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Job-sharing in the teaching profession has become gradually more common in recent years. This research provides a wide-ranging review of this form of flexible working, its advantages and disadvantages for LEAs, schools and participating teachers, and offers guidelines for future development.
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This thesis presents the findings and discusses their implications. The part played by job-sharing arrangements in the management of teacher supply is considered, together with the future of job-sharing in the context of the transfer of power over teacher appointments from LEAs to school governing bodies. Finally, recommendations are made which may assist LEAs, school heads and governors, and job-sharers themselves, in the setting up of shared posts and their successful operation.
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INTRODUCTION

Job-sharing is usually defined as an arrangement by which two (or more) employees share a single full-time post with the salary and employment benefits divided pro rata. Its purpose is to provide a better quality of work and life for the participants through the wider availability of part-time jobs which offer security and opportunity for promotion, benefits seldom available within such part-time jobs as have traditionally existed.

The term first came into general use in the USA in the late 1960s. Workers became dissatisfied with either conforming to traditional full-time work patterns or accepting low-level, poorly paid and insecure part-time work. By fitting the job to the worker, rather than the worker to the job, those with other responsibilities and interests could combine secure part-time employment with the benefits and career prospects normally available only to full-time employees. New patterns of work, such as job-sharing, bring to the surface judgements that must be made on how to measure the costs and benefits, not only for employers and employees, but for society as a whole, when individuals have a wider choice about how they combine their work and non-work lives. Gretl Meier (1978) in her research for the Upjohn Institute points out the need for attitudes about part-time working to change so that, as the sharing of jobs becomes more widely acceptable, changes to regulations and policies may occur which in turn make job-sharing more available.

"Much of the difficulty comes from the still pervasive feeling that only certain jobs are suitable, and from the perception that the person unable or unwilling to work the standard work week at standard hours is a less valuable worker. Endorsement for change at the highest levels in the organisation is crucial."

An organisation called New Ways to Work was started in California to promote job-sharing and assist its development. By 1982, 25 states, plus the federal government, had official policies to enable or promote job-sharing (Epstein 1986). The same writer reports interest being shown in Germany in the 1980s as well as in Eire and the United Kingdom. Elsewhere in Europe there are instances of job-sharing in France, the Netherlands, Belgium and Denmark, but these "appear to be isolated cases". The further development of job-sharing is outlined in an article by Walton in 'New Patterns of Work' (ed. Clutterbuck 1985). In 1977 the Job Share Project (later renamed New Ways to Work but not directly connected with the American organisation) was established in London, and during the 1980s there was a steady increase in job-sharing in the United Kingdom.

Research on job-sharing was first done in America by Gretl Meier (op.cit). 56% of her 240 job-sharing respondents reported that the initiative for job-sharing had come from themselves, 29% from their organisations and 11% from their unions. Most said they had no
unusual difficulties in creating the job, but those who did had problems with 'organisational personnel policy' or 'the division of salary and fringe benefits between the sharers'.

"Most arrangements, however, were initiated by workers, made possible because the organisation responded to their needs and considered innovation potentially rewarding in instances when particular applicants presented themselves. This held true even when organisational policy for sharing already existed."

Meier found that the sharers considered the greatest reward of job-sharing was that it gave them an opportunity to balance working time with the rest of their lives. While work was important in their sense of identity it was not the sole criterion. They felt they had time for family, other interests and 'to gain perspective'. They knew they would be overstressed if they tried to balance full-time work with other responsibilities. As sharers they felt able to perform better at work and to fulfil their duties and personal needs outside working time. When asked how shared jobs differed from the usual part-time work, few mentioned the increased number of part-time jobs which could result. Most stressed the opportunities available for higher grade, more skilled and responsible work than could normally be offered on a part-time basis.

Epstein's account of the growth of job-sharing (op.cit) refers to views of some employers that job-sharing is merely 'up-market' or 'glorified' part-time work. She mentions also that one trade union (BIFU 1983) states that 'there is very little difference in essence between job sharing and part-time work'. In contrast 91% of the sharers in Mary Pritchard's survey (Pritchard 1990) concluded that job-sharing is different from part-time work. The reasons in order of preference were:

i) teamwork, partnership, less isolation
ii) higher status, opens up more senior jobs
iii) better conditions and security
iv) more career progression
v) more responsibility and commitment
vi) the need for good communication
vii) equal opportunities factors
viii) greater flexibility in organising work

Several other research studies have sought to discover more about job-sharing in particular areas or occupations. These include research by New Ways to Work on local authority job-share schemes "Putting Policy into Practice" (NWW 1987), the Employment
Relations Research Centre on Job-sharing in South-East Essex (Leighton and Rayner 1986), a study of job-share cases in the Irish Republic (Conlan 1986) "Does job-sharing work?", case studies of seven job-shares in different occupations (Leighton and Winfield 1988), and "Job-sharing in the Health Service" (Meager, Buchan and Rees, IMS Report 174 1989). As Leighton and Winfield (op.cit) point out, the distribution of job-sharing remains unclear because in most organisations sharers are simply recorded as part-time workers. There are also problems in defining exactly what constitutes a job-share. Meier (op.cit) uses the term to mean 'an arrangement whereby two employees hold a position together, whether they are as a team jointly responsible for the whole or separately for each half. Her criteria are:

i) it is voluntary, an option chosen by the employees

ii) it involves the deliberate conversion of a full-time position

iii) it depends on the existence of a partner

iv) it includes the provision of fringe benefits.

Leighton and Winfield (op.cit) say that

"Job-sharing usually connotes an integrated work pattern whereby at least some of the tasks are shared..."

Meager, Buchan and Rees (op.cit) defined job-sharing with the inclusion of the phrase "...employees...have equal responsibility for the whole job, and must co-ordinate and collaborate to ensure that the whole job is done." Unless such collaboration and joint responsibility is present many writers use the expression 'paired part-timers' rather than 'job-sharers', and the term 'job-split' rather than 'job-share'. Where individual workers have persuaded management that two should share one post, the conditions do not always fulfil the classic definition. The sharers sometimes have renewable fixed-term contracts and lack opportunities for training and promotion. Such examples should not be included as job-shares, though they may sometimes be referred to as such and distinctions may be difficult to make. In fact job-splitting and fully integrated sharing may be considered as opposite ends of a continuum within which the term job-share may be appropriate, provided that other criteria of comparability with full-time benefits are met.

Much has been heard of the 'core' and 'peripheral' workforce, the former having most of the legal and occupational benefits, and the latter, including part-time workers, few or none. Job-sharing is a deliberate policy aimed at moving some part-time workers from the periphery to the core, where they can have the same job security, conditions of service and opportunities for promotion as their full-time colleagues. A strange departure from this scenario is to be found in an article 'The Changing Corporation' by John Atkinson in New patterns of Work (ed. Clutterbuck 1985) in which job-sharing is assigned to the second peripheral group.
"Job-sharing, short-term contracts, public subsidy trainees and recruitment through temporary contracts all perform a similar function - maximising flexibility while minimising commitment to the worker, job security and career development."

It is possible that he is using the term job-sharing to refer to a government-sponsored plan to find part-time posts for those currently unemployed by splitting jobs, for which a subsidy was offered. Whatever the explanation, the use of the term 'job-sharing' in connection with minimal job security, career development, and commitment by the employer, illustrates the problems involved in defining a job-share and disseminating information about the purposes for which this way of structuring work-time is intended.

While job-sharing for teachers has received considerable attention in America, particularly in 'Job Sharing in the Schools' (Moorman, Smith and Ruggels 1980) and 'Part-time Teachers and How They Work' (Dapper and Murphy 1968), little has been written about teacher job-sharing in the United Kingdom. A survey of books in one University library, in the section on management of schools and teacher supply, produced very few references to part-time teachers and none about job-sharing arrangements. Well-reviewed handbooks on 'Applying for a Teaching Post' and 'Staff Appointment Procedures' published by The Education Appointments Council in 1994 include no reference to job-sharing, and enquiries revealed that the author had no knowledge or experience in this area. Occasional items about particular job-sharing partnerships have appeared in the press, but the only work of any substance appears to be a study of ten teacher job-sharers in the early stages of the introduction of a scheme in Sheffield (Angier 1982) and a detailed account (unpublished) of one informally arranged job-share submitted by S.D.Brown as part of a higher degree in curriculum studies (London University) in 1984. The distribution of job-sharing in the teaching profession across the United Kingdom, the motives behind the introduction or rejection of such schemes, their implementation and development, have not before been studied as a whole. This research seeks to fill the vacuum and comprises three parts:

Part I Background Literature

In Part I the existing literature will be reviewed with regard to both job-sharing in general and those issues affecting teachers in particular. The material will be presented in three sections:

Section A: The legal and administrative background to job-sharing.

This section considers how employment law treats job-sharing and discusses whether job-sharers have rights comparable to those of full-time workers or whether they are regarded in the same way as other part-time workers. Legal cases of particular relevance to the teaching
profession are also discussed. Other issues addressed are teachers' contracts and conditions of service and the rules of the Teachers' Superannuation Scheme as they apply to part-time staff.

Section B: The origin and development of job-sharing - advocates and opponents

This section studies accounts in the literature of how job-sharing originated and developed and the parts played in this process by

- Individuals wishing to share a post
- Trade Unions
- Employer attitudes to part-time workers
- Equal opportunities issues
- Customers and clients

Section C: The job-sharers - a survey of existing research on job sharing in action

This section reviews the literature on the operation of job-share schemes and the experiences of participants in a number of different areas of employment.

Part II The Empirical Research

This part firstly provides a description of the research methodology and secondly sets out and analyses the results of

- the LEA questionnaire
- the interviews with LEA officers
- the headteacher questionnaires
- the job-sharer questionnaires
- the register applicant questionnaires

Part III Discussion and Conclusions

In this part there are discussions of a number of important issues based on the combined results of the empirical research. These include the evidence on the origins of the job-share schemes, their implementation, and the perception of the participants concerning their success. Conclusions are drawn about the manner in which innovation is handled by policymakers and managers and the possible influence on outcomes. Suggestions are made for the guidance of those intending to introduce job-sharing in LEAs so that potential problems can be avoided and maximum satisfaction for schools, teachers and pupils can be achieved. Finally there is a
consideration of current changes in the education system and of how these may influence job-sharing in the teaching profession in the future.
PART I

BACKGROUND LITERATURE

SECTION A THE LEGAL AND ADMINISTRATIVE CONTEXT OF JOB-SHARING

INTRODUCTION
Definitions and descriptions of job-sharing usually incorporate comparisons with full-time employment and references to advantages over other forms of part-time employment.

"Job-sharing is important because it links part-time rights and conditions to those of full-time employment, and thereby avoids many drawbacks usually associated with part-time work." (E.O.C. 1981)

"Job-sharing is defined as the voluntary sharing of an established post with the salary shared on a pro-rata basis. Job-sharers are not therefore to be regarded as part-time workers." (Sheffield City Council 1983)

Reassuring as such statements may be to the advocates of job-sharing, the truth of the matter is that job-sharers fall uncomfortably between full-time and part-time workers. Their rights are affected by three sets of regulations - Law, National Conditions of Service and local agreements. The position is further complicated by the fact that in many cases the regulations are not at all clear and may be subject to variation and interpretation. The following discussion refers to law and agreements in England and Wales, some of which may differ in Scotland.
CHAPTER ONE

THE LAW AND JOB SHARING

THE EMPLOYMENT PROTECTION (CONSOLIDATION) ACT 1978

In law, a job-sharer is simply a part-time worker. The statutory rights of part-time workers were laid down in the Employment Protection (Consolidation) Act 1978. As a general rule a person working 16 or more hours a week could benefit from the provisions of the Act. One who worked between 8 and 16 hours a week must have five years continuous service to qualify. The table below shows how some of the more important rights were affected by the number of hours worked per week at the time the research was carried out in 1988.

A pair of job sharers, one of whom worked 16 or more hours per week and the other less than 16, would have differing statutory rights.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of service before right becomes operative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>8 hours per week but less than 16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written statement of terms of employment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time off for public or trade union duties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maternity leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notice of dismissal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Written statement of reasons for dismissal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair dismissal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redundancy pay</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from E.O. Review 1987 (I.R.S)
It was possible for an employer to agree to treat the less protected employee as if s/he worked for 16 hours or more and such an agreement might be written into her/his contract. The prevalence of such a practice does not appear to have been researched.

While this situation seems quite complex enough for job-sharers in general, the situation for teachers is even more complicated. The critical question is "How many hours is a teacher normally required to work each week?" Before the new conditions of service in 1987 teachers commonly worked for between 25 and 28 hours a week in their schools. Implicit in this was an assumption that teachers worked additional hours in marking and preparation since the Government classified all workers employed for less than 30 hours a week as part timers, but most teachers were treated as full-timers. Barrell (1978) states "There are problems in connection with teachers' service as there is no definition of a teacher's hours of work." In Lake v Essex County Council (1977), Mrs. Lake wished to claim unfair dismissal, but her specified hours fell just short of the necessary minimum. She considered that allowance should be made for the additional working time needed to prepare and mark work. The EAT supported this view, stating that Mrs. Lake was 'under contractual obligation to the Council to do as much work outside the school hours specified in her contract as was reasonably necessary for the proper performance of her teaching duties in school hours and ... this must be included in the computation ...' This ruling was subsequently overturned on appeal on the grounds that a requirement of this kind was too vague to be implied in a contract between teacher and employer.

Humphries (1983) comments that, in teaching, job-sharing "unfortunately poses a problem which is not encountered elsewhere. Although it is an accepted fact that teachers work for longer than their specified hours, legally they are only employed during those hours. What is needed is an additional commitment on the part of the employer to compensate for loss of protection in law. This fact, incidentally, means that proportionally more part-time teachers are unprotected than is the case for part-timers in other occupations."

The new School Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document (1987) improved the situation slightly by stating that a full-time teacher would be required to work an average of about 32½ hours a week in school, thus bringing the hours of a half-time share just above the critical 16 hour mark. Even this advantage would have been speedily demolished if the White Paper "Building businesses- not barriers" (1986) had gone on to become law. Here it was proposed that the 8 hour and 16 hour limits would be changed to 12 hours and 20 hours respectively, but the proposal was not implemented.

For sharers operating an unequal share, the major sharer would be protected by the 16 hour rule, while the minor sharer would have to work for 5 years to obtain the same benefits, unless these have already been acquired by length of service immediately before the job-share.
Time taken to prepare lessons, mark work and keep records remains unqualified since the document provides that teachers shall work 'such additional hours as may be needed...'

Other provisions which affect job-sharers are

i) "a teacher employed full time ... shall be available for work for 195 days in any year, of which 190 days shall be days on which he may be required to teach pupils ..." (Part X. 36 (1)(a))

ii) "teachers in regular part-time service shall be paid a proportion of the salary and allowances that would be appropriate if they were employed full-time as school teachers. The proportion shall correspond to the proportion of the school week that the authority deems the teacher to be normally employed..." (Part VI - Supplementary 22(1))

iii) "... a (full-time) teacher shall be available to perform such duties ... as may be specified by the head teacher ... for 1256 hours in any year, those hours to be allocated reasonably throughout those days in the year on which he is required to be available for work." (Part X - 36 (1)(b))

The partners in an equal job-share can thus be assumed to be under contract for half of 1265 hours spread over 195 days, i.e. for just over 16 hours a week. This is, of course, an average figure, some weeks being less than 16 hours and others where, for instance, a staff meeting and a parents' evening were held, being much higher. It seems probable that such an arrangement would be seen as 'normally' involving 16 hours or more a week, although averaging is not usually permitted. In Opie v John Gubbins (1978) Mrs. Opie worked 20½ hours one week and 13½ hours the next on an alternating basis for two years, but although the average is in excess of 16 hours the EAT held that she was not employed under a contract which 'normally' involved work for 16 hours or more weekly.

The fact that two equal sharers would only just qualify indicates the danger of unequal sharing. Even the smallest differences in hours between the sharers would give them differing status under the Act. The most popular splits among teachers, mornings/afternoons and Monday-midday Wednesday/midday Wednesday-Friday are not usually equal because morning sessions are commonly longer than afternoon ones. Certainly teachers preferring a week on/week off pattern would be well advised to work a 'week' such as Wednesday to Tuesday rather than on a calendar week basis in order to preserve the maximum number of hours per calendar week.

In Lloyds Bank v Secretary of State for Employment (1979) the EAT regarded full-time working on alternate weeks as preserving continuous service. This decision was placed under question however by a House of Lords decision in Ford v Warwickshire County Council (1983). A useful summary of such decisions can be found in Equal Opportunities Review No.16 (1987). Other instances where teachers need to be wary are those in which the sharers
teach particular classes whenever these happen to be timetabled. The arrangement of the teaching periods may vary from year to year and the same number of teaching periods may require different totals of hours, depending on the number of break periods to be included. Teachers operating such an arrangement need to ensure that contracted hours do not oscillate about the critical 16 hour limit. The problem is further compounded where schools have 6 or 7 day timetables or even 'two-week' ones. In further education, teaching loads can vary, possibly being heavier at the beginning of a year and lower whenever students sit exams and leave. It is possible for a pair of job-sharers to be asked to arrange their hours so that they total more than one full-time person when there are more students to teach and less when there are fewer. This flexibility may be useful to the employers but teachers should beware that their contracts do not expressly stipulate that fewer than 16 hours are to be worked for part of their contracts. Even so they may be able to make use of a clause in the Employment Protection Act which preserves an employee's status if the hours worked drop below 16 (but are at least 8) for no longer than 26 weeks. (para. 5. Schedule 13). The fact that this clause was held not to apply in Opie v John Gubbins (op.cit) illustrates the complexity of this area of legislation.

New Ways to Work (1992) warns that "There is no way of knowing how a tribunal might decide in the future, and it can only be emphasised, therefore, that current case law is inconclusive on the question of whether not working at all in alternate weeks breaks continuity of employment. It does seem clear, however, that in working uneven weeks, where hours regularly fall below the threshold, continuity will be broken. If it is only an occasional shortfall, however, continuity will not be broken.

It should be noted that in 1981 the EEC produced draft proposals to improve the status of part-time workers. An amended draft was submitted in 1983 timetabled for implementation in 1984. The Government has, however, opposed this plan on the grounds that in the United Kingdom, part-time workers already have sufficient protection and that further protection might result in fewer part-time jobs being offered. The Confederation of British Industry, the Institute of Directors and the Association of British Chambers of Commerce all condemned the European Community Social Action programme which would have given part-time staff similar rights to full-time employees in such matters as social security, pensions, holidays, health and maternity benefits. The director general of the ABCC said that "Giving employees more employment rights means fewer employment opportunities", and he called on the Government to exercise "a veto where possible and negotiate flexibility where not". A spokesman for the Department of Employment said that the views of the CBI, IoD and ABCC would give the Government ammunition "when it argues against the directives with community members of the Commission." ('Independent' report 17.9.90)
However, in Regina v Secretary of State for Employment, ex parte Equal Opportunities Commission and Another (3.3.94) the Law Lords ruled that British law breached European legislation because it was indirectly sex discriminatory. This meant that ministers had to consider legal changes to extend employment protection on unfair dismissal and statutory redundancy payments to anyone with two years service who had worked for eight hours a week or more instead of requiring five years service from those working between 8 and 16 hours a week. Workers affected could make claims for compensation if they had been dismissed during the previous 18 years. The general effect of this change in legislation has yet to be seen, but as far as the teaching profession is concerned an article in the TES (11.3.94) quotes responses ranging from "It will certainly change how schools deal with redundancies. Recent industrial tribunals have shown that schools often see part-timers as easier to get rid of", and "This could lead to schools getting rid of part-time teachers within two years unless they are certain they want them for ever. It will certainly affect schools' staffing strategies", to "It is good that these teachers will have the same rights as their full-time colleagues. I'm sure that no self-respecting head will object."

**EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES LEGISLATION**

a) **Redundancy.** Even those who have the right to claim unfair dismissal may feel that as part-timers they are more vulnerable to selection for redundancy. Here another piece of legislation may be helpful. Since the majority of job-sharers and other part-time workers are women, they may have legal support from another quarter, the Sex Discrimination Act (1975). This does not insist on minimum hours or continuous service but, in order to make a case, employees would have to show discrimination on the grounds of sex or marital status. A woman who is denied benefits or is, for example, dismissed because she works part-time may be able to claim indirect discrimination on grounds of sex or marital status. It must be shown that there is disproportionate adverse impact on one sex or on married persons and that such discrimination cannot be justified. In Clarke v Eley (IML) Kynoch Ltd. (1981) the employers made part-time staff, all of whom were women, redundant first. The criterion of 'last in, first out' was then applied to full-time staff. The EAT found that considerably fewer women than men were able to work full-time and that Mrs. Clarke had been indirectly discriminated against. In another case a policy of making part-timers redundant first was held to be not indirectly discriminatory. (Kidd v DRG (UK) Ltd. 1985). Here all the part-time and full-time staff were female and the tribunal had to decide whether considerably fewer married women were able to work full-time. The EAT considered also that there were other reasons for justifying the policy and held that there was no direct discrimination. A consideration of the operation of the Sex Discrimination Act with reference to women part-time workers can be found in more detail in Robinson and Wallace (1984).
At the time the empirical research was carried out there had been few redundancies among full-time teachers, and only one case of a redundant part-time teacher claiming discrimination under the Act has since been encountered. A report in the T.E.S. (17.9.93) describes how a teacher, Gillian Tickle, shared a class with a colleague. She had been employed for 3 years on a succession of fixed-term contracts and the governors of her school decided not to renew her contract as they wished to replace the two experienced teachers by a full-time probationer who would be cheaper. The industrial tribunal found that the governors had indirectly discriminated against Mrs. Tickle by not renewing her contract and in the way they had decided who would take her place.

Within LEAs redundancy could often be avoided by the operation of redeployment schemes, but with the introduction of Local Management of Schools in the late 1980s, and the development of Grant Maintained Schools independent of LEAs, re-deployment has become harder to achieve. While equal opportunities legislation will apply to individual schools, governors may find it difficult to understand the implications for the employment of part-time teachers, including job-sharers, to the staff of a school, and they may be reluctant to take risks.

b) The Right to Job-Share There is no statutory right to job-share, but there have been a few cases in which a refusal to allow an employee to work part-time has been judged to be indirectly sex-discriminatory. The first such case was Holmes v The Home Office (1984). It was necessary to show that, while the requirement to work full-time would apply equally to a man,

i) the proportion of women who could comply was considerably smaller than the proportion of men

ii) the employer could not show the requirement to be justifiable and

iii) the inability to comply was to the claimant's detriment.

The case was decided in Mrs. Holmes' favour, and while both the Industrial Tribunal and the Employment Appeal Tribunal made the judgement on the detailed facts of this particular case, the result has influenced other decisions where an employee has sought to work part-time in order to care for a dependent child, in particular after return from maternity leave. The LACSAB (Local Authorities Conditions of Service Advisory Board) handbook on job-sharing refers to the Holmes case as one which should be taken into account. Even so the factors to be considered may result in contrasting Tribunal decisions. In Fulton v Strathclyde Regional Council (1983) a claim failed because the proportion of female social workers in Strathclyde working full-time was 90% compared with the male proportion of 100%. Thus the proportion of women able to comply was not "considerably smaller". But in Robertson v Strathclyde Regional Council (1985) the claim was won because the statistics used covered all careers officers in Scotland. The Holmes case had not relied upon statistics, the Tribunal simply accepting that the burden of child care more usually falls upon women. A further issue
involves the need for the employer to justify that the job needs to be done on a full-time basis. In the Robertson case a fear of communication problems was not considered sufficient, but in Clymo v Wandsworth Borough Council (1987, Appeal 1989) a tribunal accepted that an employer was justified in refusing Mrs. Clymo's application to job-share as the post involved responsibility for ten staff. In addition the tribunal took account of the joint salaries of Mrs Clymo and her husband and childminding facilities locally, and concluded that it was not that she "could not comply" with the requirement to work full-time, but that it was her "personal preference not to". Such cases illustrate the problems faced by those wishing to change from full-time to part-time working on return from maternity leave, particularly where the job involves a managerial or supervisory element. Fortunately, as job-sharing has grown, it may be easier to show that similar jobs have been successfully shared elsewhere and that the requirement for full-time work is harder to justify.

While some maternity leave returners may not be aware that equal-opportunities legislation can assist in their desire to job-share their posts, and others will feel it pointless to pursue the issue against opposition from an employer or line-manager since this would inevitably sour relationships, there is some evidence that employers and employees are becoming more aware of the legal implications. In one edition of the Times Educational Supplement (18.12.92) there were two references to this issue. In one a teacher referred to considerable initial difficulty in obtaining agreement to share her post of responsibility on return from maternity leave, but after negotiation she had finally been successful. In the other it was reported that a Leicestershire industrial tribunal had found the governors of a Roman Catholic voluntary-aided school guilty of sex discrimination and unfair dismissal after refusing a member of staff a job-share on return from maternity leave.

Promotion

Job-sharers who seek promotion may find themselves rejected in favour of less experienced and qualified applicants merely because they are job-sharers. The London Borough of Newham had a policy that all jobs were open to sharing unless otherwise stated. In Short v Director of Education, Newham (1992), Ms. Short was job-sharing the post of Senior Administrative Officer (Finance), but was unsuccessful in gaining the post of Finance Manager despite having more experience and higher qualifications than the successful candidate. Council for Newham agreed that if the tribunal found that there had been discrimination because of the job-share, this would amount to indirect discrimination under the Sex Discrimination Act because the number of job-share employees was clearly greater among women than men. The decision in Ms. Short's favour was said by the NALGO officer who represented her to give "existing job-sharers parity of opportunity for promotion with full-time workers." This appears, however, to overlook the fact that the claim of indirect sex discrimination could not have been brought if Ms. Short had been male. In fact it seems that male job-sharers are unfairly discriminated against in such cases compared with female ones.
It is understandable that employers are cautious about extending relatively new arrangements such as job-sharing to higher-level posts. As some prove willing to take the plunge, and examples of successfully shared senior posts become more available, it may perhaps be easier for job-sharers to obtain promotion on merit and without recourse to the law.
CHAPTER TWO
NATIONAL CONDITIONS OF SERVICE FOR TEACHERS

As far as these are concerned job-sharers, whatever their patterns of work, are simply part-time teachers. Their pay and conditions are to be 'in proportion' as we have seen earlier. As yet there still exists much confusion about the interpretation of the Teachers' Pay and Conditions Document (1987) and there are differences between local education authorities in the implementation of some of the clauses. For example, is the half-time job-share to be directed for half of the 190 teaching days and half of the 5 non-teaching days required, or could both job-sharers be required to work full-time for the 5 non-teaching days if sufficient time can be saved from the relevant proportion of the 1265 hours of directed time specified for the whole year? Decisions by LEAs, or by governors in locally managed schools, could be of importance to those sharers who have other jobs, and such details may need to be clarified in individual contracts.

It is highly probable that teacher job-sharers will receive differing amounts of pay even when splitting time equally. A teacher's position on the pay scale depends on qualifications and experience and this situation is well-understood and accepted by teachers. What was less well understood was the regulation concerning the payment of increments which was in place at the time of the empirical research. This was extremely complex and meant that while equal sharers would receive increments every two years, those with slightly unequal shares (e.g. 0.52/0.48, which is not unusual in a 2.5 day/2.5 day share in which the half represents a morning in one case and an afternoon in the other) would find that one sharer advanced faster than the other in an irregular manner, depending on the cumulative total of the whole-year equivalents completed by each September. In addition, since each sharer received half of the value of an increment every two years, the cost to the employer of the whole job would become progressively less when compared with a full-time teacher in the same post. This issue was of importance to the participants in the research. Since then the anomalies have been removed, and since 1991 sharers have progressed by annual increments.

The Teachers' Superannuation Scheme also treats job-sharers simply as part-time teachers. Those who choose to job-share as a run-down to retirement may be at a disadvantage (each year's work as an equal sharer counting as 6 months service) though not as badly as some teachers fear since the 'final salary' used in the computation is the full-time equivalent salary, not the half-salary actually earned. It will, however, normally be derived from the last two years (for a half-time sharer) and thus part of the sum will not reflect any pay-rise awarded in the final year. The chief danger is for those teachers who have held higher-paid posts but job-share on the basic scale only. A further problem is that while full-time teachers may 'buy in added years' by regular payments to the scheme to make up for gaps in service, part-time teachers can only do this by the 'lump-sum' method (Leaflet 374 PEN).
Most of such a payment will not be allowable against tax and is thus an uneconomic proposition. The introduction of a scheme for AVCs (additional voluntary contributions) may alleviate this problem, but a better solution would be the introduction of a scheme similar to that introduced in California in 1974 (New Ways to Work, California 1980). Under a phased retirement scheme full-time teachers between 55 and 65 could work half-time but contribute to the State Teachers' Retirement System as if they were working full-time. Conditions included that the teacher had at least 10 years previous service of which five must have been immediately prior to entering the reduced work-load programme. A teacher was thus able to share a post with another teacher and still receive full retirement credit. Under the Teachers' Superannuation Scheme (England and Wales) a teacher leaving service may elect to pay combined teachers' and employers' contributions before the age of 60 to cover up to 3 years reckonable service (Leaflet 721 PEN). Unfortunately there is no similar scheme to cover the parts of 'years' lost by taking a job-share post rather than leaving the service altogether.

At the beginning of this research officials of the teachers' superannuation scheme were interviewed, and the disadvantages of the 'lump sum only' rule for part-time staff pointed out, together with the disadvantages associated with the final salary calculation. At this time equal opportunities legislation did not cover pension schemes. The officials promised to look again at the regulations, particularly the 'lump sum only' ruling for which they acknowledged there was no strong reason. When consulted a year later they stated that no changes were proposed. More recently, in 1994, the Teachers' Pension Agency stated that changes were at last being considered.

LOCAL AGREEMENTS

Where LEAs permit job-sharing either informally or as part of formal schemes, there may be differences of detail in the way job-sharers are treated. A preliminary study of the few documents available at the beginning of this research showed a number of variations between locally agreed policies and methods of implementation and also a great deal of (perhaps unintentional) vagueness in many areas. The only available research to cover teacher job-sharers with several different employers was that of the California project (op.cit). Here some differences were reported which may illustrate the fact that job-sharing schemes are not identical. For example:-

"The majority of school districts do not guarantee sharers a return to full-time. Instead these districts usually state that teachers will be placed in suitable full-time positions wherever possible and that they will be assigned to full-time openings for which they are qualified before new teachers are hired."

However some districts were reported as giving an absolute guarantee of right to return to full-time work if the teacher wished it. This was because they wanted to encourage existing full-time teachers to share jobs in order to minimise redundancies and feared that not enough
teachers would be willing to job-share if the decision was irrevocable. Others were introducing job-sharing as an experiment and wanted the right to return job-sharers to full-time posts at a later date if they decided to discontinue the scheme.

Job-sharers need to look carefully at the details of any local agreements associated with formal schemes, or at the wording of letters of appointment which accompany contracts given to those with informally-agreed sharing arrangements. Differences between LEAs may occur in such areas as, for example:

1) method of appointment
2) availability of promoted posts
3) replacement of a partner who leaves
4) permitted time-sharing patterns
5) in-service training arrangements.

One purpose of this research is to obtain and analyse relevant information from a range of LEAs so that a picture of the differences between local agreements can be seen. This topic is therefore examined in greater detail in the analysis of the empirical results.

CONCLUSIONS (SECTION A)

To those for whom job-sharing is an alternative to either no job at all, or, at best, occasional casual supply work, the details of Acts of Parliament, case law precedents, national conditions of service, and local agreements may be of no great importance. Part-time work on a permanent basis is their main aim. However, for those who consider changing from full-time teaching to a job-share, or who wish to combine part-time teaching with part-time employment elsewhere, the level of job-security offered and such matters as the availability of promotion and superannuation entitlement may be vital in reaching a decision. While Sheffield City Council advises that "job-sharers are not therefore to be regarded as part-time workers" (ibid) the truth of the matter is that as far as the law is concerned, and as far as national regulations affect them, that is exactly how they are regarded. Local agreements and contracts, however, can be very variable and may indeed seek to provide the high quality part-time opportunities sought by the promoters of job-sharing. On the other hand they may do little more than permit two teachers to occupy one full-time post, hedged by limitations of various kinds. At one extreme, the existence of job-sharing school inspectors or deputy headteachers would have been almost unthinkable a few years ago, while at the other NWW (1987) quotes a complaint from NALGO that "certain departments were treating job-sharers as part-timers, which contravenes our understanding of the principle of job-sharing." This statement however suggests that only those part-time workers who are 'paired' by job-sharing should be entitled to permanent contracts and opportunities for promotion. Those who
promote job-sharing usually do so as one possible way of improving the quality of part-time work, but it need not be the only way of doing so. Improvements in conditions for all part-time employees as suggested by the E.E.C. could help job-sharers, though these are opposed by the government and some employers as we shall see in Chapter 5. Equal Opportunities legislation offers some help to women who wish to job-share (especially after maternity leave) but little help to men who may wish to share child-rearing or to care for a disabled or elderly relative. As such legislation is extended to cover superannuation schemes it may follow that regulations will be amended so that job-sharers and other part-time workers are not disadvantaged.

Finally, the relevance of law and national agreements to job-sharing for teachers is complex and sometimes open to differing interpretations. Local agreements and contracts for job-sharers are likely to differ, and may do so even more widely as governors take over the responsibility for appointments from LEAs. The question of how far job-sharers can expect to have the rights and privileges normally accorded to full-time staff is comparable with the age-old question about the length of a piece of string.
The origins and development of job-sharing -
Advocates and Opponents

Introduction

As we have seen earlier the term 'job-sharing' first became general in the USA in the late 1960's. Subsequently the practice has spread not only in the USA, but in Europe and Australia. Commenting on this spread Clutterbuck & Hill (1983) assert that

"What can be said with some degree of certainty is that the extensive advantages to both employer and employee of job-sharing, and the minimal problems that have been revealed by practical experience will make this an increasingly viable option ..." and "... governmental and trade union pressure is also likely to play a part."

The literature on the origins and development of job-sharing may usefully be viewed through a study of the contributions made by the various participants, either advocating its use from a variety of motives or opposing it for other reasons. The participants can be considered under the following headings:-

- Individuals wishing to share posts
- The Trade Unions
- The Employers, and National Government interests
- Equal Opportunities groups
- Client groups who may be affected (e.g. the patients of job-sharing health service workers)

In each chapter the general background literature will be surveyed, followed by a more detailed study of published material relating to the teaching profession in particular.
CHAPTER THREE
INDIVIDUALS WISHING TO SHARE A POST

Usually job-sharing has arisen at the initiative of individual workers rather than at the behest of employers or organised labour. As Epstein (1986) stresses:

"It is important to note that job-sharing, wherever it is taking place, in the U.S. or Europe, has in almost every case been introduced originally at the initiative of workers - not organised workers, but rather individual workers who have perceived in job-sharing the solution to their various needs and problems."

Moorman (1982) states that:

"Most shared jobs have come about informally - proposals made by one or two employees have been accepted by their employers."

There are many instances of posts being shared by two (or more) people long before the term 'job-share' came into use. Often two employees particularly valued by their employer would find themselves, for various reasons, unable to work full-time, and the employer would permit, or even encourage them to remain on a part-time basis sharing the work load between them. As such arrangements were made on an individual basis, and not categorised by any particular title, they have not generally been regarded as a fertile field of study. The examples of Fulton v Strathclyde and Robertson v Strathclyde discussed in Section A illustrate the efforts made by individuals to obtain shared posts against the wishes of their employers. It is significant that such individuals often had strong support from their immediate line managers. Examples of individuals who have sought job-shares but failed are unlikely to find their way into the literature unless they become newsworthy by creating case-law. Those who succeed and share successfully for a few years on an informally agreed basis are also unlikely to appear in research literature, though Brown (1984) was able to arrange to share her teaching post in an LEA without a job-share policy, and her success opened the way for other teachers to request a similar arrangement. Only when other employees have sought to extend the possibilities and opportunities of working in this way, and employers have responded favourably, has there been a need for the drawing up of suitable agreements and formal contracts within that particular area of employment. It is at this more formal level that most research has been done. In Ireland, Conlan (1984) has traced the development of job-sharing schemes in several areas of employment and shown clearly how schemes have grown from accommodation by employers to the needs of a few particular individuals who requested job-sharing arrangements.
As public awareness of the idea of job-sharing has grown, the setting up of schemes has become more likely to occur because employers have seen possible advantages, or because of pressure from equal opportunities groups. In either case trade unions have often had a strong part to play in the ensuing negotiations, as we shall see in the next chapter.
CHAPTER FOUR
TRADE UNIONS

EVIDENCE FROM OTHER COUNTRIES

Europe (except the UK)

It might be thought that trade unions would support schemes springing from the needs of their grassroots members. However Epstein (op.cit.) says

"...unions in Europe are generally opposed to job-sharing, but there are signs that union attitudes are changing, at least in the United Kingdom."

An article in Social and Labour Bulletin (1981) reports that in the Federal Republic of Germany the price to be paid for job-sharing is considered by the unions to be too high. The number of full-time jobs would most certainly decrease and the development of job-sharing would be at the expense of the vast majority of workers who need a proper living wage. A combination of job-sharing and social assistance would hardly be desirable according to the unions. However, progress was made in 1985 when an earlier ruling, that if one sharer left the other must lose his/her job, was changed, and better terms for job-sharers were incorporated into the national statutes.

An example of trade union opposition to job-sharing in France can be found in Loos (1983). Here women workers pressed for the right to job-share but found their union opposed to the idea. The women found management more sympathetic to their needs than the union and it was only after some sharing had begun that the union came round to supporting the growing band of women sharers in meetings with management.

In the Republic of Ireland, Conlan (op.cit) studied a job-sharing scheme at Aer Rianta. An application from two employees with young children to share a job was supported by the company as they wished to retain two fully-trained members of staff who would otherwise leave. Their union representative was very sceptical and the local branch official disapproved. The women themselves pressed for negotiation to continue, and with eventual success, though an assistant branch official took part 'under duress'. An executive council report of the Irish Trade Unions (1983-4) said that "Job-sharing could have a detrimental effect on the participation of women in the work force and the promotion of equality of opportunity for women."

Beyond Europe

There have been job-share schemes in the USA (particularly), Canada and Australia.

USA Here job-sharing schemes have been popular and the literature reveals little real opposition from unions. Olmsted (International Labor Review 1979) comments that in the
United States unions have not historically sought to organise part-time workers or to increase opportunities for part-time employment. Even so, rank-and-file union members who would prefer to work part-time have generally influenced policy towards improving part-time conditions of service, and the Service Employees International Union was quoted as having 13% of its members working part-time and that its attitudes had changed towards organising them. Greater involvement with union members who work part-time may lead to increased interest in job-sharing on the part of unions. Nollen and Martin (1978) in a survey for American Management Associations, reported that few labour unions were involved in the implementation of part-time employment. Only about 6% of all part-time employees were union members. In view of the lack of interest in them shown by the unions this seems hardly surprising. There were even some collective bargaining agreements which effectively prevented part-time employment, but there were also instances of participatory, or at least accepting, roles played by labour unions.

Sorby and Pascoe (1983) report that by 1979 ten American states had officially encouraged the use of job-sharing. Moorman (op.cit) points out that "it makes absolutely no sense, particularly during times of high unemployment, to lock workers into full-time jobs when their preference is for part-time jobs". Trade unions obviously feared that job-sharing could become a means by which workers could be pressured into accepting part-time work as an alternative to redundancy. An article in News and World Report says that in Detroit job-sharing could be used as an alternative to pay-offs but "the practice has been stymied by labour union opposition." In Hawaii a bleak employment picture for teachers led to a job-share programme for up to 100 partnerships. Goodhart (1982) reports that the American New Ways to Work organisation had told him that "the more traditional unions have been discouraging", and while there was evident enthusiasm for job-sharing in teaching, "in almost every case groups of teachers have had to persuade reluctant union leaders to let schemes go ahead". Moorman (ibid) notes changing attitudes: "With increasing frequency, unions are negotiating job-sharing as an employee option without ties to lay-off conditions. Teachers and other public sector unions have led on this issue."

Australia Research by Hogan and Minton (1980) found that while 89% of employees supported the idea that some part-time work should be permanent, only 49% of union responses did so. Options which implied the sharing of responsibilities were not in general supported by employees and were substantially opposed by unions especially blue-collar groups. For job-sharing, 39 unions were surveyed, of whom 5% had a policy in favour, 49% had a policy opposing, 36% had no policy and 10% were in the process of developing one.

This lack of enthusiasm is further illustrated by Benson (1982) who reports on a survey conducted by the Victoria Trades Hall Council to explore union interest in job-sharing. Of twenty unions which responded, three had policies opposed to sharing, and fourteen did not
envisage developing a policy. The remaining three were neutral rather than positive. Interest from members was reported to be slight, though some came from parents of young children and some from those who wished to phase into retirement. There seemed to be fears that job-sharing might be imposed on workers, resulting in a broader spread of lower-paid work opportunities and an increase in exploitation of the work force. The writer appears to feel that many of the fears expressed, e.g. loss of morale in the work-force, difficulty in dividing responsibilities, are a result of lack of understanding on the part of unions, and that experience of schemes in other countries shows such fears to be unjustified for genuinely voluntary, properly planned schemes which pro-rate the rights of the sharers with those of full-time employees.

The approach of the unions to innovative practices such as job-sharing is questioned by Wood (1984) who writes

"The Australian trade union movement also has not yet demonstrated (to me) any clear understanding of the potential benefits of work-time options. Basically the effect of unions has been to standardise the hours of work and benefits available to workers. This strategy may have been appropriate in an industrial society; however, as we approach an information-based, post-industrial society homogenous working conditions for all union members may prove to be the downfall of the union movement."

**THE UNITED KINGDOM.**

British trade union response to job-sharing has also been very cautious. The TUC, like union confederations in Belgium, France, the Netherlands, Spain and West Germany, has concentrated on a reduction in the working week. In Denmark and Luxembourg greater attention has been given to early retirement and in Norway to the extension of paid holidays. (Blyton and Benson 1982). Prior to the 1980s little attention had been given to voluntary job-sharing but the government’s job-splitting (later re-named Jobshare) scheme was disapproved of for several reasons. The essential feature of this scheme was that the Government would give a subsidy of £1,000 for one year to an employer who split a full-time job into two part-time jobs for which employees must be recruited from the unemployment register. Such jobs offered no more security than other part-time jobs, were usually low level and required little or no mutual co-operation, and were not available to (otherwise suitable) married women who could not register as unemployed.

In 1983 the Trade Union Research Unit produced a discussion paper on job-sharing (Ruskin 1983). It admitted that union officers were receiving increasing numbers of enquiries from individuals, but that many unions were unwilling to commit themselves to supporting schemes because of the fear of job losses, of abuse of employee rights, and loss of trade union
influence. Since the main aim was for all part-time employees to have pro-rata wages and conditions, there would be no need for job-sharing. Until this were achieved job-sharing should be taken seriously as an alternative. It was however true to say that many part-time workers did not feel that their unions were interested in negotiating on their behalf, and they pointed to agreements made by unions that, for instance, made part-time employees the first to lose their jobs when cuts were made, regardless of length of service or domestic and financial circumstances. [Rosser and Mallier (1983), referring to the Clarke and Powell v Eley case mentioned in Chapter I, point out that the decision that part-time employees (all women) would be selected first for redundancy resulted from an agreement between the employer and the relevant unions. They state "it is unknown how many similar agreements exist that are designed to discriminate, but it doubtful if this agreement was unique"].

The TUC report mentions that a few unions were in favour of job-sharing at that date and had passed resolutions to that effect at national conferences - the First Division Association (of Civil Servants) in 1980, and the National Union of Journalists, the EEPTU and the National Association of Probation Officers in 1981. The NUT and NATFHE had working parties studying the subject. Subsequently both these unions have negotiated job-sharing schemes with employing authorities, and other unions have also supported the practice, particularly NALGO which has been in the forefront of developments in job-sharing. This union represents staff in national and local government. Its handbook "Job-sharing - NALGO negotiating guidelines" provided a comprehensive document consulted by other unions in which the view is expressed that "the introduction of job-sharing can be a progressive and practical development for sharers and employers alike." A survey by the EOC in 1986 showed that over a third of all local authorities in Great Britain provided job-sharing opportunities, and a more detailed survey by New Ways to Work (1987) traced the initiation and development of these policies in 38 authorities outside London, showing the important part played by NALGO in most areas.

Another union to contribute to development in more recent times is the GMB. This union contributed to the costs of the New Ways to Work publication 'The Legal Context to Job-Sharing' and its general Secretary observes in the introduction that GMB surveys "show consistently that people want more flexible patterns of work. This is especially true for women but interest in finding a better balance between paid work and other responsibilities is gaining ground among men too".

The Hackney Job Share organisation has several years experience of devising and implementing job-share programmes. They have links with private sector employers and local authorities nation-wide. Their literature (1985) comments that in the past unions had been male-dominated and based on full-time work patterns. They had paid little attention to the rights and conditions of part-timers. Flexibility had been considered threatening and they had concentrated on preserving the status quo. Some union members had felt that 'men's jobs'
were more important since "a man works for necessity and a woman for luxuries". As more women had joined unions the call for more flexible working patterns had increased, though since executive positions in the union hierarchy were predominantly male, even in areas with a high level of female employment, the call was not always acknowledged or acted upon. As we shall see in the section on equal opportunities issues, women's groups in unions were sometimes involved with the feminist lobby and occasionally opposed job-sharing for other reasons. The Hackney Job Share document points out that unions would be in a better position to influence policies if they researched the matter fully and became positively involved in co-operation with management, rather than standing back and allowing employers to develop schemes suited to their own needs rather than those of the workers.

A survey of the literature suggests that unions may be suspicious of job-sharing because they fear that it will limit the number of full-time jobs available to those wishing to work full-time, that they may lack influence over schemes and find it difficult to organise the part-timers who participate, and that a higher proportion of workers would have reduced employment rights. A further problem may be that the unions represent line-managers who fear extra administrative work, as well as workers who wish to share posts, and there may therefore be an internal conflict of interests. On the other hand the section on employer attitudes will show the progress which had been made in the second half of the 1980s with the co-operation of unions. At the start of this research project (1988) the TUC was invited by the author to contribute more up-to-date material on its attitude to job-sharing and this was provided in a 'recent' paper of guidance to unions. This stated that "many trade unionists are, rightly, suspicious and critical of job-sharing. While it is an attractive concept, in practice it can have many disadvantages and can put employment rights at risk." The guidelines were written to help trade union negotiators to take advantage of the possibilities while "avoiding the pitfalls". The document reassures readers that attention to job-sharing does not imply any reduction in demands for shorter working hours, better rights for all part-time workers and the provision of child-care facilities. In particular, voluntary job-sharing should not be confused with the government's job-splitting scheme, later re-named job-share, which could replace full-time jobs with the "disadvantages and insecurities of part-time work". Job-sharing should also not be confused with work-sharing which is a method of spreading work among the existing work force to avoid redundancies. The TUC regrets that "some schemes go ahead without union involvement" and insists that "trade unions should have control over the scheme at all times". The document includes details of the agreement unions should seek to reach with employers concerning the wording of contracts and the implementation of job-sharing schemes.

The subsequent growth of job-sharing in such areas as the civil service, the health service, Boots, BP, British Telecom, the BBC and the Police Force suggests an increasing willingness on the part of unions to work with employers on the introduction of formal job-share schemes to the benefit of both employer and employed. News of the introduction of such schemes
occurs in a variety of press items, but these rarely refer to union participation and negotiation although it has presumably occurred. In common with other countries it is the professional, managerial and white-collar groups who have shown the greatest interest, particularly those which have a higher than average proportion of female members, which of course includes the teaching profession

**JOB-SHARING AND THE TEACHER UNIONS**

The main teacher unions were asked to provide policy statements for the purpose of this research. While for practical reasons, job-sharing lecturers in the Universities and Further and Higher Education have not been studied in detail in this project, their unions were included to provide a wider view over the breadth of the teaching profession. The information received from the unions is summarised below.

**Association of University Teachers**

A council resolution in December 1983 stated that

"Council believes demands for more flexible structures and patterns of employment ought to be met. It declares its complete opposition to job-splitting, but recognises that voluntary job-sharing, properly safe-guarded by adequate contracts, would enable many individuals, particularly parents of young children, to achieve an acceptable balance between home responsibilities and paid work. Council therefore instructs executive to draw up model conditions for job-sharing contracts."

The policy document listed advantages which might accrue to job-sharers and university departments, and suggested issues which should be considered when constructing job-share contracts.

No estimate was given of the number of job-shares existing in Universities at that time, but an article in AUT Woman, Spring 1988, described the advantages and disadvantages found by two sets of sharers at Birkbeck College, London. The main disadvantage was that the timing of important meetings, and visits by external examiners, overseas scholars etc., do not take account of a limited working week. Saying that one is not available implies lack of commitment, yet it is easy to allow additional commitments to eat into that part of life intended to be reserved for non-academic activities, and thus be involved in working more than the proportion of salary earned.

**National Association of Teachers in Further and Higher Education**

NATFHE expressed concern about sharers finding themselves outside employment legislation and has a policy of negotiating shares on an individual basis, usually for three years in the first instance. However an agreement had been negotiated with ILEA. The document
relating to these points out that there is a healthy tradition of part-time salaried posts in further education and that this will be built on by stating that all posts from Lecturer I to Principal Lecturer are considered suitable for job-sharing. So long as the appropriate number of weekly class-contact and attendance hours agreed for the post were worked, the more flexible arrangements of further education were likely to give rise to fewer problems than those in schools. Contractual maternity provisions (in ILEA) were already more generous than statutory ones and would apply to job-sharers. The issues to be considered in job-share contracts, e.g. whether time or tasks are to be shared, the proportions in which the job is to be divided, and the procedures to be followed if one partner leaves were similar to those suggested by the AUT.

**National Association of Head Teachers**

The administrative officer replying to the author's request for information admitted to an inability to find a NAHT statement on job-sharing. While it is unlikely that many Heads or deputies will themselves become job-sharers they are very likely to have to consider such arrangements in their own schools at some time and to interview prospective candidates. It seemed surprising that at least some document providing guidance was not available. During the course of this research a conference of the NAHT in Wales rejected a motion encouraging the development of job-sharing. A request for details of points made in the debate was not answered.

**Secondary Heads Association**

This association stated that while its members welcomed part-time teachers in schools there was no formal policy statement on job-sharing.

**National Union of Teachers**

This union has a strong equal opportunities policy and said in its reply that requests for information and guidance about job-sharing were being received in increasing numbers both from individuals and local associations. Reasons given for seeking job-shares were similar to those given by the AUT but included more emphasis on opportunities for women teachers to continue on the career ladder while raising a family, and as an option for those returning after maternity leave. There was a warning that few opportunities are yet available to job-share promoted posts and that the superannuation regulations were a problem for those wishing a transitional phase before retirement. The benefits for schools were similar to those mentioned by the AUT in respect of offering a wider range of skills, a larger pool of potential employees, fresher and more energetic teachers, and greater stability in the event of absence. Problems might occur where classroom work is integrated and not easily apportioned between two teachers, where there were problems of compatibility and teaching style, and timetabling. On the other hand, particularly in secondary schools, there might be greater timetabling flexibility
since both teachers could be present together at certain times if convenient. It was also suggested that schools might gain extra help and a wider range of non-curricular activities from two staff rather than one. While in some cases job-sharers who would otherwise leave might reduce promotion prospects for others, those who would otherwise remain full-time would in effect make another post available. On the subject of contracts it was recommended that there should be separate, not joint, agreements so that the security of one is not dependent on the continued employment of the other. Details of the time and/or task split should be set out, as well as the procedure to be followed in the event of one partner leaving. The reply included details and criticism of the government's job-splitting scheme. The NUT had previously carried out research into women's career patterns with special reference to the career-break (OEC/NUT 1980). It was recommended that the right to return to work after maternity leave should be extended to include a break of several years, and that the promotion and tenure situation of part-time teaching staff, the vast majority of whom are women, required particular attention.

Association of Assistant Masters and Mistresses (later renamed the Association of Teachers and Lecturers)

This union sponsored research by Trown and Needham (1981) on the effect on women's teaching careers of the reduction of opportunities to teach part-time. In a later article Trown (1983) suggested that yesterday's part-timers may become tomorrow's job-sharers. The AMMA document on job-sharing stressed the distinction between two part-time teachers with individual contracts who fill a full-time equivalent post, and a pair of job-sharers whose contracts are related and who have a single commitment to the employer. There would thus be serious implications for one partner when the other leaves. The emphasis here was slightly different from that in the NUT document which stressed the need for separate non-dependent contracts. AMMA acknowledged that there were advantages, both educational and administrative, in having two teachers employed to cover the work of one. Experience with the way part-time teachers have sometimes been treated had led the union to be suspicious of job-sharing schemes proposed by employers. Maximum security was best obtained from a permanent part-time contract, they said, but they recognised a "small demand" for job-sharing from teachers themselves. The tone of the document was one of caution, and teachers were advised to discuss details very carefully before committing themselves. Individual responsibilities should be stated clearly in each contract and ideally there should be timetabled "overlap" time for consultation. Teachers were cautioned that they should be sure that the conditions of service were at least as good as those for individual part-time teachers. There seemed to be a fear that they might not be, whereas other unions suggested that conditions were likely to be better for a job-share than for a separate part-timer.
National Association of Schoolmasters/Union of Women Teachers

No reply to the author's request for a policy statement was received. Sir Philip Goodhart (1982) reported that a letter from the then General Secretary of the NAS/UWT had stated "The Teachers' Unions are not keen to try it on; quite simply, no teachers feel able to exist on half pay". [He also stated that at that time the NUT's response was neutral, and he expected that the Executive's response would be increasingly negative. Interpretation of these comments is difficult since Goodhart's paper often appears to confuse voluntary job-sharing with the government's job-splitting scheme].

Since the original union survey was carried out the NAS/UWT has published a policy document on job-sharing agreements and a leaflet entitled "Part-Time Teachers, Action for Equality" which refers to its participation in the TUC campaign "to get part-time workers' rights similar to best practice in Europe".

Educational Institute of Scotland

No reply was received. The EIS has however been involved in the negotiation of a job-share scheme for teachers in Strathclyde.

Professional Association of Teachers

Interest from members has been shown by motions passed at annual conferences supporting the principle of job-sharing, and requesting modifications to the superannuation scheme to make it easier for teachers to share as a run-down to retirement. No policy statement has been made, and it was felt that further information was needed before agreement could be reached on the content of such a document. As a result a financial contribution was made available towards the expenses associated with this research. Subsequently the author has produced a booklet "Job-Sharing for Teachers - some questions answered" for PAT and has advised members on issues relating to job-sharing.

CONCLUSION

Job-sharing is a prime example of the way in which trade union leaders have been forced to listen to the needs of grass-roots members. Reluctance to take a serious interest in the idea has gradually eased through pressure from ordinary workers, particularly women, who seek such opportunities and are prepared to negotiate for themselves if their unions refuse to do so. Gradually the unions are beginning to see that job-sharing may have some value. As Wood (op.cit) says "Unless unions endorse the principle of work-time options, their ability to successfully represent the interests of union members may meet with limited approval".
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CHAPTER 5
EMPLOYERS

INTRODUCTION

Despite the growth of flexible working practices and the increase in the employment of part-time workers in all sectors of the economy, employers' attitudes to job-sharing have traditionally been ambivalent at best. The first part of this chapter surveys employers' attitudes towards part-time working and examines how far similar reasons might apply to job-sharing. A survey of the literature on employers' attitudes to job-sharing and the reasons for and against job-share posts reveals a preference for part-time working as against job-sharing, and raises the question of how far this preference is entirely justified and how far job-sharing might produce positive benefits for employers.

The second part reviews the research evidence on the part-time employment of teachers in particular, and investigates the reasons why they have been employed and the ways in which employers have made strategic use of them.

The third part looks at the situation regarding teacher supply at the time the research data was collected (1988) and concerns about the staffing of schools in the 1990s. These concerns prompted the government, LEAs and other interested bodies to suggest how part-time and job-share opportunities might prove useful as strategies for retaining existing teachers or enticing back those no longer working.

1 EMPLOYERS AND THE PART-TIME WORKFORCE

a) Part-time employment and flexibility

Discussions on flexible working practices and part-time employment are numerous. Nollen and Martin (1978) examined the performance of part-time workers in 460 US firms, and Tavernier (1979) studied part-time working in relation to personnel management. Leicester (1977) forecast that the UK would almost double its number of part-time workers from around 4 million to more than 7 million by 2001. DOE figures show that the percentage of workers in part-time employment had grown steadily from 15.4% in 1971 to 24.7% in 1988, with women constituting 82% of all part-time employees. The underlying reasons for growth in part-time employment are examined in detail in Robinson and Wallace (1984) and Atkinson and Meager (1986).

The status accorded to part-timers within the workforce varies. Clutterbuck and Hill (1981) state that they are no longer considered marginal.

"Part-time work is on the up. Exactly how fast it is growing is difficult to calculate because much of the data is unreliable. The accepted notion of part-
timers as marginal workers has only recently been discarded by governments in the western world..."

while Atkinson (1985) considers them still to be peripheral. He describes the structure of the 'flexible firm' as having a core group of full-time permanent career employees, a first peripheral group comprising full-time workers with less job security and less access to career opportunities, and a second peripheral group introduced if the firm "needs to supplement the numerical flexibility of the first peripheral group with some functional flexibility". This second group includes, for example, part-time workers, and these have the same lack of security and career prospects as the first group. "Job-sharers, short-term contracts, public subsidy trainees and recruitment through temporary contracts all perform a similar function - maximising flexibility while minimising commitment to the worker."

There is no suggestion here that job-sharers might be part of the 'core', though Atkinson suggests that unions may press for the extension of agreed rates and conditions for core workers to be extended to peripheral groups where common or comparable jobs can be defined. Similarly, Leighton and Winfield (1988) regard job-sharing as "a deliberate policy to move one group of workers from the periphery to the core. The implications are that traditional areas of personnel practice have to be reviewed and new ones developed to cope with job-sharing; this is sometimes a lengthy and painful process".

In 1987 an ACAS survey set out to explore whether more flexible working practices were indeed becoming more common or whether their introduction was being achieved only slowly and with difficulty. The respondents were asked to give reasons for introducing flexibility. These were:

- to increase productivity (42% - most common in the manufacturing sector)
- to reduce labour costs (40% - high in manufacturing, but also in health and education)
- to meet fluctuating demand (36% - usually in manufacturing)
- because of increased competition (26%)
- to cope with technological change (26%)
- 13% gave other reasons such as: harmonisation; good work relations; to improve morale/act as an incentive; company policy/philosophy; to attract and recruit staff.

The ACAS list can be complemented by Meager and Buchan's 1988 survey of 30 employing organisations. The 5 main reasons for employing part-time workers, in order of importance, were:
• flexibility in deployment of labour (matching hours to workload, etc.);
• external labour market forces (staff shortages, recruitment and retention difficulties);
• internal labour market forces (mainly requests for part-time work from individual employees);
• technological factors (e.g. the need to operate expensive capital equipment intensively);
• savings on labour costs (national insurance, paid breaks, absence, fringe benefits).

Two-thirds of the ACAS sample of employers used part-time employment to provide flexibility of various kinds, especially in the service or public sectors, and one-tenth had introduced forms of job-sharing, mainly for white collar employees. The greater use of part-time work in the service and public sectors had also been noted in Blyton (1985).

The ACAS survey also indicated some consequences for employers of increasing flexible working patterns by employing more part-time staff. There is a great danger that part-timers may feel marginalised and so become alienated. Careful thought needs to be given to the recruitment, induction and training of part-time staff; to effective communication, and negotiation with unions; to training supervisors in new management skills. Above all, a more open style of management and employee participation may be needed to enlist part-time commitment.

b) Part-time workers and job-sharers - a comparison

It is interesting to consider the reasons which employers gave in the ACAS survey for employing part-time workers to see how far these putative benefits would also hold true for job sharers.

• Increased productivity. Job-sharers may be fresher and maintain a higher work rate during the hours they are employed than full-time staff. Though this may be equally true of other part-time workers, job-sharers may be more committed since they will have permanent contracts and possibly be seeking promotion.

• Reduction in labour costs. This may or may not apply to job sharers. While national insurance costs will usually be reduced because of the banding system, job-sharers will be paid pro rata to full-time employees and have equal access to pension schemes and other perks, so that there will be minimal savings on on-costs. If, for example, uniforms, company cars, or preferential mortgage rates are offered, a job-share pair
could prove more expensive than a full-time worker. One possible saving relates to overtime, if job-sharers work extra hours at normal rates.

- Meeting fluctuating demand. In manufacturing this is often done by taking on part-time staff on temporary contracts. However, in the service sector job-sharing can be used to meet fluctuating demand, for example by both sharers working at times of peak demand. Reduced demand might be accommodated by offering job-shared posts to full-time staff.

- Increased competition, technological change, and harmonisation. These are not described in detail in the research, but possibly job-sharers may increase the range of technological skills available within one post and enable those with such skills who are unable to work full-time to be more readily recruited.

- Improvement of working relations, morale, and company philosophy. These are all reasons which could encourage employers to offer job-sharing, either as part of an equal opportunities policy, or as a response to the needs of individual employees.

- Attracting and recruiting staff. This was mentioned by few respondents in the ACAS survey, perhaps because there was no shortage of workers at that time, but the advantages to the worker of job-sharing compared with part-time work on temporary contracts could be a considerable recruitment factor in time of staff shortages.

c) Employers' attitudes to job-sharing

Evidence concerning the attitudes of employers in other countries towards job-sharing is available, particularly from America, Australia, Canada, France and Germany. While in many cases findings are similar to those in British research, it is not always possible to make clear comparisons. There are differences in definition about what constitutes a job-share, in the relevant employment law, and in the associated costs. Apparently very similar job-sharing initiatives may be very successful in one country (for example, job-sharing schemes for teachers in the USA), and produce almost no response in another (a similar scheme in Belgium). In view of the differences among countries, only accounts of job-sharing practices in the UK are considered in detail.

Major studies which have looked at employers' attitudes to job-sharing in this country are: Syrett (1983), as part of a wider study of part-time working, undertook case studies of four large organisations which encouraged job-sharing among part-time staff; Meager and Buchan (1988) surveyed employer attitudes to job-sharing and job-splitting in a sample of thirty employing organisations; a report from the IMS (No. 183, 1990) studied good practice in the employment of women returnees in a number of firms, many of which offered job-sharing as an incentive; Meager, Buchan and Rees (1989) reported on job-sharing in the National Health Service; and a number of surveys and newsletters from New Ways to Work have reported on
job-sharing schemes. The overall picture to emerge from this research is that job-sharing (and in particular job-share policies) is much more common in the public than in the private sector, and within the public sector is almost exclusively confined to service rather than manufacturing jobs. Leighton and Winfield (1988) found it much easier to locate job-shares in the public sector:

"Our searches confirmed that the public sector is much further forward in job-sharing at high levels. Both the civil service and local authorities now display a quite astounding array of job-shares. Moreover they show a willingness to push at the boundaries of what was hitherto considered unthinkable, for example job-share under-secretaries and job-share heads of policy units."

Similarly, Walton (1989) reports that by 1989 some three-and-a-half thousand civil servants were sharing jobs and a large number of local authorities had official job-share policies.

What benefits, then, do employers claim arise from job-sharing, and for what reasons do they reject it - what are the advantages and disadvantages of job-sharing as perceived by employers?

i) Costs. The balance of advantage seems to be finely weighed, some employers finding cost savings in job-shares as compared to full-time posts, others (and especially manufacturing industry) being worried about additional costs. Among the perceived savings in costs were: increased productivity, cover for absences, reduced wastage and absenteeism, reduced overtime costs, less cost for pensions and national insurance. The major item of greater cost was related to administration and management - all the extra cost involved with supervising two workers rather than one. In the IMS (1989) Health Service study, 71% of respondents gave increased managerial workload as a disadvantage of job-sharing schemes. Other perceived costs were: extra payment for 'hand-over' and communication time between sharers; extra induction and training costs; extra payroll costs. BIM (1985) refer to extra costs of "recruitment, payroll, headcount, administration, and training." Meager and Buchan (1988) found that cost factors dominated the perception of employers who had not experienced job-sharing; those who had tried job-sharing placed less importance on cost and were more aware of non-cost factors, the benefits being generally perceived as outweighing any cost involved.

ii) Productivity, flexibility, continuity and other job-related factors. Quality of work is seen to improve in a number of ways under job-sharing. Those working shorter hours can maintain higher energy levels than full-time workers, while the greater job security and benefits enjoyed by job-sharers should promote higher levels of commitment and motivation than among part-time workers. Two people may bring a wider range of skills to a job-share, and their interaction may lead to greater creativity in their work. IMS (1990) reported distinct job
benefits such as a high degree of commitment, motivation and enthusiasm, and a wide range of experience and ability within one job share. Continuity is also improved, since if one sharer is absent the other can continue with at least half the job and may even be able to cover full-time for a short period. Job-sharing allows greater flexibility, for instance arranging hours so that both can work at peak times, or work flexibly to meet changes in demand. Dunn (1990) expresses the kinds of job-related benefits to be expected from job-sharing:

"Directors were quick to realise the potential for employing two nurse teachers offering different specialist skills. They were also aware that the increased flexibility made a more profitable use of time. The job-sharers were able to cover for busy work periods and not work when the load was reduced."

On the other hand, some employers expected less commitment from job-sharers than from full-time workers (although as Syrett (1983) points out, the evidence suggests that job-sharing actually encourages involvement and commitment).

However, a particular problem arises with job-sharing in some jobs which demand continuity, for instance supervisory jobs. Meager and Buchan (1988) found that some 'casework' jobs were suitable for sharing, when an appointment system was possible or the caseload could be managed flexibly to suit the workers' schedules, but such jobs were unsuitable for sharing if a worker had to be 'on-call' at any time. Secretarial jobs were deemed suitable or unsuitable for sharing according to the services provided and the seniority of the post. Similarly, research projects requiring detailed and continuous teamwork were less suitable than posts involving relatively discrete and complementary areas. In the IMS (1989) Health Service study, the highest rated drawback to job-sharing (mentioned by 77% of respondents) was the inherent unsuitability of some jobs for sharing.

It seems evident though that as job-sharing has become better known, views in at least some areas of employment have become more positive, both in relation to the kinds of jobs which may be suitable for sharing, and their level of responsibility. The NWW Newsletter (Vol.6 No.3, 1990) reported job-sharing consultant anaesthetists, and in 1993 the Norfolk Family Health Services Authority published a guide to job-sharing for General Practitioners. When part-time working opportunities were introduced for the police force in 1992, job-sharing was considered particularly suited to those in responsible positions. "In the case of superintendents and other senior ranks, the proposals will entail job-sharing." (Daily Telegraph 16.5.92).

iii) Recruitment and retention of staff. The IMS (1989) survey found that National Health Service employers and managers reported the main advantage of job-sharing to be improving retention (95%), helping recruitment (89%), and access to a wider source of labour supply (84%). Retention and recruitment of skilled staff was also the major reason for job-sharing given by employers in Meager and Buchan (1988). Talented people unable (or
unwilling) to work full-time are more readily attracted to work in job-share posts, and skilled staff, especially women who would otherwise have to leave to care for children, more easily retained. Undoubtedly this is a powerful inducement for employers to introduce job-sharing schemes, and accounts for their prevalence in organisations with a large number of female workers. The employer-led women returner schemes studied in IMS (1990) were aimed mainly at women in positions of responsibility, and were designed to retain skilled personnel after a career break. Similarly, the schemes for flexible working in the police force (NWW Newsletter, 1992) appear to be largely employer-led as a result of concern about the loss of women officers after maternity leave, many of whom have skills in counselling or abuse cases which are important to retain. These schemes are important because, unlike most job-shares which are at lower levels, they are designated as appropriate to higher-ranking and management posts.

Nevertheless, although the increased availability of job-sharing promoted posts for women with young children may have a clear value for employers as a means of retaining skilled staff, such schemes may obscure a wider view of job-sharing as offering the choice of an improved quality of life throughout the workforce at any stage of a career, for both sexes and for any purpose. Employers who offer job-sharing as part of a career package for women may still be unwilling to offer the opportunity to male employees, or to those who wish to work part-time for other reasons (for instance, to care for elderly relatives, or as part of a 'run-down' to retirement). However, experience of successful job-sharing by women in career-break schemes may encourage companies to consider extending the opportunity to others in the workforce.

The reverse of this particular coin is that some employers report problems over recruitment as a major disadvantage to job-share schemes. They envisage difficulties in recruiting for job-share posts, in obtaining the right match of skills and compatibility of personnel, as well as the time and expense involved in arranging suitable job-shares.

iv) Equal opportunities and personnel policies. A marked shift in the more recent surveys of employer attitudes to job-sharing has been away from limited economic and efficiency considerations towards broader employment factors. These figured not at all in Syrett's 1983 survey; by 1989 Walton was able to report that a large majority of local authorities with job-share policies had introduced them as part of their overall equal opportunities policies. Meager and Buchan (1988) found this given as an important reason by a wide range of employers, and 78% of employers in the IMS (1989) survey gave improving equal opportunities as a reason for job-sharing. Nevertheless, this emphasis on equal opportunities, directed at women, may obscure the desirability of providing more general job-sharing opportunities for both men and women and for a variety of reasons.
v) Management preference and prejudices. Given the benefits which might be expected to accrue from judiciously planned job-sharing schemes, it is surprising to find the attitudes of employers, especially in the private manufacturing sector, so consistently half-hearted or even hostile. This appears in the research as a preference for full-time workers constituting the 'core', whether on grounds of cost, administrative convenience, commitment to the organisation or, possibly, just inertia. A DOE survey (1982) found that employers had "a generally negative view of job-sharing and similar schemes, and were rarely convinced that their benefits would outweigh their costs to the organisation". A CBI survey (1985) found widespread opposition to the idea of job-sharing, but commented that in the few cases where it had been used "managers were generally extremely enthusiastic about its potential". Epstein (op.cit) however believes that this potential may be more to do with company productivity than worker quality of life. She adds that:

"This attitudinal resistance among management ... has often been found to keep job-sharing out. Even where a high-level policy decision has been made to offer job-sharing to meet worker interest, the evaluation literature documents a number of instances where middle management has been slow to comply and line supervisors have been reluctant to approve individual applications."

Significantly, in view of the above, the CBI evidence (1989) to the House of Commons Employment Committee enquiry into part-time work makes no mention of job-sharing. Although they recognise the importance of part-time work and "areas where their [employers'] actions can play an important role in encouraging the take-up of part-time work", they specifically objected to much of the detail of the EEC draft directive which includes among its aims "to overcome the discriminatory treatment of part-time workers compared to full-time workers and guarantee the same rights with respect to working conditions, social facilities, access to training and promotion and the rules governing dismissal" and "to enhance the status of part-time work and thus contribute to the reorganisation of working time and the reduction of unemployment". Although the CBI say later in their evidence that employers are "extending the provision of occupational benefits to include part-timers and seeking to enhance training and career opportunities" no role is seen for job-sharing in this 'enhancement'. It would be interesting to know how many promoted posts and real career opportunities are available to part-time workers other than those available through job-sharing.

A similarly ultra-cautious attitude towards job-sharing is demonstrated in a report on managing new patterns of work from the British Institute of Management Economic and Social Affairs Committee (1985). The report warns that "it [job-sharing] adds to costs without yielding any compensating benefit" and advises "managers should be cautious about job-sharing ... Normal part-time work with proportional benefits is likely to meet business and
employee requirements most satisfactorily, with fewer conceptual and administrative complications. The advantages of employing part-time workers are said to include 'low cost', though why part-time workers should not also incur the alleged job-share costs of "recruitment, payroll, headcount, administrative and training" is not entirely clear. Perhaps it is the "conceptual complications" which loom largest in the minds of those preparing the report.

d) Employers and job-sharing - some conclusions

It is clear that the successful implementation of job-sharing schemes depends very much on the 'culture' of the employing organisation. Meager and Buchan (1988) found that organisations with large numbers of female staff and part-time workers were most likely to be aware of the potential benefits of job-sharing, while those with a culture which was male-dominated and oriented towards full-time work were least likely to do so. "In several instances, apparent obstacles to the introduction of these forms of work which were ostensibly related to issues of costs and/or job content turned out on further questioning to be largely attitudinal in nature."

This managerial hostility towards job-sharing is illustrated by the different attitudes which Meager and Buchan found towards job-sharing and job-splitting. In job-splitting the participants were really paired part-timers, undertaking discrete proportions of a job with little or no co-operation. Job-splitting was usually a proactive initiative by the organisation, and the reasons given were those for part-time workers generally - flexibility, labour costs reduction, and external market pressures. In contrast, job-sharing had generally been introduced reactively, in response to staff requests, then later formalised as a policy to retain staff and to promote equal opportunities. This pattern of informal, ad hoc, employee-led job shares, later being taken over, formalised, and promoted (sometimes with enthusiasm) as management policy, is common in the literature, even in public sector service organisations. As Linda Dunn (op cit) reports: "the paucity of current information within the National Health Service and the absence of supportive policy or practice has made job-sharing demand led". Individuals usually instigate discussions and implement a scheme in the absence of policy guidelines.

This 'cultural' difference may also be found within organisations. Meager and Buchan (op.cit) found that personnel departments often referred to equal opportunities or good personnel practice as reasons for introducing job-sharing, but justified their actions to reluctant line-managers on the grounds of short-term cost-savings or retention of key staff.

Overall, research appears to indicate that those employers who have introduced job-sharing schemes have been very satisfied with the results, finding little increase in costs, and compensating advantages associated with the retention of skilled staff and sometimes increased productivity. The negative approach of the IBM and the CBI indicates that employers as a whole remain very cautious about the value of job-sharing as a form of part-
time work, while stressing that part-timers form a very important section of the workforce. It may be that there is considerable resistance to the idea that part-time employees should become part of the 'core' workforce rather than remain in a traditional peripheral role. However, it is not necessary, under job-sharing, for the existing 'flexible' workforce to move from periphery to core; rather, existing core full-time posts could be made available where appropriate to those who wish to share them, thus leaving unaltered the numbers of core and peripheral jobs.

2 PART-TIME TEACHERS AND THEIR EMPLOYERS

a) Background

Research on part-time teaching is sparse. Even though the vast majority of part-time teachers are women and it is estimated that some 40% of women teachers work part-time at some time in their careers, several books on women in teaching make no mention of part-timers (e.g. De Lyon and Mignuolo 1989 - Women Teachers, issues and experiences). Few books on management in education refer to the use of part-time teachers. DES statistics, and those from other sources, are often unhelpful. Some (e.g. the LACSAB survey on teacher resignations 1990) totally omit part-time teachers, others include part-timers in full-time equivalent totals. As far as the views of employers are concerned there are three areas where opinions may be explored:

* the government - from whom most of the finance comes by way of local authority grants, and who are concerned with the overall supply and quality of teachers,
* the Local Authorities - who are technically the employers of teachers in most state schools, and whose policies can influence whether or not part-timers are employed and what kinds of contracts are available,
* headteachers and governors - who, while not employers, except in Grant Maintained Schools, have a major part to play in decisions about whether part-timers are appointed and on what terms.

The views of these three sets of participants may be from differing perspectives. The government may be most concerned about overall supply factors - 'bodies in front of classes' - and in particular in the numbers of teachers available in different subject areas where there may be shortages. Local authorities have similar concerns within their own areas but are also interested in the kinds of contracts to be offered and the ability to dispense with staff or move them between schools as needed. Headteachers and governors will be less interested in wider supply and staffing strategies, and more concerned to obtain the best staff available for their own schools, together with flexibility.
b) Temporary and supply teachers

Traditionally part-time staff in the teaching profession have been used to provide quantitative flexibility. When teachers are absent through sickness, maternity leave or further training, their work cannot be left undone or 'piled up in an in-tray' for another day. Pupils have to be supervised and preferably taught, they can rarely be sent home for the day. The education service thus depends on an army of teachers willing to provide supply cover at short notice for parts of weeks and even parts of days. These teachers are commonly women, caring for families, who want to do some teaching but are unable or unwilling to work full-time. They are normally hourly paid and have no security. Little research appears to have been done on this group of part-time teachers except that carried out by Chessum (1986). She studied the experiences of 24 part-time teachers in 5 education authorities in West Yorkshire. While the interviews were with the teachers themselves they shed some light on why their authorities chose to employ them. Only 5 of the teachers were not performing at least some remedial teaching and all of the rest but two taught remedial only. None had taught remedial groups in their previous full-time employment, but when seeking part-time posts they had been offered this kind of work which could fit in well with part-time hours. Two of the teachers had been specialist teachers on Scale 4, and three had been Heads of Departments. All felt that their present status was very low - 'a part-time nobody' - though they had adapted well and enjoyed their work. All had become downwardly mobile except five who had in any case been on the basic scale in their full-time work. Chessum comments that the part-timers seemed to accept that they had less security than full-timers even where they had permanent supply contracts. The number of hours they worked was often changed and they were often moved to other schools or required to undertake other roles, such as providing cover for absent staff. Many moved from temporary contracts to hourly-paid supply to renewable fixed-term contracts and back again constantly. They seldom knew exactly where or what they would be teaching for very far ahead. They were often unable to take part in in-service training courses and were frequently excluded from the opportunity to apply for full-time posts unless there was no other applicant currently teaching full-time. One was told that she could not apply for a full-time promoted post until she had returned to a full-time post on the basic scale. Another had, however, succeeded in obtaining a full-time promoted post based on her earlier professional experience. The comments of these part-timers reveal how employing authorities use part-time teachers to provide a higher degree of flexibility from day to day as well as from term to term. In return they generally offer little security, status or opportunity for promotion.

Other part-time teachers have expressed their frustration that their training, expertise and experience is being wasted because authorities and/or headteachers are unwilling to employ them in secure posts with opportunities to play a full part in schools. Even those whose skills
are in short supply may find themselves teaching any and every subject but their own as casual short-notice supply teachers.

The following extracts from letters illustrate the frustration of teachers wishing to work part-time but unable to find security and continuity.

"I am ready to return now ... Why are there not more part-time jobs and job-sharing with permanent contracts? ... What a waste to relegate so many fine, experienced teachers to the scrap heap. ... for too many years we have been regarded as expendable: it is time to revise that blinkered, wasteful, male opinion and see us for what we are - invaluable." [Collette Eales, letter, Education Guardian, June 14th 1988].

"Things seem to be getting worse. I have been working on a part-time basis for the last 4 years and am now job-hunting for the third time. ... That particular head values the flexibility part-timers give her in fine-tuning the staffing arrangements: she can offer you little or no work as the situation demands from year to year. Other heads round here refuse to use part-time or job-share at all as a staffing resource. All the jobs ... were the last resort, or a stopgap until a permanent post holder could start. My present job was (however) meant to be forever, but has now been terminated as an economy measure. They have absorbed my half-post amongst non-specialist staff: ... Headteachers now look at my CV [she was applying for full-time as well as part-time jobs] and remark that I seem to have worked for a lot of schools in a short time, implying that I am a social butterfly only in it for the pin money. ... I am beginning to feel I can't win. Damned as a part-timer, damned as too unreliable for full-time work."

(Part of a letter written to the author expanding on a shorter letter published in 1990 which expressed frustration that the skills of qualified teachers unable to work full-time are not fully used. - Name withheld).

c) Regular part-time teachers.

A further group comprises those who have contracts as regular part-time teachers. This group provides qualitative flexibility when the workforce has to be expanded or contracted. Between 1965 and 1975 there were teacher shortages due to increasing school rolls, and the number of part-time teachers in maintained schools rose by 37% (DES statistics). In the early 1970s there was one part-time teacher for every 8.5 full-time ones. By 1979 school rolls were falling and there was only 1 part-time teacher for every 14 full-time posts. Between 1970 and 1978 full-time posts had increased by 33% but part-time posts fell by 21%.
Concern about the effect of reduced part-time teaching opportunities on women's careers resulted in research by Trown and Needham (1980) in conjunction with the Assistant Masters and Mistresses Association. This research was carried out against a background of oversupply of teachers as a whole, though there remained shortages in some subject areas, and a general concern for newly qualified teachers needing to be redeployed. Byrne (1978) wrote of the social injustice of the phasing out of the part-time teachers who had been recruited so enthusiastically in the 1960s. Ollerenshaw and Flude (1974) forecast that highly qualified women were unlikely to be quiescent a decade later if they were to be regarded "merely as forming a reservoir of qualified manpower [sic] to be called on in times of stress, but unashamedly left without the opportunity to practise their chosen profession when they are not so urgently required."

Trown and Needham (op. cit) asked LEAs about their policies on the employment of part-timers. About two-thirds of the 55 respondents neither encouraged nor discouraged the appointment of part-time staff, leaving decisions to individual schools. One discouraged part-timers altogether, one discouraged their use in secondary schools, and one used them only for remedial work in primary and middle schools. The contracts used varied, some giving fixed-term contracts automatically and others using permanent contracts. Some acknowledged that renewable fixed-term contracts were in effect permanent after several years (usually five) because of the Employment Protection Act. Only seven of the authorities thought that costs had any influence on decisions to employ regular part-timers. Some thought that part-timers were less likely to be employed when good full-timers were available and one felt that the Employment Protection legislation had reduced part-time appointments since it had become harder to issue the fixed-term contracts desirable in a falling-roll situation. There was some evidence of an increased use of part-timers on temporary contracts to cover for absence of staff on maternity leave.

* Attitudes of head teachers to the employment of part-timers were very varied:

"We have normally only employed part-time teachers as a replacement for someone on secondment or maternity [leave] when it was impossible to obtain one full-time teacher. These have been very limited, temporary appointments, ad hoc stop-gaps in part."

"This school does not generally appoint 'part-time' teachers, in the permanent or even fixed-term contract sense. During the past 3 years or so we have had part-time temporary supply teachers on a very irregular basis to fill in for temporarily absent teachers, on a casual basis."

"In this school preference will always be given to full timers. In my experience heads have always taken the view that a part-timer is not as fully committed as a full-timer..."
Other heads were much more positive:

"Part-time teachers form a most valuable part of the school's teaching staff. It would be difficult to function without them."

Trown and Needham found that the majority of heads favoured part-time work as a transition from a career break to full-time return, possibly in conjunction with a 'refresher course', but not as a pattern of working in its own right.

They also found that the majority of part-timers were fulfilling specialist roles, particularly remedial work in primary schools and subject specialisms or remedial work in the secondary sector. Here the motivation for employing part-timers is seen to be not primarily quantitative but due to the identification of a specialist function which can be done on a part-time basis. Many of the remedial teachers were probably not specialists by training but were undertaking a specialist role which did not need full-time commitment. In primary schools the teacher would commonly take individual groups withdrawn from normal lessons during the morning only. At secondary level the school might need more staff in a subject department, but not as much as a full-time teacher, so a part-time appointment might be appropriate.

Throughout the research Trown and Needham found contrasting views from heads. One regretted that "we are losing too many qualified capable women teachers at present" and suggested that two such teachers could share a post, each having responsibility for the other's children in turn. Another said that "part-time teachers play no part in my plans ... I will use them where necessary, just as in many cases they will use me as a source of pin money."

One said "Part-time teachers give excellent value in every respect", while another "I think part-time teaching is totally against the ethos of our profession".

A group who mentioned that the loss of part-timers would mean reduced flexibility in timetabling, staffing and loss of cover for full-time absences was balanced by a group of similar size who said that timetabling would be easier if constraints introduced by part-time staff were removed and that school organisation would be more efficient as a result.

Some secondary heads thought that the provision of mid-career part-time teaching opportunities was necessary if women teachers were to be able to continue their careers in order to fill senior administrative and pastoral posts at a later stage in mixed comprehensive schools.

As a result of their research Trown and Needham suggested that LEAs should give serious consideration to job-sharing so that women with families could build mid-career experience to enable them to compete for senior posts, and because those forced to take full-time posts as the only alternative to casual supply work were reducing employment opportunities available to other teachers.
d) LEA action

The earliest example of an education authority introducing a formal job-share scheme for teachers is that of Sheffield City Council in 1982. Job-sharing opportunities were offered to all employees as part of a plan to generate more employment. Within the context of a no-redundancy policy staff could volunteer to share posts, thus creating vacancies for returners and newly-qualified teachers. Those who preferred to work part-time would not feel pressurised into retaining or applying for full-time jobs. The early operation of the scheme was studied by Angier (1984). It is of some importance that part-time teaching was already common in Sheffield schools and that job-sharing was positively encouraged by the employing authority in order to extend such opportunities. Here we have an example of an employer encouraging job-sharing as a permanent form of part-time employment for social and philosophical reasons. While the main reason was to help generate job opportunities at a time of high unemployment, the scheme also helped the authority to avoid redundancies and ensure that there were some vacancies for young newly-qualified teachers so that a reasonable age-profile of teaching staff could be maintained.

Also in 1982 two teachers in ILEA wished to share a full-time post so that they could also share the care of their first child (ILEA n.d.). The authority found no educational grounds for objecting and the arrangement was in line with its philosophy on equal opportunities. Headteacher and governors were in favour and a job-share was agreed, the first of many in that authority. Here the employer responded to a request from a pair of employees for an arrangement which suited their needs and which was in accordance with the employers' philosophy. The headteacher was glad to retain two valued members of staff, supported equal opportunities initiatives and considered that a husband-and-wife team could have particular value in pastoral work. The Divisional Inspector felt the post was not technically a job-share since despite the fact that the partnership shared a pastoral group and held a promoted post with joint responsibility for Primary/Secondary liaison, they taught different academic subjects.

e) Summary

The limited literature available thus points to employers using part-time teachers

(i) to provide overall quantitative flexibility, more being recruited when there are general shortages in the profession, with this group being the first to be dispensed with when sufficient full-timers are available,

(ii) to provide flexibility in fulfilling a variety of specific needs, covering for absent teachers on a short-term basis and moving between schools as necessary, and

(iii) to provide qualitative flexibility, giving additional help in specialist areas when the need arises, usually in the form of more regular part-posts.
These teachers usually lack job-security, though there is some evidence of a few longer-term part-time appointments where these suit the needs of individual schools, though they are very seldom in promoted posts, and may not be eligible for in-service training. While employers do not consider financial savings a factor, they would certainly find it far more expensive, e.g. in terms of travelling expenses and superannuation, if they had to employ sufficient permanent full-time supply teachers to cover all necessary absences.

Part-time posts with permanent contracts (sometimes available for individual part-timers) and opportunities for promotion (seldom available for individuals) have been established in some LEAs in the form of job-shares. These originally resulted from the requests of experienced staff whom the employers did not wish to lose. In Sheffield the main purpose was to spread employment opportunities as widely as possible. Walton (1987) records 38 local authorities with formally adopted job-share policies, usually related to equal opportunities initiatives, but teaching staff were covered in only 6 of them, education departments appearing to be generally slower to implement the policy in schools.

The advent of job-share schemes may increase the likelihood of retaining and recruiting staff in short supply or of reducing staff by allowing existing full-time teachers to volunteer to share one post. In this sense job-sharing may offer some flexibility to employers without subjecting part-time teachers to poorer conditions of service than their full-time colleagues. Job-sharing has been mentioned on several occasions in recent years as having a possible part to play in the teacher supply position in the 1990s.

3 THE MANAGEMENT OF TEACHER SUPPLY

In the 1980s falling rolls caused concentration on the redeployment of displaced teachers, though there remained concern about shortages in some subject areas. Demographic projections for the 1990s however showed that between 1987 and 1994 there would be a 20% reduction in the size of the 18 year old population from which most entrants to Bachelor of Education courses would be drawn, and a similarly reduced population of new graduates 3 or 4 years later from which to attract entrants to PGCE courses. At the same time the number of pupils would begin to rise again in 1988 and was projected to do so throughout the 1990s. In fact the rise in pupil numbers between 1995 and 2000 is expected to be almost twice as great as the rise between 1988 and 1995. The introduction of the National Curriculum has implications for teacher supply, requiring for example an increase in the number of foreign language teachers. More detailed analysis of the problems of teacher supply in the 1990s, containing references to the role which might be played by part-time teachers, can be found in IMS Report 161 (1988), submissions to and the report from a House of Commons Select Committee set up to address the issue, subject-teaching associations and teacher unions.
The Select Committee

The committee's report (1990) notes the DES evidence that about 50% of all entrants to teaching in the 1980s were re-entrants (DES evidence pp. 19-20) and that these were predominantly female and mainly aged 30-45. The submission assumed a continuing high level of entrants and an increase in part-time teachers (Section 36) and included a specific reference to job-sharing (section 44). A previous DES report on 'Action on Teacher Shortages' (1987) records "Discussion with Local Authority Associations over ways in which restrictive employment practices of local authorities, e.g. over ... part-time job-sharing, could be adopted to help combat shortages." A 'First Report on the impact of Government Initiative' in 1988 makes no mention, however, of any success associated with these discussions. The Select Committee in its report (1990) endorsed methods of encouraging qualified teachers to return to the profession, mentioning career-breaks, keep-in-touch schemes, and the provision of child-care as well as an increase in flexible working practices "such as job-sharing and other forms of part-time work" (p.xxiv 104)

IMS Report 161 'Supply and Demand for Teachers in the 1990s' (op. cit)

This comments on the comparative lack of part-time career opportunities, pointing out that this is likely to be a disincentive for many women in the 30-45 age group, while in other areas of employment, such as nursing and the financial sector, employers were beginning to provide more opportunities for shorter hours and flexible working times.

"If, as seems likely, teaching has to place a greater reliance on mature entrants and re-entrants as a source of recruitment, the provision of training and working conditions attractive to mature entrants will have to be actively explored. In particular, the role of part-time working, currently under-represented in teaching compared with some other professions and occupations, will have to be examined."

Subject-specific shortages

Several bodies have expressed concern about teacher supply in particular subject areas. The Royal Society and the Institute of Mathematics and its Applications (1988) recommended to LEAs that they should

(i) advertise imaginatively for part-time work teaching mathematics
(ii) keep a register of teachers who wish to job-share and advertise its existence
(iii) ensure that part-time mathematics teachers have the same job-security as their full-time colleagues
(iv) provide for part-time mathematics teachers the same relative salary and prospects for promotion as full-timers.
An HMI document published by the DES in 1989 on Girls Learning Mathematics referred to the shortage of women teachers in senior posts:

"Encouraging initiatives noted during the visits included an example of job-sharing which enabled two women teachers to share a Scale 3 post for mathematics; neither could have taken a full-time post in view of her commitment to a young family."

Union papers on teacher shortage

The importance of supply cover is stressed by several headteachers in a report on 'Teacher Shortages - a view from the Chalk Face' compiled by the six teacher unions in 1990. "There is no supply cover for sickness or courses. Nearly all supply staff are covering for permanent vacancies." "I have 2.6 of my staffing made up of seven part-timers. This uses up all my supply contacts so I now have virtually no-one to call on for courses or sickness." Here is revealed one reason why, in spite of teacher shortages, headteachers may resist permanent job-shares - they reduce the pool from which short-notice supply teachers may be drawn. Other heads comment that their supply teachers are not up-to-date and receive no in-service training, a further reason why heads may be reluctant to appoint them on a permanent basis.

Statements by Government Ministers

On several occasions government ministers have referred in speeches to the role which part-timers might play in the teacher supply position. In 1986, Kenneth Baker, then Secretary of State for Education, spoke to the Hughenden Foundation about the shortage of teachers in mathematics, physics, and craft, design and technology. He stated that secondary schools should do more to attract 'married returners' both as job-sharers and independent part-timers. In 1989 at the annual conference of the Professional Association of Teachers, Angela Rumbold, then Minister of State for Education, said that

"All means of recruitment will have to be exploited fully. Authorities can do much more, for example, to encourage job-sharing and part-time teaching by ensuring that job-sharers and part-timers are fully integrated with their schools and given full access to in-service training."

Other sources

While there are, as we have seen, a number of references to the use of job-sharing as a means of attracting and retaining teachers in the 30 to 40 year age range, there is little reference in the literature to the use of job-sharing as a means of retaining older teachers who might otherwise take early retirement.

The IMS Report (op.cit) refers to a LACSAB survey revealing a high rate of early retirement in the teaching profession. This may in part have been occasioned by staff reduction due to falling rolls, but a small survey of maths teachers suggested that this could be
in part due to disillusionment with teaching. (IMS ref. 7). Teaching is often referred to as a stressful job and older teachers may feel 'burnt out' or be unable to cope with continued full-time service, but the literature appears silent on whether part-time and job-share opportunities might enable teachers to find a new lease of life and continue to work longer. In practice teachers are commonly advised against this route because of the potential damage to superannuation entitlement.

While opportunities to job-share may make it easier for teachers to be retained or encouraged to return, it is difficult to assess the extent to which the supply of teachers could be increased to meet the needs of the government and local authorities by this method. For every teacher sharing who would otherwise be out of teaching, there may be another who would choose to work full-time if the job-share were not available. In each case the critical question is what the teacher would choose to do if not sharing a post.

TASC, the teacher supply body set up by the DES, issued recruitment guidelines in 1988. Central funding for initiatives was made available through the education support grant (ESG) to boost recruitment at local level, (TASC bulletin issue 7). The DES received bids from 69 LEAs, but TASC reported later that "...conspicuous by their absence from the majority of bids were references to part-time work and job-sharing - practices which are on the increase in other professions. Nevertheless some authorities did indicate their intention to consider the possibilities."

A further problem concerns the introduction of Local Management of Schools. While the Government and LEAs may be interested in the impact of job-sharing on the supply of teachers as a whole or within their authorities, the governors of a school are likely to be interested only in the staffing of their own institution. If job-sharing enables them to retain good teachers, or recruit those with skills the school needs, they may consider making such appointments. If they are wary of employment practices with which they are not familiar, uncertain of whether pupils will suffer or benefit, or worried about the outcome when one partner leaves, they are unlikely to appoint job-sharers even if the continued employment of the teacher is in the best interests of the education service in general. The danger is that the longer the teacher is absent from the classroom, the less likely it is that the teacher will return. The transfer of decision making on staff appointments to governing bodies in individual schools reduces the opportunity for government and LEAs to influence the use of job-sharing and other forms of permanent part-time work as an instrument in the management of teacher supply.

No research on the content of the various training packages for governors in relation to staff appointment appears to have been done so far, and the National Association of Governors and Managers was unable to offer any examples of literature advising governors on the roles which can be undertaken by part-time teachers in their schools. A forecast shortage
of teachers may persuade the government and local authority employers that there should be an increase in the use of part-time teachers as part of the core of the teaching force, but for this to become effective there needs to be a programme of education for the governing bodies who have power to make appointments.

Summary and Conclusions

In this chapter we have seen that employers have traditionally used part-timers to provide flexibility, covering periods of increased workload for example, and that they have been reluctant to grant such employees rights comparable with those of full-time workers. Part-timers have been seen as short-term and easily disposed of, and have often been denied access to pension schemes and further training programmes, thus saving money. Because job-sharing offers permanent employment and a pro-rata share of benefits some employers have been reluctant to consider it, but others have seen benefits accruing from the retention of trained and experienced staff or the opportunity to recruit those not available full-time. Some employers, particularly those in the service and professional sectors which employ many women, have found that aligning themselves with equal opportunities philosophies and responding to the wishes of staff seeking job-shares has contributed to satisfying their own needs for quantitative and qualitative flexibility of staffing. There has, however, remained a divergence of opinion about the kind of jobs suited to job-sharing. Some employers allow the practice only at lower levels of responsibility, while others consider lower levels more suited to separate part-time contracts and higher levels more suited to job-sharing.

In the teaching profession research has shown that most part-timers (mainly women) have been employed on short fixed-term contracts or as hourly or daily paid supply teachers. While pay has been pro-rata to full-time staff and superannuation has been available to those with regular contracts, they have usually been regarded as essentially short-term employees. They have had little opportunity to use the full range of their skills and qualifications and have frequently expressed frustration about their lack of job-satisfaction and low status. Many have shown interest in more regular employment such as that provided by job-sharing, which would offer access to further in-service training and promotion.

At the time the research data was collected, in the late 1980s, there was a shortage of teachers, particularly in some geographic areas and for certain subjects. Some LEAs even sent recruiters abroad to find additional staff. An even greater shortage was predicted in the 1990s due to the 'demographic time-bomb'. At several levels, government, LEAs and schools, there was concern about recruitment and retention and this led to suggestions that job-sharing might be one way of attempting to alleviate the shortages. Thus the situation seemed ideal for the introduction of job-share schemes which could meet the needs of both employers and employees. As we shall see in the next chapter, the growth of equal opportunities policies and
associated initiatives provided a framework within which job-share schemes could be
developed.
CHAPTER 6

EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES ISSUES

CAREERS FOR WOMEN AND OTHER DISADVANTAGED GROUPS

Before 1980 job-sharing in the UK had usually been arranged in response to the needs of individual employees by flexible employers wishing to retain the services of valued workers. The rise of national pressure groups for equal opportunities provided assistance to groups of employees in encouraging employers to consider their needs. Sex discrimination legislation provided further support. A survey carried out in 1975 (Commission of the European Communities) compared the attitudes of men and women to some of the problems facing society and showed a widely held view that greater flexibility in working hours was perhaps the most important measure which could improve women's opportunities. In practice women were most likely to be responsible for the care of children, the elderly, or disabled or chronically sick relatives. Part-time work was often not available at all in the area of employment for which women were qualified, and where it was available it was often only at a low level of skill and responsibility and with little security. The Equal Opportunities Commission therefore launched a series of studies showing how conventional working patterns affected women's opportunities of employment, and considering the potential of other arrangements for increasing sex equality. One arrangement, that of job-sharing, was discussed in a publication (EOC 1981) which included the results of a survey of existing schemes and of forty individual sharers and twenty-four shared jobs. At that time several banks had sharing or 'twinning' schemes involving mainly women but including a few men, and other employers had schemes for such workers as office staff and librarians. As far back as 1969 the DHSS had suggested that women doctors could be helped to continue to practise if medical posts could be split into part-time jobs (DHSS 1969), and from 1975 the Lothian Health Board had allowed sharing of any post from house officer to consultant. The London Borough of Hackney had a formal job-share policy as part of its equal opportunities initiative, and Sheffield City Council had approved a job-share policy in principle. The Commission concluded that:

"Job-sharing is a way of increasing access to professional, skilled and rewarding work for people who choose, or are only able, to work part-time. In addition job-sharing may provide women who have been out of the labour force for a number of years while caring for children, with the opportunity of a way back into employment. Job-sharing therefore has the potential to improve women's job opportunities and help break down occupational barriers.

At present it is of particular relevance to women, but it may also be a way of creating more flexibility in the work patterns of those men who wish to
spend more time looking after their children, but are currently unable to do so because there are few part-time opportunities in their area of work. Thus in the widest sense job-sharing can contribute towards equality of opportunities between men and women."

It is frequently forgotten that there are men who are single parents, have disabled wives or care for elderly parents. Part-time jobs are often very female-orientated, for example, clerical workers, shop assistants and factory work with a traditionally female workforce, and the opening up of higher levels of work in a wider range of occupations could increase men's opportunities too.

Other groups who may wish to take part in job-sharing are those who are themselves disabled or have health problems which deny them the stamina for full-time work, and those nearing retirement in stressful jobs they find have become over-taxing. Research by Linda Marsh of Jordanhill College (unpublished) showed that a high proportion of both men and women teachers thought they might be interested in a pre-retirement job-sharing arrangement. Trown and Needham (1980) had earlier found some men, as well as women, interested in pre-retirement sharing, and in a follow-up article (Trown 1983) the author says that a small minority of younger men would like a temporary break from a full-time pattern if it were seen to be realistic.

Further concern about equal opportunities for women has been expressed in the field of career progression. Not only should appropriate employment be available for women who are able to work only part-time for a period, but they should not inevitably lose promotion opportunities because of this.

Hirsh, Hutt and Atkinson (1985) suggest that women are tempted to defer having children until their careers are established, perhaps at about the age of twenty-eight. For men, the favoured age for promotion is thirty to thirty-five years, thus coinciding with the woman's career break period. When the women return at thirty-five to forty years of age they find they have been left behind in the promotion race and are lacking in the recent experience needed to catch up quickly. Women who do not take a career break, but return immediately after maternity leave, may be thought to show ambition and dedication to their work. Even so, the fact that they have children to care for may affect the judgement of others on their suitability for promotion.

Hirsh et al (op.cit) records the case of a "female doctor at consultant level, where hours of work are usually very flexible. She found that it was quite acceptable for her male colleagues to leave work early to play golf or collect a car from the garage. It was definitely not seen as acceptable that she should organise her work schedule so as to collect her young children from school!"
Thus even women who take the minimum career break may find themselves at a disadvantage in terms of career progression.

According to the Women and Employment Survey (Martin and Roberts 1984), 95% of those whose first baby had been born between 1960 and 1964 had returned to the labour market at some point, 52% to part-time work. Women taking a longer break following the birth of a child were more likely to return part-time, and almost half returned to a job in a lower occupational category. Even those whose families had become more independent were not necessarily free to take up a full-time career once more. The survey also showed that 21% of women over forty provided care for sick or elderly dependants. It is for such people that equal opportunities initiatives seek to encourage working patterns which allow women to progress in their careers as well as undertaking caring functions:

Hirsh et al (op.cit) comment:

"Virtually no literature addresses the issue of whether statutory provision or longer career break schemes have actually helped retain women at work or assisted their career progression. It may be that company policies cannot be separated from other influences (e.g. the generational changes in attitudes) or that the data on retention is not available, or just that the time scales of cause and effect are so long that major longitudinal studies are required."

Also

"We do not know how many female recruits into professional and managerial jobs have taken career breaks at some stage. We do not know whether they suffer in terms of career prospects."

In 'A Matter of Hours' Beechey and Perkins (1987) write that:

"Moves have thus been made in some workplaces, generally on the initiative of feminists, to introduce positive measures to improve women's situation at work. These have sometimes been instigated by employers and sometimes by unions, and have been more widespread in the public sector than in private industry. In recent years policies designed to promote sexual equality at work have often been linked with measures to promote equality for ethnic minorities, people with disabilities, and lesbians and gay men."

The authors also say that little attention has been paid to part-time workers, concentrating on helping women to gain promotion or enter non-traditional jobs. However, they admit that some initiatives such as job-sharing do assist women to work part-time with security and opportunities for higher-level jobs commensurate with their skills, experience and qualifications. They add that "Job-sharing is also one of the few practices that can encourage men to share domestic responsibilities".

55
CAREER DEVELOPMENT FOR TEACHERS - EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES?

It is well-known that while the teaching profession has a high proportion of female employees, women are clearly under-represented in promoted posts. For example, DES Statistics (1987) showed that in Primary Schools 35% of women teachers and 9% of men teachers were on the basic scale while 7% of women teachers and 31% of men teachers held headships. In secondary schools the proportions were even more unbalanced, 40% of women and 19% of men being on the basic scale while 0.7% of women and 3% of men were heads. A number of surveys and research projects have sought to explore the reasons for these differences, for example NUT (1980), Grant (1983), ILEA (1984), INTO (1985) and Evetts (1986). The conclusions are difficult to compare because the ILEA, Evetts and INTO studies were based on samples in differing geographical and socio-economic areas, the NUT research did not include data on men as comparators and the ILEA sample were all secondary teachers with between ten and fifteen years service. In addition it is difficult to isolate the effect of a career break from other influences such as the fact that men made more applications for promotion and were more willing to move house or travel longer distances. Evetts (1988) found that the women in her sample who had gained promotion had not been out of teaching for long periods and most had been able to undertake intermittent supply work or more regular part-time teaching at some stage during the break. She comments that at times of teacher shortage it may be easier for women to return to teaching and resume a climb up the career ladder, while "in the tighter economic and educational climate of the 1980s and 1990s, when there are fewer promotion posts and less movement generally within the profession, it is probable that only those with continuous (or almost continuous) teaching service ... will be sponsored for promotion" (Evetts 1989).

Grant (op.cit) also comments that

"The present career structure makes little allowance for women teachers to experience a relative period of career inactivity without jeopardising their career chances for good".

Earlier research by Hilsum and Start (1974) found that promotion was less likely after the age of forty, and little allowance was made for the fact that a woman of forty was likely to have as much accumulated experience as a man of, say thirty to thirty-five. There seemed to be a general view among interviewers that promotion is age-related and anyone who has not been promoted before the age of forty must somehow be unworthy of promotion. This general view is reflected in the NUT/EOC research (op.cit) and also in Grant's survey.

The NUT research highlights the fact that older teachers are more likely to be given internal promotion and that heads of other schools may be reluctant to appoint them to advertised promoted posts, and that complaints of discrimination on the grounds of age may well be justified. In addition to this a woman who had climbed some way up the promotional
ladder before a career break might have to start all over again from the bottom on re-entry. One of the respondents said that she "never ceased to be amazed that women are penalised for having children but men are promoted because they have a family to support."

The NUT research also showed that over 60% of women returned to work part-time, but that part-time teaching was generally used merely as a means of solving staffing difficulties temporarily.

"When I tried to get a part-time job, the head informed me that he didn't approve of married women teachers in general and part-time married women teachers in particular. A year later, when desperate, he rang me and offered me a job."

During the 1960s and early 1970s there was an acute shortage of teachers and the government launched a recruitment drive to encourage married women back into teaching. Then with falling rolls and an increase in newly trained teachers the number of part-time opportunities decreased. In March 1981 part-time teachers accounted for 22% of all teachers and lecturers in England and Wales. (Dept. of Employment Gazette 1981: Manpower in local authorities). The loss of part-time teaching posts prompted concern for the career prospects of women teachers and in 1980 research by Trown and Needham (op.cit) sponsored by AMMA and EOC explored the effects of the reduction in opportunity. Not only were there many fewer posts available but they were mainly on the basic scale, and over a half were on fixed-term contracts and lacked security of employment. Some lost their jobs as the teaching force contracted and others had their hours reduced. In addition the range of jobs available was limited. For example, 75% of primary part-time posts were not class-teaching but for remedial specialists or in the art and music areas. Only teachers of shortage subjects found part-time employment at all readily available. The views of heads were very variable. Some felt part-time teachers to lack commitment and only employed them when necessary, for example to cover temporary absence, while others regretted that so many able well-qualified teachers were being lost to the profession. Thus, while one said that married women teachers must decide whether they are to be good mothers or good teachers - "it is impossible that they can be both" - another suggested that two compatible teachers could share a class and the care of their families when not teaching. While many were extremely doubtful whether part-time experience would add anything to promotion prospects, there were suggestions that such prospects could be improved by the encouragement of job-sharing. Many women were faced with a choice between full-time teaching, which was difficult to integrate with family responsibilities, supply teaching, with little job satisfaction and continual insecurity, or leaving the profession altogether. Many felt angry that their training and experience were being wasted. One respondent wrote:
"I feel very strongly that it should be possible to build a career in part-time teaching, with security, promotion prospects etc. comparable to those of full-time teachers. Why should we be treated as 'casual labour' simply because we have a strong sense of responsibility towards our families? We also have a strong sense of responsibility towards our profession!"

One of the conclusions of this research was that "A well established mode of re-entry to teaching, compatible with the care of young families, is essential if women teachers are to maintain career momentum, building mid-career experience in time to compete for senior posts. There is now a danger of discrimination between women who have families and those who do not, as well as between the sexes."

Trown (1983, op.cit) considered whether the drawbacks of part-time teaching could be largely overcome by job-sharing.

"Ideally, at a particular stage in their careers, two teachers would choose to assume joint responsibility for a full-time post, combining strengths and specialisms in a way that would further, rather than merely safeguard, the interests of children. Each would contribute to decision making and curriculum development as well as taking an appropriate share of other duties. If this was so, then job-sharers could establish themselves as professional equals to full-time teachers, achieving a status to which part-timers rarely aspire."

As we have seen in the last chapter, the situation in the 1990s was expected to be similar to that in the 1960s and early 1970s because of demographic changes. This expectation has been modified because the recession in the early 1990s has reduced job-opportunities outside teaching. If, at the end of the recession, teacher shortages are again high on the agenda, it will be interesting to see whether the need to encourage women to stay at work, even on a part-time basis, will increase pressure for such work to be secure and at a level suited to qualifications and experience, or whether the fact that more part-time work will be available will render initiatives such as job-sharing less necessary.

**EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES AND TEACHERS' EMPLOYERS**

Apart from independent schools and universities, which are not included in this research, the employers of teachers are local education authorities. [Grant maintained schools had not been introduced at the time the research data was collected.] As we have seen, equal opportunities considerations are more likely to be found in areas of public rather than private employment. How far has job-sharing in the public sector been the result of equal opportunities initiatives? A study of job-sharing in local authorities (New Ways to Work 1987) found that thirty-eight authorities outside London had formally adopted policies on job-sharing and a further thirty-six employed some job-sharers without having a formal policy.
Teachers were given job-sharing opportunities in six of them. A large majority of councils with job-sharing policies had introduced them as part of equal opportunities initiatives. The Chair of one Personnel Committee launched a job-sharing policy with the words "This is one positive step forward in putting into action the Council's Equal Opportunities Policy". Several mentioned the benefit to women, but also mentioned the value of such schemes to the disabled, as a pre-retirement plan, and as an alternative for men as well. Other councils in areas of high unemployment saw job-sharing as a way of increasing the number of people employed without extra cost, rather than from any equal opportunities point of view. There was a range of views about the suitability of senior posts for sharing. Some considered that all posts were suitable unless proved to be otherwise, others limited job-sharers to lower-status posts. There had, however, been a steady increase over the previous few years in the sharing of more senior professional and managerial posts. Practical problems resulted in some clashes with other equal opportunities policies. For example, it was felt that interviewing prospective job-sharers as a pair would not meet the accepted code; all individuals should have equal access to appointment without being dependent on the choice of a partner. Several authorities had 'Women's Committees' which took a special interest in job-sharing, and the person responsible for the scheme was often clearly responsible for equal opportunities matters in general, e.g. 'Senior Personnel Officer (Equal Opportunities)'. Where the initiative for job-sharing had come from a Trade Union (usually NALGO) it was usually the equal opportunities committee of the union which had studied and promoted the idea. Advertisements for posts often used statements such as

"As part of the Council's policy on Equal Opportunity in Employment, most of the Council vacancies are open to job-sharing."

One council said that:

"Whilst job-sharing may theoretically have other uses, it is largely as part of the County Council's Equal Opportunities Policy that it has been examined."

Even where job-sharing had begun as a programme to increase employment opportunities, later development revealed strong influence from equal opportunities groups.

While the New Way to Work survey (ibid) refers mainly to Administrative, Professional, Technical and Clerical Staff, and the employing bodies do not always equate with those employing teachers, the very strong influence of equal opportunities on the initiation and development of job-sharing policies is clearly shown.

In 1988 the EOC published research by Isabella Stone on Equal Opportunities in Local Authorities. A survey of all 514 local authorities in Great Britain, carried out by the EOC in 1986, had shown that 82 out of the 446 who replied had some sort of special equal opportunities structure and 59 employed equal opportunities officers of some kind. There was
considerable evidence of tension between these officers and the personnel department on the one hand, and between the officers and trade union representatives on the other. They felt that they did not wholly belong to either group and had to maintain an independence, while facilitating negotiations between the two other bodies on matters of interest to the equal opportunities lobby. One officer felt resentment from both sides that their normal roles were somehow being usurped. Also while equal opportunities matters were top priority for the officer, they were only a part of the range of concerns felt by unions and the personnel department. Many officers also felt that positive political support was coming from only a small group of elected members and that overall support for their work from the council was tokenistic.

Teachers who wish to promote job-sharing policies, or take advantage of them, thus have to deal with a number of groups: the elected members of their local authorities, particularly those on the education committee, the professional officers of the Education Department, particularly the personnel section, equal opportunities officers who may or may not be part of the personnel section, and their own trade union groups who are involved in policy-making discussions and negotiations. As we have seen, equal opportunities groups and officers may be particularly interested in promoting job-sharing. There are, however, problems underlying the use of this source of support. Firstly there are conflicts between particular areas of equal opportunities policy.

On women's career patterns the IMS report (op.cit) says:

"Several of those interviewed were equal opportunities officers or had similar job titles. It is apparent that there are some potential conflicts between pressing for special arrangements for women with young children (particularly part-time working), and some other aspects of equal opportunities policy (treating women in the same way as their male colleagues). Policies for managing the career break do amount to positive discrimination (albeit in the organisation's own interest) and this stance is not yet acceptable to many organisations."

A further problem is the question of the suitability of job-sharing for teachers. However much the participants in negotiations may want women and other disadvantaged groups of teachers to have equal opportunities, the first priority is whether such arrangements could damage the education of pupils. Could they perhaps be of value to pupils? This issue is considered further in Chapter 7. If pupils would suffer, then equal opportunities initiatives must take second place. There is, however, another factor at work. If we are to have equal opportunities in the future, pupils must be able to see women in positions of seniority and responsibility. Measures to increase women's career expectations in this generation are also measures to increase the awareness of equal opportunities in the next generation.
A further issue is that the 1988 Education Reform Act and subsequent Government action encouraged schools to become 'grant maintained' i.e. to opt out of Local Authority control. It remains to be seen whether individual schools adopt equal opportunities policies or, even if they do, whether as separate institutions they contribute as much to issues of women's career development or options for men to share child care as a larger employing authority may be able to do.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

It seems clear that Equal Opportunities issues have influenced the development of job-sharing. This has happened not only because of Equal Opportunities legislation, but because some large employers such as local authorities have wanted, for ideological reasons, to be seen as operating equal opportunities policies. Some employee pressure groups or consultative bodies have initiated the discussion of such policies and been involved in their implementation. Job-sharing can be of particular value to those whose health or disablement makes full-time work difficult as well as to those who have family care responsibilities. The fact that the teaching profession contains a high proportion of women, and that these are articulate women who seek career progression, means that there is a strong desire for systems which enable women to aim for positions of responsibility despite career breaks and periods of part-time working. Those in senior management positions are more usually male however, and evidence suggests that they are not necessarily sympathetic to those who do not adopt the traditional 'male' pattern of continuous full-time work. To some, career breaks and part-time working imply lack of commitment to the profession.

While equal opportunities issues have clearly influenced the development of job-sharing, could the fact that job-share schemes are so often linked to equal opportunities and 'women's issues' prove to be detrimental? There is some evidence that job-sharing is seen as an arrangement mainly for women with young families, and hence there may be some resistance by men to taking part themselves. Job-sharing may be seen as somehow lacking in virility, running counter to the male image, and considered to be a low level way of working. If this image of job-sharing as being 'women's work' is, or becomes, general, it will be difficult for job-sharing ever to attain the status its promoters wish. Unless men see job-sharing as a real possibility for them at various stages of their lives - raising a family, further study, pursuing another interest, increasing life-satisfaction in the years before retirement - it is unlikely that job-sharing will be respected as a form of work and be allowed to operate at higher career levels. Has the association of job-sharing with equal opportunities policies, frequently seen as implying equal opportunities for women reduced the chances that job-sharing can truly contribute to equal opportunities for all?
CHAPTER 7
JOB-SHARING AND THE CONSUMER

Relatively little has been written about the effect of job-share arrangements on consumers. In many occupations customers or clients will be unaffected and probably unaware that a job-share exists. Few will be concerned, for instance, by whether their library books are stamped, or their medicines dispensed, by different people at different times of the week. There is, however, some debate about the suitability of certain jobs for sharing. These are usually those where there is considerable public contact, a client or patient load, and a need for continuity.

"The critical factor in these jobs is the need to provide personalised service and efficient follow-through. If you and your partner have chosen to work interchangeably, you must be thorough in communicating to each other the details of particular client interactions."
(Olmsted and Smith, 1983)

While consumers will seldom have a direct part to play in decisions on whether to permit job-sharing, opinions on the likely effects on customers, clients, patients and pupils will be important.

While a job-share split on the basis of time may require the partners to share responsibility for all aspects of the job, it is sometimes possible for the sharers to split the responsibility by task. Examples of this include sales executives who deal with discrete groups of customers, accountants and lawyers who arrange appointments during their respective working hours, and social workers who split their caseload on a geographic basis.

Social Work Research on a sample of sharers from the New Ways to Work Directory (Pritchard, 1990) revealed that 18% were in social work, probation and personal service occupations, an area where there is much public contact and need for continuity. One social worker reported that she and her partner had separate caseloads but kept a 'watching brief' for any emergencies which might arise in the other's client group. "It worked well - no problems at all; clients seemed quite happy with it" (quoted in Walton 1990). Here job-sharing improved client care compared with separate part-timers who would have no responsibility for each other's areas of work. The Social Services Department of Nottinghamshire County Council is reported in the same research to have 34 shared posts, and the personnel officer is quoted as saying that a further considerable asset in comparison to full-time staff is that "provided staff are amenable, job-sharers can work on the same day and double staff for special projects such as outings".

Meier (1978) reports that job-sharing social workers in America usually work independently of each other and may not even need to know their 'other half'. Total independence of this kind may, however, represent a situation more akin to two part-time posts than a genuine job-share.
Health Service  The same writer refers to a job-share between two physicians. While responsibility for individual patients is not shared, each knows that the partner will check on patients if necessary during the other's absence. Since patients in hospitals, or even general practice, are accustomed to being seen and treated by several doctors and nurses, they may be little affected by job-share situations. Many hospital consultants are working in a group of hospitals, or have to spend some time in private practices, so may not be available to patients throughout the week in any case.

A study of job-sharing in the National Health Service (Meager, Buchan and Rees 1989) found nursing posts shared in 50 participating authorities, many being in community-based jobs such as health visiting. One case-study described a pair who found that dividing a caseload geographically did not work very well since cases were difficult to schedule into the times when the relevant person was on duty. They decided instead to share the whole caseload, conducting ante-natal classes jointly so that mothers knew both partners before encountering them either on a new-birth visit or at a baby clinic. Some cases were not shared, e.g. those involving child abuse where it was felt better for one person to follow the case through, especially as the family would already have to deal with a number of other professionals. Advantages following from the job-share arrangement included the continuity which might be available from extra cover provided by one sharer during the other's absence due to sickness, and even if this could not be provided there would always be someone with knowledge of a case on duty for at least part of the time. This study again mentions the advantage that two job-sharers may be able to attend two events, such as case-conferences, which happen at the same time, thus providing greater flexibility than one full-time employee. Another advantage could be seen where both partners might work a greater number of hours in one week, contributing more than one full-timer could if, for example, there was an epidemic. While such arrangements provide flexibility for management they also offer an advantage for patients. Walton (1990) op.cit, reminds us that

"There is sometimes a false assumption that full-timers are there all the time, which is clearly not the case: people take holidays, are ill and go to meetings. In the area of health care, people frequently have to relate to more than one person. As two sharers point out: 'We have found that people are not confused by having two stoma care nurses to deal with - possibly due to the fact that they have to relate to many professionals, so this is just one more'."

