

NOTTINGHAM
TRENT UNIVERSITY 

**DISCUSSION PAPERS
IN
ECONOMICS**

No. 2013/1 ISSN 1478-9396

**IS IT GOOD TO SHARE? DEBATING
PATTERNS IN AVAILABILITY AND
USE OF JOB SHARE**

DAN WHEATLEY

DEC 2013

DISCUSSION PAPERS IN ECONOMICS

The economic research undertaken at Nottingham Trent University covers various fields of economics. But, a large part of it was grouped into two categories, *Applied Economics and Policy* and *Political Economy*.

This paper is part of the new series, ***Discussion Papers in Economics***.

Earlier papers in all series can be found at:

http://www.ntu.ac.uk/research/research_at_ntu/academic_schools/nbs/working_papers.html

Enquiries concerning this or any of our other Discussion Papers should be addressed to the Editors:

Dr. Marie Stack, Email: marie.stack@ntu.ac.uk

Dr. Dan Wheatley, Email: daniel.wheatley2@ntu.ac.uk

Division of Economics
Nottingham Trent University
Burton Street, Nottingham, NG1 4BU
UNITED KINGDOM.

Is it good to share? Debating patterns in availability and use of job share

Dan Wheatley¹

Abstract

This article investigates job share, specifically considering current availability and use of this flexible working arrangement. Empirical analysis is conducted on waves 11-19 (2000-2010) of the *British Household Panel Survey* and wave 2 (2010-11) of *Understanding Society*. The evidence is indicative of job share remaining a marginal work-life balance policy, but one which has specific uses in providing flexibility for certain groups, including working mothers. Differences between availability and use, however, suggest job share may be perceived as a 'last resort' by employees, although this disparity could reflect divergence in employer attitudes to availability (being seen as engaging in 'good' HR practice) and use (generating substantial 'costs'). This may prevent expansion of the use of job share, for example to ameliorate unemployment. There remain questions, though, regarding whether limited use is a result of institutional barriers driven by business case arguments, or the practical limitations of current job share constructs.

Keywords: employee flexibility, flexible working arrangements, institutional barriers, job share, satisfaction levels, work-life balance.

¹Corresponding author: Economics Division, Nottingham Business School, Nottingham Trent University, Burton Street, Nottingham, NG1 4BU, U.K. Phone: +44(0)115 848 4053, E-mail: daniel.wheatley@ntu.ac.uk.

Introduction

This article empirically investigates job share, specifically considering current availability and use, and reflecting on potential barriers to the expansion of this work-life balance policy. Job share is a less well-known and less researched flexible working arrangement, often considered within broader studies which focus on work-life balance and flexible working arrangements. However, while generating some important findings in analyses job share is frequently ‘bundled’ with other arrangements within ‘part-time’ or ‘reduced hours’ categories (for example see Dex and Scheibl, 2001; Poelmans and Beham, 2008; Stavrou, 2005; 2010), thus job share itself is rarely given detailed consideration. Job share is a flexible work option in which one full-time position is shared between two employees (Branine, 2004, 137; Walton, 1990). It differs from work sharing which refers to the short-term reduction in working hours to spread work among employees, often used as an alternative to job losses (Crimman et al, 2010). Under a job sharing arrangement a job is divided in respect to task, time, and other individual, role, or employer-specific criteria. Job sharing has the potential to open work opportunities for a broad range of employees. In the majority of cases full-time working hours are divided equally between two job sharers. Job share can take the form of one employee working mornings and the other afternoons, alternate day working, alternate two/three days, or two-and-a-half day splits (Branine, 2004, 137). Salary, leave and other benefits are also divided between each worker on a pro-rata basis. Together job sharers are responsible for the entire job with each benefiting, in principle, from improved work-life balance and the career opportunities and status of a full-time employee (Branine, 1998, 63). Some organizations, especially larger national employers, use job share registers so that

individuals can advertise details of their role and request a job share (Tomlinson, 2006, 592). Depending on the nature of their employment, job sharers may not need to share the same characteristics. It is possible that an able person shares with a disabled one, a woman with a man, people of different nationalities and ethnicity, or someone younger with someone older (Branine, 2004, 137-8). When successfully implemented a job share arrangement has the potential to provide ‘win-win’ benefits to both the job sharers, through improvements in work-life balance, and their employer, including productivity improvements (Lewis, 2001; Stanworth, 1999) and knowledge sharing (Branine, 2003; Eick, 2001).

Job share is a flexible working arrangement. Within post-industrial economies, including the UK, these arrangements have seen significant expansion in the last three decades, driven by the work-life balance agenda. Work-life balance is defined as the ability of individuals, regardless of age or gender, to combine work and household responsibilities successfully, or as Clarke (2000, 751) describes with minimum conflict. However, the household-workplace interface has become increasingly blurred (see Bulger et al, 2007), creating a range of challenges for workers and their households. This was recognized by the *Work-Life Balance Campaign*, introduced in the UK in spring 2000, which promoted the potential benefits for employers and employees of work-life balance policies and practices (BIS, 2010). The 2003 *Flexible Working Regulations*, further, offer workers the legal right to request the use of a flexible working arrangement.¹ This policy has thus driven increased availability of flexible working arrangements in recent years. Evidence, further, is indicative of potential ‘win-win’ outcomes for employer and employee from

the use of flexible working arrangements. Positive impacts, for example higher levels of job satisfaction, indicative of perceived improvement, have been reported among those using various flexible work options (Gregory and Connolly, 2008; Hyman and Summers, 2004; Kelliher and Anderson, 2008; Author A). There remain concerns, however, over the extent of formalization of arrangements, including job share. In the private sector this may reflect the nature of some businesses. Nevertheless even when available, implementation is often informal and *ad hoc* and can result in the marginalization of flexible workers (Hoque and Kirkpatrick, 2003; Author B).

