

Student Perceptions Of Flexible Deadlines

Lynne N. Kennette, PhD, Michelle Rivers, MEd,
Durham College

Keywords

flexible deadlines, student perceptions, student success, universal design for learning, UDL

Article History

Received 23 June 2024

Received in revised 18 July 2024

Accepted 22 July 2024

Available online 13 Aug 2024

 This article is published under a [Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives 4.0 International License \(CC BY-NC-ND 4.0\)](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/)

***Original Research Papers** are papers that report on original empirical research with a focus on teaching and learning. Papers may be qualitative or quantitative and include an Abstract, Introduction, Method, Results, Discussion, and Reference section, as well as any tables and/or figures.

Abstract

Instructors' course policies have an important impact on student success in our courses, as well as their perceptions of instructors. One such course policy, which is the focus of this descriptive study, is that of assessment deadlines, more specifically, the various permutations of flexible deadlines. These might include automatic extensions, short or long extensions with or without a penalty, open deadlines for submissions, or a bonus point as an incentive for meeting the deadline. In the present study, we asked students to evaluate these submission deadline policies and how they might affect their wellbeing, procrastination, and perceptions of their instructor. Although they report encountering them most frequently, students don't perceive extensions with a reduction in grade (e.g., 10% per day) as helpful for their learning and would prefer automatic non-punitive extensions to help support their success and wellbeing. Additionally, students reported that they would have a more positive view of their instructor (nicer and cares about their success) if they had a flexible deadline policy and that it would increase their satisfaction with both the course and instructor. Surprisingly, the largest number of students indicated that their preferred flexible deadline policy would be to receive a bonus for submitting it on time. Implications for policy and student success are discussed. The authors recommend that faculty who use hard/rigid deadlines consider adopting flexible deadlines to better support student success.

Introduction

As instructors, we make many pedagogical and administrative decisions when planning and delivering our courses. Choosing policies related to assessment deadlines is one such decision. Deadlines are often employed as a means of structure built into the course, which have the potential to promote or hinder student success (Koch et al., 2015; Levitin, 2019; Wyre, 2019). Seeing as policies surrounding due dates are found in almost every scholarly experience, an intentional analysis of why we implement deadlines, how they are perceived, and what effects they have are all worthwhile endeavours. Due date policies are often course-specific and individual instructors typically have the autonomy to alter these policies; thus,

such considerations may lead to different student experiences and could also affect the quality of the course and perception of the instructor.

There are various types of deadlines. There are hard/rigid deadlines, in which no late submissions are accepted. Late submissions may be accepted, with or without a penalty, such as the submission being docked marks based on how late they are (e.g., 10% per day). Another option is to offer an extension for a set period of time (e.g., 3 days) without any penalty. Alternatively, faculty could impose a penalty after a grace period; for example, after 4 days late, the penalty is 10% per day. There can also be the option for students to receive bonus marks (e.g., 1%) if they submit their work on time. In many of these cases, the extension might be automatic, while in other cases, students may have to formally request an extension (often in writing). One final option, which might be less commonly encountered in higher education, is to have an open submission deadline where there are no due dates at all until the end of the course. Some of these possibilities are not mutually exclusive and can be used together to form a highly accommodating deadline/late submission policy. For example, an instructor could allow students an automatic extension grace period of 3 days, without requiring approval and without penalty, followed by a 10% penalty per day up until 10 days late, at which point the grade is zero. These are just some examples of the many deadline structures that could be implemented to encourage flexibility and support students with both documented and undocumented accommodation needs.

An examination of the purpose behind a due date is important because the purpose should drive the policy. Why do we implement deadlines for students? Part of the answer surely lies in our own (instructor) workload management; after all, it could be highly problematic to submit final grades on time if all student work arrived in the final week(s) of the semester. However, aside from that, our rationale likely centres around student success, both during their studies as well as in their eventual careers, because workplace deadlines are a part of the working world. Scholarly due dates are meant to promote commitment and prevent procrastination (Koch et al., 2015; Levitin, 2019). Many teachers rationalize the use of inflexible deadlines as being reflective of real-world experience; however, the reality of multiple constraints of real-world deadlines compels strategies such as time management and prioritization, and workplace deadlines may be necessarily

delayed. Providing flexibility and accommodations may better reflect the workplace, where deadlines are often negotiated with supervisors or bumped rather than being set in stone (Warner, 2019). Interestingly, some research shows that rigid deadlines may be counterproductive (Hasinoff, 2022). Course deadlines assume that students submit coursework on time with ease, and they do not accommodate individual circumstances or challenges (Hills & Peacock, 2022). Evidence shows that penalties for late coursework can increase anxiety and poor grades, potentially harming the ability of students to succeed (Hasinoff, 2022). To promote student success, many educational systems have recently pivoted towards a more compassionate and inclusive learning environment that leaves space for obstacles and mistakes and supports the individual needs of students. One way this can be done is by providing the option of flexible deadlines, which decreases anxiety and helps students who may need to adapt to life complications (Hasinoff, 2022).