Leighton and Winfield (1988) were unable to interview any of the third parties associated with their studies of job-sharers but relied on managers' and colleagues' perceptions. They considered that

"It is likely that the view that people outside an organisation expect the same individual to be constantly available to them is overstated. Indeed, those
we interviewed who expressed reservations or criticisms of the operation of job-sharing did not identify this as a problem area."

The occupations providing these case studies may not, however, exhibit the same need for continuity and close contact with consumers as is evidently necessary in the teaching profession.

Education Social work and the health service are clearly areas in which consumer contact and continuity have a high priority. This is also true of teaching. In fact, schools are continuing communities without the frequent turnover of, for example, patients in most hospitals, and they therefore have longer contact with their consumers on average. In addition, the 'consumers' of the education process, the pupils, are seldom able to speak for themselves if unhappy, except through their parents. Thus the perceived advantages and disadvantages to pupils and parents will play an important part in decisions on whether job-sharing is appropriate in the teaching profession or should be permitted in individual cases. Such evidence as exists in the literature is therefore of importance.

(i) The USA Job-sharing in the teaching profession has a longer history in the USA than in Great Britain. Meier (1978) refers to a preliminary study carried out in California in 1976 in which it was found that

"Advantages to the districts centred on the higher quality of shared teaching, a result of greater skill diversity within a single position and sharers' increased energy and enthusiasm."

Dapper and Murphy (1968) produced a research report on part-time teachers for the organisation Catalyst. Framingham had a partnership scheme for teachers which was possibly the fore-runner of job-sharing. One child was in a partnership classroom at the beginning of the experiment. On the first day she told her parents "It's kind of funny having two teachers." The next year she announced that it was "Kind of funny only having one teacher." From parents' comments it seemed clear to the writers that the children were not at all confused by having two teachers. One principal said he'd like to have his own children involved in the scheme. Other parents were enthusiastic. One said her child enjoyed the diversity, it had been "a superb educational experience". While parents had volunteered neither praise nor blame to the school administrators, they had expressed appreciation to the teachers themselves. One principal had telephoned six parents at random to ask their reactions. These included

"When I first heard about it, I didn't like it .... but ... they impressed me greatly and I have no misgivings now."

"I think it's great. I'm very pleased. I think that the new face is stimulating".
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"I didn't care for it originally, but my daughter has had no trouble adjusting to the two teachers and likes both of them".

"My son reacted beautifully ... It's a great idea".

Another Principal thought there were advantages for parents as well as children. "For example, when parents come for conferences they get the benefit of two different points of view on their child."

A third did not welcome the partnership programme and was "forced into it" when no full-time teacher was available. Later he became convinced of its benefits for pupils "even to the extent that he would choose a partnership over one full-time teacher".

One of the pupils expressed a preference for having two teachers, "if the morning teacher is down on you, you always have a new chance in the afternoon".

Olmstead and Smith (1983) record how a teaching pair transformed 12 year old Craig into an ardent student. He enjoyed a change of teacher. "She'd come up with all sorts of surprises. It was kind of neat having two teachers. The other kids said 'You're pretty lucky'."

The Office of Research and Development in the Mount Diablo Unified School District prepared an evaluation report on job-sharing. (Moorman, Smith and Ruggels 1980). They found that 97% of the students said they enjoyed the arrangement. 87% of the parents indicated that they would allow their children to participate in a shared classroom again. All 43 school administrators agreed that the education of the students had not suffered. 13 administrators listed improved education in the classroom as an advantage of job-sharing. In one school district parents of children in a shared class were sent a questionnaire which asked them to assess the programme. Twenty parents said it was better than a one-teacher classroom, seven said it was the same. Only one considered it to be worse.

(ii) The United Kingdom Job-sharing for teachers in Great Britain did not start formally until 1982 and little research has been done about its effects on pupils involved.

The research by Angier (1982) on a small sample of job-sharers and paired part-time teachers in Sheffield mentions several perceived advantages and disadvantages for pupils and parents. Parents who saw both teachers on parents' evenings obtained two perspectives on their children's progress, but it could sometimes be inconvenient if a parent's request to one sharer had to be dealt with by the other sharer on the next day. The communication of details between sharers needed to be very thorough and up-to-date. There was some feeling expressed that very young children might find it confusing to have to adapt to two different personalities, and children with social and emotional problems might need the security of one full-time teacher. One headteacher remarked that some children do have personality clashes with teachers and if there is a job-share there is a better chance that he or she will get on with at least one of them. Another felt that many of the children had social problems arising from
split families, and seeing two adults working together supportively and co-operatively gave them an experience not available at home. No marked discipline problems had arisen and sharers had in two cases coped better with difficult classes than their previous full-time teachers. Overall the learning and educational opportunities were perceived to be the same as in classes with a full-time teacher, and sometimes better because of the two sets of individual skills, variety for pupils and greater energy and enthusiasm of teachers who were less tired.

An in-depth study of one partnership working with a primary school class is provided by Brown (1984). Brown and another teacher were allowed to operate a 'one-off' job-share so that one could have time for advanced study and the other could give more time to her family. The research is concerned particularly with the curricular experience and continuity provided for the class. The headteacher commented that pupils had benefited from the joint planning and more comprehensive record-keeping which were part of the liaison process, as well as the experience and special skills of two people. At the beginning some parents had been worried about the arrangement but later they reported that their children were happy and secure and they didn't "give it much thought now because it's become part of the school". The sharers had begun by working in a fully-integrated way, taking up each topic where the other had left off. They felt that this sometimes led to confusion and later changed to splitting subject areas between them which they felt was more successful. Some pupils gained because if they did not get on well with one teacher they might have a better relationship with the other, and there was greater continuity for the class because the sharers normally covered for each other's absences. The head teacher's end of year report mentioned that the teachers' complementary talents "had obviously been an asset to the class". In fact "the only danger seems to be that their combined enthusiasm may provide over-rich stimulus for the children so that they finish the term with the children exhausted and the teachers full of energy!"

Brown and her partner devoted a great deal of their time to joint planning and liaison. This leaves open the question of continuity where sharers have no paid overlap time or are unable or unwilling to devote a great deal of their own time to it. Plowden (1967) commented, after observing two part-time teachers sharing a class, "two or more teachers need to be employed for rather longer in total than one full-time teacher if they are to share a class efficiently."

Comments in the literature on the effects of job-sharing on pupils are mainly confined to primary and middle schools where classes traditionally have one teacher and job-sharing presents a departure from normality. In secondary schools pupils are accustomed to having a number of teachers and in any case timetables may be so arranged to avoid class-sharing, even though other responsibilities may be undertaken jointly. Although the literature indicates that parents and some headteachers have doubts about the likely impact of job-sharing on pupils, this often appears to relate to lack of experience of it in practice.
Those who actually found themselves in shared classes, and their parents, seem quickly to adjust to the situation and in many cases to find some advantages in it. Those without direct experience may share the concerns expressed in several important reports. Auld (1976, p.48) in his report on the William Tyndale School writes of a class taught by two part-time teachers (not job-sharers in the formal sense):

"This class suffered, not only in the lack of a single teacher to care for it, but also from the lack of co-ordination between the two teachers in their handling of the class and the teaching methods they employed."

The Cockcroft Report (1982, p.134) refers to the shared teaching of a mathematics class:

"When shared teaching of this kind is unavoidable we believe that it should be timetabled with a group of pupils whose attainment is high. Pupils in a group of this kind can benefit from being able to 'pick the brains' of two teachers and will quickly question any inconsistencies which may appear to exist in the teaching they receive ... If, on the other hand, shared teaching is timetabled for a low attaining group, pupils will not receive the continuing reinforcement and revision which they need from period to period and instead of questioning inconsistencies of approach between their two teachers, are likely to become muddled."

In contrast HMI (1978) have mentioned a major drawback in the one teacher/one class system:

"The range of work and the range of the pupils present a formidable challenge to the knowledge and skill of an individual class teacher. The older and more able the children, the more obvious the difficulty is for the individual teacher."

They then put forward the idea that a system in which a single teacher may be responsible for teaching the whole range of the curriculum could be a contributory reason for poor performance in some areas. It seems likely that the introduction of the National Curriculum will add weight to such an argument, and a report by inspectors from the Office for Standards in Education (Rose 1994) states that the national curriculum has "prompted the challenging of certain long-held assumptions, particularly the belief that the generalist class teacher can cope almost unaided with teaching a 10-subject curriculum to adequate depth."

**CONCLUSIONS**

It is important to be aware that, apart from the reports quoted above, most of the literature on job-sharing has been written by those who are themselves sharers or who seek to promote sharing. They may well stress the positive aspects rather than the negative, and parents may be less willing to express critical comments to the sharers themselves or to the
headteachers involved, than they might be if interviewed privately by researchers independent of schools. A further problem in analysing the effects of job-shares on pupils and parents is distinguishing whether the effects are actually due to the job-share, or the quality of the teachers involved. Just as some parents may attribute their children’s success to a job-share partnership, others may blame their child’s failure on it. The success or failure might have happened if the child had one full-time teacher and the causes could well lie with the child or the quality of the teacher(s) rather than factors arising from the job-share situation itself. As Brown (op cit) concludes:

"It has been shown that the gains in terms of input to the curriculum are firstly difficult to quantify, and secondly related strongly to the professional skills of the participants ... However, it is possible to suggest that the curriculum does gain from job-sharing and its further promotion as part of curriculum development is very worthwhile."

There is little doubt that the positive or negative effects of job-sharing on pupils is of the utmost importance. Issues of teacher supply or equal opportunities will be of little consequence unless job-sharing can be seen not to disadvantage pupils. This research does not attempt to explore the reactions of pupils and parents directly, and acknowledges that reports by the sharers themselves may be biased. The most relevant evidence will be that from headteachers and secondary heads of department, who are unlikely to express satisfaction with the job-shares in their schools if they feel that pupils suffer.
Any study of job-sharing needs to take into account not only the legal and administrative background (addressed in Section A) and the origin and development of job-sharing arrangements (addressed in Section B), but also the personal characteristics of those who share posts and the ways in which the posts are managed in practice. While the personal characteristics of sharers are likely to be fairly general across different areas of employment, the details of how shared posts are organised are more likely to be job-specific.

Published material on the experiences of job-sharers themselves is limited to a few accounts of detailed research and a wider scattering of articles in newspapers and magazines. Major research has been carried out in America by the Upjohn Institute (Meier 1979) and New Ways to Work (New York) (NWW 1980). In the UK it has been carried out by Essex Employment Relations Research Centre (Leighton and Rayner 1986), the Industrial Society (Leighton and Winfield 1988) and the Institute of Manpower Services (Meager, Buchan and Rees 1989). Walton (1990) explores material from several sources collected by New Ways to Work (London) including a survey carried out by Pritchard (1988), and further evidence has been produced by the Hackney Job Share Project. The influence of articles in the press and popular magazines describing the experiences of job-sharers should not be underestimated. Many cases have arisen in which people have heard about job-sharing from such sources, and these have been a spring-board from which to apply for shared posts themselves. One such magazine-article-initiated application to job-share is related in Conlan (1984). Other press accounts of influence include legal reports such as those concerning Robertson v Strathclyde (1986) from which those interested in sharing learnt that refusal to offer part-time opportunities to those returning from maternity leave could constitute indirect discrimination.

In the field of education Angier (1982) studied the experiences of six pairs of job-sharing teachers and four pairs of paired part-timers in the early stages of the Sheffield Job-Share scheme, and Brown (1984) described in detail her experience as a job-sharer of a junior class.

The material available can be divided into

a) statistics about the sharers themselves
b) the process of obtaining shared posts
c) the organisation of the shares
d) the advantages and disadvantages encountered by the sharers.
a) The Sharers

Pritchard (1988) unsurprisingly found that 88% of her sample were female and that the mean age was about 35 years. Two-thirds of them had children under 10 years old, and about half had worked full-time immediately prior to sharing. Over 60% wanted a better balance between home and work, particularly where children were involved. Other reasons included care of the elderly, easing back into work after a break, preparing for retirement, and finding full-time work too demanding, particularly if there were health problems. Pritchard's survey was based on sharers who had made contact with New Ways to Work (London) and covers a range of employment areas.

b) Obtaining a shared post

Accounts of the setting-up of job-shares are particularly interesting since they illuminate the interplay between employees, unions, line-managers and policy makers whose contributions were discussed separately in Section B. Even where employers have a policy of permitting job-sharing, the process of obtaining a shared post is seldom straightforward. Meager, Buchan and Rees (1989) studied job-sharing in the Health Service, where in the majority of cases

"The job-share arrangement had come into place following an approach by an individual staff member ... to her manager and/or a personnel manager, requesting to work part-time or to be allowed to share. In some cases this occurred purely on an individual basis, in others it resulted from two potential job-sharers getting together to put a joint case to management."

They found that situations where the job-share had come about largely through managerial initiative were extremely rare, and those which were the result of an explicit proactive policy drive by the employing authority concerned were even rarer.

Pritchard (op cit) reports that

"Negotiating terms and conditions could also be problematic ... A strong theme was that job-sharers had to show great persistence to obtain favourable conditions."

Walton (op cit) warns

"If you are likely to be the only job-sharer within an organisation or department, then you may find yourselves in a pioneering role. It can take a while for the idea to become part of the organisation's culture."

Accounts of the setting up of job-shares range from the case of Robertson v Strathclyde (op cit) where potential sharers and their managers were confronted by employers who refused
the arrangement because they 'did not have a policy' and eventually won by means of a legal case, to that of Sheila and Ann recounted by Walton (op cit). Fearing rejection they invited their boss out to lunch,

"He reacted positively straight away ... what a super idea! We'd got all these arguments ready and it was completely unnecessary. He said, 'What a good idea, which job are you going to share?'"

Some potential sharers encountered difficulties if they wanted to share a promoted post. The Sheffield policy statement on job-sharing for teachers stated that while 'there are no inherent restrictions' there could be particular problems attached to teaching posts above Scale I. Angier (op cit) gives an account of a Biologist with Scale II responsibility. In this case the headteacher could support the idea of a job-share, but not the sharing of the scale post. In contrast Meier (op cit) describes a high level post of development consultant shared by Pat and Bruce whose employers preferred a shared situation in order to get the greatest variety of skills to reach out to all city departments.

Where pairs are interviewed for vacant posts it is common to find that employers and interviewers are ignorant of job-sharing. Hackney Job Share described the experiences of a couple who wished to share work as well as the care of their daughter. (Quoted in Walton op cit). It took four interviews before they were successful, and in each case the employers were unprepared and "didn't know what to do with them".

"We were aware in each interview of a resistance to the idea of job-sharing ... I came away feeling despondent and demoralised ... I felt we were trying to achieve the impossible and I was very reluctant to apply for any more jobs and put myself on the line again."

After the fourth interview the couple received a phone call telling them they were the best applicants for the job, but that the employer was very worried about job-sharing. They were asked to go and discuss it further. Eventually they were successful even though one of the people involved in the decision was particularly opposed to the application.

Walton (op cit) also recounts the experience of a pair being interviewed for a Head of Department teaching post. The Chair of the panel said that a letter had been received from the LEA saying that "if they should favour us as the ones for the job, the authority was not sure that we could be appointed as no proper agreement had yet been worked out". The interview concentrated on the minutiae of the sharing arrangements rather than the considerable experience of the sharers. A full-time teacher with only three years experience got the job.

In another case promoted status proved a potential stumbling block for a principal officer working for Westminster City Council who faced being downgraded to senior officer in order
to work part-time, but the personnel department suggested that she share her post and
departmental management eventually agreed.

A contrasting account concerns the experience of a pair of existing sharers who were
readily promoted because they had already shown their ability to work well together.

Even where jobs were advertised as suitable, Leighton and Winfield (1988) found that
applicants often had to persuade individuals or groups of the viability of sharing the post, quite
apart from convincing the panel that they themselves were suitable as sharers. Angier (op cit)
quotes one sharer as saying that advertisements were sometimes wrongly or badly worded.
"There did not seem to be the commitment necessary to make something new work on the
part of the authority."

Overall the material on the setting up of job-shares indicates considerable caution, or even
antipathy, on the part of some line managers, even where a job-share policy is stated by senior
management, and sometimes a lack of response from senior management to requests from
employees whose immediate line managers are supportive. Greatest opposition appears where
more senior posts are involved, and in areas where there is no tradition of regular part-time
working. Greatest success is encountered where existing employees request to share a job and
management are keen to retain rather than lose skilled personnel.

Since the majority of job-shares are initiated by the sharers themselves, and often take
considerable planning and persistence, the sharers are likely to have a strong personal stake in
making sure that the share works well. There is also an associated danger that those who
originally opposed the arrangement may have a stake in demonstrating that it doesn't.

c) Organisation of shared posts

Studies of job-shares usually include some reference to the sharing pattern used.
Pritchard (op cit) found that over half of the sharers in her survey divided the job by a
combination of time and task/project/client. The second most common method was by time
only. Typists may, for example, deal with whatever work is to be done during the time they
are on duty, while doctors may have their own patient lists, but occasionally see each other’s
patients. Researchers may divide areas of the task between them, meeting occasionally to
collaborate. Walton (op cit) describes two social workers who attempt to counter the usual
criticism of part-timers that they are away from the office for long periods. One works
Monday and Thursday, the other Tuesday and Friday. Both work half a day on Wednesdays,
alternating so that they take turns to attend the weekly morning team meeting. Time patterns
appear predominantly to be chosen to suit the requirements of the job, and secondarily to fit
the needs of the sharers. Meier’s (op cit) American sample showed 44% using split weeks,
either 2½/2½ or 2/3 days, or sometimes alternate weeks. 29% worked half days, 14% had no
fixed time pattern and 6% used an overlapping pattern. Angier's job-sharing teachers showed 3 pairs working a 2½/2½ day pattern, and 3 a morning/afternoon arrangement.

The issue of communication is highly relevant. Those jobs needing a great deal of joint liaison are unlikely to work well on an alternate week or 2/3 day pattern since sharers are never at work on the same day. The hand-over period, on one lunch time, or all of them, is thus desirable unless an overlapping time pattern is used. Those who do not meet report a combination of log books, note files and home phone calls. The need to make particularly detailed records involves extra time input, and phone calls result in higher phone bills.

Walton (op cit) describes nursing sisters Judith and Elizabeth who overlap on a Wednesday for 2 hours discussion. They feel this time is essential, and "although the period of overlap to an employer may appear wasteful financially, we have found that working closely together has led to greater creativity, each of us stimulating the other."

Communication can be a source of problems. Walton (op cit) quotes one sharer as identifying a possible source of misunderstanding.

"The clear, detailed and diplomatically worded notes we must write to each other daily can become a time-consuming chore. When we write in haste, one of us tends to become confusingly verbose, the other succinct to the point of dropping the occasional key word."

Married sharers have the greatest opportunity for liaison, but they often find it difficult to 'switch off'.

"It's been hard,' John says. 'You know, the work is there to be done and it's easy to go home at night and do it and work until 11.00.'" (quoted in Meier).

Lammiman (1982) describes her shared post as a Senior Training Officer at the Stock Exchange:

"We are given a great deal of freedom in organising the division of the working week, which tends to reflect our workload. We may not be in the office every day, but a carry-over day with both of us present is essential. In addition, our hour-long journey home on the same tube line has hidden benefits in allowing us to brainstorm and formulate ideas in a more 'relaxed' (i.e. going home) environment."

Since many of the sharers in the research samples were the only ones in their organisations they have often had to work out how to organise the share for themselves and adapt it from experience. While some were happy to do this, others felt they would have liked more help.
"It would have been nice to discuss with somebody else who has had some previous experience of it or ... other people who were also job-sharing." (Quoted in Leighton and Winfield op.cit)

d) Sharers' personal experience - advantages and disadvantages

i) Attitudes of colleagues

Many sharers have encountered resentment from colleagues. Walton (op cit) quotes a sharer who describes some colleagues as thinking that "Job-sharing is seen as an easy get-out for part-timers". One male sharer said "Sometimes I feel a bit guilty, as though I have a soft option and I'm not always sure what colleagues think." Another complained that "Colleagues don't appreciate the organisation involved". Leighton and Winfield (op cit) report that many are aware of resentment from full-time colleagues who felt they were 'on a cushy number'.

Lathlean (1987), describing a shared ward sister's post says that

"Aggression and hostility seem to be an inevitable aspect of the implementation of change, especially where individuals feel threatened or vulnerable or seek stability. The introduction of job-sharing was new and threatening and despite considerable plans and discussion still required time not only to be accepted but also welcomed."

In contrast, Angier (op cit) found that in her 10 teacher sample:

"Job-sharing had not led to staff criticism or resentment. Most staff were intrigued with the new work option and interested in the sharing arrangement and its success. Part-time situations were well established patterns of the school."

It seems likely that where regular part-time working is common its extension and upgrading may be more acceptable to colleagues than in those areas where there is no such tradition.

ii) Working hours

Pritchard (op cit) found that 65% of job sharers regularly worked more than their contractual hours. Of these, 30% received no recognition of any sort and 59% received time off in lieu or flexi-time. Meier (op cit) quotes Bruce, a city development consultant:

"It was terrible - I was getting a 20 hour pay cheque and working 45 hours a week. I realised I had fallen into it and I decided to cut back."

and Brenda, co-director of a special university programme:
"It's important that you don't fall into the trap, particularly in a job like this where you could always stay extra hours, not to fall into working over your agreed time limit."

It is difficult to judge when teacher sharers are working more than the appropriate proportion of time because a teacher's contract is open-ended

"... a teacher shall ... work such additional hours as may be needed to enable him to discharge effectively his professional duties. The amount of time required for this purpose ... shall not be defined by the employer but shall depend upon the work needed to discharge the teacher's duties." (School teacher's pay and conditions document. DES 1987)

A first school sharer in Angier's sample found herself trying to fit five days work into two and a half and had to alter her pace.

iii) Training

A further problem arose over training. Each sharer usually needs as much training as a full-time worker, but may have only part of the week in which to be involved in a training programme. While most of Leighton and Winfield's sharers received training opportunities, others felt that they had missed out or had to make an extra effort to ensure that they obtained the necessary training. Meager, Buchan and Rees found that in most case studies the sharers received a full complement of training, though in a minority of instances training budgets were set in terms of the post rather than the individual so that sharers tended to receive less training than their full-time colleagues.

iv) Partnership

Job sharers commonly stress the need for compatibility.

"It is absolutely vital that we as job-sharers are compatible (not the same) in personality and attitude and outlook." (Lammiman op cit)

Kathy, an assistant editor said "I think there is a certain competition in that you want to be as productive as the other person" but also "Your partner is somebody who really cares, and not someone who's just listening to you." (Quoted in Meier op cit).

Ralph, a teacher, is also quoted:

"As I told Lucille, shared teaching is the next most intimate relationship to marriage ... The whole thing rests on the compatibility of the two partners, on their communication and flexibility."
It seems likely that jobs which are shared in an integrated way have a higher need for compatibility than those in which the work is split so that the sharers have separate areas of responsibility.

The sharers generally find there is great value in sharing work:

"I can think of being uncertain of my own response to a given problem and being able to turn to Lois and, if she questions it, then I can set off in a different way, or if she supports it, I'm doubly sure I'm right." (Beth, legislative assistant, quoted in Meier ibid).

"...a tremendous opportunity to learn from each other. It's hard to get feedback from teachers when you're alone ... It gives you more confidence when you can collaborate." (Evelyn, reading resource teacher quoted in Meier ibid)

"I think I gained an enormous amount from working with a partner who was different from me and who had different strengths." (occupation unspecified; Leighton and Winfield op cit).

v) Promotion

Many sharers in Leighton and Winfield's sample recognised that gaining promotion as sharers would be difficult. They felt that at least they could retain their existing position on the pay ladder, though one sharer had been demoted in order to job-share. There was some evidence of sharers being promoted individually to full-time posts, but where pairs had applied together for promotion this had not usually been successful. In Pritchard's sample about a fifth had tried to get promotion, half of them being successful. Half of the sharers expressed an interest in promotion and there was great determination to win promotion while remaining a sharer.

Walton (op cit) reports that a partnership sharing a planning job in one London Borough applied for three promoted posts, were interviewed on each occasion, and became principal planning officers for another London borough. Examples of promoted partnerships are gradually increasing according to New Ways to Work.

vi) Comparison with other part-time work

Pritchard's research showed that 91% of respondents preferred job-sharing to the kind of part-time work (if any) usually available. They referred to

a) teamwork and mutual support
b) higher status and more senior posts
c) better conditions, security, access to training
d) career progression not interrupted
e) more responsibility and commitment
f) importance of compatibility and communication
g) equal opportunities issues
h) increased flexibility in organising work

vii) Combining work with other responsibilities

Sharers commonly express increased satisfaction in both working and non-working lives. Walton (op cit) describes married couples who wished to share the care of their children and who shared a job to make this possible:

"It has been a very good solution for us, because it has allowed us both to do that ... However it's interesting that some men who say they have a commitment to child care say, under pressure, that they themselves wouldn't want to do what we do."

Another pair said:

"We feel job-sharing is not only a contribution to a balanced way of life, but also a significant way of producing some day-to-day equality between male and female roles."

Single parents may feel that they cannot cope with full-time work and family:

"As a single parent I won't earn more than I can get on Social Security, but working is necessary for me. I don't think it is right to be cloistered at home 24 hours a day. Job-sharing gives me time for myself and my home as well as stimulation and it will make it much easier to return to full-time work later." (Walton op cit)

Similar comments come from those who care for disabled relatives or the frail elderly. Those who are themselves disabled are helped by job-sharing. A woman sharing the post of Head of Disability Unit for Hackney Council says:

"Both myself and my job-sharer have disabilities and wanted to work less than a 35-hour week because of physical limits on energy due to disability." (Quoted in Walton op cit)

Workers nearing retirement may find full-time work puts them under too much pressure, and some jobs are exhausting anyway. A principal social worker says:

"It's a very pressurised area we work in, it's very busy and we're understaffed and under-resourced. It is quite tiring and demanding, so doing half a week is quite a relief." (quoted in Walton op cit).

A teacher quoted by Moorman, Smith and Ruggels (New Ways to Work USA 1980) says
"I do extra planning and projects in my day off that I couldn't do if I were still working full-time and had to do them at midnight."

Another said "less pressure, am happier, more time to prepare units, NO BURN-OUT".

Other sharers want time to pursue other activities, paid or unpaid. Walton mentions those who study or do research, write or paint, share the running of a farm, work as actors or musicians or combine work in industry with lecturing.

viii) Job satisfaction

Of course sharers have some areas of dissatisfaction too. They worry about compatibility with a partner, problems with communication, and the attitudes of colleagues, as discussed earlier. They may find themselves working more than their fair share of full time with little recognition, and they may find it difficult to adjust to reduced pay if previously working full-time. They may find hopes of promotion frustrated and opportunities for training reduced, but overall the researchers reveal considerable satisfaction, the main exception being those sharers who would prefer full-time work but are unable to obtain it. Conlan (op cit) describes his sample as showing evident enthusiasm, with reduced role-conflict, relief from 'overload' and a better balance between work and other areas of life. All expressed increased satisfaction with non-work life, and three-quarters enjoyed working life more. Leighton and Winfield (op cit) report that "overall the job-sharers were satisfied". Olmsted (op cit) comments that most of the job-sharers seem to agree with the one who said "It's the best of both worlds - [I have] a professional job, stamina, and time for my family." Brown (op cit) and her partner, while valuing the opportunity to share a teaching post, found that "the amount of time the job-sharers actually spent ensuring continuity, in planning and implementation of plans, may be considered a disadvantage of the scheme". Both sharers agreed that this was one of the reasons why they would consider job-sharing only as a temporary strategy.

Meager, Buchan and Rees (op cit) point out that many of the sharers felt themselves to be in some sense pioneers, they felt a responsibility to 'make the job-sharing experiment work'. This was particularly so where managers had opposed the experiment. Some said this made it difficult for them to air any grievances they had for fear of being seen to jeopardise the continuation of the job-share agreement. Angier's teachers were said to experience a strong sense of commitment and responsibility to each other and a desire to make the job-share succeed. They may thus be willing to tolerate areas of dissatisfaction and eager to stress success and satisfaction.
CONCLUSION

While evidence concerning job-sharing occurs in a number of pieces of published research we have seen that the major work relating specifically to the teaching profession has been done in the USA, in particular the study of 38 teachers sharing classrooms in the San Francisco Bay area in 1976 which is used both as a source for Meier's wider study and forms part of the New Ways to Work (USA) study of Job-sharing in the Schools. In the UK, while there are some references to job-sharing teachers in more general studies, the specific research is limited to Angier's study of 6 partnerships and Brown's in-depth study of her own. Research carried out by LEA staff within their own authorities has resulted in a number of other sources which will be referred to in Part II. Collected research on job-sharing in the teaching profession, spread over a number of LEA areas in both primary and secondary sectors, and viewed from LEA officer, headteacher and sharer perspectives is thus virtually non-existent, and it is this vacuum which the current research seeks to fill.
PART II
THE EMPIRICAL RESEARCH

CHAPTER 9
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The overall aims of the research were to discover the extent of job-sharing in the teaching profession in the academic year 1988/9, to investigate the origins of job-share arrangements and attitudes towards them on the part of LEA officers and senior school staff, to analyse the personal details of teachers sharing jobs, the ways in which they organised their shared responsibilities, and their perceptions of the effects of job-sharing on themselves and their schools.

The chief method of collecting information was by questionnaire, but officers from 10 LEAs with formal job-share schemes were interviewed. Each interview lasted approximately one-and-a-half hours and was semi-structured. A list of areas to be covered was used to ensure that no important points were missed, but freedom of direction during the interview was permitted so that points made which had not been included in the list could be followed-up.

(a) The LEAs

All 117 LEAs in England, Scotland and Wales were sent a questionnaire (see Appendix 1) asking whether they had a formal job-share scheme, and if not whether informally agreed job-shares were in existence. Follow-up interviews were requested from those authorities which had schemes in place, and those without schemes were asked whether job-sharing had ever been discussed and what opinions had been expressed. Five LEAs with formal schemes were selected as a representative sample for closer study on the basis of geographical spread, size and urban/rural characteristics. These gave permission for questionnaires to be sent to job-sharers and their head teachers. LEAs with informally agreed partnerships were asked if teachers from these could be approached to take part and responses from these were combined to form an 'ad hoc' group. Those LEAs with a register of teachers seeking shared posts were asked if a survey of these teachers could be carried out.

Detailed material from the interviews with LEA officers can be found in Appendix 2 and comparisons of the formal schemes and analysis and discussion of the LEA questionnaire returns can be found in Chapter 10.
(b) Senior Management in Schools

Questionnaires (see Appendix 1) were sent to the head teachers of schools which had job-sharers and, in secondary schools, to their heads of department. These set out to explore the comparative attitudes of senior staff before experience of a job-share in operation and afterwards. They were asked to offer opinions on the advantages and disadvantages of job-sharing for schools, and to comment on the attitudes of other staff and the effects on pupils and their parents. Analysis and discussion of the questionnaires completed by senior staff can be found in Chapter 11.

(c) The Job-sharers

A questionnaire (see Appendix 1) was sent to each sharer requesting personal details and reasons for wishing to share a post. Information was also sought on the way in which the post had been obtained and how the shared responsibilities were organised. Sharers were asked about any difficulties which had been encountered and their perception of the advantages and disadvantages of job-sharing for themselves and their pupils. Analysis and discussion of the questionnaires completed by sharers can be found in Chapter 12.

(d) The Register Applicants

A questionnaire (see Appendix 1) was sent to teachers who had entered their names on LEA registers in the hope of obtaining shared posts. A year later this group were sent follow-up letters to discover whether they had been interviewed for any posts and with what success. Analysis and discussion of the questionnaires completed by register applicants can be found in Chapter 13.

Overall, questionnaires were returned by:

99 LEAs (85%) (another 5 replied by telephone)
169 Head teachers and heads of department (about 70-75%)
227 Job-sharing teachers representing 163 partnerships (about 80% of partnerships contributed evidence from at least one partner and about 56% of individual sharers responded)
70 Register applicants (% of applicants responding originally unknown, but follow-up rate 86%)

Some of the problems of calculating exact response rates, of ensuring compatibility of data collected from various sources, and problems of the classification of replies, together with details of modifications of original plans, can be found in a general consideration of the limitations of the questionnaire surveys (Appendix 1).
(e) Informally collected material

This material was collected from teachers who wrote to the author after media publicity about the research. It cannot be analysed and compared with the formal research data, but references to it have been made from time to time because particular cases illuminate issues raised through the analysis of the formally collected material.
CHAPTER 10
SURVEY OF LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AUTHORITIES

This chapter is divided into three sections

1 Background to the general survey of LEAs and outline of the responses
2 Analysis of responses from the 75 LEAs without formal job-share schemes
3 Summary and comparisons of material collected by interviews with LEA officers from 10 LEAs with formal job-share schemes. Detailed accounts of the interviews can be found in Appendix 2.

1 BACKGROUND

Letters to the Association of Metropolitan Authorities and the Association of County Councils in 1987 revealed that neither knew which of their members operated job-share schemes for teachers. They expressed an interest in the results of any survey which would reveal this information. The Education Management Information Exchange had collected information from a few authorities, but had no overall view of the situation. A questionnaire (see Appendix 1) was sent to every education authority in England, Scotland and Wales (omitting the Isle of Man and the Channel Isles) in the Spring of 1988. The authorities were asked whether they had a job-share scheme for teachers, and if so, whether they would be willing to be interviewed. Those who did not have a scheme were asked to complete the remainder of the questionnaire, which was designed to discover whether the issue had ever been discussed, by whom, and with what outcome. They were also asked whether they had informally agreed job-sharing, whether teachers had requested such an arrangement and been turned down, and whether any 'ad hoc' sharers could be contacted and invited to take part in the research.

Authorities with job-share schemes for teachers

Of the 99 LEAs who replied (85% of the total), 12 had schemes in place and a further 9 were expecting to introduce a scheme in the near future. Eleven of the twelve agreed to be interviewed but one later withdrew owing to a change of personnel. The remaining ten were interviewed during 1988 and 1989. Five of these authorities agreed to take part in the teachers' and headteachers' surveys. The five were chosen to provide a geographical spread and included one large regional authority, one metropolitan authority and three shire counties.

Authorities without schemes but with informally agreed job-shares

31 authorities fell into this category and 12 were willing to allow contact with sharers to be made. The replies from these formed the 'ad hoc' group in the sharers' survey, combining
responses from 7 authorities. In at least one case the contact letters did not reach the sharers because of a change of personnel or decision.

 Authorities who did not reply in writing

Of the 18 LEAs who did not reply, 4 telephoned to say that they had no job-share scheme and 1 said that a scheme was under discussion.

RESPONSES TO THE SURVEY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Written replies</th>
<th>99 (85%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone calls</td>
<td>5 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total contacts</td>
<td>104 (89%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4 responses were blank and accompanied by letters apologising for being too busy to complete the questionnaires. 4 stated that no job-share policy existed and did not complete the remainder of the questionnaire.

Of 117 LEAs:

12 had job-share schemes for teachers (though 2 were only recently agreed and no job-sharers had yet been appointed)

9 were planning to introduce a scheme in the following few months

79 had no job share scheme for teachers

17 not known

(An informal survey of advertisements in the Times Educational Supplement during the Summer of 1989, one year later, revealed that several of the 79 without job-shares at the time of the survey had introduced them subsequently.)

2 LEAS WITHOUT FORMAL JOB-SHARE SCHEMES

The responses analysed below refer to the 75 authorities who had no formal scheme and who completed at least some part of the remaining questionnaire.

1a) Had a job-sharing scheme for teachers ever been discussed?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>46</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>by education department officers</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by a joint negotiating committee</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by the Education Committee</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by an equal opportunities group</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(more than one answer possible)
b) On whose initiative did the discussion take place?

Of the 46 LEAs who reported that discussion had taken place:

- 11 did not reply
- 11 said Education Department Officers
- 4 head teachers and governors
- 2 the Education Committee
- 2 an equal opportunities group
- 2 a joint negotiating committee
- 2 advisors and inspectors
- 1 the local authority personnel department
- 11 indicated that the subject arose from joint initiatives and were unable to identify a point of origin

At first sight it may seem surprising that, while over half of the reported discussions had been between officers, only about a quarter of the negotiating groups involving teachers had discussed job-sharing and very few equal opportunities groups were mentioned. This has, however, to be considered in relation to the fact that not all authorities have equal opportunities groups and that the reply was usually written by an education officer. He or she was thus in a position to know whether the issue had been discussed by officers, but might not know whether it had been discussed by other bodies unless he or she was a member, or unless a report on the discussion had been circulated. Similarly it was not always easy for the officer replying to identify the source of an initiative, for example teacher union representatives might raise the issue in either a negotiating body or an equal opportunities body, with that body being credited as the source rather than the unions themselves.

There is some evidence in the comments made by officers of 'top down' initiatives, for example where a local authority has a job-share scheme for other employees as part of its equal opportunities policies, and seeks as a matter of principle to extend job-sharing to teachers. There is also evidence of 'bottom-up' initiatives where head teachers and governors, sometimes aided by local inspectors, request job-sharing schemes to enable them to offer posts to good teachers whom they wish to retain or recruit, and who are not willing to work full-time. (For a further discussion see Part III Chapter 14).

c) The officers were asked what they considered to be the likely outcome of the discussion. Of the 46,

- 21 were still discussing the issue
- 18 were no longer doing so, of whom 4 thought it would be raised again in relation to retention and recruitment problems
- 7 did not reply
d) If job-sharing was no longer being discussed, what were the reasons? Of the 18 no longer discussing the issue, 16 mentioned reasons, of whom 2 gave more than one.

5 considered a formal scheme unnecessary. They preferred to respond to individual requests from schools where such an arrangement would suit a particular situation and heads and governors were supportive. Two added that this approach would be more suitable under the Local Management of Schools scheme, when governors would have responsibility for appointing staff and the local authority correspondingly less power.

5 preferred to make part-time appointments separately, on permanent contracts where appropriate, rather than considering shared posts. This, they felt, provided greater flexibility. One commented "job-sharing does not provide sufficient flexibility to operate in such a fast-changing world as education". One preferred to keep all part-timers on one-year renewable contracts.

3 had foundered on disagreements within negotiating committees:
"The major union does not wish to proceed"
"There were disagreements between unions about safeguards for the sharers and safeguards for the head teachers of their schools"
"There was no simple way of resolving the issues and problems identified".

3 felt there was no demand for job-sharing:
"There is no call for it"
"It seems to be more a reflection of wishes of teachers than a lack of policy"
"There is no discerned need".

1 authority reported the view that job-sharing might cause time-tableing problems in secondary schools, that there might be problems in matching for compatibility in all schools, and that in any case "there is plenty of part-time work to provide opportunities for women".

1 said that while the issue of job-sharing had been 'put on the back-burner' owing to more pressing business, it was likely to be discussed again because "inspectors are desperate to fill posts".

Of the 7 respondents who did not complete this question, several had indicated earlier that discussions had been informal. Probably, as indicated by one officer, other issues such as Local Management of Schools (LMS) and the National Curriculum had been more pressing, and the question of whether to introduce job-sharing had been postponed. The two main reasons for deciding against a scheme appear to have been (i) a preference for leaving decisions to individual schools, particularly with the introduction of LMS, and (ii) a belief that separate part-time posts would offer great staffing flexibility.
In the two cases where lack of agreement was reported in negotiating committees it is likely that the above issues also played a part. Head teachers in particular may have been very aware of the financial problems likely to be encountered under LMS, and full-time teachers may feel that their own security will be greater if part-time staff are used as flexibly as possible to increase or decrease staffing. Separate part-time teachers can be made redundant if the school can cope with the loss of half a post whereas a job-share cannot be split easily, and actual hours taught can be adjusted year by year according to the school's needs. Such teachers would have much less security of employment and probably little chance of promoted posts. These are precisely the drawbacks of part-time working which job-sharing was designed to overcome. Very few negotiating committees will include part-time teachers and their voices are unlikely to be loudly heard. While LEAs were responsible for the appointment of teachers there existed the possibility of redeployment of staff between schools. The introduction of local management hands employment decisions over to governing bodies (although the LEA is still technically the employer) and flexibility will be looked at in terms of the needs of individual schools rather than of the authority as a whole. Job-sharing has always been accommodated more easily by large rather than small employers, and staffing constraints and decisions under local management of schools may be more comparable to those of the smaller employer.

e) The 75 authorities were asked what extra costs or savings might result from job-sharing.

24 did not reply
6 said these had not been considered
8 said none, 5 commenting that there would be minimal costs and savings which could be expected to balance out overall.

Where costs and savings were listed separately, they can be summarised as follows:

Increased costs:
9 referred to 'on-costs' generally, of whom 6 said they would be minimal
6 thought (wrongly) that National Insurance costs would increase
8 referred to minor administrative costs
9 to the possibility of paid over-lap time
5 to the need for twice as much in-service training and
2 to additional travelling costs for meetings and 'non-employed' days.

Savings:
10 said there would be none
10 mentioned on-costs, 3 referring to National Insurance and 3 to Superannuation specifically
Others referred to savings which might be available from covering for each other's absences with time off in lieu, and retention of existing staff reducing the need for outside recruitment. Only one referred to savings from salary increments which would have been available at that time.

One officer pointed out that while 'costs and savings' implied financial considerations these were unlikely to be large enough to outweigh the importance of the savings in human resources and expertise which might otherwise be lost. An opposite view was that financial considerations were unimportant compared with the 'organisational and perceptual difficulties'. This officer considered that there would need to be a very careful public relations initiative with parents. "Where temporary class-sharing occurs because of the absence of a member of staff, there is commonly considerable concern expressed by parents as to the continuity of approach".

While financial implications may not be of prime importance compared with other advantages and disadvantages, they are nevertheless worthy of consideration. Are financial implications likely to influence whether a job-sharing scheme is introduced? The overall picture is of agreement that extra costs would be minimal and might well balance out overall with savings. The number of sharers in any authority was not likely to be large, and any costs and savings would be negligible in comparison with staffing costs as a whole. Several authorities had not studied the financial implications in detail, since factors such as administrative time needed to set up a scheme, the need to recruit and retain staff, or the need to reduce staffing while avoiding redundancy were of greater importance.

The respondents to questionnaires were generally personnel specialists and thus not necessarily financial experts. Even so their views on this issue are interesting. Only one authority appeared to realise that where the teachers were on an incremental scale there would have been savings on salaries. Part-time staff progressed, at that time, at a slower rate, e.g. a half-time teacher would have earned an increment every two years instead of one, and since the normal full-time increment would be halved because of the pro rata salary rule the total cost of the post would increase much more slowly than for a full-time teacher. (Since the research was undertaken, this situation has changed.)

While six officers specifically mentioned National Insurance as a source of extra cost, three specifically mentioned it as a probable saving. In fact, if all were paid at the same salary point there would normally be a saving from employing sharers rather than one full-time teacher except for a narrow range of promoted posts. This is because of the banding system of National Insurance contributions in which the lower-rate band will apply to part of both salaries. One LEA enclosed a document about job-sharing, already implemented for non-
teaching staff, in which the savings were clearly set out. It is unclear whether the six authorities expecting National Insurance to cost more were unaware of the facts, or whether they were expecting that job-sharers would, on the whole, be teachers at the top of their incremental scales and occupying posts which would otherwise be available to younger and lower-paid teachers. The latter would cost less in National Insurance contributions. A similar argument could explain the replies of the nine who referred to 'on costs' in general and the ones who mentioned additional salary and superannuation costs, the latter being proportional to salary for those who opt in to the scheme. This idea of older, higher-paid sharers being more expensive than young, lower-paid full-time teachers would also have to be balanced against the fact that older teachers opting to share would release one post to a younger recruit and therefore give rise to savings.

The major possible extra costs centred on payment for liaison time, if this were to be made, and the need for both sharers to receive as much in-service training as one full-time teacher. The additional administrative cost at various levels of management was generally seen in terms of time rather than money.

Material informally contributed to the research indicated that extra cost might sometimes be used as an excuse for not permitting job-sharing. Two members of teacher/LEA negotiating panels reported that when the subject of job-sharing had been raised their authorities had rejected it out of hand on the grounds that it would cost more. One teacher described how she and a prospective partner, with their headteacher's support, applied to share the post of one of them. They described themselves as having been 'grilled' by LEA officers, and then told that they would not be permitted to share because (a) it would cost the authority more and (b) it would 'open the floodgates'. The latter reason implies an awareness on the part of the authority of a demand for job-sharing, and the former is particularly interesting in view of the fact that this authority stated in their questionnaire response that they did not expect any increased costs to result from job-sharing!

The question of costs was covered in more depth in the interviews with those authorities already running schemes. At the time of the research, costs could be considered in relation to those of the whole authority. With the advent of Local Management of Schools the actual costs and savings related to the employment of even one pair of sharers in a small school will assume much greater significance. If LEA officers are to advise schools on the likely costs of employing sharers, then they themselves must be well informed. Such issues as whether or not the sharers will opt to join the superannuation scheme, whether they are willing to cover for each other and exchange time in lieu thus saving supply costs, and whether overlap time is to be paid for, may become particularly important. While ideally the recruitment and retention of good teachers should be the prime consideration, the knowledge that allowing two older teachers to share a post could release the job of one of them for a younger and cheaper teacher
is likely to be of interest to governing bodies. Similarly there may be a temptation to appoint a cheap probationer rather than a pair of older career-break returners to an advertised full-time post when the cost has to be met by an individual school's budget rather than being passed on to the LEA.

f) The 75 authorities were asked whether they had informally-agreed sharing arrangements.

   1 did not know
   6 did not reply
   37 said that they did not, although a few were not entirely sure. Two added that any applications to do so would be treated sympathetically
   31 said that they had. Of these 12 gave permission for the sharers to be contacted, 19 did not. Half of these said it would be difficult for the authority to identify who the sharers were. There was some evidence that sharing was loosely defined, often referring to class-sharing only. One sharer contacted was surprised to find that the authority considered her a job-sharer - she thought she was just one of two part-time staff. The maximum number of informally-agreed ('ad hoc') pairs in any one authority was five, most had one or two.

   g) The 37 authorities without 'ad hoc' sharers were asked whether any teachers had asked to share and had been turned down.

   8 did not reply
   22 said 'No'
   2 said they didn't know because the matter would be dealt with at area level
   3 said 'Yes', they had been turned down because job-sharing was against the authority's policy
   2 said 'Yes', but this was because the applicants were not suitable for the post.

   It appears that these authorities have had few requests for job-sharing arrangements. This cannot be interpreted as a lack of interest for the following reasons:

   i) Few teachers are likely to make a request to job-share at County Hall level if they know that there are no other job-shares in existence. Most will enquire at school or area level, and on being told that there is no job-share policy will not make further representations.

   ii) One authority who said that no-one had applied and been turned down is known from informal contributions to have turned down an application backed by a head teacher with the words 'it would open the floodgates'.
iii) Other informal contributors have sought help on how to make requests for job-shares in these authorities, being clearly interested in the possibility but unsure how an approach should be made.

iv) One authority claiming not to have informal sharers has at least one pair clearly sharing a post after negotiation at local level. (Letter of appointment seen by the author.)

Discussion

Throughout the analysis of the replies to the local authority questionnaires it must be remembered that the information and views are generally those of one particular officer. This officer may not be aware of all discussions concerning job-sharing even at committee level, and particularly at area level. His or her point of view will not necessarily represent those of other participants, for example the reasons for not introducing a job-share scheme may be seen differently by LEA officers and by teachers on a negotiating panel. Similarly, while most discussions on job-sharing are said to have taken place between officers, this may in part be because the officer will know about these but will not necessarily know of discussions within other groups. The apparently small number of equal opportunities groups initiating discussions must be viewed in the light of the fact that many LEAs may not have had such groups.

Within those responses are indications of conflict:

i) should policy on the appointment of job-sharers rest with the LEA or individual schools? This particular conflict has to some extent been resolved by the 1988 Education Act which gives governors power over appointments. But since governors may be guided by LEA officers they may not consider job-sharing appointments unless the authority has suitable contracts for such arrangements on offer.

ii) which should take priority - the desire of part-time teachers for permanent contracts or the desire of LEAs and schools for greater staffing flexibility? A full-time applicant for a post is unlikely to be turned down on the ground of lack of flexibility. Is job-sharing thus considered less flexible than appointing a full-time teacher, or is it simply that if part-time staff are to be used then employers want to use variable hours and renewable contracts as an added management convenience?

The replies from the three LEAs who felt there was 'no call' for job-sharing are particularly interesting in view of the fact that the researcher had received letters from teachers in two of them who were anxious to obtain shared posts and who sought advice on how to go about it. Is it true that there was 'no call' or was there a call which was not being heard? Does the authority mean there is no call from teachers wishing to share, or no call from head teachers wishing to make shared appointments?
While the availability of part-time posts with permanent contracts is sometimes seen as making job-sharing unnecessary, there are further questions to be asked. How easily available are such posts? If all advertised posts are full-time, do teachers seeking part-time work feel able to apply? Since references to separate part-time posts seemed to be linked to those about flexibility, are these posts really as secure as shared posts might be? Are opportunities for promotion available to these separate part-timers? These issues need to be addressed before the existence of permanent part-time separate posts is accepted as an alternative to job-sharing. Such issue were evidently not in the mind of the senior education officer who said that a job-sharing scheme was not needed because "we have plenty of part-time supply work which answers the same need". Since supply work is by definition of limited duration with respect to any one school, and usually with respect to continuity of employment anywhere; and since it seldom offers any opportunity of promotion, and for many teachers does not offer job satisfaction, any positive comparison of such work with job-sharing is untenable. A job-share should by definition offer the same security, opportunity of promotion and prospect of job-satisfaction as a full-time post. Such an uninformed and casual remark from a senior education officer is regrettable but hardly surprising.

It is perhaps more surprising to notice that reasons given for not introducing job-share schemes were almost always managerial rather than educational. Only three responses mentioned fears that the quality of education provided for pupils might suffer, for example because there might be a lack of continuity. One of these thought there would need to be a public relations exercise to persuade parents in primary schools to accept shared posts, and two mentioned that head teachers on negotiating committees were cautious about the possible effects on pupils. Perhaps the fact that most respondents were personnel officers is responsible for the emphasis on management of the teaching force, rather than quality of education. However, the fact that several local authorities had job-sharing policies which had been implemented in other areas of employment, but not yet in teaching, could imply doubts about the appropriateness of job-sharing to the pupil-centred work of teachers. Those officers still discussing schemes were more likely to mention the advantages of being able to retain and recruit high quality staff with a wide range of skills, and these factors were seen to improve the quality of education offered as well as to offer solutions to personnel problems from the management point of view. Thus job-sharing could be seen to offer qualitative as well as quantitative flexibility.

3 LEA JOB-SHARING SCHEMES FOR TEACHERS - SOME COMPARISONS DERIVED FROM THE INTERVIEWS

Of the 12 LEA schemes revealed by the general survey 2 were only just being finalised and no sharers had been appointed. Officers from the remaining 10 LEAs were interviewed. Descriptions of those LEAs, including the 5 chosen for closer study, a copy of the interview
schedule, and detailed accounts of the interviews can be found in Appendices 1 and 2. This section summarises and compares the findings using the sequence of topics explored in the interview schedule.

I Origins

II Implementation

i) control

ii) contracts

iii) relationship with other permanent part-time appointments

iv) how appointments are made

v) further development

vi) costs

vii) feedback

viii) opinions

I ORIGINS

The reason for introducing a job-sharing scheme was seldom clear-cut. Often the decision appeared to have been taken when the needs of different groups coincided; for example pressure from individuals or equal-opportunities groups may bear fruit when an authority realises that such a scheme may also help to reduce teacher numbers painlessly or provide a way of recruiting staff who are desperately needed. Similarly the rationalisation of informal sharing agreements may be undertaken because unions have found sharers being treated differently in different areas of the authority, or simply to clarify the contribution of such arrangements to career opportunities for e.g. female staff returning from maternity leave. The chief reasons for introducing schemes appeared to be:

i) altruistic a) to create more employment opportunities in general

b) to enable those with other responsibilities, e.g. caring for children or the elderly, to continue with their careers while working part-time, on permanent contracts and with opportunity for promotion

c) to provide a method of reducing teacher numbers without redundancy by allowing those who would prefer to work part-time to do so voluntarily

d) to make better use of scarce resources, retaining valued and experienced staff who would otherwise leave, and offering jobs to those currently unemployed because they cannot work full-time

ii) managerial e) to rationalise, clarify and extend job-sharing opportunities previously agreed to on an individual informal basis.
The relative importance of these reasons varied depending on the situation of the authority at the time with regard to teacher supply factors, attitudes of elected authority representatives and their professional officers, and the success of pressure groups such as teacher unions or equal opportunities groups.

II IMPLEMENTATION

i) Control

There appeared to be a continuum from very permissive schemes to highly controlled ones. Where an authority had been willing in the past to permit job-shares supported by heads and governors there seemed to be little more than a recognition of the possibilities, publicity about their availability, and a 'tidying-up' of agreements and contracts. While head teachers could be 'persuaded' if thought to be unreasonable in refusing a share, they would not normally be over-ruled. Also they were expected to play a decisive part in the selection of job-sharers and assessment of their compatibility. Patterns of sharing and replacement of a leaving sharer were generally left to schools, though guidelines were provided to protect the security of the remaining sharer. Where such permissive and pragmatic arrangements had developed over a period of time there appeared to be a much more relaxed and accepting attitude on the part of administrators and head teachers. The opposite end of the continuum is seen in schemes which have been introduced as a 'new' initiative. Sometimes it had been customary for part-time staff to be automatically on short-term renewable contracts and there was no tradition of permanent part-time teachers giving service to a particular school over a number of years. Here there seemed greater caution; there was often a pilot scheme with limited numbers, to be reviewed after a year or so. Head teachers might have reduced power over decisions on whether to have sharers in their schools or even in the selection of new partners. Schemes appeared to be more detailed and sometimes more restrictive. Teacher unions were generally supportive, though they sometimes had differing views on the details of schemes, e.g. on how far an existing sharer should be involved in the selection of a new partner.

ii) Contracts

These varied from a standard form of contract used for other permanent part-time staff accompanied by a document setting out the provisions of the job-sharing agreement, to contracts which referred specifically to job-sharing, naming the appropriate proportion to be undertaken, and in a few cases even naming the partner. In the event of one partner leaving, the procedure normally included an assurance of continued employment for the remaining partner, though not necessarily in the same school. Some agreements provided for a review of the post to assess whether the vacant half needed to be filled, followed by an offer of the full-time job to the remaining sharer or advertisement for a new partner. Some problems arose where there was no provision for review of the post mentioned in the agreement, yet this was carried out in particular cases with a decision not to appoint a new partner. The remaining
sharer was not happy at being 'reduced' to an 'ordinary' part-timer in at least one of these cases. It was not always clear whether the existing sharer would be offered the full-time post immediately, or only if a new partner could not be found. In one case this problem was overcome by the suggestion that the existing sharer could apply for the vacant part-share in the same way as other interested teachers. These differences may appear trivial but they are of importance to teachers who give up a full-time post in order to job-share. They will in any case be concerned about what will happen when a partner leaves. Some would be most unhappy to become separate part-time staff as, particularly in primary schools, this could mean that they were no longer able to be class teachers. Those in promoted posts might have to relinquish their responsibilities if reduced to separate status, and those who hoped to share for a few years, returning to full-time on the resignation of a partner, could find their original full-time post was no longer available. Similarly some head teachers were unhappy that a remaining sharer might automatically take over the whole post and sought a way of avoiding this if they felt the appointment undesirable.

Where staff numbers were to be reduced it was usual to restrict sharing to existing full-time staff, then perhaps those with a record of part-time or temporary full-time work. This sometimes limited the available choice of partners to those in the same area, without much opportunity to select for compatibility. Here existing sharers, heads and temporary staff might be unhappy because a potential partner known to be highly compatible through regular supply work at the school could not be considered for the vacant share.

Most areas excluded head teacher shares and deputy head shares, though one of the former was under consideration and two of the latter in operation. Posts with pastoral responsibility were sometimes considered unsuitable, but generally it was necessary to justify the exclusion of any post from job-sharing. Even so, most sharers appeared to be on Scales 1 and 2 (or the main professional grade), though some higher promoted posts such as head of department were reported.

Only two authorities provided paid overlap time in addition to the full-time post, though most thought joint planning and liaison very important. Attendance at non-contact activities and 'professional development' or in-service days was usually considered as pro rata, with no pay available for extra hours. One authority required, and paid for, full attendance at such activities, one was considering a system of extra payments, and another left it to the discretion of heads.

Sharers were generally encouraged, but not required, to cover for each other's absences, as this provided greater continuity for pupils. They were usually free to decide whether to be paid for this or exchange time in lieu.
iii) Job-sharers and permanent part-timers

This proved the most difficult question for the officers to answer. It was necessary first to identify the ways in which full-time and permanent part-time teachers might be treated differently, and then to decide whether job-sharers would be treated in a way comparable to full-time staff or to other part-time staff. It seemed evident that this had not previously been thought through in most cases. In one case the officer concerned thought there was no difference between the treatment of job-sharers and permanent part-time staff, but because a study of relevant documents had been made by the author beforehand, specific questions were asked which did reveal differences. It is likely that in other areas there were differences which were not identified at the interview.

The first problem was to define a job-share. This was normally accepted to be a pair of teachers whose contracts, or documents attached to them, referred to job-sharing. There were problems however in deciding when such a contract might be issued. In some authorities two part-time teachers might occupy what would otherwise be a full-time post, but because they did not share any classes they would not be considered job-sharers, merely 'back-to-back' part-timers. In other instances two part-timers filled a full-time post but arranged their hours to suit timetabling in secondary schools so that their time patterns overlapped. If both partners left simultaneously their joint timetables could not be taken over by one full-time teacher, therefore they were not considered to be job-sharers. Conversely, some authorities were quite happy to consider pairings of this kind as job-shares. The issue is complex, and particularly affects secondary schools. A full-time post may be advertised and a pair of potential sharers interviewed. If they insist on blocks of time they will have to share classes and thus may be categorised as job-sharers; if they are prepared to be sufficiently flexible to work an irregular pattern of hours for the benefit of the pupils so that shared classes are avoided, they will be regarded as paired part-timers. Officers making this distinction were asked what would happen if the teachers insisted on working blocks of time to obtain job-share contracts in the first instance, then rearranged their working hours by agreement with the school. This was obviously something they did not wish to think about! Similarly a full-time post combining two specialisms might be advertised, the potential sharers wanting to divide the specialisms between them, e.g. one teaching the Biology part of the timetable, the other the PE. Here again they might not be considered for job-sharing in spite of the fact that they would together fill a single post. They would be considered in some authorities to be separate part-timers. The answer for intending job-sharers in such circumstances seemed to be that each, if possible, should agree to teach a little of the other's subject to obtain a job-share contract, then revert to single subject teaching with the head teacher's consent at a later date. A further confusion could result from two part-time teachers who shared neither subjects nor classes, but nevertheless wished to share responsibility for some other aspect of school life, e.g. careers or exam administration, in order to obtain promoted status. Would they have to change from
paired part-time status to job-sharing in order to do so? Where there are no differences between the treatment of job-sharers and other permanent part-timers, paired or not, these distinctions may matter little. When, however, there are different ways of treating the two categories e.g. with regard to redeployment agreements, opportunity of promotion and variability of hours, then teachers may need to be very cautious about the form of contract they accept. The 'purist' view is that both partners must be capable of all aspects of work involved in the post, that their joint timetable should be capable of being filled by one person, and that there must be a strong aspect of sharing classes, subjects and responsibilities.

The fact that sharers may be able to offer wider and complementary skills rather than the same ones, and can be in two places at once, is seen by some as an advantage to be seized. Indeed, the 'practical' view is that there is little sense in rejecting the flexibilities which may be available merely because of a theoretical stance.

iv) Organisation

The chief differences here centred on whether applicants had to be existing employees. If so, the area officers had the job of matching applicants and arranging the transfer of at least one unless they were both in the same school. Otherwise requests to share from existing employees were handled between schools and area officers in the normal way, advertisements for part-shares being made as necessary. There were relatively few reports of paired applications for advertised full-time posts, though one authority with a long-running scheme found that these were almost always successful. It was not known how many of these pairs consisted of teachers already known to the school e.g. having taught there before on a permanent or supply basis, and how many of these pairs succeeded against competition from full-time applicants. In this authority a number of sharers had found partners from the register, but in most others the register was virtually non-operational as far as teachers not currently employed were concerned. Several officers felt it should be better used and publicised, others considered that officers did not have time to act as 'dating agencies' or even that such registers might be counter to equal opportunities ideals. Some registers were available for consultation by professional staff only, where a school might be seeking a potential partner for an existing staff member; others were open to inspection by any teachers interested in seeking partners for themselves. Several officers said that most partnerships were formed 'by the grapevine', often from teachers who had worked together before, who were already known to schools, and particularly by maternity-leave returners sharing with their relief teachers. While there were some reservations that this system might exclude some teachers, and mean that opportunities to job-share were often a matter of being in the right place at the right time, many officers considered that the shares were more likely to be successful if arranged between teachers who already knew each other and were in a position to assess compatibility. Some authorities allowed schools to arrange shares between teachers they knew and considered to
be compatible, others insisted that all part-posts must be advertised, even if the selection of the partner was almost a foregone conclusion. There also appeared to be an element of exchange of information between head teachers with good staff who wanted to share and who could be put in touch with each other. Existing sharers generally had no right to take part in the selection of a new partner, but documents of guidance usually suggested that it would be wise for them to meet informally before interview to assess likely compatibility, and that the interviewing panel would be expected to take any comments into account. The authority which made a provisional appointment first, then expected the potential sharers to meet and assess compatibility before the appointment was confirmed, was an interesting exception.

A further difference was the 'profile' given to sharing. This varied from a 'permissive' stance to a 'promoting' one. In some cases the authority merely made it known that it would consider applications for job-sharing arrangements sympathetically and supplied documents outlining the scheme. In others there was a high profile publicity campaign, all advertisements mentioned the option of job-sharing, and area officers were requested to identify posts which were considered especially suitable. Surprisingly, only one had ever held a meeting of existing sharers and others interested in sharing to discuss the operation of the scheme. One authority made use of an enthusiastic head teacher with positive experience of a job-share to speak to groups of head teachers throughout the authority, describing benefits and allaying fears.

v) Development

Comparison is not easy since the schemes had been in operation for varying lengths of time. Some differences were not easily explained. Why did some authorities have a large number of applicants immediately, while others had very few? The figures must be compared taking into account the number of teachers in the authority as a whole, but differences did not seem to be accounted for by such matters as the number of unemployed teachers seeking posts in the area, for example. In some areas there were very few secondary shares, in others more secondary ones than primary ones. There may be some connection with the fact that while rolls overall were generally falling, those in secondary schools were generally falling faster, and this may have affected some authorities more than others. While some officers considered that job-shares were easier to organise in the secondary sector, others were at a loss to explain why they had so few in comparison with primary shares. All authorities had a predominance of female sharers and most were in unpromoted posts. Generally the authorities wanted to encourage job-sharing in promoted posts but they acknowledged that schools were more cautious about this. Additionally, staff who wanted to work part-time because of other responsibilities might not want the extra work of a promoted post for the same reason.

Only one of the longer-running schemes had received detailed scrutiny. Most were to be reviewed after one or two years, but how this would be done was not at all clear. Officers suggested that they would discuss it among themselves and with teacher unions but it seemed
likely that there would be little collection of relevant statistics or discussions with the sharers themselves or those on registers. Several admitted that it was not easy to identify sharers without going through files by hand, because they were recorded only as part-timers on the computer.

vi) Costs

As most of the officers interviewed were in personnel departments their knowledge of financial implications was generally admitted to be superficial. Administrative time involved in the setting-up of shares was seen to be of more importance than any administrative costs. The only major extra cost was likely to result from paid overlap-time or extra in-service training to give both partners as much as full-time staff. Minor savings might be made on superannuation or supply costs, but officers were unanimous in considering that the advantages of more efficient use of available staff, both quantitatively and qualitatively, outweighed financial considerations.

vii) Feedback

Several officers said that they were likely to know of problems only when they were serious; any other problems were dealt with at area level and successful shares did not in general make news. A few area officers were said to dislike job-shares because they were 'another category of employment' to be dealt with. Some head teachers and governors were said to be cautious about new ideas and needed to be persuaded of the possible benefits, though others were very positive. One example mentioned was of a head teacher who encouraged job-sharing in his school because his son had gained so much from being in a shared class at another school. Other heads were said to be glad to keep good staff, and inspectors were keen to recruit shortage-subject teachers by the offer of shared posts. No responses from parents were known.

viii) Opinions

Most officers considered that job-sharing could feature as an element in the management of teacher supply by permitting voluntary sharing to reduce numbers or offering shared posts to recruit extra staff. None thought these to be the most important reasons for having a job-share scheme although they might accelerate the introduction of one. Qualitative flexibility was considered more important, relating to the satisfactory deployment of good teachers so that their expertise was not lost to schools at times when they were unable to work full-time. This was of value to the education service as well as to the teachers themselves. It was acknowledged that women taking a career break could find it difficult to return, and that while supply-teaching suited some, it was unsatisfying for others. The opportunity of continuing to work on a part-time basis while raising a family, or undertaking further study, for instance, was seen as a valuable option, and the need of some staff nearing retirement to reduce their
commitment was generally regarded sympathetically. None of the officers mentioned any disadvantages which might affect pupils. They generally felt these could be overcome with good planning and personal commitment on the part of teachers.

The officers interviewed were very willing to discuss their schemes, often offering information and documents not asked for, or providing details of useful contacts. Several were interested in finding out how other authorities dealt with particular issues and three actually wrote to job-sharers and their head teachers encouraging them to take part in the research. Their co-operation has been much appreciated.

**SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS**

There appeared to be three chief reasons for setting up job-share schemes:

i) to assist with recruitment and retention problems or with the need to cut staffing while minimising redundancy, i.e. quantitative flexibility

ii) as part of a programme of equal opportunities initiatives

iii) as a 'tidying-up' process where the LEA had previously responded positively to individual requests for job-shares on an informal basis.

Those LEAs without schemes commonly revealed some evidence of interest in the idea, but often other issues were more pressing and job-sharing had received little serious attention.

Schemes which had been formally agreed were similar in most respects. However, there were clear differences between the majority of the schemes and those in the two areas where staff cuts were being made and job-sharing was aimed chiefly at existing full-time teachers. There were some differences of detail within the schemes, and lack of guidance on some issues meant that the newly-appointed sharers and their head teachers were sometimes unsure of how the job-share should operate. Local officers sometimes applied their own interpretations in different areas of an LEA, causing confusion, and few authorities had any one person to whom reference could be made.

A few authorities had sought information from one LEA which had permitted job-sharing for several years (Area 5 in this research) but otherwise there appeared to be very little exchange of information, and new schemes were set up without the opportunity to learn from the errors of others.

Several LEAs monitored, or intended to monitor, the take-up of their schemes after a year or two, but there was seldom any in-depth study of the impact of job-sharing on the schools themselves and little organised opportunity for schools and their sharers to discuss their experience and develop successful practice. Feedback to officers was seen to be
unrepresentative because they were told when difficulties arose but seldom heard anything about the shares which operated successfully.

Some LEA officers exhibited a lack of awareness of the costs and savings involved, but most considered the overall effect to be minimal. With the advent of Local Management it has become more important that school governors are advised correctly, since costs and savings are more significant within the small budget of an individual school than the larger one of an LEA.

In general LEAs, schools and individual teachers could benefit greatly from better access to information about job-sharing in the teaching profession and the minimal sharing of information between LEAs has hindered the introduction of schemes and the development of good practice.
CHAPTER 11

SENIOR MANAGEMENT IN SCHOOLS

Questionnaires (see Appendix 1) were sent to Principals, Headteachers and secondary heads of department (HODs) in the five close-study areas and seven others in which there were some informally agreed job-shares (the 'ad-hoc' group). The purpose was to explore the attitudes of senior management to job-shares in their schools, whether attitudes had changed with experience, what advantages and disadvantages had been encountered, and how other staff, parents and pupils had responded.

For a variety of reasons (see Appendix 1) it was not possible to calculate an exact response rate in every area. The overall response rate is likely to have been between 70 and 75%, details being shown in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Type</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>% Return</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Scheme</td>
<td>Area 1</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Area 2</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Area 3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;</td>
<td>Area 4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-running scheme</td>
<td>Area 5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>55-63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ad-hoc' group</td>
<td>A/H</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80-90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

The questionnaires were returned anonymously as it was felt that heads would be more open if they knew that their comments could not be paired with those of their job-sharers by identifying the school concerned. This meant that it was not possible to send follow-up requests to those who did not respond. Even so, a surprising number of heads took the trouble to identify themselves and offer further help if needed. Two heads telephoned offering to give their opinions verbally instead of completing the questionnaire, and several added extra pages of information beyond that asked for. It was noticeable that the earliest returns tended to contain the views of those who were unhappy with their job-sharing arrangements, taking the opportunity to 'let off steam'. One admitted that he/she had not felt able to do this before because other heads in the area seemed much more positive about their sharers.

The responses were grouped by LEA and then into sub-groups depending on the age of the pupils taught by their sharers. Two responses could not be classified in this way as they taught across the primary/secondary age-range, and middle-schools were classified as primary
or secondary depending on whether the sharers taught general subjects to younger pupils or specialist subjects to older pupils or to several different year groups. The numbers in the four sectors are shown in Table 2.

### Age groupings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Sec</th>
<th>HOD</th>
<th>P/J</th>
<th>N/I</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Secondary (11+) Head HOD
Primary (Junior) (7-11)
Infant/Nursery below 7

Total Secondary responses
\((SH + HOD) = 70\)

Total Primary responses
\((P/J + N/I) = 97\)

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A/H</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reasons for grouping in this way are:
- There may be differences in the success of job-sharing and its appropriateness at different stages of education
- The problems encountered may be different in kind.

For some purposes in the analysis totals may vary. For example, the two unclassifiable shares may be entered in totals but not in sector sub-totals. In some cases the HOD responses are omitted as they will normally duplicate factual information given by heads in the same secondary schools. Some heads pointed out that their school had more than one pair of sharers. Where two different sets of responses were given these were included separately, so that the total number of replies could be greater than the total number of questionnaires returned.

### RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

**LENGTH OF TIME FOR WHICH THE SHARES HAD BEEN IN OPERATION**

Since Areas 1 to 4 were by definition those with new schemes, the shares had been in operation for between a few months and a year, though a few pointed out that a partnership had existed informally for a year or more prior to the official job-share scheme. Even so, some had already had changes of personnel. 14% of shares had been interrupted by maternity leave. In 4% one sharer had left teaching or moved from the area. In 7% one sharer had returned to full time work, either in another school or when a partner left. 1 sharer had died.

In the long-running scheme (Area 5) the range was as expected much greater. Omitting the HOD responses:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of share</th>
<th>Number of shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>up to 1 year</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. 2 years</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 years</td>
<td>1 (see note)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The scheme had been in operation for seven years, but the longest partnership had existed for 15 years on an informal basis before the scheme began.

Ten of the heads reported that the partnerships had changed during this period, some more than once:

3 for maternity reasons
4 because one partner had retired
7 because one partner had returned to full-time work
1 because a partner had taken on a different role in the school.

On only two of the above fifteen occasions was there any difficulty in finding a replacement.

The 'ad hoc' group also showed a range of time-length:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length of share</th>
<th>Number of shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 1 year</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. 2 years</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 years</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the fifteen partnerships, seven had at some time changed personnel:

3 for maternity reasons
1 to take a full-time post
3 because they were leaving the area.

In three cases there were problems in finding a replacement, two because it was difficult to find anyone suitably qualified, and one because the remaining partner felt unhappy about adapting to a new relationship and chose to become a supply teacher instead. It is worthy of note that, in a geographically desirable area which has reasonable house prices, it may be easier to attract a full-time teacher of a 'shortage' subject from elsewhere in the country than to
find someone locally with sufficient expertise who is willing to work part-time. The need to find a half-post limits the opportunity to recruit from a wider field of applicants. Conversely other heads in less desirable or more expensive areas commented that it was very difficult to recruit from outside the area and that those already living there, for example the wives of men employed in the area, were their chief source of recruitment, and these were often interested only in part-time work. Here a part-share could be easier to fill than a full-time post.

**REACTION OF OTHER STAFF TO THE JOB-SHARING ARRANGEMENT**

18% of the respondents did not answer this question

48% said staff approved and were supportive

27% said staff were neutral or accepted the situation

4% said that staff were mainly against or 'cool' (though these include some who said staff were negative at first but were 'won over' on seeing the job-share in practice)

3% said that staff reactions varied widely.

Over a third of those reporting a 'neutral' stance said that staff had taken a pragmatic view, reserving judgement to see how the system would work out. Several heads reported that staff had originally reacted with caution, but were now very satisfied and happy with the outcome. Only one mentioned the reverse, in a case where sharers were considered to lack commitment to each other and to the school. Others said that staff were envious (until they saw the sharers' pay slips!) and had begun to wonder whether they might at some time wish to share themselves. Discontent was shown by irritation when a sharer was needed for information but not at school when wanted, and in one school staff resented the fact that a sharer would automatically be offered the full-time post if a partner left. One suffering head added that maternity leave is always inconvenient for a school, but two people taking it in the same job at slightly different times, needing two supply teachers, sometimes working together and sometimes with one or the other of the sharers, had been perhaps more than their colleagues (or indeed pupils) could cope with. There was general agreement that staff reaction depended more on the quality of the partnership than the fact of there being a shared job per se. Where teachers were known to the school and valued for their professional skills and compatibility, a job-share would usually be viewed very positively. If the teachers were weak or lacked compatibility and commitment, it was likely that staff might criticise the job-sharing arrangement rather than the partners involved.

The overall statistics do, however, conceal differences between areas.
For example for those responding to this question from each area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Description</th>
<th>For</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Against</th>
<th>Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Areas 1, 3 and 4 (New schemes)</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2 (New scheme)</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 5 (long-running scheme)</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is interesting to note that in the area with the long-running scheme a third of the 86% of positive responses included qualifications such as 'very' positive or 'strongly' in favour.

Area 2 is clearly different. Not only does it contain almost all of the cases where staff were said to be on the whole negative about job-sharing, (the few examples of negative initial reactions in other areas were almost all said to have become positive after experience of job-sharing in action), it also had by far the lowest percentage of positive responses and an indication that other staffrooms were divided. Possible reasons for this will be discussed in Part III.

The ad-hoc group contains fewer positive and more neutral responses than Areas 1, 3 and 4, though the numbers are too small to be considered significant. It is possible that in areas where there are formal schemes opinions become polarised as teachers discuss the advantages and disadvantages of such arrangements, while in areas where a job-share is permitted informally to meet a local need the situation is simply accepted without strong feelings either way.

**MANAGEMENT PERCEPTION OF THE INCREASE IN ADMINISTRATION**

Heads and HODs were asked whether the existence of a job-share in their school (or department) had caused an increase in administration which was 'negligible', 'moderate', or 'considerable'. They were asked to ignore the time taken to set up the job-share (some asked why, since it had been time-consuming) because the intention was to explore the effect of having a job-share on the everyday running of the school. Eleven respondents felt it too early to express an opinion and one gave different replies for two pairs of sharers. Differences were most noticeable between sectors.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Negligible</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Secondary heads</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary HODs</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary (Junior)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nursery/Infant</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall percentages</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results show that most heads felt that increase in administration had been negligible, with a smaller proportion moderate and a few considerable. Causes of a considerable increase included replacement of leaving partners and finding cover for maternity leave. In primary schools reasons for increased administration included oversight of the sharers to ensure that joint planning was sufficient to provide continuity, especially with newly-appointed pairs, and the need to ensure that staff were given information they had missed at times they were not employed. Some secondary heads complained of extra problems with timetabling, but a comparable number reported greater timetabling flexibility.

The greatest increase in administration was reported by the secondary HODs. They felt it most inconvenient and irritating that all their departmental staff were not at meetings, and that individuals were missing just at the time they were needed. Efforts were made to arrange for sharers to teach different groups and thus information on particular pupils was not usually available from the other partner. While in a primary school one or other of the teachers of a class would always be present, in a secondary school the only teacher of that particular subject to a class might be missing. Most problems were in themselves trivial: a need to obtain a particular exam paper for a pupil who had been absent; a need to obtain a comment on a pupil's progress because a parent would be visiting the school on the following day; a need to fix a date for a GCSE internal moderation meeting. A great deal of information is exchanged casually in breaks and lunch hours and the interactions involve many more staff, both departmental and pastoral, than in the average primary school. One HOD said that the problem was minimised by the fact that each sharer was present on some part of four days each week. "A 2½ day block pattern would present greater difficulties. If I needed some information on Wednesday afternoon, I would have to wait until Monday or 'phone up." Many frustrations were due simply to the fact that a minor piece of information had not reached a sharer, who then failed to act in an agreed way and caused confusion in the department. A more organised system of exchanging information had to be found. Some HODs obviously resented this, but others felt that the increase in administration was well worth it in order to recruit or retain specialist teachers in their departments.

Once again the overall statistics obscure differences between areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Negligible</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Considerable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary Heads</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2 (n=20)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other areas (n=17)</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Secondary HODs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2 (n=15)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other areas (n=13)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary (Junior)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area 2 (n=27)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All other areas (n=26)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The table shows that Area 2 heads in the primary sector, and particularly Area 2 HODs in the secondary sector, feel a much heavier administrative burden. The figures need to be treated with caution since numbers are small and can be influenced by a few atypical cases. For example, the relatively high 'considerable' score for secondary heads in other areas includes a case where one sharer suffered from serious illness, causing frequent absences until her subsequent death, and another in which both sharers took maternity leave.

**PARENTAL REACTION TO JOB-SHARES**

The differences reported were largely between sectors.

**Secondary heads**

- 63% did not reply
- 20% said there had been no comments from parents, several reporting that their sharers taught different classes and parents were unaware that a job-share existed
- 13% said that parents were positive because they knew the school had been able to obtain the services of highly qualified teachers of specialist subjects.

One head said that where pupils were taught by both teachers parents felt confused by which one of them was the 'senior'

**Secondary HODs**

- 50% did not reply
- 40% said no comments had been received.

None, surprisingly, mentioned parental awareness of the availability of specialist skills.

**Primary heads**

Here parents were more affected because, except in the case of ‘special needs’ teachers who taught different groups withdrawn from classes, the children had two teachers instead of one.

- 19% did not reply
- 12% said no comment had been received
- 11% said parents accepted the arrangement
- 4% said parental views varied
- 30% reported that parents were very positive
- 25% said that parents had at first been cautious, or even worried about their children being taught by a partnership, but with experience had been ‘won over’. One said "Now they
can see the benefits". Others that parents had become 'doubly satisfied' or even 'enthusiastic'.

Other comments included "They are quite happy. We have had job-sharing here for a long time. They know it works", and "My son is lucky, he has two good teachers."

The only negative reactions were from parents whose children tried to 'play off' one teacher against the other - and who tried to do so themselves - and one head commented that twenty out of twenty-two sets of parents were very happy, "the others have children who are not achieving well and want something or someone to blame for the fact".

Infant/Nursery heads

16% did not reply

9% said no comment had been made. In most nursery schools sharers taught different pupils in morning and afternoon sessions and parents were not affected.

9% said parents accepted the situation (one 'reluctantly')

7% said reactions were mixed

21% that reactions were positive throughout

26% that parents were now positive after initial worries

12% reported some dissatisfaction. Apart from one secondary head and one head of department, this was the only group to do so.

Some parents felt that their young children needed a constant 'mother' figure and doubted whether teachers who were there for only part of the week would have the same commitment. "Mothers feel they need to hand over their children to a replacement for themselves and feel it difficult to identify with two people." Yet in the 47% of schools which reported positive responses this attitude had generally been soon overcome.

Several of the Junior and Nursery/Infant Heads whose parents were positive stressed the need for good communication with parents. Usually parents of the class to be taught had been invited to meet both teachers before the year started, or as early as possible. The head had explained how the system would work, what the advantages might be, and how parents could share their concerns with either or both teachers whenever necessary. The sharers were able to explain the strengths they had to offer and the way in which they would co-operate for the benefit of the pupils. Heads felt this helped parents to understand the arrangement and appreciate the possible benefits, rather than feeling that their children were having to accept something that was 'second best'.
**PUPIL REACTION**

Heads and HODs were asked how pupils reacted to the job-share.

37% did not reply

9% said pupils had made no comments, particularly in nursery classes and some secondary schools where the sharers taught different groups.

19% reported very positive pupil response. They 'see the advantages', 'like the variety', 'look forwards to the change', 'appreciate more specialist skills'. One pupil said "having 'only one teacher is boring", and another, "having two teachers is great, they've got lots of different ideas."

13% said that pupils were 'happy', 'contented', had 'settled', or that there were no problems.

10% considered that pupils had adapted to or accepted the situation, though one head referred to 'long-suffering' acceptance.

4% said that pupils preferred one sharer to the other.

4% were said to be confused by which one was 'the boss', and by differing expectations of work standards and behaviour.

There were a few references to pupils trying to take advantage of the situation by 'playing-off' the sharers against each other. References to particular pupils feeling insecure or difficult pupils needing greater consistency were balanced by comments that pupils who found it hard to get along with one teacher could make better contact with the other, and that difficult pupils responded to a 'team' approach.

The overall results analysed above are heavily biased towards the primary sector. Only 16 of the 70 secondary heads and HODs replied:-

5 said pupils were aware that they had access to a wider range of expertise and enjoyed the variety of ideas and approach, particularly where 'A' level work was involved.

2 said pupils accepted the situation.

2 that pupils attempted to 'play-off' their teachers.

2 said pupils found it inconvenient that their subject teacher was not always there for consultation between lessons, particularly where work had been missed or exam coursework was involved.

5 (all in area 2) described pupils as being confused, putting up with the situation, or feeling disadvantaged.
IN-SERVICE TRAINING

Teachers are required to take part in five training days per year. Part-time staff have pro-rata contracts, which may mean that a half-time sharer will attend only two-and-a-half days, thus missing valuable training time with their colleagues. Heads were asked whether their sharers attended pro-rata or more, and in the latter case whether they were paid for extra days. This question was not asked in Scotland, and HODs' replies are omitted to prevent duplication. Some heads gave different answers for different pairs. The results are shown in the following table:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pro rata</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more voluntarily</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one of each</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more paid</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The remaining responses included no reply or a statement that the job-share, or new form of contract, had not been in existence long enough to find out. Three heads said that sharers had been given time off in lieu, in secondary schools after exam candidates had left, or in primary by the head or a 'floating' teacher taking over the class for a day.

Four of the pairs who had received some payment came from one area. The heads commented that this had happened because no-one seemed to know what should be done, since the new national conditions of service were unclear, but they believed that payment was soon to be stopped.

The confusion was illustrated by one HOD (not included in the data above) who was not sure how much his sharers had attended, or even how much they were supposed to attend. The general issue of in-service training for job-sharers will be discussed later in Part III, Chapter 15.

PROMOTED STATUS

The heads were asked whether their sharers held promoted posts. (HODs were excluded to prevent duplication). This question was difficult for some to answer, and the responses were difficult to analyse. Teachers previously on Scale 2 under the old regulations in England and Wales, and thus promoted, had been transferred to the top of the main professional grade and thus appeared to be unpromoted while not having been demoted. In some cases one sharer had a 'protected' status transferred from previous full-time service. These two categories were treated as promoted where the situation was made clear by heads. A further problem arose because the lower levels of incentive allowance under the new regulations were released over a period of time. It was clear that some pairs had special responsibilities likely
COMPARISON

Headteacher and HOD attitudes before and after experience of job-shares in action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Level</th>
<th>Before Experience</th>
<th>After Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td>very positive</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td>fairly positive</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td>neutral</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>fairly negative</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td>very negative</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
to merit 'A' allowances but had not yet received them. The data in this section must therefore be treated with caution.

None of the heads in Area 2 reported promoted sharers, though there were a very few in existence according to the authority.

In Area 5, the long-running scheme, about a quarter of the shares were in promoted posts.

In Areas 1, 3 and 4 together the fraction was also about a quarter.

Details of the posts were not requested but examples given included two head-of-department pairs and two pairs in charge of nursery units. A general discussion on promotion and job-sharing will be presented later in Chapter 15.

HEADS AND HODS ATTITUDES TO JOB-SHARING

They were asked to rate their attitudes to job-sharing before they had experience of it in practice, and their current attitude. The assessments were on a 5-point scale

- a very positive
- b fairly positive
- c neutral
- d fairly negative
- e very negative

For detailed results see Appendix 3 (sheets 1-7).

Figure 1 (opposite) shows that after experience of job-sharing the proportion of positive attitudes improves, largely at the expense of neutral ones. Grouping provides the following comparison:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>before</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A closer examination is necessary to investigate underlying differences. In particular Area 2 is a large sub-sample and contains a relatively high proportion of secondary responses. It is necessary to compare Area 2 with other areas, and the secondary sector (heads + HODs) with primary (P/J + N/I) to trace whether the source of differences lies in area, sector or both. Matrices showing detailed results and comparisons are given in Appendix 3. These show that:

i) attitudes throughout are more negative in Area 2

ii) attitudes improve considerably in the primary sector but show a very slight deterioration in the secondary sector.
REASONS FOR CHANGE IN ATTITUDE

Heads and HODs were asked to indicate the reasons for any change in attitude. Some made general statements such as "it is working well", "I have found many benefits" or "it is a fine idea in principle but difficult in practice". Most were more specific, often giving more than one reason. The reasons can be classified as follows:

i) The quality of the sharers

43% of the 169 responses mentioned this as the chief factor.

Positive: they were described as flexible, hardworking and committed, and showing enthusiasm, energy and freshness. 7 said that the contribution of the two sharers together was greater than one could expect from a single teacher. One was pleased by the way a weaker teacher had learned from a stronger partner, providing an effective form of in-service training.

Negative: 6 complained that their sharers were uncommitted or incompatible, and 3 that the sharers were 'clock-watchers'.

ii) Administration

Positive: 4 said that the extra administration load had proved much less than they had feared. 2 added that the willingness of sharers to cover for each other and occasionally other members of staff had 'eased a constant headache'.

Negative: 12 respondents (8 in the secondary sector) considered that their administrative load had been increased. This view was particularly strong among secondary HODs.

iii) Class sharing and timetabling

This problem was particularly relevant to secondary school heads and to HODs.

Positive: 5 were glad that their sharers were flexible and willing to work a scattered pattern of half-days to suit the timetable. By this means the sharing of classes was minimised or even avoided altogether, and overlapping sessions meant greater timetabling flexibility since two people could be in two places at once.

Negative: 7 stated that the sharing of classes who had only two or three lessons each week in that subject was undesirable, yet avoidance of class-sharing meant restrictions on timetabling. This was particularly a problem where a 'block' pattern of hours was being operated, e.g. 2½ days consecutively by each partner. It was not always clear whether such a pattern was being used at the request of the sharers, but there were some hints that LEAs expected some form of 'block' pattern.

iv) Communication

Positive: 10 of the respondents had feared communication problems which had not occurred in practice or had been easily overcome.
Negative: 13 replies mentioned problems relating to communication between the sharers themselves or between sharers and their departments or other colleagues. 4 felt there should be paid over-lap time, and 4 complained of problems with organising staff and departmental meetings at which both could be present. Some missed in-service training and 'planned activity time' (Scotland).

v) Teamwork

Positive: 12 mentioned the advantages of joint planning. This was particularly strong in the primary sector where a class could gain from the particular strengths and interests of two teachers, and several mentioned that because planning was obviously necessary it was much more thoroughly done than would often be the case with a teacher working alone.

vi) Limitations resulting from the job-share scheme

Negative: 5 heads (4 from Area 2) criticised the time taken to pair potential sharers. There was sometimes a period of uncertainty or a need for a temporary supply teacher while awaiting a permanent partner for a full-time teacher reducing to job-share. 2 heads (one with three pairs of sharers already) feared that a school might find itself with more shared posts than it could cope with. 2 had found their choice restricted when one sharer left. In one case the head would have preferred non-replacement and in the other the availability of potential sharers had been very limited.

vii) Parents

Negative: 2 primary heads had been concerned about parental reaction. In one case the share had not been a success and the parents' fears had proved to be justified. In the other much time and effort had been given to calming parental worries and after a time these had been replaced by positive enthusiasm. This head felt that any school which had not had job-sharing teachers before would need to prepare parents carefully and explain the potential advantages of the system.

viii) Other reasons given for change of attitude

Negative: a) sharing of equipment causes problems in a practical subject

b) poor health of one sharer meant that pupils were in practice taught by three teachers, the sharers and a supply teacher

c) there was a lack of coherence in a department consisting of only one full-time teacher and two job-sharers

d) there is less job-satisfaction for teachers if they have to share a class.

Positive a) in a small school it is a great advantage to have an extra teacher to share responsibilities, contribute extra skills, and for pupils to relate to

b) it has enabled my wife to have a permanent part-time contract (!)
Several heads distinguished between their general attitude to job-sharing and their attitude to the job-share currently in their school. "I still believe it can work, and work well, but our current experience is very unfortunate." "I would not be keen to appoint two unknown teachers on a shared basis, but the sharers we have were well-known to the school. I was sure they could make a success of it, and they have."

**ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF JOB-SHARING**

They were asked to say what they felt the advantages and disadvantages were for teachers, schools and the education service as a whole. Many replies repeated points made in the previous section, but here those who had not changed their attitudes were included and a more wide-ranging expression of opinion sought.

Only 19 of the 169 did not complete this section, and many wrote quite lengthy answers. These were classified, the number of responses appearing in brackets.

**Advantages**

(56) A wider range of skills, ideas and interests may be available from a partnership. They can contribute their own strengths and minimise each other's weaknesses.

(22) The teachers are less tired and offer freshness, energy and enthusiasm. Just as one teacher begins to tire, the other arrives to take over. Their classes seem to get through more work - "the teachers are not so exhausted, I'm not so sure about the pupils though!" Several mentioned a wider range of extra-curricular activities being offered.

(19) Schools are able to retain highly-valued staff and recruit those whose skills are in short supply. One secondary school had a chemist and a biologist sharing a science post and another a French specialist and a German specialist sharing a language post. Both commented that the school had gained from having two specialisms in one post. One pair had special skills and experience in teaching the deaf and blind which were not easily obtainable.

(15) Particularly in small schools there is value in having an extra member of staff to share responsibilities, offer a wider range of skills and provide extra adult contact for pupils.

(15) Joint planning and the sharing of ideas can aid the professional development of teachers as well as providing a richer education for pupils.

(15) Job-sharing enables teachers to continue their careers when they are unable to work full-time, makes it easier for them to return to full-time posts later, and helps older teachers to
continue teaching with enthusiasm instead of feeling overtired and stressed. As sharers they have permanent posts and can be part of the continuing school community.

6) A school can gain from cover for absence which some sharers are able to provide. As members of the regular staff they are more useful than casual supply teachers.

2) Job-sharers may have employment or voluntary activities outside school life, giving them a balanced point of view and wider experience of life which is valuable to older pupils in particular.

2) There is increased timetabling flexibility if overlapping patterns are used. Two sharers can be in two places at once.

1) It is good for top juniors. They get used to having more than one teacher before moving on to secondary school.

1) A particularly difficult pupil can wear down a full-time teacher. Job-sharers have to cope for only half as much time and can share the burden and responsibility and stress, providing mutual support.

1) Job-share schemes allow teachers to reduce hours in permanent posts if they want to, thus saving other teachers from redundancy or redeployment.

One of the most satisfied heads was also one of the most brief. "I call our sharers the dynamic duo. In our case $0.5 + 0.5 = 1.5$ at least."

Disadvantages

30) Often both sharers are needed at staff and departmental meetings, in-service days, planned activity time, internal exam moderation, and so on. Their commitment pro rata is very inconvenient unless they are willing to work longer hours on a voluntary basis.

20) The need for joint planning and liaison means that a shared job requires more total time than a full-time one. From the sharers' point of view they need to work more than the pro rata number of hours but only receive pro rata salary. Telephone bills may be higher too. If the job is done thoroughly the sharers suffer, but if they don't put in the extra time the pupils will suffer. Many of the heads believed there should be paid overlap time so that the school was not at the mercy of the sharers' goodwill.

20) Heads commented on the risk that a pair of sharers will prove incompatible, have differing expectations and teaching styles, or that one 'strong' teacher might have to carry a 'weaker' one. There might simply be a clash of personalities. This was a frequent fear in Area 2 where heads appeared to have less say in the choice of partnerships and thus a concern that unsuitable pairings might be arranged by administrators.
The problems of arranging timetables to avoid shared secondary classes was discussed. These were more pronounced where sharers worked in large blocks of time, and particularly in Area 2 where more flexible patterns appeared rare. One head in Area 1 said that he had introduced an overlapping pattern with the agreement of his sharers to overcome this problem "but I am keeping quiet about it because I don't know whether we should really be doing this". (In fact it was perfectly acceptable to the authority.)

Administration:

(8) General increase in administration, particularly for HODs

(7) There may be difficulties in finding a replacement if one leaves

(2) Maternity leave is more disruptive in a job-share than in a full-time post.

(17) There are problems of communication within a department or the school as a whole when one (or even both) sharers may be missing at a given time.

(11) Continuity for pupils may be a problem, especially where there is an integrated curriculum in a primary school.

(8) Sharing may not be suitable for younger children who need to relate to one adult. The majority of comments here came from those whose sharers taught juniors or secondary pupils rather than those with experience of infant class sharing.

(4) Parents don't like their children being shared.

(3) Sharers offer less time for extra-curricular activities.

(2) It is harder to have consistent discipline, pupils try to 'play-off' the teachers.

(2) Sharers cannot play a full part in pastoral care.

(1) Separate part-timers are easier to manage in the timetable, and you can get rid of one without the other if necessary.

One head felt it depended on whose point of view took priority. If teachers' needs came first you would have job-shares. If pupils' were more important you wouldn't.

There was general agreement on the qualities necessary for a job-share to work well, and on the possible advantages and disadvantages, but there were differences as well:

* A few thought advantages were all for the sharers and none for the school. Others thought there were no disadvantages which were not dwarfed by the available benefits to the school.

* In secondary schools there was disagreement over whether timetables were restricted or made more flexible.

* In primary schools a 'two heads' approach to the curriculum or to the needs of individual pupils could be seen as better than one or considerably worse.
• Plays, concerts, outings and extra-curricular activities gained from the input of two teachers in some schools but not in others. Possibly this depends more on the willingness of individual teachers to take part, and their home responsibilities, than on the job-sharing situation itself.

• Heads with older children thought job-sharing unsuitable with younger ones, but those with nursery and infant shares were often very positive.

**SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF THE HEADS AND HODS SURVEY**

• There is broad agreement on the advantages and disadvantages which may be available from job-sharing arrangements. Which category outweighs the other depends to some extent on the particular post, but to a large extent on the quality, commitment and compatibility of sharers.

• Attitudes to job-sharing in Area 2 are less positive than those in other areas. After experience of job-shares, attitudes tend to be slightly more negative in the secondary sector but much more positive in the primary sector overall.

• There is no evidence of a different pattern of views in Area 5, the long-running scheme, when compared with other areas which have new schemes, except for Area 2. The number of secondary shares in Area 5 is surprisingly small, though no reason for this has been found.

• The relative lack of support in the secondary sector appears to be associated with class-sharing and timetabling problems, increased administration by HODs, and communication difficulties. The range of day-to-day communication in secondary schools tends to be wider, including members of the subject department and those with pastoral responsibilities such as Head of House or Year. There seemed few opportunities for secondary schools which had overcome such problems to disseminate good practice to those which had not. In secondary schools the ability to recruit and retain experienced and highly qualified staff in particular subject areas was the main attraction of job-sharing.

• In primary schools class-sharing is less of a problem, since each sharer will teach a class for (say) half the week and have time to build relationships with pupils. The class may gain from the greater variety of skills and interests available from two teachers and both teachers and pupils may gain from the joint planning necessary.

• Only 15 heads referred to advantages for teachers' career continuity or equal opportunities issues. A few of these wrote in strong terms of the need to enable women in particular to stay in teaching while raising a family. Since the questionnaires were anonymous and no question regarding the sex of the head was included, it is not possible to investigate
whether there are differences between male and female heads in attitude to job-sharing. It is probable that a large majority of the secondary heads were male, and a small majority of the HODs. The numbers of male and female primary heads were probably more evenly balanced. How far this factor may have affected the discrepancy between primary and secondary sector attitudes is a matter for conjecture.

ADDITIONAL INFORMALLY COLLECTED MATERIAL

Several heads wrote as a result of press coverage about this research or through mutual contacts. Their contributions are added here to illustrate situations in which a head is keen to appoint job-sharers but prevented from doing so. Such examples will not, of course, be found in the survey material which studied heads who already had job-sharers.

One secondary head felt that the range of academic skills available to his school could be increased by introducing one or more job-shares, but his governing body were against the idea, possibly fearing that part-timers would lack commitment.

Three heads were keen to appoint partnerships from teachers known to the school. These were either existing full-time staff wanting to reduce hours, temporary or supply staff wanting permanent posts, or previous members of staff who had left to have families and wanted to return on a part-time basis. In each case the governors were supportive, wanting to keep staff they knew to be good teachers. The authorities, however, were unwilling to appoint job-sharers as they did not have a 'job-share policy'. This is an interesting reason since the authorities who employ the sharers in the 'ad hoc' research sample do not have policy statements either. Some authorities appear to be more flexible and permissive, others are more rigid.

One head was a job-share enthusiast. His own son had received such a good education from a pair of teachers at another junior school that he wanted to appoint a similar pair to his own.

Interesting contributions came from two heads in LEAs which were not part of the research sample. These heads had job-sharing deputies. Both felt this an advantage in a small school. It provided a management 'team', a greater sharing of responsibilities and ideas. In one case the sharers were not part-time, but shared both the deputy post and a lower level one. This not only provided a management team but meant that both could gain experience of management which would prepare them for further promotion. This situation is not a classic job-share, and should perhaps be treated as a 'double job-share' or a 'post share'. It is an idea which may appeal to other heads seeking a team management approach and to teachers seeking experience of further responsibility.
CHAPTER 12
THE TEACHERS' SURVEY

Of the ten LEAs with job-share schemes for teachers who agreed to be interviewed, five were invited to take part in a closer study. They were chosen to give a geographical spread across England, Scotland and Wales, and to include a large regional authority, three counties and a metropolitan borough. Four of the schemes had been introduced in the previous eighteen months and one had been in operation for seven years.

In these selected Areas questionnaires were to be sent to all job-sharers and those with their names on any job-sharing register. The methods for arranging this varied at the authority's request, and this may possibly have led to differing rates of reply.

In Areas 2, 3 and 4 letters requesting participation were sent out by the authority. Because of the small numbers involved in Areas 3 and 4 the rate of return can be considered accurate, but in the much larger Area 2, since requests were sent out by area officers and numbers were not known accurately by senior officers, the rate of return can only be an estimate. Those teachers who expressed a willingness to participate were then sent copies of the questionnaire (see Appendix I). The rate of return of these can be calculated exactly.

In Areas 1 and 5 the authorities supplied a list of schools having job-sharers on their staff. In Area 1 letters were sent to headteachers asking them to pass on requests for participation to their staff. Where neither sharer replied it is not known whether the sharers actually received the request, but the response rate can be computed as a percentage of the schools contacted. In Area 5, owing to shortage of time and an approaching school holiday period, the questionnaires were sent directly to the schools for distribution instead of the usual request for co-operation being sent beforehand. The authority warned that the list of schools included all those with pairs of part-time teachers who might be job-sharers. About one fifth of the schools returned the questionnaires saying that the teachers were not job-sharers; others may also have been in this category but did not return the material. Whether this change in method affected response rates is unknown. Some teachers might reply to a request for co-operation out of curiosity but be deterred by the sight of a time-consuming questionnaire. Others might be more willing to complete a questionnaire already to hand than to offer co-operation without knowing exactly what would be required of them. The percentage response rate is again only an estimate as not all those receiving questionnaires
were job-sharers, and these should be omitted from the calculation if they could be identified.

In all cases the percentage of partnerships represented in the data is higher than the percentage of job-sharers because often only one partner returned a completed questionnaire.

Teacher questionnaires were also sent to the 'informally agreed' partnerships in authorities without schemes, forming the 'ad hoc' group in the data. Most of these authorities estimated that they had 'a few' such partnerships, so the number of teachers receiving the requests in this group is an approximation, and hence the percentage agreeing to take part is an estimate.

Questionnaires were also sent to teachers who wrote offering their experiences as a result of press publicity, and to cases of particular interest discovered from interviews of other LEA officers, press items, etc. Categories of particular interest included husband-and-wife sharers, male sharers and high-status (i.e. promoted) sharers. The results of these are not included in the main analysis but presented as informally collected material.

The analysis is presented in six sections

I By LEA participation
II By sector/pupil age
III Data about the sharers themselves
IV Data about the organisation of shared posts
V The opinions of the sharers
VI Informally collected material.

SECTION I RESPONSES BY LOCAL AUTHORITY AREA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>No of Pairs</th>
<th>No. of sharers</th>
<th>Pairs</th>
<th>Sharers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ad hoc</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>227</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As discussed in Appendix 1, the variations in the methods by which questionnaires were distributed at the request of LEAs made response rates difficult to calculate. This was particularly so where LEAs wished to distribute the
questionnaires themselves, and where an LEA was able to offer only a list of schools having pairs of part-time teachers, some of whom may not have replied because they were not job-sharing. In each case estimates were based on the best evidence available.

Overall it is estimated that about 80% of partnerships surveyed contributed information from at least one partner, with a response rate of about 56% from individual sharers.

SECTION II  RESPONSES BY SECTOR/PUPIL-AGE (Pairs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Nursery (Under 5)</th>
<th>Infant (5-7)</th>
<th>Junior (7-11)</th>
<th>Secondary (11-18)</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ad hoc</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7%  26%  36%  28%  2%

(N.B. The parallel calculation based on individual sharers as opposed to pairs gives percentages differing by no more than 1%)

The proportion of teachers nationally who teach in the primary sector is about 45%. Omitting the three pairs who teach in special schools, or across the age range as specialist teachers of the visually or hearing-impaired, the proportion of the research sample teaching in the primary sector is 71%. This overall figure conceals the fact that while other areas had proportions in the range 56-66%, Area 5 had a figure of 91%. The officer of this area who was interviewed was unable to suggest any likely reason for the small number of shared secondary posts there. There are several possible reasons why the proportion of shared posts in the primary sector is higher than the proportion of teachers in that sector:

a) most job-sharers are women, and there is a higher proportion of women in the primary teaching force. DES statistics for England and Wales (1984) state that about 55% of female teachers are in the primary sector so this may have some effect on the proportion of sharers found there.

b) slightly more than half of all part-time teachers work in the primary sector, so more of these may be combined into job-shares. The DES statistic is 53%, however, so any effect from this is likely to be insignificant.
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c) in the primary sector there are some part-time teachers who operate separately, in particular those who offer special needs skills, but most will share a class with another teacher and operate as a job-sharing partnership. In the secondary sector the organisation is such that teaching responsibilities can be more easily split between separate part-time staff, each taking different classes for example, and the teachers are more likely to be considered as independent part-timers rather than job-sharers. Where such part-timers are offered permanent posts and good conditions of service they may feel less need to press for the advantages of job-share status.

d) the ratio of male to female headteachers in the primary sector is 54% to 46% while in the secondary sector it is 84% to 16%. (DES statistics for England and Wales, 1979). It is possible that female headteachers may be more sympathetic concerning the problems encountered by women teachers in trying to combine work and family care and may thus be more willing to consider job-sharing arrangements in their schools. The headteacher questionnaires were completed anonymously and the respondents were not asked to state their sex. While most of the sharers gave the names of their schools no analysis of the sex of the heads of these schools was carried out as, especially in the case of the more established partnerships, the current headteacher may not have been in post at the time of the appointment. It is therefore not possible from this study to assess whether this factor had any part to play in causing the higher proportion of primary job-shares in comparison with secondary.

SECTION III  THE SHARERS THEMSELVES - Analysis based on the responses to questions 2-17 of the questionnaire

The first part of the teachers' questionnaire was designed to produce a profile of the job-sharers, their reasons for sharing and their plans for the future.

1) Sex (Q.3)  
Female 216 (95%)  
Male 8 (4%)  

3 respondents did not answer this question.

The preponderance of female sharers compares with that in other research. Of the male sharers one was over 60 years old and combining a teaching commitment with partial retirement, one was caring for a disabled parent and unable to move to find another full-time post after being declared surplus, two were sharing child-care with their teacher-wives, and four were involved in other paid activities or self-employment.
Age Distribution of Job Sharers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in Years</th>
<th>% of sharers responding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-60</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 60</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2) **Age (Q.2)**  (See Graph {Fig. 2} opposite).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age in years</th>
<th>No of sharers</th>
<th>% of sharers replying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-60</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>over 60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>222</strong></td>
<td><em>(5 respondents did not answer this question)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Over half of the sharers are between 30 and 39 years of age, 70% between 30 and 44. Since nearly 60% of sharers gave the care of a family as their reason for sharing, this age-range is as expected. The age profiles of those areas with samples large enough to be considered separately were similar except that the long-running scheme in Area 5 had only half the proportion of the under-34 age groups compared with the newer schemes, and twice the proportion of over 40s. A possible reason for the latter statistic is that here teachers have returned from career-breaks as sharers, or remained as sharers while rearing families, and felt contented to remain as sharers as their children have grown up, while in other areas teachers have taken career breaks and either returned to full-time posts, supply work, or not returned at all. If this is the case a similar pattern may develop over time in the new-scheme areas. Whether, on the whole, job-sharing opportunities discourage teachers from returning to full-time work, or whether they encourage teachers to return who would otherwise not do so at all, is debatable.

3) **Length of previous teaching experience (Q.7 & 8)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Full time</th>
<th>0-4 years</th>
<th>21</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-14 years</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-19 years</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Mean 10.5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24 years</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>range 0-27 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall 53% have undertaken some part-time teaching work other than job-sharing. In the new scheme Areas 1 and 2 the proportion is around 70%, but in the long-running scheme Area 5 the proportion is 48%; presumably returners had been
able to move directly into job-sharing since this had been available for 6 years (or longer informally), instead of other forms of part-time work.

The vast majority of previous full and part-time work had been within the same authority.

4) **Subjects taught by sharers** (more than one response possible) (Q.6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full range of primary subjects</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>art</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biology</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chemistry</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drama</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foreign languages</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>geography</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>history</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>home economics</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information technology</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mathematics</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>music</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physical education</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physics</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>religious education</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>special needs</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most frequently mentioned subjects, English, languages, biology, home economics, reflect traditional 'female' subject areas. Two sharers qualified to teach languages in the secondary sector, one to teach maths, and one to teach general sciences, were in fact teaching in the primary sector. These are entered under 'primary subjects' and also under the subject specialism.

5) **Employment status immediately before starting to share** (Q.9)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teaching full-time in same LEA</td>
<td>131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teaching part-time in same LEA</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>employed as a casual supply teacher</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not employed in teaching</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some respondents named two categories, e.g. one term's full-time supply, two terms part time.

The results reflect the policies of the authorities. In Area 2, where existing full-time teachers were permitted to share, or if a partner could not be found from this group a supply teacher with a long-service record could be selected, 75% had previously been full-time teachers and 17% supply teachers. In Areas 1 and 5 about 40% had been full-time teachers, 14% (Area 1) and 28% (Area 5) had been regular part-time teachers, and 33% (Area 1) and 23% (Area 5) had been casual
supply teachers. The remaining teachers had mainly been taking a career break in
the previous year, in particular 12% of the Area 1 sample. A few had been
working for other LEAs.

6) Promoted status in immediately previous post (Q. 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not promoted</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 2</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale 3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above Scale 3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistics here are difficult to interpret. During the period in which the
data was collected teachers' salary and promotion structure in England and Wales
changed. In particular teachers on Scale 1 and Scale 2 (promoted) were
transferred to points on the Main Professional Grade. This meant that some
teachers of equal status would have described themselves as promoted (Scale 2) if
responding before the change-over, but not promoted (MPG) if responding
afterwards. Some of the latter group explained this apparent change of status and
these were included as promoted if they had originally been on Scale 2. Others
who should have been included in this category may have been omitted because
they failed to make this clear. Some of those previously on Scale 2 were expecting
to receive 'A' allowances as soon as these became available, and would thus clearly
have promoted status again. It was also possible to have been a Head of a small
department on Scale 2, and this was again considered as a promoted post even if
the teacher had been transferred to the Main Professional Grade at the time of
responding. Ten teachers had been on Scale 3 or above immediately before
beginning the job-share. Two mentioned that they had had to relinquish Head of
Year posts in secondary education in order to share, but were hoping to apply
shortly for a Head of Department post. Two others had asked to share their
promoted posts but had been refused and had had to accept a non-promoted post
in order to share. There was some evidence of sharers receiving a 'protected' salary
not available to their partners. In those areas with samples large enough for
separate analysis, between 42% and 47% of sharers had previously held a
promoted post, 5% having been on Scale 3 or above, except for Area 2 where
none of the respondents had been promoted teachers. Several respondents pointed
out that, while they had not been in promoted posts immediately prior to the job-
share because they had been working as supply teachers, they had held promoted
posts earlier before taking a career break. Further discussion on promoted posts
and job-sharing will appear in Section III, Chapter 15.
7) **Discovering that a job-share scheme existed** (Q.11) (More than one response possible)

The ad hoc group is omitted because by definition they did not have schemes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of information</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>From a school circular</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEA officer or advert</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From another teacher</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a friend</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a teachers' union</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a newspaper</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From the headteacher</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked the LEA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From a local councillor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no reply</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Though this question did not apply to the ad hoc group, two pairs used the space to mention that they had heard of job-sharing through the media or from friends in other authorities and had taken the initiative in requesting a shared post. In both cases considerable discussion had been needed but the authorities had eventually been willing to agree to the job-share. It would be interesting to know how many pairs in these and other authorities have tried and failed. Some informally collected samples are discussed at the end of the chapter.

Since the vast majority of sharers were in schools in the previous year, as full-time, regular part-time or supply staff, it is not surprising that the major sources of information in the areas which had job-share schemes were school circulars and other LEA publicity sent to schools. The next largest categories were those who had heard of the scheme from a teacher-friend, or from an LEA source other than school publicity material, such as an LEA officer in person, or an advertisement. The local press was particularly mentioned in Area 1, where an article on the setting-up of the new scheme had been published. Relatively few mentioned teacher unions as a source and a small number discovered job-sharing was permitted only by taking the initiative and asking the authority themselves. Two pairs mentioned that they had asked before the formal scheme had been approved and had been involved, with their unions' support, in the discussions which preceded its introduction.

8) **Meeting the job-share partner** (Q12) (To eliminate duplication the analysis is based on pairs)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method of finding partner</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>had worked with partner before</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a friend</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partner found by headteacher</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>partner found by LEA</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no reply</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where a response referred to the partner as 'a friend I had worked with previously' this was classified under 'worked with' rather than 'friend'. In some instances a simple reference to 'a friend' may have included someone worked with before, but this was not stated. Thus at least 61% of the sharers had worked together at some time before becoming partners. Some had been full-time teachers at the same school, others a full-time teacher and a supply teacher. In several cases a maternity-leave returner shared her post with the person who had covered during her absence, or with an older teacher wishing to reduce to a part-time commitment. Some mentioned that they were happy to share with someone they already knew and were compatible with, but would have been more cautious about having to share with someone they had not previously met.

Of those areas large enough for separate analysis Areas 1 and 5 had very large proportions of pairs who had worked together before sharing (88% in both cases) and low proportions of pairs matched by the LEA or meeting only at interview (12%, 8%). In Area 2, 51% had known each other beforehand and 46% had not (the remainder did not specify). This is likely to be due to the authority maintaining a list of existing full-time staff wishing to share and arranging partnerships on the basis of age group taught, subject, and geographical proximity. Only one teacher in any other area mentioned that a partner had been found through a job-share register. In several cases it was clear that headteachers recommended to each other good supply teachers they knew to be interested in regular part-time employment.

9) By whom was guidance on job-sharing given? (Q.13) (more than one answer possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None received</th>
<th>134</th>
<th>55% of response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>from headteacher</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from teachers' union</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority (59%) claimed to have had no guidance. Of those who had, about two-thirds mentioned their headteacher and one third mentioned the LEA. Only 15 teachers mentioned a teachers' union and others said they had received help from a spouse, other sharers, the Equal Opportunities Commission and New Ways to Work. Only two sharers had the opportunity to visit a job-sharing pair in another school and discuss how that partnership operated. A common complaint was that information was difficult to find, and when found was often confusing. LEA officers, teacher union officers and headteachers frequently interpreted agreements differently or gave conflicting advice. Information about the effects on superannuation was referred to several times as being difficult to obtain, although
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one would expect this to be readily available from teacher unions. The interpretation of agreements and forms of contract caused the greatest problems. Phone calls and letters to the LEA were often unanswered in spite of frequent reminders, and area officers sometimes appeared to operate their own versions of the local authority's agreement. One example of this was where the agreement stated that any arrangement of shared time could be considered, but an area officer stated that the choice was "between mornings/afternoons or 2½-day blocks and preferably the latter". Several exasperated sharers claimed that while a job-sharing scheme existed, the authority's officers did little to help teachers who wanted to participate in it. One teacher asked for her name to be put on the job-share register, but the area officer claimed that no register existed. One pair did not want the details of their very flexible over-lapping time pattern publicised. "It suits the school and it suits us. No-one seems to know whether we are allowed to work like this so we have decided not to ask in case they say 'No'." Another pair had been told by their headteacher that they could not cover for each other's absences - a supply teacher must be engaged. In fact the authority encouraged sharers to cover for each other wherever possible. As well as confusion over the operation of individual schemes, and paucity of information about financial and legal aspects of job-shares, little appeared to be done to help sharers develop and disseminate good practice. New sharers had to find their own ways of working together when perhaps the opportunity to discuss potential problems with experienced sharers could have been helpful. Since all but one of the schemes was relatively new there was perhaps no pool of expertise on which to draw, but there was no suggestion that any authority arranged in-service events at which sharers could learn from each other's experiences.

10) The reasons for wanting a shared post (Q. 14) (more than one answer possible)

(See pie chart, Figure 3 opposite)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>% of Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Care of children</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Needs of family</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care of elderly</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better contract than other p/t</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time for other activities</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A run-down to retirement</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time too much pressure</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health reasons</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

61% of the responses described 'caring' responsibilities, two-thirds of these referred specifically to young children, and a small proportion to elderly relatives. Two of the men shared child-care with their wives and one cared for his father, though he was able to work full-time if a suitable post became vacant locally.
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A second category (15% of responses) included those who wanted to reduce their commitment as a prelude to retirement, who felt full-time teaching had become too stressful, or who had health problems. These groups were not mutually exclusive.

14% wanted time for other activities. Some of these were other forms of employment, e.g. as a journalist or lecturer in further education, or self-employment as an artist, author or even children's entertainer. Two women wanted time to help their husbands run a business enterprise. Others were doing voluntary social work, such as the minister's wife who wanted to help in his parish, or simply pursuing their own interests and hobbies. The latter group included many of the older sharers whose financial needs had become less pressing and for whom quality of life had assumed greater importance.

10% described reasons for wanting to job-share as opposed to other types of part-time teaching. This group were dissatisfied with supply work and sought the security of a permanent post in which they could feel part of the school community. Primary teachers frequently mentioned that having 'a class of one's own' was all-important to them. Separate part-time teachers usually 'floated' or taught small groups withdrawn from other classes. Sharing a class gave the job-sharers much greater satisfaction and a sense of identity.

A few replies came from those who did not really want to be job-sharers. These fell into two categories. Firstly there were those who were unable to find suitable full-time posts and were job-sharing as the best available alternative, and secondly there were those who would have preferred to be separate part-timers. These are considered in the next section.

11) Preference for a separate permanent part-time post (Q.15)

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>71% of response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Reply</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 71% who would not prefer a separate permanent part-time post gave as their reasons that they were very happy with their present job-shares and considered that other part-time posts were less secure and less satisfying.

10% were not sure. "I might or I might not, it would depend on the particular post available." Others (particularly in Area 2) found it difficult to believe that part-time posts could really be permanent. One simply stated that "Part-time posts are not permanent, only job-shares."
Those who would prefer separate posts fell mainly into two categories. One group said that the amount of joint consultation and planning meant that they were working more than half time for only half the salary, and a separate post would mean a fairer level of remuneration for work done. The others preferred to work with small groups in primary schools, particularly special needs pupils, or to teach a specialist subject such as music or maths to several classes in a primary school rather than sharing a generalist class-teacher post. In several cases they had previously been carrying out a specialist rôle as part-time teachers when their schools needed to create a new class. Instead of employing a new full-time teacher an extra part-timer had been appointed to share with the existing one. The share was seen as temporary in some cases, the new partner having only a temporary contract for instance, and the original part-timer hoped to return to separate specialist work where, as one put it, "I can be my own boss and not answerable to anyone else". Such arrangements are included in the research as they are regarded by the employing authorities as 'temporary job-shares', but they are not permanent job-sharing arrangements in the normal sense.

12) For how long did the sharers hope to continue sharing? (Q.16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-4 years</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9 years</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at least 10 years</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The 79% who expressed a preference were almost equally divided between short-term (less than 5 years), medium-term (5-9 years) and long-term (10- years or more). The 'short-term' group included some who hoped to return to full-time working as soon as their children reached school age, or possibly secondary age, those approaching retirement, and those seeking full-time work or a return to separate part-time posts. The fact that over half of the sharers hoped that the arrangement would last for at least five years indicates that they viewed job-sharing as a feature of their working lives for a reasonable length of time, not merely as a brief interlude. Several expressed particular satisfaction:

"With this partner I would like to share for as long as possible, but if I had to share with someone I was not in tune with I might reconsider."

Another hoped that the share would continue "Until death do us part"
Career Intention beyond Job Sharing

- Return to full-time teaching: 45%
- Retire: 27%
- Other (e.g. career break, supply teaching): 7%
- Seeking employment outside teaching: 8%
- Don't know: 48%
13) What did they hope to do after job-sharing (Q.17) (See pie chart Figure 4 opposite)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To return to full-time teaching</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To retire</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To seek employment outside teaching</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Almost a half intended to return to full-time work at some time in the future when their children were less dependent on them, or when a suitable full-time post became available. Just over a quarter intended to share until retirement and this group included a number of teachers in younger age groups as well as the over-50s. A few were considering taking a complete career break for a few years, perhaps combined with occasional supply teaching. These were usually mothers of small babies who could conveniently be left with child-minders. They felt that they might take a break after having another child, or when the complications of taking children to and from school each day made the use of a child-minder less straightforward. A few others were considering leaving teaching for other areas of employment. The remaining 21% were unsure about their future career plans.

SECTION IV THE ORGANISATION OF SHARED POSTS -
Analysis of responses To Questions 21 - 23

This section of the questionnaire was designed to show how shared appointments had been obtained, how they operated and what problems had arisen.

14) Appointment (Q.21)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area 2 only</th>
<th>Sharing a post I originally held full time</th>
<th>49</th>
<th>57% of response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing a post applied for while full-time by transferring to another school</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sharing as a result of a general application to be considered for job-share vacancies other</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Areas</td>
<td>Interviewed in competition with other prospective sharers only</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interviewed in competition with full-time applicants</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not interviewed because already holding post full time</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not interviewed because already doing the job part-time</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not interviewed as known to the school (supply/temporary post/ex-staff)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other (e.g. interviewed but only candidate)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Area 2 requested re-wording of this item in the original questionnaire as they felt it did not fit their situation. Since their policy was to offer the opportunity to share to existing full-time staff in the first instance it is not surprising that 72% of the sharers had previously been full-time teachers. Most had remained in their previous posts and been allocated a partner. Some had themselves moved schools to share with someone else. Most of these sharers were either older teachers reducing commitment or mothers of young children wanting more time for their families. Other sharers were offered posts because of their long service record and suitability for the vacant part-shares.

In the remaining areas just over a third were sharing their own previously held full-time posts and there was a greater variety of other methods of appointment. 21% had applied for vacant part-shares and been interviewed in competition with other applicants. 25% were not formally interviewed either because they already held part-time posts in the school or were known to the school through supply work or wished to return after a career break. A typical example is that of the teacher who provides supply cover on a full-time or part-time basis for another on maternity leave, and eventually shares the post with the returning teacher.

A further 13% were interviewed but were the only applicants, in some cases because the post was not advertised. They belonged to a group similar to the previous one but with the addition of the formality of an interview. One was the only suitable person on a job-share register.

The most significant figure is that only 2 sharers were interviewed for their posts in competition with full-time candidates, though several other pairs had been interviewed for internal promotion in competition with full-time staff and been successful. It still seems extremely rare for a pair to apply for an advertised full-time post, or even for potential sharers to apply hoping to find a partner at interview, and succeed. How many applications of this kind have taken place in the research areas and been unsuccessful is unknown. LEA officers had no information on this.

15) Responsibility (Q.22a) (pairs)
Sharing a promoted post or a named area of responsibility 39 24% of response

For reasons given earlier concerning changes in the structure of teachers' pay scales this figure is difficult to interpret. Particular examples are several pairs with responsibility for a Nursery Unit, and shared Head of Department posts in Chemistry, Music, Drama and Information Technology. Other pairs were
responsible for Health Education throughout the (secondary) school and Careers Education. The overall percentage conceals the fact that Areas 1 and 5 have approximately 36% of sharers with Scale posts or named areas of responsibility, while Area 2 has only 4%. While the ad hoc group is a small sample it is of interest to note that almost half are in the promoted category. Possibly it is the more senior members of staff who are best able to negotiate informal job-shares when they want to work part-time. The percentage of promoted staff is higher than that recorded in the question about status before the share commenced, as the latter includes teachers who were not employed, or employed as casual or temporary supply teachers in the previous year, and were therefore not eligible for positions of responsibility.

16) **Time-pattern of the share (Q.22b) (pairs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pattern</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Morning/afternoon</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2½ day blocks</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five ½-days, not blocks</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>equal share, pattern not stated</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alternate weeks</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>unequal share</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no reply</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the equal sharers, 2½ day blocks were most common in the primary sector but a morning/afternoon pattern was common in nursery classes where the morning group of pupils was often different from the afternoon group. Other primary sharers worked alternate calendar weeks, a 'rolling week' pattern from the middle of one week to the middle of the next, or 2 days/3 days exchanging in alternate weeks. Secondary sharers commonly worked 5 half-days each, or sometimes unequal numbers of half-days, arranged to fit the timetable so as to minimise the number of shared classes. The pattern in these cases tended to change from year to year to fit new timetables. The 'other' category includes three pairs who shared posts greater than one full-time equivalent, and three very integrated partnerships, close friends or married couples, who operated more flexibly depending on the needs of their families or the school, and exchanged time in lieu by private agreement.

Some of the secondary sharers had overlapping time patterns. This meant that timetables could be more flexible as two teachers could be available at the same time. An example is the pair of P.E. teachers who both taught on the afternoon when senior pupils could opt for a wide range of small-group activities, some off-site, and extra teachers were needed.
Where numbers are large enough for separate analysis, Area 1 and Area 5 had about 40% of pairs using either morning/afternoon or 2½ day block patterns and a wide range of other patterns. Area 2 had 67% using morning/afternoon or 2½ day block patterns, a few alternate or 'rolling' weeks, and very few of the other patterns.

17) **The task-sharing pattern (Q.22c) (pairs)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>all aspects shared</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>57%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>subject split</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pupil-age or ability-level split</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>according to timetable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teach different classes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>some tasks shared, some split</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no reply</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The majority shared all aspects of the work, and a further group shared most aspects but took individual responsibility for others. In primary schools only one partner might do music or P.E. for example, or while both might teach basic subjects one would take overall responsibility for language and the other for mathematics when planning and developing the programme of work. In secondary schools both partners would share departmental responsibilities but they might not share classes. 13% split their work by subject, for instance a language post might be filled by one teacher doing mainly French and the other German, while science posts sometimes had partners who divided work largely according to subject expertise. A few divided the work according to age and ability level of pupils, one partner teaching a large proportion of 'A' level and other exam work, while the other preferred to work with lower ability groups. 4% taught entirely separate classes and operated effectively as separate part-timers. In one case the post involved two schools and the sharers worked entirely separately in different buildings, while peripatetic sharers often worked with different pupils or visited different schools.

18) **Decision making (Q.22d) (sharers)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mainly by the sharers</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>by sharers and headteacher</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainly by the headteacher</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decided by existing sharer</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>depends on the timetable</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>decided by LEA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>combination of any of the above</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no reply</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The sharers were asked how decisions about time and task sharing had been arrived at. Since the perceptions of the sharers in each partnership often differed, this was analysed on an individual basis. In some cases a new sharer had been appointed to a vacancy or to share the job of an existing full-time teacher and here the sharing pattern was often dictated by the practice or preference of the teacher already in the post. Some secondary teachers planned both time and task sharing according to the timetable, and patterns of either might vary from year to year. Four teachers said that the time pattern had been decided by the LEA, and five more mentioned the LEA as contributing to the decision, for example by requiring a 2½ day block preference to be changed to alternate weeks. Eight of these were from Area 2 and one from Area 4. The headteacher was considered to be the chief decision maker in 8% of cases, occasionally over-ruling the sharers' preferred time pattern and insisting on his/her own preference. About a third of sharers felt that decisions had been mainly left to them, and a further third saw the decisions as reached jointly by sharers and headteacher. In secondary schools the head of department was more often involved than the headteacher, and in a few instances the deputy-head responsible for planning the timetable was also involved. Apart from the part played by the LEA, the chief differences between areas lay in the proportions of those who considered the sharers themselves to be responsible for decision making. In Area 1 this was 51% and in Area 5 65%, while in Area 2 the figure is only 15%. It is possible that in Area 5 with its much longer experience of sharing there is a more relaxed attitude to such arrangements and sharers are given greater freedom to make their own plans. A new scheme could result in much more caution and in monitoring of plans by headteachers and LEA, but this does not seem to be so in Area 1. On the other hand more of the partnerships had worked together before in Area 1 than in Area 2, so possibly headteachers were confident that they could leave the planning to the sharers themselves. Since the primary/secondary proportions in Areas 1 and 2 are similar, sector balance does not appear to be likely to account for differences shown.

19) Liaison and joint planning time (Q.22d) (Sharers, more than one answer possible)

Number of sharers mentioning:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Sharers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meeting in own time</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meeting in lunch hour</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>using telephone</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>keeping a log book</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overlap time, directed time, etc.</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>not needed, no shared classes</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no reply</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

40% of sharers
The respondents commonly gave more than one answer. A half met during their lunch hour, either on the change-over day (usually mid-week), or more often with morning/afternoon patterns. 40% stated specifically that meetings were arranged in their own time, including after school, weekends or during school holidays, while 13% had access to some overlap time during pupil hours or held meetings as an official part of directed time. In a few cases the lunch-time meetings were counted as directed time but more usually they were not. Almost 40% communicated frequently by phone, and those who shared classes commonly kept a log book. Only 8 sharers had totally separate work and did not need to meet at all. Several pointed out the distinction between the long-range planning generally in the school holidays, weekends or after-school sessions, and the daily or weekly exchange of information about where one sharer had got to in a particular programme of work or details relating to individual pupils. One pair had two log books, one for recording work done and the other for general remarks such as "David and Mark had a fight this morning so I have told them they will be separated for the rest of the day" and "Zoreh's mum is coming to fetch her at 3pm." Not surprisingly joint planning was difficult for those who taught alternate or rolling weeks or 2 day/3 day alternate patterns since they were never in school together except by special arrangement. Where overlap was available this appeared to be by internal organisation rather than contractual design. In secondary schools pairs working flexible patterns often found that they were both in school together at some stage and it was sometimes possible to arrange one or two free periods to coincide. This was felt to be particularly useful in an afternoon as departmental meetings could be arranged at the end of the day when both partners could be present. In primary schools it was sometimes possible for the head or deputy, or a floating teacher, to take the class while the sharers met. One pair said that this happened alternately at the end of Wednesday mornings and the beginning of Wednesday afternoons, each sharer in turn arriving earlier or leaving later than usual so that they had time for a working lunch and a more formal time for planning.

Two husband-and-wife pairs were able to discuss their work "at any time of the day or night - usually the latter", and one highly integrated pair cared for each other's small children while not teaching and could thus exchange information or carry out more detailed planning when collecting or delivering their children.

The amount of joint planning needed varied greatly depending on whether subjects, classes and pastoral responsibilities were all shared or whether some of the work was split. Where there was a high degree of sharing the teachers were very conscientious about providing continuity of learning experience for pupils and
a joint approach to such issues as classroom management, discipline and record-keeping. There was a clear need for much time to be spent together. Since most of this took place in the sharers' own time, and the keeping of a detailed log book and making of 'phone calls created an added burden, it seems clear that job-sharing requires considerable personal commitment.

Analysis of the larger samples reveals only small differences, except for a larger proportion of reported meetings 'in our own time' in Area 5. One possible reason for this is the very high proportion of primary sector shares in this Area and these almost always demand more time as classes and subjects are normally shared, in comparison with the greater incidence of splitting in the secondary sector. Another possible reason is that contracts in this Area make it clear that liaison must take place in the sharers' own time; in other areas individual heads may be more willing and able to make internal arrangements for overlap or to consider meetings as part of the overall 'directed time' commitment.

20) Problems encountered (Q.23) (Sharers, more than one answer possible)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication (with each other or other staff)</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding enough time to liaise, working more than half</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing important meetings</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes of other teachers</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacing a partner who leaves</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problems specific to post, not easily classified</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No problems encountered, or minor ones easily solved</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In many cases the share arrangements were relatively new and the sharers were predicting what problems they expected to encounter rather than those which had actually occurred.

27% considered they had no problems or did not expect any, including some who reported minor 'hiccups' which had been easily solved. About a third of the respondents reported some problems in the general area of communication. This fell into two categories, communication with partner and communication with other members of staff. The primary teachers in particular, almost all of whom shared a class, were most conscious of the need to be aware of all that their partners did in the classroom, whether related to academic work, administrative tasks or pastoral care. Since there was usually one of the pair at school at any given time, general school information would reach one partner and have to be passed on via log book, telephone or meeting. There was therefore much greater emphasis on communication with the partner rather than other members of staff. Partners found it necessary to develop a very well-organised system of communication between themselves. In secondary schools, on the other hand, the
communication concerns centred on a much wider range of staff. The sharers often taught separate classes or quite separate topics which reduced the need for detailed joint planning, but while they could develop a good 'internal' communication system between themselves it is much harder to organise communication with a range of other people. Heads of Department have to pass on information to two people instead of one, and neither sharer might be present at the critical moment. When a problem arises about a pupil it cannot be assumed that both partners teach him or her, and the teacher who does may be the one who is not at school that day. It may be difficult to arrange departmental meetings when both sharers can be present, yet one cannot fully represent the other if they teach different classes, different subjects or at different academic levels. A secondary sharer calculated that she needed to communicate regularly with seven other members of the subject department as well as sixteen pastoral tutors of the pupils she taught. A great deal of staffroom communication takes place at breaks and during lunch hours and it is easy for an absent sharer to miss out. After one or two instances of vital information not reaching sharers, one department made a rule that all important messages should be written on the departmental noticeboard, not merely passed on verbally. Other members of the department subsequently agreed that the new system worked much better for them too, as they were less likely to miss out on information themselves while on yard duty, away on a course, etc. One sharer pointed out that important messages were always passed on, it is the petty irritants of the "where the **** has he left the keys this time?" situations which cause most trouble, particularly when the sharer concerned cannot be contacted.

A related problem mentioned by a quarter of the sharers was the shortage of time for joint planning and consultation. This was particularly noticeable among the more integrated primary sharers where long-range as well as weekly planning of work schemes was needed. One or two lunch-hour meetings a week covered only more general matters and sharers commonly met at weekends or school holidays to plan in greater depth. Many felt that this meant that they were working far more than half-time for only a half-time salary. Finding time to do all that was necessary was a matter of some concern, particularly for those who were never in school on the same day. Some sharers thought that more attention should be given to providing liaison time for sharers within the school day, but others thought this would be difficult to arrange (especially in primary schools) and make job-sharing more expensive for the employer and therefore less likely to be permitted. They considered that on the whole it was worth the extra effort in order to have the opportunity of permanent part-time work, and also that the experience of joint
planning was enjoyable and had contributed to their own professional development. One pair stressed the value of the 1¼ hours per week in which they worked together with the class. This was not only very valuable for exchange of information, but allowed the pupils to see them working together as a team.

Only twelve teachers felt that the attitudes of other teachers had (or might) cause problems, eleven of them from Area 2. Here they considered that headteachers and heads of department did not really want job-sharers (in some cases correctly, as shown in the headteacher survey) and that they would have to work especially hard to overcome prejudice. One sharer felt that the slightest thing wrong would be attributed to the job-sharing situation, whereas it could often happen just as easily to a full-time teacher. Several pairs said how determined they were to make a success of their job-share precisely because others were sceptical. A few very closely integrated partnerships which were very successful gave rise to worries about what might happen if one partner left and a new one proved less compatible.

Other problems mentioned were difficult to classify:

"We are each expected to do as much departmental administration as the full-time staff. They forget we should only be doing half as much."

"Because I was a full-time teacher here for many years the parents see me as the senior partner and all want to consult me rather than her. She finds it difficult to cope with this too."

"Some children try to play us off against each other - 'Mrs. S. said I could' for example."

"I would like us to gain promotion as a job-sharing pair and take on more responsibility, but my partner is not so keen and this holds me back."

Several sharers mentioned that they were needed at all the 'Baker' days set aside for professional training but only paid for half of them. There was some confusion about which partner should attend on which days, particularly if more of them fell on days on which one partner worked rather than the other. Many attended all the Baker days for the benefit of the school, but resented the fact that full-time teachers would not be expected to give up a whole week of their vacation to work unpaid in school, while part-time staff were considered to lack commitment if they failed to work the extra half-week voluntarily. Some mentioned that both teachers accompanied the class on out of school trips, attended sports days etc., and a few had very supportive heads who were sometimes able to arrange days off in lieu as a recompense.
Other miscellaneous problems mentioned were the difficulty of adjusting to expecting only half a week's work from the children. The sharers felt they were in danger of overworking the children by overestimating what could be done in the time. The afternoon teacher or end of week teacher felt at a disadvantage in always having pupils when they were tired, and some sharers arranged to change round every half-term so that they took turns to have the advantage of morning or early-week freshness and energy. Secondary teachers often reported 'following-up' problems, particularly where they taught different classes. Forgotten homework could not be demanded the next day if they were not at school, and it was harder to arrange to follow up disciplinary or pastoral problems with pupils and staff before the matter to be dealt with became 'stale'.

A particular problem mentioned in Area 2 related to an agreement on identifying teachers who might be considered as 'surplus to requirements'. In a school or department which was overstaffed the teacher with least previous service would be identified as surplus and, if possible, redeployed. Where job-sharers were involved the previous service used would be calculated as the average of the service of the two partners. Some of the sharers had long previous service records and feared that they might at some time be allocated a new partner with a short service record which would render the pair vulnerable if there was a need to reduce staffing levels.

SECTION V  THE OPINIONS OF SHARERS

This section of the questionnaire was designed to explore the perceptions of sharers about the advantages and disadvantages of job-sharing for themselves, their pupils, their schools and the education service in general. A final blank page provided respondents with the opportunity to write extended material giving greater detail or referring to matters which were not included in the questionnaire.

21 Advantages and Disadvantages of Job-sharing  (Qs.18 and 19)

The material is presented in three sections:

a) in relation to pupils and schools

b) in relation to sharers

c) in relation to the administration of education generally, although these are often independent.

Each topic is prefaced by the percentage of respondents who mentioned it, and topics are included if at least 5% of respondents mentioned them. The content of
each topic is treated in greater detail, and with supporting quotations, in Appendix 4.

ADVANTAGES

a) FOR PUPILS AND SCHOOLS

i) Teacher energy

70% of the respondents said that job-sharers had more energy and enthusiasm; they were less stressed and pupils benefited from lively teachers. 21% felt that they were able to operate at full power because they did not have to pace themselves to last out a full week.

ii) Range of skills

65% said that two teachers may be able to contribute a wider range of skills, subject strengths, ideas and interests than one. 15% added that this wider range of expertise was of particular value in small schools or subject departments.

iii) Personal contact

33% thought that it was good for children to have to adapt to more than one personality, and that if they fail to get on well with one teacher they may relate better to the other. 8% pointed out that skills in adapting to more than one teacher were important for upper primary pupils as a preparation for secondary school.

iv) Joint planning

32% considered that because planning had to be done together it tended to be done more thoroughly and that there were two people to keep abreast of the latest ideas in curriculum development.

v) Continuity

31% cited greater continuity for pupils. Both sharers were unlikely to be away at the same time, so that at least part of the week would be unaffected and sharers were sometimes able to cover for each other.

vi) Co-operation

5% mentioned that pupils gained from seeing two adults working together in close co-operation, particularly those from single parent families or where parents were constantly at loggerheads.
b) FOR THE SHARERS

i) Careers

31% said that job-sharing could play a valuable part in a teacher's career pattern, enabling the career to be combined with other responsibilities and providing a better quality of part-time work.

ii) Health

27% claimed to be less stressed; they felt happier and healthier.

iii) Professional Development

26% had found shared planning with another teacher to be a rewarding form of professional development.

iv) Balance

15% thought that full-time teachers had little time to think about anything but their school work, whereas job-sharers could have a more balanced approach to life.

v) Support

11% said that teachers coping with difficult classes or individual children gave each other mutual support. Sharers felt less isolated than full-time class teachers.

c) FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF EDUCATION

i) Recruitment and Retention

21% considered that job-sharing enabled schools to keep good teachers who would otherwise take a career break or retire early. Those who had left but felt unable to return full-time could also be attracted back.

ii) Job-creation and the Avoidance of Redundancy

15% said that schools and LEAs could avoid redundancy and increase the number of available jobs by allowing existing full-time teachers to share posts on a voluntary basis.

iii) Qualitative Flexibility

8% pointed out that, particularly in secondary schools, job-sharing could offer a wider range of subject expertise within one post and greater timetabling flexibility via overlapping timetables.
DISADVANTAGES

a) FOR PUPILS AND SCHOOLS

i) Risk of Incompatibility

29% said that unless partnerships were carefully chosen there could be a risk of sharers proving incompatible so that the quality of education offered might suffer.

ii) Communication Problems

29% warned that careful organisation is needed to avoid communication problems causing extra work for other teachers.

iii) Continuity Problems

15% thought that there could be continuity problems for a class unless both sharers were willing to put in a lot of extra time for planning and liaison.

b) FOR THE SHARERS THEMSELVES

i) More than half the work load for only half the pay

33% pointed out that because sharers have to work their appropriate proportion of time and give extra time to shared planning, the salary does not truly reflect the amount of work done.

ii) Missing meetings and unpaid training days

17% found that they had to attend parents' evenings on days not normally worked and risked missing important information if they were not at staff meetings, departmental meetings etc. In-service training days were often necessary for both partners but there was often no method of paying sharers to attend beyond their relevant proportion. Many had to attend unpaid.

iii) Hostility from colleagues

7% of the sharers mentioned that they had encountered some hostility from colleagues.

iv) Parental doubts

6% of the respondents (all from primary schools) had had to make extra efforts at the beginning of the arrangement to win over parents who were doubtful about their children having two teachers.
v) **Adjusting to workload**

5% had found difficulty in adjusting to the quantity of work appropriate to half a week when they had been accustomed to working full-time.

vi) **The need to compromise**

5% felt they were not free to do things as they wanted to in the classroom - there was always a need to compromise with their partner's wishes.

vii) **Reduction in status and position**

5% warned that some teachers may have to relinquish posts of responsibility to job-share and reduced final salary will affect their level of superannuation.

c) **FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF EDUCATION AS A WHOLE**

No disadvantages were mentioned frequently enough to reach the 5% level, but two commented that the setting up of a formal job-share scheme would take administrative time at LEA level, though this disadvantage would be temporary and quickly outweighed by advantages.

**ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES IN GENERAL**

The vast majority of respondents said that advantages firmly outweighed disadvantages and that many disadvantages could be overcome or at least minimised with good will on all sides.

There was much less unanimity about the disadvantages, the highest percentage response being 33%, compared with 70% for advantages. 24% of respondents did not mention any disadvantages at all. The greatest unanimity was in perceived advantages for pupils and schools, viz. sharers have more energy and enthusiasm and are less stressed (70%) and two teachers can contribute to a wider range of expertise, ideas and interests than one (65%).

22) **Additional comments by respondents (Q.24)**

Many of the respondents made use of this section of the questionnaire, even adding extra sheets. The material fell into three categories:

i) **More detailed expansion of answers to previous questions.** This material has been used in the appropriate sections.

ii) **Material additional to that given earlier in the questionnaire, e.g. descriptions of how the job-share had been negotiated or accounts of the failure of other teachers to negotiate shared posts.**
iii) An expression of how the sharer felt about the experience of sharing.

Some of the responses are illuminating and examples are given in Appendix 5 under the headings a) Setting up the job-share arrangement
b) Attitudes of LEAs
c) Attitudes of senior management in schools
d) Personal responses to the experience of job-sharing.

A considerable number of respondents used this space to express support for this research project, saying that it was greatly needed, and hoping that the results would be made widely available.

SECTION VI: INFORMALLY COLLECTED MATERIAL

Many teachers have responded to publicity about this research. Most have described attempts to be allowed to job-share which have failed through lack of support. In several cases headteachers had been very supportive but the authority had been unwilling to consider job-sharing. Class-shares on temporary contracts have been permitted but not permanent job-shares. The teachers usually felt that the LEA officers had little knowledge of job-sharing and they sought examples of contracts offered in other LEAs and information which could be persuasive. Some had been offered a form of contract they felt to be unsatisfactory and wanted advice on whether they should accept it or seek changes. The teacher who was told by an area officer that job-shares could not be considered, but taught in an LEA whose personnel officer had replied in the research questionnaire that applications would always be sympathetically considered, is typical. In another case a potential partnership had been told that their authority did not have informally agreed job-sharers, while another pair of teachers in the same authority had written in describing their own sharing agreement, including a copy of a contract which specifically mentioned that they would be 'sharing a post'. Other examples of teacher frustration and LEA confusion abound.

Two pairs of deputy-head sharers described their experiences, though one of these was really a 'post' share. In each case small schools gained from an extra person in the management team and the opportunity for the many responsibilities which commonly fall on one person to be spread between two. One husband-and-wife team had shared for six years, the husband taking over full-time during each of the wife's maternity leaves. This had enabled both to share child-rearing, both to remain in teaching, and the school to have continuity. The husband was planning
to take over the job full-time shortly and his wife was taking up a post in another school. They were used to receiving much interest from other teachers in their situation. Their LEA had had a permissive approach to job-sharing on an informal basis for many years, and recently introduced a formal scheme to rationalise forms of contract and conditions of service.

**GENERAL DISCUSSION**

Many of the particular issues arising from the survey of sharers, e.g. organisation of posts, attitudes of LEA officers and school colleagues, the possibility of sharing promoted posts, will be discussed further in Part III Chapter 15, where responses from the LEA and senior management surveys can be integrated with those from the sharers.

The sharer responses were characterised by a great eagerness to contribute, questionnaires often being accompanied by additional sheets or personal letters. The most common complaints concerned the difficulty in obtaining information and the effort needed to persuade those in power to consider a job-share arrangement. There was great praise for those headteachers who were positive and supportive and it was clear that sharing was likely to be more successful in such a climate. The very close relationship between sharers, and the commitment of time and effort needed to make the partnership a success, were frequently emphasised. It was clear that the younger sharers with family responsibilities were very glad to be able to continue their careers, and that the 'pre-retirement' group found themselves much less stressed and in better health, and believed that this made them much more effective and lively teachers.

As with the headteacher survey some differences between the LEA areas became apparent. In the area with the long-running scheme attitudes were much more relaxed and schools and sharers were free to organise shares in whatever way seemed most appropriate. In Area 2 the job-share scheme was closely linked to the need to reduce staffing levels and here more of the sharers were full-time staff opting to share, not always with strong support from their schools, and with matching of partnerships largely carried out by LEA officers. Here, there were some indications of more formal and less flexible arrangements. The possible effects of the purpose and style of implementation of job-sharing schemes in different LEAs on the participants, and on the attitudes of those around them, will be discussed further in Chapter 16.
CHAPTER 13

THE REGISTER APPLICANTS

Three of the LEAs with job-sharing schemes who kept a register of teachers interested in obtaining shared posts agreed to send out letters requesting participation in the research. The officers could not immediately estimate the number of register applicants, particularly as in larger authorities these were sometimes held on area lists rather than centrally. It was not possible to check the exact number of requests actually sent out in each case so it is difficult to estimate the percentage of register applicants who responded. At a later date the response rate was considered by officers to be fairly low (about 40%) in Area 1, but high (about 80%) in Area 4. No opinion was given by officers in Area 2.

The personal profiles of the register applicants were similar to those of the existing job-sharers. Those who responded were sent a second questionnaire (see Appendix 1) a year later designed to reveal their progress towards obtaining a shared post. The percentage return rates for the follow-up were high:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Number Originally participating</th>
<th>Number Replying to Follow-up</th>
<th>Response rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The overall follow-up response rate was 86%

RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

These are presented as follows:

i) Type of employment at time of first contact

ii) Type of employment at time of second contact (1 year later)

iii) Was the respondent still seeking a job-share?

iv) The respondents' comments on their progress during the year in each of the areas surveyed.
i) **Employment at time of first contact** (follow-up respondents only)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Type</th>
<th>Area 1</th>
<th>Area 2</th>
<th>Area 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part time work on a permanent contract</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time work on a temporary contract</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time work on a permanent contract</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time work on a temporary contract</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-notice supply work in same LEA</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-notice supply work in adjacent LEA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed in teaching (career break)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (e.g. lecturing, advisory work)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Four from Area 1, and 3 from Area 2, reported some combination of types of employment during the previous year.

The data show different uses of the registers. In Area 4 the scheme was intended to apply to existing full-time teachers who would prefer to share, and thus the register consists of such applicants. In Area 1 existing full-time teachers wanting to share would not normally place their names on the register. If headteachers and governors agreed to their request there would be consultation with the area office and the appointment of a partner would be initiated. Existing full-time teachers do not therefore appear on the register. In Area 2 the scheme was intended mainly to permit existing full-time staff to share posts; the fact that only one such person replied to the research request may indicate that such teachers are dealt with separately from the register, that such teachers were not sent requests, or that they were less likely to be interested in participating.

ii) **Employment at time of second contact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Type</th>
<th>Area 1</th>
<th>Area 2</th>
<th>Area 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared post (temporary)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared post (permanent)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time post (permanent)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time post (permanent, not shared)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full or part-time post (temporary, not shared)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-notice supply</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed outside teaching</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 respondents in Area 1, and 7 in Area 2, reported some combination of the above categories. In particular 11 combined short-notice supply work with other part-time teaching on a regular basis, or other employment e.g. as lecturers in Further Education or work outside the education system.
Only 7 of the 70 register applicants had obtained a permanent shared post a year after making their applications. In the two larger areas, the percentage of success was 9% in each case. This figure must be treated with caution in view of the fact that the proportion of register applicants taking part may be low.

iii) Are job-shares still desired?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area 1</th>
<th>Area 2</th>
<th>Area 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable (share obtained)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No reply</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chief feature of this table is that both of the unsuccessful applicants in Area 4 and 73% of those in Area 2 were still seeking shared posts, while only 35% of those in Area 1 still wanted them. The reasons for no longer seeking a job-share are interesting. In Area 2 one had simply 'given up hope' and another had left the area while a third now had a permanent part-time contract. A fourth applicant gave no reason for a change of mind. In Area 1, two had obtained full-time posts, one as a lecturer in F.E. and one in an adjacent authority, and a third was expecting to return to full-time work in the immediate future. The most important factor was that 8 of the applicants now had individual permanent part-time contracts. This had largely arisen from the authority's practice of giving permanent contracts to those who had completed five years service in a part-time post on a sequence of fixed-term renewable contracts. Several of the applicants had not wished to change jobs but had applied to job-share because of the insecurity of their current posts. When these posts became permanent the need to search for a shared post receded. Five of these teachers pointed out that while they were not currently seeking a job-share they would do so if they were in future threatened with redundancy or saw the opportunity for promotion through a sharing arrangement. One commented that as a separate part-timer she felt more vulnerable if a school needed to shed staff, but as a job-sharer she would feel vulnerable if a partner left and could not easily be replaced. In Area 2 it appears that permanent part-time contracts are extremely rare, and thus job-shares are the only real hope for those who want permanent part-time work.

iv) Comments on progress

The applicants were invited to comment on any progress made towards obtaining a shared post - or lack of it.
Of the 8 applicants still wanting to share, 6 queried the operation of the register. They had had no communication since submitting their names for inclusion and wondered if there really was any attempt to identify suitable posts or potential partners. One regularly scanned the advertisements for part-share vacancies, but had no potential partner in mind with whom to make a joint application for a full-time post. Another had nearly given up hoping and was considering taking up a post outside teaching. At an earlier stage in this research the authority admitted that the register was not 'active'. An officer could consult it to see if there was anyone suitable for a vacancy but this was probably a rare occurrence. Certainly there was no attempt to put potential partners in touch with each other. Two of the applicants had expressed dissatisfaction with the register system which appeared to give them little help. They had both attended a course of in-service training for supply teachers at which the group had set up a keep-in-touch facility so that pairs could apply jointly for posts in which they were interested.

Two of the teachers included did not actually appear on the register, but had nevertheless applied to job-share. They worked in the same department of a secondary school, one having been there for fifteen years and the other for four. While the timetable was so arranged that classes were not shared they felt that in practice they shared one full-time post. Certainly if both had resigned at the same time a full-time post would have been advertised. They saw themselves as in practice sharing a post, but having poorer contracts than official job-sharers. One was still on a fixed-term renewable contract, and the other had a permanent contract which specified that hours could be varied within given limits, that in the event of redeployment the post would be low in the order of priority and no transitional travelling expenses would be payable. Since job-sharers had the same status as full-time staff the teachers felt that they would like to be recognised as bona fide sharers. This caused consternation, particularly because senior school staff were unaware of the implications. The deputy in charge of timetabling had to be reassured that there was no need to re-write the timetable since overlapping hours were acceptable. The headteacher needed a swift consultation with the area officer. Finally the headteacher decided not to support the application as it would reduce 'staffing flexibility'. In fact both teachers were asked to work for more hours the following year, after which both partners would have permanent contracts, giving greater security to the one currently on the fixed-term contract. The teachers considered an appeal, but as the school roll was due to rise in the future, and the need for redeployment unlikely, they decided against it. If an
appropriate opportunity for promotion occurred (whether internal or external) they still intended to apply for it jointly. At the same time they remained unhappy that long-serving de facto job-sharers should have less favourable contracts than newly appointed de jure partnerships.

Area 2

Of the unsuccessful applicants two had received no further communication after submitting their names for the register, and one had simply given up hope. One said that no-one in her area had been identified as a suitable partner, another had been offered one sharing vacancy but had refused it as it was an hour's journey from her home. One had discovered that it was easier for her husband to obtain a shared post in the social services sector so he was combining this with part-time child care while she worked full-time.

A third of the respondents said that job-shares were available only to those with permanent full-time contracts or a very long record of temporary and supply work. One added that it seemed unfair that current service after a career break counted, but long service before a career break was worth nothing. Another pointed out that

"All positions which become available and appear in the monthly circulars specify in bold print that only teachers with a full-time permanent post may apply!"

Some queried the fairness with which qualifying limits on previous service were applied:

"There does seem to be a very 'grey area'. Someone who was a supply teacher on a long-term basis managed to secure a permanent job-share post even though she had not yet achieved the 'magic number' of consecutive teaching days to warrant applying!"

While pairing of applicants appeared to be done by officers rather than at interview by schools, there was some evidence that care was taken to assess compatibility of teaching styles and attitudes to the educational process, as well as qualifications and geographical convenience. One applicant described how she had been interviewed when requesting that her name be entered on the job-share register:

"This was a formal interview which lasted thirty minutes and required me to answer six or seven questions ranging from discipline procedures to outlining, in every aspect, the purpose of project work within the classroom! My husband thinks he had an easier interview when he"
applied for [a senior promoted post]. I was told that if a job-share post came up which could not be filled by a permanent teacher then [the officer] would notify me."

This applicant had so far been unsuccessful in obtaining a shared post and continued to work as a short-notice supply teacher.

Area 4

Of the two unsuccessful applicants one had 'heard nothing' and the other had now applied for the third time. She had recently had a second baby and did not wish to continue working full-time. The purpose of the register in Area 4 was to pair full-time teachers wishing to share and if no partner was found there appeared to be no suggestion that a part-share could be advertised or offered to a suitable supply teacher.

SUMMARY - THE USE OF JOB-SHARE REGISTERS

Areas 2 and 4 illustrate the use of registers in schemes where the main advantage for the LEA lies in the possibility of reducing staff numbers by permitting existing full-time staff to share posts. Here the registers are used by authorities to organise partnerships between existing employees, firstly those with permanent full-time contracts, and secondly those with a long record of supply service. This may be seen as a fair way of sharing employment opportunities at times when there is a need to reduce staff. From the point of view of teachers who are not qualified by current contract or length of service for priority consideration, the situation can be very frustrating. They have expressed an interest but see little hope of success. In particular, although full-time vacancies are still available for full-time applicants, they do not appear to be available for job-sharers, even though this could increase the number of teachers obtaining work.

In both Areas 2 and 4 paired applications could in theory be made for full-time posts, but the register is likely to be involved only if the partners are already employed.

In Area 1 the job-share scheme was initiated largely as part of equal-opportunities policies, and while there was some need to reduce the number of secondary teachers and increase the number of primary teachers, job-sharing was seen as offering only an incidental contribution to staffing flexibility. Thus new job-sharing arrangements were not restricted in the secondary sector, and existing full-time staff were not discouraged from sharing in primary schools. Here the register was admitted to be virtually non-functional. It was a vehicle by which
teachers could express an interest in obtaining a shared post, and an opportunity for officers to consult a list of potential partners, but little positive use was made of it. Only one mention was made by sharers in this area of any reference to the register being made. One claimed that her area officer denied that any such register existed. The authority recognised that a more positive use of the register could be made and that this might be undertaken when staffing permitted. The advent of other government initiatives such as LMS had relegated such matters to a very low priority. The study of the sharers in this authority shows that most were known to schools before appointment, with the advantage that the schools had been able to assess the likely compatibility of partners beforehand. Vacant part-shares had also been advertised locally to provide opportunities for other interested candidates to apply. Register applicants nevertheless felt that it was difficult for them to make paired applications for full-time posts without some mechanism for identifying potential partners. They had hoped that the register would fulfil this function and been disappointed. This is well illustrated by the group of supply teachers who agreed to keep in touch after an in-service course with a view to establishing potential partnerships. Few felt they had any hope of obtaining shared full-time vacancies by applying as separate potential job-sharers and hoping for a partner at interview; only ready-made partnerships were likely to have any chance of success.

Positive action in operating a job-share register seems likely to occur when this has some value for the LEA, e.g. in assisting in the reduction of staffing levels, rather than when it is of value to those wishing to find shared posts. If a shortage of teachers in the 1990s comes about, as was predicted in the late 1980s, then registers may be used positively to recruit teachers currently unemployed or under-employed to fill vacant posts.

The operation of job-share registers will be considered further in Part III, Chapter 15.
PART III

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Part III contains a discussion of important issues concerning job-sharing in relation to the teaching profession, some of which are applicable to other areas of employment. It uses the research material analysed in Part II, combining the contributions collected from LEA officers, senior management in schools, participating sharers and register applicants. Information from informally collected material is included where this adds to or illuminates that collected by the formal research.

Chapter 14

In this chapter the origin and implementation of the job-share schemes is discussed. This leads to the consideration of an appropriate descriptive terminology for the ways in which the schemes arose and were developed, and a suggestion that attitudes and outcomes may be affected by the way in which policy is made and put into practice.

Chapter 15

In this chapter a variety of issues relating to job-shares operating in schools is discussed using the information obtained from all the interviews and questionnaires.

Chapter 16

This chapter considers how the origins and methods of implementation of the job-share policies discussed in Chapter 14 may have influenced the operation of the shared posts and attitudes towards job-sharing discussed in Chapter 15.

There is a discussion on the ways in which innovation at grass-roots level may lead to the introduction of formal policy - "innovation-led policy", or formal policy decisions may lead to innovative practice - "policy-led innovation".

There follows a section of practical suggestions for LEAs considering the introduction of job-share schemes for teachers, which may also have some relevance to other areas of employment.

Chapter 17

Here we take a look into the future and consider whether changes in education, particularly following the Education Reform Act 1988, may lead to an increase or decrease in job-sharing in the teaching profession.

Chapter 18

The final chapter provides a summary of the findings of this research and some general conclusions.
CHAPTER 14
THE ORIGIN AND IMPLEMENTATION OF
JOB-SHARE POLICIES FOR TEACHERS

ORIGINS

The question of whether an LEA has a policy on job-sharing for teachers is not as simple to answer as might be expected. While 12 of the 117 LEAs had formal and explicit policies in operation or about to be produced, others who described themselves as not having job-share policies were nevertheless willing to consider sympathetically requests from schools to appoint two teachers to a post, where this was supported by head and governors. Such LEAs can be described as having implicit job-share policies, since 'ad hoc' sharing of a post is permitted but there is no formal policy statement. In contrast other LEAs can be described as having an implicit anti-job-sharing policy, since requests from schools are turned down on the grounds that no formal policy exists. Those which permit informal sharing arrangements may find that these become gradually more common, and may wish subsequently to introduce a formal policy, either because of the need to rationalise the organisation of sharing arrangements, or because they wish to encourage the practice for particular reasons.

Policies which have developed from an informal 'permissive' situation to a more formalised structure with documentation can be described as 'evolutionary', but within this category there remains a range of possible action or inaction by the LEA. Some merely permit job-sharing where a school seeks to make such an appointment, while others may promote the practice, giving positive encouragement by spreading the idea and examples of successful sharing via local inspectors, advisers, area education officers and the personnel department.

It is at the stage where an LEA realises that informal job-sharing is becoming more common, or that its extension would benefit the education service, that a formal scheme is introduced. The details of such a scheme may be strongly influenced by the organisation of partnerships already in existence; for example the exclusion of head of department posts is unlikely if some such posts are already successfully shared. Limitations on time-sharing patterns are unlikely to be made if schools already operate a wide variety of patterns to suit individual needs. Areas most in need of rationalisation are usually those relating to contracts. Informal sharers are often on renewable fixed-term contracts, and these need to be replaced
by permanent ones referring to the shared nature of the post and giving details of
the procedure to be followed if one partner should leave.

In LEAs where informal sharing has not been permitted a decision may be
made to introduce a formal scheme. If there has been no tradition of permanent
part-time contracts this may be a considerable shock to the system for those who
view part-time work as suited only to temporary low-level vacancies, and the
introduction of a job-share scheme may be described as a 'Big Bang'. Where
permanent part-time contracts have been available, the idea of two such teachers
sharing a full-time post may be less of a culture shock and the situation may be
described as a 'Little Bang'. The equating of 'part-time' with temporary, supply,
low-level and easily-terminated posts has resulted in a conceptual barrier for many.
A notion that part-timers are not committed and 'only do it for the pin money' is a
further hurdle to be overcome. Even so, there will be some headteachers and other
senior staff who will welcome the new opportunity and feel that its introduction
has been long overdue.

The reasons for which LEAs have introduced formal job-sharing policies,
either as an innovation or as a means of encouraging or rationalising existing
informally shared situations, are of particular interest. A more detailed discussion
of a descriptive terminology ranging from 'Evolutionary' to 'Big bang' occurs at
the end of this chapter. The motivation and interplay of the groups involved in
negotiating policies can be very complex, and the relative importance of the various
forces at work may be seen differently by the actors involved. Few cases seem to
be clear cut, the best examples being those of the oldest scheme, Area 5, which
was based on the desire to extend employment to as many people as possible when
few jobs were available in the area, and one of the new schemes (Area 4) which
was introduced as part of a package of policies aimed at reducing over-staffing
without redundancies. Equal opportunities issues played a major part in several
others, though this could be initiated from the bottom by pressure from trade union
groups who wanted evidence that the LEA was committed to equal opportunities
(as in Area 7), or from the top by a Local Authority stating its equal opportunities
philosophy and requiring its Education Department to introduce measures such as
job-sharing which would support its aims (as in Area 1). A legal case stating that
refusal to allow an employee returning from maternity leave to work part-time
could constitute indirect sex discrimination affected not only the Authority
concerned (Area 2), but provided a warning to other Authorities too. Some LEAs
needed to reduce staffing owing to falling school rolls, while others were
desperately short of teachers overall or of teachers in some particular subject areas.
Concern was felt not only at personnel department level, but at school level too.
Heads and local inspectors knew of well-qualified and experienced teachers unable or unwilling to work full-time whose skills could be more fully used by job-sharing. Some heads wished to retain the services of good staff in their schools by allowing them to return to shared posts after maternity leave even when full-time applicants might be available. Thus in some areas heads and local inspectors put pressure on LEAs to permit job-sharing. In others headteacher groups were seen to be very cautious or even opposed. Part-timers could be seen as lacking commitment, children as needing the continuity of one teacher, and the organisational demands as too burdensome. In some cases negotiating committees involving teacher unions and personnel officers were unable to reach agreement, and plans to introduce job-sharing were therefore abandoned, or at least shelved. In others, where a Local Authority had directed that a job-sharing scheme should be introduced, the negotiating groups became involved in long and difficult discussions on the details of the schemes. While teacher unions had differing attitudes to job-sharing at national level, as shown in Chapter 4, the personal opinions of those representing the unions at local level could be of particular importance to the progress of negotiations. New schemes, where job-sharing had previously not been permitted, were often discussed without the advantage of experience about how job-sharing worked, and there was a tendency towards caution, together with a desire to cover points as comprehensively as possible (e.g. Area 2). In such cases the details of the scheme and its implementation could be very limiting and require adjustment at a later stage to permit greater flexibility and more imaginative use of job-sharing. Conversely other schemes remained very vague, leaving schools and potential sharers without guidance and advice (e.g. Area 3).

It is not easy to distinguish between those schemes where details (e.g. with regard to in-service training) have been deliberately omitted on the grounds that these should be agreed between sharers and head according to local circumstances, and those where details have been omitted because the issues have not been considered at all. The research shows that heads and sharers were often pleased to be given freedom to come to their own decisions, especially when heads were supportive of job-sharing. In other cases there were obvious tensions, and heads and sharers would have preferred more detailed guidance. Possibly the provision of guidelines, with a rider that alternative patterns were permissible if head and sharers wished, could have provided an acceptable compromise.

It is not always easy to separate the concept of the policy itself and the details of its implementation. Some job-share schemes were initially accepted in principle but were aborted due to lack of agreement on the details for their implementation.
In others the introduction of job-sharing was required by the Local Authority and implemented with the minimum of detail, limitations being introduced or discretions permitted as experience of job-sharing was gained.

There is some evidence that the decision to introduce a formal job-sharing policy often resulted from a coming together of both philosophical and practical aims, sometimes from different participants. Discussions on job-sharing entered into for equal opportunities reasons, but foundering on differences of opinion and details of implementation, could very quickly be brought to fruition by pressures of a legal case and an awareness that voluntary job-sharing by existing full-time staff could assist in reducing teacher numbers without redundancy. Pressure from teacher groups for job-sharing as part of an equal opportunities programme achieved success where LEA officers considered that such a scheme could help to retain and recruit staff in Areas with teacher shortages. Similarly government support for the idea of job-sharing had been voiced not only because of pressure from those (mainly women) who sought more flexible working patterns, but because reports on teacher shortages caused a search for any forms of action which might contribute to a solution.

The combination of philosophical and practical motives echoes those seen in Chapter 5 where some employers outside education wished to support equal opportunities and respond to the needs of individual employees and realised that such action could also benefit the employer, by facilitating the retention of experienced employees, for example, or enabling more employees to be at work at peak times.

**DEFINITIONS**

In order to decide whether a job-share policy should be introduced, it is necessary for the participants to have a concept of what job-sharing involves. A total lack of understanding was shown by a reply from a senior education officer of a local authority: "We don't need job-sharing; there is plenty of temporary and supply work available here and that's the same sort of thing". This respondent seemed unaware that one of the main purposes of job-sharing is to make permanent posts available to part-time workers. This point was, however, clear to another senior officer. He replied that the greatest value of part-timers was that they could be kept on temporary contracts to boost the proportion of employees who could be used for flexibility in staffing numbers. To give permanent contracts to part-timers would reduce what for him was their major advantage.

Some of the 'ad hoc' sharers had renewable termly contracts, often because permanent ones were not available, even though they were considered as
permanent employees. Some of the sharers in formal schemes had fixed-term contracts for the same reasons as these might be issued to full-time staff, e.g. they might be covering for a teacher on secondment. In some LEAs only those with permanent contracts were called job-sharers, those on fixed-term contracts being referred to as 'paired part-timers'. Some job-shares were to cover a temporary bulge in pupil numbers and consisted of a permanent part-timer temporarily sharing with a fixed-term partner. Other sharers on temporary contracts were replacing a permanent sharer on maternity leave. While the most common example is of a permanent post filled by two permanent part-time sharers, there are occasions when the post may not itself be permanent, or one of both of the sharers may not hold the share permanently. The fact that the LEAs did not always use the same terminology made some statistical comparisons difficult. In particular some class-shares in primary schools were referred to as job-shares when they were clearly of a temporary nature, and some pairs of part-timers in secondary schools operated for many years as sharers of a full-time post but were not classified as job-sharers by their LEA.

**JOB-SHARERS AND PERMANENT PART-TIMERS**

The different nature of work in primary and secondary schools resulted in different classifications for permanent part-time teachers. Apart from 'floating' teachers in primary schools, generally dealing with the special needs pupils or some particular aspect of the curriculum, primary teachers are predominantly class teachers. Thus when two teachers share one class they are easily referred to as job-sharers. In secondary schools teachers are within subject departments and teach several different classes. It is possible for two part-time teachers to occupy one full-time post without ever sharing a class. The emphasis is more on sharing the work of a department. The amount of teacher-time needed by a department varies with the curriculum of the school and is not necessarily expressed in full-time equivalent units. Thus unless two teachers apply for, and are appointed to, an advertised full-time post, or an existing full-time teacher requests to share his or her post, they are more likely to be referred to as part-time teachers than as sharers. At least one LEA (Area 1) decided that for a pair to be classified as job-sharers they would have to show that they shared some aspects of the job. Whether pastoral responsibility for a tutor-group would be sufficient was not clear. Since job-share contracts had advantages over permanent part-time contracts offered in this authority, the distinction was important. Prospective sharers were advised by unions to plan to share at least some classes at first in order to be classified as sharers, but then switch to teaching separate classes afterwards, if this appeared to be in the best interests of the pupils and was preferred by the sharers.
and head-of-department. The data on secondary job-shares is thus affected by the fact that (a) LEAs offering permanent part-time contracts were likely to have lower proportions of secondary teachers identified specifically as job-sharers, (b) those pairs who actually shared classes were more likely to be classified as job-sharers than those who split timetables between them, but (c) those who did split timetables but were still classified as job-sharers appeared to be the most successful. A further reason for some heads preferring permanent part-time posts in secondary schools was that the actual number of hours worked could be more easily varied from year to year by agreement between teachers and the school, and that the teachers were often willing to work 0.6 or 0.7 of a week each and could therefore contribute more than if sharing at (say) 0.5 each. The notion of a shared post being equal to more than one full-time equivalent was encountered only in the longest-running scheme (Area 5), and a new scheme which offered 'overlap' time for consultation (Area 1). The great drawback for teachers in the use of permanent part-time posts rather than job-shares was that while job-sharers could hold promoted posts, separate part-timers were hardly ever considered eligible.

THE WHOLE JOB

In some LEAs each sharer was expected to be competent to undertake all aspects of the whole job. This qualification also appeared in the NAS/UWT guidelines. In practice this requirement was found to be limiting and could prevent schools from appointing partnerships with a range of qualifications. The problem applies particularly to secondary schools, who may for instance be glad to have a pair of language teachers one of whom can teach French to 'A' level and the other German to 'A' level while both can teach either language to GCSE. A full-time post requiring the teaching of maths throughout the school could well be filled by a partnership only one of whom teaches to 'A' level, the other having a special interest in working with slow learners or having additional qualifications in computing. While the ability of each partner to cover the whole job description was sometimes mentioned in the LEA policy document it was seldom insisted upon, though it could affect the offer of the whole job to the remaining partner if one left. A caveat that this offer might not always be made was usually included in LEA guidelines.

SHARING TIME

In most LEAs the time ratio worked by the partners was not specified, though 4:1 was often considered too unbalanced to constitute a real job-share and teachers were commonly advised that a system of equal shares was the only way to ensure that each partner worked the 16 hours needed to obtain protection under
employment legislation (See Chapter 1). Some LEAs expected the sharers to cover all ten sessions a week between them. This is normally necessary in primary schools, though some used the shared post for the teaching of small groups of pupils with learning difficulties and preferred to have both partners working in the mornings. Some LEAs stated that any method of splitting time which suited the school and the sharers would be acceptable, while others implied that 2½ day/2½ day or morning/afternoon patterns would be most likely. None explicitly mentioned the possibility of working patterns which overlapped, with sometimes both and sometimes neither of the partners being at work. Some schools had simply never considered the possibility, and some LEA officers were rather vague about whether it would be permitted. Constraints on secondary school timetabling in order to allow sharers reasonably coherent working patterns could be balanced by the added flexibility arising from the possibility of both sharers working at the same time, provided that the LEA would allow it. Schools and sharers were often not clear what limitations existed implicitly in the scheme and how far discretion in the organisation of the shared post was permitted. In one school (in Area 1), an overlapping system operated successfully but the headteacher requested that this information should be confidential in case the LEA should find out and put a stop to it! This is perhaps another area where an LEA could have provided guidelines with a provision that schools could use alternative arrangements if they wished. The emphasis in documents often seemed to concentrate on how time should be split rather than on how the whole job might be shared.

NON-WORKING TIME

One scheme (Area 10) required that job-sharers should not be employed elsewhere in their non-teaching time. This is of considerable importance to those who wish to undertake lecturing or, for example, commercial translation work in the remainder of their time. Whether self-employment as an artist or author would be included was not made clear. This regulation was possibly honoured more in the breach than in the observance!

REPLACEMENT OF A PARTNER

The procedure to be followed if one partner left provoked a great deal of discussion when job-sharing schemes were being planned, and there were some differences in the processes agreed. Generally the remaining teacher is first offered the post on a full-time basis, though this may not be done if (a) the remaining sharer is unable to cover all aspects of the work, (b) the job-share was set up to reduce staffing and the vacancy can be filled by a volunteer from a full-time post, and (c) the remaining sharer did not hold the post previously in a full-time capacity.
(e.g. a maternity leave returner who changed from full-time to job-share would be guaranteed the option to return to full-time status but her partner would not). If the remaining sharer does not wish to work full-time the part-post is advertised. An alternative method is that the remaining sharer is not immediately offered the full-time post, but can apply for the vacant share in competition with others responding to the advertisement. This means that the school retains the option of continuing with the job-share by appointing a new partner if it wishes. If after advertisement no new partner can be found, the existing sharer may be given a second chance to take over the full-time post, possibly with a view to advertising again at a later date, or may instead be offered a separate permanent part-time post in the same or a different school. Under local management the opportunity for LEAs to promise redeployment is seriously diminished and many schemes have had to be amended since to take account of this. This is one of the areas which were usually decided in detail and set out clearly in the original documentation of a scheme. One issue had however caused concern in at least two LEAs. Where a school had to reduce staff numbers, could it do so by not replacing a leaving job-share partner? Not to do so changes the status of the remaining sharer, reduces the likelihood that s/he can obtain or keep promotion, and removes the option of return to full-time work by taking over the partner's share. This issue had not been addressed in the documentation and in one case it was decided that the post was a whole job which could be retained or declared redundant but not split, in another the remaining sharer was content to remain in a permanent part-time post, and in a third the remaining sharer left for a job elsewhere while the matter was being considered.

**PROMOTED POSTS**

The most general statement in policy documents is that promoted posts are not excluded from job-sharing. In some instances pastoral head-of-year posts, deputy-head and headships are stated as excluded explicitly, while in others there is some cautious statement that while promoted posts are not excluded, each case should be dealt with on its own merits. A few mention the possibility of promotion as one of the attractions of job-sharing.

**ADVERTISEMENTS**

While advertising for a vacant part-share is relatively straightforward, the issue of permitting or encouraging paired or single job-share applications for full-time posts is not. In LEAs where job-sharing formed part of a package of equal opportunities initiatives, it was usual for some general statement to be included in advertisements, e.g. "all posts are considered suitable for job-sharing unless
otherwise stated”. In LEAs where job-sharing was permitted at the request of schools, the wording of advertisements was more usually left to headteachers. Although some might add “applications from potential job-sharers will be welcome”, most would not even think of mentioning the possibility. In such Areas there was evidence from the informally-collected research that many teachers were not aware that job-sharing could be considered, much less that it might be worth applying for a full-time post without a partner in the hope that someone else might do so as well, or that a job-sharing register might be consulted. Only those who happened to know of existing partnerships, or who had perhaps seen local press items at the time the scheme was introduced, might feel able to apply for advertised full-time posts. Even in areas where job-sharing was clearly advertised, the encouragement given by the LEA to potential sharers to apply for full-time posts did not necessarily represent the views of the headteachers of the schools concerned. Thus such applications might stand little chance of being considered. The policy statements gave little or no guidance on how joint or single applications for full-time posts should be dealt with, how pairing and interviewing might proceed or how governors could be made more aware of the advantages and disadvantages of appointing job-sharers. It is perhaps hardly surprising that this method of obtaining a shared post was extremely rare within the formal and informal research.

JOB-SHARING POLICIES - 'EVOLUTIONARY OR 'BIG BANG'?

It was not originally planned that this research should address issues of social policy theory, partly because the author does not have an academic background in the social sciences. In the event, the study of the different ways in which the job-share policies had been introduced in various LEAs gave rise to the need for some descriptive terminology. A continuum from 'Evolutionary' to 'Big Bang' seemed a useful way of categorising the approaches found, and served a useful purpose in attempting to account for differences in the data obtained from the participating LEAs.
**BIG BANG**

Introduction of a comprehensive detailed policy (minimal regular part-time tradition, local initiatives previously refused)

**LITTLE BANG**

As above, but following a tradition of permanent part-time opportunities

**FORMALISED POST-EVOLUTIONARY**

Formal policy based on experience of ad hoc sharers (may be more or less permissive/restrictive)

**ENCOURAGED EVOLUTION**

Encourages and promotes local initiatives, monitors, supports and enables, but no detailed formal policy

**EVOLUTIONARY**

Permits local initiatives freedom to develop.

Subsequently it seemed appropriate to consider briefly whether terms used by other researchers and writers might be more or less useful in describing the processes explored in this research. Descriptive terms include 'top down' in which an employer develops a policy which furthers the aims of the organisation, and 'bottom up', in which the impetus for change comes from the workforce or administrators at lower levels. Other terms include 'muddling through', 'incrementalist' and 'rational comprehensive' to describe the processes by which policy is developed and translated into practice. Each of these terms appears to have limitations when applied to the job-share policies studied here.

a) **'Top down' and 'bottom up'**

References to 'top down' and 'bottom up' seem overly simplistic. In most areas there appeared to be a desire on the part of teachers for more permanent and satisfying forms of part-time work, but this often failed to become pressure for change because requests were turned down at school and local office level on the grounds that the LEA did not have a job-share policy, and teacher unions seldom appeared to take up the cause on negotiating committees. In other areas equal opportunities groups, including union representatives, looked at positive measures to advance their cause and were able to exert upward pressure for action which included job-sharing opportunities. In one such example (Area 7) a group demanded a statement from the LEA about whether it was an 'equal opportunity employer'. The authority thought it was, somewhat tentatively, but was then pressured to show how this operated in practice. A job-share scheme was among the initiatives which followed. In another area (Area 2), two employees outside
teaching had requested to share the job of one of them on return from maternity leave. Despite strong support from line managers in their sector this was refused, and the authority was taken to a tribunal on the grounds of indirect sex discrimination. The employees won their case and the authority had to permit job-sharing. While a job-share policy had already been under discussion, the limitations proposed had been unacceptable to unions, and the 'bottom up' initiative leading to the tribunal had a clear influence on the authority concerned and on other authorities as well. Even so it appears that employers generally introduced job-share policies when it suited their own needs. One LEA (Area 2) was clearly helped to avoid redundancies by using voluntary job-sharing as a mechanism to reduce overstaffing. Another (Area 4) admitted that job-sharing primarily arose as a result of consideration of various means of reducing staffing levels as painlessly as possible. In southern counties with an overall staffing problem LEAs were able to see that job-sharing might enable them to recruit or retain staff, and elsewhere LEAs found that they could retain teachers with skills in short supply, e.g. teachers of the deaf. Some local authorities introduced job-sharing for reasons of equal opportunities philosophy (e.g. Area 1), or to spread the available work in times of recession (e.g. Area 5). Such policies seem in several cases to have been more readily implemented for the non-education sector of the parent Local Authority than for teachers. Few, if any, of the policies appear to be either wholly top-down or wholly bottom-up, being more likely to arise when the needs of those at the top and the desires of those at the bottom can be met through the introduction of the same policy.

The top-down/bottom-up dimension also seems difficult to relate to situations where there are several tiers in the decision-making process. A local authority may want a job-share scheme for philosophical reasons while the Director of Education may not favour it for practical ones. Education personnel managers may want job-sharing as a means of recruitment but headteachers on negotiating committees may fear administrative difficulties and adverse effects on pupils. Teachers may want to share, but governors may be wary of new ideas. There is not simply a 'top' represented by local authority policy makers and a 'bottom' represented by teachers, but a range of 'in-betweens' who are able to influence, or even make, policy decisions, and who may be 'top' or 'bottom' depending on the particular interface considered.

A further problem is that while the origins of a policy may be due to bottom-up pressure, the introduction of the policy and its implementational framework may be clearly dictated from the top. In contrast, an authority which decides in a top-down manner to permit job-sharing in principle, may leave much of the detail to be
decided at local level so that the development of the outline policy becomes bottom-up.

Finally the analysis of the introduction of such a policy is fraught with difficulties. Accounts in the informally collected material from two members of a negotiating group (both teachers) showed considerable differences in their understanding of how decisions had been made; an account from one of the personnel officers present would probably have offered a different perspective again.

Other terms used by writers on policy theory include 'muddling through', 'incrementalist' and 'rational comprehensive'.

b) 'Muddling through'

The expression 'muddling through' could apply to cases where local requests to job-share are acceded to without much thought, as a means of solving a particular staffing problem, and probably as a temporary measure. It does not appear applicable to instances where an authority deliberately reacts favourably to individual requests, provides support where needed, monitors the development of such initiatives with interest, and perhaps actively spreads examples of good practice via area officers, advisers, or local inspectors.

c) 'Incrementalist'

'Incrementalist' could imply that the authority has a policy of improving part-time opportunities in a step-by-step way leading towards the introduction of job-sharing. This gradualist method could be accompanied by clear regulations at each stage which limit the scope for local initiative, growth and development to suit individual circumstances. The term does not carry the connotation of 'freedom to develop' implicit in 'Evolutionary'. The latter term implies trust relationships within which headteachers and governors are permitted to exercise discretion over staffing arrangements in their schools, and allowed to develop the possibilities of new situations with minimum interference from above.

d) 'Rational Comprehensive'

'Rational comprehensive' may be close to the situation described here as 'Big Bang', in that the purpose of the policy and the details of the implementation package have been thought out before its introduction on a particular date. In this research the term 'Big Bang' is preferred however, partly by analogy with 'Evolutionary', and partly because it permits the use of 'Little Bang' to describe situations where the changes introduced by the policy are of lesser impact, e.g. because permanent part-time posts are already well accepted.
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Conclusions

Any descriptive terms used have limitations and few real situations will precisely fit a given framework. Nevertheless some means of description seems useful in analysing the variations in policy development and implementation observed, and in suggesting possible reasons for differences emerging from statistical data. Since *Evolutionary → Big Bang* appears to fit the structures found in this research most appropriately, this terminology will be used where relevant in subsequent discussion.

Authorities planning to introduce job-sharing at the present time commonly have to decide whether to accede positively to individual requests and permit growth, or whether to introduce a detailed package of policy statements and implementation details. Perceived advantages and disadvantages are both likely to vary with the standpoint of the viewer. Administrators, for example, and union field officers, may prefer clear and detailed regulations which save argument, and some headteachers may welcome the fact that 'loose ends' are tied up. Other heads may regret the loss of power to make decisions themselves, where particular variations could suit their own schools. Sharers may be glad of regulations which protect them from unsupportive heads or LEA officers, or regret those same regulations if they limit freedom of action desired by themselves and more supportive and adventurous heads. The table below lists some characteristics relating to opposite ends of the *Evolutionary → Big Bang* continuum. Of course many job-share schemes will not be appropriately placed at either end, but could appear somewhere along the continuum with characteristics associated more closely with one end rather than the other.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Evolutionary</strong></th>
<th><strong>Big-Bang</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Job-shares start in supportive environments (participants want to make it work)</td>
<td>Some environments may be hostile (some line managers/colleagues want to show it won't work)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Pragmatic solutions to problems</td>
<td>Solutions may be limited by the 'rules' of the scheme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Changes can be made easily at local level</td>
<td>Change is more difficult - may need committee decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Arrangements can adjust to individual school/sharer circumstances</td>
<td>Permitted variations may not fit specific cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Freedom of decision and development encourages personal commitment</td>
<td>Staff may feel less involved since freedom of decision is restricted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Job-shares grow out of local needs, remain part of school community</td>
<td>Sharers may be seen as a 'special' group, different, privileged, possibly resented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Other staff are able to retain a neutral stance, postpone judgement until the outcome is seen</td>
<td>Discussion on whether to introduce a policy may drive staff into taking sides and being very 'pro' or very 'con'. Positions may be polarised</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Those whose views on job-sharing are neutral can benefit from successful experience developed elsewhere in positive environments</td>
<td>Those who are neutral may be influenced by job-shares which fail due to hostile environments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Getting a job-share depends on who you know, whether the head is supportive etc. Some luck involved</td>
<td>All applicants to share are treated alike; it doesn't depend on the views of a particular head or LEA officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Lack of guidance - sharers not sure what they can and can't do - different heads make different decisions</td>
<td>All the rules are clear so it is fairer to everyone and saves arguments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Some teachers may not even be aware that other schools have job-shares, so it does not occur to them to ask about the possibility</td>
<td>Availability of job-sharing is published in school circulars, job adverts etc. so everyone is aware of the possibility</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12 Progress may be slow. It takes time to evolve into a generally accepted practice, let alone a policy.

13 Obtaining a shared post may depend on individual initiative, and (possibly) determination to get it accepted and operational. Potential sharers may feel lacking in 'clout' to get anything done.

14 Few supportive structures exist, e.g. mechanisms for finding a partner.

15 Local initiatives may be cautious e.g. only basic scale jobs, or only fixed-term contracts at first - others may get the idea that only such posts are suitable.

16 Local initiatives may be more confident and appoint sharers to higher level posts because they know the sharers and believe the arrangement will be successful.

Job-sharing can be introduced immediately

Usually a standard procedure for applying - a direct route to decision-making.

Wider supportive structures available, e.g. the existence of a register of potential partners.

Formal policy statements can make clear that job-sharing may apply to promoted posts and involves permanent contracts.

Formal schemes may limit the level of posts to be shared (or include promoted posts in theory but make it difficult for them to happen in practice).

Thus the 'Evolutionary' → 'Big Bang' continuum not only appears useful in describing the development of the job-sharing policies in the LEAs studied, but it illuminates factors which may affect the implementation of the policies, the perceptions of the participants and the effectiveness of the outcome.

Many of the factors listed may apply to other innovative practices which may develop or be introduced in areas outside of, as well as within, education.
CHAPTER 15
THE POLICIES IN PRACTICE

In this chapter we turn from the origins of job-share policies for teachers, their structure and documentation, to the experience of the participants when the policies are put into practice. The discussion takes place under the following headings:

1 Administration
   a) Subversion
   b) Regulation and Discretion
   c) Access to Information
   d) Appointment
   e) Induction and Follow-up

2 Management
   f) Liaison
   g) Contact and Non-contact time
   h) Promotion

3 Attitudes
   i) Attitudes of colleagues
   j) 'Evolutionary' or 'Big Bang' - possible influences on attitudes
   k) Consumers - pupils and parents
   l) Media influence
   m) Male sharers
   n) Job Satisfaction

4 General
   o) Teacher supply
1 ADMINISTRATION

a) Subversion

One LEA officer pointed out that the intentions of policy-makers can be subverted by the actions (or lack of them) of those who implement policy. Several examples appeared of how policy initiatives can become restricted in practice. This can happen at a variety of interfaces. For example a Local Authority with an Equal Opportunities policy may require its education department to introduce a job-sharing scheme. The introduction can be delayed by 'pressure of work', by lengthy discussions in working parties which are allowed to run on without resolution, by conditions which make it relatively difficult in practice to obtain a shared post, or by failing to publicise or support such arrangements effectively. Even where senior officers of the Education Department respond with enthusiasm, area officers may foresee administrative difficulties and create their own restraints. In one LEA (Area 2) no directions were given about how time splits should be organised beyond a recommendation for equal sharing, the intention being that schools and sharers should decide the best patterns for themselves. One area officer, however, told potential sharers that the only options were a $2\frac{1}{2}$ day/ $2\frac{1}{2}$ day split or mornings/afternoons. In another LEA (Area 1) an area officer denied that a job-sharing register existed, and in several areas with implicit policies, area officers told enquirers that job-sharing was not possible even though the personnel department had stated that it would consider requests sympathetically.

At another level, local inspectors, headteachers or heads of department could try, as a matter of principle, to block applications to share, without giving the issue any serious consideration. Even where schemes permitted sharing, unless heads were able to present a clear case against the suitability of a particular post, teachers often felt that to go ahead with an application against such opposition might damage their career prospects. Those who did go ahead and obtained shared posts sometimes felt that senior staff were obstructive and wanted to prove that job-sharing did not work. Even where senior staff accepted the situation, the sharers felt under very strong pressure to succeed and show that it could work. Some potential sharers were at the mercy of a head's previous experience. If a previous share had proved unsuccessful owing to an unbalanced partnership, one or both sharers taking maternity leave, or even some factor which could just as easily be applied to a full-time teacher as to a shared post, then potential sharers could face a 'never again' response, even though they felt they could be a successful team. In most cases, however, heads had found a first experience of job-sharing to be a success and thus had been willing to consider further applications. Examples of
sharers achieving internal promotion in competition with full-time candidates, and headteachers expressing satisfaction with job-sharing on the headteacher grapevine, make it easier for later applicants to gain acceptance than earlier ones (who may have met resistance from senior staff fearing the unknown). In one LEA (Area 2), which operated a job-share scheme for volunteers from full-time staff in order to reduce overstaffing, the lengthy process by which the area office found a partner from one school to pair with one from another, sometimes with a temporary sharer in between, caused so much disruption to schools that many heads tried to dissuade staff from sharing, and the whole idea of job-sharing as a positive opportunity became undermined.

Thus it can be seen that however positive the aims of the original policy and however much discretion is permitted, the actual practice of obtaining and operating a job-share can be made more difficult by those in middle-management who do not themselves approve of the scheme, who wish to avoid the administration of a new pattern of work or who simply fail to implement the policy efficiently.

b) Regulation and Discretion

As described in the previous section, some schemes included regulations and limitations, while others were general, leaving much to the discretion of the head and sharers. In some cases detailed schemes were welcome, since they saved argument and constant questions about what might or might not be permitted. In other cases schools felt limited by regulations which did not fit their particular circumstances, or expressed pleasure that the general nature of schemes gave them the opportunity to organise the shared posts as they and the sharers felt to be best. The use of overlapping timetables in secondary schools is a particular example. Those schools forced to use blocks of time found timetabling much more difficult unless classes were to be shared, while those free to use any pattern, including overlapping time, welcomed some extra timetabling flexibility and the fact that departmental meetings could be arranged on a day when both partners were present. In some shares the partners were free to exchange sessions when required, e.g. to take a child for a hospital appointment, while in other LEAs time-exchange was frowned upon. One sharer commented that her head never minded which one of them was present as long as one of them was; they felt they shared a joint responsibility for the post and had a great deal of freedom about how the sharing could best be done. In another, one sharer taught full-time for a fortnight while her partner went on a tour of Egypt, with a reciprocal time-exchange at a later date. The head did not ask the LEA whether this was permitted - "they might
have said no!" This head felt that the pupils greatly benefited from sharing the planning of this trip with their teacher and from the photographs and experiences she shared with them on her return. They had been working on a major project about Egypt which involved history, geography, mathematics and other curriculum areas. The head did not see why bureaucracy should be given the chance to interfere with an arrangement which seemed clearly to benefit pupils. Here a school and its sharers, positive about the advantages of job-sharing, gained from the fact that the formal job-sharing scheme was not too detailed and left much to local mutual agreement. In other cases sharers faced with an unsupportive head found difficulty in agreeing on aspects of the organisation of their shared post and wished that the LEA had produced more detailed rules to which they could refer.

c) Information

Many of the teachers complained of the difficulties of getting information about job-sharing in general and their LEA's scheme in particular. They found that heads, LEA officers and union field officers gave conflicting advice and that information on such matters as the likely effect on superannuation was not easy to obtain. Sometimes printed material did not seem designed to fit their situation and it was difficult to understand. Some phoned an area officer with a question only to find the answer differed from that given by the personnel department. It was difficult to discover the limits of discretion allowed to a particular school and its sharers. Teachers sending their names for inclusion in a job-share register frequently found that there was no mechanism for putting them in touch with prospective partners. This caused much irritation because hopes had been raised but nothing had materialised. A typical conversation with an area officer went as follows:

"How does the job-share register work?"

"You give us details of name, subject, age-group taught and geographical area and we put you on the list."

"Then what happens?"

"Well, nothing really."

Even in the LEAs where a register was being actively used to pair existing staff to aid reductions in staffing levels, there were complaints about long delays with no information about progress. Headteachers who had been fairly open-minded about job-sharing were often turned against it because of delays and because they had no control over the pairing process.
d) Appointment

The partnerships in the research samples were largely formed of teachers who had worked together before and knew that they would be able to get on together. The largest category among the remainder were those, particularly in Area 2, who had been paired by the LEA on the basis of subject and geographical area after requesting to move from full-time to job-sharing. In very few cases were both partners new to the school. Usually the pairings consisted of teachers who had previously worked at the school on a full-time, part-time or supply basis, or one already in the school with a partner appointed from outside. Where an applicant was not known to an existing sharer before appointment, it was usual for heads to encourage them to spend some time together informally before interview to assess their likely compatibility, and, while the existing sharer would not be on the selection panel, her/his views would be taken into account.

Since there are clear benefits in appointing sharers who already know each other and believe they could work well together, there is an element of chance in obtaining a shared post. A supply teacher covering the maternity leave of a teacher who wishes to return to a shared post is in a very good position to apply for a part of it. If the teacher on maternity leave returns full-time or leaves altogether, the opportunity is lost.

There was a network of communication among friends through which teachers heard of potential part-shares, and a good deal of being in the right place at the right time. Some heads knew of good supply teachers seeking permanent posts and recommended them to other heads with job-sharing vacancies. In theory job-share registers should provide details of suitable applicants, but in practice these were seldom used except where only existing full-time teachers were eligible. Teachers who were not already within the school system because they had taken a career break or recently moved into an area found it harder to find a shared post. They seldom had a partner with whom to apply for a full-time post, and were seldom aware that they could apply on their own, hoping someone else would do the same. When they did apply for advertised part-posts they often found themselves at a disadvantage in comparison with other applicants who had already worked in the school. An exception appears in the case of promoted posts. Here a teacher who has taken a career break or recently moved to the area may have had previous experience, e.g. as a head of department, which is unavailable within the supply staff known to the school. Even teachers with good previous experience of responsibility may find it difficult to obtain a shared post by applying for a full-time
vacancy with a partner. A school in an Area with a long-established job-sharing policy advertised three full-time posts, one of which carried responsibility for an area of the curriculum. Only the two basic scale posts were mentioned as being suitable for sharing. An enquiry about whether the promoted post could be considered received no reply. (Source: informally collected material.)

Sharers in successful partnerships showed some concern about the prospect of having to adjust to a new partner if the other left. A few felt that their working relationship was so close that they might consider trying for a separate part-time post or even returning to supply work rather than have to accommodate themselves to a new and unknown partner. Some replacement partners clearly were able to forge a successful new relationship, though the more successful the previous one the more carefully the partnership needed to be handled in the early stages, particularly in order to avoid a tendency for the existing partner to be seen as 'senior' to the new one.

Where a headteacher did not really wish an existing full-time teacher to share, or would prefer one partner of a previously shared post to take over the whole job, there appeared to be some suggestion that s/he could make the appointment of a sharer more difficult. One reluctant head agreed that a part-share should be advertised to allow an existing full-time teacher time to undertake study for further qualifications. After some time there had been several enquiries but no applications, and there was a strong suspicion that enquirers had been deliberately deterred from applying by the head, who had responded in a very negative way to phone calls from potential applicants.

e) **Induction and follow-up**

Once a job-share had been agreed there appeared to be virtually no follow-up by the LEA of individual situations. One of the longest-running schemes was studied in a statistical survey by its LEA a few years after introduction, and in one of the new schemes a brief summary was prepared after one year. An individual researcher had studied a group of the first sharers in another of the older schemes, and in two others a teacher and a member of the LEA staff had researched and written on their schemes in connection with equal opportunities issues.

None of the sharers reported being offered the opportunity to visit an existing partnership (though one pair arranged to do so privately) or mentioned any training opportunities specifically for new sharers, although several thought that a meeting with experienced sharers to discuss achievements and problems would have been helpful. While there was usually someone in the LEA responsible for general oversight of the scheme, often in conjunction with equal opportunities, the sharers
seldom knew who this was, and there seemed to be no-one collecting and collating examples of good practice for dissemination to other schools. One of the LEAs with a new scheme had, however, found a headteacher with experience of a successful job-share who was sometimes asked to talk to other heads and governors about the advantages which might be available to their schools from appointing a job-share partnership. One LEA officer mentioned that only partnerships giving rise to problems were heard of. The majority of successful partnerships went unnoticed outside their own schools.

2 MANAGEMENT

f) Liaison

Sharers and heads were clear about the essential nature of joint planning and liaison time. This was seen as particularly vital in primary schools where continuity of learning for the class must be ensured. In secondary schools where classes were not shared then liaison within the department was more necessary than between partners, although if they shared administrative or pastoral responsibility within the school then joint planning time again became vital. Because of the potential cost, additional 'overlap' time for this purpose was seldom built in to the time pattern and paid for. One LEA classed job-shares as 1.1 of a full-time post so that the sharers had 0.05 of time to work together. In secondary schools it was sometimes possible to arrange for 'free' or non-contact periods to be taken together where overlapping timetables were in operation, so that these could be used for liaison. In other cases, and generally in primary schools, staff were expected to liaise in their own time or in 'directed' time, most commonly using one or more lunch hours when one sharer would be taking over from the other. While the majority of sharers worked a pattern such as 2½ day/2½ day or morning/afternoon which provided for at least one lunch time hand-over, there were others who preferred a 2 day/3 day split or some other variation which meant that there was no day on which both teachers would be at school. This could present considerable problems for communication and joint planning. Many of the sharers also met in each other's homes, after school, or during holidays, for longer-term planning sessions. Some resented the fact that they were working liaison time as well as half a normal teaching week for only half the salary, but many felt that while the situation was not ideal it was a price which had to be paid for the opportunity to job-share. They also considered that they gained greatly as teachers from joint planning, developing each other's ideas and "striking sparks off one another". One described the experience as "the best in-service training and professional development I've ever had." Heads often remarked that planning was necessarily more thorough than that which might be
done by a single teacher, and that some pairs had considerable joint strength because any areas of weakness in one were covered by strengths in the other. Two heads reported on the improvement in teaching skills shown by the weaker or less experienced member of a partnership. In general heads, particularly of primary schools, were aware of the extra work put in by sharers and there were several examples of heads who arranged to take classes from time to time to allow sharers more time together in school. Several sharers attended their schools voluntarily for an extra hour in order to work together. One pair achieved a 2 hour overlap each week by the afternoon teacher arriving mid-morning on the Wednesday of one week, and the morning teacher staying until mid-afternoon on the next. This enabled them to spend an hour working together with the class as well as having a liaison meeting during the lunch hour. Several married couples who shared a post found that joint planning could easily take over much of their out-of-school life - even at meal times or in bed!

Claims that sharers worked proportionally longer than full-time staff are supported by research commissioned by the School Teachers' Pay Review Body in 1994. This found that part-timers on half-time contracts worked an average of 28 to 29 hours a week, while full-time staff on the same grade worked an average of about 49 hours. It is not known how many (if any) of the part-time sample were job-sharers, however.

g) Contact and non-contact time

As well as teaching, teachers are required to work under the direction of the headteacher for additional hours which in England and Wales are called 'directed time' and in Scotland 'planned activity time'. This time may include supervision of pupils arriving at school or after the end of lessons, but is largely used for full staff meetings, departmental and pastoral meetings, working parties on various areas of school policy and organisation, and meetings with parents. Job-sharers usually share attendance at meetings, each reporting back to the other and representing the partner's opinions as well as his/her own. This may mean simply that they attend the meetings which are timetabled on their own working days, or they may split the areas between them, meetings being arranged for when the appropriate sharer is present. Both usually attend parents' consultation evenings together, except where they teach different year groups. Overlapping timetables in secondary schools made it easier to plan departmental meetings so that both partners could be present. To avoid communication problems, the sharer present at a meeting usually had to make very detailed notes to pass on to the missing partner. Sharers living near schools were sometimes able to be more flexible about attending
meetings on days when they did not normally teach. Those working mornings only had greater problems about attending after-school meetings. In some cases the afternoon sharer attended a higher proportion of meetings, this balancing the fact that afternoon teaching sessions are usually shorter than morning ones. Several pairs in primary schools exchanged morning and afternoon working each half-term so that both attended meetings in turn. This had an added advantage that they also took turns at teaching in the mornings when pupils were more alert, and afternoons when they might be more tired. Difficulties were more likely to arise where heads and/or sharers were meticulous about exact hours worked and proportional time allocations. Some colleagues resented the need to plan meetings or working groups on particular days to accommodate sharers, but some sharers who lived near their schools were prepared to attend a meeting on a non-employed day if it was particularly important. Where there was a high level of co-operation and a genuine sense of one shared post rather than a split one, problems were usually resolved by mutual give- and-take both within the partnership and between the sharers and the school. Examples of this are a teacher who came in voluntarily to help her partner prepare for a Christmas drama performance because she normally taught on Mondays and had the benefit of most bank holidays, and teachers who both went on class outings, taking it in turn to be the one giving time voluntarily. Once again supportive heads were sometimes able to arrange time off in lieu by teaching a class themselves or arranging for a 'floating' teacher in the school to do so.

h) Promotion

The analysis of promoted status amongst job-sharers was rendered difficult because of a change in the structure of teachers' pay scales during the early part of the data collection. The largest sample, from Area 2, contained no replies from those sharing major areas of responsibility, although LEA officers thought that a very few were in existence. Some of the sharers had held promoted posts in the past, e.g. before taking a career break, and a few had had to accept a drop in status in order to share with an available partner. Throughout the remaining areas there were examples of promoted partnerships with responsibility, sometimes at head-of-department level, for, among others: nursery units, Drama, Information Technology, Careers, Chemistry, and Health Education. It was generally agreed that care needed to be taken over the suitability of promoted posts for job-sharing, particularly where management of other members of staff was involved. Some heads thought that head of department posts would hardly ever be suitable, others already had such an arrangement and found that it could work perfectly well. A further problem, mentioned by both heads and LEA officers, arose in connection
with the replacement of a leaving partner. In favoured Areas an advertisement for a full-time head of department post could attract applications from across the country, giving a wide choice from which to make an appointment. The advertisement of a part-share would be likely to attract from only a limited geographical area, and the number of applicants seeking part-time posts, while having sufficient up-to-date experience in lower-level departmental responsibility to warrant consideration at head of department level, might be limited. In the event that no candidate appeared suitable and the remaining partner did not wish to resume full-time work, a full-time post would have to be advertised and the school might not be able to afford to retain the remaining partner, even in an unpromoted post. The redeployment of a partner-less head of department to another school might not easily be managed. A further problem was that, as long as leaving partners were replaced by new ones, the opportunity for other full-time members of departments to aspire to internal promotion would be blocked. None of the head-of-department sharers within the research had so far had to deal with this problem, and in several of them either partner would have been willing to take over full-time in any case.

One deputy-head partnership was encountered in the informal research, and one head-of-department partnership was promoted to Senior Teacher status in competition with other internal full-time applicants. One other example of interest was a deputy-head partnership which should perhaps be referred to as a 'post-share' or even a 'double job-share' since both teachers worked full-time but shared both a deputy-head post and a lower-level promoted post. The headteacher was glad to have a management team and two teachers were able to gain experience of working as a deputy-head. In the event of either gaining promotion elsewhere the remaining partner would take over on a full-time basis as deputy and the other post would be advertised. As an idea for enabling more teachers to gain experience of senior posts the notion of 'double job-sharing' may be worth further consideration.

3 ATTITUDES

i) Attitudes of colleagues

Most colleagues were said to be supportive or at least neutral in attitude to job-sharing. Some were interested in becoming job-sharers themselves at some stage in their careers, some resented the time sharers could give to other activities but did not envy the half pay-packet. Generally teachers were interested to see how pupils would fare in a shared class and were pleased when a job-share proved
successful. A few resented job-sharers taking promoted posts "blocking promotion for those of us dedicated enough to work full-time", but overall the sharers were more likely to be judged by the quality of their teaching and performance in areas of responsibility. There was a common appreciation that well-qualified and experienced teachers were needed in schools and that if they felt able to work only part-time then structures should enable them to play a full part in the life of a school, provided that pupils did not suffer in any way.

Heads of department in secondary schools found increased administration, needing to remember that information reached sharers not present at critical times. Often communication was verbal and took place at breaks or in lunch hours, and more organised systems of distributing information, designed to ensure that absent sharers were not missed, proved better for full-time staff as well. Opinions depended very much on the quality of the staff involved, and the availability of a wider range of skills, interests and subject knowledge could make up for any administrative inconvenience.

A common reaction to the idea of job-sharing for teachers is that it would probably work well in secondary schools but might be less successful in the primary sector. The results of the survey of headteachers and heads of department is therefore of special interest. The research aimed to find out how attitudes towards job-sharing changed after experience of it in practice, and the reasons for any changes which occurred. The results (see Appendix 3) show that, of the 52% of respondents who reported a change in attitude, twice as many changed their opinions in the positive direction after experience as changed them in the negative direction. Some care needs to be taken in the interpretation of these figures since the reasons given for change were sometimes linked to particular situations and personalities rather than to the arrangement of job-sharing itself. Also some reasons were linked to particularly rigid schemes where problems could have been overcome under the more flexible arrangements permitted elsewhere. There were also differences between responses from the primary and secondary sectors and these were not easy to disentangle from the fact that LEAs had differing proportions of primary and secondary sharers and also differing patterns of attitudes to job-sharing before experience of it in practice.

A further factor which may have had some influence is that of the gender of the respondents. Are women more likely to be sympathetic to job-sharing than men? Since the heads' responses were anonymous the figures cannot be compared, but heads of infant and first schools are very likely to be female, those of primary schools about equally likely to be of either sex, and heads of middle and secondary
schools are most likely to be male. It cannot be assumed that female heads will be more supportive of an arrangement which at present particularly benefits women. Some who have gained their senior status by always working full-time themselves may feel that others should do the same. While the results in Area 2 differed noticeably from those in the other Areas, in all cases the strongest support from job-sharing came from those in the primary sector, who were the more positive in attitude before experience of job-sharing and considerably more positive afterwards. In the secondary sector more were neutral beforehand and attitudes tended to stay the same or even show a slight decline after the experience.

The reasons for differences between the primary and secondary responses are of importance for those planning job-shares and are worthy of more detailed study. The reasons given for success in the primary sector were chiefly

a) the quality of the teachers involved, who might not be available without job-share opportunities
b) the wider range of skills and interests available from two people
c) the hard work put into planning which had allayed fears about lack of continuity for pupils
d) the discovery that additional administration was less than had been expected.

In secondary schools more problems were mentioned such as:

a) timetabling restrictions caused by the need to ensure that classes had the same teacher for each of their two or three lessons
b) sharers missing departmental meetings
c) each pupil usually had only one teacher and thus there were parts of the week when no one could be consulted about that child by a head of department or pastoral tutor except by telephone, and a pupil needing help with a project would have to wait until the relevant teacher returned.

Such problems were more evident where sharers worked 2½-day blocks, with maximum length of time away from school. Where sharers worked a pattern of half-days spread across the week these problems were minimised, particularly where overlapping timetables were used. The latter permitted greater flexibility of timetables, since two teachers could be in action at the same time, enabled meetings to be held when both partners were present, and ensured that teachers were not out of school for long blocks of time. Such patterns usually changed from year to year to accommodate timetables, and though convenient to schools
they were disliked by, and sometimes banned by, area officers who wished to avoid additional administration. Some heads disliked overlapping patterns because they prevented continuous pastoral responsibility.

The final problem distinguishing the secondary sector from the primary was that of communication. A secondary teacher often has to communicate with as many teachers within a department as a primary teacher within the whole school. In addition there are the pastoral tutors of the several hundred children they teach, and colleagues on various committees and working parties. While primary sharers usually operated on an integrated model, teaching the same class and sharing the same responsibilities so that colleagues could communicate with whichever partner was present, the secondary sharers usually operated on a more differentiated model, teaching different classes and being members of different committees, although they usually shared a pastoral group unless on overlapping timetables. Colleagues, therefore, often needed to communicate with a specific partner who might not be present at the time they were needed. Thus, contrary to views commonly expressed that job-sharing is likely to be more successful in secondary than in primary schools, this research shows a higher level of approval from heads of the more integrated primary school class-share than of the more differentiated secondary job-share pattern. Secondary heads did value the quality of staff and range of skills available from secondary sharers but some would prefer to offer part-time posts (even permanent ones) rather than job-shares. The sharers themselves however preferred job-sharing because they often had more secure contracts, felt more integrated into the school community and, most importantly, had the opportunity of promoted posts largely denied to separate part-timers.

j) The 'evolutionary' or 'big-bang' factor - its possible influence on attitudes of senior staff and other participants

The perceived success, or otherwise, of a job-share may be influenced by the initial attitudes and expectations of those, such as senior staff, who are making the judgement. In Chapter 14 a descriptive continuum was devised ranging from 'Evolutionary', for a permissive system in which job-sharing grows from within schools who have requested it, to a 'Big-Bang' system in which a detailed policy is introduced following previous refusal to permit job-shares. This background, and the way in which job-sharing is permitted to develop or is formally introduced as a package, may have significant influence on perceptions of job-sharing. A more detailed analysis of how this may happen was set out in Chapter 14. Study of the views of heads and heads-of-department on job-sharing, and the accounts of job-
sharers' experiences with senior staff suggest that the background to the introduction of a job-share scheme may indeed influence its outcome.

Where there has been little or no experience of part-time work on a permanent and/or promoted basis it may be difficult to eradicate prejudice and the concept that part-time work is essentially low-status. (The prevalence of such views in general was seen in Chapter 5.) Heads and heads-of-department who are reluctant to have job-sharers, seeing the system as only a means of avoiding redundancies, or merely a matter of having two part-time teachers but without the flexibility of the fixed-term contracts they have been used to, are unlikely to approach the arrangement with enthusiasm and imagination. Similarly teachers who see job-sharing as merely an initiative which provides the opportunity to work part-time on a permanent contract, but without a vision of the shared nature of the whole post and the possibilities this may offer, may themselves have low expectations.

In contrast the Evolutionary pattern is seen in LEAs where part-time work has traditionally been more valued, more often rewarded with permanent contracts, and where some sharing of posts has been permitted on an informal basis. Here the idea of job-sharing as a positive opportunity with advantages for both sharers and schools, and offering the possibility of promotion for part-time staff, is more easily accepted. In such a situation job-sharing becomes a natural development rather than a new idea to be viewed cautiously, or even in some cases with resentment.

Certainly schools which have a positive, encouraging attitude to job-sharing seem to achieve greater success than those who treat it warily. Sharers frequently commented on the importance to their success of senior staff who were flexible and had a vision of the potential of job-sharing, while others spoke of the struggle to succeed within an atmosphere of rigidity, indifference or expectation of failure. Even so, there are examples in the research of doubtful senior staff being won over by the success of the job-share, with initially negative heads becoming positive as well as many neutral ones. Examples of initially positive heads becoming negative appear in many cases to relate to particular circumstances, e.g. both sharers taking maternity leave, one sharer being frequently absent for health reasons, poor pairing of sharers with different teaching styles, and problems caused by rigid time-share patterns in secondary schools together with lack of imagination in the deployment of sharers within the pastoral system.

Within an Evolutionary setting job-shares will only be set up where heads are at least neutral to the idea and where the LEA has examples of successful practice which can be disseminated. Within a Big-Bang setting there may be more entrenched attitudes to be overcome: part-time workers being regarded as of low
status, a last resort and easily dispensable. Heads who would not readily choose to have job-sharers may find that the scheme gives them little or no choice, and there is at first no experience of good practice within the LEA to be shared. Some of these obstacles are partially overcome in a ‘Little Bang’ setting where permanent part-time work is already relatively common.

It may be significant that the area in the research which showed the greatest similarity to a ‘Big Bang’ setting, Area 2, was also the area which showed the highest level of negative attitudes amongst heads both before experience, and, despite considerable improvement in the primary sector, after experience. Those areas which introduced formal job-share schemes simply to ‘tidy-up’ or encourage practices which had been allowed to develop in a flexible and permissive way over the years showed more positive attitudes, and these are the ones which can be placed towards the ‘Evolutionary’ end of the continuum. LEAs considering the introduction of job-share policies need to consider the advantages and disadvantages of the ways in which such policies can be implemented and their likely effects in practice. The more detailed discussion in Chapter 14 may also be applicable to the introduction of other policy initiatives and in other areas of employment.

k) Consumers

While consumers - pupils and their parents - were not directly surveyed, headteachers were asked to report on parental reaction to job-sharing. Some of the sharers also included comments from pupils and parents to illustrate their questionnaire responses.

In secondary schools pupils were seldom aware that a job-share existed. They were used to being taught by many teachers. Only where a class was being taught by both sharers was there any evidence of problems arising, usually because contact was so short that there was little opportunity for relationships to develop between teachers and taught. Some pupils who needed help between lessons had to wait until ‘their’ teacher returned to school again, particularly where there was an ongoing project being undertaken. In other cases pupils gained from the input of two teachers with differing enthusiasms, specialisms and points of view, and a pastoral group containing a high proportion of pupils from broken homes was reported by one head to have gained from the care of a husband-and-wife partnership.

In primary schools pupils were described as at least accepting the situation, adapting to it, and in many cases benefiting from it. Pupils were often quoted as being glad of a change of teacher during the day or aware of the wider range of
interests and knowledge available from two teachers. Occasionally pupils 'played-off' one teacher against the other, a situation which often occurs between parents in the best of families, but sharers usually had mutually agreed ground rules and were able to avoid inconsistencies. While some difficult pupils were felt to need to relate to one teacher all the time, others benefited from a joint approach to their problems, and where one teacher might be worn-out and impatient by the afternoon or latter half of the week, the arrival of the other sharer would mean a fresh teacher better able to cope with the stresses involved. In the primary sector parents were sometimes worried at the prospect of their child's class having two teachers and concerned about pupil progress. Usually the headteacher and sharers would meet parents at the end of the previous year or beginning of the new term to describe how they would work together and the benefits which would be available. Parents, wary at first, soon adjusted to the idea, sometimes even finding two teachers better than one. Continuity of learning was seldom mentioned as a problem because of the quality of the planning carried out by both partners. Once the shared post became established in a school and pupils had moved on successfully to the next class, parents of the next year's pupils were more confident about the arrangement. For older junior pupils the need to adapt to two teachers was seen as a useful stepping-stone to secondary education with its range of subject teachers.

One sharer pointed out that the sharing of a class between a deputy head and a part-time teacher was common, yet this seldom caused concern even though there was often less joint planning involved. In such situations heads and parents saw an experienced teacher in overall charge with an 'assistant'. Job-sharers were sometimes equally experienced teachers with shared responsibility, but they were viewed with much greater caution. Possibly it was not continuity that was the real issue, but that in one case there was a traditional full-time teacher involved and in the other both were part-time and possibly seen unconsciously as therefore less committed and lower in status.

In the most successful shares pupils clearly enjoyed having a change of teacher - "You get bored with the same one all the time" - and parents became aware of the value to their children of having two good teachers. The increased range of skills and interests available, and the simple advantage of contact with another teacher, were particularly valued in small schools where coverage of the full curriculum could cause problems and interactions between pupils and adults could sometimes prove limiting.
I) Media influence

Attitudes of LEA officers, headteachers, governors and parents, as well as potential sharers themselves can all be influenced by references to job-sharing in the media. Several sharers and those seeking shared posts had read or heard of successfully shared jobs in other areas and been encouraged to request the opportunity for themselves. Many examples portrayed were jobs of a more 'splittable' kind, such as secretaries or bank assistants, or those dealing with different clients such as librarians. These left open questions of whether teaching is a suitable occupation for sharing, particularly where younger children are involved. Most media reporting concerns either teacher supply or equal opportunities and women's issues. Reference to job-sharing in the area of teacher supply is frequently unhelpful. "Teacher shortage has forced LEAs to consider job-sharing" can be taken to imply that such arrangements are really undesirable and a matter of last resort rather than a positive opportunity. Where equal opportunities issues are under discussion the fact that job-sharing can help women teachers, or teachers with disabilities, to continue with their careers may be accepted, but the headteacher, governor or parent will be most interested in the welfare of the pupils, not the teachers. This issue is seldom addressed. In addition most media reporting shows examples of female sharers. While this is hardly surprising in view of the fact that the vast majority of sharers are indeed female, it increases the likelihood that job-sharing is seen as an arrangement made for the benefit of women and not relevant to men. This means not only that men are less likely to see job-sharing as an opportunity for themselves, but also that they may be less likely to want to participate in an arrangement 'mainly for women' even if they do see advantages for themselves. In the long term job-sharing may have difficulty in being accepted as a means of working without loss of status unless it is seen as an opportunity for male workers as well, and more men actively participate.

m) Male sharers

Since there were very few male sharers in the formal research, evidence on them was also collected informally, particularly through officers in other LEAs and items in the media. Male sharers identified were invited to complete questionnaires identical to those in the formal research. The reasons given for wanting to share were

a) because they were lone carers, either as single parents or having responsibility for disabled relatives

b) because they wished to share the care of children with their wives or partners, and

187
c) because they were involved in other employment, e.g. as authors, craftsmen, journalists, or even as a children’s party entertainer.

One young male teacher had been made 'surplus to requirements' in his full-time post but was not able to travel far to seek another job because he cared for his disabled father. While hoping for a suitable full-time vacancy to occur, he had been pleased to share a post in his school with another (female) teacher wishing to reduce her hours.

Only one male sharer was sharing as a prelude to retirement. This is probably because of the likely effect on pension entitlement, and also because of an admitted reaction among male friends and colleagues that job-sharing is an odd thing for a man to want to do. A third reason may be that men are more likely to be in promoted posts and to be faced with having to accept reduced status in order to persuade heads to agree to a job-share arrangement. Unpublished research in one of the LEAs studied indicated that 48% of male teachers thought that job-sharing would appeal to men as well as women at some time in their careers, but this seems unlikely to become more common until the sharing of promoted posts (or at least protection of salary levels) becomes more acceptable, and the superannuation regulations are changed. There also needs to be a climate of opinion which regards job-sharing as offering positive opportunities for men as well as for women.

Two husband-and-wife shares were found. Both were promoted posts and both involved a high degree of flexibility within which the husband might work full-time while the wife was breast feeding a new baby, or one would work full-time while the other cared for a sick child. These partnerships were clear that family responsibilities were to be shared and that opportunity for career progression should not be sacrificed by one partner for the benefit of the other.

n) Job satisfaction

The page of the teachers' questionnaire left blank for 'further comments' provided an opportunity for many of the respondents in the formal research to comment on their level of job-satisfaction. There were inevitably some sharers who were not happy because they had never wanted to share in the first place. Either no full-time jobs were available or those on separate part-time contracts, usually doing specialist work with groups of pupils in primary schools, had been requested to join with another teacher to take charge of a class. Some of these looked forward to returning to specialist work, and as their partners were sometimes on fixed-term contracts the arrangement might well be termed a class-share rather than a job-share in the usual sense. Of the great majority who had chosen to share most expressed satisfaction. A few felt that they were in unequal
partnerships, doing most of the planning work, or considered it unlikely that they would be able to gain promotion together with their existing partner. Slightly more were struggling to ensure the success of their partnership in a situation where senior management were unhelpful or even obstructive. Many were constantly aware that they were working far more than half as hard as if they were full-time, but only being paid half a salary. A number of headteachers were also aware that sharers worked particularly hard, commonly mentioning that 'a half plus a half equals more than one' or that no single teacher could do all the planning and preparation flowing from the partnership. Those who had previously been full-time teachers were said to find it hard to cut down their work to a half, and such was the amount of energy and enthusiasm shown that the children were occasionally in danger of being overworked! Many of the sharers complained of initial problems and delays in obtaining a shared post, and difficulty in obtaining answers to their many questions about contracts, pay and superannuation. In spite of these problems the sharers generally expressed considerable satisfaction with their posts and many wrote at great length about the positive changes to their lives and the unexpected bonuses discovered. Those with young children felt they 'had the best of both worlds', were able to do a good job as teachers and as parents without much of the strain and conflict commonly associated with attempting to juggle family and full-time work. Several had in fact tried to do this, but even with good reliable child-care they had found themselves under strain because so much school work needed to be done in evenings and at weekends when families also needed their attention. Older teachers who had been finding full-time work stressful and tiring described themselves as finding a new lease of life, being in much better health, and enjoying teaching very much more. Not only did these sharers feel that their lives were better 'balanced', but it was clear that they had a strong need to feel that they were doing their jobs well and that increased job-satisfaction made up at least in part for the reduced salary. The sharer who said "I may only teach part-time but I still think teaching full time" reflected the experience of many of her colleagues, and others described how they had been able to read more literature, listen to more music, collect more materials and undertake a wider range of activities which were then shared with their pupils. "I am more enthusiastic, have more energy, more patience and more time to prepare and mark work," said one sharer; "this must be better for pupils." This may be as much a comment on the work input required from full-time teachers, making them unduly tired and stressed, as on the benefits of job-sharing as such. The picture seen from these sharers is very much at odds with the 'uncommitted', 'only do it for the pin money' descriptions sometimes applied to part-time staff. Some hoped to remain as
sharers for a considerable time and looked forward to possible promotion for the partnership; others intended in due time to return to full-time teaching. A common experience was of the great value in working together as a team. Sharers, particularly in primary schools, gave each other new ideas, planned in greater detail and discussed class management and the problems of individual pupils. This was often described as a most enjoyable experience and excellent professional development. The effect was less marked in secondary schools as teachers were less likely to share classes, and joint planning tended to be at departmental rather than partnership level.

A further small group of sharers were combining other paid or voluntary work with teaching. These included those whose skills as writers or artists did not earn them an acceptable living wage, but who were able to obtain security of regular income from teaching and at the same time to offer pupils the benefits of their special talents. Others spent much of their non-teaching time in voluntary activities in the local community. One was the wife of a church minister who helped with his pastoral work. It seems likely that wider experience of the community and the home backgrounds of pupils may contribute to better understanding and pastoral care within the schools where such sharers work. Some headteachers commented on the value to the school community of teachers who are involved in other walks of life as well as teaching.

While the sharers were willing to accept the lower salaries associated with part-time work, many clearly needed to earn in order to supplement the pay received by their partners, and some were sole family wage-earners, particularly those who were lone carers. It was evident that many of these had struggled for some time with insecure forms of work, fixed-term contracts and casual supply teaching. Job-sharing had given them not only financial security but a more satisfying experience of being a permanent part of a school community and being able to use their teaching skills more effectively. Some were not sure whether their careers would be advanced by job-sharing, but at least they would not stagnate and become out-of-touch by taking a complete career break. Those who were promoted as a partnership or saw other pairs in promoted posts hoped that experience of job-sharing in action would encourage senior management to consider promoting other sharers in future.
4 GENERAL

0) Teacher supply

How far can the job-sharing schemes be seen to have contributed to the overall management of teacher supply?

Clearly where there are teachers who do not wish to give up teaching altogether, but who would welcome the opportunity to reduce their commitment by sharing a full-time post with a partner, reductions can be made in the size of the teaching force, with the possible avoidance of redundancies. Similarly, where the absolute size of the teaching force is not in question, but the age profile of staff shows a shortage of young teachers and a preponderance of older ones, pre-retirement job-sharing (possibly with some promised superannuation enhancement) could usefully be offered. This would not necessarily involve great expense since the enhancement may be paid for from savings caused by the increased number of younger teachers on lower-level salaries. There is a worry in some LEAs, however, that general offers of job-share posts to existing staff on favourable terms might result in far more applications than needed, introducing problems of fair selection. Two of the areas studied in the research were over-staffed and targeted existing full-time staff with job-sharing appointments. In one of these the scheme was in its infancy, and in the other older teachers greeted the opportunity with enthusiasm, though few of the shared posts had promoted status. It is not easy to assess how far the schemes had contributed to reducing staff numbers or even providing better opportunities for newly qualified teachers to find employment. Job-share schemes are often introduced as part of equal opportunities initiatives and officers may not be too keen to publicise their additional value as a mechanism for reducing staff numbers lest the scheme be thought of as merely a means to that end.

In other LEAs there was a hope that job-share schemes might aid retention of existing staff (particularly those who would otherwise leave to care for young families) and recruitment of some not currently teaching. Whether this aim was being achieved is again difficult to answer from an authority-wide point of view. Individual headteachers often referred to success in retaining staff who would otherwise have left, or obtaining the services of staff, particularly in shortage subjects, who did not wish to work full-time. On the other hand it is difficult to know how many sharers might have been working full-time if sharing had not been available, and how many might continue in successful partnership beyond the time when they might otherwise have returned to full-time work. It is clear that the longer teachers stay away from teaching, the more difficult it may be for them to
return, perhaps because they have lost confidence, and also because of increased awareness of the need for re-training in order to cope with new initiatives such as the national curriculum, changing methods of assessment and increased use of information technology. Respondents to the research also stressed that, while casual supply teaching may provide a satisfactory means of keeping in touch for some teachers, for others this form of work can be very unsatisfying. They often found themselves covering subjects about which they knew little and unable to use their own expertise (especially in secondary schools); they missed being part of a school community, getting to know children and seeing them make progress; they lacked security, regular income and status. If job-shares or regular part-time contracts are not offered, such teachers may accept other work locally and never return to teaching. Some headteachers were, in contrast, unhappy about offering permanent posts to teachers living in the vicinity and requiring part-time work. They saw these as a 'captive' source of supply teachers and feared being unable to obtain sufficient cover for absent staff if they were given permanent contracts. In fact many job-sharers were willing to undertake extra supply work in their own schools (including some who were not willing to do supply work except in the school where they already knew pupils and staff). Some were happy to cover for each other's absences, either at supply rates or with exchange of working time in lieu. Several headteachers considered this willingness to do additional hours a particular bonus of job-sharing, especially as the sharers were more familiar with pupils and the school's system than those acting as supply teachers on an occasional basis. At least one headteacher was finally persuaded to accept a shared post at this school, despite considerable earlier reluctance, when he realised that the sharers would sometimes be willing to supply additional cover at short notice.

Perhaps the most valuable points of view on the relationship between job-sharing and teacher supply were offered by two senior education officers. The first was concerned that pupils were suffering because of an overall teacher shortage, and a lack of sufficient teachers for specialist subjects. He considered it quite unacceptable that qualified and experienced teachers were not being used to full advantage, if at all, simply because they were not able to work full-time. It made sense to organise a job-structure which would provide flexible patterns of working for such teachers so that pupils could have the advantage of their skills and experience. "Good teachers should not be wasted simply because we are not far-seeing enough to find them a place in the system." The second officer focused on good personnel management. He considered that a good employee should be valued by management, and that, if at various times in a career employees needed a different balance of work/home responsibilities, or wanted to broaden their outlook.
on life by undertaking other activities, then they should be helped to do so by flexible career management and working patterns, providing this can be done without compromising the needs of the job. Such an attitude can, of course, apply to career breaks, sabbaticals etc. as well as job-sharing and other forms of flexible working. It also implies a mutual commitment between employer and employee.

The next chapter considers how the origins and methods of implementation of the job-share policies discussed in Chapter 14 may have influenced the operation of the shared posts and attitudes towards job-sharing discussed in Chapter 15. There is a discussion on preferences amongst policymakers about whether policy should build on grass-roots innovation or whether innovation should only follow policy decisions. The possible effects of such differences in attitude on the existence and subsequent development of innovative practices are viewed in the context of the job-schemes studied, and guidelines are offered to LEAs setting up job-share schemes in the future.
CHAPTER 16
POLICY-MAKING AND INNOVATION

In addition to the manner in which job-sharing was actually introduced in the areas studied, within a continuum from Evolutionary to Big-Bang, a further dimension was encountered which affected both the initiation of innovative practice and its subsequent development. This dimension relates to attitudes about how innovation should be managed. Research among the LEAs without formal policies revealed quite distinctive differences. In some, the absence of any formal policy appeared to carry an implied statement that therefore requests to job-share could not even be considered. In others, despite the absence of any policy statement, individual requests could be considered sympathetically on an informal basis. In the first case there was a view that innovation must be preceded by formal policy - 'policy-led innovation' - but in the second innovation could be permitted before formal policy existed - 'innovation-led policy'. Those whose preferred method is policy-led innovation will almost always introduce innovation in a manner towards the Big-Bang end of the continuum. Those who prefer innovation-led policy will generally permit and monitor variations in practice with development towards a formal policy in the Evolutionary manner. Research on the existing schemes showed, however, that the actual manner of their introduction did not necessarily follow the preferred management style. A chief officer who might have preferred a more informal and experimental approach to precede formal policy may be required to introduce a scheme speedily as a complete package in order to meet a directive on equal opportunities or as a means of dealing with staff shortages. On the other hand a chief officer who would prefer formal policy to precede action may realise that such a policy would not be accepted by a negotiating body without evidence of some successful examples in practice. S/he may therefore decide to permit a few informal arrangements beforehand. The following table provides an illustration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preferred management style</th>
<th>Manner of introduction</th>
<th>Probability of occurrence</th>
<th>Examples</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy-led innovation</td>
<td>Big-Bang</td>
<td>Almost always</td>
<td>Area 2, Area 1 (Little Bang)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy-led innovation</td>
<td>Evolutionary</td>
<td>Rare</td>
<td>Possibly some of the ad hoc group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation-led policy</td>
<td>Big-Bang</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Area 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation-led policy</td>
<td>Evolutionary</td>
<td>Usual</td>
<td>Most of the ad hoc group, Area 5, Area 9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The distinction between management preferences for policy-led innovation or innovation-led policy may at first sight seem of little significance, but they proved important to many respondents in the research for the following reasons:

a) because they determined the likelihood of success for those requesting to job-share in LEAs without formal schemes

b) because the preferences affected not only the existence of job-sharing, but also how much freedom was permitted to schools to develop job-sharing arrangements in an innovative way once they existed.

In Chapter 5 we saw how early job-sharing practices in employment frequently came about because employers and managers were willing to look favourably on innovative ideas from employees (e.g. the cases cited by Conlan op cit), but also how others were forced into taking legal action to obtain shared posts denied to them because 'we have no policy on job-sharing'. (Robertson v Strathclyde op cit)

It is therefore of interest to consider

1) The possible sources of such differences in attitude towards the management of innovation

2) How such differences affect outcomes.

1) SOURCES

In any organisation, who decides whether the predominant style will be policy-led innovation or innovation-led policy? Is there in fact likely to be a predominant style or will it vary from situation to situation? Some possible factors may be worthy of consideration.

a) Corporate Ethos. It is possible that large organisations such as LEAs or their parent local authorities develop a tradition of permitting innovation, monitoring it with interest and encouraging the spread of new ideas which prove successful, or alternatively a tradition of maintaining existing structures, allowing change only after much discussion and formal agreement.

b) Chief Officers. They may be appointed to suit the 'personality' of the organisation, or maybe their own preferred management styles are the ones that become predominant. In education it is unclear whether the Chief Personnel Officer of the local authority, or the Chief Education Officer is likely to be the source of attitudes towards innovation in the employment of teachers.
c) **Size** In a smaller LEA a single officer, or a group of them, may be able to make decisions and have an overview, while in a very large one functions may be delegated to a wider range of people. It may therefore be more necessary to have joint discussions and agreements before decisions are taken, to ensure a common approach. This may have the effect of formalising policies before agreeing to requests for new forms of action. While this may be a contributory factor, however, it does not help to explain why LEAs of comparable size should have differing preferences for policy-led innovation or innovation-led policy. Even the interviews with the ten officers of LEAs which did have formal policies revealed that some were more interested in innovation and learning from experience, while others seemed more cautious and more concerned about the need for regulations before permitting change.

d) **Political differences** As far as could be judged from the interviews and the questionnaire responses, the preferred management styles did not appear to be related to the political orientation of the LEAs.

e) **Precedence** Possibly the apparent choice between policy-led innovation and innovation-led policy may be less a conscious style of management than the effect of the critical factor of the response made to the first request to job-share. If this is placed before an officer who does not reject it out of hand, and the conditions are particularly favourable - e.g. high quality staff, strong school backing, experience of working successfully together, no full-time teacher available - the sharing of the post may be permitted. If the partnership is thought not to be strong, the head and governors are luke-warm, and full-time candidates are available, the request may be rejected. Such decisions may thereby set a precedent. Once permission has been given for an informal share others cannot be ruled out. However, if the first request to share has been refused, this may be taken as the accepted stance on informal sharing, rather than a response to a particular case which may be hard to justify if others are later permitted. One anecdote from the informal research showed how an application to job-share was refused on principle until the teachers involved were able to show that the LEA had acceded to a similar request elsewhere in that authority. Thus the result of the first request to share which reaches senior LEA management may have a strong influence on whether innovation is permitted to precede formal policy or vice versa.
2) **EFFECTS**

a) **LEAs without formal schemes** Whatever the sources of decisions made in areas without formal policies, the question of whether informal sharing arrangements may be permitted before formal policies are in place has important effects within the organisation. In the informal research, teachers, heads and even lower-level LEA officers were not always sure about the implications of the absence of a job-share policy. Many teachers sought advice on what action could be taken because they, their headteachers, and sometimes even their area officers, assumed that because there was no job-sharing policy statement that was no point in making a request to job-share. Yet senior officers in the same Areas sometimes replied to questionnaires saying that applications to share posts would be considered sympathetically on their merits, and that there were even one or two partnerships already in existence. This may also help to explain why some other officers claimed that no teacher had even enquired about the possibility - the enquiries had never reached them, having been stifled at local level by statements that no job-share policy existed. Where teachers, heads and governors had pursued the possibility of a job-share arrangement at higher levels in LEAs with policy-led innovation structures, there had been a sense of 'knocking one's head against a brick wall'. Frequently they had to explain to officers that absence of a stated policy for job-sharing did not necessarily have to imply the existence of a stated policy against it. At this level a few dedicated fighters continued to try to promote the idea through their unions, but most reluctantly gave up, not willing to earn a reputation as 'trouble-makers'. Reasons given for not permitting informal sharing included lack of appropriate forms of contract. Generally, regular part-time contracts were used together with a covering letter referring to the 'sharing' of a post, but some LEAs appeared to have only fixed-term contracts available and were unwilling to adapt them. Similarly refusals were sometimes made on the grounds of extra cost, even though in most cases the shared post would have been cheaper due to National Insurance savings, and in some cases also slower salary progression (before 1991) and related superannuation savings. Potential sharers, and their advisors, seldom had the knowledge with which to refute arguments of this kind. Those who did achieve shared posts in LEAs without formal policies, and who formed the 'ad hoc' group in the formal research, held a higher proportion of promoted posts. While numbers are small it seems likely that they were in a better position to negotiate. Evidence from the LEAs without policies shows that some were not convinced of any value in job-sharing schemes. Others were not necessarily against them, particularly if they
could assist in the management of teacher supply, but found a host of problems arising under the headings of implementational procedure and negotiation with teacher unions. It appears strange that in some LEAs negotiations foundered through lack of union enthusiasm, in others there was good LEA/Union cooperation, and in a few the unions had played a positive leading role. There was little evidence of LEA or union representatives making great efforts to study the experience within other LEAs, though officers had in some cases obtained documents about the organisation of one of the longest-running schemes. [Since the existence of this research has been made public there has been a steady stream of requests for information sent to the author from both LEA officers and union representatives.]

b) **LEAs with formal job-share schemes** While policy-led innovation and innovation-led policy preferences are most clearly seen in those LEAs without formal schemes, the influence of such preferences may continue within the implementation process of schemes which are later introduced. The schemes themselves may be 'Evolutionary' (in that they have developed from existing practices, whether these were largely casual and piecemeal or part of a conscious innovation-led policy viewpoint), or 'Big-Bang' (if they introduce new patterns and structures, either following a policy-led innovation preference or because external needs do not permit a more leisurely and informal development over time). The details of the formal schemes, and the way in which new job-share arrangements are permitted to develop, still reveal basic differences in management styles. In some there is considerable freedom for schools to develop working patterns best suited to their own needs, a minimum of regulation and an interest in the development of good practice. In others the limitations of the scheme are more clearly documented and development more controlled. Particular examples of limitation seen in the research are: a bar on other employment when sharers are not teaching (Area 10), the exclusion of existing pairs of 'back-to-back part-timers' from a change of status to job-sharers (Area 1), and a lack of freedom for partners to exchange time with each other even with the head teacher's consent (Area 2). It seems probable that regulations assist administrators, making it less likely that they will be plied with many queries, be involved in discussions, or have to make decisions, but they can also form a strait jacket, preventing further innovation and greater flexibility. The sharers themselves also showed contrasting preferences, some being very pleased that once appointed they and their schools were free to develop the posts in the best possible interests of the whole community. Such sharers felt trusted and in 'ownership' of their way of working. Others would
have preferred more detailed guidance; they were not sure what was allowed, what freedom they were permitted, or whom to turn to for advice. They felt that their working pattern was 'owned' by the employer but without sufficient support for employees. Thus, even when a job-sharing policy was in place, some LEAs permitted schools to innovate and experiment to develop good practice, while others precluded further innovation and development by providing a package of detailed regulations, leaving little opportunity for individual initiative.

GUIDELINES FOR POLICYMAKERS

What guidelines can be suggested for LEAs and others concerning innovation in working practices and the introduction of job-sharing in particular?

1) A decision must be made about whether new working patterns should always be preceded by formal policy statements. If so, individuals requesting such opportunities and being refused must be offered more than 'because we don't have a policy on it'. Genuine discussion of the issue, with valid reasons for refusal, would prevent the build-up of much frustration.

