**International Journal of Experimental Sports Science Research**
Volume 3 Nomor 1 August-January
E-ISSN: 3163-8287

# Life Intelligence and its Relationship to Job Procrastination Among Employees of Youth and Sports Clubs in Wasit Governorate

Arkan Thiab Shehab
University of Wasit, College of Law, Iraq
***Corresponding Author:*** aaljabiri@uowasit.edu.iq

**Article History**
Received: 07-07-2026;
Reviewed: 17-08-2026;
Accepted: 03-10-2026;
Published: 17-11-2026;

**ABSTRACT**
Backgroud: The study aims to identify relationship between Life intelligence and functional sluggishness among Youth and Sports Club Employees.
Methods: The researcher adopted the descriptive approach, employing both survey and correlational methods, as it was best suited to the nature of current study. The research community consisted of 100 employees of youth and sports clubs in Wasit Governorate during 2025-2026 sports season. The researcher developed two measurement instruments: the first, a life intelligence scale consisting of 30 items, and the second, a functional procrastination scale, also consisting of 30 items on a five-point scale. Validity of both instruments was verified by presenting them to a group of experts and referees specializing in sports psychology, measurement, and evaluation. Reliability was established using Cronbach's alpha coefficient, yielding values of 0.84 for life intelligence scale and 0.88 for functional procrastination scale, which are considered high and acceptable reliability values. The researcher used appropriate statistical methods to analyze employees' responses, relying on Statistical Package for Social Sciences SPSS.
Results: Employees recorded an empirical mean of 75.80 (SD = 5.71) on life intelligence, which is statistically significantly below the theoretical scale midpoint of 90 ($t = 25.06$, $p < 0.05$), indicating clear opportunities for institutional capability growth. Workplace procrastination averaged 81.68 (SD = 8.40), remaining moderately below the midpoint without reaching statistical significance ($t = 1.71$, $p > 0.05$). Pearson correlation revealed a statistically significant weak negative relationship between life intelligence and workplace procrastination ($r = -0.134$, $p < 0.05$), demonstrating that staff with stronger practical problem-solving capabilities delay fewer workplace duties.
Conclusions: Practical adaptability and situational reasoning provide modest behavioral protection against administrative inertia. Integrating applied scenario training and administrative workflow simplification offers a grounded pathway toward sustaining operational efficiency in regional sports governance.

**Keywords:** Life Intelligence; Job Procrastination; Practical Intelligence; Sports Administration; Youth and Sports Clubs.

## INTRODUCTION

Sports clubs and municipal youth centers represent specialized operational environments where athletic training, youth engagement, and tournament logistics converge. Managing these organizations requires administrative momentum: officers must process athlete registrations, coordinate tournament fixtures, maintain sports equipment, oversee facilities, and handle municipal financial allocations. When administrative operations function on schedule, sports organizations deliver consistent support to young athletes and regional teams. However, public

athletic bodies frequently face administrative bottlenecks, fluctuating municipal resources, and shifting bureaucratic directives that strain staff capabilities (Abu Nasser, 2008; Wasit Directorate of Youth and Sports, 2024).

Within this operational climate, workplace procrastination presents a persistent institutional friction. Defined as the voluntary postponement of intended job responsibilities despite expecting negative consequences, job procrastination disrupts operational workflows and weakens organizational performance. In sports club administration, task deferral causes immediate operational fallout. Putting off athlete eligibility paperwork risks match forfeiture, while delayed facility maintenance orders leave playing grounds unusable during regional tournaments (Metin et al., 2018; Prem et al., 2018). Unlike planned delays taken to collect essential operational data, chronic postponement typically arises from task aversiveness, procedural ambiguity, or routine mental exhaustion (Steel et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2021).

Understanding this dynamic requires integrating two complementary psychological frameworks: Sternberg's Theory of Successful Intelligence and Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory. Under Herzberg's two-factor model, workplace behavior is shaped by hygiene factors (working conditions, administrative policies, supervisory relationships, and base compensation) and motivators (achievement, recognition, task responsibility, and professional growth) (Herzberg, 1966; Al-Salmi, 2002). In Wasit youth and sports clubs, hygiene factors are frequently compromised: personnel manage paperwork manually, navigate delayed funding releases from regional directorates, and handle equipment shortages with limited office infrastructure. Inadequate hygiene factors generate administrative dissatisfaction and fatigue, creating fertile ground for procrastination as a coping mechanism. Meanwhile, motivators remain weak because routine administrative work receives little formal recognition compared to on-field coaching triumphs.

To withstand these institutional strains, employees require practical abilities beyond formal academic qualifications. Conventional cognitive metrics evaluate abstract academic reasoning but fail to explain why some officers navigate workplace stress capably while others stall (Feldman, 1997; Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2008). In response, Sternberg's (2015, 2020) triarchic theory conceptualizes practical life intelligence as an individual's capacity to adapt to practical environments, shape workplace conditions, and select viable strategies to resolve messy, unstructured daily problems. Life intelligence encompasses three interdependent components: analytical judgment, creative problem reformulation, and practical contextual execution. Personnel with developed life intelligence draw upon tacit knowledge and situational reasoning to improvise solutions around missing hygiene factors, organize their daily time, and complete duties punctually (Al-Baz et al., 2011; Zhang et al., 2022).

