

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

Effects of time management interventions on mental health and wellbeing factors: A protocol for a systematic review

Anna Navin Young^{1¶*}, Aoife Burke^{1&}, Sarah Foley^{1&} & Zelda Di Blasi^{1&}

¹ School of Applied Psychology, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

* Corresponding author

E-mail: anavinyoung@ucc.ie

¶ These authors contributed equally to this work.

& These authors contributed equally to this work.

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

24 **Abstract**

25 **Background**

26 Poor employee mental health and wellbeing are highly prevalent and costly. Time-related factors such
27 as work intensification and perceptions of time poverty or pressure pose risks to employee health and
28 wellbeing. While reviews suggest that there are positive associations between time management
29 behavior and wellbeing, there is limited rigorous and systematic research examining the effectiveness
30 of time management interventions on wellbeing in the workplace. A thorough review is needed to
31 synthesize time management interventions and their effectiveness to promote employee mental health
32 and wellbeing.

33 **Method**

34 A systematic search will be conducted using the following databases: PsychINFO via OVID (1806-
35 Present), Web of Science, Scopus via Elsevier (1976-Present), Academic Search Complete (EBSCO),
36 Cochrane Library via Wiley (1992-Present), and MEDLINE via OVID (1946-Present). The review
37 will include experimental and quasi-experimental studies that evaluate the effects of time management
38 interventions on wellbeing outcomes on healthy adults in a workplace context. Only studies in English
39 will be included. Two authors will independently perform the literature search, record screening, data
40 extraction, and quality assessment of each study included in the systematic review and meta-analysis.
41 Data will be critically appraised using the Cochrane risk-of-bias tools. Depending on the data, a meta-
42 analysis or a narrative synthesis will be conducted. The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic
43 Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines were followed in the development of this protocol.
44 The protocol has been registered in PROSPERO (CRD4202125715).

45 **Discussion**

46 This review will provide systematic evidence on the effects of time management interventions on
47 wellbeing outcomes in the workplace. It will contribute to our understanding of how time
48 management approaches may help to address growing concerns for employee mental health and
49 wellbeing.

50 **Introduction**

51 Each year, the consequences of poor employee mental health and wellbeing cost the
52 global economy an estimated \$1 trillion [1]. In 2022, the U.S. Surgeon General raised the
53 issue of workplace wellbeing to national prominence [2]. Time is a critical factor to consider
54 in understanding the current mental health and wellbeing challenges observed in the
55 workplace. In the European Union’s 2022 Occupational Safety and Health survey, nearly half
56 of respondents reported that severe time pressure and work overload contributed to increased
57 work stress [3]. Research over the last few decades indicates that work intensification,
58 referring to both the increased pace and increased amount of work, impairs employee
59 wellbeing, health, and motivation [4-6].

60 Additionally, research on time poverty, or the perception of not having enough time,
61 finds this temporal perception is detrimental to self-assessed mental health and health,
62 emotional wellbeing, work-family conflict, physical activity, life satisfaction, perceived work
63 performance, concentration at work, and turnover intentions [7-13]. Time poverty can also
64 increase stress and stress-related symptoms including headaches, sleep disturbances, and
65 musculoskeletal pains [9,11,14].

66

67 **Time Management Interventions**

68 Time management interventions are the most common time-focused intervention
69 implemented in the workplace and may support employee mental health and wellbeing by
70 addressing experiences and impacts of time poverty and work intensification. Definitions of
71 time management vary across the literature, often including components related to goal and
72 priority setting, planning, structuring, organizing, and evaluation [15-19]. Time management

73 interventions consequently vary depending on which definition of time management has been
74 adopted [15,16].

