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#### Abstract

Part-time work is a double burden for undergraduates and deteriorates their mental health. Indeed, research shows that academic performance can suffer if students are under stress, inflexible when it comes to time and not doing well mentally. However, in real life undergraduates have acquired skills to compensate for this especially when they are highly motivated. In the current study we investigate whether academic performance and mental health of students was influenced by the presence of a part- time job, the number of hours spend on it, and self-efficacy beliefs. Based on prior findings, we propose that students who work part-time have lower average grades and lower psychological well-being compared to students who do not work part-time. Furthermore, student's self-efficacy beliefs will influence their study hours. Students from different faculties $(N=189)$ filled an online questionnaire regarding their academic performance, characteristics of their part-time job, level of wellbeing, and self-efficacy beliefs. To examine potential differences a cross-sectional field study was conducted. Results demonstrated that neither academic performance nor mental health was significantly affected by part- time work or time spend for it. We found that working part- time besides studying did not lower academic performance nor was harmful for students' well- being. However, we discovered that part-time work was related to confidence in owns abilities. But no relation between self-efficacy beliefs and study hours in students. The implications of the study regarding representativeness of the sample, generalization of the results and follow up data collection are discussed.
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## Consequences of Part Time Employment on Academic Performance

In recent years there has been a rising number of students who are forced to work alongside their studies to stay afloat financially. This circumstance effects not only students with limited financial resources from low-income households, but also those who strive for an improved life through additional income. While this opportunity seems favorable at first, it may have some drawbacks, including significant negative impacts on the social, physical, and psychological well-being of the student (Barron \& Anastasiadou, 2009). Moreover, spending time to earn money can significantly lower academic performance (Oonyu, 2019; Verulava \& Jorbenadze, 2022). Therefore, it is crucial to explore measures to alleviate students and offer solutions through better financial aid. In this research we aim to shed light on this dilemma and contribute to the literature by investigating the consequences of a part- time job while studying.

The literature suggests that part time employment among undergraduate students is a prevalent phenomenon driven by financial necessity, but it comes with several negative consequences. Verulava et al. (2022) and Robotham (2009) report that most students work in simple part time jobs, which are typically unrelated to their future career. While financial reasons like family support are the main motivation for employment, their research shows that work study conflicts and associated sleep disturbances can negatively affect the students' academic performance, physical and mental health. These unfavorable reactions appear in constant stress levels, anxiety, and for some even in social isolation. Therefore, generate changes in energy, loss of appetite, concentration difficulties and changes in mood like feeling sad and hopeless. To mitigate these negative effects, Verula et al. (2022) and Robotham (2009) suggest that universities should provide flexible support such as consultation in archiving educational and career goals, as well as considerable preparations to facilitate the combination of study and part- time work and provide training in time management skills to
help students achieve their academic and career goals, as well as increased awareness of mental and physical health issues among students. To gain a deeper understanding of the relationship between part-time work, academic achievements, and students mental well-being we aim to test whether students with a part time job will experience lower levels of well-being compared to students without a part time job (H1a). Further, we stated that the size of student's part-time job (measured in hours) will correlate negative with levels of well-being (H1b).

Additionally, Broton et al. (2016) demonstrates private need-based assistance can effectively induce changes in the students' work behaviors, indicating that financial support can be an effective solution to ease work study conflicts. On the other hand, Béduwé and Giret (2021) suggest that student employment can disrupt higher education, especially during intensive exam periods, leading to exam failure, university dropout, and prolonged education. Their study also identified distinctions based on the number of hours spent in employment and whether it was occasional, frequent, or recurrent, suggesting that short periods or short hours of employment are much less disruptive than regular, and continuous student employment.

Lastly, Vaughn et al. (2016) highlights the importance of workplace relationships in the mental health and well-being of working students, suggesting that creating a positive work environment could lead to higher job satisfaction, lower turnovers, and better mental health outcomes for students. Overall, the literature indicates that while part- time employment among undergraduate students can provide financial support, it can also have negative consequences for academic success and progression in high education. Universities should provide flexible support and increase awareness of mental and physical health issues among students to mitigate these negative effects.

On the other hand, working part time while studying can have numerous more positive outcomes for students besides just financial relief. According to Watts and Pickering (2000), respondents perceived several benefits, including the acquisition of transferable skills and enhanced employability. Moreover, students' confidence in the world of work increases and they improve their organizational and time-management skills. This hand-on experience provides students with practical skills that cannot be gained solely through classroom learning.

