THE UNIVERSITY of EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Exploring the work/life study balance

OPEN ACCESS

Exploring the work/life/study balance: the experience of higher education students in a Scottish further education college

Janet Lowe[*] and Vernon Gayle
University of Stirling, UK

This study explores the dimensions of the work/life/study balance and its influence on student participation in higher education, through a case study of the experience of higher education students, studying both full time and part time, in a Scottish further education college. The experience of the students and the work/life/study challenges that they face stand in marked contrast to the traditional conception of university students, on which higher education policy is usually based. The majority of the students in this case study combined study with work and/or family commitments and the normal 'working' week was of 59–71 hours. Full time and part time students experienced different but equivalent demands on their time and were equally at risk of overload. Over half of the students achieved a good or manageable work/life/study balance, whilst some experienced stress caused by conflicting priorities. The students' success in balancing study with work and family life was influenced by their coping strategies and by the nature and quality of the support they received from families and employers. It is recommended that there is scope for the further development of an institutional culture and ethos that is compatible with the reality of the students' busy lives. A case is made for the equalization of financial support for full time students and part time students.

Introduction

Further education colleges are now major providers of both full time and part time higher education in Scotland (Garrick, 1997; Gallacher, 2006). In 2004–2005 38 further education colleges in Scotland offered higher education to over 52,000 enrolled students.[1] Higher education students based in further education colleges are a distinctive group with specific characteristics. Compared with university-based higher education students, higher education students in further education colleges are more likely to be older, have non-traditional entry qualifications, study part time,

*Corresponding author. Department of Applied and Social Science, University of Stirling, Stirling FK9 4LA, UK. Email: janetlowe@aol.com

be enrolled on HNC or HND courses (most of which are vocationally orientated) and come from less advantaged backgrounds (Garrick, 1997; Raab, 1998; Schuller *et al.*, 1999; Gallacher, 2003; HEFCE, 2005). The mission of most further education colleges is to provide education and training for their local communities. Therefore higher education students based at further education colleges are generally also more likely to be local students (SFEFC, 2005).

In 2000–2001[2] 28% of all higher education students in Scotland were studying at a further education college. Thirty-four per cent of all undergraduates were studying at a further education college. This group represents 21% of those studying full time and 61% of those studying part time (Scottish Executive, 2002). Higher education students based in further education colleges are consistently overlooked by policy-makers but their share of the higher education student population surely merits greater attention.

In terms of research this group of higher education students has received little empirical attention. Therefore we have termed this group the 'hidden higher education students'. This paper is a first attempt at painting a broad picture of the lives of higher education students studying in further education colleges. Within the social sciences there is much contemporary concern regarding 'work/life' balance (Warren, 2004). In this article we explore the dimensions of the work/life/study balance for higher education students who are studying at a further education college. We conjecture that a specific set of work/life/study challenges present themselves to these students.

There are two theoretical types of higher education students upon which policy decisions are usually based:

Ν Student A: a young full time student who may be working part time.

Ν Student B: an older employee who is studying part time.

Student A is found primarily in higher education institutions but also in further education colleges. It has long been acknowledged that full time higher education students participate in part time work during term-time (see Hansard, 1993). Various empirical studies have examined the nature and impact of part time work amongst students (Ford *et al.*, 1995; Taylor, 1998; Smith & Taylor, 1999; Metcalf, 2001; Curtis & Shani, 2002; Hunt *et al.*, 2004; Carney *et al.*, 2005). Interest in the issue of combining work with study is not therefore particularly new. We observe, however, that these analyses have focused exclusively on university students.

Research into the experience of part time higher education students (Student B) has explored their ability to cope with and 'juggle' competing demands on their time (Blaxter & Tight, 1994a, b). Hill and McGregor (1998), Kember (1999) and Kember and Leung (2004) have investigated the importance of the support systems available to part time university students. However, Student B is more commonly found in further education colleges. As employees, these students have work commitments and, typically, they are studying vocationally oriented courses for work-related reasons. The experiences of part time higher education students in further education colleges have largely remained undocumented.