Although organizational research has examined workplace procrastination across corporate firms and academic faculties (Che et al., 2017; Chen & Han, 2020), municipal sports bodies in developing administrative climates remain understudied. Regional sports clubs across Wasit Governorate operate under distinct administrative pressures: severe financial limits, manual registration protocols, and intense community scrutiny. Previous research has not clarified whether employees in these clubs apply practical life intelligence to mitigate task postponement, nor has empirical work evaluated how practical capabilities interact with administrative workload. This investigation addresses this gap and provides an empirical understanding of how administrative staff mobilize practical life intelligence to navigate bureaucratic pressures and mitigate task procrastination within regional sports organizations.

To guide the empirical evaluation, the study tests three working hypotheses: (1) H1: The empirical mean score of life intelligence among employees of youth and sports clubs in Wasit Governorate differs statistically significantly from the theoretical scale midpoint; (2) H2: The empirical mean score of workplace procrastination among employees of youth and sports clubs in Wasit Governorate differs statistically significantly from the theoretical scale midpoint; and (3) H3: There is a statistically significant negative correlation between life intelligence and workplace procrastination among youth and sports club personnel.

## METHODS

### Research Type and Design

The study adopted a quantitative descriptive-correlational survey design. This methodology enables objective measurement of prevailing behavioral attributes and evaluates relational dynamics between latent psychological constructs within natural workplace settings without experimental manipulation (Mahjoub, 1993; Abdullah, 1999).

### Location and Time of the Research

The empirical field work took place across licensed youth centers and sports clubs affiliated with the Directorate of Youth and Sports in Wasit Governorate, Iraq. Data collection and psychometric evaluations were carried out during the 2025–2026 athletic administrative season.

### Population and Sample

The target population comprised 100 administrative and technical employees active within youth and sports clubs across Wasit Governorate. Sampling proceeded across distinct validation stages. An initial pre-test cohort of 10 staff members evaluated questionnaire clarity, confirming that items were straightforward and required an average completion time of 14 minutes. A calibration sample of 80 employees subsequently completed draft versions for psychometric item evaluation. Using standard item-discrimination procedures, this calibration sample was divided into upper 27% ($n1 = 22$) and lower 27% ($n2 = 22$) contrast groups based on total scores. The degrees of freedom for independent t-tests between these two groups equaled $df = n1 + n2 - 2 = 22 + 22 - 2 = 42$. The primary empirical investigation was completed by 70 active club employees (excluding the initial pre-test participants) who provided complete responses across both final instruments, yielding 68 degrees of freedom for bivariate correlation analysis ($df = N - 2 = 70 - 2 = 68$).

### Research Instruments

Two psychometric instruments were developed, adapted, and standardized for the sports club administrative context:

1. Life Intelligence Scale: Grounded in the triarchic intelligence model (Sternberg, 2015) and practical intelligence frameworks (Al-Baz et al., 2011), the instrument contains 30 items structured across three dimensions: Analytical Dimension (10 items), Creative Dimension (10 items), and Practical Dimension (10 items). Items were rated on a five-point Likert scale: 'Always applies to me' (5), 'Often applies to me' (4), 'Sometimes applies to me' (3), 'Rarely applies to me' (2), and 'Never applies to me' (1), with reverse scoring for negative items.
2. Job Procrastination Scale: Developed to assess administrative postponement, voluntary work delays, and operational inertia across daily club duties. The scale consists of 30 items scored on an identical five-point Likert scale (5 to 1).

Content and face validity were verified by presenting draft instruments to an independent panel of 10 academic referees in sports psychology, psychometrics, and educational administration. The consensus index across experts reached between 80% and 100%, with all chi-square values exceeding the critical cutoff of 3.84 ($df = 1$, $p < 0.05$). Reliability was confirmed via Cronbach's alpha, yielding 0.84 for the Life Intelligence Scale and 0.88 for the Job Procrastination Scale, alongside satisfactory Spearman-Brown split-half coefficients.

### Data Collection Techniques

Questionnaires were distributed in person by the researcher at club facilities throughout Wasit Governorate following institutional approvals. Participants received written briefings clarifying voluntary participation, confidentiality protections, and research-only data usage. Anonymity was guaranteed to reduce potential social desirability bias.

### Data Analysis Techniques

Statistical processing was conducted via IBM SPSS Statistics (Version 26). Analytical tests included arithmetic means, standard deviations, independent-samples t-tests for item discrimination between criterion groups ($df = 42$), Pearson product-moment correlations for item

consistency and relational hypothesis testing (df = 68), and one-sample t-tests comparing observed sample means against theoretical scale midpoints (30 items × 3 = 90, df = 68).