2) A decision must be made on whether requests for innovation may be granted on an informal basis and monitored with a view to the possible introduction of a formal policy at a later date. If so this view needs to be well publicised so that those who wish to make requests know to whom they should be put, and that they will be sympathetically considered.

3) Care needs to be taken that middle-level management does not obstruct the development of new working practices by introducing restrictions not intended by policy-makers.

4) Where possible there should be a named person with oversight of the innovation. Not only can this person provide all relevant information on matters such as contracts, superannuation etc., but he or she can arrange for groups of sharers to meet and learn from each other's experiences and can help with induction of new partnerships and dissemination of good practice. S/he could also act as a mediator if there is a difference of opinion between a head and sharers, and be in a position to judge whether regulations should be abolished or new ones introduced into the scheme. This could help to avoid frustrations caused by difficulty in obtaining information, conflicting statements from different officers, and situations such as that in which an LEA (Area 6) continued to send out a document to new or potential sharers
based on conditions of service which had changed three years previously and which was seriously flawed. No one person appeared to be responsible for its revision.

5) The operation of a job-share register needs to be agreed on and if it exists it must be active. Either teachers must have access to it themselves or there must be a method by which potential sharers can be put in touch with each other.

6) A balance should be found between making regulations too detailed and restrictive and not giving enough guidance. Generally speaking sharers would prefer suggested guidelines together with a statement that other alternatives which suit sharers and schools are not excluded, and the name of the person with whom they can discuss any queries. This offers freedom to those with the confidence to plan their own shares, together with guidance and support for those who need it.

7) Care should be taken that administrative difficulties do not colour attitudes to the innovation itself. Some heads were put off job-sharing because of problems in the wording of contracts or advertisements issued by the LEA, or a very slow process in matching existing full-time staff applying to share. Here again the appointment of one officer to have oversight of such issues might help.

8) Training courses for school governors should include material on job-share schemes. Apart from factual information, they should be encouraged to see that skills and experience should not be wasted simply because the teacher cannot work full-time, and that commitment to a school can be reasonably expected only if the school is also committed to the teacher. Part-time teachers who feel that they are treated as second-class, undervalued, and easily disposable, are unlikely to give of their best.

9) LEAs should encourage a climate in which job-sharers should, if performing well, be reasonably entitled to expect promotion.

10) The rejection of job-shares in favour of permanent part-time posts with variable hours, particularly in secondary schools, often limits the scope for promotion. There is no reason why half-time job-sharers may not have additional hours on separate contracts which may vary. If pairs of part-timers are refused job-shares on the grounds that they are needed to work for a total of more than one full-time equivalent, then alternative means should be provided for access to promotion.
11) Job-sharing has often been associated with equal opportunities initiatives and is commonly promoted as an opportunity for women, particularly those with young children, although older women often have responsibility for the elderly. While job-share schemes are of particular value to ‘carers’ and also to the disabled who may not be able to cope with a full-time post, this may give rise to a very narrow view. LEAs should ensure that job-sharing is portrayed as an opportunity for all, centred on a range of possible working patterns, rather than as just a ‘women’s issue’. Unless this is done opportunities may be lost for all sorts of initiatives - teachers combining school work with work in commerce or industry, with further study or research, with lecturing or social work. Artists, musicians and writers who are also teachers could contribute to the work of schools without having to teach full-time, particularly if the work to be shared is seen as 1265 hours, plus preparation, marking and record-keeping time, spread over 39 weeks, rather than 32½ hours spread over 5 days each week. This would allow one teacher to work full-time for a particular module on a modular course while a partner would take over full-time for the next module. Each would then have reasonable blocks of time to devote to painting, writing or performing between teaching commitments. The introduction of job-sharing is not an end in itself; there is the possibility of innovation within job-sharing.

12) LEAs must be aware of the implications of national regulations and make strong representations to government and the DfE when these disadvantage job-sharers. Examples at the time of the research which seem to have been ignored, or at best merely accepted, related to sharers with long service being paid at a lower point on the incremental scale than full-timers with much less service because of provisions in the transfer from the old to the new pay scales, the regulations of the superannuation scheme such as those on the buying-in of additional years of service, as well as regulations on the use of grants for in-service training.

GUIDELINES FOR NATIONAL GOVERNMENT

Making speeches which encourage employers to consider job-sharing schemes is not sufficient. Consideration must be given to changing rules and regulations within conditions of service documents and the superannuation scheme which disadvantage job-sharers together with other part-time teachers. At the time of the active research the changes made by the Education Reform Act were in their infancy. At the time of writing (1993) the effects of these changes are becoming
more evident and the next chapter will consider the possible effects of these changes on the progress of job-sharing in the teaching profession.
CHAPTER 17
A LOOK INTO THE FUTURE

During the period of this research there have been several changes which may affect job-sharing in the teaching profession in the future. These can be classified under three headings:

1. The Education Reform Act (1988) and subsequent related legislation
2. The introduction of teacher appraisal, the National Curriculum, and the easing of teacher supply problems
3. General issues in society such as plans for increased nursery school provision, relations with the rest of Europe and attitudes towards working and non-working time.

1. THE EDUCATION REFORM ACT. Transfer of power from LEAs to Schools

a) Appointment of teachers

Power over the appointment of teachers now rests in the hands of governors. While LEAs can guide and issue contracts, they have little control over whether job-sharers are appointed. The main obstacle is that, where redeployment could previously be promised to a sharer for whom no new partner could be found, this is no longer possible, and schools may be unable to afford to retain the sharer and appoint a new full-time teacher. Grant-maintained schools are not linked to LEAs, and if large numbers of schools choose this status the influence of LEAs will be reduced even further. It is difficult to predict how this might affect job-sharing. In some schools heads and governors had previously wanted to retain staff by allowing job-shares, but been prevented from doing so by LEAs without job-share policies and with a policy-led innovation stance. In such instances it may be easier to obtain a shared post in the future. In other cases heads and governors had been much more cautious, and only strong persuasion from LEA officers had resulted in a job-share being agreed to. In such cases it may be much harder to obtain a shared post in the future.

b) Financial management

Schools have become responsible for their own budgets, and thus the additional costs or savings from employing sharers will be reflected in that particular school's budget rather than being swallowed up in that of the LEA as a whole. While the overall cost of one full-time teacher at the same scale point...
would be about the same - savings on National Insurance for job-sharers being balanced by minor administrative costs - governors may be considering teachers at different pay levels. Two returners whose previous experience has earned additional scale points will cost more than a full-time new entrant to the profession, but in contrast two experienced full-time teachers who choose to share the job of one of them will free the second for a young and cheaper teacher, thus saving money. Such considerations will be more critical in the context of an individual school budget than when they balanced out across the budget of a whole LEA. While governors may put teacher quality first in theory, budget considerations may bear heavily on decisions in practice.

c) Discretionary additions to teachers' pay

The replacement of negotiation with unions on pay by the establishment of the School Teachers' Review Body gave rise to increased freedom for governors to award extra pay beyond the minimum of the national pay scales. When this initiative was first introduced the governors could (i) offer acceleration through the incremental scale, (ii) extend the top of the incremental scale, or (iii) offer additional payments between incremental points. Incentive allowances could also be awarded for 'good classroom practice' as well as extra responsibilities. From September 1993 a new pay spine was introduced giving governors the opportunity to award additional points for recruitment and retention, and classroom excellence, as well as responsibility. Evidence suggests that earlier discretion was seldom used. The present Conservative government seeks to extend discretionary payments to form a major element in teachers' pay. How such discretion will affect job-sharers is difficult to predict. In some cases it may be easier to reward a successful partnership, in others a prevailing view that part-time work is essentially low-level may mean that governors are more likely to offer discretionary payments to full-time members of staff. Schools with equal opportunities policies may need to monitor developments in this area.

d) School policies

Schools may develop their own policy statements, possibly in relation to staffing and equal opportunities issues. These may be more or less permissive than those of the appropriate local authority, as far as issues such as job-sharing are concerned. The author already knows of one school which produced its own job-share policy in 1991.
e) Governor training

LEAs have set up training schemes for school governors, though whether these will continue as existing members retire and are replaced by new ones is not clear. Other organisations also supply advice and training, but whether job-sharing is mentioned is unknown. Two LEA training officers admitted that training time is so short that the most which could reasonably be done is to mention job-sharing briefly in an encouraging and positive light. In those LEAs without formal schemes it may not be mentioned at all. Other sources of information for governors, e.g. the 'Staff Selection' paper (no.44) issued by the National Association of Governors and Managers, and 'Selecting Staff and Making Appointments', a volume of guidance produced by The Education Appointments Council, contain no reference to job-sharing at all. Governors with little or no previous knowledge of job-sharing schemes in education or elsewhere may be very cautious and reluctant to support innovation of this kind in their schools. On the other hand, the growth of job-sharing in other areas of employment may persuade some governors to approach the idea positively.

2 NATIONAL INITIATIVES

a) Appraisal

All teachers will in future be appraised on a 2-year cycle. It will be necessary for training programmes to consider how a job-share partnership should be appraised. What should be the balance between the appraisal of each partner and the appraisal of the effectiveness of the partnership? The answer may be of importance if the results are used in relation to promotion, either within the school or outside it. Possibly the advantages and disadvantages of job-sharing will become better understood because appraisers and appraised sharers will reflect more deeply on the value of such partnerships. It will also be interesting to see whether promoted job-sharers act as joint appraisers or act individually in this role!

b) The National Curriculum

The introduction of the National Curriculum has brought to the surface the issue of the wide range of subjects primary teachers have to deal with. Particularly in upper junior classes, teachers could be expected to deal with science, technology, history, geography etc., as well as English and maths, to pupils progressing towards higher levels in the National Curriculum. Discussion has encompassed the possibility not only of setting or greater use of ability groups, but also of more specialist subject teaching in primary schools. Once it becomes
accepted practice for older junior pupils to be taught by more than one teacher, and that it may be valuable for their teachers to have specialist subject expertise rather than being generalists, some of the objections to job-sharing may carry less weight and some of the advantages of the wider range of expertise available from two teachers may become more appreciated.

c) **Teacher supply**

The early part of this research, in the late 1980's, took place against a background of teacher shortages generally in some geographical areas, and in relation to some subjects throughout the country. LEAs were sending recruiters abroad to find staff, reports of severe future shortages appeared in conjunction with titles such as 'The Demographic Time-bomb', and the DES offered financial incentives to encourage graduates in certain subjects to train as teachers. In 1991 the country went into recession, many lost their jobs, and vacancies for new graduates withered. Teacher training benefited, with applications showing greatly increased levels and government claims that teacher recruitment problems were being solved. The question remains of how many of these newly-trained teachers will stay in the profession when the economy recovers. Will applicants drop again and will young teachers leave for the kind of employment they had originally wanted anyway? Research by Smithers and Robinson in 1989 showed that there was still a considerable exodus from the teaching profession in spite of the recession, many taking early retirement, and younger teachers opting for other jobs, particularly self-employment. Letters in the press pointed out that those who had obtained early retirement were the lucky ones, many others would choose to leave if they could afford to, and more young teachers would choose to leave if job prospects were better elsewhere in the economy. An increase in recruitment is of limited value unless there is sufficient job-satisfaction, remuneration and status to keep those recruited in the profession permanently. The need for job-sharing schemes to enable carers to continue as teachers is therefore likely to continue, though job-shares which provide a bridge to those setting up their own business with a view to leaving the profession might not be so popular with management!

3 **GENERAL ISSUES**

a) **Child care**

Increasing links with practice elsewhere in Europe as well as equal opportunities pressure may result in greater provision of after-school care and more nurseries. The National Commission on Education Report (1993)
recommended that nursery schooling should be available for the vast majority of children from the age of 3 years. Such provision may make it easier for carers to work full-time, though this research has shown that many of the sharers actually wanted to spend time with their children, and that even with reliable child care they preferred to work only part-time. In contrast, the extension of nursery school provision would result in a greater demand for nursery-stage teachers and some of these additional jobs might be shared.

If attitudes change in the direction of greater participation in child care on the part of fathers, more men may seek shared posts. At present any father who seeks to job-share for this reason, unless he is a single parent, is viewed as extremely unusual. The research sample included two pairs of husband-and-wife sharers, and another whose husband had become a job-sharer in the social services, all in order to share child care. Some men would like to share child care but find that career structures prevent them from doing so. Equal opportunities initiatives have achieved a good deal over the past few decades, but it remains to be seen whether they will progress in such a way as to enable men to take up job-sharing opportunities without being seen as even less committed to their jobs than women in similar circumstances.

b) Closer relationships with other European countries

The future may offer increased opportunities for British teachers to work abroad and teachers from other European countries to work in the UK. If such an option becomes popular it may affect teacher supply, and in particular the position with regard to language teaching. The supply of language teachers may be affected not only by the balance of teachers moving in each direction, but also by increased opportunities for the teaching of European languages to business executives, secretaries and in adult education. A high proportion of foreign language teachers are female and thus more likely to assume the 'carer' role at some stage in their careers. About a sixth of the secondary sharers in the research, and a few of the primary sharers, were qualified in languages, and job-sharing may be particularly useful in retaining language teachers if the demand for their skills increases.

A further factor relating to European union is the possible harmonisation of employment law on part-time work which was discussed in more detail in Chapter 1. At present the Conservative government resists changes, but they may still take place at some time in the future or under a different government. Whether harmonisation would affect the prevalence of job-sharing is difficult to predict.
c) Attitudes to work and non-working time

Writers such as Clutterbuck (1983, 1985), Robertson (1985) and Sherman (1986) have looked forward to changes in the balance between working and non-working time, and increasing flexibility for individuals to change the balance at different stages in their lives. Since the beginning of this research there has been an increase in general awareness of job-sharing possibilities, and it is no longer rare to see advertisements in the press for vacant part-shares in relatively senior posts in some areas of employment, particularly social work and the health services. Job-shares in senior teaching posts appear to be rarely advertised however. Attitudes towards new patterns of working are still changing very slowly and the concept of the full-time career worker, contrasting with that of the uncommitted part-time earner of pin-money, still lurks at the back, or even parades at the front, of many minds. As far as education is concerned, a variety of motives have persuaded LEAs to consider job-sharing. Without job-sharing and other forms of regular part-time work there will continue to be experienced and well-qualified teachers who are eager to work but unable to find part-time opportunities to use their talents to the full. Such people may eventually drift away from teaching altogether. The DfE submission to the School Teachers Pay Review Body in 1993 showed that while the proportion of part-time teachers had risen over the previous decade, fewer than half had permanent contracts. Also, of those women teachers currently unemployed, 46% considered that 'greater availability of part-time work, more flexible hours and job-sharing' would be the most important measure to encourage them to return to the classroom. Conversely, there are many good teachers struggling and over stressed as they try to cope with both full-time work and other responsibilities, who would welcome the chance to share their jobs. Others would welcome the opportunity to combine teaching with work in industry, the world of the arts or voluntary service. At present they risk being seen as uncommitted to either area of work and excluded from career advancement. If attitudes towards greater flexibility of career patterns become more positive in the future there could be a significant increase in job-sharing opportunities.
CHAPTER 18
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The research shows that by 1988 roughly 10% of LEAs had formal job-share schemes for teachers, while some others were prepared to look sympathetically at individual requests from schools. Since that date the number of formal schemes has increased considerably, though the transfer of power from LEAs to governors has limited LEA influence on their continued development. Some schemes have been introduced as a comprehensive package following earlier refusal to permit job-sharing (the 'Big-Bang' approach) and others as a means of 'tidying-up' and extending more widely the opportunities to job-share which already existed in an informal way (the 'Evolutionary' approach). The introduction of job-sharing and the freedom given to schools and sharers to develop practice in the best interests of all participants was also influenced by attitudes amongst policy-makers and management towards innovation and whether this should always follow policy decisions (policy-led innovation), or could be allowed to precede and lead towards formal policy-making (innovation-led policy). The main forces behind job-sharing initiatives were requests from individuals to share posts, the need to increase teacher supply via recruitment and retention or reduce it while minimising redundancy, attitudes towards equal opportunities within the authority, and the operation of equal opportunities legislation.

The existence of job-share schemes does not, however, ensure the opportunity to job-share. This is illustrated by the experience of Christopher Ratcliffe, a father who shares child care with his partner. In an article in the Times Educational Supplement (4.6.93) he writes

"Although our local education authority has the required phrase 'this post is open to job-share' on all teaching posts it advertises, these words are generally meaningless. In our experience few institutions actually welcome job-sharers."

This research has shown how few of those seeking job-shares by means of an LEA register were successful, except where the LEA wished to use transfer from full-time to job-share status as a means of reducing staff.

The survey of headteachers who did have sharers in their schools has shown that in the primary sector heads' attitudes towards job-sharing improved markedly after experience of it in practice. In the secondary sector improvement was not seen, but those partnerships which were free to operate in a very flexible way proved more successful than those with more rigid working patterns, and greater
satisfaction could be achieved by the dissemination of successful practice. Most partnerships operated in isolation and knew little of how job-sharing worked elsewhere. The LEA which used a headteacher with experience of a very successful job-share as an adviser to other schools and partnerships provides a good example for others to copy.

Even those heads who can see the advantage of employing two excellent staff may act with caution. As Christopher Ratcliffe says in the article mentioned above:

"One headteacher, at whose schools we had been working as support teachers, took us to one side after we'd submitted an application to join the permanent, mainstream staff. 'Look, I know you and Elaine are first-rate teachers, but I daren't take you on as a job-share. Appointing you could open the floodgates.'"

Some heads are, however, very positive indeed. One of the most positive in the research was the head who chose to employ sharers because his own son had gained so much from being taught by a partnership in another school. Another thought that the ideal staffing pattern for his small village school would be two full-time teachers and two pairs of sharers. After experience of sharing 31% of heads and heads of department declared themselves as very positive, 27% as positive, and 23% as neutral. Of those who were negative some gave reasons relating to very special circumstances or personalities rather than job-sharing per se, and others were limited in flexibility by the details of their schemes.

The sharers themselves were overwhelmingly happy with their job-shares. They valued the better balance between home and work in their lives and felt they were better teachers because they were more integrated into the school community than those on temporary contracts, because they had more time to prepare and mark work, and because they were healthier and more energetic and patient than if they had been struggling with the stress of working full-time. A few were sharing only because they could not find a full-time post, others were struggling to prove their worth to an antipathetic senior management, some lacked the compatibility with their partner so necessary in job-sharing, but most were enjoying teaching and finding partnership a rewarding experience professionally.

For some job-sharing provided an interlude, often while children were young, before reverting to full-time teaching. For others job-sharing offered a run-down to retirement, and for a third group it was a means of combining teaching with other employment or interests. For most it was seen as a way of life for several years at least, while for others it was the preferred work pattern for the foreseeable future. Two of the respondents had been job-sharing informally for nearly 20
years, though with occasional changes of partner. Compared with other forms of part-time work, described as being a 'part-time nobody', job-sharing seemed to offer the chance of being a 'part-time somebody'.

However convenient job-sharing may prove as a means of managing supply for LEAs and governors, and however happy job-sharers may be with their work, the most important question is whether job-sharing is an advantage or disadvantage for pupils. This research does not have controlled samples of responses from pupils and parents, and comments reported by sharers themselves must be treated with caution, but the most useful measure is that of the headteachers' responses. A few mentioned that pupils suffered due to some aspect of job-sharing, mainly in secondary schools where a pupil was normally taught by one sharer who would be inaccessible for half the week. The number of primary heads who thought that children with difficult behavioural problems needed the consistency of one teacher was balanced by the number who thought that they gained from the team approach of a partnership. The overall analysis of the advantages and disadvantages reported by heads is sufficient to show that many pupils benefited from the input of two teachers, particularly in primary schools, and especially in small primary schools. In secondary schools the chief benefit derived from the school's ability to recruit and retain experienced subject teachers who would not otherwise be available, and the wider range of specialist expertise often available from two people compared with one.

Job-sharing is not merely the splitting of a full-time post between two part-time workers. In teaching, compatibility of partners is of great importance, and complementary skills and interests are a bonus. As job-sharing has become more widespread, and as more teachers in senior management teams have experience of shared posts in operation, perhaps even of having shared a post themselves, maybe attitudes generally will become more positive. One of the chief impressions from the research is of the immense dedication of the vast majority of the sharers and the way in which they worked far more than their official share of hours - a factor mentioned by many of their headteachers. Far from the stereotype of the uncommitted who 'do it for the pin money' it was clear that for many their permanent integration into the school community, and the welfare of their pupils, were of immense personal importance. Not all job-shares will prove to be a success, but then, not all full-time appointments are successful either. Dissemination of good practice in the management and operation of shared posts would minimise failure and maximise success. Currently there is little evidence of guidance to heads and governors or any sharing of experience at all. Meanwhile there are many teachers who have to choose between scattered supply work, full-
time work or no work at all. This is surely a tragic waste of highly qualified staff which should concern all those involved in the world of education.
APPENDIX 1
SURVEY INSTRUMENTS

SECTION A
COPIES OF THE QUESTIONNAIRES AND INTERVIEW SCHEDULE
JOB-SHARING IN THE TEACHING PROFESSION

Does your authority have a job-share scheme for teachers?

YES □ NO □ (please tick)

If you have answered YES please complete Section 1 below, if NO complete Section 2.

SECTION 1

Would it be possible for me to visit you and discuss your experience of the scheme with an appropriate officer?

YES □ NO □

Please go to Section 3.

SECTION 2

(a) Has a job-sharing scheme for teachers ever been discussed by:

(i) the Education Committee ........................................... □
(ii) Education department officers.................................... □
(iii) Members of consultative groups involving teacher trade unions □
(iv) Others (please specify)?

If none of the above, go to (e)

(b) At whose suggestion was this topic discussed?
(c) Are you:

(i) Intending to introduce a scheme in the future ............. (Please give approximate date if known)

(ii) Still discussing the possibility ......................

(iii) No longer considering such a scheme? ............... 

(d) If you have decided against introducing a scheme what were the main reasons?

(e) In what ways, if any, do you think employing a job-sharing pair instead of a full-time teacher would:

(i) increase costs?

(ii) allow possible savings to be made?
(f) Do you have any individually negotiated shared posts even though there is no formal scheme?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If so

(i) How many pairs? ☐

(ii) Would you allow me to send them a letter, through you, asking if they would be willing to contribute to my research on job-sharing?

Yes ☐ No ☐

(g) Have any 'pairs' of teachers requested to be allowed to job-share but been turned down?

Yes ☐ No ☐

If YES please give reasons if possible.
SECTION 3

(h) Most of the information in this questionnaire will be used for statistical purposes, but I should like to include in my final report a list of those authorities who have schemes, and a list of those who do not have schemes but employ some job-sharers. Are you willing to have your authority's name included in such a list?

Yes [ ] No [ ]

Thank you for completing this questionnaire. Please give the name, address and telephone number of the person dealing with this questionnaire whom I may contact further if necessary.

NAME

ADDRESS

TELEPHONE NUMBER

NAME OF EDUCATION AUTHORITY
JOB - SHARING

Survey of Heads of Departments, Headteachers and Principals

I. How long has the job-share in your school been in operation?

2. Which age-group do your sharers teach?

3. Does the shared post carry an incentive allowance or other promoted status?
   YES ☐ NO ☐ (please tick)

4. Before the job-share was arranged, was your attitude to sharing:
   a) very positive ☐
   b) fairly positive ☐
   c) neutral ☐
   d) fairly negative ☐
   e) very negative ☐

5. At the present time is your attitude:
   a) very positive ☐
   b) fairly positive ☐
   c) neutral ☐
   d) fairly negative ☐
   e) very negative ☐

6. If your answers to 4 and 5 are different, please give some indication of the reasons for the change.

7. Has your increase in administration caused by the job-share been:
   a) negligible ☐
   b) moderate ☐
   c) considerable ☐
   d) too early to say ☐

   (Please ignore the time taken to set up the job-share in the first place)
8. How would you describe the attitude of other members of staff to the job-share arrangement?

9. How have parents and pupils reacted to the job-share? Examples of comments would be very welcome.
   a) Parents
   
   b) Pupils

10. i) Has either of the original partners left? [ ] YES [ ] NO
    ii) If so, what was the reason?
        a) maternity
        b) retirement
        c) to take a full-time job
        d) leaving the area
        d) other (please specify if possible)
    iii) Were there any problems in finding a replacement partner? [ ] YES [ ] NO

    If 'Yes', please describe them briefly.
11. (English and Welsh schools only)
Have your sharers attended school-based in-service days ("Baker days") pro rata or for a higher proportion than this?
   a) pro rata
   b) more

If 'more', were the teachers paid for the extra attendance or was it voluntary?
   a) paid
   b) voluntary

12. I would value any further comments you would like to make on the advantages and disadvantages to schools resulting from job-sharing arrangements in the teaching profession.

13. Please give the name of your Education Authority:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR HELP IN COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.
Please complete the following:

1. NAME

2. AGE

3. SEX

4. I have already been offered a job-share post
   Please tick: [ ]

   I have entered my name on the job-share register and
   am seeking a post
   Please tick: [ ]

5. What age-range do you hope to teach?

6. Indicate any subject specialisms you have to offer

7. How many years teaching experience do you have?
   (a) full-time
   (b) part-time

8. How many of those years were with the
   Local Education Authority?
   (a) full-time
   (b) part-time
9. In the academic year 1986-1987 I was
(a) employed full-time by L.E.A. □
(b) employed part-time by L.E.A. □
(c) employed as a casual supply teacher by L.E.A. □
(d) not employed in teaching □
(e) other (please give details) □

10. If you were employed in teaching during 1986-1987 were you the holder of a scale post or a named area of responsibility? (Please specify)

11. How did you become aware that a job-sharing scheme was introducing a

12. Do you already have a prospective job-sharing partner?
   YES □   NO □

   If YES, how did you meet?

13. Were you given guidance and support in seeking a job-sharing post?
   YES □   NO □

   If YES, from whom?
14. What are your reasons for wanting to share a post?

15. Would you prefer a separate permanent part-time post if one were available?

YES  [ ]  NO  [ ]

Please give your reasons

16. For about how many years do you hope to share a job?

17. At the end of your period of job-sharing do you intend

(a) to return to full-time teaching

(b) to retire

(c) to seek employment outside teaching

(d) other (please specify)

(e) don't know
18. What do you see as the main benefits of job-sharing schemes for pupils, teachers, schools, and the education system as a whole?

19. What do you consider to be the main disadvantages?
The following section should be completed only by those who have already been offered a job-share post.

20. Give the name and address of the school at which you will be teaching.

21. (a) I was interviewed for my job in competition with other prospective job-sharers only
(b) I was interviewed in competition with full-time applicants
(c) I was not interviewed because I was already doing the job in a part-time capacity
(d) I was not interviewed because I was proposing to share a full-time post I already held
(e) other (please specify)
22. (a) Will you be sharing a Scale Post and/or a named area of responsibility? YES __ NO __

(b) How do you intend to split your hours?

(c) Will you be sharing all aspects of the work, or will you take separate responsibility for different elements of it? (please specify)

(d) How have decisions about hours and responsibilities been arrived at?

(e) How do you intend to carry out the joint planning and exchange of information required in a job-share?

23. What do you expect to be the main problems you and your partner may encounter?
24. Please add any additional comments you feel may be relevant to this research.

Thank you for your help in completing this questionnaire.
Dear

About a year ago you returned a questionnaire about job-sharing in the teaching profession in which you said that you were interested in obtaining a shared post. I am now writing to ask about your progress during the past year, and would be grateful if you could complete and return this letter. Please tick as appropriate:

1. a) I now have a temporary shared post. 
   b) I now have a permanent shared post. 
   c) I now have a full-time permanent post. 
   d) I now have a part-time permanent post (not shared). 
   e) I have been engaged in regular supply teaching (e.g. cover for maternity leave, secondment etc.)
   f) I have been engaged in casual supply teaching (e.g. hourly-paid, to cover sickness, short courses etc.)
   g) I have been employed outside teaching.
   h) I have not been employed.
   i) Other. (please specify)

2. Do you still hope to obtain a shared post? Yes No

3. If you have applied for any posts on a shared basis and been unsuccessful, or have any other comments to make about your progress (or lack of it) in finding a shared post, I should be pleased to hear of your experiences on the back of this sheet.

Thank you for your help.

Yours sincerely,

JUNE SMEDLEY
GUIDELINES FOR LOCAL AUTHORITY INTERVIEWS

THE ORIGIN OF THE SCHEME

i) When was the scheme introduced?
ii) From whom did the initiative for the scheme come?
iii) What were the reasons for introducing the scheme?
iv) Were there any particular problems with negotiation and planning?
v) Were schemes from other authorities studied?

CONTRACTS

i) Is sharing specifically referred to? How much detail of the arrangement is stated?
ii) Is any added employment protection promised if the sharer works for less than 16 hours?
iii) Are there any limitations on who may apply to share a post?
iv) Are there any limitations on how hours must be divided? May they overlap? Is there paid consultation time?
v) Are sharers required or encouraged to cover for each other's absences?
vi) Are sharers able to obtain as much in-service training as full-time staff?
vii) Are there differences in local agreements between the treatment of full-time staff and separate permanent part-time staff (if any)? If so under what circumstances are job-sharers treated as comparable with full-time staff and when with part-time staff?

ORGANISATION

i) How are applications to job-share made?
ii) Is the availability of job-sharing explicit in advertisements?
iii) Who has the final say in whether job-sharers are appointed?
iv) What happens when one sharer leaves?
v) Is an existing sharer given any say in choice of partner?
vi) Is there a register of teachers interested in job-sharing? If so how does it operate?

DEVELOPMENT

i) How many pairs of sharers are in post now? What is the total number of teachers employed? How many are in each kind of school? How many have promoted posts? How many are male?
ii) Have any changes been made to the scheme as a result of experience?
iii) Is the scheme being monitored or statistics collected?
OPINIONS

i) Has there been any feedback about the operation of the scheme from the sharers, headteachers, inspectors, union officials, administrative staff?

ii) What do you consider to be the likely extra costs and savings resulting from employing job-sharers?

iii) Do you think the scheme will be of any use in increasing staffing flexibility? If so how?

iv) What do you consider to be the main advantages and disadvantages of job-sharing for teachers?
B. FURTHER DISCUSSION OF PROBLEMS ARISING FROM THE RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

LIMITATIONS OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE SURVEY

1 LEAs

The response to the first mailing was about 70% and a second survey mailing increased this to 85%. Five responses by phone increased the number of contacts to 104, or 89% of the total number of LEAs. Some small authorities stated that they did not have job-sharing but did not complete the remainder of the questionnaire saying that they did not have sufficient staff time available. Two authorities returned questionnaires without filling in the name of the LEA, one by a direct mailing system which yielded no postmark. Others answered only selected questions. The high rate of return was encouraging though there were some doubts concerning the accuracy of some of the responses. One LEA claimed never to have received and turned down any requests to share, but two teachers had previously written to the author about their application, backed by the head teacher, which had led to a 'grilling' at County Hall followed by a refusal. The reason given for the refusal had been the likelihood of extra cost, although in the questionnaire response the LEA stated that they did not consider that job-sharing would involve any extra cost. In another example an authority stated that it had no informally agreed job-shares, though a letter from a teacher to the author enclosed evidence of a contract stating that she and her partner were to 'share' a post. These responses are not considered to be attempts to mislead, merely that the person replying was not aware of the circumstances.

Several LEAs expressed a willingness to send requests for participation to their informal job-sharers. Most of these resulted in a good response, but a few produced no replies. In one case subsequent contacts showed that at least some of the sharers had not received the requests. (They had probably dropped into the 'oubliette' with which every local authority office seems to be equipped!) In another, a follow-up letter to the officer concerned produced the information that he had left for another job and no-one knew of the existence of the letters. All LEAs who said they had job-share schemes were willing to give interviews, though one authority which did not reply but subsequently admitted to having a long-standing scheme was obviously unwilling to contribute further.
2 THE SHARERS

i) Sources

The original selection for close study consisted of four new schemes in England, Scotland and Wales. These were selected from the LEAs with formal schemes on a geographical basis, one from the north, one midlands, one west and one south. They also included a range of sizes and a mix of rural and urban areas. Since more of the schemes were in labour controlled authorities it was not possible to obtain a balanced sample with respect to political control, but the selected southern county had a conservative majority. Unfortunately the introduction of the scheme in this authority was delayed for two terms and it became necessary to replace this authority with another southern one with no overall political control. It seems unlikely that political control will have a major part to play in the day-to-day operation of job-share schemes except that labour authorities seem more likely to introduce job-sharing in the first place as part of equal opportunities initiatives. Data from teachers job-sharing in the four new schemes were balanced by data from teachers in a long-running scheme in a northern metropolitan authority and data from the 'ad hoc' group in a range of LEAs without formal schemes.

ii) Method of contact

In the above five LEAs questionnaires were sent to all job-sharers and any teachers with names on a job-sharing register. The methods for arranging this varied at the LEA's request, leading possibly to varying response rates and also problems in calculating these accurately in some cases.

In one new scheme, and the long-running one, the names of schools were provided. In the new scheme head were asked to pass on requests for participation to their job-sharers. Those who returned a slip signifying willingness to participate were sent a questionnaire. In the long-running scheme the approach of the long vacation made this two-stage process impracticable and heads were asked to give requests together with questionnaires to their sharers. It is possible that teachers would have been more willing to complete the questionnaires they had to hand than to return slips committing themselves to the unknown, but this is conjecture. Similarly those who felt themselves to be part of an exciting new scheme might have been more willing to take part than those who took sharing opportunities for granted. In addition to this, the officer providing the list of schools in the long-running scheme admitted that while these schools had two or more part-time staff the computer did not identify whether they were actually job-sharers. About one fifth of the heads returned the package saying that their part-time staff were not job-sharers. Others may also have been in this category but did not return the
material. Thus the number of questionnaires sent out does not necessarily equate with the number of sharers and the percentage return rate from sharers cannot be accurately calculated.

In the three remaining areas the names of schools were not provided by the LEA, who undertook to circulate request slips for participation by the internal mailing system. In the two areas with few job-sharers the number given by the LEA can be regarded as accurate, but in the area with a much larger number the requests were sent via area offices to schools, and the number given by the LEA may not be entirely accurate. The total number of job-sharers given by staff at area offices did not equate to the total number quoted by County Hall. Three LEAs had job-share registers and the numbers on those who were sent information by the LEAs must be accepted as correct, though it is not possible to verify that all such applicants actually received it.

iii) Classification of responses

The teachers' responses to the questionnaires were frequently accompanied by letters and lengthy contributions to the section inviting opinions. Many were clearly pleased to be able to contribute and expressed support for the research and an interest in reading the results. It was not easy, in many cases, to classify responses. This was particularly true in those from the long-running scheme. Here there was a much greater diversity of arrangements, and sharers were sometimes involved in a second or third partnership, or a temporary arrangement which the school saw as only a 'stop-gap' situation.

The question 'how do you split your hours?' should have been extended by a list of possibilities to tick, as some merely replied '50/50' without describing the pattern. Another problem was in identifying the 'pairs' where a school had more than one. The subject taught usually helped in secondary schools, and pattern of time sharing in primaries. There were still instances where it proved difficult to identify partnerships within (say) four responses from a school with three job-shares. There was sometimes great relief when a sharer used her partner's name, thus identifying the partnership. In a few cases the matter was resolved according to what seemed the greatest probability, some resolution being necessary since some questions needed to be analysed by individual data and others by partnership data, to avoid double counting where both partners replied compared with those in which only one did so. While errors here could cause slight inaccuracies in calculations, the number of examples causing difficulty was sufficiently small to have little overall effect.
The question about how the sharer had heard of the authority's job-share scheme was successful in showing the importance of being 'in touch with', and preferably active in, the school scene. In one authority it was essential as only those with permanent posts or a very lengthy supply-teaching record were considered. Classification of replies was often difficult, however, since 'saw LEA circular' and 'found out about it from the school notice board' might refer to identical situations. 'Heard about it from a friend' and 'another teacher told me' might also be equivalent and it was not clear from these whether the information was passed on within the school setting or socially in the world beyond. Some interesting cases were revealed of unemployed teachers actually taking the initiative and asking whether such arrangements were permitted, and others saw articles in the local press. Few referred to job advertisements as their source of information. In spite of classification problems this question provided a general picture of the way information on job-share schemes had been obtained.

'For about how long do you hope to share?' was designed to discover whether the sharers regarded their mode of work as a short, medium or long-term proposition. 'Until I retire' involved a calculation which omitted the possibility of early retirement, and 'until my children are older' presented classification problems. Possibly a selection of items to tick e.g. 0-4 years, 5-9 years etc. would have been better. The majority of respondents did in fact give an estimated number of years and most of the remainder could reasonably be assigned to short (0-4 years) medium (5-9 years) and long (10+ years) term classification. Some felt unable to say, and others who said, for example, 'As long as my partner wants to continue' or 'It depends whether my husband changes jobs and we leave the area' were also classified as 'don't know'.

iv) Ambiguity

One question proved to be ambiguous. Teachers were asked whether they had been interviewed in competition with full-time applicants. This was designed to reveal cases in which a full-time post had been advertised and both full-time and job-share applicants interviewed. Some teachers replied that they had been in competition with full-time teachers who wished to reduce to a part-time job, but not with those wanting to work full-time in the vacant post. It is possible that brief 'yes' or 'no' answers may have concealed differences in interpretation of the meaning of the question. As a result there was no clear case in the responses of a pair of applicants being appointed in preference to full-time applicants except
a) where two existing part-time teachers in a school, possibly on fixed-term contracts, move into a full-time post which becomes vacant and the vacancy is not advertised

b) where existing partnerships apply for promotion within the school and obtain this in competition with existing full-time staff

c) in peripatetic posts, or those in adult education where the ability of both partners to work at the same time can be an advantage.

vi) Promoted status

The question asking whether sharers had held a promoted post before beginning to share was designed to discover any who had had to relinquish promoted status in order to do so. In retrospect, a question asking whether promoted status had ever been attained in previous employment might have been helpful, though a number of teachers added this information e.g. 'I was on Scale 3 before I left to concentrate on my family for a few years'. The main problem with the analysis of responses to this question was caused by the changes in teachers' salary structure in England and Wales during the research. Since Scales 1 and 2 were integrated to form the main professional grade (MPG), teachers formerly promoted to Scale 2 became indistinguishable from those who had been only on Scale 1 despite the fact that they retained responsibility and sometimes a title e.g. 'second in department'. The gradual phasing in of the lower incentive allowances meant that many of these teachers expected to receive one in the near future, but only some had already done so. Thus analysis of data for this question was extremely difficult. Only more senior teachers could be seen to have retained status since they were awarded incentive allowances immediately. A few teachers referred clearly to the fact that they had had to relinquish a promoted post to share, sometimes because a suitably qualified and experienced partner could not be found, and sometimes because, for a while at least, they had chosen to opt for reduced responsibility. Conversely, one pair who had lost status because their original pastoral posts were considered unsuitable for sharing, regained it by being promoted jointly to head an academic department. The important point being investigated in this question could thus be considered only from anecdotal evidence rather than analysis of the data.

vii) Follow-up questionnaires

In the early stages of the research it was intended to follow up the sharers in the new schemes a year later when they had had longer experience of working as a partnership. This was later abandoned as too expensive and time-consuming since
the estimated population of sharers taking part, about 20 to 30 in each of four authorities, had in fact become nearer to 200. The data from sharers in the long-running scheme and those from the 'ad hoc' group, many of whom had been sharing for several years, was felt to be sufficiently representative of experienced partnerships.

viii) Teachers in further and higher education

In two LEAs teachers in post-secondary education were included. However in most areas the department dealing with such lecturers was quite separate from that dealing with schools, and liaison with two different sets of LEA officers threatened to double the amount of communication involved. In view of this the further and higher education data obtained has been treated as a special case, and results in this area were not sought from other authorities.

3 THE HEADTEACHERS

In two Areas the names of schools were provided by the LEA and here all relevant head teachers were sent questionnaires. Here there may be responses from heads whose sharers did not reply, i.e. the number of heads replying could be greater than the number of schools from which sharer responses were obtained. In two others the questionnaires were sent to the head teachers of sharers who had expressed a willingness to take part by returning slips sent out by the LEA. In the fifth LEA the questionnaires were sent to heads directly by the authority. These differences were at the request of the LEAs concerned. Response rates, which were very high, were easier to calculate than those for the teachers as there was more direct control of the number of questionnaires sent out. The head teacher questionnaires were intended to be returned anonymously, as it was felt that heads would feel more free to comment honestly if they knew that their responses could not be linked with the sharers they referred to. In fact quite a number of heads attached names and telephone numbers and offered further help if needed. The responses proved straightforward to analyse. One omission regretted is that no question asked for the time pattern worked by the sharers, thus it was impossible to test whether any particular time-split was associated with more positive headteacher attitudes. Because of the anonymity of returns the sex of the head teacher could not be guessed at and there was no request for this information. It was not therefore possible to consider whether one sex favoured job-sharing more than the other, but in any case the differing proportions of male and female head teachers in the infant, primary and secondary sectors would have made comparisons unreliable.
4 THE SCHOOLS

A classification problem arose with both the heads' and teachers' surveys. Job shares operate differently in secondary schools because sharers are likely to teach several classes and may share few or none, while primary teachers mainly share one class. Informal comments received early on indicated that some teachers felt that job-sharing would be less likely to succeed with younger children. In order to make comparisons the sharers, and their head teachers, were to be classified as 'nursery', 'infant', 'junior' and 'secondary' depending on the age of the children taught. Thus if sharers taught pupils between 5 and 7 years old, both they and their heads were classified as 'infant' regardless of whether their school was officially an infant school, first school, primary school or Scottish junior school. Middle schools posed a problem, and here a share could be identified as 'junior' if the pupils taught were below 11, or if the sharers appeared to be chiefly class-teachers of 11-12 year olds. In a few instances sharers were clearly subject specialists, sometimes with secondary experience, and here they were classified as 'secondary' if they were mainly engaged in teaching their own subject to older pupils in the middle school.

A further difficulty arose where a head had two (or more) shares in the school, one in each of two categories, e.g. a primary head might be commenting on an 'infant' share and a 'junior' share. When comments were clearly differentiated the data could be treated as if it came from two different heads, with the same head appearing in both categories. When comments were global, applying to both partnerships, they could apply twice in relation to the number of shares, but only once in relation to head teacher opinions. Decisions had to be made about the entry of data in such cases and these decisions account for some variation in the apparent numbers used in calculations.

5 CONCLUSION

Overall it is felt that minor problems in classifying responses to questions or identifying exact percentage response rates are not such as to affect the general analysis or conclusions of the research. Failure to deal with the important issue of promotion in relation to job-sharing as fully as intended is regrettable but unavoidable, given the ongoing changes in the structure of teachers' pay scales at the time of the research.
LIMITATIONS OF THE INTERVIEWS WITH LEA OFFICERS

Each interview took about 1½ hours and a semi-structured schedule was used so that important factors were not omitted. Within this framework interesting lines of discussion were followed-up as these often revealed information which would not have been revealed from strict adherence to the schedule. All the officers concerned were most willing to contribute to the research and they often sought information on how their schemes differed from those of other LEAs.

The chief drawback to comparability was the fact that the officers interviewed had differing roles. Some were personnel officers with a detailed knowledge of administrative matters, while others were more involved with general policies, e.g. equal opportunities, and these were not always aware of implementation details. One officer has a more general role within the local authority with regard to staffing and was not specifically attached to the education section. Because of these differences the interviews sometimes elicited more information in some areas of interest than in others. On a few occasions information was not available. The detailed accounts of the interviews in Appendix 2 indicate the roles of the officers involved and the areas in which their contributions were limited.

One further drawback arose over questions concerning the origins of schemes, the reasons for establishing them and the negotiations which took place within planning committees. Some of the officers had not been involved at this level and were thus unable to comment on the setting-up of schemes though they were knowledgeable about the practical outcomes.

In most cases documents were available which provided information for the research and the content of these has been included with the accounts of the interviews.
APPENDIX 2
THE INTERVIEWS

Details on the selection of LEAs appear in Chapter 9 and this appendix includes detailed accounts of the interviews from which comparisons are made in Chapter 10.

Representatives of ten of the twelve authorities with job-sharing schemes for teachers already in operation were interviewed, the remaining two not wishing to take part. Each interview lasted from one to one-and-a-half hours and a structured sequence of questions was used as shown in Appendix 1. The order of questions was not strictly adhered to and there was freedom to pursue promising lines of discussion.

Interviews were used in preference to questionnaires because

a) it was felt that officers were more likely to agree to an interview than to complete a lengthy questionnaire

b) there would be more opportunity to clarify comments and pursue points of interest

c) information might be offered on points which might not have been included in a questionnaire.

The interviews were not recorded as this might have been inhibiting, and a more relaxed and open discussion was preferred. Officers were not always able to answer every question, and some of the replies were necessarily subjective - another officer might have given a different answer. The particular responsibilities of the officer could also affect the perspective from which job-sharing was viewed, for example, it might be seen from a theoretical policy-making point of view, an administrative implementational one, or as chiefly an equal opportunities matter. Where particular facts were unknown, a list of questions was left so that answers could be passed on at a later date. This was not always done.

AREA I A COUNTY AUTHORITY

The officer interviewed was responsible for personnel within the education department, and described himself as a 'shaper' rather than an initiator of policy. He was concerned particularly with its implementation. The job-share scheme was introduced in the Autumn of 1987. It sprang from local authority initiatives on equal opportunities, and job-sharing occurred in other areas of employment, especially Social Services and secretarial/clerical. In this authority, unlike some others, job-sharing for teachers and lecturers was introduced at an early stage of
the policy implementation. An Education Committee paper stated that "there are considerable advantages both to the LEA, the schools, and individual teachers in such a scheme". The main objective was "to explore the scope for opening up, as far as possible, a much wider range of part-time opportunities, including some posts at higher responsibility level". Headships, deputy-headships and posts with a large responsibility for pastoral care e.g. Head of House, Head of Year, were to be excluded, but all other posts would be considered suitable for sharing except in special circumstances. A register would be set up and applicants 'put in touch' with other teachers seeking the same kind of employment. An existing full-time teacher could request to share a job with a colleague or for part of it to be advertised. An advertised full-time job could be applied for by a pair of prospective sharers or by a single applicant with the authority seeking a partner from the register. Sharers would be appointed individually on merit and there would be no payment for additional liaison time. A strange feature of this scheme is that pairs of existing part-time teachers, already operating in practice as job-sharers, were ineligible to apply for recognition as sharers. Technically they could both resign and re-apply for their existing post as sharers, or they could apply jointly for a shared post in another school. The officer was asked whether this put existing de facto sharers at a disadvantage. He could not think of any way in which they were. Careful study of documents relating to the employment of part-time staff in this authority showed, however, that separate part-time staff would have less protection than those officially designated job-sharers. For example:

a) While job-sharers would immediately have permanent contracts, the existing de facto sharers would have to work for two or five years to qualify for them, depending on the hours worked.

b) Separate part-time staff had much lower priority under redeployment procedures, and if redeployed would not receive travelling expenses, while job-sharers, like full-time teachers, would do so for a few years.

c) The hours of even permanent part-time staff could be varied by means of a clause in their contracts, while the total hours of job-sharers would always be a full-time equivalent.

The officer accepted these disadvantages when they were pointed out and suggested that the position could be 'considered on an individual basis' for cases where existing de facto sharers had already achieved permanent contracts by length of service. This possibility did not appear in any documents circulated to teachers.

With regard to in-service training the officer considered that sharers could attend all five so-called 'Baker days' if sufficient 'directed time' had been saved for
the purpose from the appropriate proportion required by the teachers' contract. No payment would be made for extra attendance above the pro-rata commitment.

By September 1988 (just over a year after the introduction of the scheme) there were estimated to be 34 shared posts (19 primary, 14 secondary and 1 in a special school) including a pair of departmental-head sharers and a few on lower level promoted posts. (The number of teaching posts in the authority was approximately 9,000.) There were also about 70 names on the job-share register. It was acknowledged that this list was being kept but not used. There was no positive action taken to put teachers in touch with each other and only one known request for information from an area officer seeking a potential partner for an applicant. A plan to make better use of the register was under consideration.

Any pattern of hours was acceptable and this depended on the preferences of sharers and needs of schools. While headteachers had the final say about whether job-sharers would be employed in their schools, there might be some discussion and persuasion, or even 'full and vigorous debate' if heads were thought to refuse job-sharing unreasonably.

While vacant part-shares should be advertised to comply with equal opportunities policies, it was admitted that a potential partner known to the school and acceptable to the existing sharer would always be in a a better position to get the job. The existing sharer would have no formal say in the choice of a new partner but would doubtless be able to meet applicants, and a wise head would probably want to take their views into account.

Local advertisements carried a statement that "the following posts are suitable for a job-sharing arrangement unless otherwise stated."

The procedure (hereafter referred to as the 'standard procedure') for dealing with the resignation of one partner would be as follows:

a) the remaining partner would be offered the post on a full-time basis providing that he/she was suitably qualified to undertake it.

b) failing this the vacant part-share would be advertised, and applicants, who might be currently employed full-time, part-time, permanently or temporarily, or not currently in employment, would be eligible to apply.

c) if no suitable partner could be found the remaining sharer would continue to be employed on a permanent part-time basis, though this would involve individual casework and might not necessarily be possible in the same school.
Costs had been considered by the County Treasurer, who had estimated that overall salary costs would not change, that superannuation costs would not increase, and might decrease if some sharers did not elect to join the scheme, and that National Insurance might involve a saving of some £100 per annum on average for each sharer.

The officer felt that the greatest advantage lay in the opportunity of recruiting and retaining experienced staff - their expertise would not be lost just because they were unwilling to work full-time. Schools could also gain flexibility from a wider range of experience which two teachers in one post might provide, and possibly from a willingness to cover for each others' absences on occasion. "Good personnel management involves a consideration of the needs of the individual employee where these do not conflict with the needs of the employing institution." He considered that there is greater loyalty and better morale if employees feel that they can still be employed part-time at certain stages of their lives rather than be forced to leave. The disadvantages were seen as an increase in management input for supervision and communication, and the possible extra costs of in-service training for two teachers instead of one.

Asked about feedback from other officers, inspectors, headteachers, etc., the officer reported that some were wary of change, and particularly of the sharing of promoted posts, but there had been little dissatisfaction expressed once a job-share was in operation. The only problem which had arisen was about whether a leaving sharer need be replaced. A school had had to reduce its staffing allocation by 1½ full-time equivalent posts, and it had seemed sensible to lose the ½-post by non-replacement. The remaining sharer was not happy about this, feeling less secure as a separate part-timer, though the officer said that in this case the teacher would retain the rights of a job-sharer with respect to redeployment agreements and no variation of hours. Union officials had insisted that the post must continue to be treated as a whole and considered for redeployment or retention as a full-time post, not reduced to a single part-time one. This appeared to have been handled at area level and might give rise to discussion at county level in future.

It is interesting to note that a year later this authority was operating a job-share arrangement within its inspectorate.
AREA 2: A LARGE REGIONAL AUTHORITY

The officer had responsibility for personnel. Job-sharing schemes outside education were introduced in 1986, and for teachers in 1987. The schemes were part of equal opportunities initiatives.

Schools were generally over-staffed and thus, while the scheme was available for existing and prospective employees in principle, applications would be accepted only from existing staff wishing to share their jobs. The job-shares would be permanent, though temporary partners might be appointed until permanent ones could be found. Letters accepting applications (though not the contracts themselves) state the time-pattern of the share, which is normally expected to be a two-and-a-half day block or mornings/afternoons, though other patterns can be considered by special request. Adjustments would be made to share public holidays fairly. While promoted posts were not excluded, very few were shared in practice. The job-share schemes for employees outside teaching stated that sharers might not undertake other paid employment, but the officer thought that this did not apply to teachers. If one teacher left, the standard replacement procedure would operate.

While existing teachers wishing to share had to apply through their headteachers, and the latter were able to comment on the application when forwarding it to the divisional officer, it was made clear that an application would only be refused for very clear stated reasons and the teacher could appeal. Thus it would be difficult for a headteacher to refuse a job-sharing arrangement in his/her school. The divisional officer would have the task of finding a suitable partner from among other applicants, taking into account age-group taught, subject, geographical accessibility etc., and would arrange the transfer of one to the school of the other.

The unions were said to have agreed amicably with the scheme, and the chief problem that had arisen was that headteachers were unhappy that they had little say in the choice of partnerships.

The cost was thought to be nil, although there would be financial implications if overlap-time or extra in-service training were to be paid for. New conditions of service for permanent part-time teachers referred to an existing pro-rata commitment to non-contact time for parents' evenings and other professional activities, but the document adds that permanent part-time staff would also be required to attend the balance of time allocated to such activities and that payment would be made for this extra time.
The general effect on teacher numbers was thought to be minimal. For every half vacancy created, a half teacher who might have left had stayed. There was a surplus of teachers and a no-redundancy agreement, staff being directed for redeployment on the basis of curriculum need and length of service. The length of service for a job-share pair was considered to be the average of their individual records.

This scheme appeared to be controlled 'from the top' and could leave headteachers feeling left out of the decision-making process. It is likely that such opinions will be expressed in the planned review of the scheme. It was the only scheme that mentioned balancing-out public holidays so that one sharer does not gain unfairly, and the only scheme that required sharers to take part in all non-contact activities while being paid for the extra hours. It is significant that opportunities at the time of the interview were available only for existing permanent employees, thus many teachers acting as supply or temporary staff while trying to obtain a permanent post were excluded from applying. The particular size of this authority may also mean that decisions taken at a high level may be interpreted and implemented differently by officers in different geographical areas.

[Additional material (not from the interview)]

The background to the introduction of this scheme is of some importance, and is illustrated by case notes for an industrial tribunal. NALGO had been negotiating without success with the authority for several years about introducing a job-share agreement. A meeting of those interested in the idea was held, and there was a general feeling that while local officers and managers might be supportive, senior staff in charge of manpower and far removed from local affairs and perceptions were 'quite hostile'. Two experienced employees wished to share the post of one of them on return from maternity leave and were strongly supported by their senior officer who hated losing qualified and experienced staff who had proved themselves excellent workers. A campaign began of making phone calls and sending letters to elected council members and senior officers in order to attempt to create a positive 'climate of opinion' about job-sharing. The two employees had been told that they could not job-share because the authority did not have a job-sharing policy. Their senior officer considered that this need not prevent an agreement being made in a particular case, "They will be telling us next that because they do not have a policy on breathing, we cannot be allowed to breathe." Eventually the case was taken to an industrial tribunal with the help of the EOC on the grounds that the refusal amounted to indirect sex discrimination, and the case was won. In fact the authority claimed that in principle they were committed to
job-sharing. They were said at the tribunal to 'have a policy of having a policy on job-sharing', but until an agreement had been made with NALGO and introduced throughout the authority they 'were not prepared to allow job-sharing on a piece-meal basis'. Also if these particular applicants were allowed to job-share that would lead to many more job-sharing applications. The tribunal found that refusal to allow the employees to share was not justifiable and recommended that the authority should make the necessary arrangements for them to work part-time as they desired. There is little doubt that the campaign for job-sharing carried out by the employees involved, and the tribunal decision, had a strong influence on the subsequent development of a job-sharing policy in this authority.

Some time after the interview a report on sex equality in the education service was produced by a working party. Background research for this was done by questionnaire, but not published. The only reference to job-sharing in the report is that

"In many cases part-time work, often at a low rate of pay, has to be accepted because of the lack of places in nurseries and the inflexibility of employment arrangements. While there are signs of progress in these areas also, such as the acceptance of job-sharing ... there is much room for future improvement."

**AREA 3: A COUNTY AUTHORITY**

The officer interviewed had responsibility for personnel. Some informal job-shares had been operated in the past but a formal scheme was set up in the Spring of 1987, the prime motive being to rationalise the existing situation. The main impetus had come from teachers themselves, particularly those with family responsibilities who had 'looked to more varied patterns of work than that offered by full-time employment'.

An added attraction for management was that as staff numbers had to be reduced owing to falling rolls there had sometimes been problems in covering the curriculum, but a job-share could offer a wider spread of specialisms. A paper presented to the schools sub-committee also mentioned that pupils could gain increased stimulation from two fresh faces in the classroom, teachers might have more time available for planning, and there could be advantages in working with the professional support of a partner. The trade unions had been very supportive of job-sharing and the authority had set up its scheme after studying those already in operation in Sheffield and ILEA.
Posts had so far been split equally, although other proportions could be considered. When one partner left the whole post would be reviewed. If a full-time post was still needed it would be offered to the existing sharer if suitable, the part-post could be advertised, or the remaining sharer redeployed and the whole post advertised. Conditions for redeployment were equivalent to those for full-time staff, although premature retirement was available to full-time staff only. While there was no objection in principle to the sharing of promoted posts, the existing sharers were all on the main professional grade. Job-sharers were seen to have more security than other part-time teachers even when the latter had permanent posts.

The attitude of headteachers to the appointment of job-sharers would be important, but if objections appeared to be irrational then officers might use 'some persuasion'. While advertised posts could be applied for on a shared basis this was not stated in national advertisements. Where one sharer is being replaced, the existing sharer's choice may be taken into account at the discretion of the headteacher. A register of interested teachers was held but had only two or three names.

By two years after the start of the scheme there were five pairs of sharers, out of a total of some 3,000 teachers. The number of sharers, and of those on the register, seemed small compared with the experience of other authorities and the officer was asked to comment on this. He felt that some full-time staff were wary of giving up their jobs because of worries about what might happen if a partner left. In rural areas schools were often far apart and it would not always be easy to find a suitable partner within a reasonable travelling distance. For the same reason it was not always easy to find a suitable school for redeployment if a new partner could not be found. In addition to this some governing bodies, particularly in rural areas, were very much against change and 'new fangled ideas', and some headteachers too were unpersuaded of the value of job-sharing. One head who supported such arrangements had taken the opportunity to retain two good teachers for the benefit of her school, and she had been of great value in talking to other heads about the success of the job-share and encouraging them to consider the possibilities.

The impression given by this authority was one of a permissive scheme not widely publicised. The rural nature of the area may affect the take-up of the scheme - while full-time teachers may move to take up a new post, job-sharers commonly seek posts within a reasonable distance of where they already live and there will be a smaller pool of potential sharers within range of a rural school.
compared with one in an urban area. Even so it remains surprising that the register list should be so short, since supply or temporary teachers might seek permanent posts by this route. If there is a shortage of teachers in the next few years it may be that this scheme will be more actively promoted as an aid to recruitment.

**Area 4: A County Authority**

The officer interviewed was responsible for personnel matters. The scheme began in September 1988. While lecturers in further education were included none had so far been appointed as colleges appeared to prefer separate part-time posts. The scheme was initiated directly by the Director of Education after reading about one operating in Sheffield. The authority had needed to plan a package of action to reduce secondary teacher numbers which had included early-retirement, re-training for primary, and voluntary job-sharing. The teacher unions had been happy about the scheme provided that sharing was genuinely voluntary, and the scheme was to be permissive. Job-shares could be arranged if existing full-time teachers wanted to take part and heads and governors were agreeable.

