

FROM DELAYING TO DELIVERING: SELF-MANAGEMENT TRAINING FOR YOUTH MINISTRY LEADERS IN GKI GEJAYAN

Chrysan Gomargana^{*1}, Sandra Handayani Sutanto², Samuel Adiprasetya Isaputra³

^{1,2,3} Faculty of Psychology, Universitas Pelita Harapan

Jl. M. H. Thamrin Boulevard 1100 Lippo Village, Tangerang 15811, Indonesia

Submitted: May 25, 2026

Revised: September 04, 2026

Accepted: September 08, 2026

* Corresponding author's e-mail: chrysan.gomargana@uph.edu

Abstrak

Prokrastinasi merupakan tantangan yang konsisten dihadapi remaja Generasi Z yang tumbuh dalam lingkungan digital yang kaya akan distraksi. Kegiatan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat (PkM) ini bertujuan meningkatkan pengetahuan mengenai prokrastinasi dan strategi manajemen diri serta mendukung penerapan strategi tersebut pada teen leaders Komisi Remaja GKI Gejayan. Empat puluh peserta mengikuti program empat tahap yang mencakup asesmen kebutuhan kualitatif dan sosialisasi, pelatihan tatap muka, pendampingan penerapan, dan evaluasi. Desain pelatihan mengintegrasikan kerangka Experiential Learning Kolb dengan prinsip pembelajaran yang diadaptasi secara selektif dari pendekatan andragogi Knowles, sedangkan evaluasi dilakukan menggunakan Model Empat Level Kirkpatrick. Hasil uji paired-sample t-test menunjukkan peningkatan yang signifikan pada pengetahuan mengenai prokrastinasi dan manajemen diri dari pre-test ($M = 70,00$, $SD = 12,50$) ke post-test ($M = 80,00$, $SD = 11,80$), $t(39) = 7,44$, $p < .001$, $d = 1,18$. Tingkat kepuasan peserta juga tinggi terhadap materi pelatihan ($M = 4,80/5$) dan fasilitator ($M = 4,82/5$). Temuan kualitatif eksploratif dari jurnal tugas, laporan diri, observasi fasilitator, dan umpan balik mitra menunjukkan peningkatan kesadaran terhadap pemicu prokrastinasi, penerapan sejumlah strategi manajemen diri, serta perubahan positif pada beberapa aspek koordinasi pelayanan. Karena hasil perilaku dan tingkat tim tidak dievaluasi menggunakan pengukuran pre-post yang terstandar, temuan tersebut diinterpretasikan secara deskriptif. Secara keseluruhan, program menunjukkan peningkatan pengetahuan yang signifikan dan bukti awal penerapan strategi manajemen diri, serta mendukung kelayakan pelatihan berbasis experiential learning dalam konteks komunitas remaja berbasis iman.

Kata kunci: experiential learning; generasi z; manajemen diri; pemimpin remaja; prokrastinasi.

Abstract

Procrastination is a persistent challenge among Generation Z adolescents navigating distraction-rich digital environments. This community service program aimed to strengthen knowledge of procrastination and self-management strategies and support their practical application among teen leaders of the GKI Gejayan Youth Commission. Forty participants completed a four-phase program comprising qualitative needs assessment and socialization, on-site training, mentored practice, and evaluation. The instructional design integrated Kolb's Experiential Learning framework with selected learner-centered principles adapted from Knowles' andragogical approach, while evaluation was organized using Kirkpatrick's Four-Level Model. A paired-sample t-test showed a statistically significant increase in self-management knowledge from pre-test ($M = 70.00$, $SD = 12.50$) to post-test ($M = 80.00$, $SD = 11.80$), $t(39) = 7.44$, $p < .001$, $d = 1.18$. Participant satisfaction was high for both training content ($M = 4.80/5$) and facilitators ($M = 4.82/5$). Exploratory qualitative findings from task journals, self-reports, observations, and partner feedback suggested greater awareness of procrastination triggers, application of selected self-management strategies, and favorable changes in aspects of ministry coordination. Because these behavioral and team-level outcomes were not assessed using standardized pre-post measures, they were interpreted descriptively. Overall, the program demonstrated significant knowledge gains and preliminary evidence of strategy application, supporting the feasibility of experiential self-management training in a faith-based youth-community setting.

Keywords: experiential learning; generation z; self-management; youth leaders; procrastination.



