

Flexibility by default: Increasing the advertisement of part-time or job-share options

Natalia Shakhina, Rony Hacohen, Dr Georgina Bremner, Shoshana Davidson, Tom O'Keeffe, Tim Hardy, Vivek Roy-Chowdhury and Hannah Burd - The Behavioural Insights Team

Contents

Acknowledgements	3
Executive Summary	5
Introduction	8
Exploratory data research	10
The intervention and rationale	10
Intervention design	11
Research aims and trial methodology	14
Participant journey	14
Description of data and sample	16
Outcome measures	17
Process evaluation	18
Analytical strategy	19
Implementation challenges	20
Trial results	23
Primary outcome	23
Secondary outcomes	24
Exploratory analysis	25
Survey	29
Discussion and Conclusion	31
Appendices	34
Appendix A: Materials provided to managers with to help design jobs suitable for part-time or a job-share	34
Appendix B: Data cleaning	35
Appendix C: Balance checks	36
Appendix D: Robustness checks	38
Appendix E: Further analysis details	40
Appendix F: Survey analysis	46

Acknowledgements

We wish to acknowledge the roles that the following individuals had in this project:

- John Lewis Partnership (JLP) Partners: Karl Patterson for project management, Amina Chiadmi for providing us with historical and trial data, Imogen Haikney and Fergus Tinto for implementing the trial.
- Ariella Kristal, James Lawrence and Marta Gamelo at the Behavioural Insights Team (BIT) for their quality assurance input.
- The following individuals at the University of Exeter: Professor Michelle Ryan for advising on how to measure belonging and Associate Professor Oliver Hauser for ongoing academic advice.

Executive summary

Executive Summary

The Government Equalities Office (GEO) established the Gender and Behavioural Insights (GABI) Programme in partnership with The Behavioural Insights Team (BIT). The GABI programme aims to build evidence on what works to improve gender equality in the workplace.

BIT partnered with the John Lewis Partnership (JLP) to analyse the drivers of its Gender Pay Gap (GPG) and develop, test and evaluate a behaviourally-informed solution. Our exploratory data analysis suggested that one of the key factors contributing to the GPG at JLP was a lower representation of women in senior roles. More than two thirds of the gender gap in promotions was explained by fewer promotions of part-time employees (referred to in this report as 'Partners'¹) who were more likely to be women.

We designed an intervention to tackle the lack of progression among part-time Partners based on a similar project we ran with Zurich Insurance (Zurich) because of the similarities in the underlying drivers.² The major innovation of this trial compared to the Zurich trial was to use a two-armed randomised controlled trial (RCT) rather than a before-and-after evaluation design. JLP's retail branches were randomly assigned to either continue with their business-as-usual process (control group) or receive an intervention (treatment group).³

To be promoted to the next level, a Partner needs to apply for a vacancy at that level. Therefore, the intervention focused on advertised vacancies and comprised of the following components: 1) changing the default for advertising above entry-level vacancies to be available on a part-time and/or job-share basis; 2) including these options in the job title line and adding an 'inclusive' statement; and 3) sending emails to the hiring managers about the new process.

We failed to detect a significant impact of the intervention on the promotion rates of part-time Partners and women. On the positive side, the intervention resulted in a 50% increase in the number of applications per vacancy from 11.1 in the control group to 16.7 in the treatment group. Moreover, the share of female applicants increased from 38% to 51%. We did not find a significant impact on the number of external part-time hires, and the proportion of women, ethnic minorities and part-time Partners in above entry-level roles.

The trial suffered from a lack of statistical power because it took place from September 2020 to January 2021, when social-distancing measures were in place to reduce the spread of COVID-19 and the volume of vacancies was low.⁴ The result should not be taken as evidence that such an intervention is ineffective. The intervention could have a bigger impact over a longer time period. In particular, the

¹ JLP is an employee-owned business and refers to its employees as Partners.

² BIT. (2020). <u>A field trial with Zurich Insurance to advertise all jobs as part-time</u>.

³ Randomisation was clustered at operational region level.

⁴ The promotion rates of part-time Partners were about half of the level during a similar period in 2019. Promotion rates were marginally higher in the treatment group, but we cannot claim that this was due to the intervention.

increase in the number of female applicants can lead to an increase in the promotions rates and the overall share of women in above entry-level grades. We encourage organisations to make part-time working available by default across all seniority levels. This would contribute to a more diverse pool of applicants and a better equality in the workplace.

Introduction

Introduction

From April 2018, British companies with more than 250 employees started publishing annual gender pay gap (GPG) reports following a new legal requirement.⁵ Seventyeight per cent of employers who reported their data in 2019 had higher median hourly pay for men than for women⁶ and almost half saw an increase in their GPG compared to the previous year.⁷ In 2020, the requirement was suspended because of the COVID-19 pandemic. According to data from the ONS annual employee survey, the GPG among all employees was 15.5%, slightly down from April 2019's GPG of 17.4%.⁸ However, ONS data includes employers with fewer than 250 employees and is not directly comparable to the numbers published on the government's gender pay gap portal.⁹ Moreover, the GPG could have deteriorated since the start of the COVID-19 pandemic due to existing inequalities in the economy which may have been exacerbated by policy response.¹⁰

A large portion of the gap is explained by women having more caring responsibilities and being less likely to work full-time, which strongly affects wage progression.¹¹ The wage gap tends to increase after the birth of a woman's first child. Approximately half of the widening is explained by the lower hourly rates of part-time work compared to full-time work.¹² Women who need flexible working arrangements, such as part-time work, may struggle to progress into more senior roles within their organisation. They may also have limited opportunities for external promotions that meet their work-care requirements, as only 15% of advertised jobs explicitly offer flexible working.¹³

As a result, some women decide to leave the labour market, while others get 'stuck' and find it difficult to advance.¹⁴ Some women also report experiencing discrimination when requesting flexibility during the recruitment process.¹⁵ Therefore, increasing the availability of flexible working arrangements could contribute to improving gender equality in the workplace and reducing the GPG, by making it easier for women to stay in the labour market and progress into jobs with higher salaries.

The Behavioural Insights Team (BIT) is partnering with the Government Equalities Office (GEO) to deliver a multi-year research programme - the Gender and

8 ONS

⁵ <u>The regulation came into effect in April 2017</u>.

⁶ House of Commons. (2020). The Gender Pay Gap. Briefing paper Number 7068, 6 March 2020 ⁷ Sourced from this BBC news article

⁹ Sourced from gov.uk

¹⁰ Women and Equalities Committee. (2021). <u>Unequal impact? Coronavirus and the gendered</u> <u>economic impact</u>.

¹¹ Costa Dias, M., Joyce, R., & Parodi, F. (2018). Wage progression and the gender wage gap: the causal impact of hours of work. The Institute of Fiscal Studies.