Higher education students (both full time and part time) in colleges tend to be older than standard university entrants and are therefore more likely to have children and family commitments. The increase in mature student participation generally in higher education has prompted some consideration of the pressures that students might face through their family responsibilities (Woodley *et al.*, 1987; Osborne *et al.*, 2001). A particular concern is that mature female students may have multiple roles and responsibilities that carry considerable emotional, practical and financial burdens (Edwards, 1993). We suggest that many higher education students in further education colleges, both full time and part time, will face the complexity of both work *and* family commitments and that a simple typology may not adequately represent the diversity of the student experience.

A central aim of lifelong learning policies is to extend higher education opportunities to non-traditional student groups (Scottish Executive, 2003). We argue that, for higher education students based in further education colleges, the work/life/study balance is central to their participation. Therefore an improved understanding of the complexity of the inter-relationship between employment, studying and home (or family) life is critical to theorizing lifelong learning and developing evidence-based policy.

This article is based upon a case study of higher education students in a further education college in Scotland. A questionnaire survey of all of the higher education students in the college was undertaken in 2000–2001 and replicated in 2001–2002 and 2002–2003. An overall response rate of 44% was achieved. A series of focus groups was conducted with participants selected through purposive sampling. A full description of the methodology can be found in Lowe (2005).

Work and family responsibilities

Administrative data from the case study college confirmed that the student body was heterogeneous and this diversity was reflected in the response to this survey. There was an even mix of male and female students and a spread across all age groups. In the survey, 37% of the respondents were studying full time in 2000–2001, 50% in 2001–2002 and 41% in 2002–2003. This reflects the profile for Scotland of 43% full time enrolments in 2000–2001 and 2001–2002 and 45% in 2002–2003.[3]

There was ample evidence of students combining work with study. Almost all of the part time students in each of the three years reported that they had a job. Of the full time students, 47% had a job in 2000–2001, 33% in 2001–2002 and 40% in 2002–2003. Working patterns varied between the full time and part time students as might have been expected. However just under 70% of the employed full time students in each year were spending a proportion of Monday to Friday at work during term-time (Table 1).

Family circumstances were diverse for both full time and part time students. Table 2 shows that only a minority of the full time students were living alone or with friends. In each year, nearly 40% were living with a spouse or partner and at least one in three had children. More than half of the part time students were living with a

Table 1. Time of work (% of those employed)

	2000–2001			2001–2002			2002–2003		
	All *n5428*	FT *n596*	PT *n5332*	All *n5215*	FT *n555*	PT *n5160*	All *n5219*	FT *n548*	PT *n 5171*
Mainly during the day (Monday to Friday)	58	11	72	66	13	84	69	6	87
Mainly during the evening (Monday to Friday)	5	14	2	3	13	0	7	29	1
Mainly during the day (weekend)	5	24	0	6	20	0	6	25	1
Mainly evening (weekend)	2	8	0	3	14	0	1	6	0
Mainly shift work	16	11	17	6	2	8	6	4	6
Different times	14	32	9	16	38	8	11	29	6

spouse or partner, with or without children. However 22% of the part time students in 2000–2001, 23% in 2001–2002 and 31% in 2002–2003 were living with parents or guardians.

Taken together, these data on employment and family circumstances question the validity of the 'ideal types' (i.e., Student A and Student B) on which policies are

Table 2. Family circumstances (%)

	2000–2001			2001–2002			2002–2003		
	All *n5561*	FT *n5208*	PT *n5353*	All *n5349*	FT *n 5175*	PT *n5174*	All *n5309*	FT *n5129*	PT *n5180*
Living with parents/ guardian	26	32	22	31	38	23	34	40	31
Living with spouse/partner	20	13	24	18	14	22	18	15	21
Living with spouse/partner and children	34	26	40	32	22	42	30	23	34
Living with friends/other adults	3	3	3	1	1	1	2	5	1
Living alone	9	10	8	10	11	8	10	10	9
Living with own children	6	11	3	8	12	4	6	8	4
Other	2	4	1	1	2	0	0	0	0

