Procrastination in the workplace: The role of hierarchical career plateau
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Abstract. Workplace procrastination adversely affects any company’s activity. The purpose of the research is to examine the hierarchical career plateau (HCP) perceived by the employees and the workplace procrastination (WP) variables, and to determine the role of the HCP, if any, in WP of employees. The methodological framework of the research includes career development theory and rational emotive behavior theory. Utilizing the screening model and survey technique, the data were obtained from 367 employees in Zonguldak location of Turkey. To evaluate the data, the authors use the methods of statistical and econometric analysis (confirmatory factor analysis, correlation analysis, regression analysis, Independent Sample T test and One-Way ANOVA Test), as well as the face-to-face survey method. According to the research findings, there is a positive correlation between the HCP and WP, and 1-unit increase in the HCP results in an increase of 0.751 units in the WP behavior. In terms of socio-demographic factors of workers, the study shows that WP does not differ significantly according to gender, age, education level, income level, job sector and work experience. The research results indicate that the HCP is among the primary factors influencing the timely performance of official duties. The theoretical and practical significance of the study is to minimize employees’ unwanted work behavior and contribute to the HCP and WP literature.
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INTRODUCTION

There is a dynamic process in the development of organizations and employees, as well as all areas of the world. Changing organizational structures, employee expectations and pursuing new approaches in management are the central focus in this process. While the competition among organizations has intensified globally, organizations’ expectations of their employees’ performance have heightened as well. However, it is obvious that the expectations and values of employees should be taken into consideration in order to provide such performance within the modern management approach, and today’s organizational behavior research studies are concentrated on this issue. Particularly, the desire of individuals to meet their career needs rather than their basic needs resulted in the emergence of the career plateau concept and the necessity to examine this concept from the organizational perspective. Career plateau expresses the situation, where there is only a low, if any, probability of additional hierarchical career promotion of an employee [Ongori, Agolla, 2009]. Although numerous researchers have examined this problem with different subspecies (personal, organizational, objective and subjective), its generally accepted dimensions are work-based plateau and hierarchical plateau. Failure of an employee to be promoted for corporate reasons characterizes the hierarchical career plateau (HCP). Hierarchical plateaus occur when an individual has little chance of vertical movement within a company. On the other hand, business content dissemination occurs when the individual is no longer challenged by their job or job responsibilities. Therefore, career plateaus are now defined as “not being able to move upwards” in the organization [Allen et al., 1998].

It is a very important motivation tool for employees to progress in their careers. Employees with limited opportunities for advancement in their companies feel like they are in a HCP [Armstrong-Stassen, Ursel, 2009]. Such a plateau can potentially create discomfort among employees, as the lack of progress is considered as an instrument to measure employees’ performance [Ongoni, Agolla, 2009]. Accordingly, the employees, whose career expectations cannot be met, are believed to demonstrate procrastination behavior. Workplace procrastination (WP) is a negative behavior in terms of time management and one of the rare issues in the literature on this topic. WP implies that a person tends to show delay behavior by not performing a task or decision [Milgram et al., 1998]. Considering the time factor, which is among scarce resources today, the loss of time due to procrastination includes the part that employees normally consume from the time they need to work. Consequently, time costs also cause financial losses for organizations as they affect individual and corporate productivity [Gupta et al., 2012].
The literature analysis shows that WP has many important effects on organizations. Tice and Baumeister [1997] have found that WP benefits in the short term but leads to negative business outcomes over time. Dewitte and Lens [2000] have reported that many people chronically perform below their capacity as a result of WP. Haycock et al. [1998] have suggested that WP causes missed opportunities and tense business relationships. Chu and Choi [2005] have noted that procrastination affects not only the person exhibiting such a behavior, but also other employees, resulting in decreased efficiency, interruption to work and high stress. Barabanschikova and Kaminskaya [2013] have stated that they play an important role in the occurrence of high financial losses. According to Ariely and Wertenbroch [2002], Ferrari and Tice [2000], and Eerde [2003], employees with high WP have low performance. Researches prove that WP is associated with a number of negative mental health conditions, such as anxiety [Solomon, Rothblum, 1984; Rothblum et al., 1986; Beswick et al., 1988; Lay et al., 1989; Ferrari, 1991; Senecal et al., 1995; Haycock et al., 1998], depression [Solomon, Rothblum, 1984; Beswick et al., 1988; Saddler, Sacks, 1993; Senecal et al., 1995; Martin et al., 1996], and high stress [Tice, Baumeister, 1997]. As these studies suggest, WP can be described as an undesired behavior in organizations. Hence, in the current research, the HCP, which is considered to cause WP, has been explored in the context of examining and eliminating the factors resulting in such a behavior.