The contracts offered were the same as those for other permanent part-time staff and did not refer to sharing. If one partner left the situation would be reviewed. The remaining sharer would not automatically be offered the full-time post, though this might be done where appropriate, but would in any case remain as a permanent part-time employee. Teachers were recommended to split the time equally to qualify for employment protection. At the time of the interview job-sharing was available only for existing staff but a part-share might be advertised if no existing staff were interested. A register is used to pair existing full-time employees who would prefer to share and reduce their current commitment. Advertisements for full-time jobs do not mention job-sharing but there would be no objection to a paired application. Promoted posts could be available where appropriate, on a shared basis, or one sharer might retain a proportion of a previously held allowance while the partner remained on the main professional grade. Overlap time is not paid for, though schools are free to timetable both partners together for non-contact time. In one case extra hours were needed for a special needs pupil and both sharers worked 0.6 of a full-time post, thus sharing a nominally 1.2 full-time equivalent post.

For in-service training sharers can be paid for extra attendance on professional development days if the headteacher considers this to be desirable.
Redeployment was usually decided on a curriculum basis with the most junior staff in the affected subject being redeployed. Asked how this would affect sharers if one partner was long-serving and one a newcomer the officer said that this had not yet occurred. Such problems were better dealt with by individual casework and common sense rather than rules.

Headteachers and governors had the final say about the appointment of job-sharers but could be 'persuaded' if they were thought to be acting unreasonably, though this influence would be reduced after the introduction of LMS.

After two terms there were ten pairs in action, (five in secondary, two junior, two infant, one special school). The register contained the names of 18 existing full-time staff seeking to share their jobs, and 4 currently not in permanent employment.

Costs were considered to be minimal and mainly a matter of administrative time, though extra in-service training for two teachers rather than one would be the main financial cost.

The chief concern about job-sharing came from headteachers, particularly of infant schools, and centred on curriculum continuity. The officer felt that the scheme was new and people always tended to be cautious, 'fears may be allayed with wider experience of sharing in operation.'

One of the most interesting factors influencing this scheme was its introduction directly as a factor relating to teacher supply, in this case a need to reduce teacher numbers. Other factors, such as equal opportunities and curriculum flexibility occur as a by-product rather than a prime purpose.

**Area 5: A Metropolitan Authority.**

The officer had responsibilities for personnel. In 1982 all schools received a policy document from the authority concerning the introduction of job-sharing. The city had long-term problems with unemployment and planned several initiatives to encourage a wider spread of the available work. Existing full-time employees wishing to share their jobs could create vacancies for newly-qualified teachers and those wishing to return from a career break. There was also a need to redeploy teachers because of falling rolls, and some part-time teachers took full-time posts rather than losing their jobs, thus occupying half-posts they did not really want and which could otherwise be available to other teachers.
A study in 1983 found approximately 15 pairs of sharers, of whom six pairs were interviewed. A further study in this LEA in 1986 found that the number had risen to about 70 pairs out of a total of 4,500 teachers. Only 4 pairs were in the secondary sector, and only one pair was promoted above Scale 2. All except one were female. At the time of the interview, in 1988, the number of pairs was thought to be possibly approaching a hundred, though statistics were not readily available. While it was possible to identify schools with part-time staff who might be sharers, some were in fact independent and not on job-share contracts.

In late 1988 there was still a falling-roll problem so job-sharers were generally teachers who wished to reduce their full-time hours, though partners were sometimes found from existing part-time or supply teachers. No level below headteacher was excluded from the scheme in theory, a deputy-head share being under consideration, and patterns of hours could be decided freely at the discretion of heads and sharers. There was no paid overlap time, teachers being required to liaise in their own time. No payment was available for attendance on extra non-contact days.

Headteachers had the final responsibility of deciding whether job-sharing was permitted, but the officer considered that there was little opposition now as the arrangement was better accepted and understood. In the 1986 study 11 women interviewed about returning to teaching after maternity leave said they had considered job-sharing. Three said that their headteachers had suggested the idea, and two had accepted the suggestion. Others had thought of the idea themselves but rejected it for financial reasons (after paying a nanny the income wouldn't be worth it), because they did not know of a possible partner, or because they might have to change to another school. Seven headteachers were reported as being 'less than positive' with a few saying directly that job-shares were not welcome in their schools.

Comments included "He said it was full-time or nothing" and "I could have applied ... but I didn't want the battle." "I wrote to the office but they said the head's decision was final." Whether attitudes had improved between the 1986 study and the 1988 interview is of course a matter of conjecture. Headteachers were advised to take account of an existing sharer's opinion concerning a new partner, and a register was being set up to help potential sharers find suitable partners. The relatively small number of secondary job-shares identified in 1986 was reflected in 1988. The officer could not suggest any reason for this.

Costs were considered to be marginal and had not been studied in detail.

Advantages were seen to include:
a) a pair contributes more than 100%
b) experience can be retained, not lost
c) it is better to have happy energetic sharers than stressed, tired, full-time teachers
d) pupils gain from greater spread of expertise and interests, and from different rôle models.

Disadvantages included
a) lack of paid overlap time
b) no pay for extra in-service days attended
c) sharers may find promotion prospects less good than they expect, in particular full-time staff moving to job-share may find headteachers wanting them to relinquish promoted posts to do so.

The teacher unions were said to be very supportive and experience of good practice meant that primary heads were generally willing to consider job-share arrangements though secondary ones continued to be more cautious.

Documents issued to schools appeared somewhat vague on the procedure to be adopted when one sharer left. Because of the continuing need to redeploy staff there was some effort to find partners from those already employed wherever possible. There was some evidence of existing sharers having temporary supply partners for a while before a permanent appointment was made. Whether the existing sharers had been offered the job on a full-time basis was unclear.

At the time of the interview the authority were planning to renew their job-sharing initiative by recommending it to schools, re-wording advertisements so as not to discourage job-share applicants, issuing essential information to teachers on the financial implications of sharing, maintaining a register of those interested, and sending further guidelines to headteachers. This action appeared largely due to equal opportunities policies, though the officer thought that job-sharing might in the future be used as a source of recruitment if there should be a teacher shortage as predicted.

The main features of this scheme are the length of time it has been in operation, its origin as a means of spreading employment opportunities, the fact that it is very strongly encouraged yet leaves final decisions to headteachers, and the fact that there are very few secondary shares compared with other authorities. It is permissive in general approach, with few regulations, yet there is a positive promotion of the scheme and its perceived advantages.
The officer was from the education personnel section. There had been informally agreed job-shares since 1985 but the formal scheme started in 1987. The scheme was initiated by the County Council as part of its Equal Opportunities policies and may have been stimulated by the experience of informal job-sharing in the Education Department. Teacher unions had been supportive and schemes in action in Sheffield, ILEA, and Leicestershire had been studied as well as information from New Ways to Work and Hackney Job-Share.

Contracts refer specifically to job-sharing and state the name of the partner. The 'standard procedure' was followed if one partner left, a remaining sharer for whom no partner could be found would revert to permanent part-time though possibly with different hours and responsibilities. Only permanent shares are referred to as job-shares, temporary ones being considered as separate part-time posts. Promoted posts may be shared, any pattern of hours permitted, and overlapping times encouraged to facilitate liaison, though no extra time would be paid for. Vacant part-shares are available first to those already employed on permanent contracts who may be interested in such an opportunity. If no existing employee is available the part-share will be advertised. Applicants will normally meet the remaining sharer before interview and the selection panel must consider compatibility.

Heads and governors have the final say on whether a job-share is established. Applications for full-time posts must be paired; those without a partner can consult the register (which is available to teachers) and search out other teachers interested in forming a partnership.

Just over one year later there were an estimated 30 pairs of sharers out of roughly 8,000 teachers. No analysis of primary/secondary numbers had been done and the number of names on the register was not known.

Costs were considered minimal, the officer being unsure of the effect of National Insurance. Administrative time would be needed for setting up the sharing arrangements, but once these were settled extra administrative costs would be negligible. Extra attendance at in-service days would be open to negotiation within individual schools. It was not clear whether any extra payment could be made.

A leaflet on teacher job-sharing was issued to teachers expressing an interest in the scheme. (This appeared to be an NUT document in origin but the source was not acknowledged.) [The same document continued to be issued to potential
sharers as late as Autumn 1989 despite sections of it being seriously inaccurate by
that time owing to changes in teachers' conditions of service nationally.

This authority had no particular problems of teacher shortage or surplus so
any possible contribution of job-sharing to quantitative flexibility was irrelevant.
Each sharing arrangement could provide its own set of advantages to a school, and
its own problems. Nursery schools commonly had different children in the
mornings from those in the afternoons so job-sharing in this sector was easily
accepted. There were some doubts expressed by heads about the suitability of job­
sharing with reception and lower infant classes. In secondary schools pupils were
used to having a number of different teachers and timetables were often shared so
that different classes were taught anyway.

This scheme appeared to be permissive and pragmatic with any individual
problems being dealt with as they arose.

**AREA 7. A COUNTY AUTHORITY**

The Officer interviewed was in charge of staff development and training within
the personnel section of the LEA. This authority had declared itself an equal
opportunities employer in February 1988 to the surprise of some who thought this
unusual for a Conservative controlled authority. The County Personnel Officer had
earlier produced a report on Career Development for Women, and following
representation from the teaching associations a working party had been set up to
consider equal opportunities matters as they related to the teaching force. The
result was a report on career development for women teachers which included a
'returner' scheme and a job-share scheme. The latter was seen as creating work
opportunities for women not able to work full-time, and additional advantages for
the authority and for schools could include the retention of experienced staff and
the provision of a wider range of skills within one post. For the future it could help
to combat a predicted teacher shortage. There might be some slight increased
costs initially, and some organisational difficulties for heads, and there would
always be a risk of personality conflicts between sharers, but overall the working
party believed that advantages would outweigh the disadvantages. Letters were
sent to all teaching staff advertising the job-share scheme. This expressed an
intention to 'mount a campaign advertising the Authority's Job-sharing and
Returners Schemes', expected a substantial number of enquires, and considered
that the scheme would apply mainly to primary and special schools but could be
available in secondary schools where appropriate. An appendix listed 15 possible
advantages of job-sharing and 15 possible disadvantages, relating to children,
teachers and the employing authority. While the advantages were roughly equally split between these categories, only one disadvantage related to the pupils while 8 related to the employer.

The draft scheme stated that job-sharing would be available at all levels below headteacher. Existing teachers could request to become job-sharers or posts could be advertised welcoming applications by potential sharers. Each shared post would be considered as 1.1 full-time equivalent so that each sharer would have 0.05 additional time for liaison. If one partner leaves the part-post is advertised. If no partner can be found the existing sharer might wish to continue on a full-time basis or every effort would be made to redeploy to an alternative post. At first each area might target 10 posts as suitable for sharing and progress would be assessed after 12 months. 'The scheme should not be seen as an option to existing part-time staff.'

Contracts refer specifically to job-sharing, naming the partner and time-proportion applicable and that an extra 0.05 is allocated for 'consultation and co-ordination'. The number of non-contact days to be attended is stated using an approximate pro-rata calculation.

At the time of the interview, some eight months after the start of the scheme, there were approximately 50 pairs of sharers in post. It was felt that variation was likely between areas depending on whether they were rural or urban, had teacher shortages (acute in some areas), and also perhaps on the attitudes of individual area officers. Feedback had so far been favourable, only one report of an incompatible pair having been received. Nothing was known about how the teachers concerned had been paired, whether they were self-chosen or selected by interview. The officer was asked whether there were any previous pairs working de facto as sharers who might be disturbed by the fact that the document appeared to exclude existing part-timers from the scheme, especially as those officially job-sharing would be paid extra from liaison time. This officer did not know of any, although a previous discussion with another officer had revealed that there were some very long-standing partnerships in existence.

Registers of interested teachers would be kept at area level and it was known at County level how many names were on them.

Any extra costs were seen to result from the 0.1 paid overlap time and possibly extra in-service costs.
This authority was undergoing radical reorganisation at the time of the interview, and the job-sharing scheme had taken a back seat because of the changes in the responsibilities of the officers. A number of questions were left unanswered.

The most interesting features of this scheme are that

a) it sprang directly from equal opportunities initiatives in the authority as a whole and the issue of women's career patterns. Whether male employees felt this meant job-sharing was a women's issue and was not really appropriate to them would be interesting to know

b) the importance of liaison and joint planning is underlined by the provision of paid over-lap time

c) the 'standard' replacement sequence is slightly different in that a new partner is sought first; only if this fails is the existing partner offered the post on a full-time basis

d) the scheme is positively promoted, with attempts to identify suitable posts for sharing

e) only headships are excluded from consideration.

[Additional material. An article on this scheme was published later in a national newsletter (NWW, 1988). Here the origins of the equal opportunities initiatives were said to lie with action taken by the NUT to impress on the authority the need for such initiatives. Previously the County Education Officer had said that the authority would not declare itself an equal opportunity employer just in case it wasn't one, while the Chair of the Education Committee had said there was no need for such a declaration because it already was one. The part played by teachers from other associations was not mentioned, probably because the writer was an NUT officer. Other members of the working party agreed that the unions had all played a major part in promoting equal opportunities awareness, and that it was this that had provided the impetus to the setting up of the returners and job-share schemes.]

**AREA 8 A METROPOLITAN BOROUGH.**

The officer interviewed was involved with educational personnel.

The scheme originated in 1987 as a result of the development of equal opportunities initiatives in the authority as a whole. The intention was to provide 'more flexible patterns of employment' and to open up 'a wider range of job opportunities'. Also it could be 'an invaluable tool in the retention of scarce skills.'
A teaching post would be considered suitable for sharing unless (a) the cost would substantially exceed that of the post being filled on a full-time basis or (b) where it can be determined that job-sharing would have a significant detrimental effect on the service to pupils or students.

Existing full-time staff may apply to job-share, and returners from maternity leave may do so as well, as long as the post is not exempted.

All advertisements for non-exempted posts should carry the phrase 'Job-sharers welcome', and candidates may apply in pairs or individually. Where a teacher is offered an appointment to a vacant part-post he or she will be given the opportunity to meet the incumbent in the presence of the headteacher or head of department before a decision is made to confirm the appointment. Where one partner leaves, the remaining part of the job will be advertised. If the remaining sharer is interested in taking up the post on a full-time basis "they should apply to do so". Hours and duties can be decided by consultation between headteachers and sharers bearing in mind various criteria, and sharers who wish to cover for each other's absences may do so and be paid for additional hours or be given time off in lieu.

Contracts refer to the job-sharing arrangement, state the proportion to be worked, and offer approximately one hour a week of paid overlap time. Promoted posts are eligible, but none were thought currently to be held. While non-contact days are to be attended pro-rata, staff are encouraged to attend more where the school can offer time off in lieu, and pay for extra attendance might be agreed in the future.

A register of interested teachers is kept to which heads may refer when seeking possible partners for unpaired sharers. At present teacher supply was roughly in balance. Reduction in teacher numbers had earlier been dealt with by very generous early retirement opportunities, but there could well be shortages of staff in the future and it might be necessary to design recruitment 'packages' within which the possibility of job-sharing could be a valuable element.

After two years there were two shared secondary posts and six shared primary posts out of a teacher workforce of just over one thousand.

Costs were seen to be related to extra in-service training, and the payment for the overlap period. This was to be paid for from central funding after the introduction of LMS so that job-shares were not more expensive for schools than full-time staff.
The main advantages were seen to be the possibility of gaining a wider range of skills in one post, and especially of recruitment in general, i.e. both qualitative and quantitative flexibility.

The disadvantages were seen mainly as 'selling the idea' to headteachers. Their reservations, 'one might not be very good' or 'one might want maternity leave' often applied just as clearly to full-time staff, yet with job-sharers there would still be one good partner or one remaining to provide continuity which could make the situation easier rather than more difficult.

While the origin of this scheme lay in equal opportunities policies, it was clearly seen to be of value in recruitment of staff and efficient use of skilled teachers who might not be able to work full-time. It is not entirely clear how the replacement of a leaving partner is handled, though the implication is that the remaining partner can apply for the vacant share as well as others interested in the post. Thus he or she does not have the automatic right to the full-time post, but is able to be considered for this if desired. This system could be of help to those headteachers who feel that they could be 'landed' with a weaker partner on a full-time basis when a stronger one left, without any means of escape. Similarly, if it is thought that the remaining partner would not be able to cope satisfactorily with all aspects of the full-time post, there would be the option of appointing a new partner more suitably qualified and experienced. It is also interesting to notice that where a new appointment is to be made, the potential sharers meet before the appointment is confirmed. Most other authorities allow the potential partners to meet before appointment is considered to assess their compatibility. It seems likely to be very difficult for either potential sharer to express doubts about this after an appointment has been provisionally agreed. Once again, it is not clear how rigidly the written guidelines are adhered to in practice.

**AREA 9 A COUNTY AUTHORITY.**

The officer interviewed was responsible for teaching personnel.

Requests for teaching posts to be shared had been responded to positively for several years, and the term 'job-sharing' had been in use since 1981/2. The situation had been formalised in 1987. This was not therefore a new initiative but a rationalisation of piecemeal developments. Officers and teacher unions felt it about time to introduce clear guidelines and policy. The Sheffield and Lothian Health Service schemes had been studied.
Contracts refer specifically to job-sharing and state the relevant proportion and name of partner. A document outlining the job-share scheme is attached to the contract. Only permanent arrangements are referred to as job-shares and both currently employed and non-employed teachers may apply. Promoted posts are available and two pairs of deputy-head shares were in existence at the time of the interview. Time sharing was expected to be equal or 40%-60% though this was up to the school and the sharers. There was an 'expectation' that sharers would cover for each other's absences wherever possible, but no requirement to do so. Liaison should take place during 'directed time' i.e. the hours of non-contact time under the direction of the headteacher. Existing 'de facto' sharers could apply to be formally recognised.

While separate part-time employees were seldom in promoted posts, job-sharers might be, and the system of ranking used for deciding who might apply for a full-time post placed job-sharers higher than separate part-time staff. This ranking was necessary while staff numbers were being reduced. Under redeployment job-sharers were treated in the same way as full-time staff, though in practice there might be greater difficulty in finding suitable posts, for example within reasonable travelling distance for both partners. Opportunities for in-service training were comparable with those for other part-time staff and early retirement considered on an individual basis.

The decision on whether to permit a post to be shared remained largely with the headteacher although any refusal should be justifiable. In particular teachers wishing to job-share on return from maternity leave should be very positively considered because of legal cases on equal opportunities. While a reduction in staff was necessary, any vacant part-shares would be available for redeployed staff in the first instance, for other employees secondly, and then by local advertisement. Full-time vacancies could be applied for by pairs or by individuals. A register is kept but contains only about six names. It does not really function since "officers have no time to run a dating agency". There was in any case a question of whether selection from a register might breach equal opportunities policies, and most pairings seemed to be made 'through the grapevine'. An existing sharer had no right to have a say in the choice of a new partner, though a sensible headteacher was likely to arrange for applicants to be shown round by the existing sharer and would take account of any reactions.

After the formal scheme had been in place for about one-and-a-half years the number of sharers was about 50 pairs out of a total of about 6,500 teachers. Many of these had been informally agreed sharers before the scheme had been
introduced. Post-maternity leave applications created a steady flow, while there was a 'bump' of applications in the Spring from older staff wanting to share from the following September as a run-down to retirement. Promoted posts were thought to number about ten, including two shared deputy-head posts and a husband-and-wife team. Detailed statistics were not readily available.

A change in earlier forms of contract had been made, removing a 'frustration' clause. This had stated that if no replacement partner could be found and the existing sharer did not want to take over on a full-time basis then the contract would be terminated. This was replaced by a promise to continue the employment of the remaining partner whenever feasible, possibly by redeployment.

Pairs of sharers were required to show willingness to cover between them all ten sessions of the week, a situation normally required in primary schools. There was, however, no objection to overlapping time-patterns where not all ten sessions were covered if this suited the needs of the school. In theory each partner should be capable of doing all aspects of the job, but in practice this might not be so. A share in which only one partner was capable of teaching to 'A' level, for instance, would not be turned down merely because of this.

On costs, the officer considered that National Insurance contributions would be higher. After consulting a colleague in the Treasurer's department he admitted that he was surprised to find they would usually be reduced. He commented that there might also be savings on salaries if the sharers were on an incremental scale. There might be superannuation savings if one or both sharers chose not to contribute and some minor administrative costs. The largest extra cost would be for in-service training for two teachers instead of one. There was no pay for attendance at extra 'non-contact' days, but the possibility was under discussion.

The chief advantages were felt to be a double measure of skills, freshness, and the possibility of mutual cover for absences. There were considered to be no real disadvantages if everyone was supportive and the partners had a high level of compatibility. Some had claimed that "parents don't like it". Asked for evidence of this none had been provided. Could this be an excuse used by headteachers who don't want to bother with something new? With regard to teacher supply, job-sharing could be used as a mechanism to increase or reduce staffing levels depending on the situation.

The situation under LMS was considered to be problematic. While a local decision could be taken to enable valued staff to be retained at a school, there was also the possibility that governing bodies might be reluctant to try something they
knew little about, and that they might be less aware of, or committed to, equal opportunities initiatives.

The characteristic of this scheme is that it had grown up in response to local wishes. It was merely a 'tidying-up' of the status quo. This meant a minimum of regulations since there were fewer fears that an arrangement might not work and plenty of good experience to rely on. The attitude was generally permissive - allow the headteacher and governors to decide what is in the best interests of their school; job-sharing in the past was not refused simply because of the absence of a formal policy.

It is of particular interest to note that there were two pairs of deputy-head sharers in small schools. In one of these the arrangement was most unusual in that both sharers were full-time employees. They shared both the deputy-head post and a lower-level promoted post. The headteacher felt this provided her with a management 'team' and had the added advantage of allowing two teachers the opportunity of management experience as a step towards further promotion. This situation is perhaps better described as a 'post-share' rather than a 'job-share', since two full-time jobs are involved.

[Additional material]

In 1985 a study of job-sharing arrangements (all then informal) was undertaken by a teacher employed by the authority as part of a term's secondment. At this stage there were 12 job-shares in the authority, 4 of them in promoted posts, and 7 of the pairs contributed accounts of their experiences. All agreed that they had had very little difficulty in having their job-shares approved with the support of headteachers and heads of department. A few in basic scale posts were concerned about whether job-sharers were really likely to obtain promotion, there was unhappiness about the 'frustration' clause (later deleted) and considerable stress on the importance of commitment and compatibility and the need for liaison time, preferably timetabled. All appeared to be very happy with the sharing arrangements and felt that their schools also gained. One of the schools had produced a clear document about how job-sharers could fit into the school, what would be expected of them and whether they would be as fully accepted as any ordinary full-time teacher. The document includes a statement that an incumbent sharer would be involved in the selection process of a new partner by taking part in short-listing, discussion with candidates, and being present at decision-making. It is clear throughout that the schools were free to make job-sharing arrangements and develop their possibilities with the minimum of interference from outside, and that where a problem was found, e.g. with the 'frustration clause', the authority was
willing to make adjustments to previous practice when introducing a formal scheme.

**Area 10 A large metropolitan authority**

The officer interviewed was responsible for 'employment and policy development and advice' within personnel and involved in other areas of employment as well as teaching.

The authority as a whole had introduced job-sharing for other employees as a result of equal opportunities policies some years previously, but a pilot scheme for teachers began in 1984. Research on the progress of the scheme was carried out in 1984 and 1985, culminating in a report on the operation of the pilot scheme in 1986. The main purposes were to make more part-time opportunities available and to allow access to promoted posts and better career progression for those not able to work full-time.

One of the chief bones of contention in the planning of the scheme was whether there should be paid over-lap time. This was not available for staff in other blue or white-collar jobs, yet education department personnel considered it to be more necessary for teachers. This was turned down, because it did not fit the 'theory' of job-sharing i.e. the sharing of one post, not 1.1 of a post, and because committee members did not see why teachers should be treated differently. There was some implication here that teachers considered themselves as in some way worthy of 'special' treatment, and that if both teachers had all the necessary skills to do the job there should be no need for more than minimal liaison. An added consideration was whether those in other jobs would demand parity with teachers thus making all job-sharing more expensive.

Contracts referred specifically to job-sharing and the proportion of the share. Only head and deputy-head posts were excluded, together with pastoral posts unless special cases were made for these to be included. Patterns of sharing could be decided by sharers and headteachers, and sharers were permitted to undertake supply work, but in common with all other employees were not permitted to work for another employer in their remaining time. This seemed unusually restrictive; sharers might wish to undertake lecturing for example as well as teaching in a school. The officer thought that there might be cases which were known about officially, or where management 'turned a blind eye'.

If one partner left, the headteacher would consider whether a full-time post was still necessary. If so the existing sharer might wish to take over the whole
post, the vacancy might be available for a redeployed teacher, or the part-share advertised. The officer was not involved with the details of administration and was not completely clear about the order in which this process would occur, or in what ways job-sharers would be treated comparably with full-time or other part-time staff. Problems could arise because job-sharers are compared with full-time staff in concept but with part-time staff in terms of practicalities. Some administrators did not like job-sharing because it provided an extra category to think about. "If you ask what procedures apply to full-time staff they will tell you. If you ask about how they affect part-time staff they have the answer. If you ask about job-sharers they throw a fit."

All applications for full-time posts must be paired, with potential sharers responsible for finding a suitable partner, using the register if necessary. If any head considers a job other than deputy head or a pastoral post to be unsuited to sharing, a special case must be made for its exclusion. Advertisements state that all posts are suitable for sharing unless otherwise indicated. Existing sharers were able to meet applicants for part-shares to assess compatibility and could contribute views to the interviewing panel.

There were some problems over whether a returner from maternity leave had to return to the full-time post before requesting to share it, or could ask for a share to be arranged ready for her return. Although the latter was possible there was some concern that the returner might want to change her decision when the time came, either by deciding to return full-time or leaving altogether, thus causing difficulties if a partner had already been selected.

Some changes were made at the end of the pilot scheme; for example, pastoral posts were no longer to be automatically excluded since some were being shared satisfactorily after special pleading. Others had become necessary due to new conditions of service for teachers and the operation of the redeployment scheme. Since the pilot scheme ended, no formal monitoring had taken place and it was not easy to find out how many sharers there were. Computers were said to record whether teachers had part-time contracts, but not whether they were job-sharers.

The issue of paid overtime was to be considered again at the end of the pilot scheme, and this was still to be resolved. The report had emphasised the value of such a scheme, since joint planning and liaison was essential in the interests of pupil progress. The possibility that under the new conditions of service this overlap-time could be part of 'directed time' was mentioned, but the officer thought that while this might happen in practice, "we wouldn't say that". Possibly other employees
would see this as overlap becoming part of paid time and demand the same facility themselves.

At the time of the interview some secondary schools were greatly overstaffed and others (especially primary) very short of teachers. Job-sharing could help both to reduce teacher numbers and recruit new teachers, but its effect would vary from school to school.

Asked about feedback the officer felt that this would be unbalanced, as only problems come to the advice centre - they heard little of the shares that worked well. Some headteachers did not really support sharing. They sometimes complained of extra management problems, but were seldom able to justify these complaints. One supervisor of peripatetic staff wanted to exclude job-sharing. He found it hard enough to organise his staff as it was. The advice unit staff sat down with him and showed him that the increased flexibility could actually be an advantage, and he went away much happier having thought matters through in detail.

There had been some problems with Aided schools whose staff were employed and paid by the authority but whose governors did not necessarily take on local agreements. This could be a foretaste of future problems under LMS.

The officer was not really involved with finance and felt unable to discuss possible costs and savings.

Throughout this interview it was clear that the officer was more closely involved with policy theory than with policy implementation. A 'pure' view of job-sharing was often taken. In theory each sharer should be able to do the whole job, but administrators are happy to have different skills in the same post so theorists may turn a blind eye, even though they think the teachers should be considered 'paired part-time' staff rather than job-sharers. Similarly if both sharers left simultaneously it should be possible for one teacher to take over full-time. This could not be done with overlapping timetables. Again administrative flexibility might take precedence over pure theory. The question arose of whether it really mattered whether the teachers were called 'job-sharers' or 'paired part-timers', but it evidently does to them if the title applied gives rise to differing treatment because they fall into different categories. There was also a view that any two people who are independently able to do the whole job can successfully share it. The need for personal compatibility was seen as sometimes over-emphasised, possibly because it is less necessary for job-sharing bank-clerks, librarians and so on.
It may be interesting to compare the results of the research and report carried out after the pilot scheme with the current research. The research covered 56 pairs of sharers (of whom 78 individuals replied) and their headteachers (of whom 36 replied). Comments were also obtained from inspectors, teacher unions and administrators, and about 50 sharers attended a meeting one Saturday to express their views. The final report recommended acceptance in principle of the concept of paid consultation time, that pastoral posts should not automatically be excluded, that existing sharers should have the right to provide information on compatibility to the interviewing body and that there should be better publicity about the scheme and a more effective use of the job-share register. The research showed that there were slightly more secondary shares (37%) than primary ones (29%) with many being unattached staff. 23% were promoted above scales one and two compared with 23% in the authority as a whole, when heads and deputies were omitted, and 11% of the sharers were male. 40% had young children and most felt their shares were operating successfully. Most of the headteachers felt that benefits for their schools outweighed disadvantages but stressed the importance of planning and teamwork. When part-posts were advertised there were relatively few applicants but it was felt that there was a low level of publicity. There were fifteen cases of paired applications for full-time posts, only one of which was not successful, though there was no information about the amount of full-time competition.

The scheme in this authority resulted from equal-opportunities policies and is directive in nature, i.e. job-shares are not permitted simply because headteachers support them, but are available as a matter of principle unless a headteacher can make a good case for exclusion. This is more powerful than cases where an authority is prepared to 'persuade' heads but will always give them the final say. It is the only scheme encountered in the research where a full review of a pilot scheme was carried out, combining statistics with views of all interested participants.

**Area 11 A Metropolitan Borough**

(This authority did not respond to the original questionnaire but was approached directly as it was known from the literature to have had at least one pair of sharers in the past.)

The authority did not wish to be interviewed. Two of its teachers had requested a temporary two-year job-share in 1982 in order to have time for other
activities, and one of them wrote of the experience (S.D.Brown, 1984). This agreement was made on an individual one-off basis so that the teachers could reduce their hours but remain on permanent contracts with the same promoted status, and eventually return to full-time posts. It was agreed that each would cover for the other’s absences and would take over on a full-time basis if the other left. The authority was asked whether this experiment had given rise to further job-sharing agreements, and if so whether there remained a contractual requirement to provide mutual cover. The reply stated that there were now four pairs of primary sharers and two pairs of secondary sharers, all of whom seemed "happy with their arrangements".
APPENDIX 3
CHANGES OF ATTITUDES

An analysis of changes in the attitudes of headteachers, and heads of department in secondary schools, before experience of job-sharing in their own schools and afterwards.

The matrices show how attitudes changed in each LEA area, and in each sector within that area. Results for those not in the ordinary school sectors e.g. heads of service with job-sharing peripatetic teachers, or heads of all-age schools are excluded from the matrices but added into the final totals and percentages.

For each Area the results are summarised using only three groups

a very positive
b fairly positive
c neutral
d fairly negative
e very negative

and proportions changing view in positive and negative directions are also given.

These latter percentages must be treated with caution since those who were very positive beforehand are unable to indicate a change in the positive direction, and those who were very negative beforehand are unable to indicate a change in the negative direction. The proportions thus unable to express a change vary considerably between areas, and while the figures are of interest for any given area they should not be used to compare areas.

The full 5-point matrices were used to compare those areas with large enough samples. Comparisons revealed differences between Area 2 and other LEAs and those are shown in a combined form on Sheets 9 to 11 and discussed in the main text. Comparison between Area 5 (the long-running scheme) and the combined new schemes is limited as Area 5 had very few secondary job-shares. This may imply that secondary job-sharing proved less successful at an early stage and became less popular, but evidence from the LEA suggests that this area has always had relatively few secondary shares. Comparison between Area 5 and the rest in the Primary/Junior and Nursery/Infant sectors shows similar outcomes after experience e.g. Area 5 71% and The Rest 73% positive or very positive after experience for Primary/Junior and Area 5 75% and The Rest 69% positive or very positive after experience for Nursery/Infant. A slight increase in the percentage of
negative judgements for the Nursery/Infant sector in Area 5 results from four particular cases and cannot be taken as a general trend. The percentage of positive attitudes before experience is 59% in Area 5 compared with 29% in The Rest, but this may reflect greater freedom for headteachers to choose whether to employ job­sharers rather than a generally more positive attitude having developed within the area over time. In fact the reverse is true in the Nursery/Infant sector where 45% in Area 5 were positive before experience compared with 57% in The Rest. Once again these percentages should be treated with caution since the populations are relatively small. (Population numbers are given against each matrix in the following sheets.)
### AREA 1

#### Sec. Head

**Before**

- a: 1
- b: 1
- c: 1
- d: 0
- e: 0

**After**

- a: 1
- b: 2
- c: 2
- d: 1
- e: 0

**n = 9**

#### Sec. HOD

**Before**

- a: 2
- b: 1
- c: 3
- d: 0
- e: 0

**After**

- a: 3
- b: 0
- c: 3
- d: 0
- e: 0

**n = 6**

#### Primary/Junior

**Before**

- a: 1
- b: 0
- c: 1
- d: 0
- e: 0

**After**

- a: 1
- b: 2
- c: 1
- d: 0
- e: 0

**n = 2**

#### Infant/Nursery

**Before**

- a: 1
- b: 2
- c: 1
- d: 0
- e: 0

**After**

- a: 1
- b: 2
- c: 2
- d: 0
- e: 0

**n = 5**

### Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEFORE %</th>
<th>AFTER %</th>
<th>CHANGE OF VIEW %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ve</td>
<td>-ve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOD</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/J</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| SH       | 11      | 44               | 44  |      |              |      |              |
| SHOD     | 17      | 67               | 17  |      |              |      |              |
| P/J      | 50      | 50               | 0   |      |              |      |              |
| VN       | 60      | 40               | 0   |      |              |      |              |
### AREA 2

#### Before: Sec. Head

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- BEFORE: 0
- AFTER: 0
- n = 21

#### Before: Sec. HOD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- BEFORE: 1
- AFTER: 2
- n = 15

#### Before: Primary/Junior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- BEFORE: 6
- AFTER: 2
- n = 28

#### Before: Infant/Nursery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- BEFORE: 11
- AFTER: 3
- n = 11

### Change of View

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEFORE %</th>
<th>AFTER %</th>
<th>CHANGE OF VIEW %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+ve</td>
<td>-ve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOD</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/J</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOD</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/J</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOD</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/J</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIN</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Percentages not computed as sample is too small
Percentages not computed as sample is too small
AREA 5

**Sec. Head**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>before</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 3

**Sec. HOD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>before</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 3

**Primary/Junior**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>before</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 17

**Infant/Nursery**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>a</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>c</th>
<th>d</th>
<th>e</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>before</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

n = 20

**BEFORE %**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+ve</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>-ve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOD</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/J</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/N</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**AFTER %**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>+ve</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>-ve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOD</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/J</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/N</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**CHANGE OF VIEW %**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>more positive</th>
<th>same</th>
<th>more negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SH</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOD</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/J</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I/N</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Sec. Head

**Before**
- a: 3
- b: 1
- c: 1
- d: 6
- e: 13

**After**
- a: 5
- b: 1
- c: 1
- d: 6
- e: 3

**Totals**
- n = 40

### Sec. HOD

**Before**
- a: 4
- b: 1
- c: 3
- d: 3
- e: 8

**After**
- a: 5
- b: 1
- c: 3
- d: 1
- e: 3

**Totals**
- n = 30

### Primary/Junior

**Before**
- a: 9
- b: 6
- c: 4
- d: 2
- e: 1

**After**
- a: 10
- b: 6
- c: 6
- d: 2
- e: 2

**Totals**
- n = 54

### Infant/Nursery

**Before**
- a: 6
- b: 5
- c: 5
- d: 2
- e: 1

**After**
- a: 9
- b: 4
- c: 3
- d: 2
- e: 1

**Totals**
- n = 43

### Change of View

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before %</th>
<th>After %</th>
<th>Change of View %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+ve  n</td>
<td>-ve</td>
<td>+ve  n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SH  45</td>
<td>38  18</td>
<td>SH  35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOD 40</td>
<td>33  23</td>
<td>SHOD 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P/J  40</td>
<td>30  31</td>
<td>P/J  69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VN  51</td>
<td>33  16</td>
<td>VN  72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OVERALL TOTALS

\[
\begin{array}{c|ccccc}
  & a & b & c & d & e \\
\hline
 a & 23 & 3 & 1 & 6 & \text{33} \\
 b & 11 & 20 & 8 & 2 & \text{41} \\
 c & 13 & 16 & 20 & 7 & 1 & \text{57} \\
 d & 5 & 6 & 8 & 11 & \text{30} \\
 e & 1 & 2 & 3 & 9 & 8 \\
\end{array}
\]

(n include 2 not in sector matrices)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BEFORE %</th>
<th>AFTER %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a 20</td>
<td>Positive 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b 24</td>
<td>Positive 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c 34</td>
<td>Neutral 34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d 18</td>
<td>Negative 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e 5</td>
<td>Negative 19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

more positive 38          same 44          more negative 17

\{\text{includes } 14 a \rightarrow a, 1 e \rightarrow e\}
The graphs above demonstrate that in both the secondary and primary sectors heads and HODS were initially less favourable towards job-sharing in Area 2 than in the other areas combined.
The graphs above show that after experience the Area 2 heads remain less positive than those from other areas even though there has been a considerable increase in favour of job-sharing in the primary sector.
Headteacher and HOD attitudes before and after experience of job-shares in action.

**All areas – Secondary only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Level</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Very positive</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Fairly positive</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Neutral</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Fairly negative</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Very negative</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**All areas – Primary sector only**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude Level</th>
<th>Before</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Very positive</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Fairly positive</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Neutral</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Fairly negative</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Very negative</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above graphs show that attitudes become slightly more negative in the secondary sector and considerably more positive in the primary sector.
APPENDIX 4
THE OPINIONS OF SHARERS - ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES OF JOB-SHARING

An extended account of the material contained in Part II Chapter 12, Section V, including illustrative quotations.

The material is presented in 3 sections:

a) in relation to pupils and schools
b) in relation to sharers
c) in relation to the administration of education, although these are often interdependent.

Each topic is prefaced by the percentage of respondents who mentioned it and includes illustrative quotations. Topics are included if at least 5% of respondents mentioned them.

ADVANTAGES

a) For pupils and schools

i) (70%) Teachers who share jobs have far more energy and enthusiasm, and are less stressed, than if they were working full-time. Lively, happy teachers can only be of benefit to pupils.

(21%) Full-time teachers have to pace themselves so that they are not 'burned out' half way through the day or week. Sharers can put a lot more energy into their shorter teaching hours.

"An exhausted, irritable and drained teacher is simply filling in 5 days in school ... enthusiasm is the most important quality a teacher can have."

"A sharer can give 100% for 50% of the day. It is impossible to give 100% of yourself for 100% of the day."

"I give my ALL for 2½ days and enjoy doing so."

"I put in as much effort in my 2½ days as I did in a full week, but now have more time to recuperate."
ii) (65%) Two teachers are likely to be able to contribute a *wider range of skills*, subject strengths, ideas and interests than one.

(15%) The input of an extra teacher is invaluable in a small school or subject department.

"Each teacher can teach to their own strengths concerning curriculum e.g. musical talents, artistic talents. They can bounce ideas off one another and provide a wider approach to topics and projects."

"Our school is very small and has just one infant class. If we did not job-share the pupils would have just one teacher for all their infant schooling. As it is they have two, with differing subject strengths, so have a rounder education. We both attend functions such as outings, Summer Fayre, Christmas productions etc. where normally only one adult would be available. We give more to the school than one full-time teacher could."

"In extra-curricular activities pupils get two for the price of one. I run a music group and my partner a sports team. Neither of us would do both if full-time."

iii) (33%) Job sharers provide *variety of experience for pupils*. If a pupil does not get on well with one teacher there is a chance that they may respond better to the other. It is good for pupils to have to relate to more than one personality, they become more adaptable.

( 8%) Variety is especially important for top juniors, it helps them to adjust to the range of teachers they will have to cope with in secondary schools.

"Children like a change of face and thrive on variety. Parents have said their children 'enjoy' having two teachers."

"Different teaching styles benefit pupils."

"It is a fallacy to think that pupils cannot respond to two different teachers - they can and they do. Children are very adaptable and besides it is good for them to have experience of more than one."

iv) (32%) Because *planning* has to be done together it tends to be done more thoroughly and each sharer has more time to prepare and to keep up with curriculum development than if full-time. Pupils benefit from this.
"Job-sharing creates an environment where individuals discuss in detail their approaches to education, classroom management etc. This fosters a more critical approach to your work and that is surely of great value to all concerned."

"Teachers have a chance to develop themselves by working together, which can only make them better teachers in the long run. You share ideas and are less likely to become stale."

"Job-sharing has made me more effective in the classroom, aware of the importance of not wasting any time, and being very thorough in management and planning."

v) (31%) There is more continuity for pupils. It is unlikely that both teachers will be absent at the same time, and often the sharers are able to cover for each other's absence.

"If one of my children is ill or I need to take grandad for a hospital appointment my partner can usually exchange time with me so the class does not have to have a supply teacher."

"My head never cares which one of us is present, as long as one of us is."

vi) (5%) Pupils gain from seeing two adults working together in close cooperation and giving each other mutual support.

"It is important for the children to see that my husband takes the care of our children seriously and that I take my career seriously."

(a married pair)

b) For the sharers

i) (31%) Job-sharing can play a valuable part in a teacher's career pattern. A teacher can combine teaching with other responsibilities, possibly retaining a promoted post, and be less likely to endanger career prospects by taking a complete career break. Older teachers can continue to teach without undue stress or damage to their health and have a better quality of life. Job-shares are permanent so teachers feel secure and part of the school community, and are generally more satisfying than temporary or supply work.

"A job-sharer 'belongs'. It is seen as a proper job. Other part-time is more of a 'spare part'."
"I feel I have had the best of both worlds, a job I love and time to bring up and educate my family to a high standard."

"A fantastic opportunity for all involved, creating more jobs at the same time."

ii) (27%) Job sharers are not so stressed and overworked. They are happier and healthier.

"It has made me much more relaxed and less stressed, so much so that people have remarked about my relaxed and healthy appearance."

"Job-sharers are easily identified. They are the ones who are more satisfied, calmer, able to cope, and SMILE!"

iii) (26%) Sharers expressed appreciation of the experience of joint planning as an aid to their own professional development. (See 4 in Part A).

"It is a very rewarding experience to share the teaching of a class with another person. There is someone who understands and maybe together you can solve a problem."

vi) (15%) Job-sharers have time for other activities and can take a more 'balanced' view of life. Full-time teachers often do school work in the evenings and at weekends leaving little time to develop themselves as people. Teachers who have time in their lives for activities and interests outside teaching are happier in themselves and better for pupils and as colleagues.

"Teachers working full-time are often narrow in outlook. It is not their fault. They are overworked, and in the holidays they are too exhausted to take up new interests and activities. Sharers have time for other aspects of life and can be more balanced people."

v) (11%) Teachers with particularly difficult classes can gain support from each other rather than feeling isolated and blaming themselves for problems which arise. The same is true of coping with individual pupils who are disruptive or have severe learning difficulties. In addition sharers have more time to recuperate from stressful situations.
"We have more patience and are less affected by the stresses of the job or difficult pupils since you know that you'll always have a proper break from school every week."

"You have a partner with whom to share your worries about children with learning and/or behaviour problems."

c) Advantages for the administration of education

i) (21%) Schools can retain good teachers who would otherwise take a career break or retire, by allowing them permanent part-time posts. LEAs can also attract teachers back into schools from career breaks earlier than if only full-time posts were available.

ii) (15%) Schools and LEAs can avoid redundancy and increase the number of available jobs by allowing existing full-time teachers to work part time on permanent contracts.

iii) (8%) Schools can have greater staffing flexibility - partners can have overlapping timetables or offer wider subject expertise within one post.

Response rates did not differ significantly between areas except for the following:

a) No-one in Area 2 mentioned timetabling flexibility. It appears that few if any teachers in this area have overlapping timetables and there is some suggestion that it would not be permitted.

b) Over a quarter of Area 2 respondents mentioned job-sharing as helping to avoid redundancies, a far higher proportion than elsewhere. In this Area there was overstaffing and voluntary sharing between previously full-time teachers was the norm.

c) Only 1% of respondents in Area 2 mentioned the advantages of permanent posts. About 70% of sharers here had previously held full-time posts and were perhaps less personally aware of the dissatisfactions of those in temporary part-time work. In other areas this factor was mentioned by about 10%.

d) Other differences related to the proportion of primary/secondary shares. For example Area 5 has a very high proportion of primary sharers and correspondingly high proportion of respondents referring to the effects of the planning needed for a shared class. Those areas with more secondary shares had fewer shared classes.
Overall the advantages for pupils were more frequently stressed than those for the teachers themselves. The two advantages 'more energy and enthusiasm' and 'wider range of skills and interests' were mentioned by two-thirds of the sharers, twice as often as any of the other perceived advantages.

DISADVANTAGES

a) For pupils and schools

i) (29%) The risk that a partnership might turn out to be incompatible, involving different styles of teaching or a personality clash. Many stressed that their own partnership was very successful but considered that there could be problems if selection did not take compatibility into account. One sharer had to undertake extra responsibility for the partnership because her partner was a secondary-trained teacher with no previous primary experience. Another had different expectations of pupil behaviour from her partner, which caused difficulties. A weak partnership or one involving conflict could cause confusion for pupils.

"It's a bit like a marriage. It can be wonderful when it works, but awful if it doesn't."

"The pupils must see loyalty and a united front."

"We find after all these (6) years that we have become almost telepathic."

ii) (29%) There may be communication problems, not only between sharers but between each sharer and other staff. This can cause organisational problems when information is not passed on and causes extra work for other teachers, especially heads of department who need to communicate with both sharers. Many sharers said that the problems were not insuperable but needed careful attention and organisation.

iii) (15%) There could be continuity problems for shared classes unless the sharers put a lot of time and effort into joint planning and preparation. Time for this had to be found during the sharers' evenings, weekends or holidays, as lunch-times were not long enough for more than weekly liaison. Several felt that sharers had
to be very committed to give the time needed, as few had paid consultation time, but without it pupils could suffer.

"Co-operation and consultation is vital, yet has to be done in the teachers' own time and at their own expense."

b) For the sharers themselves

i) (33%) Teachers who were putting in a great deal of *time* and effort commonly felt that their *salary* did not reflect the amount of work they did.

"It is much more than half time if you and your partner are to communicate effectively. We meet each Wednesday lunch time, 'phone on Friday evenings and spend time together each holiday planning the next few weeks work. We both attend all the training days, all the staff meetings, both go on class outings, run the Christmas party, attend parents' evenings. Some people might think they might as well do the other 2½ days and collect a full salary."

"It is vital that if job-shares are to continue and be successful that some paid time must be allowed to the partners. So much of the planning has to be done in our own time, using our phones etc. Often we are being paid for a part-time job and working nearly full-time to make it satisfactory."

ii) (17%) Teachers had problems about how to share attendance at after-school *meetings* and in-service days. There was a problem if the staff or departmental meeting always occurred on the same day and was thus always attended by the same person. Similarly there was doubt about how the five 'Baker days' should be shared. Both partners usually attended parents' evenings, and often there were concerts or other events which meant a sharer returning to school on a non-employed day. Some pairs tried to divide such activities equitably, others simply attended everything (or were expected to), and most shared out regular meetings but attended together for special ones.

"I feel that we are undervalued just because we do not work a full week. I reckon that in my 2½ days paid employment I put in a good 3 or 3½ day week. Then to be expected to attend every parents' evening, every open evening, every curriculum meeting
and every staff meeting is really rubbing salt into the wound! 'Baker' days are now added to it!"

iii) (7%) Other sharers referred to the attitudes of other teachers. Some had encountered direct hostility, others envy, others felt that they were not considered to be 'proper' teachers.

"Initially our headteacher was VERY hostile to the idea."

"Some heads see job-sharers as lacking commitment. Will this affect my chances if I apply for a full-time post in the future?"

"Management never seems to cotton on to who is where or when, and doing what - leads to a Tweedledum and Tweedledee feeling, a mild form of schizophrenia."

"Our head of department expects us to do as much administration as the full-time staff. He forgets we should be doing only half as much. We can't object as this would 'prove' we lack commitment."

iv) (6%) Some teachers, particularly in primary schools, felt they had to win over parents who were doubtful about their child having two teachers. Most said this was an initial problem which they had now resolved, and lessened as a partnership became established in the school.

"At parents' night many parents made favourable comments about the arrangement, although at first some had expressed misgivings."

v) (5%) Teachers have difficulty in adjusting to the quantity of work appropriate for half a week.

"We both have difficulty slowing down. You forget you've only to do half the work and you try to cram as much into 2\frac{1}{2} days resulting in lack of wall space."

vi) (5%) With a partner it is always necessary to compromise, you can't always do things your own way, and are not in complete charge.

"It is hard to share the blame for your partner's shortcomings."

vii) (5%) Some had had to relinquish posts of responsibility in order to share and therefore had reduced earnings; others nearing
retirement reported the disadvantage they would suffer with regard to superannuation entitlement.

There were many other disadvantages mentioned by fewer than 5% of the respondents. These included:

i) arranging the shared hours to fit the timetable and avoid shared classes (secondary)
ii) job-shares might be less suitable for younger children who need a single 'mother' figure
iii) job-shares are inconvenient for pastoral-care arrangements in secondary schools, especially when the sharers have overlapping patterns
iv) pupils may 'play-off' one sharer against the other
v) huge phone bills
vi) uncertainty about getting a suitable new partner if one leaves
vii) less time to do preparation which has to be done at school e.g. in laboratories
viii) a sense of isolation when working at home and without access to colleagues
ix) a new sharer is slow to become part of the staffroom social group, is only there part of the time and misses out on general staff discussion and 'gossip'
x) those on alternate or 'rolling' weeks find it difficult to 'get going' again at the beginning of each teaching week; there is a feeling of being marginalised and having missed out.

All of the above achieved mention by 3% of respondents. The only noticeable difference between areas was that Area 2 reported resentment at working more than half time for only half a salary less often than the other areas, and contributed 11 of the 14 mentions of antipathy from other members of staff. The latter may be due to the fact that schools seem to have less power to decide whether a job-share should be established in this Area, the former is unexplained.

The vast majority of respondents said that advantages firmly outweighed disadvantages and that many of the disadvantages could be overcome or at least minimised with goodwill on all sides.

"I must emphasise that it requires a lot of hard work and the right partner to work properly."
"Support from senior management in schools is important. Ours have given us every encouragement because there is already another very successful partnership in the school and they know it can work well."

c) Disadvantages for educational administration

None were mentioned by more than two respondents (see main text).
APPENDIX 5

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

(See Part II, Chapter 12, Section V)

Additional material provided by teacher respondents under this open invitation included several topics of interest. A more detailed account, including illustrative quotations is given under the following headings:

a) Setting up the job-share arrangement
b) Attitudes of LEAs
c) Attitudes of senior management in schools
d) Personal responses to the experience of job-sharing

a) Setting Up The Job-Share Arrangement - some examples

i) A teacher in a promoted post requested to share it but was told this was not possible. The decision took four months. She finally agreed to share a basic grade post, but even then no permanent partner was appointed for a further nine months. At the same time another promoted teacher in a neighbouring school was going through the same process. They were aggrieved that there had been no suggestion that they could have shared one of the promoted posts instead of both losing promoted status. (Area 2)

ii) "Although we were not openly deterred from a job-share, it was made obvious that it was rather 'a nuisance'! It was only the fact that we approached the hierarchy as a 'fait accompli' that we were even considered. Although the fact of job-sharing is advertised, it is not (in our local area at any rate) being happily or openly encouraged." (Area 1)

iii) "In 1982 the school roll fell and we had to reduce staffing. I was planning to start a family as was another member of staff. I had just read an article on job-sharing so suggested this to her. The head was also very enthusiastic and so he approached the authority. For them it helped to solve a difficult problem. A new contract was sorted out and checked by my union. It does not mention job-sharing but it is a permanent part-time contract for each of us. My partner has since changed and the same conditions apply. Within the school there was great support. Some others would have liked a similar contract but as the authority had not been under pressure it has been very unco-operative." (Ad hoc)
iv) "To job-share was my idea. I recently applied for a full-time post only to realise that not only wouldn't I be able to cope with it, but that I didn't want to leave my young son. I withdrew my application." Soon afterwards there was a vacancy in a school for which applications were slow to come in. "I asked to see the headteacher and explained that although I was interested in the job I could not manage full-time teaching but had a friend with whom I could perhaps share. The head was interested but said he would need to 'clear it' with the authority. My friend was very interested. We already looked after each other's sons while doing occasional supply teaching. We put in our applications with a covering letter. Carefully we planned how we would work, what subjects, hours etc. By the time we had our interview everything had been cleared. This proved very useful as we had to convince the Chairman of the Governors that sharing a job could work. In my opinion it has!" (Ad hoc)

v) "Since I had asked to return to work from maternity leave on a job-sharing basis and had been refused in July 1986, I later submitted a special application in January 1987 asking to be considered for a post on the basis that I would never have resigned had I been properly informed of the pending changes [i.e. introduction of a job-sharing scheme]. They agreed to this eventually." (Area 1)

vi) "Job-sharing needs to be taken very seriously by the recipients. I have a friend who was told by her school (as she was a part-time teacher) that she was going to do a job-share the following year with a stranger who made no contact at all during the holidays - so she felt she would have to tell the other teacher how things should be done. She was not happy with the job-share, feeling that she put in more effort than the other teacher. She has now moved schools and works full time." (Ad hoc)

vii) "I have no suitable experience for teaching this class. I was a P.E. specialist. But I was available in the head's opinion to fill the gap." (Area 5)
impression I get is they don't want it to work. They certainly don't process your application quick enough. Bureaucracy moves very slowly indeed." (Area 2)

ii) "I am not happy about [the authority's] attitude. In my opinion they support a job saving scheme rather than a job-sharing scheme. Their main aim appears to be to reduce teacher numbers, once this is achieved they don't appear to be interested. They prefer to ignore problems. For example, how should the five 'Baker' days be shared? Surely in-service training is important for all so job-sharers should be 'compensated' if they work all five days e.g. by time in lieu or overtime pay (as for job-sharing social workers). If I come in extra I end up paying for the privilege because of child-minding costs. I could enlarge on this theme." (Area 5)

iii) "recently I was told that I would be surplus to requirements as the school had to lose half a post. After much consultation (we were convinced it couldn't be done as I am not part-time so much as half a job) the Education office agreed we were one job and they had to get rid of both or neither. It's an important point - people's jobs would become very vulnerable if this was allowed to happen and discourage others from job-sharing." (Area 1)

iv) "When given the job-share form to fill in I was under the impression that I would be informed if there was a possible job in the offing, in fact I expected a 'matching up' of files. [The LEA] merely sent me the latest bulletin of posts in the County and invited me to apply for any I fancied. They really gave very little in the way of guidance, e.g. I was not aware that one could apply for a full-time post offering oneself as a potential job-share partner." (Area 1)

"My present partner was aware of the existence of job-sharing and wanted to share her post but did not know there was a register. I would think, therefore, that information on job-sharing is either not as widely publicised as it should be, or is not actively encouraged. Also I wonder what happens to the forms we send in since nothing materialised for my benefit after placing on the register, which was at the instigation of [the LEA]." (A sharer in Area 1, who met her partner through a mutual friend.)

Other sharers referred to positive and helpful attitudes of local officers of their LEAs, but there were often complaints that only constant 'badgering' of the authority by potential sharers and supportive heads actually got anything done, and
that registers existed but were inoperative as far as those not currently employed full-time were concerned. There was very frequent reference to problems of unavailable or conflicting information about contracts and financial matters, and lack of interest in sharers' concerns once the job-share was in place. There was often a suggestion that job-sharing was only agreed to and processed energetically when it enabled an authority to solve a problem, e.g. by reducing staff numbers or filling a post for which no other suitable applicant could be found.

"Job-sharing should be seen as something positive rather than a way out of a teaching surplus."

c) Attitudes of senior management

These varied greatly. Some were reported as very hostile and others as extremely positive and even suggesting a job-share. There was little doubt about the appreciation of sharers when they felt support was given. One pair said that the headteacher attended their lunch-time planning meeting occasionally to share their discussion. Another said rather despairingly that a little imagination from senior management would help to solve minor problems which needed a school-based solution.

"I feel colleagues and management are watching very carefully to make sure all terms of the contract are being upheld and no advantages taken."

"We were lucky that our head trusts us and gave us a lot of freedom to make our own decisions, our own mistakes, and to find our own solutions. We feel supported but not constrained."

"Very positively received by the hierarchy and a supportive department, but there are a few antagonistic elements among the school staff."

"I was about to leave, and the head decided the vacancy should be filled on a temporary contract. I was pleased to find my head of department up in arms because he felt the job-share had worked so well for the department that someone should be found who was prepared to be as committed as required by job-sharing. He values the fact that he has a mini (sub)-team within his team and is enthusing about finding another job-sharer. The idea didn't come naturally though - there is a big education job to do nationally."

"I know of several headteachers who will not entertain the idea (of job-sharing)."
d) **Personal responses to the experience of job-sharing**

Apart from those who did not really want to be job-sharers but had been 'drafted in' to class-sharing or would prefer full-time posts, the vast majority expressed considerable job-satisfaction. A few had reservations about compatibility with their partners, and a much larger number felt taken advantage of:

"Two-thirds of the work for half the pay"

"Twenty-two years teaching experience and no hope of promotion unless I go full-time"

"The school and the LEA get their money's worth at our expense."

Some were very happy but gave a warning:

"There is no doubt in my mind that job-sharing in teaching can be difficult. In other professions case-loads can be divided so there is little or no sharing. Although this can be possible in teaching the vagaries of timetables mean sharing of classes. In my case all classes are shared and this can be a source of irritation although effective communication and co-operation can ameliorate this. I have noticed a change in attitude of senior staff who were antipathetic at first. They now say they are pleased with the way it is working."

"We have found these last three years most satisfying and successful, but it is not a partnership that should be entered into without a lot of thought, planning and compromise. It is a risk for the headteacher to agree to this situation, for the well-being of successive classes is at stake, plus the good feeling of co-operation throughout the school."

The overwhelming impression however was of increased personal enjoyment and job-satisfaction.

"I know many who would greatly wish to job-share if given the opportunity, but one is not encouraged to do so. More promoted posts could be shared too."

"Apart from the horrendous telephone bills I would recommend job-sharing to anyone."

"I have never felt stressed or overwhelmed with work, never not wanted to go to work, and I suspect few other teachers could say the same."
"This has been a very happy year of sharing. I feel like a new person. I have renewed enthusiasm for my job, for everything connected with it. I am loving watching the seasons come and go - something which has escaped my attention for years, due to non-stop commitments. Quite honestly, job-sharing has come at a very opportune time in my life."

"I would like to express my wholehearted delight in this new system."

"Although I have only been job-sharing for less than a year, I have been very pleased at how the reality actually exceeded my initial expectations. For people who wish to job-share, having the opportunity to do so is very important. Many with hard-won skills and years of experience will not then be lost to the profession."

Many of the respondents expressed support for the research being carried out, hoping that more teachers and local authorities would be better informed about the possibilities and successes of job-sharing so that it might be more widely available.

"We hope that this will help others who feel as we do, but at present are prevented, to have the opportunity of a job-share form of employment."
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