Furthermore, research by Muluk (2017) indicates that student's involvement in employment has a positive impact on establish career- related skills and increasing their practical competence. Therefore, working in part-time jobs does not have a significant negative effect on students' academic performance, according to their findings. The analysis of data, interviews, and GPA records of Muluk (2017) concluded that students who worked outside of university still achieved high grades. For this reason, we want to test whether students with a part time job have lower academic performance compared to students without a part time job (H2).

Moreover, researchers in educational settings have increasingly recognized the significance of student's thoughts and beliefs in the learning process. Self- efficacy, as defined by Bandura (1997), refers to individuals' confidence in their ability to perform specific tasks or achieve goals. This confidence is highly influenced by physiological and emotional states, such as stress. The thinking style associated with self-efficacy plays a significant role in shaping motivation, behavior, and outcomes. Higher levels of self- efficacy are associated with the ability to set challenging goals, exhibit persistence, and ultimately achieve success.

According to Bandura (1997), self-efficacy beliefs impact human behavior in various ways. They influence individuals' choice, action, efforts, perseverance, and resilience.

Individuals tend to select activities they feel capable of and avoid those they perceive as challenging. Self-efficacy also plays a crucial role in determining the level of effort individuals invest in a task, their ability to persist in the face of difficulties, and their resilience in adverse situations. The stronger an individual's self-efficacy belief, the greater their effort, perseverance, and resilience.

According to Van Dinther et al. (2011) the development of self- efficacy depends on four sources of information. Enactive mastery experiences, involving authentic successes in handling specific situations, observational experiences, provided by social models, particular peers who offer opportunities for comparison. Additionally, significant others expression of confidence or doubts in individuals' capabilities impact their self-efficacy and physiological, emotional, and mood states provide further sources of efficacy information. Positive mood states enhance self-efficacy, while negative symptoms and feelings may interpret as signs of failure and debility.

Based on the literature of Van Dinther and colleagues (2011) it is evident that selfefficacy can be influenced within higher education programs. Recognizing the importance of self- competence and implementing strategies to enhance it can have positive impact on students learning achievement and well-being.

Again, Alegre (2014) has also found self-efficacy beliefs as a key to academic success and thus predicted academic performance. Similarly, Cobo- Rendón et al. (2020) identified self-efficacy beliefs as s predictor for academic performance among first year students and psychological wellbeing mediated this relationship. Working part time while studying can negatively affect academic performance, but individuals with high competence in own behavior may be better able to manage the demands of both work and school. Thus, developing such ability may be a valuable way to improve performance in academic environments and mitigate the negative effects of working while studying.

Therefore, the following hypothesis is formulated. Students with a part time job will have higher self-efficacy beliefs than students without a part-time job (H3a). Further, students with high self-efficacy will have more study hours compared to students low on self-efficacy scores (H3b). The study aims to test these hypotheses and contribute to a better understanding of the effects of part time work and self-efficacy on students' academic performance and well-being.

## Method

## Participants and procedure

We conducted a cross-sectional field study to investigate the relationship between part- time working students and non- working students in academic performance, well- being, and self-efficacy beliefs. We also investigated whether there was a relationship between the number of working hours and well-being and whether there was a relationship between selfefficacy beliefs and study hours.

In our study, participants were recruited through Qualtrics, an online recruiting system (Marktforschung, Umfrage \& Erlebnismanagement Software I Qualtrics, 2023b)

There was one data collection moment during the period from 19 April 2023 to 11 May 2023. A convenience sample of 189 English-speaking participants ( 136 females, 52 males) was used. The initial measurement of gender included three divisions: female, male, and other. However, after careful consideration the "other" category we eliminated it as there was only one participant who identified with this level. Further, the variation in the grading system across different countries and institutions posed a challenge in utilizing the variable GPA data. Consequently, not all GPA data could be incorporated into the analysis.

Additionally, 25 (13.1\%) participants reported being international students while 164 (85.9\%) reported being non-international students. Only participants that were currently enrolled in a study program were asked to complete the questionnaire.

The respondent's level of study varied with 44 (23.0\%) participants enrolled in HBO (Hoger Beroepsonderwijs) programs, 142 (74.3\%) enrolled in university programs, and 3 (1.6 $\%)$ participants reported being in other institutions. Of these students 84 (44.0\%) were enrolled in the Behavioral and Social Science faculty, 48 (25.1\%) people were enrolled in the Economics and Business program and 48 (25.1\%) studied in other programs. In our sample $155(81.2 \%)$ students announced to do a part time job with a mean of 9.1 working hours per week up to a maximum of 40 working hours per week.