1. INTRODUCTION

Participation in meaningful community activities provides substantial opportunities for developing both soft skills and hard skills among young people (Armstrong et al., 2019; Fukuda & Zusman, 2024). Adolescents who take on leadership roles within community organizations gain real-world contexts to practice self-regulation, time management, collaboration, problem-solving, long-term commitment, and emotional intelligence, all of which are core competencies within the 21st Century Skills framework (OECD, 2018). Yet the demands of sustained leadership responsibility during adolescence are far from straightforward, particularly for a generation navigating an increasingly complex digital landscape.

Generation Z, broadly defined as those born between 1997 and 2012, is recognized as a technologically fluent, multitasking cohort that is simultaneously vulnerable to distraction, stress, and digital-era mental health pressures (Dimock, 2019; Twenge, 2017). Among the most prevalent challenges reported by Gen Z is procrastination, particularly in its digitally mediated form, where tasks are deferred due to gadget use, social media engagement, or entertainment consumption, a pattern widely described as doom-scrolling (Sharma et al., 2022; Rajeshwari & Meenakshi, 2023). Steel (2007) defines procrastination as a chronic tendency to delay task completion, typically accompanied by guilt, stress, and dissatisfaction with outcomes. Critically, procrastination is not simply a time-management failure; it is closely tied to self-regulation deficits, impulse control difficulties, motivational problems, and negative emotional states such as fear of failure and performance anxiety (Sirois & Pychyl, 2013). Adolescents, whose prefrontal cortex development and executive functioning are still maturing, are among the most susceptible populations (Sholehah et al., 2018).

Several factors compound this vulnerability among adolescent community leaders. Academic overload, digital distraction, and underdeveloped self-management skills are primary external triggers. Beyond these, internal factors including fear of failure, perfectionism, and a weak sense of connection between one's role and personal growth further reinforce the tendency to delay. Research in organizational and developmental psychology consistently underscores that adolescents, particularly those in Gen Z, require a perceived sense of relevance and immediate impact in order to feel genuinely motivated and engaged in their responsibilities (Perez-Jorge et al., 2024; Dawson, 2021). When that sense of relevance is absent, procrastination becomes a self-protective response rather than mere laziness, a distinction that has significant implications for how interventions should be designed.

In community leadership contexts, the consequences of procrastination extend well beyond the individual. When adolescent leaders delay task completion, the effects ripple into the performance, cohesion, and morale of the team as a whole. Coordination breaks down, preparation suffers, and the cumulative burden shifts onto others, undermining both the individual's development and the group's collective functioning. This is particularly pronounced in volunteer-based organizations, where motivation is intrinsic and structural accountability is minimal. Perez-Jorge et al. (2024) documented significant health and developmental risks associated with adolescent procrastination in such contexts, while Dawson (2021) emphasized that strengthening executive skills is foundational to helping adolescents reach their potential.

The present program was conducted with teen leaders of the GKI Gejayan Youth Commission, a church-based youth organization in Yogyakarta. Prior to intervention development, a preliminary qualitative needs assessment was conducted to identify context-specific challenges related to procrastination and self-management within the youth-ministry setting. The needs assessment incorporated consultation with ministry leadership and a preliminary focus group discussion with 10 teen leaders, lasting approximately 90 minutes. Consultation with ministry leadership identified four recurring areas of concern: delayed completion of organizational responsibilities; difficulties in time management and decision-making; limited awareness of the developmental value of sustained commitment; and a weak sense of personal relevance in relation to ministry responsibilities. The focus group discussion

complemented the stakeholder consultation by exploring the teen leaders' perceived needs, existing challenges, and expectations regarding the program. These findings were used as contextual needs-assessment data rather than as estimates of the prevalence or severity of procrastination. Collectively, they provided the practical basis for developing a training program addressing procrastination, task management, and sustained engagement, while remaining consistent with established literature on procrastination and self-regulation (Steel, 2007; Sirois & Pychyl, 2013).

Based on the needs identified through stakeholder consultation and the preliminary focus group discussion, this community service (PkM) program was designed to help participants recognize the psychological processes associated with procrastination, understand its implications for individual and team functioning, and acquire practical self-management strategies. The intervention integrated Kolb's Experiential Learning framework (Kolb & Kolb, 2006) with selected principles derived from Knowles' andragogical approach (Knowles, 1984). Although andragogy was originally developed for adult learning, the framework was not applied on the assumption that adolescent participants were adult learners. Rather, selected principles, particularly the use of learners' prior experience, immediate relevance of learning, problem-centered activities, and increasing learner involvement in goal setting were adapted to the developmental context of adolescent youth leaders. This adaptation is consistent with contemporary evidence showing that autonomy-supportive and learner-controlled learning environments can strengthen student motivation and engagement, including within secondary education contexts (Ryan & Deci, 2020; Bureau et al., 2022; Hauk & Gröschner, 2022).