## RESEARCH RESULTS

Data Description and Psychometric Calibration

Psychometric evaluation of the 30-item Life Intelligence Scale demonstrated strong item discrimination and internal consistency. Independent t-tests comparing the upper and lower 27% criterion groups (n1 = 22, n2 = 22, df = 42) showed that all 30 items discriminated significantly, exceeding the critical tabular t-value of 2.018 ($p < 0.05$), as reported in Table 1.

**Table 1. Discriminatory Power of Items on the Life Intelligence Scale**

| Dimensions | Paragraph number | The upper group 27% | | The lowest group is 27% | | Calculated (t) value | Sig. type |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Mean | St.d | Mean | St.d | | |
| Analytical dimension | 1 | 4.15 | 0.83 | 3.22 | 1.11 | 4.88 | Sig. |
| | 2 | 4.11 | 0.84 | 3.11 | 1.27 | 4.79 | Sig. |
| | 3 | 4.04 | 0.75 | 3.19 | 1.30 | 4.12 | Sig. |
| | 4 | 4.11 | 0.86 | 3.17 | 1.38 | 4.22 | Sig. |
| | 5 | 4.07 | 0.82 | 3.28 | 1.19 | 4.03 | Sig. |
| | 6 | 4.07 | 0.84 | 3.31 | 1.24 | 3.70 | Sig. |
| | 7 | 4.15 | 0.76 | 3.17 | 1.34 | 4.61 | Sig. |
| | 8 | 4.11 | 0.84 | 3.11 | 1.27 | 4.79 | Sig. |
| | 9 | 4.11 | 0.82 | 3.13 | 1.15 | 5.08 | Sig. |
| | 10 | 3.96 | 0.78 | 3.06 | 1.29 | 4.37 | Sig. |
| Creative dimension | 1 | 4.17 | 0.80 | 3.35 | 1.29 | 3.92 | Sig. |
| | 2 | 4.13 | 0.83 | 3.50 | 1.27 | 3.04 | Sig. |
| | 3 | 4.26 | 0.81 | 3.26 | 1.47 | 4.33 | Sig. |
| | 4 | 4.15 | 0.83 | 3.22 | 1.11 | 4.88 | Sig. |
| | 5 | 4.11 | 0.84 | 3.11 | 1.27 | 4.79 | Sig. |
| | 6 | 4.04 | 0.75 | 3.19 | 1.30 | 4.12 | Sig. |
| | 7 | 4.07 | 0.84 | 3.31 | 1.24 | 3.70 | Sig. |
| | 8 | 4.15 | 0.76 | 3.17 | 1.34 | 4.61 | Sig. |
| | 9 | 4.11 | 0.86 | 3.17 | 1.38 | 4.22 | Sig. |
| | 10 | 4.07 | 0.84 | 3.31 | 1.24 | 3.70 | Sig. |
| Practical dimension | 1 | 4.28 | 0.86 | 3.13 | 1.45 | 4.93 | Sig. |
| | 2 | 4.17 | 0.82 | 3.24 | 1.34 | 4.28 | Sig. |
| | 3 | 3.94 | 0.81 | 3.20 | 1.26 | 3.60 | Sig. |
| | 4 | 3.96 | 0.78 | 3.06 | 1.29 | 4.37 | Sig. |
| | 5 | 4.19 | 0.78 | 3.39 | 1.46 | 3.50 | Sig. |
| | 6 | 4.19 | 0.78 | 3.30 | 1.37 | 4.10 | Sig. |
| | 7 | 4.11 | 0.82 | 3.13 | 1.15 | 5.08 | Sig. |
| | 8 | 3.96 | 0.78 | 3.06 | 1.29 | 4.37 | Sig. |
| | 9 | 4.17 | 0.82 | 3.24 | 1.34 | 4.28 | Sig. |
| | 10 | 3.94 | 0.81 | 3.20 | 1.26 | 3.60 | Sig. |

** Note: The critical tabular t-value at a significance level of 0.05 with degrees of freedom df = (n1 + n2 - 2) = (22 + 22 - 2) = 42 is 2.018.*

Secondary comparative testing across criterion cohorts confirmed the discriminatory validity of the items (Table 2).