75 There is currently some evidence to suggest that time management interventions can
76 improve wellbeing, however there are limitations with this research [15-17]. For example, a
77 non-systematic review identified 35 time management studies using self-report
78 questionnaires, diaries, and experiments published between 1954 and 2005 [15]. The authors
79 reported that time management was positively related to perceived control of time, job
80 satisfaction, and health, and negatively related to factors such as emotional exhaustion, role
81 overload, and work-family conflict. This review identified several methodological limitations
82 within the time management literature. First, the majority of study participants were
83 university students, limiting the results' relevance in a workplace context [15]. Second, a
84 variety of time management definitions were used across studies, with some studies not
85 providing any definition. Further, ten different self-report questionnaires were used to
86 measure time management behaviors. The lack of transparent and consistent
87 operationalization indicates strong heterogeneity, making it difficult to know whether 'time
88 management' is being evaluated consistently across the literature [15]. Third, only eight of
89 the 35 studies evaluated time management interventions, indicating a limited body of
90 experimental research [15]. However, these experiments generally found that time
91 management training increased self-reported time management skills and academic and job
92 performance.

93 A recent comprehensive meta-analysis of 158 studies (n=53,957) found time
94 management (assessed based on studies using a quantitative measure of time management) to
95 increase wellbeing, particularly life satisfaction, more than academic and job performance
96 [16]. This meta-analysis further highlighted the limitations identified in the previous non-
97 systematic literature review. First, a majority of studies used cross-sectional designs, thus

98 limiting the relational conclusions that can be drawn between time management and
99 wellbeing outcomes. Second, a majority of studies involved university students and time
100 management was significantly less impactful for worker populations compared to student
101 samples [16]. Third, there are limited experimental studies done to evaluate the effectiveness
102 of time management interventions. And, finally, there is a lack of clarity, consistency, and
103 generalizability across what is being conducted as a time management intervention [16].

104 The meta-analysis addressed the question of whether time management works,
105 revealing that time management may primarily enhance wellbeing opposed to performance
106 [16]. However, the question remains whether time management interventions (and which
107 interventions) work to improve wellbeing. A review and synthesis of the time management
108 intervention literature is needed to understand the current state of the field and further provide
109 foundations for future research, development, and application of consistent, valid, and
110 generalizable time management interventions. This is the focus and contribution of this
111 systematic review.

112 **Aim of the review**

113 The aim of this proposed review is to synthesize experimental and quasi-experimental
114 studies that evaluated the effectiveness of a time management intervention on wellbeing
115 outcomes among healthy adults in a workplace context. As the need for effective
116 interventions grows alongside rising concern for workplace mental health and wellbeing, this
117 review will contribute to our understanding of whether time management interventions may
118 be integrated into impactful solutions. The proposed review aims to answer the following
119 questions:

- 120 1. Do time management interventions improve mental health and wellbeing outcomes
121 among healthy working adults?
- 122 2. What are the characteristics of effective time management interventions?

123

124 **Objectives**

- 125 1. The primary objective is to critically synthesize the effectiveness of time
126 management interventions on wellbeing among healthy adults in the workplace.
- 127 2. The secondary objective of the review is to investigate the types and
128 characteristics of time management interventions that have been conducted in
129 experimental settings.
- 130 3. The final objective is to evaluate the quality of the evidence.

131

132 **Methods and analysis**

133 The Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses Protocols
134 (PRISMA-P) guidelines were adhered to in the development of this protocol [20,21]. The
135 protocol was registered with the International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews
136 (PROSPERO; CRD42021257157). The systematic review will be carried out following the
137 PRISMA-P checklist [22] and the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of
138 Interventions guidelines [23].

139 **Types of studies**

140 The acronym PICO (Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcomes) guided the
141 inclusion and exclusion criteria for the systematic review (Table 1) [24]. This review will
142 include randomised controlled trials and quasi-experiments (controlled, non-randomised, and
143 pre/post-intervention studies). Non-experimental studies, including literature reviews, case
144 reports, qualitative, correlational, and cross-sectional studies, will be excluded from the
145 review. Included articles will be written in the English language.

146

147 **Table 1. Eligibility Criteria for the Systematic Review.**

148

PICO acronym	Inclusion Criteria	Exclusion Criteria
P - Participant/Population	Healthy (non-clinical) adults 18+ years of age, workplace context	<18 years old, clinical populations, non-workplace or educational context
I - Intervention	Time management intervention or training	No explicit time management intervention/training
C - Control/Comparison	Control group that does not complete the time management intervention	No control/comparison group
O - Outcomes	At least one wellbeing-related outcome, performance outcomes will also be recorded but only in studies that include the wellbeing aspect	Studies that do not report on participant outcomes Studies with no measured wellbeing-related outcome
Additional Criteria	Randomised controlled trials, quasi-randomised trials, non-randomised trials, and experimental studies	Correlational, cross-sectional, and qualitative studies; literature reviews, and case reports Non-English language articles

149

150 **Types of participants**

151 The review will include studies that involve healthy (non-clinical) adult participants
152 in an organisational or educational context.

153 **Patient and public involvement**

154 As this research is based on previously published data, participants were not directly
155 involved or recruited for this study. Participant consent for publication of this research is not
156 required.

157 **Types of interventions**

158 Studies will be eligible for inclusion if they evaluated the delivery of a time
159 management intervention aimed at enhancing at least one wellbeing-related outcome. The
160 review will include studies that involved one intervention (single component) or two or more
161 interventions (multicomponent). The intervention must be explicitly referred to as a time
162 management intervention, though the review will not limit study inclusion to a specific
163 definition of time management.

164 **Types of outcome measures**

165 The primary outcomes will be self-reported wellbeing-related outcomes, including life
166 satisfaction, stress, anxiety, exhaustion, burnout, and depression. Studies will only be
167 included in the review if they reported at least one wellbeing-related psychological outcome
168 measure as assessed pre-intervention and post-intervention.

169

170 **Search method**

171 The search strategy will be carried out through six specialized and general electronic
172 databases from inception for this review: Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System
173 Online (MEDLINE) via PubMed, PsycInfo, Web of Science, Scopus, Academic Search
174 Complete, and Cochrane Library Central. A range of words related to ‘time management’ and
175 ‘wellbeing’ will be searched (Table 2). The search will aim to identify published
176 experimental and quasi-experimental studies that evaluated a time management intervention
177 in relation to at least one wellbeing-related outcome. The detailed search strategy was
178 developed by the research team in consultation with a Faculty Librarian. The search will be
179 limited to studies published in the English language. The decision to include only studies
180 published in English results from limited resources and the language constraints of our
181 review team. As the aim of this systematic review is to evaluate rigorous experimental studies

182 unpublished grey literature will not be included. The review will include studies published up
183 until 1 July 2023.

184 Manual searches of references will be conducted in relevant papers, including the
185 reference lists of any studies assessed for inclusion in the review, in attempts to identify any
186 additional eligible studies. PROSPERO and the Cochrane Library will also be searched for
187 any systematic reviews planned or completed that relate to this review. The reference lists of
188 a recent meta-analysis [16] and a previous time management literature review [15] will also
189 be manually searched.

190 **Table 2. Sample Systematic Review Search Strategy.**

“Time management” OR “time perception” OR “control of time” OR “time allocation” OR
“time affluence” OR “time famine” OR “time pressur*” OR “quality time” OR “quality
work time” OR “time balance” OR “meaningful time” OR “time value*” OR “time
orientation” OR “time perspectiv*” OR time-related

AND

work OR employment OR job OR occupation OR training OR program OR activity OR
initiative OR efficacy

AND

employee* OR worker* OR human* OR adult*

AND

enhance* OR improve* OR mindfulness OR quality OR values OR wellbeing OR stress
OR satisfaction OR “quality of life” OR well-being OR happiness OR flow OR habit* OR
routine* OR pressure* OR productivity

AND

RCT OR “randomized controlled trial” OR “randomised controlled trial” OR control OR
“controlled trial” OR non-ranomi* OR quasi-randomi*