Program evaluation followed Kirkpatrick's Four-Level Training Evaluation Model (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2016). Collaboration with the Christian Psychology Association under HIMPSI (APK-HIMPSI) ensured the program was grounded in sound psychological science while remaining contextually appropriate for a faith-based community. The program also contributes to SDG 3 (Good Health and Well-being) and SDG 4 (Quality Education) by building self-management capacity in a population whose developmental needs are underserved by existing intervention programs.

2. METHOD

This program was implemented through an educative-participatory approach across four systematic phases designed around the characteristics and needs of adolescent youth-ministry leaders. The instructional design combined Kolb's Experiential Learning framework (Kolb & Kolb, 2006) with selected principles from Knowles' andragogical approach (Knowles, 1984). Rather than applying andragogy categorically to adolescents, the program selectively incorporated principles relevant to increasingly autonomous learners, including activation of prior experience, problem-centered learning, immediate applicability, and participant involvement in goal setting. Such learner-centered and autonomy-supportive practices are consistent with evidence from secondary and broader educational settings (Bureau et al., 2022; Hauk & Gröschner, 2022; Ryan & Deci, 2020). Program evaluation followed Kirkpatrick's Four-Level Training Evaluation Model (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2016).

a. Phase 1: Program Socialization and Qualitative Needs Assessment

The first phase involved program socialization and a preliminary qualitative needs assessment with stakeholders in the GKI Gejayan youth-ministry setting. Program socialization included presentation of the program rationale, objectives, implementation flow, partner roles and responsibilities, and schedule coordination. As part of the needs-assessment process, consultation was conducted with ministry leadership, followed by a preliminary focus group discussion with teen leaders. Focus group discussion was selected because it enables participants to articulate their experiences, perceptions, and needs through interaction with others who share a similar context (Kitzinger, 1995).

The discussion explored participants' perceived challenges in managing ministry responsibilities, experiences of delaying or initiating tasks, difficulties related to time and task management, and expectations regarding the support or strategies they considered relevant to their responsibilities. The discussion was intended as a contextual needs assessment rather than as a diagnostic or psychometric evaluation of procrastination. Information obtained from the stakeholder consultation and group discussion was synthesized descriptively to identify recurring areas of concern relevant to the objectives of the program. These findings were subsequently used to determine the emphasis and practical content of the training. Because the initial assessment was qualitative and program-oriented, it was not used to estimate the prevalence or numerical severity of procrastination or self-management difficulties among participants.

b. Phase 2: On-Site Training

The core training was delivered on-site over three days (February 26-28), using the Toolkit for Tackling Procrastination module as the primary instructional framework. Training design followed Kolb's Experiential Learning cycle (Kolb & Kolb, 2006), ensuring each session moved participants through concrete experience, reflective observation, conceptual understanding, and active experimentation. Four thematic sessions were delivered sequentially, each building on the previous.

The first session introduced participants to procrastination as a psychological construct. Rather than opening with a lecture, participants were first invited to articulate their own understanding of procrastination through a personal reflection activity, surfacing lay beliefs before introducing scientific definitions. The session drew on Steel's (2007) definition of procrastination as a voluntary delay of intended action despite anticipated negative consequences, alongside Klingsieck's (2013) formulation emphasizing the irrational weighing of costs and benefits. A Procrastination Cycle Bingo ice-breaking activity was used to help participants recognize familiar delay patterns in a low-stakes, participatory format.

The second session examined the psychological causes underpinning procrastination, covering four empirically supported mechanisms: poor self-regulation and impulsivity (Rebetz et al., 2018; Valenzuela et al., 2020), fear of failure and its mediating role between perfectionism and avoidance behavior (Yosopov et al., 2024; Karim et al., 2021), low academic self-efficacy (Rad et al., 2025), and boredom proneness in under-stimulating environments (Sumer & Buttner, 2022). This session also introduced procrastination typologies, distinguishing active from passive procrastinators (Chu & Choi, 2005) and dispositional from situational patterns (Behnagh & Ferrari, 2022), so that participants could identify their own procrastination profile rather than treating the behavior as monolithic.