usually based. The data demonstrate that the majority of higher education students in a further education college combined study with work and/or family commitments. Few devoted themselves wholly to study. Forty-seven per cent of the students in 2000–2001, 34% in 2001–2002 and 39% in 2002–2003 were living with a spouse/partner and/or children *and* had a job. The proportion of students who lived alone or with parents or friends and did *not* have a job was only 9% in 2000–2001, 16% in 2001–2002 and 13% in 2002–2003. Further analysis identified that only 10% of the students in 2000–2001, 19% in 2002–2003 and 17% in 2002–2003 had no job and no care responsibilities. The majority of the students therefore had to face the challenge of achieving a work/life/study balance. Our work looked in some depth at how the students faced up to this challenge and the factors that influenced their success.

Managing busy lives

Each student was asked to estimate the number of hours spent during a typical week on: studying, working, travelling to/from work/college, domestic tasks/care, family or personal time or social activities. Table 3 shows that all students were putting in a 'working' week of 59–71 hours with the balance between work and study reversed between full time and part time students. On average full time students spent 30 hours per week studying and 16–20 hours working, whilst part time students spent 10 hours studying and 40 hours per week working.[4] Full time and part time students therefore experienced different but equivalent demands on their time and

Table 3. Median hours spent per week on categories of activity split by mode of study and gender

	2000–2001 n5524						2001–2002 n5324						2002–2003 n5269					
	FT n5186			PT n5338			FT n 5162			PT n5162			FT n5105			PT n5164		
	All	M	F	All	M	F	All	M	F	All	M	F	All	M	F	All	M	F
Study	30	30	33	10	10	10	30	34	30	10	10	12	30	35	30	10	10	12
Work	18	18	18	40	42	40	16	15	17	40	40	38	20	20	18	40	40	38
Travel	4	5	4	4	5	4	3	3	4	4	4	5	4	4	4	4	5	3
Domestic	10	7	10	8	6	10	7	7	7	10	8	10	10	10	10	7	6	10
Family/social	30	40	22	30	35	28	25	31	20	30	30	25	30	32	28	35	40	25
Total	105	119	98	113	118	103	88	95	85	105	108	100	114	116	113	110	113	106
Total (excluding family/ social time)	69	67	70	69	71	66	60	62	59	70	70	70	67	60	68	68	67	69

Notes: 2000–2001: n562 (FT male); 124 (FT female); 193 (PT male); 145 (PT female). 2001–2002: n562 (FT male); 99 (FT female); 95 (PT male); 67 (PT female). 2002–2003: n542 (FT male); 63 (FT female); 104 (PT male); 60 (PT female).

were equally at risk of overload and conflict. Female students spent more time on domestic tasks and had less social time.[5]

Students assigned complex and unexpected priorities to their various activities. Only a minority of between 14% and 17% of the students reported that their college course was more important to them than their job (Table 4). There was a difference between full time and part time students but, even amongst the full time students, between 8% and 10% rated their job as more important and between 37% and 43% rated both job and college course as equally important. This contrasts with the findings of Winn and Stevenson (1997) who noted that all university students gave priority to their course. Part time students might have been expected to give priority to their jobs, but between 32% and 37% rated both college course and job as equal.

Our research methodology facilitated a more in-depth analysis of the issues associated with combining study with work and/or family life through focus groups. The focus groups provided qualitative evidence of ambivalence on the part of the students about the priority they should accord to the demands of study over work, family and parental responsibilities. Mature students, in particular, were highly motivated to achieve success in their studies despite the risk of compromising their obligations to employers and family members.