¹² Costa Dias, M., Joyce, R., & Parodi, F. (2018). Wage progression and the gender wage gap: the causal impact of hours of work. The Institute of Fiscal Studies.

¹³ Timewise. (2019). <u>The Timewise Flexible Jobs Index 2019</u>

¹⁴ Grant, Linda & Yeandle, Sue & Buckner, Lisa. (2006). Working below Potential: Women and Part-Time Work.

¹⁵ EHRC. (2016). <u>Pregnancy and maternity-related discrimination and disadvantage: experiences of</u> <u>mothers</u>

Behavioural Insights (GABI) programme. The purpose of this programme is to create new evidence and drive behaviour change towards greater gender equality in the UK, with a focus on the labour market.

The GABI programme is focused on building the evidence base on what actions are effective at improving gender equality in the workplace, by using behavioural insights and empirical approaches. To accomplish this, GABI is working with a number of large employers to run trials. The methodology for these trials begins with a deep exploratory analysis of payroll, progression, performance management, recruitment and other HR data. This exploratory analysis is designed to identify the root drivers of an organisation's GPG, and the most impactful areas for running an intervention to improve its GPG.

The study detailed in this report builds on and complements an earlier study of a very similar intervention that the GABI programme tested with Zurich Insurance (Zurich) in an office-based, financial services environment.¹⁶ Like the Zurich trial, this trial also tests a 'part-time default' in the advertising of new roles, but now in a retail context. The retail industry is a major employer of women in the UK economy, partly because the ability to work flexibly is widely available, particularly on the shopfloor. Almost 60% of the UK's retail workforce is female.¹⁷ However, above entry-level and throughout management grades, retailers suffer from an imbalance of men and women, predominantly because flexible roles become more scarce at these levels. In certain parts of the industry, particularly groceries and high-demand retail, hours can become very long and anti-social, conflicting with family life and care responsibilities. In a case study with Pets at Home (the UK's largest pets supplier which has more than 430 stores and 8,000 employees), Timewise researchers found that twice as many men than women were moving off the shop floor into assistant manager roles.¹⁸ In a British Retail Consortium survey, 56% of retail employees reported that they believed they were less likely to get promoted if they worked parttime.19

The implementation partner for this trial was the John Lewis Partnership (JLP). JLP is the parent company of two UK retail brands - John Lewis (department stores) and Waitrose (supermarkets). At the beginning of 2020, there were 50 John Lewis shops and over 331 Waitrose shops across the UK. It is the largest employee-owned business in the UK, with over 80,000 Partners co-owning it via a Trust.

In April 2020, JLP reported median and mean GPG of 8.6% and 10.4% respectively (UK retail average 7.1% and 16.2%).²⁰ JLP's long-term goal is to significantly reduce the GPG and achieve equal gender representation across all job levels. To facilitate these efforts and get an external perspective, JLP is partnering with BIT and the GEO.

¹⁶ BIT. (2020). <u>A field trial with Zurich Insurance to advertise all jobs as part-time</u>

¹⁷ British Retail Consortium. (2017) <u>What gets measured gets done - new gender pay gap reporting</u> requirements introduced

¹⁸ Timewise. (2018). <u>Moving up in retail: An employer's guide to enabling talent progression through</u> <u>flexible working</u>

¹⁹ The British Retail Consortium. (2016). <u>Retail 2020: Report 3: Solutions - The journey to better jobs</u>.

²⁰ JLP. (2020). <u>Partnership Be Yourself. Always Report 2020</u>

Exploratory data research

To better understand the underlying drivers of the GPG we examined JLP's internal HR data from 2014-2019. We analysed gaps in 1) base pay; 2) promotions; 3) recruitment; 4) retention and 5) parental leave. To ensure that comparisons were made between similar Partners, we accounted for the grade, time in position, occupation and other factors that might vary between men and women.

We found that more than two thirds (67%) of the gender gap in promotions at JLP was explained by the negligible progression rates of part-time Partners. Women at JLP were more likely to work part-time than men and the majority of women at John Lewis and Waitrose branches work part-time. Furthermore, part-time work was heavily concentrated in the lowest grade (level 10).

We ran simulation models to explore what changes would matter most for the GPG. Our models suggested that equalising promotion rates from level 10 for full-time and part-time Partners would have a stronger impact on reducing the GPG than equalising male and female promotion rates from level 10.

We also looked at recruitment, retention and parental leave data. With respect to the potential impact on GPG, we did not identify any high priority areas for an intervention. In particular, women were more likely to receive an offer when applying for a position. This was found both for internal and external applications albeit we could not account for previous experience and qualifications. Women were also less likely to resign (although part-time Partners were more likely to resign compared to full-time Partners). Finally, women took longer parental leave on average. In future, increasing the uptake of parental leave by fathers could be another fruitful way to improve the GPG. JLP is due to introduce an equal parenthood pay and leave policy to support parents of all genders to take up parental leave.

Finally, we looked at other aspects of diversity and equality. Our data analysis showed that there was a drop in the representation of ethnic minorities (EM) after the most junior level. EM Partners had lower promotion rates which was partly explained by lack of part-time promotions. While the focus of this work was on gender equality, we were also keen for the intervention to have a positive impact on other aspects of equality.

The intervention and rationale

Based on the analysis above and our discussion with JLP, we decided that the intervention should focus on improving promotion rates of part-time Partners. Our intervention was to offer positions above entry-level on a part-time or job-share basis by default. The ultimate aim was to improve the representation of women in above entry-level roles including managerial positions. We also wanted the intervention to increase the share of EM Partners in these roles.

This intervention was based on a similar project we ran with Zurich Insurance (Zurich) described in more detail in the box below.²¹ Similar to Zurich, roles at JLP (especially more senior positions) generally were not advertised with the explicit mention of part-time possibilities. This factor could act as a barrier to the progression of part-time Partners in the same way that was identified at Zurich. The major innovation of this trial was to use a randomised controlled trial (RCT) rather than a before-and-after evaluation design which we used at Zurich for operational reasons. RCTs are a stronger trial design as they make it possible to establish causal evidence, i.e. determining that the observed impact is caused by our intervention and not by other factors.