All participants gave their consent to participate. The participants were approached by students, and a link to the questionnaire was shared via social media and personal contact to gain access to the online Qualtrics platform. No incentives were offered for participating in the questionnaire. Completing the questionnaire took approximately 10 minutes, and participants were allowed to complete the survey at a location and time of their preference. This ruled out any influence by the researchers.

Members were assured of their anonymity and confidentiality throughout the study. Ethics approval was obtained from the relevant institutional review board (IRB) before data collection commenced.

## Measurements

Academic Performance

The dependent variable, academic performance, was measured using the item GPA (Grade Point Average). It was measured on a 10 -point scale where 10 means the highest grade and a point of 5.5 was the minimum pass mark. The main question included in the application was: "What is your GPA?" We left this as an open-ended question. High values indicated better academic performance.

Total Study hours

The variable study hours were composed by taking the sum of contact and self- study hours. Contact hours means the amount of time students spend at university with lectures and meetings. Self- study hours measured the time students invest at home for higher education.

## Part-time Job

The independent variable in this study was whether the participant has a part time job.

Questions regarding the participants potential part time job included the number of hours worked per week. In total, the part-time job variable was measured using thirteen items. One item in the questionnaire was: "Do you work next to your study?" The response option was:
"I don't work", "I have a part-time job", and "other".

Self-efficacy

Self-efficacy was measured using a 5-point Likert scale ( $1=$ strongly disagree, $5=$ strongly agree) (MSc, 2023). It was assessed using eight items, with higher scores indicating a high
level of self-efficacy. One item in the questionnaire was: "I will be able to achieve most of the goals that I have set for myself." The Cronbach's Alpha indicated good reliability with .884 .

Well-being

Well-being was measured using 8 items. The questionnaire utilized a 4-point scale $(0=\operatorname{did}$ not apply to me at all to $3=$ did apply to me very much or most of the time). The scale was recorded so that a high score indicated good well-being. One item included in the questionnaire was: "I have felt cheerful and in good spirits." The Cronbach's Alpha was found to be high with a coefficient of .849 .

In total, the scales we used indicated a strong level of internal consistency among the items (Cronbach's alpha > .7).

## Statistical Methods

To assess statistically significant differences in GPA, the size of the part-time job, study hours, well-being and self-efficacy scores among working students compared to students who do not work, we presented the means of the independent variables. To investigate possible differences, we performed various independent sample t-tests with $a=.05$ respectively. The null hypothesis $(\mathrm{H} 0)$ stated that there were no differences in the population means of the individual groups, while the alternative hypothesis $(\mathrm{H} 1, \mathrm{H} 2, \mathrm{H} 3)$ suggested that there were differences in the independent variables for students with a part-time job in contrast to students without a part-time job.

As we assumed equal variances in the t-tests we assessed the differences among the means of our sample groups and performed a single- factor one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Having a part time job inclusive the amount of time spend for it (measured in hours per week), peoples general well-being and student's self- efficacy ratings as the independent variables. The dependent variable was academic performance.

Prior to conducting the ANOVA assumptions of normality, linearity, and independence of observations were also estimated and found to be unviolated. We selected a significance level (alpha) of .05 to determine the statistical significance of the ANOVA.

Overall, the statistical analyses aimed to explore the association between self-efficacy, part-time work, academic performance, and the comfort of students. Therefore, providing valuable insight into the factors influencing students' academic outcomes and general wellbeing.

## Results

In Table 1 the means of our independent variables across different faculties were presented. Namely, Faculty of Behavioral and Social Science including psychology and pedagogical science and sociology students and Faculty of Economics and Business. All other faculties were placed in "other faculties".