The concept of work/life/study balance was explored in the focus groups. An analysis of the focus group discussions, set against the work of Kember (1999), Edwards (1993), Blaxter and Tight (1994a) and Morgan-Klein and Gray (2000) led to a typology of four categories of 'balance' defined in terms of the permeability of the boundary between study and work and/or family and the students' success in negotiating and managing agreement and equilibrium. The first category (a good balance) was characterized by separation and compartmentalization. Typically students in this category viewed their studies as a distinct part of their lives with limited impact on, or overlap with, other activities. The second category (manage to balance) was characterized by integration. Typically students in this category had negotiated a place for study within busy lives and had secured cooperation and support from other key people so that all their activities fitted together effectively. The third category (find it difficult to balance) was characterized by overlapping co-existence. Typically students in this category had attempted to achieve integration with only partial success so that interaction at the boundaries was subject to

Table 4. Prioritization of college or work 2000–2001 (%) 2000–2001

	All $n5430$	FT $n5100$	PT $n5330$	All $n5221$	FT $n561$	PT $n5160$	All $n5224$	FT $n552$	PT $n5172$
				2001–2002			2002–2003		
College	14	55	2	15	49	3	17	48	8
Job	49	9	61	47	8	61	49	10	61
Both equal	37	37	37	38	43	36	34	42	32

continuing negotiation and the equilibrium was unstable and at risk of breakdown. The fourth category (conflicting demands create stress) was characterized by instability. Typically students in this category had not negotiated a place for study within their lives and therefore attempted to manage the boundaries on a continuing basis depending upon the exigencies of different aspects of their lives at different times.

The occurrence of different experiences of work/life/study balance was investigated further through the questionnaire. Table 5 reveals that, despite the many demands on their time, over half of the students had achieved a good or manageable balance. A significant minority experienced conflict and stress. The relationship between study, work and family life was therefore differentiated, with both positive and negative consequences for students. This diversity of experience underlines the importance of understanding the dynamic of the work/life/study balance for the students themselves, for institutions and for policy formulation.

The role of support

The data provided no evidence of an association between the personal or employment characteristics of the students or their mode of study and the quality of work/life/study balance they achieved. This is important because simplistic typologies of students may be based on incorrect assumptions about such associations. In our study, the students' need for support and the source of that support were much more important factors.

One third of students reported that they received no financial support and 25% received no help with domestic chores.[6] In the case of childcare and leave of absence from work, both of which play a key role in enabling students to achieve a work/life/study balance, two thirds of those responding to the question reported receiving no support. Lack of financial support worsened in 2002–2003, possibly due to the withdrawal of Individual Learning Accounts (Scottish Executive, 2005). More positively, 90% of the students said that they received at least some encouragement and understanding.

Students received personal and financial support from a variety of sources (see Table 6). The balance categories (see Table 4) were compared with sources of support and, in all three years, those with a good balance or who managed to balance the demands made on them received more support from family, friends, colleagues

Table 5. How well do you balance different priorities? (%)

	2000–2001 *n*5552	2001–2002 *n*5348	2002–2003 *n*5301
Good balance	22	31	22
Manage to balance	35	35	38
Difficult to balance	24	21	26
Conflicting priorities	19	14	14

Table 6. Source of support (%)

	2000–2001 *n5548*	2001–2002 *n5341*	2002–2003 *n5293*
Family members	80	80	78
Friends	48	48	50
Colleagues at work	34	28	28
Employer	26	26	26
Fellow students	64	68	61
None of these	3	4	4
Average no. of responses per respondent	2.5	2.5	2.5

Notes: Multiple response question.

and employers than those with a less stable balance. There was a strong relationship between the students' declared need for more help and support and their categories of balance (Table 7). Those with a good balance were significantly less likely to need additional support and vice versa.

The role of support was also explored in the focus groups. Students reported that the quality of relationships could be very important. Some participants specifically described how a supportive partner or a supportive employer contributed to a balanced life. Others described how they were giving support to family members rather than receiving support. Several spoke about feelings of guilt, sacrifice and conflict in respect of family relationships, rather than support. One described how an employer specifically created problems by requiring time spent at college to be 'paid back' by extra overtime.