The purpose of the study is to determine if there is a significant relationship between a HCP and WP that employees encounter in their desire to make a career, and to determine in what direction and at what level a career plateau affects workplace procrastination based on the demographic factors.

WORKPLACE PROCRASTINATION
The phenomenon of WP is generally considered to be a problem that almost everyone faces throughout their life and thus causes both a decrease in individual performance and organizational effectiveness [Bui, 2007]. Although there is enough time for work, carrying out responsibilities and making decisions in the workplace, it is expressed as the behavior problem of leaving the tasks and duties until the last minute [Ferrari, 1991; Haycock et al., 1998; Kachgal et al., 2001]. Procrastination is a behavior that reflects the failure of self-regulation and includes a delay in the start and/or completion of a task [Ferrari, Tice, 2000]. On the other hand, WP is an avoidance behavior [Conti, 1995], a delayed task or behavior [Eerde, 2003], and a lack of employees’ self-regulation although they are aware of negative outcomes [Steel, 2007].

According to Knaus [2000], individuals engage in postponing behaviors, which have certain time constraints, useful and priority jobs, when they delay unnecessarily. In this case, WP takes place by the individual’s own will. In addition to the negative evaluation of the concept of WP, according to Ferrari [1994], individuals can also act WP in order to benefit themselves and increase their performance. It is determined that WP-prone people prefer jobs compatible with their personal characteristics [Nguyen et al., 2013]. In particular, people, who chronically postpone, perform worse in completing their tasks and this situation aggravates over time. The chronic decision delay contributes to chronic WP, as the individual cannot decide when to do something until they decide it start. If the same person has chronic decision delay and chronic task delay, he/she loses control over their life and are under stress for a long time. As a result, they experience adverse conditions for their physical and mental health [Milgram, Tenne, 2000].

In the literature, the employees who exhibit WP behavior have been examined in two different ways – passive and active procrastination. Passive procrastination is a failure to carry out planned activities due to the instability of employees and the postponement of jobs and duties until later. Unlike passive procrastination, employees in active procrastination have the ability to make decisions in a timely manner, but they deliberately postpone things and focus their attention on other important tasks [Chu, Choi, 2005; Gafni, Geri, 2010; Kim, Seo, 2013]. Various approaches have been proposed to explain WP. They generally focus on the causes and consequences of this behavior. Related approaches deal with the procrastination process as a whole and conclude that the different characteristics of the employee and environmental factors are also effective in procrastination [Baltaci, 2017].

Theories about WP include psychodynamic, psychoanalytic, behavioral, cognitive-behavioral approaches. The most prominent aspect of WP is that it is accepted as a whole consisting of cognitive, affective and behavioral components [Fee, Tangney, 2000; Seçer, 2008]. Cognitive components are defined as the mismatch between the intention determined by employees and their performance that expresses the basis of the cognitive component [Lay, 1996]. The cognitive component focuses on the reasons why they have a deliberate decision on WP, although WP negatively affects employees [Karas, Spada, 2009]. Cognitive components: the underlying reason for the difficulty of deciding when to perform tasks and adhering to the time frames is the deterrent emotional reactions to routine tasks [Milgram et al., 1988]. Pressure, anxiety, sadness and discomfort associated with a job that has been postponed until the last moment are related to the affective component of WP [Solomon, Rothblum, 1984; Senecal et al., 1995; Haycock et al., 1998]. Behavioral components: these components refer to the postponement of tasks, duties and decisions that need to be done in a certain time period [Fernie et al., 2009]. The main elements of the behavioral component are the tendency to postpone a job in cases of performing a job-
The decisive factor here is whether or not postponement takes place according to the situation. Since many situational factors are common in both postponing at work and general postponement, a high correlation has been found between work and daily postponement [Milgram et al., 1998].