The *Work-Life Balance Campaign* has further been criticised for its ‘inherent and limiting managerialism’ (Shorthose, 2004, 2), and focus on preserving current constructs of work (Fleetwood, 2007). Employers increasingly require employee flexibility for the employer (as recognised by Costa et al, 2003) including the use of numerical (fixed-term, agency and mandated part-time work) and functional (shift-work, overtime, varying work weeks using balancing-time accounts) flexibility (Raess and Burgoon, 2013, 2-3). However, in some cases they remain unwilling to offer the same flexibility to their employees. In particular, employers make ‘allowance decisions’ (Poelmans and Beham, 2008) and may reject requests for flexible working on grounds of ‘business need’ (BIS, 2010). There is acknowledgement of the need for balance between creating flexibility for employees, while also ensuring that businesses are able to continue to operate. The costs of granting flexible working arrangements present a particular concern among SMEs (Dex and Scheibl, 2001, 422). However, gaps present between availability and use of flexible working arrangements may reflect employers wishing to be seen as engaging in good

'HR' practice, but concurrently a lack of commitment by these employers to actively improve the welfare of workers. In addition, concerns specific to job share include a range of practical challenges, including arguments regarding its relatively lesser 'flexibility' when compared to other work-life balance policies, led by the dependency of current constructs on dividing normal 'full-time' hours between job sharers (Lewis, 2001; Hall and Atkinson, 2006).

This article specifically aims to develop our understanding of current applications of job share, including exploring the extent of current availability and use, and identifying job sharers through consideration of the characteristics of those job sharing. The article uses this evidence to debate current and potential future uses of job share as well as barriers to expansion of this flexible work option. This article aims to generate debate within both academic and professional spheres reflecting on: (1) whether availability and use of job share are seen as 'good' HR practice, (2) whether use of job share could be expanded, for example to ameliorate unemployment, and; (3) whether its limited use is a result of institutional barriers driven by business case arguments, or the practical limitations of current constructs of job share.

Job share: Evidence from the extant literature

Job share remained a relatively unknown form of flexible working until the 1980s (Walton, 1990). Data from the 1998 UK *Workplace Employee Relations Survey* (WERS98) indicated job share was available among 45% of non-managerial employees by 1998, and 21% of SME employees (Dex and Scheibl, 2001, 415). More recent

empirical research, though, identified its use is limited. For example, using data from Ireland it was found that while approximately 30% of employees reported the availability of job sharing at their workplace, only 6% reported use of job share schemes (Russell et al, 2008, 83). Meanwhile, there are notable gender divisions, as evidence suggests that most of those engaging in job share are working mothers (Branine, 1998; Lewis, 2001; Sirianni and Negrey, 2000). Russell et al (2008, 83) found that 9% of women reported job sharing or working on a week-on-week-off basis, compared to only 3% of men. Hutchens (2010, 1018), further, identifies that job sharing is more common among white collar workers. Given that job share remains relatively uncommon (Russell et al, 2008, 80) this raises the question whether, consistent with other flexible working arrangements, it has the potential to provide a 'win-win' outcome for employers and employees (Lawrence and Corwin, 2003, 924). Broad evidence regarding the outcomes of flexible working identifies benefits including higher levels of satisfaction with work (Gregory and Connolly, 2008; Hyman and Summers, 2004; Kelliher and Anderson, 2008; Author A). The extant literature is indicative, though, of outcomes varying between workers in respect to gender, age and other demographics (Lewis, 2003, 11), and benefits being limited by poor implementation driven by 'business need' (Author B).

A range of research exploring applications of job sharing has provided evidence regarding the outcomes for job sharers and employers. Savage et al (2001), using an empirical survey of 200 senior managers in the UK, suggested that job sharing can result in productivity improvements, and improve resilience, leadership, and commitment. Moreover, job sharers are able to use best practice, engage in joint reflection on

completed work, and learn from each other's strengths (Eick, 2001, 902). Harris (1997) used a cost benefit analysis framework to consider the relative benefits of job share schemes in UK Universities. Findings identified potential to reduce stress, reduce unemployment in the economy, and also to improve retention of valued employees. The latter finding is consistent with other research (Stavrou, 2005; Lafferty et al, 2002), although recent evidence using data from organizations in UK, Australia, Canada, New Zealand and USA is conflicting (see Stavrou and Kilaniotis, 2010). Job share is also used, often by women, as a method of maintaining secure well-paid employment while enabling active involvement with their children (Sirianni and Negrey, 2000, 71).

However, there are a range of challenges and limitations associated with job share. It has been argued that a limitation specific to job share (as opposed to all flexible working arrangements) is that this working arrangement actively perpetuates current models of working time (Lewis, 2001, 27), through division of 'normal' full-time equivalent working hours between two employees. Current constructs of job share thus may not deliver the same level of temporal flexibility as other flexible work options, for example flexi-time and reduced or compressed hours. A practical limitation to use of job share faced at the outset is in respect to finding an individual with which to share a role, although job share registers are used in larger organizations (Tomlinson, 2006). In respect to other practical aspects of job share, in some circumstances a move to part-time work may be favoured, especially if the period of reduced hours is likely to be relatively short as this will amongst other things avoid the costs involved in searching for a job share 'partner'. From an employer perspective too, alternatives such as increased availability of

home-based teleworking may be favoured to avoid the costs (including training) and disruption associated with job share (Poelmans and Beham, 2008, 401). Use of job share and other work-life balance policies which involve reduced hours are, further, often less desirable as the associated reductions in pay render these arrangements financially infeasible for many employees (Hall and Atkinson, 2006, 380). In addition, use of job share may be problematic in certain occupations. For example, research has indicated that front-line police work was not amenable for applications of part-time working and job sharing (Dick, 2004). However, where jobs are extensive and senior this, in contrast, may act as a rationale for use of job share when reduced hours are sought, as opposed to more straightforward movements into part-time work, as there may be too much work for one part-timer to undertake (Durbin and Tomlinson, 2010, 633).