Table 1
Means broken down by study direction. $N=189$

|  | Behavioral and Social Science | Economics and Business | Other faculties | Total | F - value or Chi ${ }^{2}$ | Sign. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{N}=84$ | $\mathrm{N}=48$ | $\mathrm{N}=48$ | $\mathrm{N}=180$ |  |  |
| \% Gender | 79.7 | 52.3 | 69.1 | 69.4 | 5.931 | . 003 |
| GPA | 7.3 | 7.1 | 7.2 | 7.2 | 1.327 | . 268 |
| \% International students | 20.3 | 13.3 | 4.8 | 14.3 | 3.423 | . 035 |
| \% Part- time | 73.0 | 91.1 | 88.1 | 82.0 | 3.645 | . 028 |
| Working hours per week | 7.3 | 11.1 | 10.5 | 9.1 | 5.961 | . 003 |
| Well-being | 2.7 | 2.8 | 2.5 | 2.7 | 1.385 | . 253 |
| Self-efficacy | 3.7 | 4.0 | 3.8 | 3.8 | 2.682 | . 071 |
| Contact study hours per week | 7.0 | 9.9 | 11.7 | 9.0 | 6.746 | . 002 |
| Self- study hours per week | 14.1 | 12.5 | 12.9 | 13.3 | . 445 | . 641 |
| Total study hours per week | 21.1 | 22.4 | 24.2 | 22.5 | . 994 | . 372 |

The gender distribution in each category appeared to be significantly different in favor of females compared to males. With Behavioral and Social Science Faculty having the highest proportion of women at $79.7 \%$ followed by "other faculties" at $69.1 \%$ and Economics and Business at 52.3 \%.

Another significant difference was found in accord with the international status of the student. With the most international students in the faculty of Behavioral and Social Science ( $20.3 \%$ ) and the smallest number of students from other countries in the category "other faculties" (4.8\%). Overall, there was a small number of international students in our sample (14.3\%).

Further, there were significant differences according to their employment status. With most part-time working students in the faculty of Economics and Business (91.1\%), followed by students in the "other faculties" (88.1\%) and the least working academics in the Behavioral and Social Science faculty ( $73.0 \%$ ). However, there were generally many students working besides university in our sample ( $82.0 \%$ ).

Significant differences were also observed in the number of working hours students performed in their part -time job based on their faculty. The largest proportion of working hours were found among students in the Faculty of Economics and Businesses ( $M=11.1$ ), for the "other faculties" it declined $(M=10.5)$, and the lowest number of working hours per week were found in the Faculty of Behavioral and Social Science ( $M=7.3$ ). Overall, there was a mean of student working hours of $M=9.1$.

Students with the most contact study hours per week were found at 'other' faculties with a mean of 11.7. This is followed by students from the faculty of Economics and Business (9.9 hours). Students at the faculty of Behavioral and Social science displayed the lowest performance in contact hours. This was demonstrated in 7.0 average contact study hours per week and 21.1 mean study hours in total per week. These differences in study hours were significant for weekly contact study hours but there was no significant difference in self-study or total study hours per week. Additionally, there was also no significant difference for students in GPA and well-being scores.

In summary, our findings indicate significant differences in various variables across faculties. Namely, gender distribution, international status, part- time job involvement, working hours and contact study hours per week.

To address our hypotheses, in Table 2 were diverse independent- sample $t$ - tests conducted. We compared the GPA, study hours, well-being, and self- efficacy scores for students who had a part-time job to students who did not have a part-time job. Moreover, in Table 3 the Pearson product correlations are presented.

Table 2
Academic performance and mental characteristics by employment status $N=168$

|  | Has a part- time job | Does not have a part- <br> time job | t - values | Sig. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\mathrm{N}=155$ | $\mathrm{~N}=34$ |  |  |
| GPA | 7.2 | 7.3 | .166 | .868 |
| Total study hours per <br> week | 21.3 | 15.9 | 1.997 | .047 |
| Self-study hours per <br> week | 12.6. | 11.1 | 1.331 | .185 |
| Contact study hours <br> per week | 8.7 | 2.5 | -1.617 | .092 |
| Well-being | 2.7 | 3.6 | -2.062 | .108 |
| Self-efficacy | 3.8 |  |  |  |

For hypothesis H1a, no significant differences in well-being scores were found between students with a part- time job and those without $(\mathrm{t}(166)=-1.647, \mathrm{p}=.108)$.

For hypothesis H1b similar results are yielded, indicating no significant correlation between the size of student's part- time job (measured in working hours) and well- being as shown in Table 3.

Regarding academic performance, hypothesis H 2 found no difference in GPA between students with part- time jobs and those without $(\mathrm{t}(166)=.166, \mathrm{p}=.868)$. Table 3 further demonstrated no significant association between GPA and working hours.