Respondents were asked to indicate if aspects of course organization and availability of college services had a positive or negative effect upon their experience as students. Very few negative responses emerged. Less than 10% of those responding indicated any difficulty, with the exception of timing of classes, amount

Table 7. Relationship between balance and need for additional support 2000–

	2001 *n5526*		2001–2002 *n5332*		2002–2003 *n5284*	
Do you need additional support?	Yes *n5183*	No *n5343*	Yes *n597*	No *n5235*	Yes *n593*	No *n5191*
Overall	35	65	29	71	33	67
Good balance	12	88	16	84	15	85
Manage to balance	24	76	21	79	23	77
Difficult balance	49	51	46	54	47	53
Conflicting priorities	64	36	59	41	64	36

Notes: Row percentages. 2000–2001:$x^2$553.20; *df*51; *p*,0.001; Cramer's V5.318. 2001–2002:$x^2$527.40; *df*51; *p*,0.001; Cramer's V5.289. 2002–2003:$x^2$530.28; *df*51; *p*,0.001; Cramer's V5.326.

of attendance required, and availability of staff. Even these had negative responses of less than 17%. This suggests that the practical aspects of college life were less influential than the more intangible ethos and culture of the institution.

Considering all of this evidence, it would appear that it was not the demographic characteristics of the students, nor their personal or employment circumstances that influenced whether they coped effectively as lifelong learners, by achieving a stable balance between study, work and family life. Mode of study did not emerge as a significant factor. There was also little evidence that practical issues associated with the way the college organized learning and services were influential. What appeared to be more important was the extent to which relationships were supportive, and adequate help and support were available. For employed students, the attitude of colleagues at work as well as that of the employer was important.

Discussion

The students

We noted earlier that higher education students in further education colleges have remained 'hidden' through a lack of empirical evidence about their experience. Our analysis of the students' work/life/study balance has painted a picture of a diverse community of people who lead busy lives as they juggle study, work and personal/family life. The circumstances and experiences of these 'hidden' students do not conform with a simple conventional typology of a young full time student without domestic commitments and with occasional or vacation work (Student A) or an older employee studying part time (Student B). Students in this case study spent an average of 59–71 hours per week on a combination of study, work and domestic responsibilities. There was a difference between full time and part time students in terms of the relative time spent on work and study but there were variations for each mode of study. The impression is one of a variety of individualized patterns of activity, rather than one of two polarized alternatives. The students appeared to be interpreting the options and opportunities available to them and devising personal strategies that resulted in feasible participation for each student, depending on his or her circumstances, preferences and priorities.

This research has highlighted that many students are 'working' excessively long hours. We argue that this is a hidden example of the British 'long hours' culture. Because students combine both employment and study they are not obviously protected by progressive legislation (such as the European Working Time Directive 93/104/EC). This is further justification for continuing to document empirically the complex lives of higher education students based in colleges and to understand the consequences for the institutions in which they study.

Work and family life both had, however, positive as well as negative consequences for study, for both full time and part time students. Despite the challenges they faced, half of the students achieved a good or manageable work/life/study balance although, for others, conflicting priorities caused stress and difficulty. It is reasonable to conclude that, for some if not many students, combining study with

work and/or family life was a state of choice which could confer benefits and rewards, and not just a necessity. It was not possible to predict that certain categories of student would be more or less likely to achieve successful and stable integration of learning with work and life. The influential factors which distinguished those students who were achieving a good or manageable work/life/study balance appeared to be their coping strategies and resilience and the quality of support received from their families, employers, fellow students and from the institution.

College culture and ethos

The experiences of these students suggest that it is not valid simply to discuss how to minimize the impact of life circumstances on study and to remediate potential 'failures'. The findings challenge the tendency to perceive students only as learners, and lead instead to a perception of a student as a whole person inclusive of her or his roles as partner, parent, worker, carer or job seeker, all of which have to find a place in busy lives. The students' experiences suggest that success can be achieved by people who experience a variety of life circumstances, particularly if the right support is available. Colleges in Scotland already have a unitized and credit-based higher education curriculum that is available to students in a variety of modes of study, from a defined full time or part time course to a personalized programme of individual units. Practical aspects of the college environment were not identified as significant factors in our findings. One explanation is that the college had already taken steps to address these issues. The most significant scope for institutional change to support a successful work/life/study balance therefore lies in the less tangible aspects of institutional culture and ethos. This is related to the organizational flexibility of the college and to the climate of the learning environment. In particular we suggest that the attitudes, values and priorities of staff and available resources (e.g., guidance and counselling) will all contribute to a suitable ethos and culture.