Past evidence has suggested that availability of job share is largely demand driven (Stanworth, 1999). Limited availability of job share could, though, be a result of inconsistent policies within organisations. As Smith and Elliott (2012, 677) reported as part of their case study exploring retail management in the UK, job share was available to human resource staff, but not to retail store managers. Similarly, Hall and Liddicoat (2005) reported inconsistent promotion and awareness within organizations. In some cases employees were unaware of the availability of job share, while in others employees thought job sharing available when the employer (HRM) suggested it was actively discouraged. Where job share is available institutional barriers could create further challenges. For example, Foster (2007, 74) found evidence of job share arrangements being available and granted to employees, but that when implemented job sharers were

marginalized in their role and in respect to the work they were asked to complete. This is consistent with the findings of McDonald et al (2009, 149). They found job share schemes can result, in some cases, in job sharers being given lesser responsibility, and evidence of job share only being used where a 'seamless' handover of work is possible.

Tiney (2004), investigating evidence from the application of job share among senior managers in retail, reported that job share was successfully used by two mothers to assist management of work-life balance. However, difficulties were encountered regarding communication between the job sharers, which required full-time members of staff to act as a link (Tiney, 2004, 431). Additionally, Freeman and Coll (2009) reported in their study of US education that job share can present further problems if one sharer is more competent than the other. This emphasises the importance of compatibility between job sharers. If poorly implemented job share can, additionally, result in increased work intensity if sharers are each given the workload of a full-time employee (McDonald et al, 2009). Brocklebank and Whitehouse (2003, 245), reporting on a job share of a managerial role, emphasise the need for some 'overlap' in the time job sharers are present in the workplace to facilitate effective communication and organization of the shared role. As Branine (2004, 150) identified, "it is vital that the [job sharers] work well together". Conflicts, a potentially important barrier to successful sharing, are often the product of personality clashes and differences in behaviours and attitudes (Branine, 2004, 147; 1998).

The specific outcomes associated with job share have also been discussed extensively in the context of work in medicine (see for example van Someren, 1992; Branine, 1998, 2003; Guglielmo, 2008). Much of this literature focuses on practical applications of job share among junior doctors and nursing staff. The evidence is indicative of a range of potential benefits but also a number of challenges specific to job sharing. Concerns are raised from the perspective of employers in regards to: the compatibility of job sharers; continuity of work (with respect to care in the case of medicine), and; increased administration, training and other costs (Branine, 1998, 66). Central to employees are concerns regarding: benefits associated with full-time employment being lost; conflicts between job sharers, and; lack of control over the nature and outcomes of work (Branine, 1998; 2003; 2004). However, the benefits identified in these studies include improved work-life balance from better time management, and increased opportunities for learning from one another (Branine, 2003; Guglielmo, 2008). The evidence suggests that job share could be considered an under-utilized form of flexible working as it has the potential to improve work-life balance of certain workers. Alongside the potential flexibility it offers, the evidence regarding learning, reflection, and knowledge sharing (Branine, 2003; Eick, 2001) further gives cognizance to the benefits of job share within organizations. However, it is also evident that there are some potentially important barriers and practical limitations to this flexible working arrangement. The next section seeks to extend the evidence base on job share by examining current use, including the characteristics of those job sharing.

Empirical analysis: current applications and outcomes of job share

This article uses a combination of data extracted from waves 11-19 of the *British Household Panel Survey* (BHPS), and wave 2 (2010-11) of *Understanding Society*, alternatively titled the *United Kingdom Household Longitudinal Study* (UKHLS). The BHPS was designed as an annual survey of each adult member (aged 16 years and over) of a nationally representative sample of over 5,000 households (10,000 individuals). Since its inception in 1992 individuals have been successively re-interviewed each year and, if they leave their original households, all adult members of their new household are interviewed. Children are also interviewed from age 16 (BHPS, 2010). *Understanding Society* subsumed the BHPS in 2009, incorporating the BHPS sample within wave 1 of the survey. *Understanding Society* is a multi-topic longitudinal sample survey of 40,000 households. Face-to-face and telephone interviews are used to capture data from each adult member of these households each year. The survey aims to improve understanding of social and economic change in Britain at household and individual levels (Understanding Society, 2012). In this article data is extracted from *Understanding Society* as this provides the most recent large-scale sample. Meanwhile, the BHPS data enables robust statistical analysis of data from an extended period, waves 11-19 (2000-2010), using panel regression techniques.

TABLE 1 HERE

The empirical evidence highlights the current marginal nature of job share in the UK. Table 1 presents data from *Understanding Society* reflecting on the availability and use of flexible working arrangements among men and women. The data identifies availability of

job sharing among 14.4% of men and 24.8% of women employees. However, just 2.1% of respondents actually report using job share. In contrast, incidence of part-time work is more common, especially among women. Moreover, a portion of those working part-time may be cases where employers consider the impact of a temporary reduction in hours can be redistributed within their organization, thus avoiding the necessity of a job share (Durbin and Tomlinson, 2010, 633). Meanwhile, flexi-time is also more commonly available and in use. This arrangement benefits from allowing employees to retain full-time equivalent hours (often around core hours e.g. 10am-3pm) and pay, and complete a full-time working contribution, but at times which better fit with their household responsibilities. Flexi-time is thus also often more desirable from the employers perspective. Term-time working is used predominantly by women, reflecting the continuing gender norms in place regarding care for dependent children. Meanwhile, both men (10.1%) and women (4.7%) also report greater incidence of working from home than job sharing, perhaps in some cases reflecting employers seeking to avoid disruption as identified by Poelmans and Beham (2008, 401). Returning to job share, there are notable gender divisions. The evidence suggests that of those engaging in job share 84.1% are women, and the majority of these women are mothers with dependent children (59.5%). These findings are consistent with those of other research into uses of job share (see Russell et al, 2008; Branine, 1998; Lewis, 2001). Use of job share is also more common in the public sector, as with other flexible work options. *Understanding Society* estimates suggest that 3.5% of women employed in the public sector job share (2.0% in private sector).