Other reasons behind WP are fear of failure, avoiding tasks and uncertainty [Zarick, Stonebraker, 2009]; reluctance to duties or actions [Milgram et al., 1988]; lack of concentration [Ekundayo, Ajayi, 2009]; personality factors such as jealousy and attracting attention [Schouwenburg, Lay, 1995; Pychyl et al., 2000; Di Fabio, 2006; Saydkova, 2016]; extreme perfectionism, anxiety, difficulty in decision-making, discomfort in control, fear of the results of success, perceived reluctance and competence in the task [Solomon, Rothblum, 1984]; excessive workload [Harris, Sutton, 1983]; bad time management [Balkis, 2007; Höffner et al., 2014]; lack of habits such as prioritization, planned work [Balkis, 2007]; burnout [Wilson, Nguyen, 2012]; lack of knowledge and skills to perform the task and indecision [Steel, 2007]; lack of self-confidence [Senecal et al., 1995]; high self-confidence [Lay, 1996].

In the relevant literature, the relationship between WP and business has been examined in many ways. WP has been approached from the standpoint of time management factors [Lay, Schouwenburg, 1993; Eerde, 2003; Ferrari, Díaz-Morales, 2007; Gafni, Geri, 2010; Gupta et al., 2012; Höffner et al., 2014; Aydemir, 2018], motivation [Brownlow, Reasinger, 2000; Cao, 2012; Çavuşoğlu, Karataş, 2015; Rakes, Dunn, 2010; Nguyen et al., 2013; Rebetez et al., 2015], job satisfaction [Coote, 1987], perfectionism [Flett et al., 1992; Slaney et al., 2002; Çapan, 2010; Rice et al., 2012], psychological capital [Gökler, Kaplan, 2020], wage [Coote, 1987], self-esteem and self-efficacy [Saleem, Rafique, 2012; Drysdale, McBeath, 2014; Hajloo, 2014; Kendemir et al., 2014], personality [McCown, Johnson, 1991; Schouwenburg, Lay, 1995; Milgram, Tenne, 2000; Lee et al., 2006; Bhutto et al., 2011; Doğan et al., 2014; Habibzadeh, Naeimian, 2015], performance [Ariely, Wertensbroch, 2002; Jiao et al., 2011; Michinov et al., 2011; Lakshminarayan et al., 2013; Kim, Seo, 2013]; harmony between the person and the task [Lay, Brokenshire, 1997]; quality of work/task [Harris, Sutton, 1983; Jansen, Carton, 1999; Blunt, Pychyl, 2000; Ackerman, Gross, 2005], work autonomy [Coote, 1987], locus of control [Hampton, 2005; Krumal et al., 2018], role uncertainty and role conflict [Senecal et al., 2003; Sadykova, 2016a; Gügerçin, Korkmazyürek, 2020], job insecurity [Sadykova, 2016a], job stress [Solomon, Rothblum, 1984; Flett et al., 1995; Chu, Choi, 2005; Stead et al. 2010; Behestifirar et al., 2011; Sharma, Kaur, 2011; Sirois, 2014; Kanten et al., 2018] and social loafing [Kanten et al., 2018]. The characteristics of the work to be done are also a factor related to WP.

**HIERARCHICAL CAREER PLATEAU**

The first definition of the career plateau concept has been proposed by Ference et al. [1977]. Career plateau is interpreted as the point, where the probability of hierarchical rise in career is very low. As Tan and Salomone [1994] put it, a career plateau is a lack or absence of vertical or horizontal promotion opportunities in an organization. Ference et al. [1977] explain a career plateau by dividing it into two types – personal and organizational. While the personal plateau creates the lack of ability or motivation for the employees to rise in the future, the organizational plateau indicates the lack of opportunity in an organization. Bardwick [1986] also defines two types of career plateaus – structural (hierarchical) and (job) content plateaus. While a HCP appears when there is a little chance of moving vertically in an organization, the job content plateaus arise when individuals are no longer forced by their job or job responsibilities and when the business is characterized by a general stagnation. Tremblay et al. [1995] divide the career plateau into two types – objective and positive. The objective plateau is composed of structural and observable elements and is usually measured on the basis of seniority or salary. The positive plateau implies that the prospect of the career of the employee will continue developing. Although HCP is used generally and widely by different researchers in different terms [Ference et al., 1977; Near, 1980; Veiga, 1981; Evans, Gilbert, 1984; Bardwick, 1986; Stout et al., 1988; Milliman, 1992], there are also two types of
career plateaus that refer to the same area – intrinsic career plateau and extrinsic career plateau [Crockford, 2001]. The former, which can be generalized as an extrinsic plateau, usually occurs as a result of the organization or environment. This type has been approached by the researches with different expressions such as structural plateau [Bardwick, 1986], organizational plateau [Ference et al., 1977; Evans, Gilbert, 1984], and hierarchical plateau [Veiga, 1981; Milliman, 1992]. The latter expresses the individual's perception, evaluated as interior plateau by researchers and exhibited with different names such as content plateau [Bardwick, 1986], personal plateau [Ference et al., 1977; Near, 1980; Stout et al., 1988], and job-content plateau [Milliman, 1992]. While the studies on the hierarchical plateau are the focal point in the literature, the studies on work content and life plateaus have received much less attention [McCleese, Eby, 2006; McCleese et al., 2007].