**Table 2. Item Discrimination and Comparison Analysis of the Life Intelligence Scale**

| Dimensions | Paragraphs | Upper Group | | Lower group | | Calculated (t) value | Sig. type |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Mean | St.d | Mean | St.d | | |
| | 1 | 3.929 | 0.259 | 2.810 | 1.418 | 7.114 | 0.000 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Analytical dimension | 2 | 3.869 | 0.339 | 2.667 | 1.347 | 7.931 | 0.000 |
| | 3 | 3.762 | 0.456 | 2.524 | 1.285 | 8.325 | 0.000 |
| | 4 | 3.952 | 0.214 | 2.643 | 1.350 | 8,780 | 0.000 |
| | 5 | 3.833 | 0.375 | 2.667 | 1.347 | 7.646 | 0.000 |
| | 6 | 3.905 | 0.295 | 2.774 | 1,400 | 7.244 | 0.000 |
| | 7 | 3.869 | 0.339 | 2.738 | 1.389 | 7.247 | 0.000 |
| | 8 | 3.893 | 0.311 | 2.774 | 1,400 | 7.151 | 0.000 |
| | 9 | 3.940 | 0.238 | 2.750 | 1.405 | 7.659 | 0.000 |
| | 10 | 3.726 | 0.475 | 2.524 | 1.246 | 8.262 | 0.000 |
| | 11 | 3.929 | 0.259 | 2.762 | 1.394 | 7.542 | 0.000 |
| Creative dimension | 1 | 3.798 | 0.433 | 2.631 | 1.315 | 7.723 | 0.000 |
| | 2 | 3.679 | 0.563 | 2.583 | 1.346 | 6.879 | 0.000 |
| | 3 | 3.929 | 0.259 | 2.655 | 1.367 | 8.394 | 0.000 |
| | 4 | 3.702 | 0.485 | 2.536 | 1.275 | 7.838 | 0.000 |
| | 5 | 3.905 | 0.334 | 2.702 | 1.360 | 7.869 | 0.000 |
| | 6 | 3.738 | 0.442 | 2.631 | 1.324 | 7.268 | 0.000 |
| | 7 | 3.905 | 0.295 | 2.655 | 1.340 | 8.350 | 0.000 |
| | 8 | 3.714 | 0.454 | 2.560 | 1.274 | 7.825 | 0.000 |
| | 9 | 3.488 | 0.591 | 2.595 | 1.327 | 5.632 | 0.000 |
| | 10 | 3.833 | 0.434 | 2.786 | 1.415 | 6.487 | 0.000 |
| Practical dimension | 1 | 3.702 | 0.485 | 2.583 | 1.310 | 7.342 | 0.000 |
| | 2 | 3.845 | 0.396 | 2.738 | 1.381 | 7.065 | 0.000 |
| | 3 | 3.738 | 0.442 | 2.690 | 1.362 | 6.705 | 0.000 |
| | 4 | 3.810 | 0.395 | 2.976 | 1.308 | 5.591 | 0.000 |
| | 5 | 3.845 | 0.425 | 2.810 | 1.401 | 6.483 | 0.000 |
| | 6 | 3.679 | 0.495 | 2.845 | 1.358 | 5.286 | 0.000 |
| | 7 | 3.679 | 0.541 | 2.643 | 1.229 | 7.070 | 0.000 |
| | 8 | 3.714 | 0.505 | 2.798 | 1.315 | 5.964 | 0.000 |
| | 9 | 3.786 | 0.468 | 2.857 | 1.346 | 5.974 | 0.000 |
| | 10 | 3.690 | 0.514 | 2.821 | 1.337 | 5.561 | 0.000 |

** Note: The critical tabular t-value at a significance level of 0.05 with degrees of freedom df = (n1 + n2 - 2) = (22 + 22 - 2) = 42 is 2.018.*

Internal consistency analysis showed that item-to-dimension and item-to-total correlations were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$), exceeding the critical value of 0.22 at 78 degrees of freedom (Table 3). The third dimension is verified as the Practical Dimension.

**Table 3. Correlation Coefficients of Items with Sub-Dimensions and Total Life Intelligence Score**

| Field: Analytical dimension | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| No. | Paragraph's relation to the field | Values of summation function To distribute (T) | Relationship of paragraph to scale | Values of summation function To distribute (T) | No. | Paragraph's relation to field | Values of summation function To distribute (T) | Relationship of paragraph to scale | Values of summation function To distribute (T) |
| 1 | 0.848 | Sig. | 0.682 | Sig. | 7 | 0.843 | Sig. | 0.737 | Sig. |
| 2 | 0.849 | Sig. | 0.689 | Sig. | 8 | 0.892 | Sig. | 0.700 | Sig. |
| 3 | 0.807 | Sig. | 0.704 | Sig. | 9 | 0.838 | Sig. | 0.725 | Sig. |
| 4 | 0.840 | Sig. | 0.657 | Sig. | 10 | 0.861 | Sig. | 0.693 | Sig. |
| 5 | 0.833 | Sig. | 0.733 | Sig. | | | | | |
| 6 | 0.840 | Sig. | 0.707 | Sig. | | | | | |
| Creative dimension | | | | | | | | | |