Reflecting on the outcomes associated with use of job share arrangements, both the BHPS and *Understanding Society* include questions on satisfaction with job and amount of leisure time. Data from *Understanding Society* reveals that satisfaction with job among men (77.1%) and women (77.9%) job sharers is marginally lower than average levels among all men (78.3%) and all women (80.9%). Although only marginal differences, these findings may present some evidence that job sharing does not improve satisfaction levels, potentially consistent with some of the impacts reported by Durbin and Tomlinson (2010). This additionally contrasts the effects reported in the extant literature among other forms of flexible working arrangements. In respect to women the findings may reflect the impact of other determinants (which also drive the move to job share) as, for example, lower satisfaction levels are usually reported among those with dependent children (Author A). Consistent with this suggestion are the findings in respect of satisfaction with amount of leisure time, where a notable gender division is present. A higher proportion of job sharing men report being satisfied with their leisure time (65.6%) compared to the average for all men (62.2%), whereas this effect is not present among job sharing women (61.2% compared with 61.8% for all women).²

Regression analysis: data and methodology

To extend our understanding of the current uses of job share, and the characteristics of job sharers, regression analysis is conducted. A binary probit regression model is used in this article, as the dependent variable is dichotomous. The model considers all working individuals aged 16-65. ‘Whether currently job sharing’ is the dichotomous dependent variable, where yes = 1, and no = 0. This variable is regressed against a range of time-

use, employment, and demographic characteristics. In addition, as this article seeks to improve our understanding in respect of not only the characteristics of job sharers, but also the outcomes concerning satisfaction levels for job sharers, the regression analysis includes two measures of satisfaction (satisfaction with job and amount of leisure time). A number of variables have thus been selected based on the findings presented in the extant literature regarding determinants of satisfactions levels, including age (Blanchflower and Oswald, 2004), gender (Garcia et al, 2007; Author C), education (Dolan et al, 2008), the presence of dependent children (Garcia et al, 2007), economic activity (Stutzer, 2004), and income (Clark et al, 2008). The results of the regression analysis are summarized in Table 2.

TABLE 2 HERE

Estimation results

The model identifies that job sharers work shorter hours, but also report lower incomes as a result of this reduction in working hours. Interestingly, job sharers do report greater levels of overtime and longer commutes, perhaps reflecting employee flexibility for the employer in these roles (Costa et al, 2003). Lengthier overtime may further offer evidence of job sharers being asked to perform the workload of a full-time employee (McDonald et al, 2009). They report work in professional and administrative occupations, following the identification by Hutchens (2010, 1018) of job sharing being more common among white collar workers. Job sharers are more likely to be women, in the middle of their working lives, who are married and have dependent children. This is consistent with

previous findings (Branine, 1998; Lewis, 2001; Sirianni and Negrey, 2000). They are often educated, to degree level, and work predominantly in the public sector. These employees report lower levels of satisfaction with leisure, although this may be led by the greater household responsibilities reported, especially among women. Satisfaction with work is statistically insignificant consistent (and contrasts the descriptive findings). In summary, the empirical evidence extracted from UK data sources — the BHPS and *Understanding Society* — confirms that use of job share currently remains uncommon, despite relatively broad availability. The regression analysis further identifies that, where present, job share is mostly found among working mothers who require the flexibility that this non-standard work arrangement provides, but that in turn employers may require higher levels of flexibility from these employees in respect to overtime, commuting etc. The results pertaining to satisfaction levels suggest lesser benefits for those using job share than research has found among other flexible working arrangements, though the drivers of this lesser satisfaction are not certain. The limited use, outcomes associated with job share, and the potential challenges faced in extending the use of this flexible working arrangement are the subject of debate in the following section.

Discussion and conclusion: is job share under-utilized or inherently flawed?

The evidence presented in this article is indicative of relatively widespread availability of job share, comparable to other work-life balance policies. However, use of job share remains uncommon. If applied successfully job share should allow sharers (employees) to enjoy a range of benefits of full-time work, but at reduced hours, while improving the balance between work and the rest of their lives. From the employers perspective job

share should allow a role to be completed with no loss of productivity, and also potentially with improved output as a product of the sharing of ideas and splitting of tasks (Eick, 2001). The potential for a 'win-win' outcome derived from these benefits would suggest greater use of job share than is presently found. Job share could further be considered as a potential method of reducing levels of unemployment, following the benefits outlined by Lafferty et al (2002). This could follow the effects associated with work sharing by enabling increased employment, and could open up work opportunities to a range of individuals unable to previously engage with paid work (Branine, 2004). Given the gap between availability and use evident from analysis of the BHPS and *Understanding Society*, and the intra and inter-organization inconsistencies reported (Smith and Elliott, 2012; Hall and Liddicoat, 2005), policy intervention requiring employers to increase awareness could offer a simple method of increasing take-up of job share.

Job share, however, suffers from a number of practical limitations, some of which are specific to this flexible working arrangement. In particular, the initial challenge of finding a job share 'partner', from both an employee and employer perspective, brings with it search costs. This may render job share undesirable when compared to other flexible work options, and employers in particular may question these and other costs (including training) if the job share is only likely to be in place for a limited period of time (Poelmans and Beham, 2008). A further concern is in relation to the contributions of each of the job sharers in an agreement. If one sharer is less capable or committed to their role this could cause significant difficulties for the other sharer (Freeman and Coll, 2009).

These complexities in relation to the 'fit' of job sharers require careful consideration prior to job shares being implemented and throughout the sharing agreement, in order to avoid conflicts and negative impacts including increased work-stress. Job share is acknowledged as a more complex flexible work option (Solomon, 1994). In addition, whereas alternatives allow retention of full-time equivalent hours, e.g. flexi-time and compressed hours, job share results in reduced hours and commensurate reductions in pay, consistent with the empirical analysis presented. Financial constraints (Hall and Atkinson, 2006, 380) and other concerns including potential career implications (Foster, 2007, 74; McDonald et al, 2009, 149) may therefore result in alternatives being favoured, wherever employees are able to 'manage' household responsibilities. This could reflect that job share may be seen by many as a 'last resort'. This would correspond with its limited use, and predominance of its current use among working mothers for whom job share may provide a route to continued employment when significant household responsibilities are present. Finally, due to the less 'flexible' nature of job share it may be less amenable to certain industries/sectors than some other flexible working arrangements (Dick, 2004). Current constructs of job share may therefore be limited in suitability for expansion, for example as a method of ameliorating unemployment concerns. In addition, the practical limitations outlined reduce the likelihood of achieving 'win-win' when putting job share into practice. Addressing these concerns, however, may require the design of current job share policy to be revisited. Greater flexibility is needed with respect to the structure of the working week (days/hours worked). Job share currently remains too rigidly based around current models of work time (Lewis, 2001, 27). This corresponds with the relatively lower job satisfaction and satisfaction with amount of

leisure time (among women) reported among job sharers. However, revisiting policy design would likely result in requirements for greater flexibility on the part of the employer.

‘Business need’ is a common concern associated with flexible working arrangements, acting as an institutional barrier to both availability and use of a number of policies aimed at improving work-life balance. However, this may be especially pertinent for job share agreements given the relative ‘costs’ for employers in respect of training, HR and administration associated with having two reduced hours employees covering one role. This may be a key driver of the stark differences between availability and use of job share within UK organisations present in the data. Employers may view availability as important to be seen as engaging in ‘good’ HR practice, but remain averse to the ‘costs’ associated with granting job shares. Job share may only be granted, again as a ‘last resort’, in order to provide functional flexibility to cover undesirable shifts or work routines within organizations, as evidenced by Hyman et al (2005, 715). This approach by employers, however, could be viewed as simply preserving current workplace practice (Fleetwood, 2007; Shorthose, 2004), and flexibility for the benefit of the employer as opposed to providing flexibility for the benefit of the employee (Costa et al, 2003). From the employee perspective a central concern is associated with loss of opportunities for training and promotion within their organisation. While this shouldn’t represent a concern if policies are implemented correctly, evidence does suggest that some job sharers are marginalized and given reduced responsibilities (Foster, 2007, 74; McDonald et al, 2009, 149). It should, though, be noted that this is a broader concern which remains associated

with implementation of work-life balance policies, especially in the private sector (see Author B; Atkinson and Hall, 2009: 663). These difficulties could also be implicit in the satisfaction levels found present among job sharers. In contrast with other forms of flexible working, including home-based teleworking (see Author A), higher levels of satisfaction with job and amount of leisure time are not consistently (or statistically significantly) present among job sharers. Whether these findings are a product of institutional barriers or simply provide further evidence of the practical limitations of current constructs of job share is, therefore, an important question for debate and continued research.

Endnotes

¹ This is an amendment to the UK *Employment Rights Act* (1996). The initial policy only applied to parents of young and disabled children. In 2007 the law was extended to include carers of certain adults and parents of older children, and in 2009 to include employees with parental responsibility for children under 16.

² Questions are asked on a likert scale where 1 = completely dissatisfied, 4 = neither satisfied or dissatisfied, and 7 = completely satisfied. The patterns in reported satisfaction with job and amount of leisure time among men and women job sharers are confirmed as statistically significant ($\chi^2 = 54.477$, p-value 0.000).

References

Atkinson, C. and Hall, L. (2009). 'The Role of Gender in Varying Forms of Flexible Working.' *Gender, Work and Organization*, 16, 6, pp. 650-666.

BIS (2010). Flexible Working and Work-Life Balance [online]. <http://www.bis.gov.uk/>

Blanchflower, D.G., Oswald, A.J. (2004). Money, Sex and Happiness: An Empirical Study. *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics*, 106, 3, pp. 393-415.

Branine, M. (1998). The logic of job sharing in the provision and delivery of health care. *Journal of Management in Medicine*, 12, 1, pp. 63-72.

Branine, M. (2003). Part-time work and jobsharing in health care: is the NHS a family-friendly employer? *Journal of Health Organization and Management*, 17, 1, pp. 53-68.

Branine, M. (2004). Job sharing and equal opportunities under the new public management in local authorities. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 17, 2, pp. 136-152.

British Household Panel Survey [computer file], ESRC Research Centre on Micro-social Change. - Colchester: The Data Archive [distributor], (2010). Data files and associated documentation.

Brocklebank, J., Whitehouse, H. (2003). Job sharing in academic libraries at the senior management level: Experiences of job sharing at deputy and director level. *Library Management*, 24, 4/5, pp. 243-51.

Bulger, C., Matthews, R., and Hoffman, M. (2007). Work and Personal Life Boundary Management: Boundary Strength, Work/Personal Life Balance, and the Segmentation - Integration Continuum. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 12, 4, pp. 365-375.

Clark, S. C. (2000). Work/family border theory: a new theory of work/family balance. *Human Relations*, 53, 6, pp. 747–770.

Clark, A.E., Frijters, P., Shields, M.A. (2008). Relative Income, Happiness, and Utility: An Explanation for the Easterlin Paradox and Other Puzzles. *Journal of Economic Literature*, 46, 1, pp. 95-144.

Costa, G., Akerstedt, T., Nachreiner, F., Baltieri, F., Carvalhais, J., Folkard, S., Frings-Dresen, M., Gadbois, C., Gartner, J., Grzech-Sukalo, H., Härmä, M., Kandolin, I., Sartori, S., Silvério, J. (2003). As time goes by – Flexible work hours, health and wellbeing. *Working Life Research in Europe Report*, Vol. 8. Stockholm: The National Institute for Working Life.

Crimman, A., Wiener, F., Bellman, L. (2010). The German work-sharing scheme: an instrument for the crisis. *International Labour Organization*, Conditions of Work and Employment Series No. 25.

Dex, S., Scheibl, F. (2001). Flexible and Family-Friendly Working Arrangements in UK-Based SMEs: Business Cases. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, 39, 3, pp. 411-431.

Dick, P. (2004). Between a Rock and a Hard Place: The Dilemmas of Managing Part-Time Working in the Police-Service?. *Personnel Review*, 33, 3, pp. 302-321.

Dolan, P., Peasgood, T., White, M. (2008). Do We Really Know What Makes Us Happy? A Review Of The Economic Literature On The Factors Associated With Subjective Wellbeing. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 29, 1, pp. 94-122.

Durbin, S., Tomlinson, J. (2010). Female part-time managers: networks and career mobility. *Work, Employment & Society*, 24, 4, pp. 621-40.

Eick, C.J. (2001). Job sharing their first year: A narrative of two partnered teachers' induction into middle school science teaching. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 18, pp. 887–904.

Foster, D. (2007). Legal obligation or personal lottery? : Employee experiences of disability and the negotiation of adjustments in the public sector workplace. *Work, Employment & Society*, 21, 1, pp. 67-84.

Freeman, B. J., Coll, K. M. (2009). Solutions to faculty work overload: a study of job sharing. *The Career Development Quarterly*, 58, 1, pp. 65-70.

Garcia, I., Molina, A., Navarro, M. (2007). How Satisfied are Spouses with their Leisure Time? Evidence from Europe. *Journal of Family and Economic Issues*, 28, pp. 546-565.

Gregory M., Connolly, S. (2008). Feature: the price of reconciliation: part-time work, families and women's satisfaction. *The Economic Journal*, 118, 526, pp. F1-F7.

Guglielmo, W.J. (2008). Job sharing: flexibility has a price. *Journal of Medical Economics*, 85, 2, pp. 40-3.

Hall, L. Atkinson, C. (2006). Improving working lives: flexible working and the role of employee control. *Employee Relations*, 28, 4, pp. 374-86.

Hall, L., Liddicoat, L. (2005). Challenges to Developing Effective Family Friendly Work Practices: Findings from New Zealand. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 13, 1, pp. 1-17.

Hoque, K., Kirkpatrick, I (2003). Non-standard employment in the management and professional workforce: training, consultation and gender implications. *Work, Employment & Society*, 17, 4, pp. 667-689.

Hutchens, R. (2010). Worker characteristics, job characteristics, and opportunities for phased retirement. *Labour Economics*, 17, 6, pp. 1010-1021.

Hyman, J., Scholarios, D., Baldry, C. (2005). Getting on or getting by? : Employee flexibility and coping strategies for home and work. *Work, Employment & Society*, 19, 4, pp. 705-25.

Hyman J., Summers, J. (2004). Lacking Balance? Work-life employment practices in the modern economy. *Personnel Review*, 33, 4, pp. 418-429.

Kelliher, C., Anderson, D. (2008). For better or for worse? An analysis of how flexible working practices influence employees' perceptions of job quality. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 19, 3, pp. 419-431.

Lafferty, G., Bohle, P., Giudice, C. (2002). Job sharing in Australia: possibilities, problems and strategies. *Economic and Labour Relations Review*, 13, 1, pp. 127-48.

Lawrence, T., Corwin, V. (2003). Being there: the acceptance and marginalization of part-time professional employees. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 24, pp. 923-43.

Lewis, S. (2001). Restructuring workplace cultures: the ultimate work-family challenge? *Women in Management Review*, 16, 1, pp. 21-9.

Lewis, S. (2003). Flexible working arrangements: implementation, outcomes, and management. *International Review of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 18, pp. 1-28.

McDonald, P., Bradley, L., Brown, K. (2009). 'Full-time is a given here': Part-time versus full-time job quality. *British Journal of Management*, 20, 2, pp. 143-157.

Poelmans, S., Beham, B. (2008). The moment of truth: Conceptualizing managerial work-life policy allowance decisions. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 81, 3, pp. 393-410.

Raess, D. and Burgoon, B. (2013). Flexible Work and Immigration in Europe. *British Journal of Industrial Relations*, forthcoming (early view).

Russell, H., O'Connell, P., McGinnity, F. (2008). The Impact of flexible working arrangements on work–life conflict and work pressure in Ireland. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 16, 1, pp. 73-97.

Savage, C. Janman, K., Knell, J. (2001). *Desperately seeking flexibility: Is job share the answer?* The Industrial Society. Loughton, Essex: CW Press.

Sirianni, C., Negrey, C. (2000). Working Time as Gendered Time. *Feminist Economics*, 6, 1, pp. 59-76.

Smith, A., Elliot, F. (2012). The demands and challenges of being a retail store manager: 'Handcuffed to the front doors'. *Work, Employment & Society*, 26, 4, pp. 676-684.

Solomon, C. M. (1994). Job sharing: One job, double headache? *Personnel Journal*, 73, 9, pp. 88-95.

van Someren, V. (1992). Part-time working and job sharing in the NHS. *British Medical Journal*, 5, 305(6866), pp.1377-78.

Stanworth, C. (1999). A best case scenario? Non-manual part-time work and job sharing in U.K. local government in the 1990s. *Community, Work and Family*, 2, 3, pp. 295-310.

Stavrou, E. (2005). Flexible work bundles and organizational competitiveness: a cross-national study of the European work context. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26, pp. 923–947.

Stavrou, E., Kilaniotis, C. (2010). Flexible Work and Turnover: An Empirical Investigation across Cultures. *British Journal of Management*, 21, 2, pp. 541-554.

Stutzer, A. (2004). The role of Income Aspirations in Individual Happiness. *Journal of Economic Behaviour and Organisation*, 54, 1, pp. 89–109.

Tiney, C. (2004). Job share: can this work in management? *International Journal of Retail & Distribution Management*, 32, 9, pp. 430-433.

Tomlinson, J. (2006). Routes to part-time management in UK service sector organizations: implications for women's skills, flexibility and progression. *Gender, Work and Organization*, 13, 6, pp. 585-605.

University of Essex. *Institute for Social and Economic Research and National Centre for Social Research*, Understanding Society: Wave 1, 2009-2010 and Wave 2, Year 1 (Interim Release), 2010 [computer file]. 3rd Edition. Colchester, Essex: UK Data Archive [distributor], February 2012. SN: 6614, <http://dx.doi.org/10.5255/UKDA-SN-6614-3>.

Walton, P. (1990). *Job-sharing: a practical guide*. London: Kogan Page.

Table 1: Availability and use of flexible working arrangements by gender, *Understanding Society*

Flexible working arrangement	Availability			Using arrangement		
	Men (%)	Women (%)	χ^2	Men (%)	Women (%)	χ^2
Part-time	37.1	69.4	***	15.3	44.7	***
Term-time	10.3	22.7	***	2.7	9.5	***
Job share	14.4	24.8	***	0.9	2.7	***
Flexi-time	27.7	31.0	***	19.3	14.9	***
Compressed hours	11.9	13.0	**	2.3	1.9	
Annualised hours	6.3	6.8		2.8	1.1	***
Work from home	14.7	11.2	***	10.1	4.7	***
Other flexible arrangement	20.8	19.9		8.0	5.0	***

Source: Understanding Society Wave 2, 2010-11.

Notes: Figures show percentages of working individuals reporting availability and use of flexible working arrangements. n = 13,200 (men), 16,486 (women). χ^2 significance levels of 1%, 5% and 10% are denoted by ***, ** and * respectively.

Table 2: Binary Probit Model: Characteristics of Job Sharers, BHPS

Binary Probit Model (Quadratic Hill Climbing)				
Variable	β	S.E.	Z	Prob.
Constant	-2.210	0.236	-9.371	0.000
Working hours	-0.028	0.002	-13.897	0.000
Overtime	0.010	0.004	2.768	0.006
Commute	0.019	0.005	3.372	0.001
Housework	0.002	0.002	0.725	0.469
Care	0.000	0.002	0.013	0.989
Male	-0.353	0.057	-6.173	0.000
Age	0.023	0.011	2.173	0.030
Age ² /100	-0.025	0.013	-1.969	0.049
Married	0.067	0.034	1.959	0.050
No. children	0.058	0.023	2.558	0.011
<i>Education level: reference is no qualifications</i>				
Degree	0.249	0.084	2.945	0.003
A Level	0.110	0.075	1.476	0.140
GCSE	0.195	0.070	2.771	0.006
<i>Occupation group (UK SOC): reference is elementary occupations</i>				
Managers and senior officials	0.167	0.110	1.514	0.130
Professionals	0.337	0.106	3.174	0.002
Associate professional and tech.	0.362	0.098	3.694	0.000
Administrative and secretarial	0.620	0.088	7.004	0.000
Skilled trades	0.264	0.144	1.833	0.067
Personal service	0.010	0.097	0.102	0.919
Sales and customer service	0.092	0.107	0.854	0.393
Process, plant, and machine ops.	0.463	0.128	3.633	0.000
Private sector	-0.200	0.043	-4.629	0.000
Annual income	-0.009	0.003	-3.422	0.001
<i>Satisfaction variables</i>				
Satisfaction with job	0.005	0.016	0.294	0.769
Satis. leisure amount	-0.024	0.013	-1.769	0.077
Model Diagnostics				
McFadden R-squared	0.156	Log likelihood	-2443.531	
S.D. dependent variable	0.111	LR statistic	900.587	
Akaike info criterion	0.114	Prob(LR statistic)	0.000	
Schwarz criterion	0.120			
Hannan-Quinn criterion	0.116			
Data Source				
Source: British Household Panel Survey Waves 11-19.				
Notes: Sample (adjusted): 2000-2010, included observations: 43,173 after adjustments.				

DISCUSSION PAPERS IN ECONOMICS

- 2013/1 Dan Wheatley, *Is it good to share? Debating patterns in availability and use of job share.*
- 2012/3 Simeon Coleman and Vitor Leone, *Time-Series Characteristics Of UK Commercial Property Returns: Testing For Multiple Changes In Persistence.*
- 2012/2 Otavio Ribeiro de Medeiros and Vitor Leone, *Multiple Changes in Persistence vs. Explosive Behaviour: The Dotcom Bubble.*
- 2012/1 Rob Ackrill and Simeon Coleman, *Inflation Dynamics In Central And Eastern European Countries.*
- 2011/4 Simeon Coleman, *Inflation Dynamics and Poverty Rates: Regional and Sectoral Evidence for Ghana.*
- 2011/3 Dan Wheatley and Zhongmin Wu, *Work, Inequality, And The Dual Career Household.*
- 2011/2 Simeon Coleman and Kavita Sirichand, *Fractional Integration and the Volatility Of UK Interest Rates.*
- 2011/1 Simeon Coleman, *Investigating Business Cycle Synchronization In West Africa.*
- 2010/11 Marie Stack and Eric Pentecost, *A Gravity Model Approach To Estimating Prospective Trade Gains in The EU Accession And Associated Countries.*
- 2010/10 Vitor Leone And Bruce Philp, *Surplus-Value And Aggregate Concentration In The UK Economy, 1987-2009.*
- 2010/9 Robert Ackrill and Adrian Kay, *WTO Regulations and Bioenergy Sustainability Certification – Synergies and Possible Conflicts.*
- 2010/8 Paul Alagidede, Simeon Coleman and Juan Carlos Cuestas, *Persistence Of Inflationary Shocks: Implications For West African Monetary Union Membership.*
- 2010/6 Bruce Philp and Dan Wheatley, *The time scarcity and the dual career household: competing perspectives*
- 2010/5 Juan Carlos Cuestas, Sebastián Freille and Patricio O’Gorman, *The media and public agendas: testing for media effects in Argentina Turing the Kirchner administration*
- 2010/4 Vitor Leone, *From property companies to real estate investment trusts: the impact of economic and property factors in the UK commercial property returns*
- 2010/3 Juan Carlos Cuestas and Paulo José Regis, *Purchasing power parity in OECD*