**Job Content Plateau.** It occurs when employees believe that it is not necessary to do more to increase their professional expertise. The longer an employee stays in the same position, the higher the probability of experiencing the job content plateau that can occur when employees are bored with their jobs [Bardwick, 1986]. Many researchers suggest that the content of jobs is of great importance for employees in terms of career [Derr, 1986; Hall, Richter, 1990; Schein, 1987]. In this context, Bardwick [1986] uses the term *job content plateau* to describe employees who are not too ambitious, poorly motivated and not interested in their jobs. It is important to highlight that those employees who managed to keep their positions after contraction and layoffs typical of today's business world make the best use of their careers. However, according to McCleese and Eby [2006], it is inevitable that some of these employees will encounter a hierarchical plateau, since the probability of their future promotion opportunities will decrease.

**Hierarchical Plateau.** Since the hierarchical structures of organizations are similar to a pyramid, the number of staff reaching the upper ranks is naturally low. Due to this hierarchical structure, the inability of a person to be promoted is called the plateau originating from the organization. Such a plateau is expressed as the end of a person's advancement within the organization's hierarchical structure [Bardwick, 1986]. In all institutions, the hierarchical structure takes the form of a pyramid, but in some institutions the hierarchical structure is seen in the middle statuses. HCP is observed more frequently due to the limited opportunity for promotion to upper positions in cases of agglomeration in the middle status of the hierarchical structure [Cable, 1999]. Managers with a business content plateau only tend to have less business attitudes or report fewer positive attitudes than managers with a hierarchical plateau only [Allen et al., 1998].

HCP may cause stress, frustration, dissatisfaction, intention to leave the organization and absenteeism in employees [Jung, Tak, 2008]. Allen et al. [1998] argue that the managers, who were determined to be in a HCP, have less positive business attitudes than those in the plateau for only one reason. HCP leads to many unwanted negative business behaviors, such as low satisfaction, high stress, poor performance, withdrawal symptoms, low organizational commitment, and intention to leave [Salami, 2010]. In general, a HCP is related to many organizational behavior variables. According to the literature review, there is a negative relationship between a HCP and employee performance [Lentz, 2004], job satisfaction [Milliman, 1992; Lee, 2004; Baoguo, Mian, 2005; McCleese, Eby, 2006; Jung, Tak, 2008; Xie, Long, 2008; Lentz, Allen, 2009; Salami, 2010], organizational commitment [Milliman, 1992; Lentz, 2004; McCleese, Eby, 2006; Jung, Tak, 2008; Salami, 2010]. Meanwhile, it has been observed that there is a positive relationship between the intention to leave and a HCP [Milliman, 1992; Lentz, 2004; Baoguo, Mian 2005; Heilmann et al., 2008; Salami, 2010; Wen, Liu, 2015; Bolat et al., 2017; Soybali, Ak, 2019], the increasing turnover intention [Lentz, 2004; Baoguo, Mian, 2005; Heilmann et al., 2008; Salami, 2010], and stress [McCleese et al., 2007].

According to Anafarta [2002], employees entering the plateau may cause a decrease in job performance. Contrary to this negative effect, some studies reveal that employees in the career plateau maintain their productivity, do not seem bored and show high satisfaction [Ongori, Agolla, 2009]. However, it is common that there is a direct link between career plateaus and working attitudes. Salami [2010] claims that a HCP has both negative and positive effects on working attitude. The positive effects of the career plateau appear when an employee no longer faces changing and/or increasing responsibilities. Such a position can lead to perception of satisfaction and job security. Employees can be satisfied with their current positions in firms, and, therefore, may choose to increase the perception of job security of their current jobs and challenge a higher level. The lifestyle of the community to which employees belong – that is, friends, relatives or spouses (for working couples) – can interfere with the wishes of employees. The career of relatives or spouse living in the same region can have a significant negative impact on an individual's career mobility [Feldman, Weitz, 1988]. Unlike Maimunah [2008], some employees reported that they faced a career plateau because they could not cope with the limitations and stress of progress. Within this spiral, career plateau employees can strive to improve their skills, acquire new qualifications and seek a higher-level job. In addition, when these employees do not define a career plateau for themselves, they can have higher job performance and job satisfaction [Ettington, 1998]. There is also evidence that various negativities can lead to optimism from the perspective of employees. For example, some researchers have found that some plateau workers maintain the same level of efficiency, do not look bored and are very...
satisfied with their jobs because gaining new skills leads them to a better position for other career opportunities elsewhere [Ongori, Agolla, 2009]. The cases, where there are negative effects of career plateaus, are those where employees feel they have the talent, skill, experience and initiative to go beyond the current position, but the company does not have a current position or the workers are equally unsafe [Jung, Tak, 2008].