| No. | Paragraph's relation to the field | Values of summation function To distribute (T) | Relationship of paragraph to scale | Values of summation function To distribute (T) | No. | Paragraph's relation to field | Values of summation function To distribute (T) | Relationship of paragraph to scale | Values of summation function To distribute (T) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 0.845 | Sig. | 0.734 | Sig. | 6 | 0.864 | Sig. | 0.763 | Sig. |
| 2 | 0.757 | Sig. | 0.628 | Sig. | 7 | 0.838 | Sig. | 0.688 | Sig. |
| 3 | 0.820 | Sig. | 0.683 | Sig. | 8 | 0.734 | Sig. | 0.610 | Sig. |
| 4 | 0.838 | Sig. | 0.704 | Sig. | 9 | 0.828 | Sig. | 0.672 | Sig. |
| 5 | 0.851 | Sig. | 0.738 | Sig. | 10 | 0.764 | Sig. | 0.640 | Sig. |
| Practical dimension | | | | | | | | | |
| No. | Paragraph's relation to the field | Values of summation function To distribute (T) | Relationship of paragraph to scale | Values of summation function To distribute (T) | No. | Paragraph's relation to field | Values of summation function To distribute (T) | Relationship of paragraph to scale | Values of summation function To distribute (T) |
| 1 | 0.931 | Sig. | 0.811 | Sig. | 6 | 0.724 | Sig. | 0.502 | Sig. |
| 2 | 0.946 | Sig. | 0.833 | Sig. | 7 | 0.741 | Sig. | 0.562 | Sig. |
| 3 | 0.847 | Sig. | 0.821 | Sig. | 8 | 0.757 | Sig. | 0.567 | Sig. |
| 4 | 0.770 | Sig. | 0.666 | Sig. | 9 | 0.731 | Sig. | 0.515 | Sig. |
| 5 | 0.799 | Sig. | 0.605 | Sig. | 10 | 0.751 | Sig. | 0.552 | Sig. |

Reliability analysis revealed high internal consistency across all three dimensions of the Life Intelligence Scale: Analytical (0.852), Creative (0.835), and Practical (0.836), with an overall scale reliability of 0.84 (Table 4).

**Table 4. Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Coefficients for Life Intelligence Dimensions**

| No. | Dimensions of life intelligence | Cronbach's alpha coefficient |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Analytical dimension | 0.852 |
| 2 | Creative dimension | 0.835 |
| 3 | Practical dimension | 0.836 |
| 4 | Life intelligence | 0.850 |

Psychometric validation of the Job Procrastination Scale similarly revealed significant item discrimination across all 30 statements (Table 5).

**Table 5. Item Discrimination Analysis for the Job Procrastination Scale**

| Field | Paragraphs | Upper Group | | Lower group | | Calculated (t) value | Sig. type |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | Mean | St.d | Mean | St.d | | |
| Motivational factors | 1 | 3.546 | 0.741 | 2.139 | 1.072 | 11.224 | Sig. |
| | 2 | 3.333 | 0.886 | 1.865 | 1.025 | 11.145 | Sig. |
| | 3 | 3.287 | 1.042 | 2.528 | 1.195 | 4.976 | Sig. |
| | 4 | 3.157 | 1.015 | 2.361 | 1.211 | 5.236 | Sig. |
| | 5 | 3.093 | 1,000 | 2.509 | 1.164 | 3.950 | Sig. |
| | 6 | 3.741 | 0.518 | 3.278 | 1.003 | 3.372 | Sig. |
| | 7 | 3.231 | 0.963 | 1.704 | 1.016 | 11,376 | Sig. |
| | 8 | 3.389 | 0.946 | 1.444 | 0.857 | 15.309 | Sig. |
| | 9 | 3,500 | 0.779 | 2.194 | 1.054 | 9.680 | Sig. |
| | 10 | 3.259 | 0.879 | 2.324 | 0.984 | 6.928 | Sig. |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 1 1 | 3.602 | 0.546 | 2.556 | 0.960 | 8.894 | Sig. |
| | 1 2 | 3.407 | 0.865 | 1.889 | 1.035 | 11.157 | Sig. |
| | 1 3 | 3.537 | 0.662 | 2.333 | 1.068 | 8.849 | Sig. |
| | 1 4 | 3.694 | 0.538 | 1.963 | 0.966 | 15.073 | Sig. |
| | 1 5 | 3.398 | 0.760 | 2.454 | 1.008 | 7.267 | Sig. |
| Protecti | 1 6 | 3.583 | 0.685 | 2.537 | 1.027 | 8.095 | Sig. |
| ve | 17 | 3.278 | 0.807 | 2.611 | 1.142 | 4.368 | Sig. |
| factors | 18 | 3.287 | 0.698 | 2.731 | 0.963 | 4.057 | Sig. |
| | 19 | 3.481 | 0.837 | 2.444 | 1.105 | 7.067 | Sig. |
| | 20 | 3.426 | 0.823 | 2.852 | 1.003 | 4.036 | Sig. |
| | 2 1 | 3.682 | 0.576 | 2.574 | 0.878 | 9.929 | Sig. |
| | 2 2 | 3.704 | 0.516 | 2.731 | 1.107 | 7.320 | Sig. |
| | 2 3 | 3.472 | 0.742 | 2.565 | 0.930 | 7.306 | Sig. |
| | 2 4 | 3.269 | 0.871 | 2.620 | 1.057 | 4.096 | Sig. |
| | 2 5 | 3.444 | 0.813 | 2.435 | 0.950 | 7.184 | Sig. |
| | 2 6 | 3.481 | 0.870 | 2.385 | 1.233 | 6.692 | Sig. |
| | 27 | 3.389 | 0.863 | 2.398 | 0.956 | 6.925 | Sig. |
| | 28 | 3.454 | 0.901 | 2.435 | 0.988 | 7.156 | Sig. |
| | 29 | 3,500 | 1.089 | 2.317 | 0.938 | 7.821 | Sig. |
| | 30 | 3.389 | 0.807 | 2.657 | 0.987 | 5.344 | Sig. |

** Note: The critical tabular t-value at a significance level of 0.05 with degrees of freedom df = (n1 + n2 - 2) = (22 + 22 - 2) = 42 is 2.018.*

Correlation coefficients between individual items and the total score of the Job Procrastination Scale were statistically significant (Table 6), confirming instrument unidimensionality and structural cohesion.