The third session focused on practical strategy acquisition across two clusters. The first cluster addressed task decomposition and prioritization: participants were trained to construct to-do lists, break tasks into manageable chunks, and estimate time requirements per step. The second cluster introduced time management and environmental design tools, including the Eisenhower Matrix for prioritization, the Pomodoro Technique for focused work intervals, the 2-Minute Rule for low-friction task initiation, and the 5-Minute Commitment strategy for overcoming avoidance inertia. Each tool was accompanied by a structured worksheet including a Pomodoro Session Tracker, a Do It Now Card, and a Peak Energy Map.

The fourth session addressed motivation architecture through reward and consequence structuring. Participants were guided to redesign the reward valence of delayed tasks by pairing preferred activities with habitually avoided tasks and completed a Consequence Mapping exercise to make the costs of non-completion more psychologically immediate. A Visual Reminder Creator activity guided participants to design and place personal commitment cues in their physical environment to reduce friction at task-initiation points. The session concluded with the introduction of a 7-Day Challenge, in which each participant set concrete, specific daily ministry targets for the seven days following training.

c. Phase 3 & 4: Evaluation and Mentored Practice

Evaluation was structured according to Kirkpatrick's Four-Level Training Evaluation Model (Kirkpatrick & Kirkpatrick, 2016). Level 1 (Reaction) was assessed using participant satisfaction ratings for the training content and facilitators, while Level 2 (Learning) was assessed using a pre- and post-training knowledge test. Level 3 (Behavior) examined the application of knowledge and strategies during the mentored-practice period using participant task journals, structured self-reports, and facilitator observations. Three predefined behavioral domains, derived from the training objectives, guided the evaluation: (a) recognition of personal procrastination triggers, (b) application of self-management strategies introduced during training, and (c) evidence of task initiation and follow-through in ministry-related responsibilities.

Level 4 (Results) explored changes at the team level through partner feedback and joint reflection with ministry leadership. The domains examined included the timeliness of ministry-task completion, coordination of ministry activities, and the occurrence of last-minute task cancellations or reassignments. Qualitative records from Levels 3 and 4 were reviewed using a deductive content-analysis approach, in which the data were organized according to these predefined domains (Elo & Kyngäs, 2008). Patterns identified across different sources were compared to examine convergence between participant-generated records, facilitator observations, and partner feedback (Carter et al., 2014). Because these data were collected as part of naturalistic program evaluation and were not based on standardized behavioral outcome measures, Level 3 and Level 4 findings were interpreted descriptively as exploratory evidence of behavioral transfer and team-level change.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Preliminary Qualitative Needs Assessment

The preliminary needs assessment identified several context-specific concerns relevant to the development of the training program. Consultation with ministry leadership indicated four recurring areas of concern: (1) delayed completion of organizational responsibilities, (2) difficulties in time management and decision-making, (3) limited awareness of the developmental value of sustained commitment, and (4) a weak sense of personal relevance in relation to assigned responsibilities. The preliminary focus group discussion with teen leaders complemented this stakeholder perspective by eliciting participants' perceived challenges, needs, and expectations regarding the management of their ministry responsibilities.

Rather than being interpreted as indicators of a particular "level" of procrastination or self-management, these findings were treated as contextual problem areas requiring intervention. The needs-assessment findings informed the subsequent emphasis of the training on understanding procrastination mechanisms, breaking down and prioritizing tasks, initiating tasks more effectively, managing time and environmental distractions, and strengthening personally meaningful commitment to responsibilities.

3.2. Program Implementation

The self-management training program was attended by 40 teen leaders from the GKI Gejayan Youth Commission, meeting the target participant number set in the program proposal. All four implementation phases were executed according to plan. Minor scheduling adjustments during the socialization phase were resolved through intensive coordination with the partner's ministry board, and the core training was delivered within the agreed three-day window. The partner organization played an active supporting role throughout, providing the training venue, mobilizing participants, and contributing to joint reflection during the evaluation phase. No significant obstacles were encountered during implementation.

3.3. Session 1: Understanding Procrastination

The first training session opened with a personal reflection activity in which participants were invited to articulate their own understanding of procrastination before any formal content was introduced. This approach, beginning with participants' lived experience rather than a lecture, reflected the program's selective adaptation of Knowles' (1984) emphasis on learners' prior experience, while remaining consistent with the experiential learning orientation of the intervention. Responses surfaced a range of lay understandings, from procrastination as simple laziness to more nuanced accounts involving fear, perfectionism, and digital distraction, confirming the heterogeneity of procrastination experiences within the group and establishing a foundation for the theoretical content that followed.