We suggest that students need support to understand the work/life/study balance and the concept of boundaries, to develop more conscious strategies to manage and negotiate relationships and to incorporate the role of student within their personal role sets. In more practical terms, students would benefit from advice on how to mobilize rather than alienate potential sources of support and how to develop effective study skills and time management. There is evidence that colleges have taken some steps to address these issues but further progress would clearly be beneficial to students.

Underlying these sensible and practical measures is the need for a more profound shift in institutional ethos, recognizing that students are people for whom the learning experience may be practically demanding and may also involve challenging changes in their self-concept and self-esteem and in personal and family relationships. Students in professional careers may face difficult conflicts of loyalty and priority between employment and personal development. Allowing students to bring all of these challenges into the college rather than attempting to

leave them at the door, requires a sophisticated response which balances the academic purpose of the institution with the reality of the students' lives (Thomas, 2002).

Tett (2004) suggested that elite universities find the behaviour of 'non-traditional' students to be 'extravagant' and 'unconventional'. Colleges, on the other hand, already welcome and accommodate 'new' higher education students, whether they are tentative women returners or working professionals. This research provides evidence that students would value a culture of flexibility that extends beyond the temporal availability of the curriculum to offer the opportunity for each student to choose and negotiate a model of work/life/study balance that is compatible with his or her circumstances and preferences.

Lifelong learning policy

Our empirical evidence suggests that the official distinction between full time study and part time study does not accurately reflect the reality of the students' lives. Many students who were classified as 'full time' had other commitments that resulted in what was effectively part time study. Conversely, those part time students undertaking the highest amounts of study were approaching study times observed amongst full time students. Family circumstances were not an indication of mode of study and both full time and part time students exhibited a variety of domestic commitments. In some cases, choice of mode of study is likely to have been driven by economic considerations, in that full time status confers financial advantages that are not available to all part time students (Scottish Executive, 2000). On the other hand, some part time students can claim benefits and all can (at least in theory) work more hours and earn more money than full time students. For some students, full time employment precludes anything other than part time study. However, this research suggests that the distinction between modes of study is not clear-cut for students. The reality is one of degrees of 'part time-ness', depending both upon the balance of the time spent on various activities and on the priority accorded by the student to study, work and family responsibilities.

In contrast there are distinct differences in the financial support available for full time and part time students. For example, part time students are responsible for the upfront payment of fees. They have only a restricted entitlement to loans and no eligibility for maintenance grants or bursaries. Equalization of financial benefits for both modes of study would reflect the experience of the students in this case study and would enable each student to choose a pattern of study that is compatible with his/her life circumstances. Harmonization of financial support systems would thus contribute to an optimum quality of life, conducive to educational success. Such a step would align policy in respect of student and institutional funding with the philosophy of lifelong learning (i.e., that education should be accessible to people from all walks of life across the life course). It may be argued that the introduction of the Graduate Endowment in Scotland (Scottish Executive, 2000) and the imposition of tuition fees in other parts of the UK (DfEE, 1998; DfES, 2003)

represent a move towards equalization, in that full time students now incur responsibility for the cost of tuition on a similar basis to part time students. We also acknowledge that financial concessions for some part time students have been introduced. The Department for Education and Skills has announced improved fee support for the poorest part time students in 2006 in England[7] and, in Scotland, there is already limited availability of fee waivers for part time students who are unemployed or from very low income households.[8] However the principle and practice of different student support regimes for full time and part time study remains, with consequent inequities, particularly for those part time students who are in employment. An employed person who decides to study part time receives little if any state financial support whilst a full time student who decides to work continues to be eligible for financial benefits, including loans and, in Scotland, deferred payment of fees (Scottish Executive, 2000). In our experience, opponents of equalization may point to the perils of substituting state subsidized tuition fees for the contributions that some employers make to fee payments. We suggest that this might be a small price to pay for achieving more satisfactory participation in lifelong learning. In addition, our survey research indicated that only 50% of part time students are funded (or part-funded) by their employers. Therefore this problem may be less severe than critics suggest. The UK has a long history of means testing for social and educational benefits and we have noted that there are already concessions for unemployed part time students. There is no obvious barrier to extending means testing to levels of earnings as a solution to the problem of equitable financial support for part time students. In Scotland the reintroduction of Individual Learning Accounts (www.ilascotland.org.uk) is a practical example of means testing related to level of earnings.