**MATERIAL AND METHOD**

Population and Sample of the Research
The population of the research is comprised of public and private sector workers in Turkey’s province of Zonguldak. The sample of the research consists of 367 employees participating in the research at this location. In the study, easy sampling method, one of the unlikely sampling methods, was used. The reason for not making the sector distinction within the sample is that there are career opportunities both in the private and public sectors. Although these opportunities are not at the same level, there is a possibility that individual career needs differ and employees may encounter a career plateau in each sector.

Data Collection Method
The data used in the research have been obtained by face-to-face survey method. The survey used to obtain data consists of 2 scales in 5-point Likert structure, namely HCP and WP. In the research, a 6-item scale developed by Milliman [1992] and adapted by Allen et al. [1999] has been used to measure the HCP. A 15-item scale developed by Lay [1986] has been used to measure WP.

Research Model and Hypotheses
The screening model has been used in the research and the dependent variable of the research has been WP and the independent variable has been the HCP (Fig. 1).

Hypotheses of the Research:
H1: There is a significant relationship between the hierarchical career plateau and workplace procrastination.
H2: As the hierarchical plateau perception increases, workplace procrastination increases.
H3: Workplace procrastination varies significantly by gender.
H4: Workplace procrastination varies significantly by age.
H5: Workplace procrastination varies significantly by sector.
H6: Workplace procrastination varies significantly by educational level.
H7: Workplace procrastination varies significantly by monthly income level.
H8: Workplace procrastination varies significantly by job experience.

Research Data Analysis
The data obtained in the study were analyzed with SPSS 20.0 and AMOS 24.0 package programs. In this context, confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was performed to determine the structural validity of the HCP and WP scales. The internal consistency of the scales, whose construct validity was provided after factor analysis, was tested by reliability analysis. Correlation analysis was performed to determine the severity of the relationship between the HCP and WP variables, and simple linear regression analysis was implemented to examine the relationship between these variables. The independent sample t-test and one-way ANOVA test were used to test the difference hypotheses in the research.

Research Findings
Descriptive statistics of the participants in the research are given in Table 1. According to the frequency analysis results, 49.6 % of the sample are male and 50.4 % are female, and there is no gender dominance in the sample. When the age distribution is examined, the sample includes a majority of 81.8 %, mostly in the 21–40 age range. 67.3 % of the employees are university graduates. The majority of respondents (47.7 %) have monthly income in the range of TRY 2001–3000. Considering the work experience, 89.9 % of the sample have more than 1 year of work experience. In terms of the sector, 71.4 % of respondents work in the private sector and 28.6 % in the public sector.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger than 21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21–30</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31–40</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41–50</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51–60</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>32.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-Graduate</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CFA was applied to ensure the construct validity of the scales used in the study. The compliance values obtained as a result of the factor analysis conducted for the HCP scale consisting of 6 items are presented in Table 2.

As for the compliance values in Table 2, it has been determined that chi-square value is 0.142; p value is 0.706; chi-square/degree of freedom is 0.142; RMSEA value is 0.00; CFI value is 1.000; SRMR value is 0.00; NFI value is 0.999, and GFI value is 1.000. Standardized solution values for the HCP scale tested are shown in Fig. 2.

As for the compliance values in Table 2, it has been determined that chi-square value is 0.142; p value is 0.706; chi-square/degree of freedom is 0.142; RMSEA value is 0.00; CFI value is 1.000; SRMR value is 0.00; NFI value is 0.999, and GFI value is 1.000. Standardized solution values for the HCP scale tested are shown in Fig. 2.

