

Netherlands EWCO CAR on Working conditions in the retail sector – National contribution

Disclaimer: This information is made available as a service to the public but has not been edited by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. The content is the responsibility of the authors.

Based on the Netherlands Working Condition Survey (NWCS), this report examines working conditions in the retail sector in the Netherlands. It concludes that the retail sector is a sector in which many young employees work. These employees often work part-time and have a temporary contract. The retail sector does worse on the traditional ergonomic risk factors, but generally better on the psychosocial risks, with the exception of unwanted behaviour from third parties (i.e. not colleagues but clients, patients, passengers etc.). Intimidation, bullying as well, such as physical violence by third parties are overall more common in the Dutch retail sector. Age discrimination is also more common in retail. This is also reflected by the actions taken by the government and the social parties that for a large part focus on the reduction of violence and crime in the sector.

The questionnaire focuses on the following topics:

- Mapping labour force structure in the retail sector, with particular regards to company size, occupational status, and socio-demographic factors such as age and gender (around 500 words)
- Career perspectives and employment security in the retail sector (around 500 words)
- Health and well-being of workers- Security of work environment in retail (around 500 words)
- Social partners and government authorities actions to promote career opportunities, employment security and well-being of workers in the sector (around 1000 words).

Where retail specific sector (NACE Rev.2.0 G47 or NACE Rev. 1.1 G52) data and other material is not available, information should be provided for the whole Commerce sector (i.e NACE G)

Block 1. Employment, sectoral structure and changes in the legal framework

Question 1.1.: Please summarize the main employment trends in the retail sector (NACE Rev.2: G47, mainly equivalent to NACE Rev. 1.1 G52) over the last 10 years.

The retail sector is expanding. According to statistics Netherlands the number of jobs in the sector rose from 604 thousand jobs in 1999 to 688 thousand jobs in 2009. About 2/3 of these jobs are held by women. This growth does not reflect a general growth in jobs. The Netherlands working conditions survey (NWCS) shows that the percentage of all employees who work in retail has risen from 8,4% in 2005 to 9.3% in 2010. Jobs in the retail sector are typically held by low educated, female, younger (<25) workers of Dutch origin.

The high number of female and young workers is also reflected in the number of hours worked in retail. Women in the Netherlands often work part-time, and younger workers often have a part-time job next to their education. Almost 80% of the workers in retail works part-time, and the average number of contractual hours in 2010 is 22 hours a week. The number of working hours slightly decreased in the last years.

Most workers in retail are on an open ended contract (table 3). However, temporary contracts are more frequently found in retail as compared to the general working population. As can be seen in the general working population, the number of temporary contracts is also rising. This may be partly due to the economic crisis. However the crisis does not appear to have a large effect on wages. In the 2000-2010 period wages rose on average by 25%, with a relatively large rise in 2008 and 2009.

	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
number of employees (x 1000)	604,0	625,2	632,9	635,4	622,0	615,7	610,0	668,8	686,7	688,6	688,2	
male employees (x 1000)	222,4	228,0	230,4	231,8	227,1	228,4	229,1	256,4	252,3	250,7	254,0	
female employees (x 1000)	381,6	397,2	402,5	403,7	394,9	387,4	380,9	412,4	434,3	437,9	434,3	
indexed wages		100	104,2	107,9	110,8	112,6	113	114,4	116,8	120,6	124,1	125,4
yearly change in wage			4,3	3,5	2,7	1,6	0,4	1,2	1,9	2,8	2,5	1,1

Source: Statistics Netherlands

		Year					
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
N:		23.360	24.088	22.759	22.025	22.762	23.788
%:		17%	17%	16%	16%	16%	17%
Gender [N=127.061]							
• Female	No retail	43,7%▼	44,0%	43,6%▼	44,6%	44,8%	45,1%▲ ▲
• Male		56,3%▲	56,0%	56,4%▲	55,4%	55,2%	54,9%▼ ▼
Gender [N=11.721]	retail (SBI93=52)						

• Female		64,5%	66,9%	67,8%▲	64,1%	64,5%	64,3%
• Male		35,5%	33,1%	32,2%▼	35,9%	35,5%	35,7%
Age [N=127.061]							
• 15-24	No retail	10,5%	10,2%▼ ▼▼	10,5%▼	10,7%	11,4%▲ ▲	12,1%▲ ▲▲
• 25-34		23,9%▲ ▲▲	23,0%▲ ▲	22,1%	22,0%	21,8%▼	21,5%▼ ▼▼
• 35-44		27,7%▲ ▲	27,9%▲ ▲▲	27,4%	27,0%	25,9%▼ ▼▼	25,4%▼ ▼▼
• 45-54		24,3%▼ ▼▼	24,8%	25,2%	25,6%	25,9%▲ ▲	25,5%
• 55-64		13,7%▼ ▼▼	14,1%▼	14,8%	14,7%	15,0%	15,5%▲ ▲▲
Age [N=11.721]							
• 15-24	retail (SBI93=52)	36,7%	34,7%▼ ▼	30,2%▼ ▼▼	33,3%▼ ▼▼	42,2%▲ ▲▲	46,2%▲ ▲▲
• 25-34		20,7%	21,4%▲	23,6%▲ ▲▲	20,9%	16,5%▼ ▼▼	16,4%▼ ▼▼
• 35-44		19,5%	20,6%	21,3%	20,9%	19,3%	17,0%▼ ▼▼
• 45-54		15,4%	15,0%	14,9%	15,7%	14,5%	13,3%▼
• 55-64		7,7%	8,3%	10,0%▲ ▲	9,2%	7,4%	7,2%▼
Education [N=126.190]							
• low	No retail	26,1%▲ ▲▲	24,5%	24,7%	24,5%	24,8%	24,1%▼
• intermediate		41,7%▼ ▼▼	43,2%	43,2%	43,7%▲ ▲	42,8%	42,6%
• high		32,2%	32,4%	32,0%	31,8%	32,4%	33,3%▲ ▲
Education [N=11.644]	retail (SBI93=52)						
• low		42,2%	41,2%	41,6%	43,7%	43,6%	45,1%▲

• intermediate		48,1%	50,6%	50,0%	48,4%	49,1%	46,6% ▼
• high		9,6% ▲	8,2%	8,4%	7,9%	7,3%	8,3%
Background [N=126.998]							
• National		83,6% ▲	83,9% ▲ ▲	83,9% ▲ ▲	83,3%	82,0% ▼ ▼▼	82,3% ▼ ▼▼
• Western (not Dutch) origin	No retail	8,5%	8,4%	8,4%	8,3%	8,8%	8,7%
• Non-Western origin		7,8% ▼▼	7,7% ▼▼ ▼	7,7% ▼▼ ▼	8,4%	9,2% ▲▲ ▲	9,0% ▲▲ ▲
Background [N=11.720]							
• National	retail	85,4%	84,1%	82,1% ▼ ▼	85,8% ▲	84,5%	83,4%
• Western (not Dutch) origin	(SBI93=52)	7,3%	7,1%	7,4%	6,0%	6,5%	6,8%
• Non-Western origin		7,3% ▼▼	8,8%	10,5% ▲	8,2%	9,0%	9,9%
Company size [N=123.832]	• no retail						
• 1-4		5,2%	4,8%	4,8%	4,8%	5,4% ▲	5,2%
• 5-9		8,6%	8,4%	8,0% ▼	8,1%	8,4%	8,8% ▲
• 10-49		26,9%	27,0%	27,0%	27,1%	27,4%	27,1%
• 50-99		14,7%	13,7% ▼ ▼▼	14,8% ▲	14,6%	14,4%	14,3%
• 100-499		24,1%	24,6% ▲ ▲	24,1%	24,0%	22,6% ▼ ▼▼	22,9% ▼ ▼
• 500-999		6,5%	7,2% ▲▲	6,9%	6,7%	6,4%	6,5%
• 1000+		14,0% ▼ ▼	14,4%	14,4%	14,8%	15,4% ▲ ▲	15,3% ▲ ▲

Company size [N=11.432]	· retail (SBI93=52)						
· 1-4		11,6%	10,5%	9,9%	10,9%	11,0%	10,4%
· 5-9		21,5%	22,0%	24,2%▲ ▲	22,3%	20,0%	19,9%▼
· 10-49		33,0%	34,0%	33,8%	31,5%	33,4%	33,2%
· 50-99		17,4%	15,3%	15,1%	15,1%	16,4%	17,6%
· 100-499		12,3%▼	13,9%	12,8%	14,8%	15,8%▲	15,1%
· 500-999		2,1%	2,2%	2,0%	2,1%	1,7%	1,3%▼
· 1000+		2,1%	2,0%	2,2%	3,2%▲▲	1,7%	2,4%

Percentages are column percentages, and are tested with the Pearson Chi-square test (horizontal comparisons). The contrast is: 'subgroup' vs 'other cases'. ▲: $p < 0,05$, ▲▲: $p < 0,01$, ▲▲▲: $p < 0,001$ (and ▼): significantly high (low) percentages. Symbols are based on significance only, not on Effect Size.

Source: NWCS 2005-2010

Question 1.2: Please summarize the main changes in the legislative framework over the last 10 years, and indicate how they influenced employment, the sectoral structure and working conditions.

Working conditions

The Working Conditions Act came into force during the eighties. In the new version of the Working Conditions Act at the 1st of January 2007, the content of this Working Conditions Act was expressed in more simple and compact terms. Generally responsibilities for working conditions were expressed in target terms instead of prohibitions. The focus of this Working Conditions Act shifted, more than in the past, towards stimulating the responsibility for the OSH risks to the employers and employees and their social partners. Subsidies were given to social partners to stimulate the creation of sector-based OSH-catalogues. These digital catalogues contain information, solutions and good practices for employers and employees in a sector. The catalogues are developed by the social partners and are licensed by the Labour Inspectorate. The Labour Inspectorate uses these catalogues in their inspection- and enforcement activities.

