Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research
ISSN: 3006 - 6417
Vol. 4 Issue 10, October - 2025, Pages: 366 - 383

Mind Management vs. Time Management: Assessing Ugandan Gen Z's Readiness for the Modern Workplace

Dr. Arinaitwe Julius[1], Ahumuza Audrey[2]
1,2 Metropolitan International University

Abstract

Background: The modern workplace is transitioning from time management to mind management productivity paradigms, emphasizing cognitive capacity, mental energy, and attention allocation over traditional scheduling and time allocation, with particular relevance for Generation Z entering workforces during an era of remote work flexibility, digital overwhelm, and mental health awareness.

Objective: To assess Ugandan Generation Z's readiness for the modern workplace by examining their orientation toward, adoption of, and effectiveness in utilizing mind management versus time management approaches to productivity.

Methods: A cross-sectional quantitative study (N = 385) employed stratified random sampling of Ugandan Gen Z individuals (aged 18-27 years) who were employed, self-employed, or in final university years across Kampala, Wakiso, and Mukono districts, utilizing structured questionnaires measuring awareness, practice adoption, and workplace readiness, with analysis including descriptive statistics, bivariate correlations, ANOVA, hierarchical multiple linear regression, binary logistic regression, and mediation analysis using PROCESS macro.

Key Results: Ugandan Gen Z demonstrated significantly greater awareness of time management ($M = 16.4$) compared to mind management concepts ($M = 12.8$, $d = 1.02$), yet individuals employing mind management practices exhibited substantially superior workplace readiness ($\beta = 0.387$, $p < 0.001$), productivity ($r = 0.526$), and wellbeing ($r = 0.483$) compared to those relying primarily on time management approaches. Mind management-oriented individuals scored 26.7% higher on workplace readiness than time management-only individuals (44.6 vs. 35.2, $p < 0.001$), with each 10-point increase in mind management practices nearly doubling odds of high workplace readiness (OR = 1.98, 95% CI [1.60, 2.45]). Digital resource access, global work exposure, and academic performance significantly predicted readiness, while mind management practices mediated 50.7% of the awareness-readiness relationship, indicating that knowledge translation into behavioral practice represents a critical developmental pathway.

Conclusion: Ugandan Gen Z's workforce preparation is characterized by asymmetric exposure favoring traditional time management over contemporary mind management approaches, despite empirical evidence demonstrating mind management's superior predictive validity for workplace readiness, productivity, and wellbeing outcomes. The substantial heterogeneity in mind management awareness and the strong effects of digital access suggest bifurcated workforce development patterns, with structurally advantaged individuals gaining disproportionate exposure to contemporary productivity paradigms while others remain anchored in insufficient traditional frameworks. These findings challenge conventional educational and workplace training priorities, indicating that optimizing Uganda's Gen Z workforce integration requires fundamental shifts from time-centric to cognition-centric productivity development approaches.

Recommendation: Ugandan educational institutions should systematically integrate mind management principles into core curricula through dedicated courses combining conceptual understanding with structured practice opportunities, enabling students to develop attention control, energy optimization, and psychological wellbeing capabilities essential for contemporary workplace success.

Received: 22.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research
ISSN: 3006 - 6417
Vol. 4 Issue 10, October - 2025, Pages: 366 - 383

Keywords: Mind management, time management, Generation Z, workplace readiness, productivity orientations, cognitive capacity management, attention regulation, Ugandan workforce, knowledge workers, employee wellbeing, educational curriculum development, organizational psychology

Introduction of the Study

The modern workplace is undergoing a fundamental transformation that extends beyond technological advancement to encompass how work itself is conceptualized and executed. Traditional productivity paradigms centered on time management—scheduling, prioritization, and efficient use of hours—are increasingly being challenged by the concept of mind management, which emphasizes cognitive capacity, mental energy, attention allocation, and psychological wellbeing as primary drivers of workplace performance (Aeon et al., 2021; Dmytryshyn & Goran, 2022). This shift is particularly relevant for Generation Z (born between 1997 and 2012), who are entering the workforce during an era characterized by remote work flexibility, digital overwhelm, mental health awareness, and demands for work-life integration rather than mere balance (Wilson et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2021).

In Uganda, Gen Z represents approximately 23% of the population and constitutes an emerging workforce segment that will significantly shape the country's economic trajectory over the coming decades. Unlike previous generations, Ugandan Gen Z has grown up with mobile technology, social media connectivity, and exposure to global work cultures, yet they navigate unique contextual challenges including infrastructural limitations, economic uncertainty, and evolving educational systems (Adams & Blair, 2019; Trentepohl et al., 2022). Understanding how this generation approaches productivity—whether through conventional time management techniques or emerging mind management practices—has profound implications for organizational effectiveness, employee wellbeing, and Uganda's competitive positioning in the global knowledge economy. This study examines the readiness of Ugandan Gen Z workers and soon-to-be workers to thrive in modern workplaces by assessing their orientation toward mind management versus time management approaches (Buro et al., 2023; Maindet et al., 2019). By investigating their awareness, adoption, and effectiveness of these contrasting productivity paradigms, this research aims to provide actionable insights for educational institutions, employers, and policymakers seeking to optimize workforce development strategies for Uganda's youngest professional cohort (Brosseau et al., 2017; Pande & Kumar, 2020).

Background of the Study

Time management has dominated productivity discourse for decades, rooted in industrial-era principles that equated hours worked with output generated. This approach emphasizes planning, scheduling, goal-setting, and the elimination of time-wasters as pathways to effectiveness. However, knowledge work—which characterizes most modern employment—does not operate on linear input-output relationships. Creative problem-solving, strategic thinking, and innovation depend less on time invested and more on cognitive states, mental clarity, and psychological conditions under which work occurs (Hall et al., 2020; Op den Kamp et al., 2023).

Mind management, a concept gaining traction in organizational psychology and neuroscience-informed management literature, shifts focus from managing time to managing attention, energy, and mental states. This approach recognizes that productive work happens when individuals operate in optimal cognitive conditions—when they are mentally fresh, emotionally regulated, and attentionally focused—rather than simply when they are present for prescribed hours. Mind management encompasses practices such as energy management, attention protection, cognitive load reduction,

Received: 22.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research
ISSN: 3006 - 6417
Vol. 4 Issue 10, October - 2025, Pages: 366 - 383

strategic rest, and alignment of task demands with mental capacity fluctuations throughout the day (Eaton & Hulett, 2019; Grenha Teixeira et al., 2017).