A field trial with Zurich Insurance to advertise all jobs as part-time²²

GPG at Zurich was also affected by lower progression rates for women driven by the limited range of opportunities available to part-time staff who were more likely to be women. Our intervention made all newly advertised roles available part-time and/or as a job-share by default in addition to being available full-time, unless the hiring manager provided a business case for why that was not possible. The aim of this intervention was to mitigate part-time work penalties by normalising part-time work at all levels of seniority. In the before-and-after evaluation of that intervention, we found that:

- The part-time default had high compliance: a small number of business areas requested exemption from participation in the trial, but 78% of vacancies posted by the remaining areas complied with the new policy.
- The new default did not create a statistically significant increase in the proportion
 of employees working at Zurich part-time. This could be due to a small increase
 in the number of retained employees working part-time being counteracted by
 turnover, with part-time employees disproportionately leaving and no statistically
 significant change in the proportion of new hires who worked part-time.
- There was a significant increase of 16.4% in the overall proportion of female applicants to Zurich's vacancies across the UK (+6 percentage points from the baseline of 36.4% to 42.4%), as well as the proportion of applicants who did not say they were male (+3 percentage points).
- There was a significant increase of 19.3% in the proportion of female applicants to senior roles (+6 percentage points from the baseline of 31.1% to 37.1%).
- There was a significant increase of 8% in the number of part-time employees reporting that they feel they 'belong' at Zurich (+0.38 percentage points).

Intervention design

The intervention encouraged hiring managers to advertise new vacancies at levels 4-9 (the scale runs from 10 being the most junior level at JLP to 1 being the most

²¹ BIT. (2020). <u>A field trial with Zurich Insurance to advertise all jobs as part-time</u>.

²² BIT. (2020). <u>A field trial with Zurich Insurance to advertise all jobs as part-time</u>.

senior) as available part-time or as a job-share. Table 1 outlines the specific components of the intervention.

Table 1: Trial arms

Condition	Description
Control - Business as usual (BAU)	All job adverts were posted per the standard process. Hiring managers did not experience any changes to the process and did not receive emails about the trial. No changes to how the published vacancies appeared on the website.
Treatment - Part-time default	The intervention entailed: 1. Changing the default for new vacancies at levels 4-9 to be available part-time or as a job-share.
	2. Making part-time and job-share options more noticable to applicants by including them in the job title line (see Figure 2). Having an 'inclusive' statement to emphasise these options: ' <i>This job is available part-time, as a job-</i> <i>share, or full-time. This is because we want the best</i> <i>people for our roles and we recognise that sometimes</i> <i>those people aren't available full-time.</i> '
	 Sending emails with information about the new process and relevant tips to hiring managers, branch leads, senior leadership and other relevant stakeholders.

Figure 1: Job ad example

јов Туре	Customer Service	APPLY NOW O		
Location	Pontprennau		2.	Include PT and Job-share
Partnership Level	8	Please note we moved to a new recruiting		options under 'Hours of
Closing Date	01/01/2021	system called Workday on 1 st September 2020: Click on Apply Now to start your application in Workday.		work'
Hours of Work	Full Time, Job Share or Part Time to include		3.	Add an inclusive sentence
	hours between 20:00 and 08:00. As well as weekend working.	2		

Research aims and trial methodology

Research aims and trial methodology

We ran a two-armed RCT to test whether advertising above entry-level vacancies as available part-time or as a job-share would increase (compared to the control group):²³

- the promotion rates of part-time Partners;
- the promotion rates of women;
- the share of female applicants per vacancy;
- the number of applicants per vacancy;
- the share of women, EM and part-time Partners in above entry-level roles.

We also wanted to test whether the intervention would increase the proportion of vacancies filled by part-time Partners, i.e. whether full-time or part-time Partners were ultimately hired for positions that were available part-time. However, we did not have the data to test this hypothesis.

Participant journey

JLP retail branches were randomised into control and treatment groups at the operational region level (clustered randomisation).

Figure 2: Trial design



²³ We pre-registered this trial

Control - Business as usual (BAU)

In the BAU process, a hiring manager who needed to advertise a new vacancy filled out and submitted a form with the vacancy details. This form was reviewed by a team of Resource Consultants (RCs) who supported the process from an operational perspective. RCs reviewed the submitted form, made any necessary corrections and published the vacancy live.

Treatment - Part-time default

It was not feasible to make technical changes to the system so that the preferred hours and job title could be amended automatically to include the part-time and/or job-share options by default. Therefore, we developed the following process which required manual steps.

Hiring managers in the treatment group

Hiring managers were notified about the changes to the hiring process for level 4-9 vacancies via email (see summary in Table 2). They were asked to consider how the role they were advertising could be done part-time or as a job-share and given some tips on how to do this (see <u>Appendix A</u>). If they struggled or thought these options were not suitable, they were asked to discuss it with their Branch Lead (i.e. their Branch Manager or Store Manager). If a hiring manager believed the role was not suitable for a part-time or job-share arrangement after having spoken with their Branch Lead, they could still submit it on a 'full-time only' basis. In this case, they were asked to provide an explanation for why the role was only suitable for full-time.

Table 2: Information and support provided to trial participants

Email content and supporting materials

Email

- Introduction: JLP is collaborating with BIT and GEO
- What this means for you: all job adverts for positions at levels 4-9 will need to include the option to work part-time or as a job-share plus an example and rationale for why this was important.
- What you need to do next: details on what needs to be done at different stages of the process from considering a new vacancy to interviews and hiring decisions
- Contact points for feedback and policy guidance on flexible working

Supporting materials (links provided in the email)

- Tips on designing roles suitable for part-time/job-share
- Tips on how to discuss flexible working during interviews

Resource Consultants (RCs)

RCs supported the hiring process by reviewing the vacancy request forms and publishing the vacancies. They were asked to check that new vacancies from the treatment branches were published in line with the new process. In particular, they

needed to ensure that part-time and/or job-share options were reflected in the job title heading and hours of work, and that there was an inclusive statement in the description. If a vacancy was only available as a full-time role and the hiring manager had discussed it with their Branch Lead, RCs would publish the vacancy as is.

There was only one team of RCs who covered both control and treatment branches. It was not possible to split the team by coverage of control and treatment branches. To make it easier for RCs to treat requests from control and treatment branches differently, they received the following materials:

- A randomisation file to check whether a branch was in the control or treatment group.
- A guidance document with instructions on what RCs needed to do when they received a new vacancy request form.
- A decision tree to help RCs take the correct action based on what type of branch they are dealing with.
- A log file to keep record of incoming vacancy requests and how they responded to each. This file was periodically reviewed by BIT's project team to ensure that control and treatment branches were treated differently.²⁴

Description of data and sample

The email about the trial was sent to treatment branches on 2 July 2020. It announced that the new process of advertising vacancies at levels 4-9 would be effective from 5 July 2020. We were planning to run the trial for about 6 months until the end of December 2020. Because of contamination in the control group in July-August 2020 (see '<u>Implementation challenges</u>''), we extended the duration of the trial until 15 January 2021 and used two different start dates for the analysis:

- 2 September 2020
- 2 October 2020²⁵

A result is only deemed to be statistically significant if it is significant in both of these analyses. If it is significant in one but not another, we conclude that the result is not robust.

Our sample included all part-time Partners who met the following criteria:

- Worked in retail operational regions
- Were at levels 5-10²⁶

²⁴ The frequency was set as follows: first review two weeks after trial launch, then monthly until a new HR system was introduced, weekly once this system was launched and back to monthly if everything was working as expected.