The decision to incorporate flexible deadlines is supported by some pedagogical literature. Offering students multiple options is in line with universal design for learning (UDL), first proposed by the Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST) (2018). The goal of the three principles of UDL (Multiple Means of Representation, Multiple Means of Engagement, and Multiple Means of Action and Expression) is to remove as many barriers as possible so that all students can be successful learners. Additionally, when courses are designed within the UDL framework, students shouldn't need to provide instructors with an access plan (e.g., allowing extra time to complete a test) because those barriers have already been removed. In the case of flexible deadlines specifically, providing students with choice and some control over how they allocate their time removes a number of barriers and supports the Multiple Means of Engagement principle of UDL, whereby students are motivated to learn and feel safe doing so (CAST, 2018). The equity and belonging approach to UDL is much more prominently focused on in the newest version of these guidelines, UDL 3.0 (CAST, 2024).

Having a flexible policy about deadlines also provides students with agency over their learning; thus, it provides options to self-regulate and an opportunity for goal setting, planning, and strategic development, all of which are important durable/transferable skills (America Succeeds, n.d.; Government of Canada, 2023; Government of Ontario, n.d.). Additionally, provisions for extra time may redirect

the student's focus to producing better quality work or performance rather than fixating on the ability to meet a set deadline (Warner, 2019). Furthermore, embedding flexible deadline policies into a course instead of evaluating individual student requests on a case-by-case basis is far more equitable for all students and aims to remove unequal barriers that students experience (CAST, 2024; Hasinoff, 2022; Hills & Peacock, 2022). Metacognition is an important component of students' cognitive growth and flexible deadlines, particularly if combined with personal reflection; because of this, students analyzing their own performance could contribute to their journey towards metacognition and lead to self-directed growth and improvements in time management and their own learning (Hills & Peacock, 2022).

Although some have reported drawbacks of using flexible deadlines in education, such as additional instructor workload (Levitin, 2019), increased student procrastination (Levitin, 2019; Walsh, 2019), and unrealistic workplace expectations, many research findings support positive outcomes from flexible deadline policies (see Patton, 2000). For example, the use of flexible deadlines has been reported to reduce student stress (Nickels & Uddin, 2003), improve the quality of student work (Hills & Peacock, 2022), and supports equity, diversity, inclusion, and belonging (EDIB; CAST, 2024).

The present study builds on the literature to investigate students' experience with and perceptions of flexible deadlines. We will examine what type of flexibility has been experienced by students at our institution as well as what they perceive to be helpful to them in their learning. Additionally, this study will investigate how the use of flexible deadlines might impact students' perceptions about their instructor. By describing this aspect of using flexible deadlines, we hope to gain additional insight about supporting student success, wellbeing (broadly defined), and student satisfaction.

Method

Participants

Participants ($N = 45$) were students enrolled in a course offered by the Faculty of Liberal Studies in the Winter 2024 or Spring 2024 semester at a technical college in Ontario, Canada. These courses were primarily general elective courses but also included communication courses and courses within the General Arts and Science certificate program. As such, the recruitment of students was collegewide as all programs at the college take at least one

general education or communications course offered by the Faculty of Liberal Studies (the demographic data collected confirmed this). Participant demographics showed that 71% of respondents were female (27% male, and one (2%) identified as non-binary). Ages ranged from 18 to 50, with a mean of 23.16. The most common age of respondents was 19 years old (24%). More than one-third (36%) of respondents were studying in the Faculty of Liberal Studies (in which there is only one program, General Arts and Science). The remaining participants were studying in other Faculties: Science, Engineering, and Information Technology (11%); Health Sciences (11%); Business (11%); Social and Community Services (9%); Media, Art, and Design (9%); Hospitality and Horticultural Sciences (4%) and 7% weren't sure or preferred not to disclose ($n = 3$).

International students made up 11% of the sample. Some (29%) identified that they had childcare responsibilities (either their own child/ren or that of younger siblings), approximately one-quarter had an individualized education plan (a special education plan to support unique learning needs and which may include modifications to instruction, or additional support and/or services) in high school (24%) and most (76%) indicated that they were not registered with the Access and Support Centre for an accommodation (note: of those who were registered with the office, almost all (82%) had flexible deadlines as part of their accommodation).

Materials

The survey used can be found in Appendix A and contained 31 questions. These questions were developed based on a review of the literature, with a focus on what had been previously reported as the benefits of using flexible deadlines in higher education. The authors formulated the questions to try to shed some light on the research questions that guided this project. Due to a limited subject pool at the college, the survey was not normed or tested, and no psychometric properties were available. The questions focused primarily on students' submission behaviours (e.g., when they are likely to submit assignments), their experience of specific flexible deadlines in their classes (which they had experienced in their classes) and the perceived benefits of flexible deadlines more generally. Finally, we also asked whether they perceived various forms of flexible deadlines as beneficial for their success in the course, which specific flexible deadline they would prefer if given a choice, and if flexible deadlines would have an effect on their satisfaction with the course or teacher

of the course. The survey was presented through Microsoft Forms, an online survey tool which allowed for the anonymous collection of responses.

