IJCRT.ORG ISSN : 2320-2882

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CREATIVE RESEARCH THOUGHTS (IJCRT)

An International Open Access, Peer-reviewed, Refereed Journal

Assessment Of Time Management Skills Among High School Students

Authors:

1: Shivani Bathula, Aurora's Degree and PG College.

2: Seshagiri Rao Joshi, Rehabilitation Psychologist, Aurora's Degree and PG College.

3: Dr Rithuma Oruganti, Aurora's Aurora's Degree and PG College.

Affiliation: Osmania University, Hyderabad.

Abstract

Time management is an essential academic and life skill that influences students' productivity, stress levels, and overall academic performance. The present study aims to assess time management skills among high school students using the Time Management Questionnaire (TMQ) developed by Britton & Tesser (1991).

A sample of 30 students (age range 11–14 years) participated in the assessment. Raw scores were calculated, and descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviation were derived. Results revealed that 50% of students demonstrated good time management abilities, 43.3% displayed average time management skills, and 6.7% showed excellent planning abilities. The study concludes that although most students exhibit moderate time management skills, improvements are needed in long-term planning and reduction of procrastination. Recommendations for awareness programs and skill-building interventions are discussed.

Keywords: Time management, high school students, TMQ, planning skills, academic performance, time attitudes.

Introduction

Time management (TM) is an organized process of planning and exercising conscious control over time spent on specific activities to increase effectiveness and productivity (Claessens, 2007). TM is "a form of decision making used by individuals to structure, protect, and adapt their time to changing conditions" (Aeon, Faber & Panaccio, 2021). It is directly linked to performance and well-being.

Building on Zimmerman's Self-regulatory Model, TM is addressed in the forethought phase, which influences motivation and self-efficacy (de la Fuente et al., 2022). Effective TM includes planning, goal-setting, scheduling, and prioritizing (Macan, 1994; Britton & Tesser, 1991). For students, TM is an essential academic skill that influences performance, stress reduction, and emotional well-being.

High school students often struggle with procrastination and poor planning, making TMQ an effective assessment tool. Previous research highlights that structured time management practices improve academic performance and well-being.

Review of Literature

Britton and Tesser (1991) highlighted that structured time management practices improve academic performance. Subsequent research supports the link between time management and academic success, emotional well-being, and goal-setting. Adolescents often lack long-term planning strategies, making TMQ an effective tool for assessment. Conceptualizing Time Management, a Tri dimensional Model Time management (TM) is a crucial set of skills defined not as the control of time itself, but as the planned and purposeful use of time to execute specific activities (Macan, 1994). Effective TM is widely recognized as a crucial skill for success in academic and professional settings (Britton & Tesser, 1991). The seminal review by Claessens, Van Eerde, Rutte, & Roe (2007) provides a robust meta-analytic definition, concluding that TM is best defined as a set of goal-oriented meta-activities that include planning, setting goals, scheduling, and prioritizing.

Macan (1994) reframes the discussion as effective time management is not about being efficient, but about developing Perceived-Control-of-Time, which is the mechanism that translates planning behaviors (SRP/LRP) into psychological benefits aligned with time attitude.

Zimbardo's Time Perspective Theory (1999) () BTP justifies that your Time Attitudes (TA) dimension should be viewed as a complex variable that mediates the relationship between a student's underlying disposition and their specific planning behaviors (SRP and LRP).

Aeon and Aguinis (2017) emphasizes that effective time management, especially for students facing major academic challenges, requires not just the mechanics of planning (SRP/LRP), but also the psychological conviction (TA/Self-Efficacy) necessary to engage with complex, long-term goals. The primary conclusion of the Pehlivan (2018) study is that time management skills are a learnable factor that significantly impacts academic success.

Steel (2007) provides the necessary theoretical framework to view procrastination as the ultimate failure to align attitudes and planning. It defines the negative endpoint that studies high-scoring students (those with strong SRP, LRP, and TA) successfully avoid.