²⁵ Assuming vacancies were always filled within one month of posting

²⁶ Our intervention applied to new vacancies at levels 4-9, which means that to understand if a person was promoted, we included levels 5-10 in the analysis.

Data for this trial came from JLP's datasets. There were 55,530 part-time Partners in the Partner-level dataset. Following a data cleaning exercise to remove branches that were not involved in the trial or did not match across all the datasets (see <u>Appendix B</u> for details), our final sample contained 51,188 Partners.

Balance checks

Our key balance check was on 2019 promotion rates of part-time Partners because this was the main outcome of interest. As discussed in more detail under '<u>Implementation challenges</u>' there was an issue with the initial randomisation caused by a restructure within JLP after the randomisation was performed. This left our treatment and control groups imbalanced on 2019 promotion rates of part-time Partners (see <u>Appendix C</u>). Given this imbalance, we controlled for promotion rates in different pre-trial periods:

- Entirety of 2019
- Second half of 2019
- 6 months before the start of the trial period

A result is only deemed statistically significant if it is significant in all three of the analyses.

We also performed balance checks on other important determinants of promotions as identified in previous data analysis. The control and treatment groups were balanced across gender, numbers of part-time Partners and percentage of branches which are Waitrose rather than John Lewis. There were slightly more Partners who reported their ethnicity as Black in the treatment group than we would expect if all Partners were drawn from the same distribution. The absolute difference was small and ethnicity had already been included as a covariate.

Outcome measures

Primary outcome measures

We had one primary outcome measure:

• Whether or not a given part-time Partner is promoted from one job level to another over the trial period

Ideally, we would measure the effect of the intervention on the entire population of part-time job seekers, including external hires, but we would not know whether taking a role at JLP meant a promotion for them.

Secondary outcome measures

We pre-specified the following secondary outcomes to investigate the impact of the intervention on the applicants:

- Number of external part-time hires
- Number of applicants per vacancy
- Share of female applicants per vacancy

Exploratory research

We also wanted to explore the impact on gender and ethnicity representation in above entry-level roles (levels 4-9). Therefore, we introduced the following exploratory outcomes:

- **Pre-specified:** Share of women in above entry-level roles (levels 4-9)
- **Pre-specified:** Share of EM Partners in above entry-level roles (levels 4-9)

We also added the following exploratory outcomes that were not pre-specified:

- **Not pre-specified:** Promotion rates across women (both full-time and parttime)
- Not pre-specified: Share of part-time Partners in above entry-level roles

Process evaluation

The aim of a process evaluation is to understand how an intervention was implemented and whether it deviated from what was planned. It allows us to unpack why the intervention did or did not work. We conducted a light-touch process evaluation comprising:

- Log file (implementation tracker)
- Survey

Log file (implementation tracker)

To ensure that the trial was implemented correctly, it was necessary to check that vacancy requests from the treatment branches were treated, while those from the control branches were not. We therefore introduced a log file for the RCs to keep track of incoming vacancy requests and record whether they made any changes before publishing. The log file included the following fields for the RCs to complete:

- Vacancy ID
- Request date
- Hiring manager's branch
- Whether it was a control or treatment branch
- Whether the preferred hours included part-time
- Whether the RC updated the job title to include part-time and/or job-share options
- Whether the hiring manager (from a treatment branch) provided an explanation if the vacancy was only available full-time

This data enabled us to estimate the uptake on the ground by comparing the proportion of adverts that were advertised as part-time/job-shares, across control and treatment branches. Even though this was the new default in the treatment branches, managers could actively choose not to do this.

Survey

We wanted to run a survey with part-time Partners to capture their sense of belonging, organisational fit, and perceptions about any stigma or discrimination they faced as part-time Partners. These would be similar to the survey run at Zurich and measure:²⁷

- Organisational identification (i.e. how satisfied are they as Partners at JLP);
- Presence of role models in the organisation;
- Fitting in with successful people in the same business areas of the organisation;
- Culture of long working hours at the organisation;
- Perceptions of disadvantage faced by part-time Partners at the organisation.

This was not possible due to the impact of COVID-19 lockdown on JLP (see further details under 'Implementation challenges'). Instead, JLP shared data from their internal surveys from 2017-2019 and September 2020. There were only four survey items where we had data from before the trial in 2019 and after the trial launch in September 2020. Only one of these survey items was directly relevant to the measures of interest above. This was a Net Promoter Score²⁸ ('NPS') for the following statement: 'I would recommend my business unit as a great place to work'. It should be noted that while the pulse survey was run shortly after the trial period started in September 2020, the emails about the trial were circulated in July 2020. Therefore, we expected that there could be a positive impact from this announcement.

Analytical strategy

Primary outcome - whether or not a given part-time Partner is promoted We estimated the intention-to-treat (ITT) effect of our intervention of the primary outcome using a logit model specified as below:

$$y_{ij} \sim bernoulli(p_{ij}); \ logit(p_{ij}) \\ = \alpha + \beta T_i + \Gamma \quad \Omega_{ij} + \gamma prevpromrate_i + \delta waitrose_i + \theta retail_i$$

In this model, y_{ij} is the event that part-time Partner *i* currently working in operational region *j* was promoted from one job level to another at any point during the trial period. Ω_{ij} is a vector of Partner-level covariates - gender, ethnicity, grade, job function, time in position (quadratic) and contract type. All of these are taken prior to the trial period since some of them are likely to be endogenous to the outcome variable. This vector of variables is the same as the one used in our exploratory analysis phase to model promotion likelihood. T_j is a dummy denoting whether Partner *i* was in a treatment operational region *at the end* of the trial. *prevpromrate_j* is the 2019 promotion rate of part-time Partners in operational region *j*; *waitrose_j* is an indicator for the operational region being part of Waitrose

²⁷ These indices were based on the validated measures recommended by Prof. Michelle Ryan and included in the trial based on discussion with Prof. Oliver Hauser.

 ²⁸ Respondents could agree, disagree or be neutral; the NPS for a branch is calculated as % agree % disagree.

(instead of John Lewis) and $retail_j$ is an indicator for it being Retail (instead of Supply Chain). We cluster standard errors at the operational region level. Details on robustness checks are provided in <u>Appendix D</u>.

Secondary outcome - number of external part-time hires

We examined the intervention's impact on the number of external part-time hires using a quasi-Poisson model at the shop level (with the number of part-time Partners as an offset and clustering of standard errors at the operational region level).