Generation Z globally has demonstrated distinctive characteristics that may predispose them toward mind management approaches: they prioritize mental health, value flexibility over rigid schedules, seek meaningful work, and have grown up multitasking across digital platforms. However, they also face unprecedented challenges including attention fragmentation from constant connectivity, information overload, and economic pressures that may compel adherence to traditional time-based productivity metrics (Cozzolino et al., 2020; Ericsson et al., 2022).

The Ugandan context adds complexity to this generational analysis. While urban Ugandan Gen Z increasingly resembles their global counterparts in digital fluency and value orientations, they also contend with infrastructural challenges (unreliable electricity and internet), economic constraints (high youth unemployment), cultural expectations around work ethic, and educational systems that often emphasize rote learning over critical thinking and self-regulation skills. Few studies have examined how these contextual factors shape Ugandan Gen Z's productivity orientations or their preparedness for workplaces that increasingly demand cognitive agility, self-management, and mental resilience alongside technical competencies (Brown et al., 2017; Shekhar et al., 2022).

Problem Statement

Despite the growing recognition that modern workplace success depends on cognitive management capabilities rather than mere time allocation, there exists limited empirical understanding of how Ugandan Gen Z workers conceptualize and practice productivity. Educational institutions continue to emphasize traditional time management skills without adequately addressing attention management, energy optimization, or psychological wellbeing as workplace competencies. Employers report challenges in managing Gen Z employees but lack nuanced understanding of whether performance issues stem from inadequate time management discipline, poor mind management capabilities, misalignment between organizational expectations and generational orientations, or contextual barriers unique to the Ugandan environment (Grazzi et al., 2023; Krcmarik et al., 2023).

This knowledge gap has practical consequences. Organizations may invest in training interventions that address the wrong productivity dimensions, educational curricula may fail to equip students with competencies most relevant to contemporary work demands, and Gen Z workers themselves may struggle unnecessarily due to mismatched strategies or unrealistic expectations. Without systematic assessment of Ugandan Gen Z's current productivity orientations, their readiness for modern workplace demands, and the relative effectiveness of time management versus mind management approaches in their specific context, stakeholders cannot design evidence-based interventions to optimize this generation's workforce integration and performance (Fritz et al., 2023). Furthermore, the tension between time management and mind management may be particularly acute in Uganda, where economic pressures favor hustle culture and long working hours, while global workplace trends increasingly emphasize sustainability, wellbeing, and cognitive optimization. Understanding where Ugandan Gen Z stands on this spectrum—and what factors predict their readiness for modern workplace expectations—is essential for bridging the gap between traditional and contemporary productivity paradigms in the Ugandan labor market.

Main Objective

To assess Ugandan Generation Z's readiness for the modern workplace by examining their orientation toward, adoption of, and effectiveness in utilizing mind management versus time management approaches to productivity.

Received: 22.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research
ISSN: 3006 - 6417
Vol. 4 Issue 10, October - 2025, Pages: 366 - 383

Specific Objectives

1. To evaluate the level of awareness and understanding of mind management and time management concepts among Ugandan Gen Z workers and university students preparing to enter the workforce.
2. To determine the extent to which Ugandan Gen Z currently employs mind management practices (attention control, energy optimization, cognitive load management) versus time management practices (scheduling, prioritization, deadline adherence) in their work and academic activities.
3. To identify the personal, educational, and contextual factors that predict Ugandan Gen Z's readiness to adopt mind management approaches in modern workplace settings.

Research Questions

1. What is the level of awareness and understanding of mind management and time management concepts among Ugandan Gen Z workers and university students?
2. To what extent do Ugandan Gen Z individuals currently employ mind management practices compared to time management practices in their work and academic activities?
3. What personal, educational, and contextual factors predict Ugandan Gen Z's readiness to adopt mind management approaches in modern workplace settings?

Research Hypotheses

H1: There is a significant positive relationship between Ugandan Gen Z's level of education and their awareness of mind management concepts, with higher education levels associated with greater mind management awareness.

H2: Ugandan Gen Z individuals who predominantly employ mind management practices demonstrate significantly higher self-reported productivity and wellbeing outcomes compared to those who rely primarily on traditional time management practices.

H3: Access to digital resources, exposure to global work cultures (through internships or remote work), and mental health awareness significantly predict Ugandan Gen Z's readiness to adopt mind management approaches, controlling for demographic and socioeconomic variables.

Methods.

This study employed a cross-sectional quantitative research design to assess Ugandan Gen Z's readiness for the modern workplace by examining their orientation toward mind management versus time management approaches. The target population comprised Ugandan Gen Z individuals (aged 18-27 years) who were either currently employed, self-employed, or in their final two years of university education across major institutions in Kampala, Wakiso, and Mukono districts. Using a stratified random sampling technique, participants were categorized into three strata: employed Gen Z workers, self-employed/entrepreneurs, and university students in their third and fourth years. A sample size of 385 participants was calculated using Cochran's formula for cross-sectional studies with infinite populations ($n = Z^2pq/e^2$, where $Z = 1.96$ for 95% confidence level, $p = 0.5$ for maximum variability, $q = 0.5$, and $e = 0.05$ margin of error), which provided 80% statistical power to detect medium effect sizes (Cohen's $d = 0.5$) for group comparisons and correlations of $r \geq 0.14$ at $\alpha = 0.05$ significance level.

Received: 22.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research
ISSN: 3006 - 6417
Vol. 4 Issue 10, October - 2025, Pages: 366 - 383

Data were collected between March and May 2024 using a structured self-administered questionnaire distributed both electronically via Google Forms and in paper format, with the instrument comprising five sections: demographic characteristics, awareness and understanding of productivity concepts (measured using a 20-item knowledge scale), current productivity practices assessment (using adapted versions of the Time Management Behavior Scale and a newly developed Mind Management Practice Inventory with 15 items each), workplace readiness scale (12 items assessing adaptability, self-regulation, and cognitive flexibility), and self-reported outcomes including productivity levels, wellbeing, and work-life satisfaction measured on Likert scales. Pilot testing was conducted with 30 participants to establish content validity through expert review and reliability through Cronbach's alpha coefficients ($\alpha > 0.70$ for all scales), with exploratory factor analysis confirming the dimensional structure of the productivity practice scales. Univariate statistical analyses included descriptive statistics (frequencies, percentages, means, standard deviations, medians, and interquartile ranges) to characterize the sample and summarize awareness levels, practice adoption rates, and readiness scores, while data normality was assessed using Shapiro-Wilk tests and visual inspection of histograms and Q-Q plots (Nelson et al., 2022, 2023).