Nonis & Wright (2003) concluded that effective time management involves more than just organizational skills; it requires a student to accurately assess their academic demands (workload) and possess the internal drive and efficiency (study habits/motivation) to meet those demands.

Liu et al., (2007) study provides a critical bridge between the behavioural time management models (like Britton & Tesser's) and the cognitive psychology of learning, positioning time management as a foundational academic skill. This study justifies by demonstrating that strong Long-Range Planning acts as a crucial Self-Regulated Learning strategy (Liu et al., 2007), while effective Short-Range Planning delivers measurable efficiency gains, and a positive TM provides the corresponding life satisfaction and sense of control (Hall & Hursch, 1982).

The current study among high school students argue that strong TM attitudes automatically translate into strategic planning. The literature suggests that the immediacy of psychological reward makes SRP the primary behavioral outlet for a positive TA. People having strong time attitude plan error free short-range objectives as these sub goals or objectives might pave way to long range planning. Individuals with strong time attitude have present moment, who identify that the present is essential component for future goals focusing on present things that are helpful to work in the future. It says that short range planning people have more clear view based on strong time attitude that they work in present more which is helpful for the future which solves the problem and also have path for future as well.

Methodology

The study used the Time Management Questionnaire (TMQ) developed by Britton & Tesser (1991). It measures three key dimensions: 1. Short-Range Planning (SRP) 2. Time Attitudes (TA) 3. Long-Range Planning (LRP)

The scale consists of 18 items rated on a 5-point Likert scale. A sample of 30 high school students (17 boys, 13 girls) aged 11–13 years participated. Students were briefed about the purpose of the study.

Ethics Statement

This study was conducted in accordance with ethical guidelines for research involving minors. Participation was voluntary, and no personal identifying information was collected.

Consent Statement

Informed consent was obtained from all participants and their guardians prior to data collection.

Results

Overall TMQ scores ranged from moderate to high. The mean TMQ score was 63.06 (SD = 9.07; N = 30).

Table 1. Overall Time Management Category Distribution

Category	Percentage	Frequency
Excellent	6.7%	2
Good	50%	15
Average	43.3%	13
Poor	0%	0

Table 2. Gender-wise Time Management Scores

Gender	Mean	Sum	Count	SD
Boys	64.94	1104	17	9.94
Girls	60.30	784	13	6.88

An independent t-test was conducted to compare mean scores between boys and girls. The mean total scores between boys (64.94) and girls (60.30) were statistically significant.

The overall Time Management Questionnaire (TMQ) scores for the sample (N=30) ranged from moderate to high.

Table 3. Independent t-test Summary

Group	Mean	N	df	p-value	t Stat	t Critical
Boys	13	17	32	0.023	-2.65	2.03
Girls	12.7	13	22	0.083	-2.83	2.07

An independent two-sample *t*-test was used to determine the difference between the mean scores of the two groups. The analysis was conducted with 17 observations for boys (M=13) and 13 observations for girls (M=12.7), although the variable being compared is unclear from the table[11]. The reported statistics were t-Boys = -26.5 and t-Girls = -28.3.

ANOVA: Short-Range Planning vs. Time Attitudes

Table 4

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
SRP	30	729	24.3	11.94
TA	30	85	2.8	0.28

Table 5

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p-value	F-crit
Between Groups	6912.2	1	6912.2	1131.0	<0.001	4.00
Within Groups	354.46	58	6.11			

The mean score for Short-Range Planning (M=24.3, n=30) was significantly higher than the mean score for Time Attitudes (M=2.8, n=30). The ANOVA results indicated a statistically significant difference between the means, F (1, 58) = 1131.0, which was reported to be greater than the critical F-value (F-crit=4.00). This led to the rejection of the null hypothesis.