Participants were then introduced to empirically grounded definitions of procrastination as the voluntary delay of planned, important actions despite awareness of likely negative consequences (Steel, 2007; Klingsieck, 2013). The use of two complementary definitions proved useful: Steel's (2007) formulation emphasizing chronic self-regulatory failure prompted participants to reflect on habitual patterns, while Klingsieck's (2013) emphasis on the irrational cost-benefit calculation underlying delay helped participants identify the cognitive distortions that sustain procrastination. The Procrastination Cycle Bingo ice-breaking activity successfully reduced initial resistance and created a relaxed, participatory atmosphere, consistent with experiential learning's emphasis on concrete engagement as the entry point to the learning cycle (Kolb & Kolb, 2006).



Figure 1. Participants engaging in the opening reflection and Procrastination Cycle Bingo activity during Session 1.

3.4. Session 2: Causes and Types of Procrastination

The second session deepened participants' conceptual understanding by introducing the psychological mechanisms that drive procrastination. Four evidence-based causes were presented: poor self-regulation and impulsivity (Rebetez et al., 2018; Valenzuela et al., 2020), fear of failure mediating the relationship between perfectionism and avoidance (Yosopov et al., 2024; Karim et al., 2021), low academic self-efficacy (Rad et al., 2025), and boredom proneness in under-stimulating contexts (Sumer & Buttner, 2022). Group discussions following this content revealed that fear of failure and digital distraction were by far the most commonly recognized triggers among participants, with many teen leaders reporting that anxiety about doing ministry tasks imperfectly was a primary driver of delay.

The typology framework (Chu & Choi, 2005; Behnagh & Ferrari, 2022) proved particularly valuable: distinguishing active from passive procrastinators and dispositional from situational patterns enabled participants to recognize that procrastination is not a fixed character trait but a behavioral tendency that manifests differently across individuals and contexts. Several participants noted during reflection that they had previously assumed they were simply lazy people, and that reconceptualizing their behavior in terms of specific psychological mechanisms felt both more accurate and less stigmatizing. This aligns with the observation that reframing procrastination as a self-regulatory problem rather than a moral failing is itself a meaningful step toward behavior change.



Figure 2. Facilitator's explanation on the conceptual understanding and factors leading to procrastination.

3.5. Session 3: Practical Strategies

The third session shifted from conceptual understanding to skill acquisition, introducing two clusters of evidence-based strategies directly applicable to participants' ministry responsibilities. The first cluster, task decomposition and prioritization, guided participants to construct structured to-do lists, break ministry tasks into small, manageable chunks, and estimate realistic time requirements for each step. The chunking approach draws on the cognitive load literature: decomposing a large, ambiguous task into concrete micro-steps reduces the perceived effort of initiation, thereby directly countering the avoidance behavior that characterizes the onset of procrastination (Steel, 2007).



Figure 3. Facilitator's explanation on the practical strategies and tools to tackle long-term procrastination.

The second cluster introduced four-time management and environmental design tools. The Eisenhower Matrix helped participants categorize their ministry responsibilities according to urgency and importance, revealing for many that tasks they had been avoiding were frequently in the important but not urgent quadrant, the category most vulnerable to indefinite deferral. The Pomodoro Technique provided a structured approach to managing attention across focused work intervals, with participants completing a Pomodoro Session Tracker worksheet requiring them to plan a specific ministry task, log distractions, and reflect on focus quality before and after the session. The 2-Minute Rule operationalized the principle that any task requiring less than two minutes should be done immediately rather than scheduled, while the 5-Minute Commitment strategy was introduced as a behavioral activation technique to reduce the friction of task initiation. The Do It Now Card and Peak Energy Map worksheets supported participants in translating these strategies into personalized action plans tied to their own energy rhythms and ministry schedules.

3.6. Session 4: Motivation Architecture and the 7-Day Challenge

The fourth session addressed the motivational dimension of procrastination by introducing reward and consequence structuring as self-management tools. Participants completed a Reward Section exercise in which they identified a preferred activity and committed to engaging in it only while performing a habitually delayed ministry task, a behavioral technique consistent with temptation bundling principles. The complementary Consequence Mapping exercise required

participants to explicitly articulate the costs of non-completion, making the negative consequences of delay more psychologically immediate and directly addressing the temporal discounting mechanism that Steel (2007) identifies as central to procrastination. A Visual Reminder Creator activity guided participants to design and physically place personal commitment cues in their environment, reducing reliance on willpower alone by modifying the environmental triggers surrounding task initiation.