Procedure

After approval from the institutional ethics board, the researchers asked their colleagues in the Faculty of Liberal Studies to share the research opportunity with their students via email as well as through an announcement in their learning management system. It is not known how many faculty shared the invitation with their students. Invited students who wished to participate read the consent form, which was sent to them with the invitation and clicked on the anonymous online survey link to answer the questions. Students were allowed to skip any question, though very few did: 2 questions were skipped by two different respondents (likely accidentally) across the entire sample (.001%). Once finished, participants were thanked for their time. No compensation was offered to participants, and surveys were completed anonymously.

Results and Discussion

We examined the data in order to describe student perceptions of various aspects of flexible deadlines, including their experience with different types of flexible deadlines and their impact on students' perceptions of their instructors.

When we asked students how early they usually completed their assigned work, 33.33% indicated that it was completed "a day or two before the deadline," 28.89% indicated that they completed it "earlier than 2 days before the deadline" and another 28.89% said they completed it "the same day as the deadline but many hours before." When asked when they were likely to submit their completed assignment, 37.78% responded that they typically submitted it "the same day as the deadline but many hours before," while 24.44% answered "a day or two before the deadline, 15.56% said they'd turn it in just prior to the deadline, and 13.33% indicated that they'd submit it more than two days ahead of the deadline.

It is perhaps surprising that no student indicated that they normally complete their work after the deadline has passed. One possible explanation for this relates to our sample itself; perhaps students who are likely to submit their work late did not elect to complete our survey. If this is the case, future research should attempt to capture this sub-sample of the student population. A second possibility is that students attempted to present themselves in a more positive light to

the researchers (social desirability effect; Chung & Monroe, 2003; Phillips & Clancy, 1972; Zerbe & Paulhus, 1987). Although the survey was anonymous, students might have been enrolled in the researchers' courses and, consequently, could have wanted to appear more positively. A third option is that students inaccurately perceived their own behaviours related to meeting deadlines, particularly if it served a self-preservation objective, preserving their self-esteem or academic identity, which has been reported in other areas of the scholarly literature (e.g., Barr, 2007; Bailey & Wundersitz, 2019; Baumeister, 1997; Polivy et al., 2014; Stirratt et al., 2015). Future research may wish to include a more objective measure of behaviour rather than solely relying on self-reported perceptions of students' own behaviours.

Students reported experiencing many kinds of deadline policies in their courses (see [Table 1](#)), but when asked to select only one policy which best represented the most common policy they experienced in their courses, 37.78% ($n = 17$) selected short-term flexibility with a penalty (e.g., 1-3 days late, 10% penalty per day), followed by rigid deadlines where no late submissions were accepted (15.56%, $n = 7$).

[Table 2](#) shows the number of students who indicated each Likert-type response for how helpful each type of deadline would be for them. Although reported as the most frequently occurring (above), short-term extensions with a penalty were not perceived to be particularly helpful to students. Instead, students reported that earning a bonus point for meeting a deadline, an automatic short-term extension, or a long-term extension would be the most helpful. They also reported that it would be helpful to have extensions available, even if they have to ask for them, though, as Levitin (2019) and Whillans et al. (2022) have noted, not all students feel comfortable asking for an extension, so including these flexible deadlines also supports equity in the classroom (CAST, 2024). Although students report a preference for not imposing a penalty for late assignments, Korpusik et al. (2022) reported that students demonstrated the worst performance (i.e., grades) when it was available for a lab assignment, so future research should examine this possible downside of flexible deadlines in college students. Most students indicated that not having any deadlines until the end of the semester would not be at all helpful to their learning, which is supported by the literature. Miller and Schmidt (2021) found that having regular (weekly) deadlines resulted in positive outcomes for students by way of retention of information and demonstrated by better

Table 1 Percent and raw number of students indicating that they had experienced each of the deadline policies.

Policy	n	Percent
Short term extension with penalty	34	75.56
Hard/rigid deadlines (no late submissions accepted)	33	73.33
Must ask for an extension	25	55.56
Short term extension without penalty	26	57.78
Automatic short-term extension	19	42.22
Long-term extension without penalty	9	20.00
Long term extension without penalty	7	15.56
There are no due dates until the end of the semester	4	8.89
Bonus point if submitted on time	3	6.67

Note: As this was a multi-select question, students could select as many policies as they had experienced.

Table 2 Frequencies for Likert-type responses of how beneficial/helpful each deadline policy is.

Policy	1 (very helpful)	2	3	4	5 (not at all helpful)	Mean (SD)
Bonus point if submitted on time	27	12	3	2	1	1.62 (0.96)
Automatic short-term extension	25	12	7	0	1	1.67 (0.91)
Short term extension without penalty	23	12	7	1	2	1.88 (1.07)
Must ask for an extension	22	13	5	4	1	1.87 (1.08)
Long term extension without penalty	16	7	4	9	9	2.73 (1.60)
Hard/rigid deadlines (no late submissions accepted)	8	12	7	8	10	3.00 (1.45)
There are no due dates until the end of the semester	6	7	7	9	16	3.49 (1.46)
Long-term extension without penalty	5	15	8	8	9	3.02 (1.34)
Short term extension with penalty	1	17	10	8	9	3.16 (1.21)

Note: High scores (5) indicate a policy that is less helpful.

performance on an exam at the end of the semester. It's encouraging to note that students are self-aware enough to know that not having regular due dates to keep them on track would not help them be successful.