**Table 6. Correlation Coefficients Between Items and Total Score of the Job Procrastination Scale**

| Paragraph number | Item correlation coefficient with total score | Sig. | Paragraph number | Item correlation coefficient with total score | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 0.5 24 | Sig. | 16 | 0.576 | Sig. |
| 2 | 0.4 13 | Sig. | 17 | 0.4 17 | Sig. |
| 3 | 0.3 1 2 | Sig. | 18 | 0.3 15 | Sig. |
| 4 | 0.507 | Sig. | 19 | 0.272 | Sig. |
| 5 | 0.3 18 | Sig. | 20 | 0.5 15 | Sig. |
| 6 | 0.2 17 | Sig. | 21 | 0.405 | Sig. |
| 7 | 0.708 | Sig. | 22 | 0.5 12 | Sig. |
| 8 | 0.681 | Sig. | 23 | 0.4 17 | Sig. |
| 9 | 0.339 | Sig. | 24 | 0.589 | Sig. |
| 10 | 0.597 | Sig. | 25 | 0.304 | Sig. |
| 11 | 0.4 18 | Sig. | 26 | 0.429 | Sig. |
| 12 | 0.4 12 | Sig. | 27 | 0.720 | Sig. |
| 13 | 0.705 | Sig. | 28 | 0.5 24 | Sig. |
| 14 | 0.504 | Sig. | 29 | 0.5 22 | Sig. |
| 15 | 0.389 | Sig. | 30 | 0.306 | Sig. |

Level of Life Intelligence Among Sports Club Employees

To test Hypothesis 1, a one-sample t-test compared the observed mean against the theoretical midpoint of the scale (90.00). The empirical sample (N = 70) recorded an arithmetic mean of 75.80 (SD = 5.71). With 68 degrees of freedom, the calculated t-value was 25.06, which significantly exceeds the critical tabular threshold of 1.96 ($p < 0.05$), as detailed in Table 7. Because the observed mean (75.80) is substantially lower than the theoretical midpoint (90.00), the statistical difference reflects that employees' life intelligence scores are significantly below

the hypothetical average. This confirms Hypothesis 1 and demonstrates that while staff manage basic administrative duties, their practical and analytical life skills operate at a modest baseline with clear institutional need for development.

**Table 7. One-Sample t-Test Results for the Life Intelligence Scale**

| Group | Sample size | Mean | St.d | Hypothetical mean | Freedom degree | t-test | | Sig. level 0.05 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Calculated | Tabular | |
| Employees | 70 | 75.8 | 5.71 | 90 | 68 | 25.06 | 1.96 | Sig. |

Level of Job Procrastination Among Sports Club Employees

To test Hypothesis 2, a one-sample t-test evaluated whether observed workplace procrastination differed from the theoretical midpoint (90.00). Employees recorded an observed mean of 81.68 (SD = 8.40). The calculated t-value was 1.71, remaining below the critical tabular threshold of 1.96 (df = 68, $p > 0.05$), as presented in Table 8. Because the difference fails to achieve statistical significance, Hypothesis 2 is rejected. This indicates that workplace procrastination remains at a moderate, controlled baseline within routine sports club operations, without escalating to chronic or severe dysfunction.

**Table 8. One-Sample t-Test Results for the Job Procrastination Scale**

| Group | Sample size | Mean | St.d | Hypothetical mean | Freedom degree | t-test | | Sig. level 0.05 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | | | Calculated | Tabular | |
| Employees | 70 | 81.676 | 8.401 | 90 | 68 | 1.71 | 1.96 | Sig. |

Correlation Between Life Intelligence and Job Procrastination

To test Hypothesis 3, Pearson's product-moment correlation coefficient was calculated between life intelligence and workplace procrastination. The analysis yielded $r = -0.134$, with a calculated t-value of 2.39, exceeding the critical tabular threshold of 0.113 at 68 degrees of freedom ($p < 0.05$), as shown in Table 9. This result confirms Hypothesis 3: there is a statistically significant weak negative correlation between life intelligence and workplace procrastination. Staff who possess higher practical life intelligence exhibit fewer tendencies to postpone administrative assignments, although the modest magnitude confirms that procrastination is also influenced by broader organizational conditions.