But, for hypothesis H3a, a significant difference in self- efficacy beliefs was observed between working and non- working students $(\mathrm{t}(166)=-2.062, \mathrm{p}=.041)$. Students who had a part- time job displayed a mean of 3.8 in self-efficacy scores. Contrasting, students who did not work had a mean score of 3.6 for self-efficacy. This means that students with an employment status possessed greater self-efficacy compared to students without employment. However, regarding hypothesis H3b no significant correlation between self-efficacy and study hours was found.

In Table 3 more significant correlations were found revealing associations between student performance, working hours, well-being, and self-efficacy scores.

Table 3
Correlations for academic performance, characteristics of part-time work, and mental variables $N=168$

|  | GPA | Working hours per week | Total study hours per week | Wellbeing | Self-efficacy |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| GPA | -- |  |  |  |  |
| Working hours per week | -. 11 | -- |  |  |  |
| Total study hour per week | -. 03 | -. 18 | -- |  |  |
| Well-being | . 09 | . 10 | $-.21^{* *}$ | -- |  |
| Self-efficacy | . 12 | . $16{ }^{*}$ | -. 08 | . $33^{* *}$ | -- |

[^0]Concerning self-efficacy and well- being, a weak but significant positive association was discovered. This indicates that students who perceived themselves as more self-efficient
have a better well- being or vice versa $(\mathrm{r}=.33, \mathrm{p}<.001)$. Similar results were found between self-efficacy and working hours per week $(\mathrm{r}=.16, \mathrm{p}=.03)$. Students who felt more selfefficient are working more hours in their part- time job. These results were in line with our hypothesis H3a. The only variable which correlated negative with well- being was total study hours. Students who study more in total reported lower well-being $(\mathrm{r}=-.21, \mathrm{p}=.005)$ and vice versa.

## Discussion

The primary research question addressed in this paper was whether working part-time constituted an additional burden for students and therefore lowered their academic performance. To address this question, we stated diverse hypotheses coming from a supportive or a contrary background. In line with the literature on the negative effects of working part-time as a student (Verulava, \& Jorbenadze, 2022) pursuing paid employment and studying together deteriorates students' well-being as well as academic performance.

Therefore, we formulated Hypothesis H1a and H1b which posits that students with a part-time job exhibit lower levels of well-being in comparison to their counterparts without paid employment. Further, more hours of part-time work will correlate negative with the wellbeing of the student. In Hypothesis H 2 we suggested that students with a part- time job would have lower levels of academic performance compared to those without such work.

According to an affirmative approach of working part-time and studying (Alegar, 2014; Van Dinther et al., 2011) we hypothesized that students with a part time job will have higher self-efficacy beliefs than students without a part-time job (H3a). Further, students with high self-efficacy scores will have more study hours compared to students low on selfefficacy scores (H3b). By exploring these hypotheses, this research aims to shed light on the potential challenges and benefits associated with part-time employment for undergraduates. Thereby, providing valuable insights for academic institutions and students themselves.

As our results presented in Table 2 and 3 shows, there were either a difference in wellbeing of students with or without a part-time job, nor was there a correlation between working part-time and well- being. Hence, our first hypotheses (H1a, H1b) were not supported. In addition, we found no difference in academic performance of working students compared to non-working students. Hence our next hypothesis (H2) was also not supported. However, we
found means scores of self-efficacy for working students significantly higher as for nonworking students. Moreover, we found a significant positive correlation between selfefficacy and working hours. These results confirmed our hypothesis H3a. In our research, working students had significant higher self-efficacy beliefs than non-working students. Nonetheless, we found no correlation and consequently no evidence that students with high self-efficacy beliefs will study more hours for university compared to students low in selfefficacy. Hypothesis H3b was also not supported.

Research shows that students who work part-time experience notable adverse impacts on both their mental well-being, as well as on academic performance. Our findings were not consistent with these results and demonstrated that part- time work and studying together did not deteriorated both. These deviation of our results from previous research may be attributed to the comparatively low average number of working hours among students in our sample and could be differ for students with more working hours.

## Limitations and Future Directions

Despite the valuable insight gained from this research, it is essential to recognize some limitations when interpreting the results. Firstly, the use of a convenient sample consisting of mostly students from our university who were also doing their bachelor thesis and willing to participate introduced a potential bias. This may have generated a sample that was representative of bachelor students in their third year from the university of Groningen but not of the larger population.

