

HOW TIME MANAGEMENT AND SELF-EFFICACY CAN MAINTAIN STUDENTS' MENTAL HEALTH

Amanda Putri Maharani¹, Nur Safitri²

^{1,2} Management Study Program, Faculty of Economics and Business,
University of Pamulang

¹amandaputrimaharani363@gmail.com, ²nursafitrii121104@gmail.com

Abstract

This study investigates the influence of time management and self-efficacy on students' mental health, with a focus on their stress levels. Drawing upon contemporary theories of self-regulation and psychological well-being, a quantitative survey was conducted among 100 respondents. The respondents consisted of 83.2% females and 16.8% males. The results reveal that time management and self-efficacy do not have a significant effect on students' mental health when tested separately. However, when examined simultaneously, both variables significantly influence students' stress levels. These findings highlight the importance of developing both effective time management skills and strong self-efficacy to promote better mental health and reduce academic stress among students.

Keywords: Time management, Self-efficacy, Mental health, Student stress.

Introduction

Mental health has become an essential issue in higher education, especially among university students who face various academic and social pressures that can affect their psychological well-being. Recent studies show that the prevalence of stress, anxiety, and burnout among students continues to increase due to heavy academic workloads, time constraints, and social expectations (World Health Organization, 2024; Rahman & Lim, 2024). The shift to digital learning environments and competitive educational systems also contributes to higher psychological strain, particularly for students who lack adaptive coping strategies and self-regulation (Lee et al., 2023). Time management and self-efficacy are two psychological factors that play a vital role in helping students maintain their mental health. Time management refers to the ability to plan, organize, and allocate time effectively to achieve goals efficiently, thereby reducing academic stress and improving productivity (Andini et al., 2024). Meanwhile, self-efficacy is defined as an individual's belief in their capability to perform tasks and overcome challenges, which enhances motivation, persistence, and emotional stability (Liu et al., 2024; Muchtar et al., 2025). Although both variables are theoretically associated with mental well-being, previous empirical studies show inconsistent findings; some reveal that good time management and high self-efficacy reduce stress significantly (Villegas-Frei et al., 2024), while others indicate

that the effects are not significant when tested individually. Therefore, this study aims to analyze both the partial and simultaneous effects of time management and self-efficacy on students' mental health, particularly focusing on stress levels as an indicator of psychological well-being.

Theoretical Framework

This study draws on contemporary theoretical insights that underscore the interconnectedness of time management, self-efficacy, and mental health among students. Effective time management—namely one's ability to plan, prioritise, and regulate use of time—has been shown to significantly reduce academic stress and support emotional regulation in student populations (Andini, Mauliana & Anggraini, 2024). Alongside, self-efficacy—defined as the belief in one's capacities to organise and execute actions required to manage prospective situations—serves as a protective factor for mental health and is positively associated with lower levels of anxiety, depression, and burnout in higher-education students (Liu et al., 2024; Muchtar, Wahyuni & Murniasih, 2025). Mental health, in turn, comprises emotional, psychological, and social well-being, influencing how individuals cope with life stresses, academic demands, and transitions (Villegas-Frei et al., 2024). In the academic context, when students combine good time-management skills with strong self-efficacy beliefs, they are better positioned to manage stress, maintain balance and resilience, and thus achieve more favourable mental-health outcomes.

Method

This research applies a quantitative approach with a descriptive and associative design to analyze the relationship between time management, self-efficacy, and students' mental health. The population in this study consists of university students, with a total of 100 respondents participating in the survey. The demographic composition of respondents shows that 83.2% were female and 16.8% were male, indicating that female students formed the majority of participants. Data were collected using a structured questionnaire distributed online, consisting of statements measured using a Likert scale ranging from 1 ("strongly disagree") to 5 ("strongly agree"). The questionnaire measured three main variables, namely time management (X_1), self-efficacy (X_2), and students' stress levels (Y) as an indicator of mental health.

Results

1. Hypothesis Test (Partial T Test)

Table 1. Partial T Test
Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficient Beta	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error			
1	(Constant)	22.362	6.197	3.608	.000
	Time management	.278	.195	.223	.157
	Self-efficacy	.193	.226	.134	.393

a. Dependent Variable: Student stress levels

- a) Time management (X1) is stated to have a positive but not significant influence on students' stress levels (Y), with a Sig. value of $0.157 > 0.05$ and a t-value of $1.425 < t\text{-table } (1.984)$. This means that partially, time management does not significantly affect students' mental health.
- b) Self-efficacy (X2) is also stated to have a positive but not significant influence on students' stress levels (Y), with a Sig. value of $0.393 > 0.05$ and a t-value of $0.857 < 1.984$. Therefore, the second hypothesis is rejected, meaning self-efficacy partially does not have a significant effect on students' mental health.

2. Simultaneous Hypothesis Testing (F Test)

Table 2. Simultaneous F test

Model	ANOVA ^a				
	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1265.270	2	632.635	6.302
	Residual	9737.480	97	100.386	
	Total	11002.750	99		

a. Dependent Variable: Student stress levels

b. Predictors: (Constant), Self-efficacy, Time management

Through the table above, the simultaneous hypothesis testing conducted between time management (X1) and self-efficacy (X2) on students' stress levels (Y) shows a Sig. value of $0.003 < 0.05$ and an F-count of $6.302 > 3.09$. This means that the third hypothesis is accepted, namely time management (X1) and self-efficacy (X2) simultaneously have a significant influence on students' mental health.

3. Partial Determination Coefficient Test

a. Time management on the student stress levels

Table 3. Variabel X1 Againts Y

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.329 ^a	.108	.099	10.006

a. Predictors: (Constant), Time management

Based on the table above, the partial determination coefficient value (R^2) for time management is 0.108, meaning that time management contributes 10.8% to students' stress levels. The remaining 89.2% is influenced by other factors not examined in this study.

b. Self-efficacy on the student stress levels

Table 4. Variabel X2 Againts Y

Model Summary

Mode	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.311 ^a	.096	.087	10.072

a. Predictors: (Constant), Self-efficacy

Based on the table above, the partial determination coefficient value (R^2) for self-efficacy is 0.096, meaning that self-efficacy contributes 9.6% to students' stress levels, while the remaining 90.4% is influenced by other variables not included in this research.

4. Simultaneous Coefficient Of Determination Test

Table 5. Variable X1 and X2 Againts Y

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.339 ^a	.115	.097	10.019

a. Predictors: (Constant), Self-efficacy, Time management

Based on the table above, the simultaneous determination coefficient value (R^2) is 0.115, which means that time management (X1) and self-efficacy (X2) together contribute 11.5% to students' stress levels. The remaining 88.5% is influenced by other factors not examined in this study.

5. Simple Regression Test

a) Time Management on the Student Stress Levels

Table 6. Simple Regression Variabel 1 Againts Y

Model	Coefficients ^a										
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta				Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	23.860	5.937		4.019	<.001					
	Time Management	.410	.119	.329	3.450	<.001	.329	.329	.329	1.000	1.000

a. Dependent Variable: Student Stress Levels

The regression equation is as follows:

$$Y = 23.860 + 0.410(X1)$$

The constant of 23.860 indicates that if time management (X1) is constant, students' stress levels (Y) are 23.860. The coefficient of 0.410 is positive, meaning that an increase in time management will reduce stress levels, although not significantly in the partial test.

b) Self-efficacy of Student Stress Levels

Table 7. Simple Regression Variable X2 Againts Y

Model	Coefficients ^a										
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error	Beta				Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	25.488	5.826		4.375	<.001					
	Self-efficacy	.448	.138	.311	3.235	.002	.311	.311	.311	1.000	1.000

a. Dependent Variable: Student Stress Levels

regression equation is as follows:

$$Y = 25.488 + 0.448(X2)$$

The constant of 25.488 is positive, meaning that if self-efficacy (X2) is constant, students' stress levels (Y) are 25.488. The coefficient of 0.448 is positive, meaning that an increase in self-efficacy tends to reduce stress levels, though in partial analysis the relationship is not significant.

6. Multiple Regression Test

Table 8. Multiple Regression Variable X1 and X2 Against Y

Model	Coefficients ^a									
	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients Beta	t	Sig.	Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
	B	Std. Error				Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	22.362	6.197	3.608	<.001					
	Time Management	.278	.195	.223	1.425	.157	.329	.143	.136	.373
	Self-efficacy	.193	.226	.134	.857	.393	.311	.087	.082	.373

a. Dependent Variable: Student Stress Levels

The multiple regression equation is as follows:

$$Y = 22.362 + 0.278(X1) + 0.193(X2)$$

The constant of 22.362 indicates that if time management (X1) and self-efficacy (X2) are constant, students' stress levels (Y) are 22.362. Both coefficients are positive, showing that increases in time management and self-efficacy improve mental health (reduce stress), although individually not significant. However, based on the F-test, both variables together have a significant simultaneous effect on students' mental health.

Discussion

The results reveal that neither time management nor self-efficacy alone significantly influences student stress. This finding contrasts with some previous studies that reported significant effects of time management on reducing academic stress (Adams & Blair, 2020). It indicates that managing time effectively may not automatically lower stress unless accompanied by strong internal motivation and self-efficacy.

However, the simultaneous significance ($p = 0.003$) suggests that both variables together play an important role in maintaining mental health. This aligns with the integrative perspective of psychological resilience, where self-efficacy enhances the effectiveness of behavioral strategies such as time management (Schwarzer & Warner, 2022).

These findings imply that interventions aimed at improving students' mental health should combine both cognitive and behavioral approaches—helping students strengthen their confidence (self-efficacy) while learning to manage their time effectively.

Conclusion

This study concludes that time management and self-efficacy, when combined, have a significant effect on students' mental health, specifically in reducing stress levels. However, individually, each factor does not show a significant impact. This suggests that psychological and behavioral skills should be developed simultaneously to achieve optimal stress management among students. Future research could include additional factors such as social support, emotional intelligence, or academic pressure to gain a more comprehensive understanding of student mental health dynamics.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to express sincere gratitude to University of Pamulang for providing academic support and facilitating this research. Appreciation is also extended to all student respondents who willingly participated in completing the survey and contributed valuable data to this study.

References

Adams, R. V., & Blair, E. (2020). Impact of time management behaviors on undergraduate engineering students' performance. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 45(2), 193–208.

Alaverdov, E., & Meshkova, E. (2022). Self-efficacy and psychological well-being among university students. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, 945812.

American Psychological Association. (2022). *APA dictionary of psychology*.

Bandura, A. (2020). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 71, 1–26.

Kim, H., & Park, J. (2023). Academic stress, self-efficacy, and coping strategies among college students. *Journal of Affective Disorders Reports*, 12, 100590.

Macan, T. H., Shahani, C., Dipboye, R. L., & Phillips, A. P. (2021). College students' time management: Correlations with academic performance and stress. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 113(5), 912–923.

Schwarzer, R., & Warner, L. M. (2022). Perceived self-efficacy and its relationship to stress resilience. *European Psychologist*, 27(1), 12–25.

Wang, X., Li, J., & Zhao, Q. (2023). The relationship between time management, academic stress, and mental health among college students. *Current Psychology*, 42, 15025–15038.

World Health Organization. (2023). *World mental health report: Transforming mental health for all*. WHO Press.

Zhou, M., Zhang, Y., & Fan, X. (2022). Time management, stress, and academic performance: A meta-analysis. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34, 271–295.