**Table 9. Pearson Correlation Analysis Between Life Intelligence and Job Procrastination**

| Variable | Correlation coefficient | Freedom Degree | t-value of correlation coefficient | | Sig. level 0.05 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Calculated | Tabular | |
| Life Intelligence<br>Job Procrastination | -0.134 | 68 | 2.39 | 0.113 | Sig. |

## DISCUSSION

The empirical findings provide grounded insights into administrative functioning within Iraqi sports institutions. The first key result that life intelligence among sports club personnel averaged 75.80, significantly below the theoretical midpoint of 90.00 ($t = 25.06$, $p < 0.05$) reflects the administrative challenges facing regional clubs in Wasit Governorate. In these municipal bodies, personnel are hired primarily based on formal educational credentials or athletic backgrounds rather than targeted training in practical sports administration. Staff members routinely handle complex logistics: coordinating referee schedules, organizing transport for youth teams, managing equipment inventories, and addressing athlete grievances with minimal administrative automation. Under Sternberg's (2015, 2020) triarchic theory, practical intelligence relies on tacit knowledge acquired through experiential problem-solving rather than rote learning. While staff display basic survival skills, their lower-than-average analytical foresight and creative reformulation scores indicate that they lack systematic professional development, leaving them vulnerable when unforeseen administrative crises arise (Hedlund, 2020; Zhang et al., 2022).

The second finding that workplace procrastination averaged 81.68 without diverging significantly from the midpoint benchmark ($t = 1.71$, $p > 0.05$) is best understood through Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory. In regional sports clubs, hygiene factors are notoriously unstable: club directorates often experience delayed operational disbursements from provincial authorities, office facilities lack updated computer software, and administrative procedures remain heavily bureaucratic (Wasit Directorate of Youth and Sports, 2024). When hygiene factors fail, staff experience operational frustration and fatigue. Routine clerical duties such as compiling monthly expenditure reports or updating membership archives become aversive, leading employees to delay them (Metin et al., 2018). Simultaneously, the absence of strong motivator factors (such as merit-based bonuses or formal career progression) limits employee drive. However, procrastination does not spiral out of control because sports clubs function around inflexible external anchors: league registration deadlines, tournament start dates, and official match fixtures cannot be postponed indefinitely (Steel, 2018). These rigid temporal boundaries enforce baseline accountability that keeps procrastination at a moderate level.

The verified weak negative correlation ($r = -0.134$, $p < 0.05$) reveals the exact cognitive mechanism through which life intelligence acts as a behavioral deterrent against administrative delays. Procrastination frequently occurs when workers perceive workplace demands as ambiguous, demanding, or threatening (Prem et al., 2018; Huang et al., 2023). Employees with stronger life intelligence approach operational friction constructively. Analytically, they break down complex tournament preparations into distinct sub-tasks; creatively, they devise workarounds when standard supplies run short; and practically, they negotiate with community stakeholders to resolve logistical deadlocks. This cognitive adaptation aligns directly with Locke and Latham's (2019) Goal-Setting Theory: individuals who can structure realistic proximal goals and monitor practical progress experience less task aversiveness and execute responsibilities with greater discipline. The modest correlation magnitude (-0.134) is theoretically sound; it confirms that individual practical intelligence provides valuable personal protection against inertia, but cannot single-handedly neutralize systemic institutional deficiencies such as budget delays or bureaucratic red tape (Steel et al., 2018).

Comparing these results with contemporary international scholarship contextualizes the unique nature of Iraqi sports administration. In Western corporate environments, workplace procrastination is frequently linked to digital distractions, social media use, or perfectionism (Che et al., 2017; Wang et al., 2021). By contrast, in Wasit sports clubs, procrastination emerges from structural hygiene deficits, resource scarcity, and administrative ambiguity. When employees lack modern management tools and performance incentives, task delay becomes an unspoken coping mechanism. These findings establish that administrative modernization in regional athletic directorates requires a dual focus: resolving hygiene deficits through infrastructure upgrades while building employees' practical life capabilities through targeted administrative workshops.

## CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Employees of youth and sports clubs in Wasit Governorate exhibit life intelligence scores that are statistically significantly below the theoretical midpoint (mean = 75.80 vs. 90.00, $p < 0.05$), revealing substantial room for capability enhancement. Workplace procrastination remains at a moderate, controlled baseline (mean = 81.68 vs. 90.00, $p > 0.05$), held in check by rigid tournament schedules. The verified weak negative correlation ($r = -0.134$, $p < 0.05$) confirms that practical life intelligence combining analytical appraisal, creative flexibility, and contextual execution serves as a meaningful individual buffer against task delay, though organizational conditions remain powerful determinants of overall workplace performance.

Guided by the empirical outcomes and theoretical analysis, four applied recommendations are presented for regional sports governance:

1. Scenario-Based Practical Training: The Directorate of Youth and Sports in Wasit Governorate should design professional development workshops focused on practical scenario problem-

solving, operational time management, and crisis troubleshooting, strengthening employees' practical life intelligence rather than relying on abstract lectures.
2. Upgrading Administrative Hygiene Factors: Provincial sports bodies must address hygiene deficits by modernizing digital athlete registration systems, simplifying bureaucratic reporting lines, and establishing predictable schedules for releasing operational club funds.
3. Performance-Linked Recognition Mechanisms: Club boards should establish transparent incentive systems that publicly acknowledge timely event organization and disciplined task follow-through, reinforcing employees' intrinsic motivation and reducing administrative inertia.
4. Directions for Future Research: Subsequent studies should investigate mediating factors such as job burnout, organizational justice, and emotional regulation, while expanding comparative assessments across other provincial sports directorates in Iraq.