Another scale used in the research is the WP scale. The compliance values obtained as a result of CFA applied to this scale consisting of 15 items are presented in Table 3.

As for the compliance values in Table 3, it has been determined that chi-square value is 70.259; p value is 0.000; chi-square / degree of freedom is 2.066; RMSEA value is 0.05; CFI value is 0.963; SRMR value is 0.04; NFI value is 0.931; and GFI value is 0.960. Standardized solution values for the WP scale in the work tested are specified in Fig. 3.
CFA results for the model developed within the scope of the research are provided in Table 4.

As seen from Table 4, chi-square value is 180.999; p-value is 0.000; chi-square/degree of freedom is 2.446; RMSEA value is 0.06; CFI value is 0.954; SRMR value is 0.06; NFI value is 0.860; and GFI value is 0.926. Standardized solution values for the model tested are specified in Fig. 4.

The relevant literature indicates that the goodness of fit statistics published by Schermelleh-Engel et al. [2003] is used to evaluate CFA results. It has been found that the fit values of the HCP scale (see Table 2), the fit values of the WP scale (see Table 3) and the fit values of the model (see Table 4) are in accordance with this goodness of fit statistics.

Table 5 lists the alpha coefficients (Cronbach’s Alpha) used to test the reliability of the scales used in the research. As a result of the reliability analysis performed, the alpha coefficient of the HCP scale is 0.718 and the alpha coefficient of the WP scale is 0.819. These values show that both scales used in the research have internal consistency.

Kolmogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk values determined as a result of the normality test of the data sets obtained from the scales are presented in Table 6. When the Shapiro-Wilk analysis is examined due to the sample size (n > 300), it is clear that the data sets obtained from the HCP and WP scales are not normally distributed. In social sciences, it is necessary to elaborate the normality analysis by examining the skewness and kurtosis values in these cases. Therefore, skewness and kurtosis values are examined in Table 7.

As demonstrated in Table 7, the skewness and kurtosis values of the data sets that do not show normal distribution according to Shapiro-Wilk value are between –2 and +2 and these data sets show normal distribution [George, Mallery, 2003].

Table 4 – Fit values of the research model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compliance criteria</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>$\chi^2$ / sd</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>SRMR</th>
<th>NFI</th>
<th>GFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fit values</td>
<td>180.999</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>2.446</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>0.926</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5 – Reliability analysis results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>N of items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCP</td>
<td>0.718</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>0.819</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 – Normality test results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov Statistics</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk Statistics</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCP</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.977</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.971</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 4. Standardized values of the model

Рис. 4. Стандартизированные значения для тестируемой модели
Table 7 – Normality tests: flatness and skew values
Таблица 7 – Тест на нормальность: значения эксцесса и асимметрии

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Distribution</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCP</td>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>0.322</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>−0.403</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>0.445</td>
<td>0.127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>−0.362</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pearson correlation analysis results for dependent and independent variables are given in Table 8. A positive relationship has been found between the independent variable HCP and dependent variable WP.

Table 8 – Correlation analysis results
Таблица 8 – Результаты корреляционного анализа

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Coefficient</th>
<th>WP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCP</td>
<td>Pearson correlation</td>
<td>0.354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9 shows the ANOVA results of the simple linear regression analysis for HCP and WP. The model created is statistically significant because p value is less than 0.05.

Table 9 – ANOVA results of the simple linear regression analysis
Таблица 9 – Результаты дисперсионного анализа простой линейной регрессии

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Sum of squares</th>
<th>Mean square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HCP</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2921.911</td>
<td>52.235</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>20417.343</td>
<td>55.938</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>23339.253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The created model values are given in Table 10. 12.3% of the change in WP is explained by the change in the HCP. According to the model, the value that WP can take is formulated as “WP = 17.245 + (0.751 x HCP).” According to this formula, an increase of 1 unit in the HCP results in an increase of 0.751 units in WP.

Table 10 – Regression analysis of the model
Таблица 10 – Регрессионный анализ тестируемой модели

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>r²</th>
<th>Adjusted r²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WP</td>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>17.245</td>
<td>14.229</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.125</td>
<td>0.123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCP</td>
<td>0.751</td>
<td>7.227</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 11, the relationship between WP and the gender of the employees participating in the research has been investigated. The significance value obtained as a result of the Independent-Sample T Test for gender is greater than 0.05 and WP does not show a significant difference according to employees gender.