Bivariate analyses employed independent samples t-tests and one-way ANOVA with post-hoc Tukey HSD tests to compare awareness and practice scores across demographic groups (gender, employment status, educational level), Pearson's correlation coefficients to examine linear relationships between continuous variables (awareness scores, practice frequency, productivity outcomes, wellbeing), and chi-square tests to assess associations between categorical variables such as employment sector and predominant productivity orientation. For multivariate analysis, hierarchical multiple linear regression was applied to identify predictors of workplace readiness scores, with variables entered in four sequential blocks: Block 1 (demographic controls including age, gender, socioeconomic status), Block 2 (educational factors including university tier, field of study, GPA), Block 3 (contextual factors including digital resource access, global work exposure, infrastructural challenges), and Block 4 (productivity orientations including mind management practice scores and time management practice scores), with model assumptions tested through variance inflation factors ($VIF < 10$) for multicollinearity, Durbin-Watson statistics (1.5-2.5) for independence of residuals, scatterplots of standardized residuals against predicted values for homoscedasticity, and P-P plots for normality of residuals.

Additionally, binary logistic regression was employed to predict readiness categorization (ready vs. not ready based on median split of readiness scores), with model fit assessed using Hosmer-Lemeshow goodness-of-fit test ($p > 0.05$ indicating adequate fit), classification accuracy, and area under the ROC curve ($AUC > 0.70$ considered acceptable), while assumptions including absence of multicollinearity, linearity of the logit, and adequate cell sizes (minimum 10 cases per predictor) were verified. Mediation analysis using the PROCESS macro (Model 4) with 5,000 bootstrap samples tested whether mind management practices mediated the relationship between awareness and workplace readiness outcomes, with indirect effects considered significant when 95% bias-corrected confidence intervals excluded zero. All analyses were conducted using SPSS version 26.0 and STATA version 16, with statistical significance set at $p < 0.05$ for two-tailed tests, and effect sizes reported using Cohen's d for mean differences, eta-squared (η^2) for ANOVA, R^2 and adjusted R^2 for regression models, and odds ratios for logistic regression to facilitate

Received: 22.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research
ISSN: 3006 - 6417
Vol. 4 Issue 10, October - 2025, Pages: 366 - 383

practical interpretation beyond statistical significance. Ethical approval was obtained from the institutional review board, and informed consent was secured from all participants, with confidentiality maintained through anonymous data collection, secure data storage, and aggregate reporting of results.

RESULTS

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics and Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables (N = 385)

Variable	Category	n (%) / Mean ± SD	Range
Age		23.4 ± 2.1 years	18-27
Gender	Male	198 (51.4%)	
	Female	187 (48.6%)	
Employment Status	Employed	142 (36.9%)	
	Self-employed	115 (29.9%)	
	University student	128 (33.2%)	
Educational Level	Diploma	87 (22.6%)	
	Bachelor's (ongoing)	128 (33.2%)	
	Bachelor's (completed)	143 (37.1%)	
	Postgraduate	27 (7.0%)	
Field of Study/Work	Business/Commerce	119 (30.9%)	
	ICT/Engineering	98 (25.5%)	
	Social Sciences	89 (23.1%)	
	Health Sciences	79 (20.5%)	
Digital Resource Access	High	156 (40.5%)	
	Moderate	171 (44.4%)	
	Low	58 (15.1%)	
Global Work Exposure	Yes (internships/remote work)	147 (38.2%)	
	No	238 (61.8%)	
Mind Management Awareness Score		12.8 ± 4.3	2-20
Time Management Awareness Score		16.4 ± 3.1	8-20
Mind Management Practice Score		38.6 ± 11.7	15-75
Time Management Practice Score		52.3 ± 9.8	22-75
Workplace Readiness Score		38.2 ± 8.6	14-60
Self-reported Productivity		6.8 ± 1.9	1-10
Wellbeing Score		6.4 ± 2.1	1-10

Statistical Interpretation: The sample demonstrated adequate representation across the three employment strata with relatively balanced gender distribution ($\chi^2 = 0.31$, $p = 0.576$), suggesting successful implementation of the stratified random sampling strategy. The mean age of 23.4 years positioned participants firmly within the Gen Z cohort, while

Received: 22.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research
ISSN: 3006 - 6417
Vol. 4 Issue 10, October - 2025, Pages: 366 - 383

the educational distribution skewed toward higher education (77.3% with bachelor's degree level or above), reflecting the sampling frame's focus on university-educated or university-enrolled individuals. Normality assessments revealed that mind management awareness scores (Shapiro-Wilk W = 0.984, p = 0.062) and workplace readiness scores (W = 0.988, p = 0.143) approximated normal distributions, whereas time management awareness scores exhibited slight negative skewness (skewness = -0.67, SE = 0.124), though not sufficiently severe to violate parametric test assumptions. The standard deviations indicated substantial variability in mind management awareness (SD = 4.3, CV = 33.6%) and practice scores (SD = 11.7, CV = 30.3%), suggesting heterogeneity in exposure to and adoption of mind management concepts, while time management variables showed more homogeneous distributions with lower coefficients of variation (awareness CV = 18.9%, practice CV = 18.7%). Notably, mean time management awareness scores (M = 16.4) significantly exceeded mind management awareness scores (M = 12.8) by 3.6 points, representing a large effect size (Cohen's d = 1.02, 95% CI [0.88, 1.16]), and paired samples t-test confirmed this difference was statistically significant ($t_{384} = 18.43$, $p < 0.001$).

These results revealed a fundamental asymmetry in Ugandan Gen Z's familiarity with productivity paradigms, with traditional time management concepts enjoying substantially greater awareness than emerging mind management approaches. The finding that time management awareness exceeded mind management awareness by approximately 28% suggested that educational institutions and workplace orientations in Uganda continued to emphasize conventional productivity frameworks, potentially leaving Gen Z workers underprepared for modern workplaces that increasingly prioritize cognitive capacity management over temporal scheduling. This pattern aligned with Uganda's educational system, which historically emphasized structured, time-bound academic performance metrics (examinations, assignment deadlines, attendance requirements) rather than metacognitive skills, attention regulation, or energy management strategies.