In its *Review of funding for learners* the Scottish Executive (2004) notes that there is no recorded source of funding for over 50% of part time higher education students. The Scottish Executive admits that the evidence base on whether the lack of funding suppresses demand for part time higher education or causes students to attempt to study full time whilst working full time is incomplete. Our findings reflect emerging thinking amongst leaders of higher education institutions who have begun to advocate a change in Government policy in favour of part time students (Tysome, 2005), with some limited success.[9,10] A more satisfactory approach would be to revisit the proposals of the Scottish Parliament's Enterprise and Lifelong Learning Committee (2002) for a 'learning credit' that would enable students to use a personal funding entitlement for full time or part time study.

Notes

1. www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2006/04/28100117/0 (accessed 11 April 2006). Not including 10300 enrolments at Bell College and UHIMI partner colleges which are included in the data for the HEI sector from 2001–2002. It is usual practice in the FE sector to count enrolments.
2. The first year of the survey reported in this article.
3. www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2006/04/28100117/0 (accessed 11 April 2006).

4. The survey responses provided evidence of a range of combinations of activity. In 2000–2001, the interquartile ranges were:

Full time
Study: Median530; IQR523, 40
Work: Median518; IQR512, 25
Travel: Median54; IQR52, 6
Domestic: Median510; IQR56, 20
Family/social: Median530; IQR515, 44

Part time
Study: Median510; IQR58, 15
Work: Median540; IQR537, 48
Travel: Median54; IQR52, 8
Domestic: Median58; IQR54, 15
Family/social: Median530; IQR520, 50

The pattern of dispersion has been reported only for a single year of the survey to conserve space. However the pattern is replicated in the two subsequent years.
5. For an extended discussion see Lowe (2005), especially section 8.3.
6. For details of the data see Lowe (2005), especially section 8.4.
7. www.dfes.gov.uk/pns/DisplayPN.cgi?pn_id52005_0117 (accessed 11 April 2006).
8. www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Education/Funding-Support-Grants/FFL/Introduction (accessed 11 April 2006).
9. www.hefce.ac.uk/News/hefce/2005/ptboost.htm (accessed 11 April 2006).
10. www.dfes.gov.uk/pns/DisplayPN.cgi?pn_id52005_0117 (accessed 11 April 2006).

References

Blaxter, L. & Tight, M. (1994a) Juggling with time: how adults manage their time for lifelong education, *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 26(2), 162–179.

Blaxter, L. & Tight, M. (1994b) Time management and part time study, *Adults Learning*, 5(5), 126–127.

Carney, C., McNeish, S. & McColl, J. (2005) The impact of part time employment on students' health and academic performance: a Scottish perspective, *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 29(4), 307–319.

Curtis, S. & Shani, N. L. (2002) The effect of taking paid employment during term-time on students' academic studies, *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 26(2), 129–137.

DfEE (1998) *Higher education for the 21st century* (Sudbury, DfEE).

DfES (2003) *The future of higher education* (London, HMSO).

Edwards, R. (1993) *Mature women students: separating or connecting family and education* (London, Taylor & Francis).

Ford, J., Bosworth, D. & Wilson, R. (1995) Part time work and full time higher education, *Studies in Higher Education*, 20(2), 187–202.

Gallacher, J. (2003) *Higher Education in Further Education Colleges: The Scottish Experience* (London, CIHE).

Gallacher, J. (2006) Blurring the boundaries or creating diversity? The contribution of further education colleges to higher education in Scotland, *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 30(1), 43–58.