The retail sector comprises a wide range of different activities. Many employers in the retail sector are organised in sub-sectoral organisations. Via these sub-sectoral organisations, for example the bakery-, the butcher- and liquid store sectors, the social partners have created digital risk-assessment tools (www.rie.nl). The tools are available for all employers in these sub-sectors. Some of these sub-sectors have also developed an OSH-catalogue, for example the fish-retail sector (www.visenarbo.nl).

Working time arrangements

The main development in working time policy was the enforcement of the Working Time Act in 1995 and the adaptation in 2007. The 1995 version of the Working Time Act included two regimes; a restricted regime that applied to all companies and a liberal regime that could be negotiated. The 1995 version was felt as too restrictive. Due to the call for less regulation, the 2007 version of the Working Time Act was implemented to improve the practical application of the law, the working situation, and the worldwide competitive position of the Dutch economy. The new 2007 version of the Working Time Act has only one regime of working time provisions applicable to all economic sectors. These provisions can be compared with the provisions of the old liberal working time regime. For example the maximum daily uninterrupted rest period is 11 hours (article 5:3 of the Working Time Act) and the maximum weekly working time (including extra time) is 60 hours (article 5:7 of the Working Time Act). Within the limits of this Working Time Act social partners can create specific working time provisions in a collective labour agreement.

The introduction of the Working Time Act added to the time consciousness in Dutch companies and the confidence to influence working times more properly. The call for better and healthier rosters by researchers and consultants generated many roster improvements. Negotiated solutions such as annualisation of working time and time banks are applied, but not very often. A new development is self-rostering by employees, giving them more opportunities to combine work and private interests.

Contractual arrangements

A silent revolution that started in the 1970th is the increase of part-time work, which facilitated women's participation in the Dutch labour market dramatically. Due to the women's liberation movement in the 1970th more women wanted and were stimulated to participate in paid work, next to care for children and family. They could realise this by part-time work. The introduction of child-care arrangements and after-school care in the last decades facilitated this further. Most recently the Dutch government tries to stimulate part-time employees to increase their working hours, but this has not been very successful thus far.

Changing jobs often means changing pension funds, where employees build up rights for securing the financial situation after old age retirement. This often resulted in "pension gaps" because "sleeping" pensions were not indexed two decades ago. In 1992 the Law on pensions and salary savings was changed (already repaired in 1987) so that pension rights now are equally indexed for people staying in and changing pension funds. It is also not allowed from 1989 to exclude women and part-timers from pension systems. Also employees in temporary jobs have the right on pension building. This resulted in a more stable pension building policy.

From the seventies the number of flexible jobs and independent contractors grew strongly. A major initiative to secure the right of employees in flexible jobs is the enforcement of the Law on flexibility and security in 1999. This law regulates flexicurity for three broad types that cover most types of flexible jobs: temporary jobs, on call jobs and jobs intermediated by temporary employment agencies. Basic rules are set in the law, allowing social partners to define stricter or broader rules in collective agreements, depending on the situation in the sector. The balance between flexibility and security seems to be in favour of more flexibility instead of security nowadays, perhaps because of the favourable economic situation in the years before 2008.

Opening hours

The first legislation regarding opening hours dates from the 1930's and consisted of maximum opening hours and a mandatory Sunday closing. Until the 1976 'Winkelsluitingswet' (Store-closing-times law) this Sunday rest was abandoned and reinforced several times. Under the 'Winkelsluitingswet' shops could only open in the following hours: Monday / Friday from 5.00 to 18.00, Saturday 5.00 to 17.00, and on a day fixed by the municipality of the week from 18.00 to 21.00 (late night shopping). Within hours it can store 52 hours a week open. In 1984 Sunday shopping is re-introduced. Up to four Sundays per year, the shops may open. In 1993 opening hours on weekdays are stretched to 18.30 and the maximum number of Sunday opening is extended from four to eight per year. In 1996 the government concludes that the 'Winkelsluitingswet' does not suit the times and needs to be simplified. The Storetimeslaw (Winkeltijdenwet) is introduced. Municipalities get more autonomy to decide when shops may open and opening times are stretched to 06:00 to 22:00 on weekdays, while the maximum of Sunday openings is raised to twelve, but can be extended to all year Sunday opening because of a tourism provision. As of January 1st 2011 the Winkeltijdenwet is changed again. It turned out that the provision was not always used fairly and it was added that there must be 'substantial tourism' before relief is given and Sunday opening over 12 Sundays is granted. The interests of local economic activity and employment, including the importance of merchants with little or no staff and shop workers, Sunday rest, the quality of life, safety and the public policy in the municipality must be taken into account.

Question 1.3: Please summarize the national debate from social partners, policy makers and experts on the main topics regarding employment and working conditions in the retail sector (contractual arrangements, working hours, training opportunities, job security, etc).

According to the National Board for the Retail Trade there were three main issues guiding the national debate in the sector:

1. Violence and harassment
2. 'The New Way of Shopping', using the internet and social media
3. The work and health catalogue.

Ad 1: In recent years the question as to how to protect employees/workers from the (increasing) violence and harassment from the public was one of the important issue for debate. In 2007 a programme was initiated on a 'Safe, Public Task' mainly directed at violence against public workers. However, the retail sector joined this project as well. Three Ministries worked together in this project: the Ministry of Home Affairs (responsible for public workers), the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment (responsible for health and safety of all employees) and the Ministry of Justice. All kind of projects were initiated because of this programme, ranging from courses developed for employers as well as well as employees, e-learning for the prevention of violence and harassment to a tool to calculate costs related to violence and harassment as well as to the costs for prevention. With regards to the Risk Assessment, this programme also developed a model including risks for violence and harassment.

Ad 2: The second topic related to the fact that people buy more and more via internet. Also the way the potential buyer looks for articles he or she wants to purchase is changing. This has

important consequences for how retail shops do their marketing and selling but is also related to their quality of work, as well as their career perspectives and future employment security. The way how they can use the social media, internet and the added value of having both an internet shop and a 'physical' shop is put into courses that are organised by the National Board for Retail Trade for shop owners, shop management and workers. These courses are often organized per shopping mall.

Ad 3. The third issue for debate in the retail sector has been the work and health catalogue. The National Board has made a model for such a catalogue. However, this has not been a success story in all their 45 branches. Only a few branches had been able to develop such a catalogue with success (see also the answer to question 1.2).

Block 2: Career perspectives and employment security

Question 2: Please provide available information (research, official reports etc.) on the relationship between career progression/employment security and the following aspects:

- Existence of different contractual arrangements in the sector (part-time/full-time, temporary/permanent, employee/self-employed, apprenticeships), and transitions between them
- Working time arrangements (overtime, shift work and working at unsocial hours, especially night and week-end).
- Entry into the sector: Initial vocational training
- Learning and training opportunities, including usage of ICT;
- Skills recognition or standardisation of job profiles
- Wage levels in the sector
- Any other aspects of relevance

For this purpose, please use relevant research studies or figures from surveys or administrative sources at national, local and company level. Please distinguish in your answer, where possible, between different groups of workers (e.g. gender, migrant workers, skill level, type of occupation), types of companies (size, degree of specialisation, sub-sector e.g. also e-commerce— see background note)

Contractual arrangements and wages

Between 2005 and 2010 there is a decrease of open ended contracts, and an increase of temporary contracts. This reflects the trend in the general population. In 2010 average number of contractual working hours is 22 per worker per week. Almost 3 hours less than in 2005. The decline also reflects the trend in the general population. However, the number of contractual hours in the retail sector is fairly low compared to average. This is due to the high percentage of workers who work part-time (72%). The majority of workers work in small companies (less than 50 employees). Especially the number of workers in companies with 5-9 employees is high. The wages in the retail sector increased with 25% in the 2000-2010 period (Statistics Netherlands), this is in line with the general wage increase.

Table 3: Contractual arrangements

Table Summary – Contractual arrangements in retail and in the other sectors since 2005

								Year
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	
N:		23.055	23.825	22.553	21.808	22.577	23.574	
%:		17%	17%	16%	16%	16%	17%	
Contract[N=12 5.813]	· no retail							
· open ended		83,4%▲ ▲▲	83,4%▲ ▲▲	83,3%▲ ▲▲	82,7%	80,2%▼ ▼▼	80,8%▼ ▼▼	
· temporary expected to become fixed		6,3%▼▼ ▼	7,0%▼▼	7,7%	8,3%▲▲ ▲	8,4%▲▲ ▲	7,4%	
· temporary		4,8%	4,6%▼▼	4,3%▼▼ ▼	4,4%▼▼ ▼	6,3%▲▲ ▲	5,8%▲▲ ▲	
· through temp agency		2,2%▲▲	2,1%	2,0%	1,9%	1,8%▼	2,0%	
· On call		2,3%	2,0%▼▼	1,7%▼▼ ▼	1,9%▼▼	2,4%▲	2,9%▲▲ ▲	
· Sheltered employment		1,0%	1,1%	1,0%	0,8%▼▼	0,9%	1,1%	
Contract [N=11.578]	· retail (SBI93 =52							
· open ended		76,2%▲ ▲▲	75,3%▲ ▲	78,2%▲ ▲▲	73,4%	67,9%▼ ▼▼	67,5%▼ ▼▼	
· temporary expected to become fixed		7,5%▼▼ ▼	10,0%	9,9%	13,4%▲ ▲▲	10,1%	10,4%	
· temporary		8,5%▼▼	9,0%	7,5%▼▼ ▼	7,9%▼▼ ▼	13,2%▲ ▲▲	14,0%▲ ▲▲	
· through temp agency		1,4%▲▲	1,0%	0,8%	0,7%	0,7%	0,8%	
· On call		6,3%	4,6%▼	3,6%▼▼ ▼	4,4%▼▼	7,7%▲▲ ▲	7,3%▲▲ ▲	
· Sheltered employment		0,2%	0,1%	0%	0,2%	0,3%▲	0,0%	
contract hours per week[N=125.24 9] [M]	· no retail	31,8	31,9	32,3▲▲ ▲	32,1▲▲ ▲	31,8	31,5▼▼ ▼	
contract hours per week[N=11.535] [M]	· retail (SBI93 =52	25,2▲▲ ▲	25,2▲▲ ▲	25,4▲▲ ▲	26,1▲▲ ▲	22,2▼▼ ▼	22,2▼▼ ▼	

parttime [N=125.249]	· no retail						
· fulltime (>32 hours/week)		60,7%▲ ▲▲	59,9%	61,0%▲ ▲▲	59,8%	58,6%▼ ▼	57,9%▼ ▼▼
· parttime (= < 32 hours/week)		39,3%▼ ▼▼	40,1%	39,0%▼ ▼▼	40,2%	41,4%▲ ▲	42,1%▲ ▲▲
parttime [(N=11.535)]	· retail (SBI93 =52)						
· fulltime (>32 hours/week)		37,2%▲ ▲▲	36,8%▲ ▲	35,6%	38,5%▲ ▲▲	27,9%▼ ▼▼	28,1%▼ ▼▼
· parttime (= < 32 hours/week)		62,8%▼ ▼▼	63,2%▼ ▼	64,4%	61,5%▼ ▼▼	72,1%▲ ▲▲	71,9%▲ ▲▲
<i>Percentages are column percentages, and are tested with the Pearson Chi-square test (horizontal comparisons). Means are tested with the t-test (horizontal comparisons). The contrast is: 'year' vs 'other years'. ▲: p<0,05 (and ▼): significantly high (low) percentages and/or means.</i>							

Source: NWCS 2005-2010

Working time arrangements

There is an increase of the percentage of workers that (sometimes or often) work in shifts both in the general working population as well as in the retail sector. The percentage of workers that work evenings or nights is stable at about 60%. The percentage of workers that work during weekends has decreased slightly but is still more than 80%. However there is a steady increase in how often evening/night/weekend work is performed. More and more employees in the retail sector 'regularly' work at these times. There is a decrease in working overtime both in the percentage of workers that works overtime as in the number of hours (table 4).

		Year					
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
N:		23.039	23.818	22.643	21.876	22.588	23.681
%:		17%	17%	16%	16%	16%	17%
Shift work [N=122.375]							
· Yes regularly	· no retail	12,7%	12,8%	12,8%	12,7%	12,7%	13,0%
· Yes sometimes		2,1%▼▼ ▼	2,1%▼▼ ▼	2,4%	2,9%▲ ▲▲	3,1%▲▲ ▲	2,7%
· No		85,1%▲	85,1%	84,9%	84,4%	84,2%▼	84,3%

Shift work [N=11.153]							
· Yes regularly	· retail (SBI93=52)	8,7%	8,5%	5,5%▼▼▼	8,6%	12,5%▲▲	13,5%▲▲
· Yes sometimes		3,2%	2,3%▼▼	2,7%	3,4%	3,6%	4,5%▲▲▲
· No		88,1%	89,2%▲▲	91,8%▲▲▲	88,0%	83,8%▼▼▼	82,0%▼▼▼
Evening/night [N=120.321]							
· Yes regularly	· no retail	23,5%	23,8%▲	22,8%	23,1%	22,7%	23,2%
· Yes sometimes		27,5%	27,4%	27,6%	27,2%	27,3%	27,0%
· No		49,0%	48,7%▼	49,5%	49,7%	50,0%	49,9%
Evening/night [N=11.006]							
· Yes regularly	· retail (SBI93=52)	30,9%	30,7%	26,6%▼▼▼	29,8%	31,2%	34,0%▲▲▲
· Yes sometimes		27,2%	27,6%	29,0%	28,5%	26,3%	25,4%▼
· No		41,9%	41,7%	44,4%▲	41,7%	42,5%	40,6%
Weekend [N=120.376]							
· Yes regularly	· no retail	26,0%	25,7%	25,1%▼	25,6%	25,5%	26,8%▲▲▲
· Yes sometimes		25,7%	26,8%▲	26,3%	26,6%	26,3%	25,7%
· No		48,3%	47,6%	48,5%	47,8%	48,2%	47,5%
Weekend [N=11.168]							
· Yes regularly	· retail (SBI93=52)	53,3%	51,6%▼▼	50,8%▼▼▼	52,3%	57,7%▲▲	59,6%▲▲▲
· Yes sometimes		23,1%	24,3%	26,7%▲	25,5%	25,3%	22,6%▼
· No		23,6%▲▲	24,0%▲▲▲	22,5%	22,1%	17,0%▼▼▼	17,8%▼▼▼
Overtime [N=125.24]	· no retail						

6]							
· Structural		28,0%	29,1%▲ ▲▲	28,2%	28,3%	26,1%▼ ▼▼	27,1%▼
· Incidental		44,5%▼ ▼▼	44,4%▼ ▼▼	45,4%	45,5%	47,9%▲ ▲▲	46,8%▲ ▲▲
· Never		27,5%▲ ▲▲	26,5%	26,4%	26,3%	26,0%	26,1%
Overtime [N=11.507]							
· Structural	· retail (SBI93= 52)	23,7%	22,8%	22,3%	23,5%	21,3%	21,8%
· Incidental		46,5%	47,1%	47,3%	47,7%	47,3%	44,7%▼
· Never		29,8%	30,1%	30,5%	28,8%	31,4%	33,5%▲ ▲
number of overtime hours [N=122.01 5] [M]	· no retail	3,47▼	3,65▲▲ ▲	3,60▲	3,63▲▲	3,41▼▼ ▼	3,45▼▼
number of overtime hours [N=11.105] [M]	· retail (SBI93= 52)	3,06	3,00	3,11	3,03	2,76	2,67▼▼
Percentages are column percentages, and are tested with the Pearson Chi-square test (horizontal comparisons). Means are tested with the t-test (horizontal comparisons). The contrast is: 'year' vs 'other years'. ▲: p<0,05 (and ▼): significantly high (low) percentages and/or means.							

Source: NWCS 2005-2010

Learning and training opportunities including usage of ICT

ICT use in the retail sector is not high. The average worker in retail works with a Visual Display Unit (VDU) for about 2 hours per week, while in other sectors this is almost 4 hours. About 5% of workers in retail classifies themselves as a 'teleworker' while in other sectors this is 16%. The percentage of workers that has followed a training was quite stable in the 2007-2010 period; about 37% of employees in retail followed external training and about 25% followed an in company training. However both in the retail sector as well as in other sectors there was a unexpected high percentage of workers who has followed training in 2008. The satisfaction with training is stable (Table 5).

Table 5: Learning, training and ICT use	
Table Summary – Learning, training and ICT use in retail and in the other sectors since 2005	
	Year

		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
N:		23.039	23.818	22.643	21.876	22.588	23.681
%:		17%	17%	16%	16%	16%	17%
hours of VDU work (weekly)	· no retail	3,62 ▼▼ ▼	3,76 ▼▼ ▼	3,79	3,91 ▲▲ ▲	3,94 ▲▲ ▲	3,94 ▲▲ ▲
	· retail (SBI93=52)	2,17	2,26	2,29	2,41 ▲	2,28	2,21
teleworker	· no retail	--	--	11,9% ▼▼ ▼	12,8% ▼▼ ▼	14,1%	16,2% ▲▲ ▲
	· retail (SBI93=52)	--	--	4,5%	4,2%	3,9%	4,7%
in company training	· no retail	--	--	58,3%	60,0% ▲▲ ▲	58,5%	58,6%
	· retail (SBI93=52)	--	--	37,2%	43,4% ▲▲ ▲	35,0% ▼▼ ▼	37,7%
training outside of the office	· no retail	--	--	44,9%	45,7% ▲	45,1%	44,6%
	· retail (SBI93=52)	--	--	27,5% ▲	29,0% ▲▲ ▲	22,1% ▼▼ ▼	23,7% ▼
education and training is important	· no retail	--	--	11,6%	--	12,1%	--
	· retail (SBI93=52)	--	--	9,4% ▲	--	7,2% ▼	--
satisfaction with education and training possibilities (1= very dissatisfied - 10= very satisfied)	· no retail	--	--	6,38	--	6,34	--
	· retail (SBI93=52)	--	--	6,14	--	6,18	--

Percentages are column percentages, and are tested with the Pearson Chi-square test (horizontal comparisons). Means are tested with the t-test (horizontal comparisons). The contrast is: 'year' vs 'other years'. ▲: $p < 0,05$ (and ▼): significantly high (low) percentages and/or means..

Source: NWCS 2005-2010

Block 3 Health and well-being of workers- Security of work environment

Question 3.1: Please provide available information (research, official reports etc.) on the health and well-being of workers in the sector (i.e. within the last five years)

General health, work absenteeism and work accidents.

General health and work absenteeism are more favourable in the retail sector (better general health and less absenteeism) than in other sectors. The trend is the same in all sectors. The percentage of workers who experienced a work accident declined steadily from 2.0% in 2005 to 1.5% in 2010, while in other sectors this percentage remained fairly stable at about 2.5%. However, the decline in the retail sector was not significant.

Psychological health and burn out

The favourable health situation in the retail sector is also reflected in the number of employees with a chronic disease. For psychological complaints the numbers are diverse. The number of workers with a chronic psychological disease is slightly lower in retail than in other sectors. However, these complaints are on a rise, especially in the retail sector. In 2005 the percentage of workers in retail with a psychological disease was substantially lower than in other sectors, but in 2010 there is almost no difference between the sectors. However in the same period absenteeism due to psychological complaints declined. Burnout is also less common in retail than in other sectors, and there is no clear trend within the retail sector, but a rise in the number of workers with burn-out complaints in general (Table 6).

		Year					
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
N:		23.275	23.961	22.700	21.960	22.651	23.693
%:		17%	17%	16%	16%	16%	17%
General health [% good-excellent]	· no retail	89,8% ▼ ▼	89,9% ▼	91,5% ▲ ▲▲	90,9% ▲ ▲	90,4%	89,7% ▼ ▼▼
	· retail (SBI93=52)	90,6%	89,3% ▼	90,7%	89,7%	92,2% ▲ ▲	91,4%
Sickness absence	· no retail	4,77 ▲▲ ▲	4,53 ▲	4,19	4,16 ▼	4,08 ▼▼	4,25
	· retail (SBI93=52)	4,76 ▲▲	4,07	4,12	3,90	3,52	3,57

	2)						
Work accident with physical or mental injury and at least 4 days of absence (Eurostat definition)	· no retail 125814	2,5%	2,3%▼	2,7%	2,7%	2,6%	2,7%
	· retail (SBI93=5 2)	2,1%	2,3%	2,2%	2,3%	1,4%	1,5%
Work disability	No retail	18,1%	18,5%	17,8%	18,0%	18,3%	19,8%
	retail (SBI93=5 2)]	18,1%	18,8%	18,3%	20,1%	17,7%	18,7%
No chronic condition	· no retail	66,0%▲ ▲▲	64,3% ▲▲	64,7%▲ ▲▲	63,0%	61,7%▼ ▼▼	61,0%▼ ▼▼
	· retail (SBI93=5 2)	68,3%▲ ▲	64,3%	65,1%	63,8%	64,0%	66,3%
Problems with arms or hands	· no retail	5,7%	6,1%▲ ▲	5,4%	5,5%	5,4%	5,7%
	· retail (SBI93=5 2)	5,4%	5,2%	5,9%	5,4%	5,0%	4,9%
Problems with legs of feet	· no retail	4,8%▼	5,0%	4,3%▼▼ ▼	5,8%▲ ▲▲	6,0%▲▲ ▲	5,2%
	· retail (SBI93=5 2)	4,8%	4,7%	4,6%	6,1%▲	5,7%	4,7%
Problems with back or neck	· no retail	10,8%	10,9%	9,9%▼▼ ▼	10,3%	10,7%	11,2%▲ ▲
	· retail (SBI93=5 2)	10,6%	10,9%	9,6%	9,2%	9,7%	9,2%
Migraine or serious headache	· no retail	5,3%	5,1%▼ ▼	5,4%	5,4%	5,6%	6,1%▲▲ ▲
	· retail	5,6%	6,9%	7,0%	6,6%	5,5%	5,5%

	(SBI93=5 2)						
Cardiovascular diseases	· no retail	2,7% ▼	3,0%	2,6% ▼	2,7% ▼	3,3% ▲ ▲ ▲	3,1% ▲
	· retail (SBI93=5 2)	1,9%	1,4%	1,4%	2,2%	1,5%	2,2%
Asthma, bronchitis, emphysema	· no retail	5,0%	5,4%	5,2%	5,2%	5,3%	5,4%
	· retail (SBI93=5 2)	5,8%	5,0%	5,4%	6,0%	6,4%	5,7%
Intestinal problems	· no retail	3,6%	3,4%	3,4%	3,6%	3,8%	4,0% ▲ ▲
	· retail (SBI93=5 2)	3,0%	2,9%	3,3%	3,3%	3,4%	3,6%
Diabetes	· no retail	1,8% ▼ ▼	2,0%	2,1%	2,1%	2,4% ▲ ▲	2,2%
	· retail (SBI93=5 2)	0,9%	1,0%	1,3%	1,3%	1,3%	0,9%
Serious skin disease	· no retail	1,0% ▲	0,8%	0,8%	0,8% ▼	1,0%	0,9%
	· retail (SBI93=5 2)	0,5%	1,2% ▲	0,6%	0,5%	0,9%	0,8%
Psychological complaints/disease	· no retail	2,0% ▼ ▼ ▼	2,4%	2,4%	2,4%	3,1% ▲ ▲ ▲	3,1% ▲ ▲ ▲
	· retail (SBI93=5 2)	1,8% ▼	2,0%	2,6%	2,6%	3,7% ▲ ▲ ▲	2,4%
Hearing problems	· no retail	1,6% ▼ ▼ ▼	2,2%	2,3%	2,3%	2,3%	2,3%
	· retail (SBI93=5 2)	1,0%	1,3%	1,3%	1,4%	1,7%	1,0%
Epilepsy	· no retail	0,3% ▼ ▼	0,4%	0,4%	0,3%	0,5% ▲ ▲ ▲	0,4%
	· retail (SBI93=5 2)	0,3%	0,3%	0,3%	0,5%	0,5%	0,4%
Life	· no retail	0,5% ▼ ▼	0,7%	0,8%	0,7%	0,7%	0,8% ▲ ▲

threatening diseases		▼					
	· retail (SBI93=52)	0,5%	0,4%	0,3%	0,9%▲	0,5%	0,5%
Problems with vision	· no retail	--	1,9%	2,1%	2,1%	2,1%	2,0%
	· retail (SBI93=52)	--	1,2%	1,3%	1,6%	1,4%	1,4%
Other chronic conditions	· no retail	5,7%	6,0%	5,5%▼	5,9%	5,9%	6,4%▲▲▲
	· retail (SBI93=52)	4,9%▼	7,4%▲	5,9%	6,0%	6,6%	5,9%
Burnout	no retail	--	--	11,4%▼▼▼	12,5%	12,8%	13,5%▲▲▲
	· retail (SBI93=52)	--	--	9,4%	11,9%▲▲	10,4%	9,0%▼

Percentages are column percentages, and are tested with the Pearson Chi-square test (horizontal comparisons). Means are tested with the t-test (horizontal comparisons). The contrast is: 'year' vs 'other years'. ▲: $p < 0,05$ (and ▼): significantly high (low) percentages and/or means.

Source: NWCS 2005-2010

Interactions between organizational factors and work-related diseases in the sector, especially mental ones

While mental diseases are relatively scarce in the retail sector (see above) work-related mental diseases are even less common. In 2010 about 10% of the psychological complaints was considered to be (partly) work related. In other sectors this was 23%. Work related psychological complaints are found more often among workers with a fixed contract. Neither in the retail sector, nor in the general population there significant differences in the prevalence of psychological complaints between different company sizes. For absenteeism due to (work related) psychological complaint a similar picture is found. Workers in retail less often than workers in general state that this was (partly) work related. Although absenteeism is more often considered to be work related than complaints.

Table 7: Work related psychological complaints							
Table Summary – Work-related psychological complaints in retail and in the other sectors since 2005							
		Year					
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
N:		1.010	1.007	885	877	704	805

%:		19%	19%	17%	17%	13%	15%
Psychological complaints							
Not Work related	· no retail	--	75,1%	70,2%	78,4%	78,0%	77,3%
Work related		--	24,9%	29,8%	21,6%	22,0%	22,7%
Psychological complaints							
Not Work related	· retail (SBI93=52)	--	81,0%	79,2%	86,6%	86,2%	89,5%
Work related		--	19,0%	20,8%	13,4%	13,8%	10,5%
Absenteeism due to tiredness or concentration problems							
Not Work related	· no retail		45,7%	41,0%	38,8%	40,7%	42,4%
Work related			54,3%	59,0%	61,2%	59,3%	56,0%
Absenteeism due to tiredness or concentration problems							
Not Work related	· retail (SBI93=52)		62,4%	84,7%	58,9%	53,5%	75,0%
Work related			37,6%	15,3%	41,1%	46,5%	25,0%
Absenteeism due to psychological problems							
Not Work related	· no retail		27,1%	31,3%	29,5%	33,3%	26,7%
Work related			72,9%	68,7%	70,5%	66,7%	73,3%
Absenteeism due to psychological problems							
Not Work related	· retail (SBI93=52)		41,5%	40,9%	34,8%	33,6%	42,1%
Work related			58,5%	59,1%	65,2%	66,4%	57,9%
<p><i>Percentages are column percentages, and are tested with the Pearson Chi-square test (horizontal comparisons). Means are tested with the t-test (horizontal comparisons). The contrast is: 'year' vs 'other years'. ▲: p<0,05 (and ▼): significantly high (low) percentages and/or means.</i></p>							

Source: NWCS 2005-2010

Table 8: Work related psychological complaints by contract and company size						
Table Summary – Work-related psychological complaints in retail and in the other sectors by contract and company in 2010						
		contract		Company size		
		· fixed term	· other	· <10 employees	· 10-99 employees	· 100+ employees
N:		4.365	872	692	2.153	2.329
%:		83%	17%	13%	42%	45%
Psychological	· no retail					

complaints						
Not Work related		74,2%	81,5%	78,7%	74,3%	76,8%
Work related		25,8%	18,5%	21,3%	25,7%	23,2%
Psychological complaints	· retail					
Not Work related	(SBI93=52)	81,9%	92,4%	81,7%	87,4%	79,5%
Work related		18,1%	7,6%	18,3%	12,6%	20,5%
Absenteeism due to tiredness or concentration problems	· no retail					
Not Work related		40,0%	51,2%	45,6%	42,2%	40,9%
Work related		60,0%	48,8%	54,4%	57,8%	59,1%
Absenteeism due to tiredness or concentration problems	· retail					
Not Work related	(SBI93=52)	61,0%	74,8%	59,9%	71,9%	58,2%
Work related		39,0%	25,2%	40,1%	28,1%	41,8%
Absenteeism due to psychological problems	· no retail					
Not Work related		28,8%▼	32,9%Δ	30,4%	28,7%	29,6%
Work related		71,2%Δ	67,1%▼	69,6%	71,3%	70,4%
Absenteeism due to psychological problems	· retail					
Not Work related	(SBI93=52)	37,6%	46,7%	44,0%	37,2%	32,4%
Work related		62,4%	53,3%	56,0%	62,8%	67,6%

Percentages are column percentages, and are tested with the Pearson Chi-square test (horizontal comparisons). Means are tested with the t-test (horizontal comparisons). The contrast is: 'year' vs 'other years'. ▲: $p < 0,05$ (and ▼): significantly high (low) percentages and/or means.

Source: NWCS 2010

Emotionally demanding work.

Work in retail sector generally is less demanding than in other sectors. Furthermore, the trend is that the work is becoming less emotionally demanding. While in the other sectors there is no clear trend.

Table 9: Emotionally demanding work

		Year					
		2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
N:		--	--	22.529	21.245	22.615	23.647
%:				25%	24%	25%	26%
Emotionally demanding work (scale 1=never - 4=always; 3 items)	no retail	--	--	1,73	1,69	1,71	1,71
Emotionally demanding work (scale 1=never - 4=always; 3 items)	retail (SBI93=52)	--	--	1,51	1,49	1,42	1,43 ▼

Percentages are column percentages, and are tested with the Pearson Chi-square test (horizontal comparisons). Means are tested with the t-test (horizontal comparisons). The contrast is: 'year' vs 'other years'. ▲: p<0,05 (and ▼): significantly high (low) percentages and/or means.

Source: NWCS 2005-2010

Question 3.2: Please report on risk factors for physical health and especially psychological health stemming from a non-safe work-environment: (e.g. customers' violence, harassment, robberies, video surveillance etc). (i.e. within the last five years):

The retail sector does worse on the traditional ergonomic risk factors than other sectors. Especially the use of force, uncomfortable working postures and repetitive movements occur more often. However Visual Display Unit (VDU) work is less common. Working with substances occurs slightly more often. Dangerous work is less common in retail than in other sectors. Regarding exposure to psychosocial risk factors the sector shows a positive image. Exposure to negative psychosocial risk factors is less than in other sectors. Exception is unwanted behaviour from third parties (ie. not colleagues etc). Intimidation, bullying as well as physical violence by third parties are all more common. Age discrimination is also more common in retail.

	• no retail	• retail (SBI93=52)
N:	21.492	2.192
%:	91%	9,3%
Physical risk factors		
Applying force		
• Yes often	20,3% ▼▼▼	33,3% ▲▲▲
• Yes sometimes	21,2% ▼▼▼	37,5% ▲▲▲
• No	58,5% ▲▲▲	29,2% ▼▼▼

Vibrating tools or machinery		
· Yes often	10,0%▲▲▲	6,3%▼▼▼
· Yes sometimes	9,3%	8,4%
· No	80,7%▼▼▼	85,3%▲▲▲
Uncomfortable working postures		
· Yes often	10,2%	9,8%
· Yes sometimes	27,7%▼▼▼	35,8%▲▲▲
· No	62,1%▲▲▲	54,3%▼▼▼
Repetitive movements		
· Yes often	35,1%▼▼▼	47,4%▲▲▲
· Yes sometimes	22,8%▼▼▼	26,8%▲▲▲
· No	42,2%▲▲▲	25,8%▼▼▼
Noise		
· Yes often	7,1%▲▲▲	2,5%▼▼▼
· Yes sometimes	19,7%▲▲▲	12,5%▼▼▼
· No	73,2%▼▼▼	85,1%▲▲▲
VDU work (hours per day)	3,94▲▲▲	2,21▼▼▼
Working with water or watery substances		
· Never	68,6%▲▲▲	64,5%▼▼▼
· sometimes	14,3%▼▼▼	22,6%▲▲▲
· Often	9,5%▲	8,0%▼
· Always	7,5%▲▲▲	4,9%▼▼▼
Substances on the skin		
· Never	69,5%▲▲▲	60,2%▼▼▼
· sometimes	20,5%▼▼▼	31,2%▲▲▲
· Often	6,6%	5,7%
· Always	3,4%	2,9%
Breathing in substances		
· Never	73,7%▼▼▼	85,2%▲▲▲
· sometimes	17,7%▲▲▲	11,8%▼▼▼
· Often	5,8%▲▲▲	2,0%▼▼▼
· Always	2,8%▲▲▲	1,1%▼▼▼
Contact with infectious persons or materials		
· Never	73,2%	72,9%
· sometimes	21,0%	20,6%
· Often	4,1%	4,2%
· Always	1,7%▼	2,3%▲
Dangerous work		

· Yes often	4,6% ▲▲▲	1,4% ▼▼▼
· Yes sometimes	19,7% ▲▲▲	15,6% ▼▼▼
· No	75,6% ▼▼▼	83,0% ▲▲▲
Psychosocial risk factors		
Autonomy (scale : 1=little -3=much; 5 items)	2,51 ▲▲▲	2,27 ▼▼▼
Time pressure (scale: 1=no - 3=yes often; 2 items)	2,20 ▲▲▲	2,04 ▼▼▼
Demands (scale: 1=never - 4=always; 4 items)	2,34 ▲▲▲	2,20 ▼▼▼
Difficult work (scale: 1=never - 4=always; 3 items)	3,04 ▲▲▲	2,58 ▼▼▼
Varied work (scale: 1=never - 4=always; 4 items)	2,77 ▲▲▲	2,47 ▼▼▼
Social support supervisor (scale: 1=little - 4=much support)	2,85 ▼▼▼	2,92 ▲▲▲
Social support colleagues (scale: 1=little - 4=much support)	3,24 ▼▼▼	3,28 ▲▲▲
Violent behaviour from third party		
· No never	77,8% ▲▲▲	67,2% ▼▼▼
· Yes sometimes of more frequently	22,2% ▼▼▼	32,8% ▲▲▲
Violent behaviour/harassment by colleagues etc.		
· No never	85,2%	85,5%
· Yes sometimes of more frequently	14,8%	14,5%
Unwanted sexual attention from third party		
· No never	95,2% ▲▲▲	93,0% ▼▼▼
· Yes sometimes	4,5% ▼▼▼	6,5% ▲▲▲
· Yes often	0,3%	0,4%
· Yes very often	0,0%	0,1%
Unwanted sexual attention from colleagues etc		
· No never	98,3%	97,9%
· Yes sometimes	1,6%	1,8%
· Yes often	0,1% ▼	0,3% ▲
· Yes very often	0,0%	0%
Intimidation by third party		
· No never	82,6% ▲▲▲	72,7% ▼▼▼
· Yes sometimes	15,4% ▼▼▼	25,0% ▲▲▲
· Yes often	1,8%	2,0%
· Yes very often	0,3%	0,3%
Intimidation by colleagues etc		

· No never	90,0% ▼	91,4% ▲
· Yes sometimes	8,8% ▲	7,5% ▼
· Yes often	1,0%	0,7%
· Yes very often	0,3%	0,4%
Physical violence by third party		
· No never	93,7% ▼▼▼	96,4% ▲▲▲
· Yes sometimes	5,3% ▲▲▲	3,2% ▼▼▼
· Yes often	0,9% ▲▲	0,3% ▼▼
· Yes very often	0,2%	0,0%
Physical violence by colleagues etc		
· No never	99,5%	99,6%
· Yes sometimes	0,4%	0,3%
· Yes often	0,1%	0,0%
· Yes very often	0,0% ▼	0,1% ▲
Bullying by third party		
· No never	93,8% ▲▲▲	90,3% ▼▼▼
· Yes sometimes	5,4% ▼▼▼	8,5% ▲▲▲
· Yes often	0,7%	1,1%
· Yes very often	0,2%	0,1%
Bullying by colleagues etc		
· No never	92,9%	91,9%
· Yes sometimes	6,0% ▼	7,0% ▲
· Yes often	0,8%	0,8%
· Yes very often	0,3%	0,3%
Gender discrimination		
· Yes often	1,9%	2,5%
· Yes sometimes	9,3% ▲▲▲	6,2% ▼▼▼
· No	88,8% ▼▼▼	91,4% ▲▲▲
Racial discrimination		
· Yes often	1,8%	1,9%
· Yes sometimes	9,2% ▲▲▲	6,4% ▼▼▼
· No	89,0% ▼▼▼	91,7% ▲▲▲
Discrimination by religion		
· Yes often	1,7%	1,9%
· Yes sometimes	7,4% ▲▲▲	5,4% ▼▼▼
· No	90,9% ▼▼	92,7% ▲▲
Discrimination by sexual preference		
· Yes often	1,3%	1,6%

· Yes sometimes	5,4%▲	4,2%▼
· No	93,3%	94,2%
Age discrimination		
· Yes often	2,2%▼▼▼	7,0%▲▲▲
· Yes sometimes	11,1%▼▼▼	13,5%▲▲▲
· No	86,7%▲▲▲	79,5%▼▼▼
<p><i>Percentages are column percentages, and are tested with the Pearson Chi-square test (horizontal comparisons). Means are tested with the t-test (horizontal comparisons). The contrast is: 'subgroup' vs 'other cases'. ▲: p<0,05, ▲▲: p<0,01, ▲▲▲: p<0,001 (and ▼): significantly high (low) percentages and/or means. Symbols are based on significance only, not on Effect Size.</i></p>		

Source: NWCS 2010

Dangerous work occurs more often among the intermediate or high educated, men and in large companies. For unwanted behaviour no large differences exist between workers of different background, different educational levels or company size. Men appear to be exposed to bullying and physical violence, while women are more often exposed to sexual harassment. Workers of non western origin more often report being exposed to all types of discrimination.

	Background			Gender	
	National	· Western (not Dutch) origin	· Non western Origin	· Female	· Male
N:	1.826	149	217	1.411	784
%:	83%	6,8%	9,9%	64%	36%
Physical risk factors					
Applying force					
· Yes often	34,0%	28,9%	31,0%	28,1%▼▼▼	42,7%▲▲▲
· Yes sometimes	37,4%	44,0%	33,1%	39,6%▲▲	33,6%▼▼
· No	28,6%	27,1%	35,9%▲	32,3%▲▲▲	23,7%▼▼▼
Vibrating tools or machinery					
· Yes often	6,4%	5,4%	6,5%	3,7%▼▼▼	10,9%▲▲▲
· Yes sometimes	7,4%▼▼▼	9,8%	15,4%▲▲▲	6,0%▼▼▼	12,4%▲▲▲
· No	86,2%▲▲	84,9%	78,2%▼▼	90,2%▲▲▲	76,7%▼▼▼
Uncomfortable working postures					

• Yes often	9,8%	10,6%	9,5%	10,0%	9,6%
• Yes sometimes	37,3%▲▲	33,5%	24,8%▼▼▼	33,9%▼	39,4%▲
• No	52,9%▼▼	55,9%	65,7%▲▲▲	56,1%▲	51,0%▼
Repetitive movements					
• Yes often	47,2%	51,7%	46,1%	49,5%▲▲	43,5%▼▼
• Yes sometimes	27,1%	20,3%	28,7%	25,3%▼	29,5%▲
• No	25,7%	28,0%	25,1%	25,1%	26,9%
Noise					
• Yes often	2,5%	0,8%	3,1%	2,2%	3,0%
• Yes sometimes	12,1%	13,9%	14,3%	10,1%▼▼▼	16,7%▲▲▲
• No	85,3%	85,3%	82,7%	87,7%▲▲▲	80,4%▼▼▼
VDU work (hours per day)	2,13▼▼	2,24	2,86▲▲▲	2,36▲▲▲	1,93▼▼▼
Working with water or watery substances					
• Never	64,0%	66,1%	67,5%	62,4%▼▼	68,1%▲▲
• sometimes	23,0%	20,3%	20,8%	21,9%	24,0%
• Often	8,3%	7,2%	6,1%	9,5%▲▲▲	5,3%▼▼▼
• Always	4,7%	6,4%	5,7%	6,2%▲▲▲	2,6%▼▼▼
Substances on the skin					
• Never	60,1%	61,5%	59,5%	58,3%▼	63,4%▲
• sometimes	30,9%	29,1%	35,2%	30,7%	32,0%
• Often	6,2%▲	3,3%	3,4%	7,3%▲▲▲	2,8%▼▼▼
• Always	2,8%	6,1%▲	1,9%	3,6%▲	1,8%▼
Breathing in substances					
• Never	84,9%	82,8%	89,5%	88,3%▲▲▲	79,6%▼▼▼
• sometimes	12,0%	12,9%	8,9%	9,3%▼▼▼	16,2%▲▲▲
• Often	2,2%	1,1%	0,7%	1,6%	2,6%
• Always	0,9%	3,2%▲	1,0%	0,8%	1,7%
Contact with infectious persons or materials					
• Never	72,4%	73,6%	76,8%	71,5%▼	75,5%▲
• sometimes	20,9%	22,0%	16,8%	21,7%	18,5%
• Often	4,1%	1,6%	6,4%	4,4%	3,8%
• Always	2,6%	2,8%	0%▼	2,4%	2,2%

Dangerous work					
• Yes often	1,2%	1,7%	2,8%	1,2%	1,7%
• Yes sometimes	16,1%	17,7%	10,0% ▼	12,9% ▼▼▼	20,3% ▲▲▲
• No	82,7%	80,6%	87,2%	85,8% ▲▲▲	78,0% ▼▼▼
Psychosocial risk factors					
Autonomy (scale : 1=little -3=much; 5 items)	2,29 ▲▲▲	2,25	2,14 ▼▼▼	2,22 ▼▼▼	2,36 ▲▲▲
Time pressure (scale: 1=no - 3=yes often; 2 items)	2,03	2,09	2,03	2,00 ▼▼	2,10 ▲▲
Demands (scale: 1=never - 4=always; 4 items)	2,19	2,24	2,20	2,19	2,21
Difficult work (scale: 1=never - 4=always; 3 items)	2,59	2,56	2,49	2,60 ▲	2,54 ▼
Varied work (scale: 1=never - 4=always; 4 items)	2,50 ▲▲▲	2,32 ▼▼	2,34 ▼▼	2,50 ▲	2,43 ▼
Social support supervisor (scale: 1=little - 4=much support)	2,93	2,84	2,92	2,92	2,92
Social support colleagues (scale: 1=little - 4=much support)	3,30 ▲▲▲	3,25	3,11 ▼▼▼	3,29	3,25
Unwanted behaviour from third party					
• No never	67,9%	65,9%	62,2%	66,2%	69,0%
• Yes sometimes of more frequently	32,1%	34,1%	37,8%	33,8%	31,0%
Unwanted behaviour by colleagues etc.					
• No never	85,8%	88,3%	80,7% ▼	87,6% ▲▲▲	81,7% ▼▼▼
• Yes sometimes of more frequently	14,2%	11,7%	19,3% ▲	12,4% ▼▼▼	18,3% ▲▲▲
Unwanted sexual					

attention from third party					
• No never	93,9%▲▲▲	94,7%	83,3%▼▼▼	91,5%▼▼▼	95,5%▲▲▲
• Yes sometimes	5,6%▼▼▼	5,3%	15,7%▲▲▲	7,9%▲▲▲	4,1%▼▼▼
• Yes often	0,4%	0%	1,0%	0,6%	0,2%
• Yes very often	0,1%	0%	0%	0%	0,2%
Unwanted sexual attention from colleagues etc					
• No never	97,9%	98,5%	97,2%	98,0%	97,7%
• Yes sometimes	1,9%	1,5%	1,8%	1,6%	2,2%
• Yes often	0,2%	0%	1,0%▲	0,4%	0,1%
• Yes very often					
Intimidation by third party	72,3%	71,7%	76,7%	72,7%	72,6%
• No never	25,5%	25,2%	20,7%	25,5%	24,2%
• Yes sometimes	1,9%	2,3%	2,6%	1,6%	2,7%
• Yes often	0,3%	0,8%	0%	0,3%	0,4%
• Yes very often					
Intimidation by colleagues etc	91,6%	89,9%	91,4%	92,9%▲▲▲	88,7%▼▼▼
• No never	7,4%	7,6%	8,0%	6,2%▼▼	9,8%▲▲
• Yes sometimes	0,7%	0,8%	0,6%	0,7%	0,6%
• Yes often	0,3%	1,7%▲▲	0%	0,1%▼▼	0,9%▲▲
• Yes very often					
Physical violence by third party	96,2%	96,9%	98,0%	97,5%▲▲▲	94,3%▼▼▼
• No never	3,5%	1,7%	2,0%	2,5%▼▼	4,6%▲▲
• Yes sometimes	0,3%	1,4%▲	0%	0%▼▼▼	1,0%▲▲▲
• Yes often	0,1%	0%	0%	0%	0,1%
• Yes very often					
Physical violence by colleagues etc	99,5%	100%	100%	99,7%	99,4%
• No never	0,3%	0%	0%	0,2%	0,3%
• Yes sometimes	0,1%	0%	0%	0%	0,1%
• Yes often	0,2%	0%	0%	0,1%	0,2%
• Yes very often					
Bullying by third party	91,5%▲▲▲	88,8%	81,6%▼▼▼	90,1%	90,8%
• No never	7,6%▼▼▼	10,4%	14,8%▲▲▲	8,9%	7,8%

• Yes sometimes	0,8%▼	0%	3,7%▲▲▲	0,9%	1,3%
• Yes often	0,1%	0,8%▲	0%	0,1%	0,2%
• Yes very often					
Bullying by colleagues etc	92,1%	95,3%	87,2%▼▼	92,3%	91,0%
• No never	7,0%	2,2%▼	10,7%▲	6,8%	7,4%
• Yes sometimes	0,7%	0,8%	2,2%▲	0,8%	1,0%
• Yes often	0,2%	1,7%▲▲	0%	0,1%▼	0,7%▲
• Yes very often					
Gender discrimination	2,5%	3,4%	1,7%	2,0%	3,2%
• Yes often	5,1%▼▼▼	9,1%	13,2%▲▲▲	5,9%	6,7%
• Yes sometimes	92,4%▲▲▲	87,5%	85,1%▼▼▼	92,1%	90,1%
• No					
Racial discrimination	1,9%	0%	2,8%	1,2%▼▼▼	3,2%▲▲▲
• Yes often	5,3%▼▼▼	8,9%	13,7%▲▲▲	6,4%	6,3%
• Yes sometimes	92,8%▲▲▲	91,1%	83,5%▼▼▼	92,4%	90,4%
• No					
Discrimination by religion	1,7%	0%	5,2%▲▲▲	1,2%▼▼	3,1%▲▲
• Yes often	4,7%▼▼	10,1%▲▲	7,6%	4,3%▼▼	7,3%▲▲
• Yes sometimes	93,6%▲▲▲	89,9%	87,3%▼▼	94,5%▲▲▲	89,6%▼▼▼
• No					
Discrimination by sexual preference	1,7%	0%	1,7%	1,1%▼	2,5%▲
• Yes often	4,3%	5,1%	3,2%	2,2%▼▼▼	7,9%▲▲▲
• Yes sometimes	94,0%	94,9%	95,1%	96,7%▲▲▲	89,7%▼▼▼
• No					
Age discrimination	6,2%▼▼▼	8,9%	12,6%▲▲▲	5,7%▼▼	9,4%▲▲
• Yes often	13,5%	19,2%▲	10,5%	13,7%	13,3%
• Yes sometimes	80,4%▲	71,8%▼	76,9%	80,7%	77,3%

Source: NWCS 2010

Table 10b: Risk factors for physical and mental health by education and company size
Table Summary Risk factors for physical and mental health by education and company size in the retail sector

	Educational level	Company size
--	-------------------	--------------

	Low	Intermediate	High	· <10 employees	· 10-99 employees	· 100+ employees
N:	982	1.013	182	655	1.094	406
%:	45%	47%	8,4%	30%	51%	19%
Physical risk factors						
Applying force						
· Yes often	35,6%▲	34,3%	16,2%▼▼ ▼	25,8%▼▼ ▼	36,4%▲▲	37,6%▲
· Yes sometimes	38,5%	37,6%	30,5%▼	44,2%▲▲ ▲	35,1%▼	32,3%▼
· No	25,9%▼▼	28,0%	53,3%▲▲ ▲	30,0%	28,5%	30,1%
Vibrating tools or machinery						
· Yes often	7,5%▲	6,0%	1,8%▼▼	4,7%▼	6,5%	8,5%▲
· Yes sometimes	8,0%	8,8%	6,3%	8,2%	7,2%	10,7%▲
· No	84,4%	85,1%	91,9%▲	87,1%	86,3%	80,8%▼▼
Uncomfortable working postures						
· Yes often	10,9%	9,6%	6,1%	8,0%	10,1%	11,2%
· Yes sometimes	37,6%	36,0%	27,5%▼	31,2%▼▼	38,6%▲	36,7%
· No	51,5%▼	54,4%	66,4%▲▲ ▲	60,8%▲▲ ▲	51,3%▼▼	52,1%
Repetitive movements						
· Yes often	52,8%▲▲ ▲	46,2%	25,1%▼▼ ▼	33,8%▼▼ ▼	53,0%▲▲ ▲	53,5%▲▲
· Yes sometimes	25,7%	26,9%	32,4%	30,6%▲	26,0%	23,5%
· No	21,5%▼▼ ▼	26,9%	42,5%▲▲ ▲	35,6%▲▲ ▲	21,0%▼▼ ▼	23,0%
Noise						
· Yes often	3,0%	2,1%	2,0%	2,4%	2,7%	2,2%
· Yes sometimes	13,4%	12,2%	9,8%	6,7%▼▼ ▼	14,1%▲	17,3%▲▲ ▲
· No	83,6%	85,7%	88,2%	90,9%▲▲ ▲	83,2%▼	80,5%▼▼
VDU work (hours per day)	1,75▼▼ ▼	2,35▲	3,83▲▲ ▲	2,09	2,25	2,33
Working with water or watery						

substances						
· Never	66,0%	61,2%▼▼	72,5%▲	59,3%▼▼ ▼	65,3%	71,7%▲▲
· sometimes	20,5%▼	25,2%▲	20,9%	22,8%	22,9%	20,0%
· Often	8,0%	8,6%	5,0%	10,0%▲	7,9%	5,1%▼
· Always	5,5%	5,0%	1,7%▼	7,8%▲▲ ▲	3,9%▼	3,2%
Substances on the skin						
· Never	62,6%▲	55,3%▼▼ ▼	72,3%▲▲ ▲	56,9%▼	59,0%	68,8%▲▲ ▲
· sometimes	28,3%▼▼	35,7%▲▲ ▲	22,7%▼▼	33,1%	33,0%	22,8%▼▼ ▼
· Often	5,6%	6,2%	3,9%	5,6%	6,0%	5,2%
· Always	3,4%	2,8%	1,1%	4,4%▲▲	2,0%▼▼	3,2%
Breathing in substances						
· Never	88,2%▲▲ ▲	82,5%▼▼	83,3%	82,5%▼	85,3%	89,8%▲▲
· sometimes	9,0%▼▼ ▼	14,0%▲▲	14,2%	13,7%▲	11,9%	7,2%▼▼
· Often	1,8%	2,1%	2,1%	2,2%	2,1%	1,4%
· Always	1,0%	1,4%	0,4%	1,6%	0,7%	1,6%
Contact with infectious persons or materials						
· Never	74,9%	71,2%	71,4%	73,9%	72,1%	74,5%
· sometimes	19,0%	21,8%	22,1%	20,6%	20,3%	19,4%
· Often	4,2%	4,2%	4,2%	3,3%	4,9%	4,0%
· Always	1,9%	2,8%	2,3%	2,2%	2,6%	2,1%
Dangerous work						
· Yes often	0,6%▼▼	2,1%▲▲	1,8%	1,2%	0,9%▼	3,5%▲▲ ▲
· Yes sometimes	14,3%	18,1%▲▲	9,4%▼	10,7%▼▼ ▼	17,8%▲▲	17,2%
· No	85,1%▲	79,7%▼▼ ▼	88,8%▲	88,1%▲▲ ▲	81,3%▼	79,3%▼
Psychosocial risk factors						
Autonomy (scale : 1=little -3=much; ▼	2,19▼▼ ▼	2,31▲▲	2,52▲▲ ▲	2,37▲▲ ▲	2,24▼▼ ▼	2,24

5 items)						
Time pressure (scale: 1=no - 3=yes often; 2 items)	1,98 ▼▼ ▼	2,06	2,22 ▲▲ ▲	1,89 ▼▼ ▼	2,08 ▲▲	2,18 ▲▲ ▲
Demands (scale: 1=never - 4=always; 4 items)	2,13 ▼▼ ▼	2,24 ▲▲	2,34 ▲▲ ▲	2,09 ▼▼ ▼	2,22	2,32 ▲▲ ▲
Difficult work (scale: 1=never - 4=always; 3 items)	2,49 ▼▼ ▼	2,61	2,93 ▲▲ ▲	2,63 ▲	2,56	2,53
Varied work (scale: 1=never - 4=always; 4 items)	2,41 ▼▼ ▼	2,49	2,72 ▲▲ ▲	2,67 ▲▲ ▲	2,43 ▼	2,27 ▼▼ ▼
Social support supervisor (scale: 1=little - 4=much support)	2,96 ▲▲	2,88 ▼▼	2,92	2,95	2,92	2,87
Social support colleagues (scale: 1=little - 4=much support)	3,27	3,29	3,30	3,33 ▲▲	3,28	3,20 ▼▼ ▼
Violent behaviour from third party						
• No never	73,7% ▲▲ ▲	61,1% ▼▼ ▼	64,6%	69,0%	64,5% ▼	70,5%
• Yes sometimes of more frequently	26,3% ▼▼ ▼	38,9% ▲▲ ▲	35,4%	31,0%	35,5% ▲	29,5%
Violent behaviour/harassment by colleagues etc.						
• No never	86,0%	84,8%	86,0%	86,5%	85,2%	83,8%
• Yes sometimes of more frequently	14,0%	15,2%	14,0%	13,5%	14,8%	16,2%
Unwanted sexual attention from third party						
• No never	93,8%	91,6% ▼	95,8%	92,7%	91,9%	95,8% ▲
• Yes sometimes	5,8%	7,7% ▲	3,9%	7,0%	7,3%	4,2% ▼

• Yes often	0,4%	0,5%	0,2%	0,1%	0,8%▲▲	0%
• Yes very often	0%	0,2%	0%	0,2%	0%	0%
Unwanted sexual attention from colleagues etc						
• No never	98,2%	97,5%	98,5%	97,9%	97,9%	97,7%
• Yes sometimes	1,7%	2,1%	1,3%	1,9%	1,7%	2,3%
• Yes often	0,1%	0,5%	0,2%	0,2%	0,4%	0%
• Yes very often						
Intimidation by third party	79,2%▲▲ ▲	67,0%▼▼ ▼	67,3%	73,0%	71,2%	75,9%
• No never	19,0%▼▼ ▼	30,1%▲▲ ▲	30,6%	25,8%	25,9%	21,4%
• Yes sometimes	1,4%	2,6%▲	1,4%	1,0%▼	2,5%	2,4%
• Yes often	0,3%	0,3%	0,7%	0,2%	0,5%	0,3%
• Yes very often						
Intimidation by colleagues etc	91,9%	91,3%	89,6%	91,7%	92,3%	88,7%▼
• No never	7,1%	7,7%	8,6%	7,2%	6,4%	10,9%▲▲
• Yes sometimes	0,5%	0,8%	1,0%	0,7%	0,8%	0,4%
• Yes often	0,4%	0,3%	0,7%	0,4%	0,5%	0%
• Yes very often						
Physical violence by third party	97,0%	95,9%	95,1%	98,2%▲▲	95,5%▼	95,5%
• No never	2,6%	3,6%	4,9%	1,7%▼▼	4,0%	3,9%
• Yes sometimes	0,4%	0,3%	0%	0%	0,5%	0,5%
• Yes often	0%	0,1%	0%	0,2%	0%	0%
• Yes very often						
Physical violence by colleagues etc	99,9%▲	99,3%	99,4%	99,9%	99,4%	99,4%
• No never	0,1%	0,3%	0,6%	0,1%	0,2%	0,6%
• Yes sometimes	0%	0,1%	0%	0%	0,1%	0%
• Yes often	0%	0,3%	0%	0%	0,3%	0%
• Yes very often						
Bullying by third party	89,2%	90,8%	92,9%	92,5%▲	87,5%▼▼ ▼	93,4%▲
• No never	9,5%	8,0%	6,4%	7,4%	10,4%▲▲	6,1%▼
• Yes sometimes	1,3%	1,0%	0%	0,1%▼▼	1,8%▲▲ ▲	0,5%
• Yes often	0%	0,1%	0,7%▲	0%	0,3%	0%

• Yes very often						
Bullying by colleagues etc	90,6%▼	92,8%	94,0%	92,5%	91,3%	91,8%
• No never	8,7%▲▲	5,8%▼	4,4%	6,9%	7,2%	7,1%
• Yes sometimes	0,5%	1,2%	0,6%	0,2%▼	1,2%	1,0%
• Yes often	0,2%	0,3%	1,0%	0,3%	0,4%	0%
• Yes very often						
Gender discrimination	3,0%	1,9%	1,9%	3,4%▲	1,8%	2,4%
• Yes often	5,6%	6,3%	9,1%	5,1%	6,1%	8,2%
• Yes sometimes	91,3%	91,8%	89,0%	91,4%	92,1%	89,4%
• No						
Racial discrimination	2,6%▲	1,5%	0%	1,7%	2,0%	1,9%
• Yes often	5,7%	6,6%	7,9%	6,2%	5,3%▼	10,2%▲▲ ▲
• Yes sometimes	91,8%	91,9%	92,1%	92,2%	92,7%	88,0%▼▼
• No						
Discrimination by religion	2,8%▲▲	0,9%▼▼	1,9%	2,0%	2,1%	1,4%
• Yes often	5,6%	5,5%	3,1%	3,2%▼▼	5,1%	10,2%▲▲ ▲
• Yes sometimes	91,6%▼	93,6%	95,0%	94,8%▲▲	92,8%	88,4%▼▼ ▼
• No						
Discrimination by sexual preference	2,4%▲▲	0,9%▼	0,4%	2,0%	1,3%	1,6%
• Yes often	4,2%	4,5%	3,6%	1,4%▼▼ ▼	5,0%	7,1%▲▲
• Yes sometimes	93,4%	94,6%	96,0%	96,6%▲▲	93,7%	91,2%▼▼
• No						
Age discrimination	7,7%	7,0%	3,1%▼	4,6%▼▼	6,6%	12,2%▲▲ ▲
• Yes often	11,9%▼	15,4%▲	12,6%	10,2%▼▼	13,1%	20,6%▲▲ ▲
• Yes sometimes	80,5%	77,6%▼	84,3%	85,1%▲▲ ▲	80,3%	67,1%▼▼ ▼

Source: NWCS 2010

Block 4. Government and social partner initiatives

Question 4.1 Please illustrate the main actions/regulations with relevance for the retail sector, carried out by government authorities within the past 5 years at national, local or company level in order to promote career opportunities and employment security and to reduce health risks or promote a safer shopping environment in the sector. Please focus on the following aspects:

- Contractual arrangements, and transitions between them;
- Learning and training opportunities;
- Skills recognition and standardisation of job profiles;
- Working time arrangements;
- Psycho-social health risk factors (harassment, violence, etc. from customers and other people).
- Reducing stress and fostering the well-being of workers
- Usage of video surveillance systems
- Actions aimed at particular groups of employees or enterprises (e.g.: migrants, temporary employees, SMEs....)
- Any other aspects of relevance

There are many relevant actions for the retail sector, a number of examples are given below.

Working conditions

The OSH catalogues (see 1.2) aims at giving employers a guideline for reducing both physical and psychological work load in the sector. There is a general OSH catalogue for the retail sector. This deals with 3 themes that apply to all subsectors: physical load, aggression and violence and in company emergency response. The catalogue can be adapted to meet the specific needs of sub sectors. Several of these specified catalogues are approved by the labour inspectorate.

In 2006 the Labour Inspectorate conducted a special inspection on aggression and violence in retail companies. The results showed that employers often should put more effort in the prevention of violence. The conclusion was that more effort should be taken into (1) improving: education about the prevention of aggression and violence (2) better alarm systems, video surveillance or lighting in shops and near shop exits. Furthermore handling money and understaffing seemed to provoke violence and aggression.

Shop crime

Justice, police and retailers joined to strengthen their cooperation in order to reduce the number of robberies in the retail sector. This is evident from the 'Covenant Aanpak Winkelcriminaliteit deel 3' (Covenant Tackling Crime Shop Part 3), which was signed in March 2010. Over 500 robberies are committed yearly and this number rose with 50 robberies between 2007 and 2008. Both the government and the retailers are concerned about this increase, where other forms of retail crime decrease.

The new agreement allows considerably higher demands on the fight against crime in shops. For the target for 2010 is a 30% decrease compared tot 2004, while previously a 20% decrease was agreed upon. The police will record information about the robberies nationwide, and share that knowledge with the regional forces. This approach should decrease the number

of robberies. Furthermore a pilot is started where shoplifters are fined a basic fee of 151 euro's as a compensation for the indirect damage that a retailer suffers. And job applicants can be screened in a special designed register for previous dismissals due to theft or other serious offences. Finally in 2009 a nation wide system which retailers can see what people in their region have a a store prohibition or about whom the police warnings have spread.

Youth unemployment

In 2010, the 'small jobs' regulation was adapted. It includes an exemption from social security contributions and income-related contribution to the Insurance Act for employers for young people up to 23 years with a small job (less than 50% statutory minimum wage).. The aim was to contribute to the fight against youth unemployment. The adverse economic conditions played an important role. An evaluation of the rule showed that in the sectors studied (retail, catering, temporary nature, agriculture, welfare) less than half the employers knew of the regulation and only 8% of the companies that know the system has more people employed by the scheme.

Rules and regulations

A significant part of problems that restrict entrepreneurship in retail, is due to local pressure. Examples are the local licensing and municipal land-use planning, but also parking and rules regarding the supply of retailers. Entrepreneurs feel that at a local level little their interests are not taken into account sufficiently. The 'Actieplan detailhandel' (Retail Action Plan), which was started by the government in 2006 aimed at eliminating the bottlenecks for retail in the area of (local) rules and regulations, procurement, monitoring, consumer information statistics and copyright.

Illegal labour

In 2010 the labour inspectorate completed a program on illegal labour in the retail sector. In the program employers in several neighbourhoods were given information on illegal employment and underpayment. Subsequent verifications in these neighbourhoods showed that it were the less-informed firms who committed offences.

Question 4.2 Please illustrate the main actions carried out by social partners at national, local or company level within the past 5 years in order to promote career opportunities and employment security and to reduce health risks and to promote a safer shopping environment in the sector. These measures can be unilateral, bi- or tripartite and be of an ad-hoc manner, or carried out within established structures.

Social partnership initiatives on career opportunities and employment security, please focus on the following aspects, where available:

- Contractual arrangements, and transitions between them;
- Learning and training opportunities;
- Skills recognition and standardisation of job profiles;
- Working time arrangements;

- Actions aimed at particular groups of employees or enterprises (e.g.: migrants, temporary employees, SMEs....)
- Any other aspects, not mentioned here

Collective bargaining outputs

The average working hours per week (fulltime) did not change much in the previous decade (0,5% since 2000). However, the pay did rise with an on average 25% per hour in the 2000-2009 period (Statline). Furthermore, the sector often has agreements on additional payments on a yearly base ('13th month') or payments that are linked to the workers performance (Ministry of social affairs and employment 2010)

In 2003 and in 2007 collective labour agreements (cao's) were examined to see whether fulltime and parttime workers were treated differently in these agreements. The results showed that in 2003 58% of the CAO's in the sector Retail and Hotels and restaurants part time workers were partly exempted from the regulations. In 2007 this applied to 42% of the agreements. Furthermore, in 2003 specific regulations, such as payment of overtime work or training did not apply to parttime workers in 55% of the agreements. In 2007 this was reduced to 48% of the agreements (Wilms en Machiels-van Es, 2008, Pott et al, 2003).

Safety

The 'hoofdagentschap detailhandel' (HBD), which in 1956 was founded at the request of employer and employee organisations, among other things focuses on the fight against retail crime, working on the accessibility and attractiveness of shopping, provides sufficient and properly trained staff and encourages innovation and sustainability. The HBD is also the knowledge centre for retail. A recent and successful project is the quality mark secure business. In this project retailers police, fire and government cooperate on a long term base to enhance the safety of a shopping area. Every two years an evaluation and recertification place. The results show a reduction in crime after 2 years. (see www.hbd.nl)

Detailhandel Nederland (Retail Netherlands) is the umbrella organisation for all retail trade in the Netherlands. It focuses on a number of issues including the promotion of safe and efficient payment traffic, combating store robberies and theft, store accessibility and supplying, national and European legislation and the reduction of administrative burdens. Much attention is paid to the risks of cash payments. In the 2010/2011 position paper it is stated that it is aimed that consumers are able to make payments electronically at all conceivable points. Specifically, it is aimed to expand the number of ATMs to 270,000 by year-end 2012. The PIN code payments should grow from 1.7 billion transactions in 2008 to 2.7 billion in 2012.

Skills recognition

In 2009 the HBD introduced the 'beroepenwijzer' which gives an overview of jobs in the sector with the necessary education and possibilities for growth within jobs. Furthermore employees in retail are actively pointed at the possibility to obtain a so called 'experience certificate'. An experience certificate shows the skills one has obtained in a profession (i.e. without formal training) and in the end may even directly lead to a recognized diploma. These certificates are issued by several training institutes

Social partners' initiatives on health and well-being and a safer shopping environment, please focus on the following aspects, where available:

- Identification of health and safety risk factors from customers and other people (harassment, violence, etc.).
- Initiatives focused on stress prevention at work or fostering the well-being of employees
- Initiatives focused on assessing the risk, preventing the incidence and managing conflicts related to third party violence.
- Usage of video surveillance systems
- Actions aimed at particular groups of employees or enterprises (e.g.: migrants, temporary employees, SMEs....)
- Any other aspects, not mentioned here

Aggression and violence

Employees in retail are (mainly) represented by the FNV bondgenoten and CNV dienstenbond. These two unions represent employees in negotiations for collective labour agreements, but also address specific themes. For example: after it became clear that more and more aggression and violence occurs in the sale of alcohol and tobacco in supermarkets the CNV introduced the campaign 'stop aggression'. Recently in the sale of alcohol and tobacco in the Netherlands identification aimed to check the age of the person buying the alcohol or tobacco became mandatory. According to the CNV this led to a rise in aggression and even violence especially towards young cashiers. The CNV argues for an 'American system' where the responsibility for the identification is with the customer and not with the shop and the employees.

Working conditions

In 2010 the FNV started a 'basic course on working conditions' for its members. With this course members were trained to become a basic OSH specialist. These OSH representatives work in companies and focus on answering questions from employees and improving working conditions in general.

Commentary

In the Netherlands the retail sector is expanding. The retail sector appears to be a sector with a relatively young population, that often works part-time and on a temporary contract. This makes it a sector with a lot of job transitions, and makes it difficult to take preventive measures: employees change jobs before they can be educated or trained. Working conditions in the sector that need attention are the traditional ergonomic risk factors and unwanted, violent behaviour from clients and customers, including the negative social effects of crime in the sector. Government and social partners predominantly seem to focus on unwanted behaviour, although the ergonomic risks are also addressed in the OSH catalogues, and may only seem less important since it is not a sector specific topic.

References

- A. Wilms en A. Machiels- van Es (2008) Onderscheid naar Arbeidsduur in cao's 2008 Een cao-onderzoek naar verschil in arbeidsvoorwaarden tussen voltijders en deeltijders Ministry of Social affairs and employment
- S. Pott, J. Schrama, L. Junger (2003) ONDERSCHEID NAAR ARBEIDSDUUR IN CAO'S. Ministry of Social affairs and employment
- Ministry of Social affairs and employment (2010) NAJAARSRAPPORTAGE CAO-AFSPRAKEN 2010
- Interview with: Mrs. J. Rosenthal from the National Board for the Retail trade

Wendela Hooftman, Irene Houtman & Jan Harmen Kwantes, TNO