The substantial variability in mind management awareness (ranging from minimal to comprehensive understanding) indicated that exposure to these concepts was not systematically distributed, likely depending on individual initiative, access to international resources, or exposure to progressive organizational cultures rather than formal educational curricula. The moderate correlations between digital resource access and both mind management awareness ($r = 0.34$, $p < 0.001$) and practice scores ($r = 0.41$, $p < 0.001$) suggested that internet connectivity and exposure to global productivity discourse through digital platforms played a crucial role in introducing Ugandan Gen Z to contemporary workplace concepts. Furthermore, the finding that 38.2% of participants had global work exposure through internships or remote work arrangements represented a significant minority who had encountered international workplace cultures, potentially creating a bifurcated workforce where some Gen Z individuals possessed experiential understanding of modern productivity expectations while others relied exclusively on domestic educational and workplace socialization. The workplace readiness scores (M = 38.2 out of 60, representing 63.7% of maximum possible score) suggested moderate preparedness overall, indicating neither comprehensive readiness nor severe deficits, but rather a transitional state where Ugandan Gen Z possessed foundational capabilities while potentially lacking full optimization for contemporary workplace demands that emphasize psychological agility, self-directed cognitive management, and adaptive performance strategies.

Received: 22.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research
ISSN: 3006 - 6417
Vol. 4 Issue 10, October - 2025, Pages: 366 - 383

Table 2: Bivariate Associations Between Productivity Orientations and Outcome Variables

Variable	Mind Management Practice Score	Time Management Practice Score	Workplace Readiness	Productivity	Wellbeing
Mind Management Practice	1.000	0.312***	0.587***	0.526***	0.483***
Time Management Practice	0.312***	1.000	0.441***	0.398***	0.267***
Workplace Readiness	0.587***	0.441***	1.000	0.614***	0.551***
Self-reported Productivity	0.526***	0.398***	0.614***	1.000	0.692***
Wellbeing Score	0.483***	0.267***	0.551***	0.692***	1.000

Pearson correlation coefficients; ***p < 0.001

Comparison of Productivity and Wellbeing by Predominant Productivity Orientation

Predominant Orientation	n	Productivity M ± SD	Wellbeing M ± SD	Workplace Readiness M ± SD
Mind Management (≥50th percentile MM, <50th TM)	89	7.8 ± 1.6^{a}	7.3 ± 1.8^{a}	44.6 ± 6.8^{a}
Time Management (≥50th percentile TM, <50th MM)	103	6.4 ± 1.8^{b}	5.9 ± 2.0^{b}	35.2 ± 7.4^{b}
Balanced (≥50th percentile both)	116	7.5 ± 1.5^{a}	6.8 ± 1.9^{a}	42.1 ± 7.2^{a}
Low Both (<50th percentile both)	77	5.2 ± 1.9^{c}	5.1 ± 2.2^{c}	29.8 ± 8.1^{c}
F-statistic		$F_{3,381} = 38.42$***	$F_{3,381} = 26.17$***	$F_{3,381} = 64.23$***
Effect size (η^2)		0.232	0.171	0.336

Different superscript letters indicate significant differences at $p < 0.05$ (Tukey HSD post-hoc tests); ***p < 0.001

The correlation matrix revealed that both productivity orientations demonstrated significant positive associations with desired outcomes, though mind management practices exhibited substantially stronger relationships with workplace readiness ($r = 0.587$ vs. $r = 0.441$, $z = 3.86$, $p < 0.001$), self-reported productivity ($r = 0.526$ vs. $r = 0.398$, $z = 3.12$, $p = 0.002$), and particularly wellbeing ($r = 0.483$ vs. $r = 0.267$, $z = 4.74$, $p < 0.001$) compared to time management practices, with Fisher's z-transformation tests confirming these correlation differences were statistically significant. The moderate positive correlation between mind management and time management practices ($r = 0.312$) indicated these orientations were not mutually exclusive but rather complementary, with shared variance of only 9.7%, suggesting they represented largely independent dimensions of productivity behavior rather than opposite ends of a

Received: 22.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

single continuum.

The ANOVA results demonstrated highly significant group differences across all outcome variables with large effect sizes (η^2 ranging from 0.171 to 0.336), indicating that predominant productivity orientation accounted for 17-34% of variance in outcomes, representing practically meaningful distinctions beyond statistical significance. Post-hoc Tukey HSD comparisons revealed a clear hierarchy: individuals with mind management orientation and those with balanced orientation performed statistically equivalently on all outcomes (all pairwise $p > 0.05$) and significantly outperformed both the time management-only group (all $p < 0.01$) and especially the low-on-both group (all $p < 0.001$). Notably, the time management-only group scored significantly higher than the low-on-both group (all $p < 0.001$) but significantly lower than both mind management and balanced groups, positioning traditional time management as beneficial but insufficient for optimal outcomes.

These findings provided empirical support for the superiority of mind management approaches in predicting workplace readiness and personal outcomes among Ugandan Gen Z, challenging the conventional wisdom that time management represents the primary pathway to productivity. The substantially stronger correlations between mind management practices and wellbeing outcomes (81% stronger than time management correlations) suggested that cognitive and attentional approaches to productivity aligned more harmoniously with psychological health, whereas exclusive reliance on time-based productivity metrics might generate stress, rigidity, and reduced life satisfaction through overemphasis on scheduling and deadline pressure without corresponding attention to mental states and energy management. This pattern resonated with emerging organizational psychology literature documenting the limitations of time management in knowledge work contexts where creative problem-solving and strategic thinking depend on optimal cognitive states rather than mere time allocation.

The finding that balanced practitioners (high on both dimensions) achieved outcomes statistically equivalent to mind management-oriented individuals suggested that time management skills complemented rather than competed with mind management, potentially providing structural scaffolding that allowed cognitive resources to be deployed strategically rather than reactively. However, the critical insight emerged from examining the time management-only group, who demonstrated significantly lower workplace readiness (35.2 vs. 44.6, $d = 1.33$) despite presumably possessing traditional productivity competencies emphasized in conventional workplace training—this gap of 9.4 points (representing 21% lower readiness) indicated that time management skills alone were insufficient for modern workplace demands that increasingly required self-regulation, attention control, and adaptive cognitive management. The particularly poor outcomes for the low-on-both group (representing 20% of the sample) highlighted a concerning segment of Ugandan Gen Z who lacked both traditional and contemporary productivity competencies, potentially facing significant workplace integration challenges. From a practical standpoint, these results suggested that Ugandan educational institutions and employers should not simply replace time management training with mind management approaches, but rather integrate both frameworks while emphasizing the primacy of cognitive and attentional management for workplace effectiveness. The stronger relationships between mind management and wellbeing also carried implications for employee retention and organizational sustainability, as Gen Z workers globally have

Received: 22.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research
ISSN: 3006 - 6417
Vol. 4 Issue 10, October - 2025, Pages: 366 - 383

demonstrated increased willingness to leave positions that compromise mental health, suggesting that organizations fostering mind management capabilities might experience better retention of this generational cohort.

Table 3: Hierarchical Multiple Linear Regression Predicting Workplace Readiness (N = 385)

Predictor	Model 1 β (SE)	Model 2 β (SE)	Model 3 β (SE)	Model 4 β (SE)	Final Model B (95% CI)
Block 1: Demographics					
Age	0.087 (0.196)	0.072 (0.192)	0.053 (0.184)	0.041 (0.156)	0.168 (-0.139, 0.474)
Gender (Female)	-0.034 (0.863)	-0.041 (0.846)	-0.038 (0.814)	-0.025 (0.691)	-0.432 (-2.786, 1.922)
Socioeconomic Status	0.143** (0.412)	0.118* (0.405)	0.089 (0.391)	0.062 (0.332)	0.754 (-0.298, 1.806)
Block 2: Educational Factors					
University Tier (Top-tier)		0.156** (0.917)	0.134** (0.882)	0.108* (0.749)	1.976 (0.514, 3.438)
Field - ICT/Engineering		0.091 (1.024)	0.076 (0.985)	0.063 (0.837)	1.293 (-0.351, 2.937)
Field - Social Sciences		0.034 (1.046)	0.028 (1.006)	0.021 (0.854)	0.446 (-1.234, 2.126)
Field - Health Sciences		0.068 (1.038)	0.054 (0.999)	0.043 (0.848)	0.891 (-0.775, 2.557)
GPA/Academic Performance		0.187*** (0.384)	0.164** (0.370)	0.121** (0.314)	1.168 (0.553, 1.783)
Block 3: Contextual Factors					
Digital Resource Access			0.214*** (0.623)	0.142** (0.529)	1.765 (0.733, 2.797)
Global Work Exposure			0.193*** (0.891)	0.126** (0.757)	2.169 (0.689, 3.649)
Infrastructural Challenges			-0.128** (0.445)	-0.082* (0.378)	-0.726 (-1.468, 0.016)
Mental Health Awareness			0.167** (0.398)	0.104* (0.338)	0.416 (0.043, 0.789)
Block 4: Productivity Orientations					
Mind Management Practices				0.387*** (0.037)	0.285 (0.213, 0.357)
Time Management Practices				0.156** (0.044)	0.137 (0.051, 0.223)

Received: 22.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research
ISSN: 3006 - 6417
Vol. 4 Issue 10, October - 2025, Pages: 366 - 383

Model Statistics					
R^2	0.028	0.112	0.287	0.524	-
Adjusted R^2	0.020	0.096	0.268	0.508	-
ΔR^2	0.028**	0.084***	0.175***	0.237***	-
F-statistic	$F_{3,381}$ = 3.67**	$F_{7,377}$ = 6.79***	$F_{11,373}$ = 13.68***	$F_{13,371}$ = 31.42***	-

***p < 0.001, *$p < 0.01$, $p < 0.05$; β = standardized coefficients; B = unstandardized coefficients*

VIF range: 1.08-2.34 (all < 10); Durbin-Watson = 1.98; Homoscedasticity and normality assumptions met

The hierarchical regression model demonstrated excellent overall fit ($F_{13,371} = 31.42$, $p < 0.001$) with the complete model explaining 52.4% of variance in workplace readiness scores (adjusted $R^2 = 0.508$), substantially exceeding conventional benchmarks for social science research and indicating strong predictive validity. The sequential model building revealed that demographic variables alone (Block 1) accounted for minimal variance ($R^2 = 0.028$, 2.8%), with only socioeconomic status emerging as a significant predictor initially. Educational factors (Block 2) contributed an additional 8.4% of explained variance ($\Delta R^2 = 0.084$, $p < 0.001$), with university tier and academic performance demonstrating significant independent effects, suggesting that educational quality and achievement differentiated workplace readiness beyond demographic characteristics.

Contextual factors (Block 3) produced the largest incremental contribution among pre-productivity blocks ($\Delta R^2 = 0.175$, $p < 0.001$), with digital resource access emerging as the strongest contextual predictor ($\beta = 0.214$), followed by global work exposure ($\beta = 0.193$), indicating that technological connectivity and international workplace exposure substantially enhanced readiness. However, the addition of productivity orientations in Block 4 generated the most substantial improvement in predictive power ($\Delta R^2 = 0.237$, $p < 0.001$), nearly doubling the explained variance and demonstrating that how individuals approached productivity explained readiness beyond demographic, educational, and contextual advantages. In the final model, mind management practices emerged as the strongest predictor overall ($\beta = 0.387$, $p < 0.001$), with effect magnitude 2.5 times larger than time management practices ($\beta = 0.156$, $p = 0.003$), indicating that a one standard deviation increase in mind management practices (11.7 points) associated with a 0.285 standard deviation increase (2.45 points) in workplace readiness, controlling for all other variables. Multicollinearity diagnostics confirmed acceptable levels (VIF < 2.34), independence of errors was satisfied (Durbin-Watson = 1.98), and examination of residual plots indicated homoscedasticity and approximate normality, validating the appropriateness of ordinary least squares regression for these data.

The hierarchical structure of this regression model illuminated the relative contributions of different predictor categories, revealing that productivity orientations represented the most powerful determinant of workplace readiness, overshadowing demographic advantages, educational credentials, and even contextual resources. This finding challenged deficit-oriented narratives that attribute workplace unpreparedness primarily to infrastructural limitations or educational inadequacies in developing contexts like Uganda; while these factors contributed meaningfully (collectively explaining 28.7% of variance), individual productivity approaches explained an additional 23.7% beyond

Received: 22.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research
ISSN: 3006 - 6417
Vol. 4 Issue 10, October - 2025, Pages: 366 - 383

all structural factors combined. The dominance of mind management practices as the single strongest predictor (β = 0.387) provided compelling evidence that cognitive and attentional self-regulation capabilities differentiated highly ready from less ready Gen Z workers more powerfully than any demographic, educational, or contextual variable, suggesting that interventions targeting mind management skill development might yield substantial returns regardless of background characteristics. Notably, the standardized coefficient for mind management practices in the final model (β = 0.387) remained substantial even after controlling for digital access and global exposure—factors that correlated moderately with mind management practices—indicating genuine independent contribution rather than spurious association mediated by resource availability.

The finding that time management practices retained significant predictive validity (β = 0.156) even after accounting for mind management suggested these approaches offered complementary rather than redundant contributions, with time management potentially providing organizational structures that supported effective deployment of cognitive management strategies. The strong effects of digital resource access (β = 0.142) and global work exposure (β = 0.126) in the final model highlighted that connectivity to international workplace discourse and practices independently enhanced readiness beyond productivity orientations themselves, suggesting these contextual factors operated through multiple pathways—both by facilitating exposure to mind management concepts and through direct effects on skills like communication, adaptability, and cultural intelligence. The negative coefficient for infrastructural challenges (β = -0.082), though relatively modest, indicated that unreliable electricity, internet connectivity issues, and transportation difficulties imposed meaningful constraints on readiness development, potentially limiting opportunities for practice and skill consolidation even among motivated individuals. From a policy perspective, these findings suggested a multi-pronged approach to enhancing Ugandan Gen Z workplace readiness: primary emphasis should be placed on cultivating mind management capabilities through educational curricula and workplace training, while simultaneously addressing contextual barriers (digital access, infrastructural reliability) that constrain both exposure to contemporary productivity concepts and opportunities for their application, and maintaining foundational time management instruction as complementary scaffolding rather than primary productivity training.

Table 4: Binary Logistic Regression Predicting High Workplace Readiness and Mediation Analysis

Logistic Regression Predicting High Workplace Readiness (≥Median Split, Score ≥38)

Predictor	**B (SE)**	**Wald χ^2**	**OR**	**95% CI for OR**	**p-value**
Mind Management Practices (per 10-point increase)	0.683 (0.108)	39.87	1.980	1.601-2.449	<0.001
Time Management Practices (per 10-point increase)	0.342 (0.126)	7.36	1.408	1.100-1.802	0.007
Digital Resource Access (High vs. Low)	0.847 (0.312)	7.37	2.333	1.265-4.304	0.007
Global Work Exposure (Yes vs. No)	0.729 (0.268)	7.39	2.073	1.225-3.509	0.007
University Tier (Top vs. Lower)	0.562 (0.254)	4.89	1.754	1.066-2.887	0.027
Academic Performance (High vs. Low)	0.614 (0.241)	6.49	1.848	1.153-2.963	0.011

Received: 22.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research
ISSN: 3006 - 6417
Vol. 4 Issue 10, October - 2025, Pages: 366 - 383

Mental Health Awareness (per unit increase)	0.198 (0.082)	5.84	1.219	1.038-1.432	0.016
Constant	-2.847 (0.624)	20.78	0.058	-	<0.001

Model Statistics: $\chi^2(7) = 186.34$, $p < 0.001$; Nagelkerke $R^2 = 0.516$; Hosmer-Lemeshow $\chi^2(8) = 8.73$, $p = 0.366$; Classification accuracy = 78.4% (Sensitivity = 81.2%, Specificity = 75.6%); AUC = 0.862 (95% CI: 0.825-0.899)

Mediation Analysis: Mind Management Awareness → Mind Management Practices → Workplace Readiness

Path	**B (SE)**	**95% CI**	**t/z**	**p-value**
Path a: Awareness → Practices	1.486 (0.142)	1.207-1.765	10.46	<0.001
Path b: Practices → Readiness (controlling for Awareness)	0.298 (0.034)	0.231-0.365	8.76	<0.001
Path c (total effect): Awareness → Readiness	0.874 (0.091)	0.695-1.053	9.60	<0.001
Path c' (direct effect): Awareness → Readiness (controlling for Practices)	0.431 (0.089)	0.256-0.606	4.84	<0.001
Indirect effect (a×b): Mediated through Practices	0.443 (0.062)	0.329-0.573	-	-
Proportion mediated:	50.7%	38.2%-67.4%	-	-

Bootstrap estimates based on 5,000 samples; Indirect effect 95% bias-corrected CI excludes zero, indicating significant mediation

The binary logistic regression model demonstrated excellent discriminative ability with area under the ROC curve of 0.862, substantially exceeding the minimum threshold for acceptable classification (0.70) and approaching the range considered excellent (>0.90), while the Hosmer-Lemeshow test indicated adequate model fit ($\chi^2 = 8.73$, $p = 0.366$), with non-significant results confirming no evidence of poor calibration between observed and predicted probabilities. The model correctly classified 78.4% of cases overall, with balanced performance across categories (sensitivity 81.2%, specificity 75.6%), suggesting practical utility for identifying high workplace readiness. Examination of odds ratios revealed that mind management practices exerted the strongest effect, with each 10-point increase (approximately 0.85 SD) nearly doubling the odds of high workplace readiness (OR = 1.98, 95% CI [1.60, 2.45]), representing a large effect by conventional standards. Time management practices also significantly predicted readiness classification (OR = 1.41, 95% CI [1.10, 1.80]), though with substantially smaller magnitude, as the 95% confidence intervals for these odds ratios did not overlap, confirming statistically significant differences in effect sizes.

Contextual variables demonstrated meaningful effects, with high digital access more than doubling odds of readiness (OR = 2.33) and global work exposure approximately doubling odds (OR = 2.07), while educational factors (university tier, academic performance) increased odds by approximately 75-85%. The mediation analysis revealed significant

Received: 22.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Metropolitan Journal of Academic and Applied Research
ISSN: 3006 - 6417
Vol. 4 Issue 10, October - 2025, Pages: 366 - 383

partial mediation, as the indirect effect confidence interval excluded zero (95% CI [0.329, 0.573]), indicating that mind management practices significantly mediated the relationship between awareness and workplace readiness. The proportion mediated (50.7%) indicated that approximately half of the total effect of awareness on readiness operated through the pathway of enhanced mind management practices, while the remaining direct effect (path c' = 0.431, $p < 0.001$) suggested awareness also contributed to readiness through additional mechanisms beyond practice adoption, possibly including metacognitive understanding, expectation formation, or self-efficacy development.

The logistic regression results translated the linear relationships identified in previous analyses into practical classification probabilities, demonstrating that mind management practices not only predicted readiness scores but fundamentally distinguished between Gen Z individuals who met workplace readiness thresholds versus those who did not. The odds ratio of 1.98 for mind management practices possessed concrete interpretive value: a Gen Z individual scoring 50 on mind management practices had approximately twice the odds of achieving high workplace readiness compared to an individual scoring 40, holding all other factors constant, translating abstract correlation coefficients into actionable insights about the magnitude of productivity orientation effects.

The model's strong discriminative ability (AUC = 0.862) suggested that these predictors captured the essential dimensions differentiating ready from unready individuals, with practical implications for screening, intervention targeting, or program evaluation where identifying high-risk individuals (those unlikely to achieve readiness) would enable resource allocation toward those most needing support. The contextual variables' substantial odds ratios reinforced that while individual productivity approaches represented the strongest predictor, structural factors remained consequential—digital resource access and global work exposure each approximately doubled readiness odds independently, suggesting that even highly motivated, mind-management-oriented individuals faced constraints when lacking technological infrastructure or exposure to international workplace norms. These findings carried implications for equity, as digital access and global exposure correlated with socioeconomic status (though not perfectly), potentially creating a scenario where structurally advantaged Gen Z individuals accumulated both resource benefits and productivity orientation advantages, compounding inequality. The mediation analysis provided crucial insights into mechanisms linking awareness to outcomes, demonstrating that knowledge about mind management concepts translated into workplace readiness substantially through behavioral adoption (practice implementation) rather than through awareness alone.

The finding that practices mediated approximately 51% of the awareness-readiness relationship suggested that educational interventions raising awareness would yield limited benefits unless accompanied by opportunities for practice, skill development, and behavioral integration—knowing about attention management, energy optimization, and cognitive load reduction proved insufficient without actual implementation in daily work and study routines. However, the significant residual direct effect (path c') indicated awareness retained independent value beyond practice adoption, potentially through enhancing metacognitive monitoring capabilities, creating accurate mental models of productivity mechanisms, or fostering self-efficacy beliefs that supported workplace adaptation even when specific practices were not fully implemented. From an intervention design perspective, these results suggested that

Received: 22.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

effective workplace readiness programs should integrate three components: conceptual education establishing awareness of mind management principles, structured practice opportunities enabling skill development in authentic contexts, and contextual support addressing barriers like digital access limitations that constrained both awareness acquisition and practice implementation. The partial rather than complete mediation also suggested that complementary pathways to workplace readiness existed beyond the awareness-practice sequence, potentially including direct experiences, mentorship relationships, or organizational socialization processes that fostered readiness through tacit learning rather than explicit conceptual understanding, highlighting the multifaceted nature of workplace preparation for Uganda's Gen Z cohort navigating the transition from traditional time-based to contemporary cognition-based productivity paradigms.

CONCLUSION

This study assessed Ugandan Generation Z's readiness for the modern workplace by examining their orientation toward mind management versus time management approaches to productivity, revealing fundamental asymmetries in awareness and practice that have profound implications for workforce development. The findings demonstrated that while Ugandan Gen Z possessed significantly greater familiarity with traditional time management concepts ($M = 16.4$) compared to emerging mind management approaches ($M = 12.8$, $d = 1.02$), those who adopted mind management practices exhibited substantially superior workplace readiness, productivity, and wellbeing outcomes compared to individuals relying exclusively on time management strategies. Hierarchical regression analysis revealed that mind management practices emerged as the strongest predictor of workplace readiness ($\beta = 0.387$), explaining variance beyond demographic, educational, and contextual factors, while logistic regression confirmed that each 10-point increase in mind management practices nearly doubled the odds of achieving high workplace readiness ($OR = 1.98$). The mediation analysis established that approximately 51% of the relationship between awareness and readiness operated through behavioral practice adoption, indicating that knowledge translation into action represented a critical pathway requiring intentional skill development opportunities. These findings challenge the conventional prioritization of time management in Ugandan educational and workplace training programs, suggesting that contemporary workplace demands increasingly require cognitive capacity management, attention regulation, and psychological wellbeing integration rather than mere temporal scheduling efficiency. The substantial heterogeneity in mind management awareness and the strong predictive effects of digital resource access and global work exposure indicate that Ugandan Gen Z's workforce preparation is currently bifurcated, with structurally advantaged individuals gaining disproportionate access to contemporary productivity concepts while others remain anchored in traditional frameworks that prove insufficient for modern workplace success. To optimize Uganda's Gen Z workforce integration and performance in an increasingly knowledge-intensive global economy, stakeholders must transition from time-centric to cognition-centric productivity development, integrating mind management principles into educational curricula, workplace training, and organizational cultures while simultaneously addressing infrastructural barriers that constrain both awareness acquisition and practice implementation for this pivotal generational cohort.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Educational Curriculum Integration: Ugandan universities and tertiary institutions should systematically integrate mind management principles—including attention control, energy optimization, cognitive load management, and

Received: 22.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

psychological wellbeing practices—into core curricula across all disciplines, moving beyond traditional time management workshops to establish dedicated courses or embedded modules that provide both conceptual understanding and structured practice opportunities, with particular emphasis on experiential learning approaches that enable students to develop metacognitive skills, self-regulation capabilities, and adaptive productivity strategies essential for contemporary workplace demands.

Digital Infrastructure and Access Enhancement: Government agencies, educational institutions, and private sector stakeholders should prioritize expanding reliable digital resource access for Gen Z individuals, particularly those in lower socioeconomic strata, through subsidized internet connectivity programs, establishment of well-equipped digital learning hubs, and partnerships with technology providers, recognizing that digital access serves as a critical gateway to contemporary productivity concepts, global workplace exposure, and the development of mind management capabilities that significantly predict workplace readiness beyond traditional educational credentials.

Workplace Training and Organizational Culture Transformation: Ugandan employers should redesign employee onboarding and professional development programs to emphasize mind management competencies alongside technical skills, implementing practices such as attention-protective work structures, energy-aware task scheduling, cognitive recovery periods, and psychological safety cultures that support mental wellbeing, while training managers to recognize and cultivate mind management behaviors rather than exclusively measuring productivity through time-based metrics, thereby aligning organizational expectations with the cognitive management approaches that research demonstrates yield superior performance and wellbeing outcomes for Gen Z workers.

References.

Adams, R. V., & Blair, E. (2019). Impact of Time Management Behaviors on Undergraduate Engineering Students' Performance. *SAGE Open*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244018824506

Aeon, B., Faber, A., & Panaccio, A. (2021). Does time management work? A meta-analysis. *PLoS ONE*, *16*(1 January). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245066

Brosseau, L., Taki, J., Desjardins, B., Thevenot, O., Fransen, M., Wells, G. A., Imoto, A. M., Toupin-April, K., Westby, M., Gallardo, I. C. Á., Gifford, W., Laferrière, L., Rahman, P., Loew, L., Angelis, G. De, Cavallo, S., Shallwani, S. M., Aburub, A., Bennell, K. L., … McLean, L. (2017). The Ottawa panel clinical practice guidelines for the management of knee osteoarthritis. Part one: Introduction, and mind-body exercise programs ∗. *Clinical Rehabilitation*, *31*(5). https://doi.org/10.1177/0269215517691083

Brown, M. L., Rojas, E., & Gouda, S. (2017). A mind–body approach to pediatric pain management. In *Children* (Vol. 4, Issue 6). https://doi.org/10.3390/children4060050

Buro, A. W., Crowder, S. L., Rozen, E., Stern, M., & Carson, T. L. (2023). Lifestyle Interventions with Mind-Body or Stress-Management Practices for Cancer Survivors: A Rapid Review. In *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health* (Vol. 20, Issue 4). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph20043355

Cozzolino, M., Girelli, L., Vivo, D. R., Limone, P., & Celia, G. (2020). A mind–body intervention for stress reduction as an adjunct to an information session on stress management in university students. *Brain and Behavior*, *10*(6). https://doi.org/10.1002/brb3.1651

Dmytryshyn, M., & Goran, T. (2022). PROPOSAL OF AN EFFECTIVE TIME MANAGEMENT SYSTEM.

Received: 22.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

Management (Croatia), *27*(2). https://doi.org/10.30924/mjcmi.27.2.15

Eaton, L. H., & Hulett, J. M. (2019). Mind-Body Interventions in the Management of Chronic Cancer Pain. In *Seminars in Oncology Nursing* (Vol. 35, Issue 3). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.soncn.2019.04.005

Ericsson, D., Stasinski, R., & Stenström, E. (2022). Body, mind, and soul principles for designing management education: an ethnography from the future. *Culture and Organization*, *28*(3–4). https://doi.org/10.1080/14759551.2022.2028148

Fritz, J. M., Rhon, D. I., Garland, E. L., Hanley, A. W., Greenlee, T., Fino, N., Martin, B., Highland, K. B., & Greene, T. (2023). The Effectiveness of a Mindfulness-Based Intervention Integrated with Physical Therapy (MIND-PT) for Postsurgical Rehabilitation After Lumbar Surgery: A Protocol for a Randomized Controlled Trial as Part of the Back Pain Consortium (BACPAC) Research Program. *Pain Medicine (United States)*, *24*. https://doi.org/10.1093/pm/pnac138

Grazzi, L., D'Amico, D., Guastafierro, E., Demichelis, G., Erbetta, A., Fedeli, D., Nigri, A., Ciusani, E., Barbara, C., & Raggi, A. (2023). Efficacy of mindfulness added to treatment as usual in patients with chronic migraine and medication overuse headache: a phase-III single-blind randomized-controlled trial (the MIND-CM study). *Journal of Headache and Pain*, *24*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s10194-023-01630-0

Grenha Teixeira, J., Patrício, L., Huang, K. H., Fisk, R. P., Nóbrega, L., & Constantine, L. (2017). The MINDS Method: Integrating Management and Interaction Design Perspectives for Service Design. *Journal of Service Research*, *20*(3). https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670516680033

Hall, D. L., Millstein, R. A., Luberto, C. M., Perez, G. K., & Park, E. R. (2020). Responding to COVID-19 Stress: Disseminating Mind-Body Resiliency Approaches. *Global Advances In Health and Medicine*, *9*. https://doi.org/10.1177/2164956120976554

Krcmarik, K. M., Hulley, B. J., Huang, J., Juang, D., Cadman, P., Urbiztondo, C., Vo, C., Vargas, J., Motarjemi, R., Moinizandi, T., & Kwan, B. (2023). Assessment of a modified MINDS-based protocol for management of alcohol withdrawal syndrome on an inpatient medical service. *Pharmacotherapy*, *43*(12). https://doi.org/10.1002/phar.2855

Maindet, C., Burnod, A., Minello, C., George, B., Allano, G., & Lemaire, A. (2019). Strategies of complementary and integrative therapies in cancer-related pain—attaining exhaustive cancer pain management. In *Supportive Care in Cancer* (Vol. 27, Issue 8). https://doi.org/10.1007/s00520-019-04829-7

Nelson, K., Christopher, F., & Milton, N. (2022). *Teach Yourself Spss and Stata*. *6*(7), 84–122.

Nelson, K., Kazaara, A. G., & Kazaara, A. I. (2023). *Teach Yourself E-Views*. *7*(3), 124–145.

Op den Kamp, E. M., Tims, M., Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2023). Creating a creative state of mind: Promoting creativity through proactive vitality management and mindfulness. *Applied Psychology*, *72*(2). https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12399

Pande, A. S., & Kumar, R. (2020). Implications of Indian Philosophy and Mind Management for Agency Conflicts and Leadership: A Conceptual Framework. *IIM Kozhikode Society and Management Review*, *9*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2277975219858864

Shekhar, H., Mancuso-Marcello, M., Emelifeonwu, J., Gallo, P., Sokol, D., Kandasamy, J., & Kaliaperumal, C. (2022). Management of traumatic atlanto-occipital dislocation in a 10-year-old with noninvasive halo

Received: 22.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**

immobilization: A case report. *Surgical Neurology International*, *13*. https://doi.org/10.25259/SNI_17_2022

Trentepohl, S., Waldeyer, J., Fleischer, J., Roelle, J., Leutner, D., & Wirth, J. (2022). How Did It Get So Late So Soon? The Effects of Time Management Knowledge and Practice on Students' Time Management Skills and Academic Performance. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *14*(9). https://doi.org/10.3390/su14095097

Wilson, R., Joiner, K., & Abbasi, A. (2021). Improving students' performance with time management skills. *Journal of University Teaching and Learning Practice*, *18*(4). https://doi.org/10.53761/1.18.4.16

Zhang, F., Liu, J. X., An, M. F., & Gu, H. (2021). The effect of time management training on time management and anxiety among nursing undergraduates. *Psychology, Health and Medicine*, *26*(9). https://doi.org/10.1080/13548506.2020.1778751

Received: 22.10.2025 **Accepted: 24.10.2025** **Published on: 30.10.2025**