Of significant interest to us was students' perceptions of the effect that flexible deadline policies (broadly defined) would have on their lives. To this end, we asked about the various aspects of their wellbeing (see [Table 3](#)). In all cases, the majority of students strongly agreed that flexible deadline policies would have a positive impact on their wellbeing.

We also asked students about their perception of flexible deadlines as they related to the workplace and their teachers (see [Table 4](#)). Students were divided on the effects that flexible deadlines would have on their procrastination and whether allowing for flexible deadlines is disconnected from the realities of the workplace. Employees report that more than half of their work-related tasks have somewhat flexible deadlines but that employees (and particularly women) rarely ask for extensions for fear of being perceived as less competent, even if it is clear that the deadlines are flexible (Whillans et al., 2022). This likely manifests itself in our

Table 3 Summary of respondent agreement with various statements related to wellbeing.

Policy	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Flexible deadlines would improve my overall wellbeing	27 (60.00%)	9 (20.00%)	2 (4.4%)	7 (15.56%)	0
Flexible deadlines would help with my mental health challenges	26 (57.78%)	12 (26.67%)	2 (4.4%)	5 (11.11%)	0
Flexible deadlines would reduce the amount of stress I experience	28 (62.22%)	8 (17.78%)	4 (8.89%)	4 (8.89%)	1 (2.22%)
Flexible deadlines would allow me to improve my performance in the course	23 (51.11%)	10 (22.22%)	5 (11.11%)	5 (11.11%)	2 (4.44%)
Flexible deadlines would help me be successful even if I procrastinate	20 (44.44%)	7 (15.56%)	7 (15.56%)	10 (22.22%)	1 (2.22%)
Flexible deadlines would help me balance my workload across multiple courses	30 (66.67%)	9 (20.00%)	4 (8.89%)	2 (4.44%)	0
Flexible deadlines would make course work more equitable for all students	24 (53.33%)	9 (20.00%)	8 (17.78%)	3 (6.67%)	1 (2.22%)

Note: Both raw numbers (*n*) and percentages are reported.

classrooms in a similar way. It is possible that students' limited work experience (often in entry-level jobs) has coloured their perspective on workplace flexibility. Unlike Whillans et al. (2022), who included workers of all ages, our college student sample is primarily comprised of young adults who may have mainly experienced rigid deadlines (e.g., arriving on time for their shift). Future research should continue to explore the potential future impact of flexible deadlines in higher education on students' ultimate success in various workplaces.

There is also evidence that self-imposed deadlines encourage procrastination and that externally imposed deadlines help to reduce procrastination (Ariely & Wertenbroch, 2002). Additionally, in terms of the proportion of students who submit assignments, late policies do have an impact, with the highest submission rates being encountered when there is only a small allowed extension, but adding a penalty to the extension didn't increase submission rates and was no different than having a hard/rigid deadline with no late work accepted (Walsh, 2019). In terms of procrastination, Walsh (2019) found that when there was too much flexibility (allowing work to be submitted one week or more past the deadline), procrastination actually increased and led to even fewer submissions of assignments than if there had been a rigid due date. As others have also proposed, deadlines in the

"real world" are rarely as inflexible as rigid assignment deadlines are in a classroom (Green, 2017). As such, the argument that faculty sometimes put forward to support rigid deadlines (that they are preparing students for the hard deadlines of the working world) doesn't appear to be factual. Instead, providing less rigid deadlines might actually better help to support students in their future careers by allowing them to develop transferable skills like time management and metacognition.

Students disagreed that including flexible deadlines would reduce their development of time management skills because they would use them all the time. Additionally, students reported more positive perceptions of their teachers if they were to use flexible deadlines.

When asked how much the use of flexible deadlines would increase their overall satisfaction with a teacher, 44.44% said "a lot," 28.89% answered "somewhat," and 26.67% answered "no change." Importantly, no student indicated that a flexible deadline policy would decrease their satisfaction with a teacher.

When asked whether flexible deadlines would increase their overall satisfaction with a course, 55.56% said "a lot," and 28.89% answered "somewhat," while "no change" accounted

Table 4 Respondent agreement with various statements related to perceptions of teachers and flexible deadlines.