191

192

193

194 **Study selection**

195 The first and second authors will independently screen papers, first by title and
196 abstract and then by full text. Data will be extracted using a data extraction form and
197 recorded in a shared spreadsheet. Both the extraction form and spreadsheet have been
198 designed for the purposes of this review. Any conflicts which arise in the screening and
199 extraction stages will be resolved through discussion or further involvement of a third
200 researcher (ZDB). A flow diagram will present a record of study screening following the
201 PRISMA-P guidelines. Excluded studies, and their reason for exclusion, will be documented
202 within the flow diagram.

203 **Data extraction process**

204 The data extraction form has been designed to record data from studies during the
205 full-text review stage.

206 The following information will be included in data extraction:

- 207 1. Country of origin, author(s), and year of publication
- 208 2. Study method: design (e.g., experimental and quasi-experimental)
- 209 3. Sample: number of participants, age, gender, and other demographic characteristics
- 210 4. Context: Workplace, educational environment
- 211 5. Type of intervention: single or multi-component
- 212 6. Delivery form
- 213 7. Session duration (number of sessions and duration of each session)
- 214 8. Control group(s)
- 215 9. Number of participants at follow up and overall retention rates.
- 216 10. Mean/SD, p-value, and effect size
- 217 11. Outcome measures used

218 **Missing data**

219 The authors will attempt to contact study authors in the case of missing or incomplete
220 information. The available data will be analysed as reported should study authors be
221 unavailable.

222 **Risk of bias assessment**

223 In accordance with the Cochrane Handbook, the Cochrane risk-of-bias tool will be
224 used to assess the methodological quality of the included studies. Randomised controlled
225 trials will be assessed using the Risk of Bias II tool (ROB II), while quasi-experimental and
226 nonrandomised trials will be assessed using the ROBINS I tool. Assessment will include
227 methods of randomisation and intervention allocation. Risk of bias will be independently
228 conducted by the first and second author and inter-rater reliability will be calculated using the
229 kappa coefficient. In the case of disagreements, a discussion with a third reviewer (ZDB) will
230 be used to reach a consensus. Study authors will be contacted in the case of insufficient
231 information. The risk of bias assessments will result in a classification of low risk, some
232 concerns, or high risk.

233 **Data synthesis**

234 A narrative synthesis will be structured around the included studies, the types of time
235 management interventions used, and the types of outcomes reported. The characteristics and
236 components of included interventions will be reported. The number of outcomes categorised
237 as wellbeing, performance, and overlapping will be reported, along with definitions and
238 measures of each outcome. The researchers will calculate the percentage of studies that
239 included each intervention and outcome element.

240 A limited scope for meta-analysis is anticipated due to the range of outcomes
241 measured, measurement types, and the small number of existing trials. Where studies have
242 used the same intervention, comparator, and outcomes measures, a random-effects meta-
243 analysis will be conducted with the pooled results.

244 Depending on the data gathered, subgroup analyses may be conducted to examine the
245 effects of the type of intervention (single component or multicomponent) and duration of
246 intervention.

247

248 **Discussion**

249 The aim of this study is to provide a comprehensive overview of the factors
250 influencing effectiveness of time management interventions aimed at enhancing mental
251 health and wellbeing, based on the evidence of experimental and quasi-experimental studies.

252 Considering the rise in mental health and wellbeing issues in the workplace and
253 reported time poverty, and despite the popularity of time management tools, little is known
254 about the effectiveness of time management interventions, and what elements of time
255 management are particularly useful.

256 Effective time management interventions have the potential to promote mental health
257 and wellbeing. However, the history of time management highlights limited evidence-based,
258 empirically evaluated strategies for enhancing time management in work and educational
259 settings [15-17]. The findings of this review are expected to provide an overview of time
260 management interventions that have been conducted using a robust trial design, and their
261 corresponding wellbeing outcomes.