Secondary outcome - share of female applicants per vacancy

We pre-specified a quasibinomial model:

sharewomen_{ij} ~ quasibinomial(N_{ij}, p_{ij}, φ)/ N_{ij} ; $logit(p_{ij}) = \alpha + \beta T_j + \Gamma \ \Omega_{ij} + \delta waitrose_j + \theta retail_j$; $var(sharewomen_{ij}) = p_{ij}(1-p_{ij})\varphi/N_{ij}$

Here *i* denotes a vacancy, *sharewomen*_{*ij*} is its share of female applicants, *j* is its operational region as recorded in recruitment data and Ω_{ij} is a vector of other vacancy-level covariates such as working pattern, grade and job function. N_{ij} is the number of applicants. The sample consisted of vacancies at job levels 4-9 posted between 2 September 2020 and 15 January 2021. Again, we clustered standard errors at the operational region level.

Secondary outcome - number of applicants per vacancy

We analysed the effect of our intervention on this outcome using a quasi-Poisson model, with the same vacancy-level covariates and level of clustering as above.

Exploratory outcomes - share of women and EM Partners in above entry-level roles

We analysed the effect of our intervention on these outcomes in the same way as the primary outcome, except that the sample only included above entry-level roles, the outcome was a binary indicator, and gender/ethnicity were used as a covariate.

Exploratory outcomes - promotion rates across women

We used the same empirical specification as for our primary analysis. We restricted the sample to women only, included both full-time and part-time staff, and dropped the gender dummy variable to avoid collinearity.

Exploratory outcomes - part-time Partners in above entry-level roles

We analysed the effect of our intervention on this outcome in the same way as the primary outcome (except that the sample only includes roles in job levels 4-9, the outcome is a binary indicator for being a part-time employee, and part-time status is not used as a covariate).

Implementation challenges

The impact of COVID-19

The COVID-19 pandemic and the lockdown measures introduced in the UK in March 2020 affected the implementation of this trial. John Lewis department stores had to

temporarily close in line with the lockdown rules and eight stores did not reopen after the restrictions were eased. At the same time, Waitrose supermarkets were under pressure from a sharp increase in online and in-store demand. Overall, more than 14,000 of Partners were furloughed in April 2020.²⁹

There was a very limited number of vacancies posted after the start of the first national lockdown in March 2020. Though originally planned to begin in March 2020, we postponed the start of the trial until 5 July 2020 and extended the trial period until 15 January 2021. Nevertheless, the level of promotion rates during the trial period was much lower than expected based on the numbers for an equivalent period in the previous year.

Furthermore, we were not able to measure the impact of the trial on the Partners' sense of belonging as we did in the trial with Zurich because of the disruption outlined above.

Randomisation of clusters

There was a structural change at JLP in early 2020 where operational groups were replaced with operational regions. This occurred after randomisation had been conducted at operational group level, and the alignment of branches did not match perfectly between the two structures. As a result, the original randomisation file used by the RCs contained a number of branches that had incorrect control/trial assignment. This issue was identified via the log file. From 2 September 2020, the RCs were using the corrected version of the randomisation file and the treatment of control branches stopped on this date as checked in the log file. The log file shows that no control group vacancies were mistakenly treated between the 2 September 2020 and 14 January 2021.

An important concern is that hiring managers from the final control group may have changed their behaviour if they observed that an RC changes one of their job adverts to include part-time/job-share options. This may have induced them to advertise future vacancies as available part-time or as a job-share, which they would not have done without the initial treatment. This concern is mitigated by the log file showing that no hiring managers from control branches included part-time or job-share options in the job title. In addition, only one branch which was mistakenly treated posted a vacancy which was available part-time after September, out of 12 vacancies posted in total by treated control branches during the trial period. This is lower than the overall proportion of part-time vacancies in the control group, as illustrated in Table 3.

Therefore, the treatment of a number of vacancies in the period between 5 July 2020 and 2 September 2020 does not constitute a threat to our estimation strategy. As we removed this period from the trial, the power of the trial to distinguish the estimated treatment effect from zero reduced.

²⁹ John Lewis Partnership trading update

Trial results

Trial results

There were 722 eligible vacancies (347 in control branches and 375 in treatment branches) posted between 2 September 2020 and 15 January 2021. We did not have the data to check how many were advertised with a part-time/job-share option across the whole set. However, we ran this check for the subsample of vacancies that were manually recorded by JLP's Resource Consultants in the log file (263 in total). All vacancies in the treatment branches were advertised as available part-time or as a job-share compared to about a quarter (24%) in the control branches.³⁰

Table 3: Eligible vacancies recorded in the manual log file

	Treatment	Control
Total eligible vacancies recorded	123	140
Of which: advertised with a Part- time/Job-Share option	123 (100%)	33 (24%)

Primary outcome

We did not find a significant effect on the promotion rates of part-time Partners at the 10% significance level. Being statistically non-significant means that we cannot achieve adequate levels of confidence that the differences between the control and treatment groups were due to our intervention and not chance.





³⁰ We could not check whether these numbers are representative of the population of vacancies. However, these numbers suggest high compliance with the intervention in the treatment group. Also, we did not identify any vacancies in the control group that received the treatment by mistake.

Overall, promotion rates for part-time Partners (where the job level changed) were 0.088% in the treatment group compared to 0.057% in the control group. The effect is positive in all specifications and remains nonsignificant.

The trial suffered from a lack of statistical power to identify the effect since the promotion rate of part-time workers over the trial period was approximately half of its level in 2019. In total, there were only 41 promotions (based on a change of grade) across treatment and control branches between 2 September 2020 and 15 January 2021. Tables with further details are in <u>Appendix E.</u>

Secondary outcomes

Number of external part-time hires

The treatment did not have a significant effect at the 10% level on the number of external part-time hires. This outcome was explored to alleviate the possibility that the treatment resulted in more part-time Partners at levels 4-9 due to external hires rather than internal promotions.

Number of applicants per vacancy

The average number of applications per vacancy increased by 50% from 11.1 in the control group to 16.7 in the treatment group. The increase was significant at the 1% level.



Figure 4: Number of applicants per vacancy

Share of female applicants per vacancy

The average share of female applicants per vacancy increased from 38% in the control group to 51% in the treatment group. The increase was significant at the 1% level.





Gender data was missing for around 3% of the applicants. As a robustness test, we assumed all those with missing gender were women. This left the results qualitatively unchanged, as can be seen in <u>Appendix E</u> Table E5. The results also remained qualitatively unchanged when we estimated the same model using a shorter trial period, from 2 October 2020 to 15 January 2021.

Exploratory analysis

Share of women and EM Partners in above entry-level roles

The intervention did not have a significant effect at the 10% level on the share of women in above entry-level positions (levels 4-9). Around 50% of all Partners and around 71% of part-time Partners at these levels were women in both control and treatment branches (see Figure 6 and Figure 7 below).







Similarly, we found no significant impact at the 10% level on the overall share of nonwhite Partners in above entry-level roles. This holds for the total sample of full-time and part-time Partners as well as for part-time Partners separately.