Figure 4. Participant's engagement on the fourth session: Setting daily goals and completing their Eisenhower matrix & 7 days commitment.

The session concluded with the introduction of the 7-Day Challenge, in which each participant set specific, concrete daily ministry targets for the seven days following training. The 7-Day Challenge appeared to provide a practical bridge between the training sessions and subsequent application of the strategies in participants' ministry responsibilities. Participants' reflections indicated that setting explicit written daily targets helped translate general intentions into more concrete action plans. This observation is consistent with implementation-intention research suggesting that specifying when, where, and how goal-directed behavior will occur can facilitate goal attainment (Gollwitzer & Sheeran, 2006).



Figure 5. Participants and facilitators at the conclusion of the on-site training program.

3.7. Learning Outcomes (Kirkpatrick Level 2)

Pre- and post-test results demonstrated a statistically significant improvement in participants' self-management knowledge. A paired-sample t-test confirmed that mean scores rose from pre-test ($M = 70.00$, $SD = 12.50$) to post-test ($M = 80.00$, $SD = 11.80$), $t(39) = 7.44$, $p < .001$, with a large effect size (Cohen's $d = 1.18$). Prior to analysis, normality of difference scores was confirmed via the Shapiro-Wilk test. These findings indicate that the training produced a practically meaningful gain in knowledge, not merely a statistically detectable one. The 10-point improvement is consistent with outcomes reported in comparable experiential learning-based self-management interventions targeting adolescent populations (Perez-Jorge et al., 2024; Dawson, 2021), and suggests that the sequential structure of the module, moving from conceptual grounding through psychological causes and typologies to practical strategy acquisition, was an effective design for building cumulative understanding.

It is important to distinguish this learning outcome from behavioral change. The pre- and post-training assessment measured participants' knowledge of procrastination and self-

management strategies rather than their actual self-management behavior or frequency of procrastination. Accordingly, the statistically significant increase should be interpreted as evidence of knowledge acquisition at Kirkpatrick Level 2, rather than as direct evidence that participants became more effective self-managers or procrastinated less following the training. Behavioral application was examined separately and descriptively through the Level 3 evaluation.

Table 1. Summary of evaluation results (Kirkpatrick Levels 1 and 2)

Evaluation Aspect	Score / Result	Scale / Notes
Average pre-test score	70.00	0–100 scale
Average post-test score	80.00	0–100 scale
Score improvement	+10 points (14.3%)	Pre-post gain
t-value	$t(39) = 7.44$	$p < .001$
Effect size	$d = 1.18$	Large effect
Satisfaction – training content	4.80	1–5 scale
Satisfaction – facilitator	4.82	1–5 scale
Number of participants	40	Teen leaders

3.8. Participant Satisfaction (Kirkpatrick Level 1)

Participant satisfaction ratings were highly positive across all dimensions. Training content received a mean rating of 4.80 out of 5, and facilitators received 4.82 out of 5. These results suggest that participants found both the material and its delivery credible, relevant, and engaging; conditions that Kirkpatrick and Kirkpatrick (2016) identify as prerequisites for behavioral transfer beyond the training event. The high content satisfaction score is particularly noteworthy given the psychological complexity of the material: procrastination theory, self-regulatory mechanisms, and behavioral activation strategies are not intrinsically easy subject matter for a Gen Z adolescent audience.

3.9. Exploratory Behavioral and Team-Level Outcomes (Kirkpatrick Levels 3 and 4)

Qualitative data collected during the mentored-practice period provided exploratory evidence of behavioral transfer following the training. Analysis of participant task journals, structured self-reports, and facilitator observations identified recurring patterns within the three predefined Level 3 domains. Participants described greater awareness of situations associated with procrastination and reported applying strategies introduced during the training to manage ministry-related responsibilities. Documented applications included breaking larger tasks into smaller steps, prioritizing tasks using the Eisenhower Matrix, using short focused-work periods, and setting written daily targets. The qualitative records also contained examples of participants making more deliberate efforts to initiate and follow through on assigned responsibilities. These findings represent reported and observed strategy application rather than a standardized measure of improvement in self-management ability.

At Level 4, partner feedback and joint reflection with ministry leadership suggested favorable changes in several aspects of team functioning during the follow-up period. Recurring observations included earlier completion or submission of some ministry-related materials, earlier coordination of ministry logistics, and fewer last-minute task adjustments or reassignments. These observations were broadly consistent with the intended team-level outcomes of the program. However, because the indicators were derived from qualitative partner feedback and were not systematically measured against a pre-intervention comparison period, they should be interpreted as preliminary organizational-level observations rather than as evidence of a causal effect of the training.