Policy	Strongly Agree	Agree	Neither Agree nor Disagree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
I would submit work later if I was provided with flexible deadlines	9 (20.00%)	11 (24.44%)	9 (20.00%)	11 (24.44%)	5 (11.11%)
In the real world, many workplaces have flexible deadlines	5 (11.11%)	5 (11.11%)	14 (31.11%)	14 (31.11%)	7 (15.56%)
Because many real-world workplaces do not have flexible deadlines, allowing them in school sets an unrealistic expectation	7 (15.56%)	12 (26.67%)	8 (17.76%)	11 (24.44%)	7 (15.56%)
Flexible deadlines would cause me to procrastinate (or procrastinate more)	8 (17.76%)	11 (24.44%)	13 (28.89%)	8 (17.76%)	5 (11.11%)
If I was provided with a flexible deadline, I would still wait until the last minute to complete my work	4 (8.89%)	11 (24.44%)	8 (17.76%)	14 (31.11%)	8 (17.76%)
I would use flexible deadlines all the time, so I wouldn't learn time management skills	6 (13.33%)	5 (11.11%)	8 (17.76%)	16 (35.56%)	10 (22.22%)
A teacher with flexible deadlines is nicer	12 (26.67%)	16 (35.56%)	12 (26.67%)	4 (8.89%)	1 (2.22%)
A teacher with flexible deadlines cares more about my academic success	15 (33.33%)	16 (35.56%)	8 (17.76%)	4 (8.89%)	2 (4.44%)
A teacher with flexible deadlines cares more about me	13 (28.89%)	11 (24.44%)	12 (26.67%)	7 (15.56%)	2 (4.44%)

Note: Both raw numbers (*n*) and percentages are reported.

for 11.11% of responses, and 4.4% of students indicated that their course satisfaction would actually decrease if flexible deadlines were part of the course.

Finally, to help summarize their views on flexible deadlines, we asked students if they had to choose only one policy related to deadlines which would be applied to all of their courses, which one policy they would choose. [Table 5](#) shows their responses. It appears that students would prefer a bonus for submitting their work on time, followed by a short-term no-penalty extension. The preference for a bonus/reward for on-time submissions was somewhat surprising, but others have reported similar positive student perceptions toward this policy (e.g., Becker, 2006; Korpusik et al., 2022). It is possible that, in line with the predictions of Kahneman and Tversky's (1979) prospect theory, students are interpreting these flexible deadlines to minimize losses (penalties) and maximize gains (bonus point). In this way, they are weighing their flexible deadline choices to avoid the risk of a loss and

placing greater value on the potential gain afforded by the bonus point. Alternatively, students may have been comparing the example on the survey itself in terms of absolute value (1 point as a bonus versus a 10-point reduction as a penalty). Future studies may be able to tease apart this finding by testing a number of different variations on bonuses for on-time submissions and penalties for late submissions, including framing the policy in a loss-aversion versus benefit-gained description to see why students seem to prefer bonuses over penalties (and whether that remains the case in these various manipulations).

Impact and Conclusion

Overall, students seemed to agree that flexible deadline policies are beneficial to their learning, wellbeing, and result in more positive perceptions of their teachers.

One limitation of the present study is that it was an online survey which asked students about their perceptions,

Table 5 Summary of students who selected each policy as their preferred policy to be used in all of their courses.

Policy	n	Percent
Bonus if submitted on time (example: 1% bonus)	17	37.78
Short term no penalty (example: 1-3 days late, no marks lost)	9	20.00
Automatic short term extension (example: due Friday, but can submit until Sunday with no penalty)	6	13.33
Must ask for an extension before the due date but it will probably be granted	4	8.89
There are no due dates until the end of the course	4	8.89
Short term with penalty (example: 1-3 days late, 10% penalty per day)	2	4.44
Hard/rigid deadline (no late submissions accepted)	1	2.22
Long term no penalty (example: 4-10 days late, no penalty)	1	2.22
Long term with penalty (example: after 4 days late, penalty is 10% per day)	1	2.22

Note: Both raw numbers (*n*) and percentages are reported.

which can sometimes be biased, particularly if tied to an emotionally salient memory (Kensinger, 2007; Tversky & Kahneman, 1973). However, self-report data are widely used and do tend to be relatively accurate (Baldwin, 2000; Chan, 2009). Future research should gather data in multiple ways to provide convergence on the findings presented here. Additionally, it's unclear whether these policies would actually result in improved performance and/or wellbeing for students. An experimental manipulation of multiple types of flexible deadlines might help to tease apart whether any such benefits would manifest.

In addition to what has been discussed thus far, there are certainly many additional interesting opportunities for future studies to build on the present data. For example, expanding our sample to include students from various types of academic programs (particularly highly competitive and/or rigorous ones) to see whether their perceptions differ from what has been reported here. Similarly, students with greater time constraints (e.g., mature learners or those balancing heavy work and/or family obligations) might prefer more flexible deadlines due to these constraints. Despite these limitations, this descriptive study suggests that college students do perceive flexible deadlines in a positive way for their own wellbeing and learning success, as well as having a positive impact on their perception of teachers and courses. As such, faculty who use hard/rigid deadlines should consider adopting one or more of the flexible deadline options which

better align with UDL, equity and learner needs, and which may better support students in their learning.