It should be noted that the dataset only had ethnicity data for about half of the sample. For the purposes of this exploratory analysis, we treated missing ethnicity as white. The treatment effect is qualitatively unchanged if we instead treat missing ethnicity as non-white.

Figure 8: EM Partners in above entry-level roles



Figure 9: EM Partners in part-time above entry-level roles



Promotion rates across women

There was no significant effect at the 10% level on the promotion rates of women working full-time and part-time. Figure 10 presents the results from our main specification, using the September to January trial period and controlling for part-time promotion rates for 2019.

The difference between the control and trial groups was smaller in magnitude than in our primary analysis. It is not surprising we found a smaller effect given that full-time Partners were included in this analysis even though the intervention did not target them. This nonsignificant effect was replicated across all variations of trial period and promotion rate controls.



Figure 10: Promotion rates (job level changed)

Share of part-time Partners in above entry-level roles

We found no significant effect at the 10% level on the share of part-time Partners who were working in above entry-level roles. This result is qualitatively unchanged across all specifications.

Figure 11: Part-time Partners in above entry-level roles



Survey

We analysed data from JLP's 2019 census survey and September 2020 pulse survey for 359 branches. Specifically, we considered the NPS scores for the following statement 'I would recommend my business unit as a great place to work'. We did not have the 2019 survey data for part-time Partners separately, so we conducted the analysis for all Partners and controlled for previous responses at the shop-level.

We did not find a significant impact of the intervention on the willingness of Partners to recommend their business unit as a great place to work. Details on the analysis strategy and results from the analysis of other survey items are in <u>Appendix F</u>.

Discussion and conclusion

Discussion and Conclusion

One of the key factors contributing to the GPG at JLP was a lower representation of women in senior roles. This, in turn, was affected by the negligible progression rates of part-time Partners who were more likely to be women. The aim of the intervention was to improve the progression rates of part-time Partners by normalising part-time work at all levels of seniority within JLP. We expected that this in turn would increase the proportion of women in above entry-level roles. The intervention was based on a pre-post trial with Zurich but designed as a two-armed RCT. It was intended to help establish causal evidence on the effectiveness of advertising vacancies on a part-time or job-share basis by default and making these options more salient to applicants.

The results showed that the intervention did not have a significant impact on the promotion rates of part-time Partners. Although promotion rates were higher in the treatment branches than the control branches, the overall level was very low, and we did not have enough statistical power to claim that the difference was due to the intervention. Further, the overall volume of vacancies posted during the trial period was also lower than during the same period last year. This appears to be driven by the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and lockdown on JLP's business. Department stores had to be closed during the second and third national lockdowns which overlapped with the trial and demand for hiring reduced.³¹

On the positive side, **the intervention led to a 50% increase in the number of applicants per vacancy from an average of 11.1 to 16.7.** This is in line with our findings from a trial with a large UK job site, where job adverts offering flexible working attracted 30% more applicants.³² It should be noted that our result may overstate the true impact of the intervention, had it been rolled out across the whole organisation. Given that applicants could see vacancies from both the control and treatment groups, it is possible that the treatment group vacancies 'stole' some applicants from the control group vacancies.

Furthermore, the intervention led to a significant increase in the share of female applicants per vacancy (38% in the control group vs 51% in the treatment group). This finding is in line with our results in the Zurich trial.³³ It shows that making part-time or job-share options explicitly available is important for attracting a diverse pool of applicants. Similar to what was discussed above, the increase could have been smaller, had the intervention been applied to all vacancies.

Nevertheless, the intervention had no impact on the share of women and ethnic minority Partners as well as part-time Partners in above entry-level roles and the promotion rates of women. It is possible that the increase in the number of women applying did not translate into a higher share of women in above entry-level roles if overall women were less likely to receive or accept an offer. Another

³¹ A four-week second national lockdown started in England on 5 November 2020. The third national lockdown started on 6 January 2021.

³² BIT. (2019). Encouraging employers to advertise jobs as flexible

³³ BIT. (2020). <u>A field trial with Zurich Insurance to advertise all jobs as part-time</u>

possibility is that the number of women who were recruited or promoted into these positions increased but this was not sufficient to change the overall share of women in above entry-level grades and women's promotion rates due to the low volume of vacancies during the trial period. However, it could lead to such changes over a longer time period. Further data analysis is necessary to investigate these two possibilities.

The level of uptake of the intervention was very high. All eligible vacancies in the treatment branches at levels 4-9 were advertised with part-time or jobshare options compared to 24% in the control branches. This is in line with numerous other behavioural research findings which show that making an option the default increases the likelihood of adoption because it becomes very easy to follow while effort is required to change to a different option.³⁴

This research is the first published RCT to test making new vacancies available parttime or as a job-share by default and making them salient to applicants. Although we did not find any significant effects on the promotion rates, this trial should not be taken as evidence that such effects do not exist.

We encourage organisations to make part-time work available by default across all seniority levels. We also recommend that organisations normalise other forms of flexible working. This creates more progression pathways for employees who need to work flexibly and facilitates equality in the workplace across people of different genders, caring responsibilities and ethnicities. For example, many organisations had to transition their workforce to work permanently from home to meet the requirements of the UK government measures in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. To sustain positive increases in working from home that have come about as a result of lockdown, organisations can make it the default.

³⁴ Jachimowicz, J. M., Duncan, S., Weber, E. U., & Johnson, E. J. (2019). When and why defaults influence decisions: A meta-analysis of default effects. Behavioural Public Policy, 3(2), 159-186.

Appendices

Appendices

Appendix A: Materials provided to managers with to help design jobs suitable for part-time or a job-share

How to design a part-time role

- 1. Identify the tasks, responsibilities and expected outputs that you need to be delivered. Prioritise the most important ones.
- 2. Specify the skills and responsibilities needed for these tasks. Consider whether it's realistic for one person to have all of these.
- 3. Review the list of tasks and think:
 - o could the job be done differently from how the last job holder did it
 - Has there been any 'job creep' due to the previous job holder accumulating duties over time?
 - could some tasks be done more efficiently by other teams?
 - Now consider whether the list of tasks could be cut down or split into two (or more) smaller roles.
- 4. If the role includes supervisory or customer-facing responsibilities and full-time cover is needed, consider whether there is an opportunity for another team member to deputise or job-share.

What is a job-share and how to make it work?