Several methodological limitations should be acknowledged. First, the Level 2 evaluation employed a single-group pre-post design without a comparison group. Consequently, the

observed knowledge gain cannot be attributed exclusively to the training, as testing effects and other uncontrolled influences cannot be ruled out. Second, the pre- and post-training assessment measured knowledge regarding procrastination and self-management strategies rather than participants' actual procrastination behavior or self-management skills. The quantitative findings therefore do not establish that participants procrastinated less following the intervention. Third, the Level 3 and Level 4 evaluations relied on naturalistic qualitative records, including participant reports, task journals, facilitator observations, and partner feedback, without standardized pre-intervention behavioral measures. These findings should therefore be interpreted as exploratory evidence of strategy application and perceived team-level change. Future evaluations should incorporate validated measures of procrastination and behavioral self-management, include delayed follow-up assessments to examine retention and behavioral maintenance, and, where feasible, employ a matched comparison group to strengthen internal validity.

3.10. Program Relevance and Contribution

This program contributes to a growing body of Indonesian community service literature demonstrating the value of psychologically grounded, experiential interventions in non-formal youth development settings. Existing community service programs targeting adolescent self-regulation have predominantly been delivered in academic contexts (Sholehah et al., 2018); this program demonstrates that faith-based community organizations represent an equally viable and underserved setting for such interventions. The integration of Kolb's Experiential Learning framework with selected principles adapted from Knowles' andragogical approach appeared well-suited to this group of adolescent youth leaders, as participants responded positively to learning activities that incorporated prior experience, immediate practical applicability, and opportunities for active involvement.

4. CONCLUSION

This community service program demonstrated a significant improvement in participants' knowledge of procrastination and self-management strategies following experiential learning-based training. The 10-point increase from pre-test to post-test was statistically significant and accompanied by a large effect size ($d = 1.18$), while participant satisfaction with the training content and facilitators was high. Qualitative findings from the mentored-practice phase provided preliminary evidence that participants recognized procrastination triggers and applied selected self-management strategies in their ministry responsibilities, while partner feedback suggested favorable changes in aspects of team coordination. However, because procrastination behavior and self-management skills were not assessed using standardized pre-post behavioral measures, these findings should not be interpreted as evidence that the intervention directly reduced procrastination or produced a quantifiable improvement in self-management ability.

Several recommendations are offered for program continuation and scaling. First, advanced sessions addressing stress management and resilience should be developed as logical sequels to this foundational program. Second, the church should designate an internal facilitator to sustain program delivery without external dependency. Third, a digital platform for module dissemination and asynchronous peer mentoring would extend the program's reach across ministry schedules. Fourth, the program framework, particularly its integration of psychological science with community values, is replicable in other youth community organizations, provided appropriate local contextual adaptation is undertaken.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors express gratitude to the leadership and ministry board of GKI Gejayan, the youth commission participants, and the Christian Psychology Association under Himpunan Psikologi Indonesia (APK-HIMPSI) for their collaboration and commitment throughout this