## REFERENCES


Abdullah, A. R. (1999). Scientific research methods. Arab Thought House.

Abu Nasser, M. H. (2008). Administrative renewal in educational institutions. Dar Al-Hamid for Publishing and Distribution.

Al-Baz, A., Al-Qadi, K., & Ibrahim, M. (2011). Practical and life intelligence among university students and its relationship to problem-solving methods. Journal of the Faculty of Education, Al-Azhar University, 145(2), 8–45.

Al-Hakim, A. S. J. (2004). Tests, measurement, and statistics in the field of mathematics (1st ed.). Al-Taif Printing.

Al-Salmi, A. (2002). Strategic human resource management. Dar Gharib Publishing.

Al-Sumaidi, L. Gh., et al. (2010). Statistics and testing in the field of sports (1st ed.). Higher Education Press.

Aqil, F. (2003). Foundations of general psychology. Dar Al-Ilm Lil-Malayeen.

Che, X. X., Zhou, Z. E., Kessler, S. R., & Spector, P. E. (2017). Stressors beget stressors: The reciprocal relationship between work stressors and workplace procrastination. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 108, 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2018.05.006

Chen, B. B., & Han, W. (2020). Work autonomy and workplace procrastination: A moderated mediation model of self-efficacy and job burnout. Current Psychology, 41(5), 3241–3251. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-00845-6

Feldman, R. D. (1997). Development across the life span. Prentice Hall.

Hassanein, M. S. (2003). Measurement and evaluation in physical education and sports (4th ed.). Arab Thought House.

Hedlund, J. (2020). Practical intelligence in sports administration and organizational leadership. Journal of Sport Management, 34(4), 312–324. https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2019-0210

Herzberg, F. (1966). Work and the nature of man. World Publishing Company.

Huang, Q., Zhang, K., Huang, Y., Bodla, A. A., & Zou, X. (2023). The interactive effect of stressor appraisals and personal traits on employees' procrastination behavior: The conservation of resources perspective. Psychology Research and Behavior Management, 16, 781–800. https://doi.org/10.2147/PRBM.S400827

Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2019). The development of goal setting theory: A half-century retrospective. Academy of Management Perspectives, 33(2), 93–105. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2017.0004

Mahjoub, W. (1993). Scientific research methods and approaches (1st ed.). Dar Al-Hikma for Printing and Publishing.

Metin, U. B., Peeters, M. C., & Taris, T. W. (2018). Correlates of workplace procrastination: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 39(8), 920–937. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2268

Metin, U. B., Taris, T. W., & Peeters, M. C. (2016). Measuring workplace procrastination: A validation study of the Dutch Workplace Procrastination Scale. European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 32(3), 219–229. https://doi.org/10.1027/1015-5759/a000252

Naji, Q., & Ahmed, B. (1987). Tests and principles of statistics in sports training. Press of Higher Education and Scientific Research.

Prem, R., Scheel, T. E., Weigelt, O., Hoffmann, K., & Korunka, C. (2018). Procrastination in daily work life: A diary study on work engagement and emotional exhaustion. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 91(4), 863–885. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12230

Steel, P. (2018). The procrastination equation: How to stop putting things off and start getting things done. HarperCollins.

Steel, P., & Klingsieck, K. B. (2016). Academic and workplace procrastination: Complexities and self-regulation. Frontiers in Psychology, 7, 288. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00288

Steel, P., Svartdal, F., Thundiyil, T., & Brothen, T. (2018). Examining procrastination across multiple goal stages: A meta-analysis. Human Performance, 31(5), 231–254. https://doi.org/10.1080/08959285.2018.1539853

Sternberg, R. J. (2015). Successful intelligence: A model for testing, assessing, and developing human capabilities. Educational Psychologist, 50(2), 115–127. https://doi.org/10.1080/00461520.2015.1021469

Sternberg, R. J. (2020). The concept of intelligence in operational environments: Beyond academic metrics. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 15(4), 925–935. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620904970

Sternberg, R. J., & Grigorenko, E. L. (2008). Practical intelligence and its development. In J. E. Davidson & R. J. Sternberg (Eds.), The crossroads of intelligence (pp. 215–242). Cambridge University Press.

Van Eerde, W., & Klingsieck, K. B. (2018). Overcoming procrastination: Thinking, feeling, and acting. European Psychologist, 23(3), 279–285. https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000338

Wang, H., Zhou, X., & Lu, C. (2021). How do employees procrastinate at work? The roles of job insecurity and self-control. Journal of Business and Psychology, 36(5), 903–916. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-020-09706-9

Wasit Directorate of Youth and Sports. (2024). Annual administrative report and regional club directory 2023–2024. Ministry of Youth and Sports, Republic of Iraq.

Zhang, S., Liu, P., & Ho, M. Y. (2022). Practical intelligence and proactive behavior among municipal administrative personnel: The mediating role of task mastery. Administrative Sciences, 12(3), 104. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci12030104