Moreover, our study design exclusively followed a singular data collection event at a specific moment in time. This leaves room for alternative explanations since changes in higher education or well-being over time were not measured or accounted for.

Therefore, future research may consider how potential long- term effects of part-time employment influences both students' well-being and academic performance. As already
described, our study had a mean of 9.1 working hours per week students spent for their parttime work. Correspondingly, gathering more information about how a changes in the number of working hours could affect academic performance or well-being is of importance. Moreover, the quality of student's job (is it related to the study material, how stimulating is the work, does it expand the social life of the student,) could also aid in the deeper understanding of how paid employment influences academic performance and students' wellbeing.

But a notable strength of our research is the utilization of an online questionnaire as the primary data collection method. This approach offers several advantages, including reduced costs for researchers and minimal time commitment for participants. Additionally, employing an online questionnaire facilitated the inclusion of participants from diverse locations and countries. Further, our study demonstrated satisfactory reliability as evidence by a high Cronbach's alpha value for our measurement scales.

Overall, it is essential to interpret these results cautiously and considered potential confounding variables. Longitudinal studies and qualitative research could provide a deeper understanding of the underlying mechanisms and the impact of part- time employment on various aspects of student life.

## Theoretical and practical implications

Our study has important theoretical and practical implications. As far as the theoretical implications are concerned, this study highlights that part-time working did not deteriorate academic performance or students' well-being and with this address inconsistent findings in the research literature (Béduwé, \& Giret, 2021). More specifically, our investigations provide support for the positive relationship of part- time work and self-efficacy beliefs of students and by means with this for the importance of adequate confidence in owns performance of
specific task and achieving challenging goals when combining studying and part-time work (Bandura, 1997). Herewith can support academic performance. Future studies should further investigate the positive effects between part-time work and self-efficacy for academic achievements.

As far as the practical implications are concerned, the result may be of great importance to students themselves to understand promoting behavior when combining parttime work and university. Moreover, to educational institutions as the number of part-time working students increased over the last decades (Broton et al., 2016). Finally, it is of importance to employers, and policymakers to understand students demands and find suitable measure to ease the study work relationship (Verulava, \& Jorbenadze, 2022).

## Conclusions

Taken together, these findings provide support for the assumption that students employment did not impose a double workload for them and thus did not disrupt their higher education. Moreover, it rather justifies the increasing prevalence of working students in the last decades. Nonetheless, it is crucial to acknowledge distinctions based on the duration of employment hours and whether it is sporadic, frequent, or recurrent. Additionally, it is essential to convey to universities and students themselves that their abilities, mental attitude, and study habits all together can influence their motivation and therefore their academic performance. However, it is noteworthy that our research solely identifies paid employment during university studies. Students may also engage in other activities that detract from their study time, such as unpaired childcare, taking care of older family members, or participating in internships to enhance their curriculum vitae.
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## Appendix A

## Bachelor thesis

## Start of Block: Default Question Block

Welcome to the questionnaire about student lives.
Before the start of this questionnaire, you receive some information about the research we are conducting. Additionally, you will be given an informed consent form.

The questionnaire will take about 10 minutes. Thank you in advance for your participation.

## Page Break

## Why do I receive this information?

You are being invited to participate in our research because you are a student currently undergoing a university or HBO study. This research focuses on aspects of student life.

## Who are the researchers?

This research is conducted by six students of the bachelor program of psychology, regarding their bachelor thesis project. The project is supervised by Dr. Pierre Cavalini.

## Do I have to participate in this research?

Participation in the research is voluntary. However, your consent is needed. Therefore, please read this information carefully. If you decide not to participate, you do not need to explain why, and there will be no negative consequences for you. You always have this right, including after you have consented to participate in the research.

## Why this research?

We are investigating several aspects of student life. We are therefore hoping to increase the body of knowledge about this topic, gaining insight on how to create a better work life balance for students in the future.

## What do we ask of you during the research?

First you will be asked for consent. Then you will be able to fill out our questionnaire. You will be asked about certain demographics, your academic performance, your job, your incomes, expenses and general financial situation, self-efficacy, ways to spend your time, time-management, and well-being. The questionnaire will take roughly ten minutes.

## What are the consequences of participation?

Participating in this research might give your insight into how different aspects in student life affect your academic career as well as your state of well-being. Research outcomes can however not be guaranteed.