program. This activity was supported by the Community Development and Research Center of Universitas Pelita Harapan with approval number of PM-022-KDN-FPsi/VII/2025.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, L. L., Desson, S., St. John, E., & Watt, E. (2019). The DREAM program: developing resilience through emotions, attitudes, & meaning (gifted edition)—a second wave positive psychology approach. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly*, 32(3-4), 307-332. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09515070.2018.1559798>
- Behnagh, R. F., & Ferrari, J. R. (2022). Exploring 40 years on affective correlates to procrastination. *Current Psychology*, 41(2), 1097-1111. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02653-z>
- Bureau, J. S., Howard, J. L., Chong, J. X. Y., & Guay, F. (2022). Pathways to student motivation: A meta-analysis of antecedents of autonomous and controlled motivations. *Review of Educational Research*, 92(1), 46-72. <https://doi.org/10.3102/003465432111042426>
- Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014). The use of triangulation in qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, 41(5), 545-547. <https://doi.org/10.1188/14.ONF.545-547>
- Chu, A. H. C., & Choi, J. N. (2005). Rethinking procrastination: Positive effects of “active” procrastination behavior on attitudes and performance. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 145(3), 245-264. <https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.145.3.245-264>
- Dawson, P. (2021). Helping children and teens strengthen executive skills. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 36(7), 1279-1282. <https://doi.org/10.1093/arclin/acab057>
- Dimock, M. (2019). *Defining Generations: Where Millennials End and Generation Z Begins*. Pew Research Center, 17(1), 1-7.
- Elo, S., & Kyngäs, H. (2008). The qualitative content analysis process. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 62(1), 107-115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2648.2007.04569.x>
- Fukuda, M., & Zusman, E. (2024). Meaningful Youth Engagement in Sustainability Processes in Japan and Finland. *Sustainability*, 16, 6415. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su16156415>
- Gollwitzer, P. M., & Sheeran, P. (2006). Implementation intentions and goal achievement: A meta-analysis of effects and processes. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 69-119. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601\(06\)38002-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(06)38002-1)
- Hauk, D., & Gröschner, A. (2022). How effective is learner-controlled instruction under classroom conditions? A systematic review. *Learning and Motivation*, 80, 101850. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lmot.2022.101850>
- Karim, N. F., Minarni, & Alim, S. (2021). Can fear of failure predict academic procrastination? *INSPIRA*, 2(2), 105-112. <https://doi.org/10.32505/inspira.v2i2.3402>
- Kirkpatrick, J. D., & Kirkpatrick, W. K. (2016). *Kirkpatrick's Four Levels of Training Evaluation*. Association for Talent Development.
- Kitzinger, J. (1995). Qualitative research: Introducing focus groups. *BMJ*, 311(7000), 299-302. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.311.7000.299>
- Klingsieck, K. B. (2013). Procrastination: When good things don't come to those who wait. *European Psychologist*, 18(1), 24-34.
- Knowles, M. S. (1984). *Andragogy in action: Applying modern principles of adult learning*. Jossey-Bass.
- Kolb, A. Y., & Kolb, D. A. (2006). *Learning Styles and Learning Spaces*. In *Learning Styles and Learning* (pp. 45-91).
- Lewier, M., Supriyono, A. Y., & Triyana, E. (2025). OPTIMALISASI PERAN MAHASISWA PBSI DALAM PKM MELALUI SOSIALISASI DAN COACHING. *PAKEM: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 5(2), 97-108. <https://doi.org/10.30598/pakem.5.2.97-108>
- OECD. (2018). *Education at a Glance 2018: OECD Indicators*. OECD Publishing.
- Perez-Jorge, D., et al. (2024). Tomorrow Never Comes: The Risks of Procrastination for Adolescent Health. *European Journal of Investigation in Health, Psychology and Education*, 14(8), 2140-2156. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ejihpe14080143>
- Rad, H. F., et al. (2025). Predicting academic procrastination based on academic self-efficacy. *Scientific Reports*, 15, Article 3003. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-87664-7>
- Rajeshwari, S., & Meenakshi, S. (2023). The Age of Doom Scrolling. *Journal of Education and Health Promotion*, 12(1), 21. https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_838_22
- Rebetez, M. M. L., et al. (2018). Procrastination as a self-regulation failure. *Psychological Reports*, 121(1), 26-41. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0033294117720695>

- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation from a self-determination theory perspective: Definitions, theory, practices, and future directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 101860. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>
- Sharma, B., Lee, S. S., & Johnson, B. K. (2022). The dark at the end of the tunnel: Doomscrolling on social media newsfeeds. *Technology, Mind, and Behavior*, 3(1), 144–156. <https://doi.org/10.1037/tmb0000059>
- Sholehah, S., Sangka, K., & Hamidi, N. (2018). Academic Procrastination on Digital Native Higher Degree Student. *In Proc. ICTTE 2018* (pp. 416-421). Atlantis Press. <https://doi.org/10.2991/ictte-18.2018.78>
- Sirois, F., & Pychyl, T. (2013). Procrastination and the Priority of Short-Term Mood Regulation. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 7(2), 115-127. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12011>
- Steel, P. (2007). The Nature of Procrastination. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(1), 65-94.
- Sumer, C., & Buttner, O. B. (2022). I'll do it after one more scroll. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 918306. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.918306>
- Twenge, J. M. (2017). *iGen*. Simon and Schuster.
- Valenzuela, R., et al. (2020). Young university students' academic self-regulation profiles. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, Article 354. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00354>
- Yosopov, L., et al. (2024). Failure sensitivity in perfectionism and procrastination. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 42(6), 705-724. <https://doi.org/10.1177/07342829241249784>