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Note on Contributor

Lynne N. Kennette, PhD, Durham College (Professor of Psychology, Oshawa, Ontario, Canada, lynne.kennette@durhamcollege.ca). Dr. Kennette is a Professor of psychology in three areas: General Education courses, General Arts and Science program, and degree breadth courses. In addition, she serves as a member of the Research Ethics Board and in the liaison role of Research Coordinator for the Faculty of Liberal Studies. Her research interests focus on areas of scholarship of teaching and learning (SoTL) and include universal design for learning (UDL), and various other aspects of student learning and success, topics on which she has published many scholarly articles.

Michelle Rivers, MEd, Durham College (Professor, General Education, Oshawa, Ontario, Canada, michelle.rivers@durhamcollege.ca). Michelle Rivers is a Professor at Durham College in the Faculty of Liberal Studies in General Education.

References

America Succeeds (n.d.). *Durable Skills*. Retrieved June 19, 2024. <https://durablekills.org/about/>

- Ariely D., Wertenbroch K. (2002). Procrastination, deadlines, and performance: Self-control by precommitment. *Psychological Science*, 13, 219–224. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9280.00441>
- Barr, S. (2007). Factors influencing environmental attitudes and behaviors: A U.K. case study of household waste management. *Environmental Behavior*, 39(4), 435-473. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0013916505283421>
- Bailey, T. J., & Wundersitz, L. N. (2019). The relationship between self-reported and actual driving-related behaviours: A literature review. Centre for Automotive Safety Research, *The University of Adelaide*. <https://casr.adelaide.edu.au/publications/list/?id=1820>
- Baldwin, W. (2000). Information no one else knows: The value of self-report. In A. A. Stone, J. S. Turkkan, C. A. Bachrach, J. B. Jobe, H. S. Kurtzman, & V. S. Cain (Eds.), *The science of self-report: Implications for research and practice* (pp. 3–7). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Baumeister, R. F. (1997). Identity, self-concept, and self-esteem: The self lost and found. In *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 681-710). Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-012134645-4/50027-5>
- Becker, K. (2006). *Death to deadlines: A 21st century look at the use of deadlines and late penalties in programming assignments*. <https://prism.ucalgary.ca/server/api/core/bitstreams/2335199f-d2db-4fc1-897e-14c49c560dbd/content>
- CAST (2018). *Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 2.2*. Retrieved from <https://udlguidelines.cast.org/more/downloads/#v2-2>
- CAST (2024). *Universal Design for Learning Guidelines version 3.0*. Retrieved from <https://udlguidelines.cast.org>
- Chan, D. (2009). So why ask me? Are self report data really that bad? In C. E. Lance & R. J. Vandenberg (Eds.), *Statistical and methodological myths and urban legends: Doctrine, verity and fable in the organizational and social sciences* (pp. 309-335). Routledge.
- Chung, J., & Monroe, G. S. (2003). Exploring social desirability bias. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 44, 291-302. <https://doi.org/10.1023/a:1023648703356>
- Government of Canada (2023). *Learn about the Skills*. Skills for Success. Retrieved June 19, 2024. <https://www.canada.ca/en/services/jobs/training/initiatives/skills-success/understanding-individuals.html>
- Government of Ontario (n.d.). *Transferable Skills*. Curriculum and Resources. Retrieved June 19, 2024. <https://www.dcp.edu.gov.on.ca/en/transferable-skills/introduction>
- Green, J. (2017, January 23). Deadlines in the real world. *Inside Higher Ed*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/blogs/just-visiting/deadlines-real-world>
- Hasinoff, A. A. (2022, March 1). Do late penalties do more harm than good? *Inside Higher Ed*. <https://www.insidehighered.com/advice/2022/03/02/why-instructors-should-drop-late-penalties-their-courses-opinion>
- Hills, M. & Peacock, K. (2022). Replacing power with flexible structure: Implementing flexible deadlines to improve student learning experiences. *Teaching & Learning Inquiry* 10. <https://doi.org/10.20343/teachlearninqu.10.26>
- Kahneman, D. & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 363-391. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1914185>
- Kensinger, E. A. (2007). Negative emotion enhances memory accuracy: Behavioral and neuroimaging evidence. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 16(4), 213–218. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2007.00506.x>
- Koch A., Nafziger J., & Nielsen H. S. (2015). Behavioral economics of education. *Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization*, 115, 3–17.
- Korpusik, M., Freitas, J., & Dionisio, J. D. (2022, August). Impact of Late Policies on Submission Behavior and Grades in Computer Programming. *2022 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition*. <http://people.csail.mit.edu/korpusik/asee22.pdf>
- Levitin, D. J. (2019, September 22). The deadline dilemma. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. <https://www.chronicle.com/article/the-deadline-dilemma/>
- Miller, L. A., & Schmidt, J. R. (2021). The effects of online assignments and weekly deadlines on student outcomes in a macroeconomics course. *The American Economist*, 66(1), 46-60. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0569434520968250>
- Nickels, K., & Uddin, M. (2003). The impact on student learning of resubmission of work and flexible deadlines. *Proceedings of the 2003 ASEE Gulf-Southwest Annual Conference, Arlington, Texas*. <http://www.cs.trinity.edu/~knickels/pubs/NicUdd-aseegsw03.pdf>
- Patton, M. A. (2000). The importance of being flexible with assignment deadlines. *Higher Education in Europe*, 25(3), 417-423. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713669270>
- Perkins, M. (2013, January 28). Late work: Penalty or process? *Faculty Focus*. <https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/effective-classroom-management/late-work-penalty/>
- Phillips, D. L., & Clancy, K. J. (1972). Some effects of "social desirability" in survey studies. *American Journal of Sociology*, 77(5), 921-940. <https://doi.org/10.1086/2250000>

org/10.1086/225231

- Polivy, J., Herman. C. P., Trottier, K., & Sidhu R. (2014). Who are you trying to fool: Does weight underreporting by dieters reflect self-protection or self-presentation? *Health Psychology Review*, 8(3), 319-338. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17437199.2013.775630>
- Stirratt, M. J., Dunbar-Jacob, J., Crane, H. M., Simoni, J. M., Czajkowski, S., Hilliard, M. E., Aikens, J. E., Hunter, C. M., Velligan, D. I., Huntley, K., Ogedegbe, G., Rand, C. S., Scron, E., & Nilsen, W. J. (2015). Self-report measures of medication adherence behavior: Recommendations on optimal use. *Translational Behavioral Medicine*, 5(4), 470-482. <https://doi.org/10.1007%2Fs13142-015-0315-2>
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1973). Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and probability. *Cognitive Psychology*, 5(2), 207-232. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285\(73\)90033-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(73)90033-9)
- Walsh, M. L. (2019). Flexible deadlines and their effect on the turn in rate of assignments in a high school chemistry class. <https://scholarworks.montana.edu/items/24230d82-27cd-43d2-97f0-e5934468718b>
- Whillans, A. V., Yoon, J., & Donnelly, G. (2022). People overestimate the self-presentation costs of deadline extension requests. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 98, Article 104253. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2021.104253>
- Wyre, S. (2019, August 19). Late work: Penalty or process? *Faculty Focus*. <https://www.facultyfocus.com/articles/effective-classroom-management/late-work-penalty/>
- Zerbe, W. J., & Paulhus, D. L. (1987). Socially desirable responding in organizational behavior: A reconception. *Academy of Management Review*, 12(2), 250-264. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1987.4307820>

Appendix A- Survey Questions

1. **Gender: man, woman, non-binary, other, prefer not to answer**
2. **Age (textbox)**
3. **Are you an international student?**
 - Yes
 - No
 - Prefer not to answer
4. **Please select the academic Faculty of the program you are currently studying:**
 - Science, Engineering & Information Technology
 - Business
 - Liberal Studies
 - Professional & Part-Time Learning
 - Social and Community Services
 - Health Sciences
 - Media, Art & Design
 - Skilled Trades & Apprenticeship
 - Hospitality & Horticultural Sciences
 - Unsure
 - Prefer not to answer
5. **Do you have any childcare responsibilities? This could be your own children, younger siblings, etc.**
 - Yes
 - No
6. **Did you have an Individualized Educational Plan (IEP) in high school?**
 - Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
 - Prefer not to answer
7. **Are you registered for accommodations with the Access and Support Centre (ASC)?**
 - Yes
 - No
 - Unsure
 - Prefer not to answer
 - **If yes 7b:** Does your Access Plan include being able to negotiate flexible deadlines/extensions with faculty? (Yes/No/Unsure/Prefer not to answer)

8. Suppose you have an assignment due on Friday at 11:59pm. When do you typically COMPLETE your assignment?

- Earlier than 2 days before the deadline
- A day or two before the deadline
- The same day as the deadline but many hours before
- Just before the deadline (after 11pm)
- At the very last minute
- A little bit after the deadline (a little after midnight)
- Within the first 24 hours after the deadline (sometime on Saturday)
- Right before any extended deadline (example: penalty of 10% per day for 3 days, so you would complete it on Monday)

9. Suppose you have an assignment due on Friday at 11:59pm. When do you typically SUBMIT your assignment?

- Earlier than 2 days before the deadline
- A day or two before the deadline
- The same day as the deadline but many hours before
- Just before the deadline (after 11pm)
- At the very last minute
- A little bit after the deadline (a little after midnight)
- Within the first 24 hours after the deadline (sometime on Saturday)
- Right before any extended deadline (example: penalty of 10% per day for 3 days, so you would submit it on Monday)

10. Which of the following due date policies have your teachers used? Select ALL policies that you have seen within your college classes. IF YOU HAVE AN ACCOMMODATION FOR FLEXIBLE DEADLINES, PLEASE THINK OF THE COURSE POLICIES AND NOT YOUR INDIVIDUAL ACCOMMODATION.

- Hard/rigid deadline (no late submissions accepted)
- Bonus if submitted on time (example: 1% bonus)
- Short term no penalty (example: 1-3 days late, no marks lost)
- Short term with penalty (example: 1-3 days late, 10% penalty per day)
- Long term no penalty (example: 4-10 days late, no penalty)
- Long term with penalty (example: after 4 days late, penalty is 10% per day)
- Automatic short term extension (example: due on Friday, but you can submit until Sunday with no

penalty and you don't have to ask teacher)

- Must ask for an extension but it will probably be granted (example: emailing your teacher on a Thursday and ask if you can submit it 48 hours late)
- There are no due dates until the end of the course
- Other (please specify)

11. Which of these is the one due date policy you saw the most? Select the ONE that has been used the most within your college classes. IF YOU HAVE AN ACCOMMODATION FOR FLEXIBLE DEADLINES, PLEASE THINK OF THE COURSE POLICIES AND NOT YOUR INDIVIDUAL ACCOMMODATION.

- Hard/rigid deadline (no late submissions accepted)
- Bonus if submitted on time (example: 1% bonus)
- Short term no penalty (example: 1-3 days late, no marks lost)
- Short term with penalty (example: 1-3 days late, 10% penalty per day)
- Long term no penalty (example: 4-10 days late, no penalty)
- Long term with penalty (example: after 4 days late, penalty is 10% per day)
- Automatic short term extension (example: due on Friday, but you can submit until Sunday with no penalty and you don't have to ask teacher)
- Must ask for an extension but it will probably be granted (example: emailing your teacher on a Thursday and ask if you can submit it 48 hours late)
- There are no due dates until the end of the course
- Other (please specify)

Instructions: Please choose your level of agreement with each of the following statements. We are interested in what you think, whether or not you have experienced flexible deadlines. For these questions, the term "flexible deadlines" refers to any due date which is not a hard/rigid deadline where no late submissions are accepted.

12. Flexible deadlines would improve my overall wellbeing.

- Strongly Agree
- Agree
- Neither Agree nor Disagree
- Disagree
- Strongly Disagree

Survey questions continued to next page...

13. Flexible deadlines would help with my mental health challenges.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
14. Flexible deadlines would reduce the amount of stress I experience.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
15. Flexible deadlines would allow me to improve my work/performance in the course.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
16. Flexible deadlines would help me be successful even if I procrastinate.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
17. Flexible deadlines would help me balance my workload across multiple courses.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
18. Flexible deadlines would make course work more equitable for all students.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
19. I would submit work later if I was provided with flexible deadlines.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
20. In the real world, many workplaces have flexible deadlines.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
21. Because many real world workplaces do not have flexible deadlines, allowing them in school sets an unrealistic expectation.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
22. A teacher with flexible deadlines is nicer.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
23. A teacher with flexible deadlines cares more about my academic success.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
24. A teacher with flexible deadlines cares more about me.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree

25. Flexible deadlines would cause me to procrastinate (or procrastinate more).
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
26. If I was provided with a flexible deadline I would still wait until the last minute to complete my work.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
27. I would use flexible deadlines all the time, so I would not learn time management skills.
- Strongly Agree
 - Agree
 - Neither Agree nor Disagree
 - Disagree
 - Strongly Disagree
28. Please indicate how helpful/beneficial each of the flexible deadline policy would be for you (1- VERY helpful/beneficial for my success) to 5 (NOT AT ALL helpful to my success)
- Hard/rigid deadline (no late submissions accepted)
 - Bonus if submitted on time (example: 1% bonus)
 - Short term no penalty (example: 1-3 days late, no marks lost)
 - Short term with penalty (example: 1-3 days late, 10% penalty per day)
 - Long term no penalty (example: 4-10 days late, no penalty)
 - Long term with penalty (example: after 4 days late, penalty is 10% per day)
 - Automatic short term extension (example: due on Friday, but you can submit until Sunday with no penalty and you don't have to ask teacher)
 - Must ask for an extension but it will probably be granted (example: emailing your teacher on a Thursday and ask if you can submit it 48 hours late)
 - There are no due dates until the end of the course
29. If you could choose ONLY ONE, which due date policy would you prefer to see in all of your classes?
- Hard/rigid deadline (no late submissions accepted)
 - Bonus if submitted on time (example: 1% bonus)
 - Short term no penalty (example: 1-3 days late, no marks lost)
 - Short term with penalty (example: 1-3 days late, 10% penalty per day)
 - Long term no penalty (example: 4-10 days late, no penalty)
 - Long term with penalty (example: after 4 days late, penalty is 10% per day)
 - Automatic short term extension (example: due on Friday, but you can submit until Sunday with no penalty and you don't have to ask teacher)
 - Must ask for an extension but it will probably be granted (example: emailing your teacher on a Thursday and ask if you can submit it 48 hours late)
 - There are no due dates until the end of the course
30. Flexible deadlines would increase my overall satisfaction with a course.
- A lot
 - Somewhat
 - No change
 - My overall course satisfaction would decrease
31. Flexible deadlines would increase my overall satisfaction with a teacher.
- A lot
 - Somewhat
 - No change
 - My overall teacher satisfaction would decrease