In Table 12, the relationship between WP and the sector in which the respondents are engaged has been examined with the Independent-Sample T Test. Since the significance value is greater than 0.05, WP does not differ significantly from the sector studied.

In Table 13, the relationship between WP and the age of the participants has been analyzed with the One-Way ANOVA Test. The significance value is greater than 0.05 and therefore WP does not differ significantly according to the employees age.

Table 14 shows the results of the One-Way ANOVA Test for the relationship between WP and education. The significance value is less than 0.05. WP shows a significant difference according to the education level of the employees. However, Post-Hoc analysis has been carried out to determine which educational situations differ significantly.

Table 11 – Relationship between workplace procrastination and gender
Таблица 11 – Корреляция между склонностью к прокрастинации и полом респондентов

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>26.0769</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>25.0054</td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 – Relationship between workplace procrastination and employment sector
Таблица 12 – Корреляция между склонностью к прокрастинации и сферой занятости респондентов

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Levene’s Test for Equality of Variances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private</td>
<td>25.9809</td>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td>24.4286</td>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16 – Relationship between workplace procrastination and monthly income
Таблица 16 – Корреляция между склонностью к прокрастинации и размером ежемесячного дохода респондентов

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Income Level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than TRY 1000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25.417</td>
<td>8.71457</td>
<td>1.61323</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRY 1000–2000</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>24.870</td>
<td>7.65723</td>
<td>0.54010</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>0.474</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRY 2001–3000</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>26.545</td>
<td>8.81589</td>
<td>0.88603</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRY 3001–4000</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>25.483</td>
<td>8.15627</td>
<td>1.46491</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over TRY 5000</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26.500</td>
<td>7.23878</td>
<td>1.80970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The results of homogeneity test performed to determine the technique to be selected in the Post-Hoc analysis are presented in Table 15.

Table 15 – Homogeneity test of variances
Таблица 15 – Проверка однородности дисперсий

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levene Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.883</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>362</td>
<td>0.474</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

According to Table 15, variances are homogeneous (p > 0.05). Scheffe test has been used in Post-Hoc analysis, since the number of employees in the education level groups is not equal. As a result of this test, the significance value has been found to be greater than 0.05 among all groups. Therefore, the difference of WP based on the educational status originates from within the group (between groups = 733.6 and within groups = 22605.6).

In Table 16, the relationship between the monthly income level of the participants and WP has been analyzed with the One-Way ANOVA Test. WP does not show a significant difference according to the monthly income level, as the significance value is greater than 0.05.

In Table 17, the relationship between work experience of the participants and WP has been analyzed with the One-Way ANOVA Test. The significance value is greater than 0.05 and WP does not differ significantly from work experience.

Table 17 – Relationship between workplace procrastination and work experience
Таблица 17 – Корреляция между склонностью к прокрастинации и трудовым стажем респондентов

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>24.783</td>
<td>7.99005</td>
<td>1.31356</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1–2 years</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26.358</td>
<td>7.63108</td>
<td>0.93228</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2–3 years</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>27.611</td>
<td>8.72467</td>
<td>1.06589</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–4 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>24.889</td>
<td>6.69200</td>
<td>0.99758</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 4 years</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>24.629</td>
<td>8.04373</td>
<td>0.65459</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In the current study, we have performed a comprehensive literature analysis to establish the role of a HCP, which is a major obstacle for the careers of the employees. The data were obtained from the respondents with a high level of education, sufficient work experience, etc. The sample was subjected to statistical analysis, and a significant relationship was found between the HCP and WP. As the HCP increased within the organization, it was determined that the employees also reacted to this by exhibiting WP. Demographic factors were thought to have an effect on this behavior, and the research tested whether WP showed a significant difference according to these factors. The studies that concentrate on procrastination in terms of demographic characteristics demonstrate that WP is higher in males than females [Steel, 2007; Burk, Yuen, 2007; Doğan et al., 2014; Kumral et al., 2018]; deferment behavior decreases with age [Eerde, 2003; Steel 2007; Burk, Yuen, 2007; Aydemir, 2018]; procrastination increases even more as the education level improves [Hammer, Ferrari 2002; Kumral et al., 2018]; postponement behavior is more intense compared to married employees [Aydemir, 2018]; the upper class people show more WP than the lower class [Hammer, Ferrari 2002; Doğan et al., 2014]; and WP can be experienced in every profession [Burka, Yuen 2007]. However, we found that WP did not differ significantly in terms of gender, age, education and income level, sector, and work experience, and this situation supposedly resulted from the sample difference.