262 The review will contribute to evaluating these time management interventions from a
263 health and wellbeing perspective, and provide guidance for HR professionals, leaders, and
264 health professionals regarding the current landscape of evidence-based time management
265 interventions and how they may be adopted to support employee wellbeing. Findings from
266 the systematic review will be synthesized and disseminated for relevant stakeholders to
267 promote evidence-based wellbeing initiatives in the workplace.

268

269 **Authors' contributions**

270 **Anna Navin Young.** Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Methodology, Project

271 administration, Writing - original draft, Writing - review & editing

272 **Aoife Burke.** Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Methodology, Writing - original draft

273 **Zelda Di Blasi.** Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Writing - review & editing

274 **Sarah Foley.** Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision, Writing - review & editing

275

276 **Funding**

277 No funding.

278 **Competing interests**

279 The authors declare no competing interests exist.

280 **Data availability**

281 No datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study.

282 **Supporting Information**

283 **S1 Checklist. PRISMA-P (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-**

284 **Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: Recommended items to address in a systematic**

285 **review protocol.**

286 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0280132.s001>

287 **S1 Table. Eligibility Criteria for the Systematic Review.**

288 **S2 Table. Sample Systematic Review Search Strategy.**

289

290

291 **References**

- 292 1. World Health Organization [Internet]. Mental health at work; c2022 [cited 2023 Jun 16].
293 Available from: [https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/mental-health-at-](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/mental-health-at-work)
294 [work](https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/mental-health-at-work)
- 295 2. Current Priorities of the U.S. Surgeon General [Internet]. The U.S. Surgeon General's
296 framework for workplace mental health & well-being; c2022 [cited 2023 Jun 16].
297 Available from: [https://www.hhs.gov/surgeongeneral/priorities/workplace-well-](https://www.hhs.gov/surgeongeneral/priorities/workplace-well-being/index.html)
298 [being/index.html](https://www.hhs.gov/surgeongeneral/priorities/workplace-well-being/index.html)
- 299 3. Leclerc C, De Keulenaer F, & Belli S. OSH Pulse - Occupational safety and health in post-
300 pandemic workplaces. European Agency for Safety and Health at Work. 2022.
301 Available from: [https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/summary-osh-pulse-](https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/summary-osh-pulse-occupational-safety-and-health-post-pandemic-workplaces)
302 [occupational-safety-and-health-post-pandemic-workplaces](https://osha.europa.eu/en/publications/summary-osh-pulse-occupational-safety-and-health-post-pandemic-workplaces)
- 303 4. Green F. It's been a hard day's night: The concentration and intensification of work in late
304 twentieth-century Britain. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*. 2001;39(1):53-80.
305 doi: 10.1111/1467-8543.0018.
- 306 5. Mauno S, Herttala M, Minkkinen J, Feldt T, Kubicek B. Is work intensification bad for
307 employees? A review of outcomes for employees over the last two decades. *Work &*
308 *Stress*. 2022;37(1):100-125. doi: 10.1080/02678373.2022.2080778.
- 309 6. Mazzola JJ, Disselhorst R. Should we be 'challenging' employees? A critical review and
310 meta-analysis of the challenge-hindrance model of stress. *Journal of Organizational*
311 *Behavior*. 2019;40(8):949-961. doi: 10.1002/job.2412.
- 312 7. Strazdins L, Welsh J, Korda R, Broom D, Paolucci F. Not all hours are equal: Could time
313 be a social determinant of health? *Sociol. Health. Illn.* 2016;38:21-42. doi:
314 10.1111/1467-9566.12300.

- 315 8. Dugan AG, Matthews RA, Barnes-Farrell JL. Understanding the roles of subjective and
316 objective aspects of time in the work-family interface. *Community Work Fam.*
317 2012;15:149-172. doi: [10.1080/13668803.2011.609656](https://doi.org/10.1080/13668803.2011.609656).
- 318 9. Gärling T, Gamble A, Fors F, Hjerm M. Emotional well-being related to time pressure,
319 impediment to goal progress, and stress-related symptoms. *Journal of Happiness*
320 *Studies*. 2016;17:1789-1799. doi: [10.1007/s10902-015-9670-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-015-9670-4).
- 321 10. Höge T. When work strain transcends psychological boundaries: An inquiry into the
322 relationship between time pressure, irritation, work-family conflict and psychosomatic
323 complaints. *Stress Health*. 2009;25:41-51. doi: [10.1002/smi.1226](https://doi.org/10.1002/smi.1226).
- 324 11. Zuzanek J. Work, leisure, time-pressure and stress. In: Haworth JT, Veal AJ, editors.
325 *Work and Leisure*. London: Routledge; 2004. p. 123-144.
- 326 12. Kalenkoski CM, Hamrick KS. How does time poverty affect behavior? A look at eating
327 and physical activity. *Applied Economics Perspect. Policy*. 2013;35:89-105. doi:
328 [10.1093/aep/pps034](https://doi.org/10.1093/aep/pps034).
- 329 13. Whillans AV, Dunn EW, Smeets P, Bekkers R, Norton MI. Buying time promotes
330 happiness. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA*. 2017;114:8523-8527. doi:
331 [10.1073/pnas.1706541114](https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1706541114).
- 332 14. Kleiner S. Subjective time pressure: General or domain specific? *Soc. Sci. Res.*
333 2014;47:108-120. doi: [10.1016/j.ssresearch.2014.03.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2014.03.013).
- 334 15. Claessens BJC, van Eerde, W, Rutte CG, Roe RA. A review of the time management
335 literature. *Personnel Review*, 2007;36(2):255-276. doi: [10.1108/00483480710726136](https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480710726136).
- 336 16. Aeon B, Faber A, Panaccio A. Does time management work? A meta-analysis. *PLoS*
337 *ONE*. 2021;16(1): e0245066. doi: [10.1371/journal.pone.0245066](https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245066).

- 338 17. Bedi A, Sass MD. But I have not time to read this article! A meta-analytic review of the
339 consequences of employee time management behaviors. *Journal of Social Psychology*.
340 2022. doi: [10.1080/00224545.2022.2159302](https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2022.2159302).
- 341 18. Macan TH. Time management: Test of a process model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
342 1994;79:381-391. doi: [10.1037/0021-9010.79.3.381](https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.79.3.381).
- 343 19. Hellsten LM. What do we know about time management? A review of the literature and a
344 psychometric critique of instruments assessing time management. In: Stoilov T, editor.
345 Time Management. London: IntechOpen; 2012. P. 3-28. doi: [10.5772/37248](https://doi.org/10.5772/37248).
- 346 20. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred
347 Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P)
348 2015 statement. *Syst Rev*. 2015;4(1):1. doi: [10.1186/2046-4053-4-1](https://doi.org/10.1186/2046-4053-4-1).
- 349 21. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, et al. Preferred
350 Reporting Items for Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis Protocols (PRISMA-P)
351 2015: elaboration and explanation. *BMJ*, 2015;349:g7647. doi: [10.1136/bmj.g7647](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.g7647)
- 352 22. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The
353 PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*.
354 2021;372:n71. doi: [10.1136/bmj.n71](https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71).
- 355 23. Higgins J, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page M, Welch V, editors.
356 Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions version 6.3 (updated
357 February 2022). Cochrane; 2022. Available from:
358 <https://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook>.
- 359 24. McKenzie JE, Brennan SE, Ryan RE, Thomson HJ, Johnston RV, Thomas J. Chapter 3:
360 Defining the criteria for including studies and how they will be grouped for the
361 synthesis. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch
362 VA, editors. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.0

363 (updated July 2019). Cochrane; 2019. Available from:

364 <https://www.training.cochrane.org/handbook>.

365