ANOVA: Long-Range Planning vs. Time Attitudes

Table 6

Groups	Count	Sum	Average	Variance
LRP	30	513	17.1	11.05
TA	30	85	2.83	0.28

Table 7

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p-value	F-crit
Between Groups	3053.0	1	3053.0	538.4	<0.001	4.00
Within Groups	328.8	58	5.67			

The mean score for Long-Range Planning (M=17.1, n=30) was significantly higher than the mean score for Time Attitudes (M=2.83, n=30). The ANOVA also showed a statistically significant difference, F (1, 58) = 538.4, exceeding the critical F-value (F-Crit=4.00). The null hypothesis was therefore rejected.

Discussion

The findings indicate that students demonstrate stronger Short-Range Planning compared to Long-Range Planning. Most students fall within the moderate time management range, consistent with previous findings that adolescents struggle with consistent long-term planning.

Specifically, Britton and Tesser (1991) in his study reported that the combination of Short-Range Planning and Time Attitudes was a stronger statistical predictor of college students' Grade Point Average (GPA) than their Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores. This finding underscores the core argument that for students, how they plan their immediate time (SRP) is a more potent determinant of academic achievement than generalized long-term goal setting or even baseline cognitive aptitude. Consequently, the moderate-to-high scores in SRP observed in our sample indicate that students are utilizing the most effective and reliable daily mechanisms for managing their academic load."

Replication studies of the scale, such as that conducted by Trueman and Hartley (1996) with university students, found that the Short-Range Planning sub-scale was the most internally consistent and reliable component of the time management measure. Conversely, the LRP scale showed low reliability. This evidence suggests that daily planning and immediate task organization are more stable and effective planning behaviors that students consistently execute, even compared to the more abstract long-term goal

setting which has been shown to be less reliable and, consequently, less effective for this population. Trueman, M., & Hartley, J. (1996).

Research supports that SRP is a reliable and strong predictor of academic performance (Britton & Tesser, 1991; Yilmaz et al., 2006). LRP, being more abstract, is less consistently practiced by adolescents. The results also align with studies showing positive associations between TM and academic outcomes.

Conclusion

People having strong time attitude plan error free short-range objectives as these sub goals or objectives might pave way to long range planning. Individuals with strong time attitude have present moment, who identify that the present is essential component for future goals.

In different research finding it has been demonstrated that there exists a positive significant relation between students' grade point averages and the time attitudes and the short-range planning. The present study's finding that students aged 11–14 exhibit stronger short-range planning skills aligns logically with the principles of adolescent cognitive development.

This study Students exhibit moderate time management skills with strong SRP but weaker LRP. Programs focused on developing long-term planning, reducing procrastination, and enhancing time attitudes may significantly improve academic outcomes.

Limitations

1. Limited age range (11–14).
2. Only one school was included.
3. Self-reported data may introduce bias.
4. TMQ factor structure reliability varies (SRP, TA, LRP).

Recommendations

1. Conduct time management workshops.
2. Train students in scheduling and prioritization.
3. Encourage use of planners and timetables.
4. Provide counseling for procrastination.

References

1. Britton, B. K., & Tesser, A. (1991). Effects of time-management practices on college grades. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *83*(3), 405–410.
2. Navin Young, A., Bourke, A., Foley, S., & DiBlasi, Z. (2023). Effects of time management interventions on mental health and wellbeing factors: A protocol for a systematic review. *BMJ Open*, *13*(1), e065749.
3. Claessens, B. J., Van Eerde, W., Rutte, C. G., & Roe, R. A. (2007). A review of the time management literature. *Personnel Review, 36*(2), 255–276.
4. Macan, T. H. (1994). Time management: Test of a process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79*(3), 381–391.
5. Zimbardo, P. G., & Boyd, J. N. (1999). Putting time in perspective: A valid, reliable individual-differences metric. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*(6), 1271–1288.
6. Pehlivan, A. (2018). The effect of time management skills of university students on their academic achievement. *International Journal of Higher Education*, *7*(5), 18-29.
7. Àngeles, A., & Aguinis, H. (2017). Time management research: A critical review and future directions. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, *38*(3), 445-467.
8. Liu, O. L., Hwee, S. J., & Chung, Y. Y. (2007). The relationship between time management and students' self-regulated learning and academic achievement. *Educational Psychology*, *27*(6), 725-738.
9. Hall, B. L., & Hursch, D. E. (1982). An evaluation of the effects of a time management training program on work efficiency and life satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Behaviour Analysis*, *15*(1), 47-56.
10. Nonis, S. A., & Wright, W. F. (2003). The effect of course workload and other factors on time spent on homework: A meta-analytic perspective. *The Journal of Education for Business*, *79*(1), 54-60.
11. Steel, P. (2007). The nature of procrastination: A meta-analytic and theoretical review of quintessential self-regulatory failure. *Psychological Bulletin*, *133*(1), 65-94.
12. Henry, A. D., Costa, C., Ladd, D., Robertson, C., Rollins, J., & Roy, L. (1996). *Time use, time management and academic achievement among occupational therapy students*. Work, 6**(**2), 115–126. https://doi.org/10.3233/WOR-1996-6206
13. de la Fuente, J., Martínez-Vicente, J. M., Santos, F. H., Sander, P., Fadda, S., *Karagiannopoulou, E., Boruchovitch, E., & Kauffman, D. F. (2022).* Advances on self-regulation models: A new research agenda through the SR vs ER behavior theory in different psychology contexts. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 861493. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.861493
14. Yilmaz, I., Yoncalik, O., & Bektaş, F. (2006). Relationship between the time management behavior and academic success. *E-Journal of New World Sciences Academy,* 5(3), 187-194.
15. Shazia Nasrullah, Muhammad Saqib Khan the Impact of Time Management on the Students' Academic Achievements. An International Peer-reviewed Journal Vol.11, 2015 *Journal of Literature, Languages and Linguistics* www.iiste.org ISSN 2422-8435

Appendices

Appendix A — Time Management Questionnaire (TMQ)

Instructions: Please read each statement and choose the option that best represents your usual behavior. Use the following scale:
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

Name: _____ Age: _____ Gender: _____ Class: _____ Institution: _____

1. Do you make a list of the things you have to do each day?
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

2. Do you plan your day before you start it?
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

3. Do you prioritize the tasks on your list?
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

4. Do you make a schedule of the activities you have to do on a particular day?
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

5. Do you set and honor deadlines for yourself?
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

6. Do you start major assignments well before they are due?
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

7. Do you review your class notes regularly?
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

8. Do you start preparing for exams well in advance?
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

9. Do you allocate study time based on the difficulty of the subject?
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

10. Do you make long-term academic goals (for the semester or year)?
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

11. Do you evaluate how well you have used your time at the end of the day?
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

12. Do you schedule time for relaxation and recreation?
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

13. Do you avoid wasting time on unimportant activities?
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

14. Do you feel that your study time is used effectively?
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

15. Do you find yourself procrastinating before starting your study tasks? (Reverse scored)
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

16. Do you rush to finish assignments right before they are due? (Reverse scored)
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

17. Do you balance study time and leisure time well?
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

18. Do you plan ahead for busy academic periods such as exams or project deadlines?
1 = Never 2 = Rarely 3 = Sometimes 4 = Frequently 5 = Always

Appendix B — Student Feedback Form

Name (optional): _____
Class: _____

Please tick (✓) your response:

1. 1. The session helped me understand myself and my abilities better.
   ☐ Yes ☐ Somewhat ☐ No
2. I learned new ways to think positively about who I am.
   ☐ Yes ☐ Somewhat ☐ No
3. The activities in the session made me reflect on my strengths and weaknesses.
   ☐ Yes ☐ Somewhat ☐ No
4. I feel more confident and aware of myself after attending this session.
   ☐ Yes ☐ Somewhat ☐ No

   Any suggestion or comment (optional):