, K., Maughan, E. D., & Dalal, R. S. (2021). Relationship between perceived supervisor support and workplace bullying in school nurses in Virginia. *The Journal of School Nursing*, 10598405211025771.
  49. Sigauke, Y. A. (2021). *The relationship between workplace boredom, procrastination, work engagement and turnover intention within the South African context* (Doctoral dissertation, North-West University (South Africa)).
  50. Singh, S., & Dhaliwal, R. (2015). Procrastination patterns of transactional and transformational leaders. *Pacific Business Review International*, 8(1), 33-40.
  51. Steel, P. (2007). The nature of procrastination: a meta-analytic and theoretical review of quintessential self-regulatory failure. *Psychological bulletin*, 133(1), 65.
  52. Steel, P. (2007). The nature of procrastination: a meta-analytic and theoretical review of quintessential self-regulatory failure. *Psychological bulletin*, 133(1), 65.
  53. Steel, P., & Ferrari, J. (2013). Sex, education and procrastination: An epidemiological study of procrastinators' characteristics from a global sample. *European Journal of Personality*, 27(1), 51-58.
  54. Steel, P., & Klingsieck, K. B. (2016). Academic procrastination: Psychological antecedents revisited. *Australian Psychologist*, 51(1), 36-46.
  55. Steel, P., & König, C. J. (2006). Integrating theories of motivation. *Academy of management review*, 31(4), 889-913.
  56. Suparna, S. (2021). Resilience as a Moderating Variable between Emotional Regulation and Procrastination. *Indian Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(3), 228-231.
  57. The Ottawa Citizen (2008). Procrastination a personality trait. You're sitting at your desk, and you've got work to do. from Canada.com website: <http://www.canada.com/ottawacitizen/news/city/story.html?id=4ca892ae-5ebd-411b-96bd-75163f6c6f4d>.
  58. Van Eerde, W. (2000). Procrastination: Self-regulation in initiating aversive goals. *Applied Psychology*, 49(3), 372-389.
  59. Van Eerde, W. (2003). A meta-analytically derived nomological network of procrastination. *Personality and individual differences*, 35(6), 1401-1418.
-



## رۆلی سهرکردایه تی ئەخلاقى له كه مكرده وهى دواخستنى ئهرك له شوینى كار: به لگه له زانكو حكومیه كانی ههریمی كوردستان.

پوخته:

لیكۆلینه وه كانی دوو دهیهی رابردوو پیشنیاری ئه وه ده كه ن كه شیوازی سهرکردایه تی ئه رینی په نگه رفتهاری دواخستنى ئهرك له نیوان فه رمانبه ران كه م بکاته وه. به لام زانیارییه کی كه م ههیه كه ئایا ئه م ده رهنجامه له نیوان فه رمانبه رانی زانكو حكومیه كانی له حكومه تی ههریمدا ههیه یان نا جگه له وهش، ئه ده بیات لیكۆلینه وهی له رۆلی شیوازه كانی سهرکردایه تی وهك (گۆرانکاری، ده سه لات پیدان) له سه ر په فتاری دواخستن له چوارچیهی جیاوازا کردوو، ئه مهش پیشنیاری پیویستی تاقیکردنه وهی شیوازه كانی تری سهرکردایه تی و په فتاری دواخستنى ئهرك له چوارچیهی دیکه دا ده کات به مه به ستی باشتکردن و وردبینی و گشتاندنی تیورییه که ی . سه ره پای ئه وه، له کاتییدا كه په فتاره گونجاوه كانی سه رکرده په نگه په فتاره ناله باره كانی شوینکه وتوو ان كه م بکاته وه، به لام لیكۆلینه وه ئه زموونییه کان که من. ئه م توێژینه وهیه به سود وه رگرتن له تیوری ئالوگۆپی کۆمه لایه تی و تیوری فیربوونی کۆمه لایه تی، نامانجی لیكۆلینه وهیه له سه روشتی په یوه ندی و کاریگه ری نیوان سهرکردایه تی ئەخلاقى و دواخستنى كار له نیوان فه رمانبه رانی زانكو حكومیه كانی له ههریمی كوردستانی عیراق. دواى پیداچوونه وه به سه رکردایه تی ئەخلاقى و دواخستن له شوینى كار، و په ره پیدانی گریمانه کان، داتاكان له 451 کارمهند له سه رانه سهری 14 زانکۆی حکومی له حکومه تی ههریم له که رتی خویندنی بالدا کۆکرانه وه. به به کارهینانی SPSS, Linear regression بۆ پشته راسه تکرده وهی بنیاته كانی توێژینه وه که و تاقیکردنه وهی مۆدیلى توێژینه وه که، توێژینه وه که ده ریخست که سه رکردایه تی ئەخلاقى په یوه ندیه کی نه رینی به په فتاری دواخستن له نیوان کارمهنده کاند ههیه. له رووی تیورییه وه ئه م توێژینه وهیه به شه داره له په ره پیدانی سه رکردایه تی ئەخلاقى و تیوری دواخستن به تیگه یشتن له و رۆله گرنه گی که سه رکرده کان ده یگپرن له دوورکه وتنه وه له دواخستن له شوینى کاردا. کاریگه ریه په پراکتیکییه كانی ئه م دۆزینه وان ه باس ده کرین له گه ل پیشنیاره کان بۆ که رتی خویندنی بالدا بۆ په ره پیدان و په یوه وکردنی سیسته م و پراکتیکی باشت له که مکرده وهی په فتاری دواخستنى ئهرك له شوینى کاردا.

## دور القيادة الأخلاقية في الحد من التسويف في مكان العمل: أدلة من الجامعات الحكومية في إقليم كردستان العراق.

### الملخص:

تشير الأبحاث التي أجريت في العقدين الماضيين إلى أن أساليب القيادة الإيجابية قد تقلل من تسويف الموظفين. ومع ذلك ، لا يُعرف الكثير عما إذا كان هذا هو الحال بين موظفي الجامعات الحكومية في حكومة إقليم كردستان على الرغم من المعروف عنها ارتفاع معدلات التسويف. إلى جانب ذلك ، استكشفت الأدبيات دور أساليب القيادة مثل (القيادة التحولية والتمكين) في سلوك التسويف في سياقات مختلفة ، مما يشير إلى الحاجة إلى اختبار رابط التسويف بين أساليب القيادة الأخرى في سياقات أخرى لتحسين دقتها النظرية وقابليتها للتعميم. بالإضافة إلى ذلك ، في حين أن سلوكيات القائد المناسبة قد تقلل من سلوكيات الأتباع غير المواتية ، فإن الدراسات التجريبية قليلة. بالاعتماد على نظرية التبادل الاجتماعي ونظرية التعلم الاجتماعي ، تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى دراسة طبيعة العلاقة والتأثير بين القيادة الأخلاقية والمماثلة في العمل بين موظفي الجامعات الحكومية في إقليم كردستان العراق. بعد مراجعة القيادة الأخلاقية والمماثلة في العمل ، وتطوير الفرضيات ، تم جمع البيانات من 451 موظفًا من 14 جامعة حكومية في حكومة إقليم كردستان في قطاع التعليم العالي. باستخدام SPSS, Linear regression لتأكيد بنيات الدراسة واختبار نموذج البحث ، وجدت الدراسة أن القيادة الأخلاقية مرتبطة سلبًا بسلوك التسويف بين الموظفين. من الناحية النظرية ، تساهم هذه الورقة في تطوير القيادة الأخلاقية ونظرية التسويف من خلال فهم الدور الحاسم الذي يلعبه القادة في تجنب التسويف في مكان العمل. تتم مناقشة الآثار العملية لهذه النتائج مع اقتراحات لقطاع التعليم العالي لتطوير واتباع أنظمة وممارسات أفضل في الحد من التسويف في العمل.