- countries: nonlinear unit root tests revisited*
- 2010/2 Juan Carlos Cuestas and Bruce Philp, *Exploitation and the class struggle*
- 2010/1 Barry Harrison and Winston Moore, *Nonlinearities in Stock Returns for Some Recent Entrants to the EU*
- 2009/7 Joao R. Faria, Le Wang and Zhongmin Wu, *Debts on debts*
- 2009/6 Juan Carlos Cuestas and Luis A. Gil-Alana, *Unemployment hysteresis, structural changes, non-linearities and fractional integration in Central and Eastern Europe*
- 2009/5 Juan Carlos Cuestas and Javier Ordóñez, *Unemployment and common smooth transition trends in Central and Eastern European Countries*
- 2009/4 Stephen Dobson and Carlyn Ramlogan, *Is there a trade-off between income inequality and corruption? Evidence from Latin America*
- 2009/3 Juan Carlos Cuestas and Luís Alberiko Gil-Alana, *Further evidence on the PPP analysis of the Australian dollar: non-linearities, structural changes and fractional integration*
- 2009/2 Estefanía Mourelle and Juan Carlos Cuestas, *Inflation persistence and asymmetries: Evidence for African countries*
- 2009/1 Juan Carlos Cuestas and Barry Harrison, *Further evidence on the real interest rate parity hypothesis in Central and Eastern European Countries: unit roots and nonlinearities*
- 2008/16 Simeon Coleman, *Inflation persistence in the Franc Zone: evidence from disaggregated prices*
- 2008/15 Juan Carlos Cuestas and Paulo Regis, *Nonlinearities and the order of integration of order prices*
- 2008/14 Peter Dawson and Stephen Dobson, *The influence of social pressure and nationality on individual decisions: evidence from the behaviour of referees*
- 2008/13 Juan Carlos Cuestas and Barry Harrison, *Testing for stationarity of inflation in Central and Eastern European Countries*
- 2008/12 Juan Carlos Cuestas and Dean Garratt, *Is real GDP per capita a stationary process? Smooth transitions, nonlinear trends and unit root testing*
- 2008/11 Antonio Rodriguez Andres and Carlyn Ramlogan-Dobson, *Corruption, privatisation and the distribution of income in Latin America*
- 2008/10 Stephen Dobson and Carlyn Ramlogan, *Is there an openness Kuznets curve? Evidence from Latin America*

- 2008/9 Stephen Dobson, John Goddard and Frank Stähler, *Effort levels in contests: an empirical application of the Tullock model*
- 2008/8 Juan Carlos Cuestas and Estefania Mourelle, *Nonlinearities in real exchange rate determination: Do African exchange rates follow a random walk?*
- 2008/7 Stephen Dobson and John Goddard, *Strategic behaviour and risk taking in football*
- 2008/6 Joao Ricardo Faria, Juan Carlos Cuestas and Estefania Mourelle, *Entrepreneurship and unemployment: A nonlinear bidirectional causality?*
- 2008/5 Dan Wheatley, Irene Hardill and Bruce Philp, *"Managing" reductions in working hours: A study of work-time and leisure preferences in the UK industry*
- 2008/4 Adrian Kay and Robert Ackrill, *Institutional change in the international governance of agriculture: a revised account*
- 2008/3 Juan Carlos Cuestas and Paulo José Regis, *Testing for PPP in Australia: Evidence from unit root test against nonlinear trend stationarity alternatives*
- 2008/2 João Ricardo Faria, Juan Carlos Cuestas and Luis Gil-Alana, *Unemployment and entrepreneurship: A Cyclical Relation*
- 2008/1 Zhongmin Wu, Mark Baimbridge and Yu Zhu, *Multiple Job Holding in the United Kingdom: Evidence from the British Household Panel Survey*

DISCUSSION PAPERS IN POLITICAL ECONOMY

- 2006/3 Ioana Negru, *On Homogeneity and Pluralism within Economics Schools of Thought*
- 2006/2 David Harvie and Bruce Philp, *Learning and Assessment in a Reading Group Format or Reading Capital... For Marks*
- 2006/1 David Harvie, Bruce Philp and Gary Slater, *Regional Well-Being and 'Social Productivity' in Great Britain'*
- 2004/2 Massimo De Angelis and David Harvie, *Globalisation? No Question: Foreign Direct Investment and Labour Commanded*
- 2004/1 David Harvie, *Value-Production and Struggle in the Classroom, or, Educators Within, Against and Beyond Capital*

DISCUSSION PAPERS IN APPLIED ECONOMICS AND POLICY

- 2007/2 Juan Carlos Cuestas, *Purchasing Power Parity in Central and Eastern European Countries: An Analysis of Unit Roots and Non-linearities*
- 2007/1 Juan Carlos Cuestas and Javier Ordóñez, *Testing for Price Convergence among Mercosur Countries*
- 2006/2 Rahmi Cetin and Robert Ackrill, *Foreign Investment and the Export of Foreign and Local Firms: An Analysis of Turkish Manufacturing*
- 2006/1 Robert Ackrill and Adrian Kay, *The EU Financial Perspective 2007-2013 and the Forces that Shaped the Final Agreement*
- 2004/5 Michael A. Smith, David Paton and Leighton Vaughan-Williams, *Costs, Biases and Betting markets: New evidence*
- 2004/4 Chris Forde and Gary Slater, *Agency Working in Britain: Character, Consequences and Regulation*
- 2004/3 Barry Harrison and David Paton, *Do 'Fat Tails' Matter in GARCH Estimation? Stock market efficiency in Romania and the Czech Republic*
- 2004/2 Dean Garratt and Rebecca Taylor, *Issue-based Teaching in Economics*
- 2004/1 Michael McCann, *Motives for Acquisitions in the UK*
- 2003/6 Chris Forde and Gary Slater, *The Nature and Experience of Agency Working in Britain*
- 2003/5 Eugen Mihaita, *Generating Hypothetical Rates of Return for the Romanian Fully Funded Pension Funds*
- 2003/4 Eugen Mihaita, *The Romanian Pension Reform*
- 2003/3 Joshy Easaw and Dean Garratt, *Impact of the UK General Election on Total Government Expenditure Cycles: Theory and Evidence*
- 2003/2 Dean Garratt, *Rates of Return to Owner-Occupation in the UK Housing Market*
- 2003/1 Barry Harrison and David Paton, *The Evolution of Stock Market Efficiency in a Transition Economy: Evidence from Romania.*