## How will we treat your data?

The gathered data will be used for educational purposes and will be deleted after data analysis. All data will be kept confidential according to the GDPR guidelines and collected anonymously. This research is evaluated by the Ethics Committee of Psychology at the University of Groningen (ECP).

## What else do you need to know?

If you have questions about the research, you can ask the principal researcher by emailing (p.m.cavalini@rug.nl). If you have questions or concerns about your rights as a research participant in this research, you can contact the Ethics Committee of the Department of Psychology of the University of Groningen via ecp@rug.nl. Questions regarding privacy and personal data can be asked to Data Protection Officer of the University of Groningen: privacy@rug.nl.
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## Informed consent

By agreeing to participate you understand the following: I have read the information that was provided to me about this research. My participation is voluntary, and I may withdraw my consent to participate in this study at any time without penalty. I may refuse to answer or skip any questions in this study that I do not wish to answer. There are no advantages or disadvantages for me depending on my decisions. All my responses are completely anonymous and confidential. This means that there is no possible way of using my responses to identify me. If I have communicated any information that is able to identify me, the information would be removed from the survey materials. All responses will be securely stored and only be accessible to the research team, and not passed on to any third parties. I further understand that this project subscribes to the ethical conduct of research and to the protection of the dignity, rights, interests, and safety of participants always.

- I have read the information about the research. I have had enough opportunity to ask questions about it.
- I understand what the research is about, what is being asked of me, which consequences participation can have, how my data will be handled, and what my rights as a participant are.
- I understand that participation in the research is voluntary. I choose to participate. I can stop participating at any moment. If I stop, I do not need to explain why. Stopping will have no negative consequences for me.
- Below I indicate what I am consenting to.

Yes, I consent to participate; this consent is valid until 01-07-2023
No, I do not consent to participate

# Skip To: End of Survey If Informed consent By agreeing to participate you understand the following: I have read the informa... = No, I do not consent to participate 
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## Demographics

The first few questions will be about demographics

Q1 What is your gender?MaleFemaleOther

Q2 What is your current living situation?With parentsWith a partnerAloneIn a student houseOther

Q3 Are you an international student?NoYes

Q4 At what level are you currently studying?HBOWO/UniversityOtherI am not doing a study

Q5 In what year are you studying?Year 1Year 2Year 3Year 4MasterOther

Q6 At which faculty do you study?ArtsBehavioral and Social SciencesEconomics and BusinessLawMedical SciencesPhilosophySpatial SciencesScience and EngineeringTheology and Religious StudiesNot Applicable

## Academic performance

The next questions are about academic performance. Note that the questions below refer to your normal study week, so not the exam period. Please give your answers in numbers, not in words.

Q7 On average, how many contact hours (lectures, meetings, etc.) do you have per week in this block?
*
Q8 On average, how many hours do you spend on self-study throughout the week (during this block)?


Q9 What is your GPA (grade point average)?

Q10 What were your grades on your last three exams? Please list them below. (the order doesn't matter)grade 1 $\qquad$grade 2 $\qquad$grade 3 $\qquad$

Q11 How many courses did you fail on your first try?
$\qquad$

Q12 Are you planning on completing your degree within the normal time?YesNo, I have a study delay
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## (Parttime) Job

The next questions will be about your (parttime) job. Note that these questions are also about your average weeks.

Q13 Do you work next to your study?


I don't workI have a part time jobI am self-employed (for example: freelancing, consultant, entrepreneur)Other: $\qquad$

Skip To: If Do you work next to your study? = I don't work
*
Q14 Approximately how much do you earn per month from your work?

Q15 Approximately how many hours per week do you work?

Q16 What is the main reason you work alongside your studies?Financial pressureTo gain experienceTo maintain a desired standard of livingAs an alternative to borrowingOther: .. $\qquad$

Q17 Is your side job related to the study that you are currently doing?YesNo

Q18 Do you enjoy your job?AlwaysMost of the timeSometimesNever

Q19 Does your work positively contribute to your study?YesNo

Q20 Does your work negatively affect your study?YesNo

Q21 Think of your current employer (if you are self-employed or unemployed think of your previous employer): rate the following questions on a scale of 1-7. Move the arrow to select your answer. ( $1=$ strongly disagree to $7=$ strongly agree )
Note: If you have never worked for an employer before select 'not applicable'

Not Applicable

$$
\begin{array}{lllllll}
1 & 2 & 3 & 4 & 5 & 6 & 7
\end{array}
$$

My employer is flexible when it comes to my work schedule and allows me to adjust my hours to suit my studies ()
My employer is understanding when I need time off for exams or other academic obligations ()

Q22 For how long have you been doing the job that you are currently doing? (in months)

Q23 If you are self-employed: What was your biggest motivation to become self-employed instead of getting a traditional part-time job?FlexibilityIndependencePursuing a passionUnlimited earning potentialOther, namely...I am not self-employed

Q24 For the people who are self-employed: What kind of self-employment best describes your situation?FreelancerEntrepreneurConsultantSolo self-employedOnline sellerCoachOther (please specify)I am not self-employed
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## Finances

The following questions are about income, expenses, and your general financial situation. Please give your answers in numbers, so not in words.

Q25 Approximately how much money do you loan/get from DUO per month?

Q26 Approximately how much money do you get from your parents per month?

Q27 Please select 'Very often' to show you are paying attention to this questionNeverRarelySometimesVery oftenAlways

Q28 What are your monthly expenses roughly?

Q29 Do you experience stress about your financial situation, in general?NeverRarelySometimesVery oftenAlways

## Self-efficacy

The following questions are about self-efficacy
Q30-37 Mark only one answer on the scale from:
1 strongly disagree
2 disagree
3 neither agree nor disagree
4 agree

5 strongly agree


Even when things are tough, I can perform quite well. (8)
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## Ways to spend time

The following questions are about ways to spend your time.


Q38 On average, how many hours do you spend per week meeting up with family?
$\qquad$

Q39 On average, how many hours do you spend per week meeting up with friends?

Q40 Mark only one answer on the scale 1 (not important at all) to 7 (very important)
$\left.\begin{array}{c|ccccccc} & 1(1) & 2(2) & 3(3) & 4(4) & 5(5) & 6(6) & 7(7) \\ \hline \text { How } & & & & & & & \\ \text { important do } \\ \text { you think it is } \\ \text { to meet up }\end{array}\right]$

Q41 Mark only one answer on the scale 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree)
1 (1) $2(2) \quad 3(3) \quad 4(4) \quad 5(5) \quad 6(6) \quad 7(7)$

I find it difficult to schedule leisure activities alongside study and work (1)

Q42 Have you ever had to miss school or other academic obligations because of work-related issues?YesNoNot applicable

## Time Management

The following questions are about time management.
Q43-55 Rate yourself on the following scale by assigning a numerical rating according to the following key:
1 - Never
2 - Seldom
3 - Sometimes

4 - Most of the Time
5 - Always

|  | 1 (1) | 2 (2) | 3 (3) | 4 (4) | 5 (5) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I make a fresh new "to do list" each workday. (1) | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| I set my priorities according to their importance, not their urgency. (2) | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| I know my prime work times. (3) | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| I am conscious of my true reasons for procrastination. <br> (4) | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| I set internal deadlines for myself and take them seriously. (5) | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| I use effective techniques for completing tasks on which I am procrastinating. (6) | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| I give my undivided attention to one task at a time. (7) | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| I seek quality work, but not perfection. (8) | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| I keep interruptions on my work to a minimum. (9) | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
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## Well-being

The following questions are about your well-being.

Q56-60 The following questions are about how you feel lately, the rating scale is as follows:
0 not at all
1 some of the time
2 less than half of the time
3 more than half of the time

4 most of the time
5 all of the time
Over the past 2 weeks

|  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I have felt cheerful and in good spirits (1) |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| I have felt calm and relaxed (2) |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| I have felt active and vigorous (3) |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| I woke up feeling fresh and rested (4) |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |
| my daily <br> life has been filled with things that interest me (5) |  | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ | $\bigcirc$ |

Q61-68 The following questions are about how you feel in general; the rating scale is as follows:

0 Did not apply to me at all
1 Applied to me to some degree, or some of the time

2 Applied to me to a considerable degree or a good part of time
3 Applied to me very much or most of the time

|  | I |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I found it hard to <br> wind down. (1) |  |
| I tended to over- |  |
| react to |  |
| situations. (2) |  |$\quad$| I felt that I was |
| :---: |
| using a lot of |
| nervous energy. |
| (3) |
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You have reached the end of the questionnaire. At this point, you can change your answers if you want to. If you click on 'next' the questionnaire will be submitted and you won't be able to
change your answers.
If you still have questions, you can send an email to p.m.cavalini@rug.nl
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[^0]:    *. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
    **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed)