- A job-share is a working arrangement whereby typically two part-time workers share a single job role. Some examples of such arrangements include:
 - One partner working mornings and another partner working afternoons each day
 - Two partners covering 2.5 days per person with no overlap, e.g. Monday -Wednesday am and Wednesday pm - Friday
 - Two partners covering 2.5 days per person, with a 0.5 day overlap and 0.5 days uncovered
- There is no single one-size-fits-all recipe to design and implement a job-share and various different approaches can work. The table below provides an overview of different job-share types to give you an idea of possible options.
- You don't always need to come up with the exact details of job-share arrangements yourself. Candidates can make their own suggestions based on what's required.
- Job-sharing can be successful:
 - For a variety of different role types, including senior roles with team management responsibilities.
 - Even if job-share partners do not know each other, have never worked together or if one or both partners come from outside the organisation
 - When job-share partners do not have exactly the same skill set or style. A mix
 of complementary skills and experiences can be beneficial two heads can be
 better than one.

Appendix B: Data cleaning

Initially the trial was designed to include JLP Partners in retail and supply chain. However, for operational reasons we agreed with JLP that only retail branches would be included.

There were 420 branches in the randomisation assignment file. These were the branches in the trial and included only Retail. Four of these branches did not merge successfully with 2019 promotion rate data. A further 16 branches did not merge successfully with the part-time Partners dataset. The reason for this could be that there are no part-time Partners working in these branches, they could have closed between randomisation and collection of Partner data in January 2021, they could be newly opened branches, or they could simply have been re-coded in some way.

Appendix C: Balance checks

Table C1: Balance Checks

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
	All	Control	Treatment	Balanced
Female	65.7%	65.5%	65.8%	Yes
Ethnicity				Yes
- Asian	3.2%	3.3%	3.1%	
- Black	1.8%	1.4%	2.2%	
- Mixed	1.5%	1.5%	1.5%	
- Other	0.7%	0.7%	0.6%	
- Unknown	50.6%	50.5%	50.7%	
- White	42.2%	42.6%	41.9%	
Vaitrose Branches	89.2%	89.3%	89.2%	Yes
2019 Part-Time Promotion Rate	0.0032	0.0036	0.0028	No
Q3/4 2019 Part- Fime Promotion	0.0013	0.0017	0.0009	No

2019 Part-Time Employees	104.5	103.9	105.1	Yes
Observations	51188	24735	26453	
Branches	400	196	204	

Clustered Standard Errors in Parentheses, p<0.1 +, p<0.05 *, p<0.01 **

Appendix D: Robustness checks

We pre-specified a number of robustness checks. The first was to define a Partner's treatment status by their job location at the start of the trial rather than the end of the trial. Given the data we had at the end of the trial, it was not possible to know which branch or operational region an employee had worked in at the start of the trial if they were promoted. Thus, we were not able to conduct this robustness check.

The second pre-specified robustness check was to define being promoted as receiving any promotion over the trial period (rather than a promotion which changes the employee's job level). In our 2019 data, 10.6% of part-time employees who were promoted according to this definition did not change job level. We implemented this robustness check in a slightly different way due to data constraints. Originally, we intended to include all internal transfers of JLP staff as promotions and use this for the robustness check. However, there are many reasons a member of staff may transfer and there is no way for us to distinguish promotions with no level change and, for example, sideways moves between branches. If we flag all internal transfers as promotions this increases the promotion rate in the control group to 2.3% from 0.06%; clearly most of these transfers are for other non-promotion reasons.

Instead, we used a promotion variable created by JLP to identify promotions, rather than our own definition which requires a change in job grade. This definition matches our grade promotions measure for 95% of the promotions in the September 2020 to January 2021 trial period.

Figure D1 shows the treatment effect for our main specification using the JLP promotions variable. The effect is positive and very similar in size to our primary analysis estimate, 0.038 percentage points. The results across all controls for baseline promotion rates are similar.

As a third robustness check, we perform a rough estimate of the complier average causal effect (CACE) by dividing our ITT estimate by the share of vacancies at levels 4-9 in the treatment group that were advertised as available part-time. This is trivial since the log file confirms that every vacancy advertised in the treatment group was made available part-time during the trial. Since there are only compliers, the ITT estimate of 0.038 percentage points is the same as the CACE estimate.





Primary analysis, with standard controls and promotion rates for 2019

Appendix E: Further analysis details

Primary outcome

Table E1 below, provides the main results of the analysis. Each column provides the results of the main regression specified in the Analysis section above - treatment assignment on promotions of part-time workers between September and January. All columns have controls for job level, gender, ethnicity, length of service, and if the employee is a permanent or temporary staff member and a Waitrose or John Lewis employee. All columns control for promotion rates in the pre-trial period but each in a different way. Column 1 controls for the 2019 promotion rate. Column 2 contains the promotion rate for the second half of 2019. Column 3 controls for the promotion rate in the first half of 2020.

In all specifications, we observe no significant effect of the treatment on promotion rates for part-time workers. However, the effects are all positive. The effect in Column 1 is a 0.031 percentage point increase in promotion rate for part-time employees. This is a smaller effect size than the trial was powered to be able to detect. The primary reason for this appears to be a lower promotion rate in the trial period than expected. The control group promotion rate was 0.057% compared to 0.105% in a similar 5-month period in 2019.

Promotion leading to change in grade, after	(1)	(2)	(3)
September 2	Outcome	Outcome	Outcome
Treatment	0.438	0.222	0.514
	(0.416)	(0.385)	(0.452)
Constant	-17.28**	-16.86**	-18.02**
	(1.274)	(1.257)	(1.289)
Observations	51188	51188	51188
Branches	400	400	400
Pseudo R^2	0.117	0.121	0.117
Control Group Mean	0.00057	0.00057	0.00057

Table E1: Effects of treatment on part-time promotions, September 2020 – January 2021

p < 0.05, p < 0.01. Standard errors clustered at the operational region level.

Table E2 repeats the same 3 logit regressions for part-time promotions leading to a change in grade occurring between October and January. The same pattern is evident, consistently positive but nonsignificant effects.

Promotion leading to	(1)	(2)	(3)
October 2	Outcome	Outcome	Outcome
Treatment	0.415	0.157	0.469
	(0.473)	(0.444)	(0.508)
Constant	-16.41**	-15.88**	-17.99**
	(1.316)	(1.294)	(1.291)
Observations	51188	51188	51188
Branches	400	400	400
Pseudo R^2	0.116	0.122	0.112
Control Group Mean	0.00049	0.00049	0.00049

Table E2: Effects of treatment on part-time promotions, October 2020 – January 2021

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01. Standard errors clustered at the operational region level.

Secondary outcomes

Number of external part-time hires

We examined the intervention's impact on the number of external part-time hires using a quasi-Poisson model at the shop level (with the number of part-time employees as an offset and clustering of standard errors at the operational region level).

Table E3 shows the results of these regressions for the same two trial periods as we used for the primary analysis. Treatment is not associated with external hires in the trial period. The p-values are sufficiently large that we cannot infer anything from the sign of the effect.