Having reviewed a wide array of research studies, we identified various factors that cause WP. Seçer [2011] claimed that the employees who had job insecurity violated the psychological contract with their organizations; they experienced injustice and completed their job responsibilities later in order to compensate for this injustice. Sadykova [2016b] noted that uncertainties that emerged due to insecurities and negative attitudes of employees towards work and the organization negatively affect their performance and may cause WP within the organization. Kanten et al. [2018] stated that the adequate and fair pay component of the quality of life has a positive effect on WP. Roberts [1997], Aydoğan and Özbay [2012] found that there is a positive relationship between anxiety and WP. Beheshtifar et al. [2014] showed that there is an inverse relationship between professional competence and WP trends. Sadykova [2016b] has stated that uncertainties in work roles positively affect WP. Kalfaoğlu and Erbaşi [2018] noted that WP has a positive effect on work stress. An important output of this research is that the HCP is a new factor causing WP.

In the literature, the opinion that WP should be prevented as an undesired behavior is dominant due to the negative impact of organizations. The following suggestions have been made to overcome WP: examining the things to be done; evaluating the excuses rationally; motivating oneself; preparing the to-do list; determining the priorities; dividing the task into small pieces; controlling time; showing a positive attitude; organizing the work area; managing stress; starting work; rewarding oneself when small goals are completed; thinking about the accomplished work; and celebrating the completion of the task [Breck, 2000]. Organizationally, some solutions can be developed against WP. Motivation can provide the necessary incentive in self-regulation behavior [Tuckman, 1991]. WP can be reduced with time management training [Eerde, 2003]. Those who work at lower levels of the hierarchy may think that even if they have a chance, they would not be able to do their jobs as well as in the upper ranks. Therefore, they can postpone their work to the last moment. If institutional structures are structured to make employees feel that their thoughts are given importance, people can perceive themselves as having power and WP can be low. However, as employees feel powerless in an authoritarian structure, WP is likely to occur [Burka, Yuen, 2007]. In addition, WP can be reduced by eliminating the HCP in organizations. To do so, the reasons behind the formation of the HCP should be investigated. Greenhaus et al. [1990] explained the factors causing the career plateau with the positions of the employees in the organizational career steps: organizational restrictions, management’s negative evaluation of individuals, and psychological causes. Tan and Salomone [1994] have identified six factors that could cause a career plateau: organizational resources, the impact of the economic environment, organizational stances, organizational culture, private business and consultant, demographic characteristics of employees. In addition, Özçelik and Akçay [2019] suggested that HCP would be realized due to individual deficiencies such as lack of talent, while digitalization reduced the possibility of promotion in horizontal and vertical positions in some units. Therefore, it is recommended for managers to take actions considering these factors so as to minimize the HCP and indirectly reduce WP that negatively affects the organization’s performance.

The research is of high importance in terms of maintaining the optimal organizational atmosphere in companies, minimizing unwanted work behavior in employees, contributing to the WP and career plateau literature, and bringing a new factor to the literature that affects WP.
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Прокрастинация на рабочем месте: роль карьерного плато
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2 Эрзинджанский Университет имени Бинали Йылдырыма, г. Эрзинджан, Турция

Аннотация. Прокрастинация на рабочем месте наносит значительный ущерб деятельности любой организации. Исследование направлено на изучение карьерного плато как феномена, возникающего в процессе профессионального роста сотрудников компании, а также на анализ его значимости и степени влияния на прокрастинацию на рабочем месте. Методологической базой выступили теория карьерного роста и теория рационально-эмоционального поведения. Информационная база исследования включает данные опросов 367 сотрудников государственных и частных компаний (провинция Зонгулдак, Турция). Для оценки полученных данных использовались методы статистического и эконометрического анализа: регрессионный, дисперсионный, корреляционный, факторный анализ, t-критерий Стьюдента, а также метод личного интервью. Проведенный анализ свидетельствует о положительной корреляции между карьерным плато и прокрастинацией на рабочем месте. Установлено, что увеличение показателя карьерного плато на 1 ед. вызывает рост прокрастинации на рабочем месте на 0,751 ед. Показано, что такие социально-демографические характеристики работников, как пол, возраст, уровень образования, размер месячного дохода и сфера занятости, не оказывают значимого влияния на прокрастинацию. Сделан вывод о том, что карьерное плато должно рассматриваться как один из основных факторов, влияющих на своевременное выполнение должностных функций.
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