Garrick, R. (1997) *Higher education in the learning society: report of the Scottish Committee* (London, HMSO).

Hansard (1993) Students' financial difficulties, House of Lords, 17 February, Col. 1161 (London, HMSO).

Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) (2005) *Young participation in higher education* (Bristol, HEFCE).

Hill, Y. & MacGregor, J. (1998) Support systems for women in part time study, *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 22(2), 143–149.

Hunt, A., Lincoln, E. & Walker, A. (2004) Term-time employment and academic attainment: evidence from a large scale survey of undergraduates at Northumbria University, *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 28(1), 3–18.

Lowe, J. (2005) *Integrating learning with life: a study of higher education students in a Scottish further education college: 2000–2003*. Unpublished Ed.D. thesis. Available online at: http://dspace.stir.ac.uk/dspace/handle/1893/66 (accessed 11 April 2006).

Kember, D. (1999) Integrating part time study with family, work and social obligations, *Studies in Higher Education*, 24(1), 109–124.

Kember, D. & Leung, Y. P. (2004) Relationship between the employment of coping mechanisms and a sense of belonging for part time students, *Educational Psychology*, 24(3), 345–357.

Metcalf, H. (2001) *Increasing inequality in higher education: the role of term-time working* (London, NIESR).

Morgan-Klein, B. & Gray, P. (2000) Flexible trends: researching part time students and flexibility in higher education, *Scottish Journal of Adult and Continuing Education*, 6(1), 41–57.

Osborne, M., Brink, B., Cloonan, M., Davies, P., Marks, A., Turner, E. & Williams, J. (2001) *For me or not for me in Scotland: a report of mature student participation in higher education* (Glasgow, CRLL).

Raab, G. (1998) *Participation in higher education in Scotland* (Edinburgh, SHEFC).

Scottish Executive (2000) *Scotland the learning nation* (Edinburgh, The Stationery Office).

Scottish Executive (2002) *Students in higher education in Scotland: 2000–2001*. Available online at: www.scotland.gov.uk/stats/bulletins/00171-07.asp (accessed 11 April 2006).

Scottish Executive (2003) *Life through learning through life* (Edinburgh, The Stationery Office).

Scottish Executive (2004) *Review of funding for learners.* Available online at: www.scotland.gov.uk/Resource/Doc/37428/0009560.pdf (accessed 11 April 2006).

Scottish Executive (2005) *Evaluation of individual learning accounts: final report* (Edinburgh, The Stationery Office).

Scottish Further Education Funding Council (SFEFC) (2005) *Supply and demand for further education* (Edinburgh, SFEFC).

Scottish Parliament Enterprise and Lifelong Learning Committee (2002) *Report on lifelong learning* (Norwich, The Stationery Office).

Schuller, T., Raffe, D., Morgan-Klein, B. & Clark, I. (1999) *Part time higher education, policy, practice and experience* (London, Jessica Kingsley).

Smith, N. & Taylor, P. (1999) Not for lipstick and lager: students and part time work, *Scottish Affairs*, 28, 147–163.

Taylor, N. K. (1998) Survey of paid employment undertaken by full time undergraduates at an established Scottish university, *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 22(1), 33–40.

Tett, L. (2004) Mature working class students in an elite university: discourses of risk, choice and exclusion, *Studies in the Education of Adults*, 36(2), 252–264.

Thomas, L. (2002) Student retention in higher education: the role of institutional habitus, *Journal of Educational Policy*, 17(4), 423–442.

Tysome, T. (2005, April 22) VCs: end part time students' raw deal, *Times Higher Educational Supplement*, p. 7.

Warren, T. (2004) Working part time: achieving a successful 'work-life' balance, *British Journal of Sociology*, 55(1), 99–122.

Winn, S. & Stevenson, R. (1997) Student loans: are policy objectives being achieved?, *Higher Education Quarterly*, 51(2), 144–163.

Woodley, A., Wagner, L., Slowey, M., Hamilton, M. & Fulton, O. (1987) *Choosing to learn: adults in education* (Milton Keynes, OU Press).