Number of External Hires	(1)	(2)
	Sep-Jan	Oct-Jan
Treatment	-0.0537	-0.0111
	(0.197)	(0.189)
Constant	-1.691**	-1.932**
	(0.139)	(0.136)
Observations	400	400
Control Group Mean	19.15	15.05

Table E3: Effects of treatment on external part-time hires

^{*} *p* < 0.05, ^{**} *p* < 0.01

Number of applicants per vacancy

Table E4 presents the results from the regressions. Treatment had a significant positive effect on the number of applications per vacancy. Evaluated at the mean of the control group, treatment increases the number of applications per vacancy by 5.6 (from 11.1 to 16.7). This is a 50% increase over the control group mean.

Number of Applicants	(1)	(2)
per vacancy	Sept-Jan	Oct-Jan
Treatment	0.501**	0.357**
	(0.0854)	(0.0562)
Constant	2.121**	2.134**
	(0.351)	(0.262)
Observations	722	573
Control Group Mean	11.10	11.15

Table E4: Effects of treatment on applicants per vacancy

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01. Standard errors clustered at the operations region level. Controls included: Waitrose branch, job level, location types, part-time vacancy.

Share of female applicants per vacancy

In the applications data, gender was missing for around 3% of the applicants. As a robustness test we assumed all those with missing gender are women. This leaves the results qualitatively unchanged, as can be seen in Column 2 of Table E5.

Share of Applications	(1)	(2)
nom.	Women	Non-Males
Treatment	0.545**	0.489**
	(0.118)	(0.0914)
Constant	-0.285	-0.255
	(0.600)	(0.621)
Observations	722	722
Control Group Mean	0.38	0.41

 Table E5: Effects of treatment on share of female applicants

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01. Standard errors clustered at the operations region level. Controls included: Waitrose branch, job level, location types, part-time vacancy. Observations weighted by the number of applications.

Exploratory analysis

Share of women in above entry-level roles

We analysed the effect of our intervention on this outcome in the same way as the primary outcome (except that the sample only includes roles in job levels 4-9, the outcome is a binary indicator for being a woman, and gender is not used as a covariate). Table E6 presents the results from this regression using the sample of part-time employees in above entry level roles.

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Female	Female	Female
Treatment	-0.0511	-0.0160	-0.0448
	(0.104)	(0.114)	(0.110)
Constant	-0.764**	-0.699**	-0.603**
	(0.261)	(0.239)	(0.236)
Observations	2143	2143	2143
Branches	260	260	260
Pseudo R^2	0.046	0.046	0.046
Control Group Mean	0.715	0.715	0.715

Table E6: Effects of treatment on the share of women in part-time above entrylevel roles

* *p* < 0.05, ** *p* < 0.01

Share of EM partners in above entry-level roles

We analysed the effect of our intervention on this outcome in the same way as the first exploratory outcome (except that the outcome will be a binary indicator for having an ethnicity other than white, and ethnicity will not be used as a covariate). Table E7 presents the results from this regression using the sample of part-time employees in above entry level roles.

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	Non-White	Non-White	Non-White
Treatment	-0.372	-0.443	-0.332
	(0.566)	(0.479)	(0.579)
Constant	-3.013	-2.928	-3.272
	(0.683)	(0.635)	(0.747)
Observations	2143	2143	2143
Branches	260	260	260
Pseudo R^2	0.027	0.028	0.032
Control Group Mean	0.086	0.086	0.086

Table E7: Ethnic Minorities in part-time above entry-level roles

p < 0.05, p < 0.01

Appendix F: Survey analysis

JLP conduct their own internal surveys at regular intervals. They have shared their internal survey data with us from before and during the trial. These four are the questions which were asked both before and during the trial period. Controlling for baseline differences in survey responses offers us more power to identify effects of the treatment on these attitudes. Only the second question was deemed to be directly relevant to our measure of interest which was organisational fit and belonging and was thus included in the main section of this report.

- Fairness: "I am treated with fairness and respect"
- GPTW: "I would recommend my business unit as a great place to work"
- GPTS: "I would recommend my business unit as a great place to shop"
- Co-ownership: "I would recommend co-ownership as a better way of doing business"

The first question on fairness is answered on a 5-point Likert scale, while the other three are scored as a net promoter score (NPS).³⁵ We used the 2019 census survey and September 2020 pulse survey. The 2019 survey data was not available only for part-time employees, so we were only able to control for previous responses at the shop-level including all employees.

Net Promoter Score Questions

These outcomes are in both surveys and are analysed at the shop level - we do this with the following regression:

$$outcome_i = \beta_0 + \beta_1 treat_i + \beta_2 prev.outcome_i$$

Here $outcome_j$ is the NPS for shop *j* from the 2020 survey, $prev.outcome_j$ is the NPS from the 2019 survey and we weigh by number of respondents.

³⁵ Net promoter score (NPS) - for these questions, respondents could agree, disagree or be neutral; the NPS for a branch is calculated as % agree - % disagree

	(1)	(2)	(3)
	GPTW	GPTS	Co-ownership
Treatment	0.374	-0.990	-0.520
	(2.964)	(2.523)	(1.854)
Lagged Dependent Variable	0.637**	0.522**	0.551**
	(0.0480)	(0.0430)	(0.0512)
Constant	6.609*	22.97**	3.422*
	(2.433)	(2.479)	(1.628)
Branches	359	359	359
R^2	0.308	0.226	0.232
Control Group Mean	7.11	36.35	10.15

Table F1: Effects of treatment on survey question responses at shop-level

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01. Standard errors clustered at the operational region level.

Table F1 contains the results from shop-level regressions for each of the three NPS questions. They show that treatment does not cause any statistically significant change in employee responses on whether their business unit is a great place to work, to shop, or if they would recommend JLPs co-ownership model.

Likert Scale Question

Fairness is scored on a Likert scale and is asked in both the 2019 and 2020 surveys. The percentage who responded positively is known for each shop, so we expanded the shop-level dataset and analysed at the individual level as follows:

$$fairness_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 treat_j + \beta_2 prev. fairness_j$$

Here $fairness_{ij} = 1$ if respondent *i* agrees with the statement in the 2020 survey and *prev. fairness_i* is the % who agreed with the statement in the 2019 survey.

	(1)
	Fairness
Treatment	-0.00291
	(0.0123)
Lagged Shop-level Fairness	0.00296**
	(0.000883)
Constant	0.544**
	(0.0738)
Branches	20,495
R^2	0.003
Control Group Mean	0.77

Table F2: Effects of treatment on fairness survey question

* p < 0.05, ** p < 0.01. Standard errors clustered at the operational region level.

The results of the expanded individual-level regression for fairness is included in Table F2. There is a relatively precisely estimated zero on the treatment variable. The treatment had no effect on the number of people agreeing that they are being treated with fairness and respect at work.



© Crown copyright 2019

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3

Where we have identified any third party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned.