

Based on the data from the Foundation's Third European Working Conditions survey (2000), secondary analysis relating to two specific sectors – road transport and hotel/restaurants – was carried out in 2002/3.

Fifteen national reports were produced in each sector covering the existing Member States, while a synthesis of the national findings was published in two consolidated reports:

- [EU hotel and restaurant sector: work and employment conditions](#)
- [EU road freight transport sector: work and employment conditions](#)

The reports assess the impact of trends such as globalisation, increased competition and developments in technology, and look at the role of social dialogue in the sectors. They also feature several examples of interesting and innovative practice at local and national level aimed at improving the quality of work for workers in the sectors.

NOTE: The national reports are provided for information purposes and have not been submitted to any editorial process.

Sector surveys on working conditions: Hotels and Restaurants in The Netherlands

S.N.J. van den Bossche
K. Jettinghoff
I.L.D. Houtman

29 August 2003

TNO Work & Employment
PO box 718
2130 AS HOOFDORP
The Netherlands

Contents

Executive summary.....	4
Introduction.....	8
The context of this document.....	8
The aim of this document	8
The selected NACE codes	9
Method	9
The structure of this document	10
Sector Characteristics.....	12
Economic characteristics of the sector.....	12
Labour market characteristics of the sector	13
Background information on the regulatory framework governing the sector (hard and soft law)	17
Trends and changes in the sector	17
Overall analysis and conclusion.....	18
Quality of work and employment: Descriptive features	19
Physical work environment.....	19
Work organization	20
Working hours	22
Income levels and payment systems	23
Outcomes	23
Access to social protection.....	26
Overall analysis and conclusion.....	29
Quality of work and employment: Policies and instruments	32
Regulation, collective bargaining and case law	32
Occupational safety and health policies.....	35
Company strategies, examples of good and bad practices.....	38
Overall analysis and conclusions	41
Issues and Challenges	42
View of the employers' association.....	42
View of the trade union.....	42
View of the public authorities/sector organization	43
Overview of consensus and dissents.....	44
Overall discussion and conclusions	45
References.....	47
List of key informers.....	50
Annex A Sector characteristics	51
Annex B Quality of work and employment: Descriptive features	57
Annex C Quality of work and employment: Policies and instruments	61

Executive summary

Sector characteristics

In 2001 the hotel and restaurant sector contributed approximately 3,3% to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the Netherlands. The sector turnover, number of companies and number of employees in the sector have been substantially increasing over the last ten years. Although the sector turnover is still growing, the relative growth is slightly decreasing because of the current economic slowdown. The contract catering sub-sector, however, appears less susceptible to the changes in the economic climate.

In 2001 there were over 38,000 companies in the sector, 5,5% of the total number of companies in The Netherlands. In the same year the number of new companies was nearly 4,000, while there were 3,000 closures. The number of closures appears to have been decreasing. The total number of companies in the sector has been growing until 1999, but has been decreasing somewhat since. This is contrary the national trend which shows a rise in the number of companies until present (2001).

Apart from the economic situation, the limits to growth in the sector come from impending legislation, such as environmental legislation and the implementation of occupational health and safety measures. Furthermore, the sector has to deal with rising labour-costs and higher prices for fruits, vegetables, fish and alcoholic beverages.

The sector is characterized by a high number of self-employed and small companies. Almost 70% of the companies employ 1 to 9 people (2001).

In 2001 there were approximately 310.000 people working in the sector (264.000 employees), which is about 3,7% of the Dutch workforce. This has been continuously increasing in the last decade, In 1991 people working in this sector constituted 2,9% of the work force. This rise in employees together with the recent decrease in number of companies indicates that scaling up has taken place over de last few years.

Many people are working part-time in the sector. Estimations vary from 44% to 64%, depending on the database. The number of people in the age category 15-64 years working 12 hours a week or more was 205.000. It appears that almost one third of the employees on average works less that 12 hours/week. Since the surveys of the Central Bureau of Statistics in The Netherlands only interview people working at least 12 hours/week on average, a third of the employees is lost when information on work has to be obtained from this source.

The sector has a high level of feminisation (52,3%) as compared to national numbers (44,6%). The employees are also relatively young (31% is in the age category between 15-24). Furthermore the working population can be characterized as being low educated. Partly this is explained by the fact that a high number of people haven't finished education yet and have a side job in this sector, e.g. next to being a student. Relative to other sectors a lot of people from abroad are working in this sector as well (8% in this sector versus 3,4% at the national level).

The staff turnover in the sector is high. Over the 1990's the sector had to deal with an overall shortage of personnel. It's especially hard to find qualified and experienced cooks and supervisory staff.

Quality of work and employment

Main risk factors in the sector regarding the quality of work and employment are the high pace of work, in combination with a lack of autonomy and a high physical load. Furthermore, a substantial number of employees is exposed to aggression and threats by clients.

Regarding working split shifts and irregular working hours, these are a specific risk factor in this sector, especially in relation to the combination of work and non-working life. In addition, wages in the sector are substantially lower than the national average and specific nationwide collective agreements related to, for example, the payment of additional compensation are disregarded by some companies.

Although working conditions and terms of employment in the sector are far from optimal as compared to other sectors, disability influx and sickness absence rates are among the lowest in The Netherlands. In part the lower influx in the hotel and restaurants sector can be explained by the fact that the work force in this sector is relatively young and many (young) employees only work in the sector for a short period of time. Most employees have left the sector before (work-related) health complaints can turn into long-term disorders. Regarding the sickness absence rates, many companies seem to neglect to fully register sickness absenteeism. The main reason for not reporting sickness absence is the fact that many employees have a flexible employment contract, which makes it easier to change one's shift in case of sickness.

It is to be noted that the contract catering sub-sector, whose employees are mainly older women, has one of the highest sickness absence and disability figures in The Netherlands. It is not really clear what might be the cause of this. Next of being older, they are not well educated as well, they often enter into this sector at an older age since they want to combine work and family life in this job because of the working hours and schedule, but they also have a history of work.

An interesting trend regarding risk groups is that many companies nowadays outsource several activities to specialized enterprises. Especially cleaning and security services are being outsourced in the hotels and restaurant sector. Because of the outsource of activities potential risk groups like cleaning and security personnel are no longer under the direct attention of the sector, which may inflate trend analyses at sector level.

All Dutch employees have access to an extensive network of social protection. However, a substantial number of companies try to evade the payment of taxes and social security contributions by keeping employees outside the official framework (black work). Because of this undeclared some employees are not (fully) insured for social security benefits. Also minimum term workers may not have access to sickness and disability benefits.

Regulatory framework and good examples in the sector

The nationwide regulatory framework on occupational health and safety is quite extensive. According to the Working Conditions Act all companies are obligated to take precautionary measures to protect their employees against occupational hazards. The compliance to these obligations is controlled by the Labour Inspectorate.

There are three nationwide collective sub-sector agreements: hotels & restaurants (horeca), lodging and contract catering. Main collective bargaining parties in the sector are the employers' organisations KHN (horeca), Recron (lodging) and Veneca (contract catering), and the trade unions FNV Horecabond and CNV Horeca (CNV Bedrijvenbond). The sector as a whole is characterised by a low union membership.

Whereas collective bargaining is mainly focused on wages and other terms of employment, separate agreements on occupational health and safety are made in a Covenant on Health and Safety at Work (Arboconvenant). Two covenants are concluded in the sector: one for the catering sub-sector and one for the contract catering sub-sector. Fifty per cent of the costs of the covenant are financed by the Dutch Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment. The covenants may become of great importance in decreasing occupational risks for employees. Since these covenants were started up at the end of the last decade, their effectiveness has not been evaluated yet.

A great point of concern is the compliance of companies with collective agreements and the covenant. For example, many companies haven't performed a mandatory Health and Safety Risk Assessment. According to the key informers this problem is related to the fact that many (small) companies lack the in-house expertise to carry out these assessments themselves and are reluctant to call in the help from an expensive Occupational Health and Safety Service. Furthermore a substantial number of companies don't comply with, for example, agreements related to the payment of additional compensation.

According to the key informers the sector experiences difficulties in reaching individual companies. This can be partly explained by the fact that there is a high turnover of companies (in particular small companies). Every year many entrepreneurs start a new business in the sector, while others leave the sector. This situation hampers the professionalization of the sector.

Social dialogue

In general the cooperation between social partners in the hotel and restaurant sector is quite reasonable. Social partners meet in various bipartite organisations and there are few dissents regarding issues related to the quality of work. All parties emphasize having the same interests regarding the quality of working conditions and stress the importance of keeping the social dialogue going. They stress the importance of the Covenant on Health and Safety at Work and acknowledge problems with the implementation of health and safety regulations, especially for small companies. They also acknowledge problems in finding qualified personnel (especially cooks and supervisory staff).

A point of dissent is the extent of the regulatory framework. The employers' organisations wish to lessen the amount of regulations. The unions, however, fear that compliance with regulations will get even lower in that case. Furthermore, unions urge for 'custom-made' arrangements with the companies, while employers' organisations oppose any interference of unions on a company level. Finally, collective bargaining in the sector is quite controversial at times. There are dissents on wage increases (whom they should apply to), payment of additional compensation (e.g. for working on Sundays) and flexibility of working hours.

Concluding remarks

The major part of this sector appears to grow and shrink together with economical changes. The only sub-sector that shows a course independent from the economical situation is the contract catering. The latter sector appears to be quite different in some ways from the rest of the sector. The contract catering is, even more than the rest of the sector, a low educated, 'female' sector, and the average age is much higher than the rest of the sector. Whereas for the sector as a whole it can be stated that many employees have part time jobs, and that for a lot of them this is their side job, this is not so much the case for the contract catering. The contract catering has to deal with very high absenteeism and disability percentages. The 'rest' of the 'horeca' sector shows the opposite picture. From this perspective the contract catering can be considered a risk group. Earlier in this summary, other risk groups are identified from different perspectives.

A generally minor problem with the surveys by the Central Bureau of Statistics in the Netherlands is that they only present the information (e.g. on working conditions and self reported health) for those employees who work at least 12 hours/week on average. This is, however, a big problem for the present sector, since it appears that one loses information on about a third of the employees when one is dependent upon information from these surveys. This is the case for information on working conditions, conditions of employment and self-reported health. It can be concluded that it is quite difficult to get a firm grip on these characteristics of this sector.

As for the direction the sector is going in regarding the issues tackled in the report, one can be sure that the economic situation will be of great influence regarding issues of growth, except for the contract catering. The present economic recession will therefore probably have a negative effect on the sector's growth.

The Covenant on Work, Safety and Health is promising, since it provides the sector with a stimulus to improve the conditions of work and employment. It may particularly be a chance for the small organisations when sector specific expertise is made available to draw upon. However, the problem of compliance in the sector may also hamper the effects of this stimulus.

Introduction

The context of this document

In 2000, the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (EFILWC; further on to be referred to as ‘The Foundation’) carried out its third European Survey on Working Conditions and collected information on working conditions, health and well-being of the employed and self-employed in the fifteen EU member states. These three surveys (1990, 1995 and 2000), provided a general picture on the main characteristics of the economic sectors on working conditions. This general picture is sufficient to set priorities, but not enough to understand the reasons underlying the situation described, and the policies, at various levels, undertaken to deal with such.

The Foundation asked TNO Work and Employment to report on the quality of work and employment in the sector of Hotels & Restaurants in The Netherlands. Other research institutes were asked to do the same for the situation in the other EU-countries.

The objective of the sector surveys on working conditions is to provide a cross-sectional overview of the working and employment conditions in this sector as an example of the European economy. This research project aims at collecting information on social dialogue in the hotels and restaurants sector as well.

The aim of this document

The aim of this national report on the sector Hotels & Restaurants is to:

1. describe the socio-economic context of the sector in The Netherlands;
2. identify the structural characteristics and patterns of the sector regarding labour market issues, working conditions and social dialogue in The Netherlands;
3. research on the employment status, conditions of work and conditions of employment in the sector in the Netherlands;
4. identify risks, risk factors and risk groups within the sector of Hotels & Restaurants in the Netherlands;
5. identify legislative and regulatory measures related to working conditions in the sector in The Netherlands;
6. identify and analyse other initiatives in the Netherlands such as guidelines and code of conducts;
7. show how the social partners in the Netherlands are operating in the sector; identify and describe the contents of relevant collective agreements;
8. identify and describe the positive examples and good practices aimed at improving working conditions and social dialogue in the sector;
9. identify and describe possible solutions to improve working conditions and social dialogue in the sector;
10. identify and analyse potential barriers to the implementation of legislative, regulatory and ‘soft law’ measures to improve working conditions and social dialogue in the sector.

The selected NACE codes

The sector on hotels and restaurants (NACE H 55) is the subject of this report. It was agreed upon to present data for the sector as a whole, but when data on sub-sectors are available, they will be presented as well. Since the (contract) catering has a separate ‘social dialogue from the rest of the sector, some information indeed is available on this sub-sector. Table 1 provides an overview of the sector on Hotels and restaurants.

Table 1.1: An overview of the NACE-coding by sector for the sector Hotels and restaurants (sector ‘H.55’)
H - Section H Hotels and restaurants

H.55 - Hotels and restaurants
H.55.10 - Hotels
H.55.11 - Hotels and motels, with restaurant
H.55.12 - Hotels and motels, without restaurant
H.55.20 - Camping sites and other provision of short-stay accommodation
H.55.21 - Youth hostels and mountain refuges
H.55.22 - Camping sites, including caravan sites
H.55.23 - Other provision of lodgings n.e.c.
H.55.30 - Restaurants
H.55.40 - Bars
H.55.50 - Canteens and catering
H.55.51 - Canteens
H.55.52 - Catering

Method

To construct the national report on the sector Hotels & Restaurants for the Netherlands, a literature review as well as both quantitative and qualitative analyses have been performed.

Literature review:

A literature review on national journals has been conducted for the sector Hotels & Restaurants using the following search items:

- working conditions, and/or
- employment status, and/or
- economical factors.

Quantitative analyses:

Major use has been made from the data base made available by the Central Bureau of Statistics (CBS) through internet (Statline). This data base includes the most recent data from all the surveys and other national data collected by the CBS, including data about the labour market (employee level: EBB), as well as on work and health (POLS). Much of the sector specific information (e.g. folders, reports and data) has been provided by the interviewed key informers. Some of this material were sectoral statistics or specific research.

A problem with the survey data in the Netherlands is the fact that they only report information (e.g. on work and health, as well as terms of employment) on the employees who work 12 hours or more a week on average. Generally this is no problem, but data to be presented in the Result section of the report indicate that we might loose about one third of the work force in this sector.

Another problem to be encountered in the surveys from the Central Bureau of Statistics in The Netherlands is the fact that information on occupation (ISCO) is only available at a 1-digit level. This means that a break down of information from these surveys by occupation is not detailed enough.

Finally, trend information from one of the surveys from the Central Bureau of Statistics, The POLS (Permanent Onderzoek LeefSituatie; Permanent Quality of Life Survey) including the information on work and self-reported health, has been broken in 1994. Since the effect was not the same for all items, the information before and after 1994 can not be easily compared.

Qualitative analyses:

Additionally interviews have been conducted with:

- one representative of the largest employers organization in the sector Hotels & Restaurants (Koninklijke Horeca Nederland; KHN);
- one representative of the largest employees organization in the sector Hotels & Restaurants (FNV Horecabond);
- one representative from the sector organization in the sector Hotels & Restaurants (Board for the Hotel and Catering Industry/Bedrijfschap Horeca en Catering; BHC);
- one representative of the ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, involved in the implementation of sector-specific soft law measures.

These key informers have been interviewed about:

- the national socio-economic context of the sector;
- structural characteristics and patterns of the sector regarding labour market issues, working conditions, and the social dialogue;
- their view on risk factors, risk groups, and eventual differences of the sector as it functions in The Netherlands as compared to the rest of Europe;
- the presence or upcoming of legislative and other regulatory measures related to working conditions;
- the situation at the Covenant on Health and Safety at Work;
- if present, positive examples, good practices and solutions in the sector, aimed at improving working conditions and social dialogue;
- potential barriers to the implementation of legislative, regulatory and 'soft law' measures to improve working conditions and social dialogue in the sector.

The structure of this document

In this report we will first report on the sector characteristics, such as the economic and labour market situation, the regulatory framework governing the sector (hard and soft law), and trends and changes in the sector of hotels and restaurants (Chapter 2). Next we will describe the quality of work and the outcomes (e.g. occupational accidents, diseases, morbidity, absenteeism) in the sector as well as the access to social security (Chapter 3). In Chapter 4 we will discuss policies and instruments on (the improvement of) the quality of work in the sector. In chapter 5 the views of employers organization, employees organization and sector organization regarding issues and challenges in the sector are presented. Also an overview is presented on consensus and dissent between different

parties. The final chapter (Chapter 6) briefly presents and discusses the main findings of the report.

In the appendices a lot of additional and specific information has been provided on the topics as requested. Some tables are highly specific. Although there may not be a specific reference to the appendices, it should be noted that when information is important, it is put in the main text, whereas other information requested by the guidelines, but which appeared to be less informative is put in the Annex.

Sector Characteristics

In this chapter the main economic and labour market characteristics are discussed. For extra information on these subjects we refer to Annex A.

Economic characteristics of the sector

In 2001 the hotel and restaurant sector contributed approximately 3,3% to the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of the Netherlands (BHC, 2002a). The net turnover increased by 4% in comparison to 2000. This means a slight decrease of growth compared to 1999 and 2000 (in both years there was a recorded growth of 6,75%; BHC, 2002b). The turnover shows a 4,4 billion Euro increase (46%) in a period of 7 years. The sub-sector canteens and catering contributed 13% (1,8 billion Euro) to the sector turnover in 2001. From 1994 to 2001 this sub-sector showed an 80% increase (Table 2.1).

Table 2.1 (2.1 in guidelines): Turnover (in bln Euros, excluding VAT)

Turnover (Euro)	Sectoral		National (total) GDP ²
	Sub-sector ¹	Total NACE 55	
2001	1,8	14,0	429,2
2000	1,7	13,3	402,6
1999	1,5	12,5	374,1
1998	1,3	11,7	354,2
1994	1,0	9,6	287,7

Source: BHC, 2002a

¹ SBI'93/NACE code 555: Canteens and catering

² Source: CBS Statline

In 2001 the sector hotels and restaurants counted 38.385 companies (CBS Statline)¹: 5,5% of the total number of companies in The Netherlands. Since 1994 there has been an increase in the number of companies in the hotels & restaurant sector, which reached its top in 1999 (Table 2.2). For the sub-sector contact catering the top is reached in 2000. The number of companies in the sector showed a decrease since. This trend is different from what we see at the national level, where the number of companies shows a steady rise.

Table 2.2 (2.2 in guidelines): Number of companies, including new companies

Number of companies	Sectoral		National (total)
	Sub-sector ¹	Total NACE 55	
2001	2.470	38.385	701.795
2000	2.610	39.745	693.600
1999	2.540	40.450	684.405
1998	2.410	38.975	672.520
1994	1.570	37.540	610.135

Source: CBS Statline

¹ SBI'93/NACE code 555: Canteens and catering

¹ According to the BHC (2002a) the number of companies in 2001 was 45.585 (45.631 in 2002; 42.740 in 1994). This large difference in numbers has to do with differences in definitions of what belongs to the sector. The BHC for example claim that a coffee corner in a hospital or in a warehouse is part of the sector, whereas these are not registered as such by the Central Bureau of Statistics.

Most companies have no (24,7%) or 1-9 employees (68,6%). Table 2.3 shows the percentage and number of companies according to company size in 2001.

Table 2.3 (2.3 in guidelines): Percentage and number of companies according to company size in 2001

Company size (number of employees)	Sectoral				National (total)	
	Sub-sector ¹		Total NACE 55		N	%
	N	%	N	%		
0 employees	1.175	47,6	9.495	24,7	338.320	48,2
1-9 employees	1.155	46,8	26.345	68,6	300.535	42,8
10-49 employees	115	4,7	2.295	6,0	49.140	7,0
50-100 employees	10	0,4	155	0,4	7.035	1,0
100+ employees	15	0,6	90	0,2	6.765	1,0

Source: CBS Statline

¹SBI'93/NACE code 555: canteens and catering

The number of companies that opened in 2001 was 3.990, while 3.072 companies closed (Chamber of Commerce: www.kvk.nl). The number of closures as reported by the Central Bureau of Statistics was much lower. In 1996 this was 800 (2,1%), versus 1.200 in 1993 (3,2%). This may be due to differences in definition of which companies belong to the sector (see footnote 1). The overall percentage of closures in The Netherlands was 3,2% in 1996 and 4% in 1993 (CBS Statline). Recent CBS (sub-sector) information on the number of closures in order to be able to compare them with the information on this from the Chamber of Commerce is unavailable.

The number of bankruptcies in 2001 (n=192) dropped by 44% compared to 1994 (n=340), while the national number of bankruptcies dropped by 19% (from 5.333 to 4.329) (CBS Statline).

The number of companies with a public status in the sector is negligible (see Appendix A; CBS Statline).

Labour market characteristics of the sector

In 2001 there were approximately 310.000 people working in the sector (264.000 employees). The number of people in the age category 15-64 years working 12 hours a week or more was 205.000. This means that about one third of the employees in this sector works less than 12 hours a week on average. Nationwide this number was 7.064.000. (CBS Statline). According to the BHC the number of people working in the sub-sector canteens and catering in 1999 was approximately 18.000 (De Wit, 2001). The number of people working in the sector has been steadily increasing since 1991 (see Table 2.4). The rise in employees in the Hotels and Restaurant sector over the last ten years was much higher than on the national level (55% as compared to 21%). The rise in employees together with the recent decrease in the number of companies indicates that scaling up has taken place over the last few years.

In 2000 about a third of the employees in the Hotels and Restaurants sector worked for a company with less than ten employees, while 28% worked for companies with 50 or more employees (De Wit, 2001).

When compared to national data, the percentage of women working in the Hotels and Restaurants sector is somewhat higher. Contrary to the national trend, the participation of

women in this sector hardly showed an increase in the last decade (Table 2.4). The percentage of women working in the sub-sector canteens and catering is higher than in other sub-sectors. Exact figures for 2001 are, however, not available. In 1999 the share of women working in the contract catering was almost 80% (De Wit & Rijnders, 2001).

Table 2.4 (2.8 in guidelines): Percentage and number of people employed according to gender

Gender	Sectoral				National (total)	
	Sub-sector (N x1000) %		Total NACE 55 (N x1000) %		(N x1000)	%
2001						
• Men			148	47,7	4.588	55,4
• Women			162	52,3	3.689	44,6
Total			310		8.277	
1996						
• Men			127	48,3	4.197	57,4
• Women			136	51,7	3.111	42,6
Total			263		7.308	
1991						
• Men			97	48,5	4.083	59,8
• Women			103	51,5	2.743	40,2
Total			200		6.826	

Source: CBS Statline

In 2001 the percentage of people in the age category 15-24, working in the sector Hotels and Restaurants was nearly 31% (CBS Statline). This percentage is substantially lower on a national level (12%). The percentage of people in the age category 45-64 is 18%. On a national level this is 32% (see Annex A).

The relative number of people with less than one year of experience in the sector has increased from 17% to 25% in the period 1995-2000, while the relative number of people with one to three years of experience dropped from 41% to 32% (De Wit, 2001; Annex A).

Furthermore, there are relatively more people with a lower educational level and less people with a high educational level working in the sector, compared to national data (Table 2.5). In part this can be explained by the high percentage of young people working in the sector, and of whom a large group is still receiving education for whom their job in this sector is a side job (De Wit & Rijnders, 2001). In 2000 about 20% of the employees working in the sector had a diploma of a sector specific vocational training (De Wit, 2001). So, although the bare figures on education suggest that the sector is becoming 'less educated', this cannot be concluded because of the strong increase of younger people, still receiving education, in the sector. De Wit (2001) concludes in his trend report for the sector that there is a relation between the degree of specifically trained employees in the sector and the economic growth: during economic decline, there is a decrease in specifically trained employees, whereas this groups of employees shows a rise when the economic climate improves.

Table 2.5 (2.13 in guidelines) Percentage and number of people by education

Initial educational level	Sectoral				National (total)	
	Sub-sector		Total NACE 55		N(x1000)	%
	N(x1000)	%	N(x1000)	%		
2001						
• 0 years			32	15,8	592	8,4
• lower vocational, lower general secondary education			61	30,0	1.442	20,4
• intermediate vocational, intermediate/high general secondary education			96	47,3	3.080	43,6
• high vocational or scientific education			14	6,9	1.947	27,6
1996						
• 0 years			20	12,0	476	7,7
• lower vocational, lower general secondary education			51	30,7	1.317	21,3
• intermediate vocational, intermediate/high general secondary education			80	48,2	2.779	45,0
• high vocational or scientific education			15	9,0	1.603	26,0

Source: CBS Statline

In 1998 the percentage of foreign employees in the sector Hotels and Restaurants was nearly 8 per cent (CBS Statline), which is considerably higher than on a national level (3,4%). As much as 72% of the foreign employees in the sector Hotels and Restaurants had a non-EU status, while only 28% of the employees had an (non-Dutch) EU status. Nationwide 54% of the foreign employees had a non-EU status, 46% had a (non-Dutch) EU status (see Annex A).

In the year 2001 relatively more people in the sector were self-employed (22,4%) or were employed with a flexible contract (18,0%), when compared to the national data (11,0% and 7,2%; Annex A). The percentage of employees working more than 12 hours a week with a indefinite contract was 59,5%. On a national level this percentage was about 20% higher (81,9%). Since 1996 there have hardly been any changes in these percentages (CBS Statline). According to the BHC about 66% of all the employees in 2000 had a indefinite contract, whereas 34% had a fixed term contract (De Wit, 2001). This means that among those employees working less than 12 hours, there are relatively more people with indefinite contracts. It is estimated that the number of people contracted by a temporary employment agency was about 17.000 (third quarter of 2000; De Wit, 2001). At that time this would have expanded the total number of employees in the sector by 5,5%.

Another group of employees with indefinite contracts are the 'temporary assistants' (hulpkrachten): employees working solely during holidays, at night (after 5 p.m.) or weekends (De Wit, 2001). In 2000 a percentage as high as about 29% of the employees in the sector Hotels and Restaurants could be qualified as such.

On the national level, there has been a noticeable decrease in the number of companies that hired seasonal workers from 1994 (20%) to 2000 (8%). The number of seasonal workers in the sector decreased from 10% in 1994 to only 3,5% in 2000.

According to De Wit & Rijnders (2001) in 1999 between 40% and 50% of the employees consider their job in the sector as a side job. Most of them are receiving education.

In 2001 the number of people working part-time was relatively high in comparison to the national data. In the sector Hotels and Restaurants 44,2% of the workers worked part-time², while on national level this percentage was 32,7% (CBS Statline; Annex A). There is an overall trend that the percentage of people working 35 hours or more (full-timers) is slightly decreasing (CBS Statline). When the number of people working less than twelve hours is taken into account, the percentage of part-timers³ is even higher (about 64%). About a third of these part-timers have no fixed number of working hours (minimum-terms workers with a zero-hours contract; De Wit, 2001).

Table 2.6 shows the number and percentage of vacancies, unemployment and personnel turnover in the sector Hotels and Restaurants. In 2001 there were approximately 8.700 unfilled vacancies in the sector (3,3%). This is somewhat higher than the overall percentage of vacancies in The Netherlands (2,2%; December 2001). According to the BHC there is already a slight decrease in the number of vacancies, due to the economic recession (BHC, 2002b).

In 1998 about a quarter of the employees left the sector (De Wit & Rijnders, 2001). The outflow was substantially lower in the contract catering sub-sector (16%). The main reasons for leaving the sector were low pay (mentioned by 40%), working hours (mentioned by a third) and the job content/ lack of career opportunities (mentioned by a quarter). For the employees in the sub-sector contract catering the main reasons were salary, work pressure and physical work load. In the period 1998-1999 19% of the employees changed their job within the sector. Personnel turnover⁴ is nearly 35% in the sector, for the sub-sector contract catering a lower turnover percentage of 28% was reported (De Wit & Rijnders, 2001).

Table 2.6 (2.16 in guidelines) Number and percentage of vacancies, unemployed or having a second job, and personnel turnover in the sector and at national level in 2001

Vacancies, unemployment and second jobs	Sectoral					National (total)	
		Sub-sector 1 ¹		Total NACE 55		N	%
		N	%	N	%		
Vacancies new				67.000		945.000	
Vacancies unfilled				8.700		197.100	
Vacancies filled				67.000		986.000	
Unemployed						146.000	
Having a second job							2,0
Personnel turnover ²	stayed 1999	11.200	62	157.900	51		
	flowed through	3.100	17	60.000	19		
	outflow 1998	2.800	(16)	74.800	(26)		
	inflow 1999	3.800	21	93.900	30		

Source: CBS Statline

¹ SBI'93/NACE code 555: Canteens and catering

² Source: De Wit & R.G.J. Rijnders, 2001 (figures refer to the period September 1998 - September 1999)

² People working 12-34 hours a week (CBS-definition)

³ People working less than 37 hours per week (BHC-definition)

⁴ Personnel turnover is defined as the efflux plus through flow divided by the initial number of employees plus the influx. Another definition is the number of employees that did not have that positions a year before, as a percentage of the total number of employees. In that case the turnover rate is 46% (divided by t-1), or 49% (when divided by t).

Table 2.7 shows that in 2000 the majority of the employees worked as a waiter or bartender (44%). Except for the overall growth of the number of people being employed in the sector, no real changes have taken place regarding the distribution of occupational groups since 1992.

Table 2.7 (2.14 in guidelines) Percentage and number of people employed according to occupational group

	NACE 55				National (total)	
	1992		2000		N	%
	N	%	N	%		
Kitchen (excluding dish washing)	38.000	23	58.000	20		
Waiting/bar/counter	81.000	49	129.400	44		
Reception	6.600	4	8.900	3		
Housekeeping/general service	26.400	16	50.600	17		
Other (management, clerk)	13.300	8	44.700	15		

Source: De Wit, 2001

Background information on the regulatory framework governing the sector (hard and soft law)

See chapter 4

Trends and changes in the sector

The level of turnover in the Hotels and Restaurant sector has been substantially increasing over the last ten years. Although sector turnover is still growing, the relative growth is slightly decreasing because of the current economic slowdown. The BHC forecasts a 4% turnover growth in 2002. On the other hand the turnover volume is expected to decrease by 1,5%. The sector is particularly susceptible to changes in economic conditions. When the economy is weak people are not as likely to spend their money in hotels, at restaurants, or on various types of amusements. Other limits to growth come from impending legislation, such as environmental legislation and the implementation of occupational health and safety measures (BHC, 2002b; BHC, 2002c). Furthermore, the sector has to deal with higher labour-costs and rising prices for fruits, vegetables, fish and alcoholic beverages. The contract catering sub-sector is less prone to economic changes. In the second quarter of 2002 the turnover increased more than 8 per cent (BHC, 2002b).

The number of companies in the sector has been increasing until 1999 and decreases since then. On the national level we can see a continuous growth. The rise in employees working in the Hotels and Restaurant sector has, however, kept increasing, indicating a scaling up in the sector over the last few years.

In the last ten years the sector had to deal with a shortage of personnel. Since the mid-nineties the number of unfilled vacancies has increased considerably. Research by the BHC (De Wit, 2001) showed that in 1998 and 2000 at least a third of the companies dealt with hard-to-fill vacancies. There is a lack of trained and experienced personnel, because of the enormous growth of the sector. This lack appears to be particularly apparent in years of economic decline. It's especially hard to find qualified cooks and supervisory staff (middle management). At the moment, the absolute number of vacancies is decreasing, because of the economic developments.

Overall analysis and conclusion

The sector is characterized by:

- many small companies;
- many female employees;
- many young employees;
- many low-educated employees;
- many foreign workers, and many from outside the EU;
- many small jobs (many –small- part time);
- many temporary jobs, as well as many self-employed;
- the above findings (small, part-time and many temporary jobs) make it hard to get hold of the sector. In particular national surveys (CBS) with information on conditions of work and employment only report on employees who work at least 12 hours/week on a yearly average. It appears that about a third of the employees in the sector Hotels & Restaurants are missed in these surveys. The third to be missed is not a ‘random’ group, because it consists of relatively many women, seasonal workers, and probably also people doing undeclared work;
- main job in the sector (prevalence) is that of waiter;
- recently the absolute number of vacancies is decreasing;
- the contract catering sub-sector is less prone to economic changes than other sub-sectors.

Quality of work and employment: Descriptive features

In this chapter the main aspects regarding quality of work and employment are discussed. For extra information on these topics we refer to Annex B.

Physical work environment

The most important ambient risk factor in the sector Hotels and Restaurants is exposure to noise. About 30 per cent of the employees report being exposed to a noisy environment. This is significantly higher than the national percentage of self-reported exposure to noise (Houtman & De Vroome, 2002). Table 3.1 shows the percentages of workers reporting to be exposed to noise, broken down by sex and age.

Table 3.1 (3.1 in guidelines) Exposure to noise¹

noise (noisy environment/ raise voice)	sectoral	national
• total	0,30*	0,18
• male	0,33	0,21
• female	0,27	0,13
• age < 35 years	0,35*	0,20
• age 35-49 years	0,25	0,17
• age 50+ years	0,18*	0,16
• 12-19 hours	0,37	0,14
• 20-34 hours	0,32	0,15
• 35 or more hours	0,27	0,20

Source: Houtman & De Vroome, 2002

* p<0,05

¹ The scale score varies from zero (most favourable score) to one (most unfavourable scale score). The total sectoral score (NACE 55) is compared to the total national score and the sectoral scores of the different subgroups (e.g. gender and age) are compared to the total sectoral score (excluding the specified subgroup). The national sample consists of 11.543 respondents (period 1997-1998-1999) who are 15 years or older and work 12 or more hours per week. 444 (4%) of these 11.543 respondents are working in the sector Hotels and Restaurants (NACE 55).

There is mixed evidence as to whether employees in the sector are being exposed to high levels of physical workload (see also Annex B). Regarding the physical working environment several interviewed key informers mentioned that especially waiters and cooks have to stand for a long period of time during their work and frequently have to carry heavy loads. Furthermore, the ergonomic design of the working spaces often is far from optimal. On the other hand, according to one informer most employees don't consider the physical workload as much of a problem. In addition, research by Houtman & De Vroome (2002) doesn't show a significant difference in physical workload between the sector and national figures in the period 1997-1999. However, since 1999 the percentage of employees that frequently have to carry out physically heavy work shows a considerable increase (BHC, 2002a). In 2001 the percentage of physical workload within the sector was substantially higher than on a national level.

The key informers also mentioned some sector specific risks, related to safety conditions. These risks are exposure to sharp objects and working with hot substances/materials (see also paragraph 3.5). Risk groups are cooks and kitchen aides.

Work organization

In 2000 about a third of the employees in the sector had to work under an excessively high work pressure⁵ (Klein Hesselink, Dhondt & Vaas, 2000). Work pressure appears to be especially high for the occupational group of receptionists. Furthermore, employees who combine more than one occupation seem to experience less work pressure than employees who have only one occupation. In general the percentage of employees under great pressure is somewhat higher in bigger companies. Consequently, the percentage is higher in hotels than in cafés or (fast food) restaurants. Also, the percentage of employees exposed to a excessively high work pressure is higher among people with a fulltime contract than among part-timers (Klein Hesselink et al., 2000). The work pace in the sector is among the highest of all sectors in the Netherlands (CBS Statline). In 2000, 54% of the employees said they were frequently working at high levels of work pace. The nationwide average was 40%. When working at a high work pace and under high time pressure are combined the difference with other sectors diminish. Compared to national data the level of work/time pressure within the sector is a little higher but the differences are not significant (Houtman & De Vroome, 2002). The research by Houtman and De Vroome shows that employees older than 50 experience less work/time pressure than their younger colleagues (Table 3.2). One key informer mentioned that work pressure is higher for employees with a fixed contract. Because of the high staff turnover experienced workers often have to introduce and help new employees and work harder to compensate for inexperienced employees. Furthermore, they often have to fill up unfilled shifts.

Table 3.2 (3.6 in guidelines) Pace of work, work intensity¹

	Sectoral	National
High pace of work/work under time pressure		
• total	0,42	0,39
• male	0,45	0,40
• female	0,38	0,37
• age < 35 years	0,44	0,37
• age 35-49 years	0,42	0,42
• age 50+ years	0,26*	0,35
• 12-19 hours	0,32*	0,27
• 20-34 hours	0,44	0,37
• 35 or more hours	0,44	0,41
Frequently working under high work pace ²		
• 1999	50%	42%
• 2000	54%	40%
• 2001	52%	41%

Source: Houtman & De Vroome, 2002

⁵ In this study by Klein Hesselink, Dhondt & Vaas (2000) work pressure is defined as a too high work pressure (in terms of high job demands and low decision latitude) that leads to stress/overload.

* p<0,05

¹ see note Table 3.1

² Source: CBS Statline (other years unavailable)

There are relatively limited opportunities to learn in and from the job and to develop ones competences in the sector Hotels and Restaurants as compared to national data (Houtman and De Vroome, 2002). The lack of opportunities to learn in and on the job is higher for employees younger than 35 years and for people working less than 20 hours a week (Table 3.3). However, it also seems that the need for schooling/learning opportunities isn't very high for these particular employees. A lot of them are students who consider their work in the sector as a side job. They only work in the sector during (a part of) their college-years. According to a key informer, schooling is only of interest for supervisory staff (middle management).

Table 3.3 (3.7 in guidelines) Lack of skilled work, learning in and from the job/work¹

Monotonous work/lack of personal development, fit between work and education/lack of experience, chances for promotion, solve own problems	Sectoral	National
• total		
• male	0,24*	0,18
• female	0,22	0,16
• age < 35 years	0,26	0,21
• age 35-49 years	0,28*	0,19
• age 50+ years	0,17*	0,18
• 12-19 hours	0,22	0,17
• 20-34 hours	0,39*	
• 35 or more hours	0,27	
	0,17*	

Source: Houtman & De Vroome, 2002

* p<0,05

¹ see note Table 3.1

Compared to national figures employees in the sector Hotels and Restaurants have less control in and over their work than the national average (Houtman & De Vroome, 2002). Especially part-timers and employees younger than 35 report low levels of job autonomy (Table 3.4). The lack of autonomy is a serious risk factor for all the occupational groups within the sector.

In 2001 82% of the employees working in the Hotels and Restaurants sector reported having job consultation (CBS Statline), which is relatively low compared to other sectors. On a national level this percentage was much higher (91%).

Table 3.4 (3.8 in guidelines) Lack of control in and over work¹

	Sectoral	National
Lacking: control over work pace, free to choose work method, control work order, free to interrupt work		
• total	0,34*	0,24
• male	0,31	0,20
• female	0,37	0,29
• age < 35 years	0,38*	0,26
• age 35-49 years	0,27*	0,22
• age 50+ years	0,26*	0,21
• 12-19 hours	0,44*	0,34
• 20-34 hours	0,40*	0,30
• 35 or more hours	0,27*	0,20
Direct employee consultation on work ²		
• 1999	86%	90%
• 2000	82%	90%
• 2001	82%	91%

Source: Houtman & De Vroome, 2002

* p<0,05

¹ see note Table 3.1

² Source: CBS Statline (other years unavailable)

Employees in the sector do not report more conflicts with their boss or colleagues than on a national level (see also Annex B). There aren't any differences between different groups within the sector either. The same goes for dissatisfaction with management, the lack of a good working climate and discrimination because of gender or age (Houtman and De Vroome, 2002). Aggression by customers however, is an important risk factor (Klein Hesselink et al., 2000). Almost 15% of the employees is afraid of possible threats by guests. Especially employees in bars, discotheques and fast food restaurants are exposed to aggression. Research by De Wit and Rijnders (2001) showed that in 1999 almost 10% of the employees in the sector the frequently dealt with aggressive guests. Furthermore, although less prevailing (less than 5%), exposure to harassment or intimidating behaviour by colleagues or management staff is experienced as very aggravating (Klein Hesselink et al., 2000). Exposure to harassment or intimidating behaviour is directly related to health complaints, sickness absence, motivation and staff turnover.

Working hours

In 2000 the average number of working hours per week in the sector is relatively low: 22,9 hours per week; 23,1 hours including overtime (CBS Statline; see also Annex B). The national average is 30,8 hours (31,3 hours, including overtime). The average number of overtime hours in the sector is also relatively low in the sector. According to the collective agreements employees are not allowed to make more than 152 overtime hours per year. Full timers tend to make more overtime hours than part-timers. About 3,7% of the employees in 2000 worked overtime⁶. About 19 per cent of the employees is working in shifts (9% on a national level). In general, irregular shifts and working hours are a serious risk factor in the sector. A specific risk mentioned by the sector representatives is

⁶ Figures refer to paid overtime hours

working in split shifts. Furthermore, working at night and in weekends often leads to problems in combining work and non-working life. According to the CBS (Statline) 86% of the sector employees (as compared to 56% nationwide) works during weekends and 83% (59% nationwide) works at night.

Income levels and payment systems

The average hourly wage in the sector is €10,81 (CBS Statline; Annex B). The national average is considerably higher (€15,67). According to the collective agreements of the Trade Unions FNV and CNV wages vary from €8,13 to €21,08 for employees older than 22 and working at least 38 hours. The national (mandatory) minimum wage for employees older than 23 is €7,01. Employees younger than 23 earn a certain percentage of the minimum wage, depending on their age. Overtime hours are being compensated in time off. When compensation isn't possible overtime hours have to be paid within a month.

Specific problems related to the payment system in the sector are undeclared employment/black wages and the payment of extra allowances. Research by Klein Hesselink et al. (2000) shows that almost 11% of the employees in the sector are obligated to accept undeclared work. In particular, black wages are a problem for employees working in cafes/discotheques and restaurants, and for employees working less than 12 hours a week. There are no exact figures available on the scale of undeclared employment in the sector Hotels and Restaurants. Finally, 15% of the employees say their extra allowances are paid incorrectly. For example employees sometimes don't get paid a 50% extra allowance (in accordance with the collective agreement) when working on Sundays.

Outcomes

A 2000 survey on occupational accidents showed that 3% of the surveyed employees suffered from one or more accidents in the year prior to the survey (Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2001). Nationwide this percentage was 2,1% (Table 3.5). Also, the mean number of accidents per person, per year (1.4) is somewhat higher than the nationwide average (1.2).

Table 3.5 (3.18 in guidelines) Occupational accidents

Consequences	Number of accidents		% of employees		Incidence per 1000	
	NACE 55	National	NACE 55	National	NACE 55	National
Occupational accidents	5.700 ¹	120.000 ¹	3,0 (1,4) ²	2,1 (1,2) ²	29 ¹	17 ¹

Sources: ¹ C. Stam & A. Bloemhoff, 2001 ² Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek, 2001

¹ Occupational accidents that led to first aid visit and/or hospitalisation.

² Percentage of workers who reported one or more occupational accidents in the year before the survey.

Between brackets: the mean number of accidents per person per year; figures refer to the year 2000.

Table 3.6 shows the five main causes of accidents in the sector. About half of the accidents reported in the sector is caused by sharp objects. This is almost twice as high as the national level. Furthermore, 8% of the accidents was caused by exposure to a hot substance (Stam & Bloemhoff, 2001). According to the Labour Inspectorate (Martens,

2001) there was only one reported deadly accident (400 nationwide) in the period 1997-2000.

Table 3.6 (3.20 in guidelines): Main causes of accidents

Five main causes of accidents	Number of accidents		% of workers who reported one or more accidents	
	NACE 55	National	NACE 55	National
1. Sharp objects	2.900	30.000	51	26
2. Hot fluids, steam	450	1.500	8	1
3. Moving object	380	21.000	7	18
4. Fall other ¹	270	9.500	5	8
5. Jamming/wedging object	250	12.000	4	11

Sources: C. Stam & A. Bloemhoff, 2001

¹ Excluding: stumble equal level, slip equal level, sprain/twist equal level and a fall from stairs or ladder.

The National Centre for Occupational Diseases (NCvB) provides no sector specific information on the exact incidence of occupational diseases (NCvB, 2002). Information on national incidence of occupational diseases is shown in Table 3.21 (Annex B). This information only pertains to employees and not for self-employed. There is no information on this subject for self-employed.

Research on the prevalence of work related psychological disorders among the working population in different economic sectors showed that the male working population in the Hotels and Restaurant sector has a relatively high prevalence of these disorders as compared to men working in other sectors (Laitinen-Krispijn and Bijl, 2002). The prevalence of anxiety disorders was 10%, while the prevalence of alcohol problems/addiction was as high as 17,5%.

Research on self reported health complaints by Houtman and De Vroome (2002) showed that the most important health complaints in the sector are work related neck, shoulder and arm problems. This is in line with national figures. Furthermore, employees in the sector more often report serious feelings of fatigue compared to nationwide figures (Table 3.7).

Finally, based on dermatologist notifications, there are indications that some occupational groups in the Hotels and Restaurants sector, like cleaners and cooks, have a higher risk of developing contact eczema/dermatitis (NCvB, 2002).

Table 3.7 (3.22 in guidelines) Morbidity in the sector: main types of illnesses/health complaints

Main types of illness/ health complaints	Number of illnesses		% of workers	
	NACE 55	National	NACE 55 (N=444)	National (N=11.543)
1. Work related neck, shoulder, and arm complaints			29	28
2. Serious feelings of fatigue			15*	10
3. Burnout			13	11
4. Chronic back problems			6	8

Source: Houtman & De Vroome, 2002

* p<0,05 (significantly different from national data)

The main causes for disability in the sector are psychological problems or problems related to the musculoskeletal system (Table 3.8). The interviewed key informers indicate

that the psychological problems are related to the high work pressure and the combination of work and non-working life. According to the key informers the musculoskeletal problems are a result of the fact that employees have to stand for long periods of time during their work and are often working in ergonomically poor designed workplaces.

In 2000 the risk of influx of people receiving a disability benefit⁷ (WAO-benefit, see paragraph 3.6) in the Hotels and Restaurants sector was 0,9%⁸ (2.419 persons). This is relatively low compared to the disability risk in other sectors in the Netherlands. Nationwide the average influx of WAO recipients was 1,3%. In part the lower influx in the Hotels and Restaurants sector can be explained by the fact that many (young) employees only work in the sector for a short period of time. Most employees have left the sector before (work-related) health complaints can turn into long-term disorders. Although the overall WAO-influx in the sector is relatively low, a specific risk group are employees working in contract catering. The risk of WAO-influx in this sub-sector is 2,8%. According to the key informers this high influx is partially caused by the fact that the sub-sector working population consists of a highly homogeneous group of middle aged, part-time working women who experience trouble in their work and non-working life.

Table 3.8 (3.23 in guidelines) Diagnosis of those who receive a disability benefit¹ (new cases each year) in 2000

Main causes of disability/diagnosis	% of workers					
	Total Sector Nace 55		Sub-sector ²		National	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
1. Psychological disorder	876	36,2	159	31,8	35.800	35,7
2. Disease musculoskeletal system	694	28,7	180	36,0	25.675	25,6
3. Other	497	20,5	94	18,8	24684	
4. Injury	160	6,6	37	7,4	6.321	24,6
5. Heart- en vascular disease	118	4,9	18	3,6	5.352	6,3
6. Pregnancy	59	2,4	9	1,8	2.007	5,3
7. Congenital conditions	15	0,6	3	0,6	354	2,0
						0,4
Total	2.419	100	500		100.193	100
Number of people insured for disability	268.925		18.149		6.811.194	
Disability risk	0,9%		2,8%		1,5%	

Source: Lisv, 2001

¹ WAO benefit (see paragraph 3.6)

² Contract catering sub-sector

In line with disability (WAO)-influx the sickness absenteeism percentage in the sector is among the lowest in The Netherlands. However, according to some key informers many companies neglect to fully register sickness absenteeism. The main reason for not reporting sickness absence is the fact that many employees have a flexible employment contract, which makes it easier to change one's shift in case of sickness. According to one key informer there has been a clear decrease in the absenteeism percentage since the privatisation of the Dutch Health Law (Sickness Act) in 1994.

⁷ Including catering sub-sector

⁸ Number of new disability benefits divided by the number of people insured against disability

At the same time however, absenteeism registration has worsened since this privatisation. Organisations no longer feel the obligation to register absence, so they don't. Before the change in this Act, they benefited from reporting employees sick if they were, because the sick employee would receive his pay from social benefits. The privatisation resulted in the fact the employer had to pay the sick employee himself. Like in other sectors, bigger companies tend to have higher sickness percentages than smaller companies.

Table 3.9 (3.24 in guidelines) Sickness absenteeism in 2001¹

Indicators	NACE 55		National	
	incl. pregnancy leave	excl. pregnancy leave	incl. pregnancy leave	excl. pregnancy leave
Lost days (% of calendar days)				
• 2001	4,0	3,6	6,1	5,4
• 2000	4,2	3,8	6,1	5,5
• 1999	3,7	3,3	6,0	5,4
• 1998	3,2	2,7	5,6	5,0
• 1997	3,1	2,7	5,1	4,6
• 1996	3,5	3,2	5,1	4,6
Frequency (rate of sickness spells)				
Average duration (total days absent)				
Costs of compensation (in euros)				

Source: CBS Statline

¹Figures are based on private companies and do not include governmental institutions, personnel employed by households, international community organs, and companies and institutions that don't employ people according to the CBS register.

Access to social protection⁹

In the first part of this paragraph the Dutch social security system is briefly discussed. The social insurances apply to all Dutch sectors, they do not specifically apply to the Hotels and Restaurants sector. In the second part of the paragraph legislation related to sickness, disability and unemployment is discussed in more detail.

Dutch social security system

The Dutch social security system can be divided into national insurances (Volksverzekeringen), employed person's insurances (Werknemers-verzekeringen) and welfare benefits (Sociale voorzieningen). The national insurance schemes principally apply to all Dutch residents (employees, the self-employed, unemployed) and cover old age, death, long-term invalidity, certain medical expenses and child benefit. In addition, by means of employed person's insurance schemes employees are insured against unemployment, sickness, long-term disability and medical care. Finally, welfare benefits are social benefits that are not financed out of premiums, like the national and employed person's social insurances, but are fully financed by public funds. Furthermore, in the case of (entitlement to) welfare benefits it is a question of determining the applicant's need, while in the case of social insurance it is a question of refunding a premium. The amounts of money paid from the welfare benefits are generally much lower than those paid from the national and the employed person's insurances.

⁹ This paragraph is based on the TNO/European Foundation-report 'Integrated approaches to active welfare and employment strategies: The Netherlands' by De Haan & Verboon (2000) and on information from the website of the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment (www.szw.nl).

Table 3.10 shows the main social security schemes applicable to Dutch residents.

Table 3.10 Main social security schemes

Type	Act
Social insurance: national insurance (Volksverzekeringen)	AOW (Algemene ouderdomswet) = General Old Age Pensions Act ANW (Algemene nabestaandenwet) = Dependants Benefits Act AWBZ (Algemene wet bijzondere ziektekosten) = Exceptional Medical Expenses Compensation Act AKW (Algemene kinderbijslagwet) = General Child Benefits Act
Social insurance: employed person's insurance (Werknemersverzekeringen)	WW (Werkloosheidswet)= Unemployment Insurance Act ZW (Ziektewet) = Sickness Benefits Act, privatised into the WULBZ (Wet uitbreiding loondoorbetaling bij ziekte): Act Extending the Period of Continued Payment of Wages during Sickness WAO (Wet op de arbeidsongeschiktheidsverzekering) = Disablement Benefits Act ZFW (Ziekenfondswet)= Health Insurance Act
Welfare benefits (Sociale voorzieningen)	ABW (Algemene bijstandswet) = National Assistance Act IOAW (Wet inkomensvoorziening oudere en gedeeltelijk arbeidsongeschikte werkloze werknemers) = Older and Partially Incapacitated Unemployed Workers' Income Support Act IOAZ (Wet inkomensvoorziening oudere en gedeeltelijk arbeidsongeschikte gewezen zelfstandigen) = Older and Partially Incapacitated Former Self-Employed Persons' Income Support Act WAJONG (Wet arbeidsongeschiktheidsvoorziening jong gehandicapten) = Disability Benefits Act for Early Handicapped/disabled Persons WAZ (Wet arbeidsongeschiktheidsverzekering zelfstandigen) = Disability Benefits Act for Self-employed Persons TW (Toeslagenwet) = Supplementary Benefits Act

Source: De Haan and Verboon, 2000 & Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment (www.szw.nl)

Specific legislation

According to the Act Extending the Period of Continued Payment of Wages during Sickness¹⁰ the employer is obligated to pay 70% of the employee's salary (at least the minimum wage) for 52 weeks after an employee reports absent due to sickness. In most collective agreements the employers organizations and Trade Unions agree to supplement the salary of absent employees up to the full level of pay for a certain period of time, dependent on the length of the employment contract. When an employee reports absent due to sickness during his/her probation period, the supplementary payment stops after 2 weeks. When an employee reports absent due to sickness after an employment period of one year or less it stops after 13 weeks. When an employee reports absent due to sickness after an employment period of more than one year the supplementation period is 52 weeks. The employer, however, is allowed to implement one qualifying day for sickness benefit (waiting day). These laws are important for employees, and do place those employees who are working in seasonal jobs, as a 'temporary assistant', or under temporary contracts at some risk of income.

¹⁰ Wet Uitbreiding Loondoorbetaling Bij Ziekte, WULBZ. This Acts was implemented in 1996 and took the privatisation of the sickness benefits even further than the changes by the Acts implemented in 1994. This Act is still active at present.

When the sickness period is deliberately caused by the employee, when the employee hampers his own recovery, or when the employee refuses to accept an adjusted job at his own or a job with another employer, the employer isn't obligated to pay the employee's salary. An employer can, however, also be fined when he does not cooperate, and does not put effort into job retention after the employee became absent due to sickness.

When absent employees do not have the right to 70% of their last wage paid by their employer (e.g. when employees takes a sick leave during probation time, have a fixed term contract, are contracted by an employment agency) employees receive a sickness benefit from the Employed Persons' Insurance Administration Agency (Uitvoeringsinstituut Werknemersverzekeringen, UWV). The employers can claim full wage payment of their sick employees from the UWV in case of an employee who was formerly diagnosed to be disabled for work or when, for example, the employee is sick because of pregnancy or organ donation. Employers have a choice to (partly) insure themselves for the costs resulting from sickness absenteeism.

If the incapacity of an employee persists beyond the period of a year he or she may be entitled to a benefit under the provisions of the Disablement Benefits Act (Wet op de Arbeidsongeschiktheidsverzekering, WAO). According to this act employees under the age of 65 years who are still unable to work for at least 15% or more have a right to an disablement insurance benefit. As shown in Table 3.8 in 2000 268.925 employees in the Hotels and Restaurant sector were insured against disablement. There is no information available on the number of self-employed that insure themselves against disablement. It does appear that only part of the self-employed ensure themselves against disability because of the high costs of such an insurance.

The amount of disability benefit and the duration of entitlement varies according to age, the level of pay formerly earned, and to degree of disablement. This degree of disablement is assessed by a job analyst (Arbeidsdeskundige) of the Employed Persons' Insurance Administration Agency (Uitvoeringsinstituut Werknemersverzekeringen, UWV). In the collective agreement employers organizations and Trade Unions have agreed to complete the benefit up to 70% of the last salary when fully disabled ($\geq 80\%$ loss of working capacity). The completion will be paid by the industry-level pension fund of the sector (Bedrijfspensioenfond). Employers are obligated to pay a general contribution to this fund which is used to pay employees who are disabled for more than 5 years. So-called minimum terms workers (i.e. 'on-call' workers: those who have no secure weekly working hours or those who work when their employer calls them) are not entitled to receive a disability benefit.

When employees get unemployed they have the right to an unemployment benefit according to the Unemployment Insurance Act. The amount and length of period of the benefit depends on one's employment history, family income and one's own property. People are entitled to an unemployment benefit when they are younger than 65 years and the job loss is not due to one's own fault. When an employee has worked for at least 26 weeks during the 39 weeks preceding the day of unemployment, he or she receives a temporary unemployment benefit of 70% of the minimum wage during a maximum period of six months. As a result of this minimum threshold, employees working in the Hotels and Restaurants sector as a minimum terms worker may not be entitled to an

unemployment benefit. When an employee has worked 52 days for four out of five years preceding the year of unemployment the benefit will be 70% of the last wage (up till a certain maximum) over a period based on the employment history, and after that period the employee receives a benefit of 70% of the minimum wage.

Finally, the Flexibility and Security Act that was implemented in 1999 is of specific interest for the sector¹¹. The act made "fixed" employment more flexible and increased the security of flexible employees. For example, under provisions of the new act under provisions of the new act, companies can use temporary employment contracts more than they could in the past. Furthermore, agreements between employees and temporary employment agencies will now be considered as employment contracts. In addition to this a series of consecutive temporary employment contracts will, under certain conditions, lead to a permanent employment contract. Another effect of the act is that on-call workers/minimum-terms workers can claim a minimum of three hours' pay each time they are called to work. In other words, employers must pay out (at least) three hours every time they call in an on-call worker, regardless of whether three hours are actually worked or not.

For more information on the social security in the Netherlands we refer to the TNO-report 'Integrated approaches to active welfare and employment strategies: The Netherlands', written by De Haan & Verboon (2000) for the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions.

Overall analysis and conclusion

Risk factors

With some restrictions the risk profile of the sector is as presented below. It has to be kept in mind, however, that particularly information on employment and working conditions, as well as health has to be obtained from surveys from the Central Bureau of Statistics, and that since these surveys only collect this information from people who at least work 12 hours/week on average. Because of this, no information is available for about one third of the employees. This 'third' consists of relatively many women with relatively small contracts, seasonal workers and probably people doing undeclared work as well. The quality of work and employment may therefore be biased in a positive direction.

Main risk factors in the sector Hotels and Restaurants are:

- high work/time pressure, high pace of work together with lack of autonomy;
- aggression/threats by clients;
- exposure to noise;
- physical load: standing for a long period of time, carrying heavy loads, working in ergonomically poor designed workplaces;
- exposure to sharp objects & hot materials/substances.

A specific problem in the sector is the payment system. A number of companies are trying to evade the payment of taxes and social security contributions by keeping

¹¹ This section is based on information from www.eiro.eurofound.ie

employees outside the official framework. In the case of undeclared employment employees are not insured for social security benefits. Furthermore, companies disregard specific collective agreements related to, for example, the payment of extra allowances. Finally, the average wage in the sector is substantially lower than the nationwide average.

Regarding working hours, split shifts and irregular working hours are a specific risk factor, especially in relation to the combination of work and non-working life.

Risk groups

Main risk groups for unfavourable working conditions in the sector Hotels and Restaurants groups are:

- receptionists;
- employees in contract catering;
- waiters;
- dish washers;
- cooks/kitchen aides.

Research by Houtman et al. (1992) showed that, when looking at combined exposure, most important risk groups are waiters and dish washers. They often work under high work/time pressure in combination with a high physical work load. Moreover, waiters (and other personnel working in bars, discotheques and restaurants) are frequently exposed to aggressive behaviour by customers. Receptionists report an excessively high work pressure as well (Klein Hesselink et al., 2000). According to the key informers the, mostly female, employees working in the contract catering sub-sector are a risk group too because of problems with combining work and non-working life. Furthermore, cooks and kitchen aides are a specific risk group in terms of high physical work load (standing for a long period of time) and exposure to sharp objects and hot materials/substances. In general employees working fulltime and employees working in bigger companies are more at risk than other employees.

An interesting trend is that many companies nowadays outsource several activities to specialized enterprises. Especially cleaning and security services are being outsourced. In 1994 respectively 11% and 10% of the companies outsourced these activities, whereas in 2002 32% and 35% did so. Because of the outsource of activities potential risk groups like cleaning and security personnel are no longer under the direct attention of the sector.

The Dutch social security systems can be divided into national insurances (Volksverzekeringen), employed person's insurances (*Werknemers-verzekeringen*) and welfare benefits (Sociale voorzieningen). The national insurance schemes principally apply to *all* Dutch residents (employees, the self-employed, unemployed) and cover old age, death, long-term invalidity, certain medical expenses and child benefit. The employed person's benefits principally apply to all employees (so NOT the self-employed or the unemployed). However, there are some groups of employees who will have no or limited access to some of these insurances. So-called minimum terms workers (i.e. 'on call' workers: those who have no secure weekly work schedule) are not entitled to disability benefits. In order to receive unemployment benefits, one has to have been

working for at least 26 weeks during the 39 weeks preceding the unemployment. As a result, a minimum term worker may not be entitled to an unemployment benefit either. Workers doing undeclared work will also be denied access to the employed person's insurances. A minimum term worker and a worker doing undeclared work may, therefore, be considered to be a risk group with respect to access to social protection system for workers.

Also, self employed are often not insured against sickness and disability, because of the high costs of these insurances.

Quality of work and employment: Policies and instruments

In this chapter the main policies and instruments regarding quality of work and employment are discussed. For extra information on these subjects we refer to Annex C.

Regulation, collective bargaining and case law¹²

Regulation

The most important regulations on the quality of work in the sector are the Working Conditions Act (Occupational Health and Safety Act/Arbeidsomstandighedenwet), the Working Hours Act, (Arbeidstijdenwet) the Works Council Act (Wet op de ondernemingsraden) and the Gatekeeper Improvement Act¹³ (Wet Verbetering Poortwachter).

Since 1998 the Working Conditions Act describes what employers have to do to create the most favourable working conditions for their employees. According to this act all employers are obligated to:

1. pursue a Health and Safety Policy (to prevent diseases, absenteeism, working disabilities, and occupational diseases, and to improve the working conditions in the organization);
2. analyse and evaluate the occupational risks in the organization by performing a 'health and safety risk evaluation' (Risico-inventarisatie en -evaluatie: RIE) to improve their Working Conditions Policy;
3. inform and advise employees about safety and health;
4. report occupational accidents and diseases to the Labour Inspectorate;
5. cooperate with employees (e.g. through a Works Council or by arranging direct employee consultation on work);
6. call in the services of a certified Occupational Health and Safety Service (to help companies pursuing an effective Occupational Health and Safety policy: for instance by analysing and evaluating potential risks and guidance of employees on sick leave);
7. set up an in-house emergency and first-aid service.

The Working Conditions Act refers specifically to the employer's obligations with regard to the rhythm of work; from the viewpoint of control 'the worker must be able to influence the rhythm of work', and damage caused by excessively high or low workload must be avoided. With regard to social relationships, 'the employer must protect the worker from aggression, violence or sexual harassment¹⁴.

The Working Hours Act provides standard norms for the maximum length of work days, work weeks, over work, non working time, breaks, shift work, on-call work, etc. If the employer and representatives of the employees wish to deviate from these standard norms, they are allowed to accept deviating (wider) norms in the collective agreement that better fit their situation.

¹² Source for this paragraph: www.szw.nl

¹³ official name: Amended eligibility for permanent invalidity benefit (restrictions) Act

¹⁴ Paragraph taken from European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (2002).

For example, according to the standard norms:

- the maximum length of a working day is 9 hours;
- the maximum length of a working week is 45 hours;
- incidental overtime work is allowed as long as the length of a working day does not exceed 11 hours;
- incidental overtime work is allowed as long as the length of a working week does not exceed the 54 hours.

According to the Works Council Act the formation of a Works Council is compulsory for companies with more than 50 employees. The Works Council has the authority to lodge an appeal on the plans of the employer and to make proposals about all kinds of social, organizational, financial and economical aspects of the organization and present these proposals to the employer. Further, the employer is obligated to ask for the Works Council's assent/approval with regulations on working times, holidays, working conditions, training/education of staff, and regulations regarding the appointment, promotion and firing of personnel, and the Works Council has the right to be informed about the annual account, the annual social report and policy plans in order to fulfil their work. However, according to the union key informer, relative few companies in the Hotels and Restaurant sector have formed a Works Council. Specific data on this matter is not available.

The Gatekeeper Improvement Act is brought into effect per April 1st 2002. The main goal of this act is to get sick employees back to work within the first year of sick leave and preceding the right to a disablement insurance benefit.

*Collective bargaining*¹⁵

The collective bargaining takes place in three sub-sectors: hotels & restaurants (horeca), lodging and contract catering.

Bargaining parties in the catering sub-sector are the Royal Catering Netherlands (employers' organization; Koninklijke Horeca Nederland, KHN), the Dutch Trade Union Federation (FNV Horecabond) and the Christian Trade Union Federation (CNV Horeca). The agreement between the KHN, the FNV and CNV is usually generally extended. A second, competing, employers' organization is the relatively small Dutch Catering Guild (Nederlands Horeca Gilde, NHG). The NHG has been established as an alternative to the KHN and concludes a legally valid collective wage agreement with the small ABGP trade union¹⁶. However, the NHG and ABGP do not participate in any other agreement or social fund. The agreement of the NHG and ABGP represents only a small number of employees in the catering sub-sector. The KHN and NHG question each others representativeness.

¹⁵ Source: Jossart, A. & Walthery, P. (2001). Sectoral Unions and Employers Organisations in the EU Hotels, Restaurants and Cafés sector (NACE55)

¹⁶ Source: Nederlands Horeca Gilde (www.horecagilde.nl)

In the lodging sub-sector bargaining parties are the employers' organization RECRON (Vereniging van Recreatieondernemers Nederland), the FNV Horecabond and the CNV Horeca.

Finally, bargaining parties in the contract catering sub-sector are the employers' organization Veneca (Vereniging Nederlandse Cateringorganisaties), the FNV Horecabond, the CNV Horeca and the small trade union De Unie.

Despite the low union density in the total sector, the trade unions FNV Horecabond and CNV Horeca are recognized by the employer's in the sector as legitimate and representative organizations. Apart from the NHG/ABGP agreement they negotiate all collective agreements and are represented in all governing organizations, social funds and advisory councils (as far as they exist). Tables 4.1 and 4.2 show more detailed information about the bargaining parties.

Table 4.1 (2.18 in guidelines) Employers' organizations negotiating collective agreements.

Name	Type of companies covered	Companies	Employees	Density ¹	Collective Bargaining	National Affiliation	European Affiliation - indirect
KHN	Catering	18.000	185.000	5.7% (65% ²)	Yes	VNO- NCW	HOTREC, UNICE
NHG	Catering	350	8.000	2.5%	Yes	MKB- Nederland	UEAPME, Eurocommerce
RECRON	Lodging and one-day recreational companies	1.400	18.000	5.6% (>90% ²)	Yes	-	EFCO
VENECA	Large contract catering companies	12	15.840	5% (>90% ²)	Yes	VNO- NCW	FERCO, ECA, UNICE

Source: Jossart, A. & Walthery, P. (2001).

¹ Density is the ratio between affiliates or employees members of an and the total number of employees in the sector.

² Density rate is the number of employees members of an organization divided by the potential members in respective sub-sectors/occupations, estimated by a national expert.

Table 4.2 (2.19 in guidelines) Trade unions negotiating collective agreements.

Name	Type of employees covered	Members	Members nationwide ²	Density ¹	Collective Bargaining	National Affiliation	European Affiliation - indirect
FNV Horecabond	All	28.000	123.400	8,7%	Yes	FNV	EFFAT, ETUC
CNV Horeca	All	2.750	354.400 ⁴	0,85%	Yes	CNV	EFFAT, ETUC
De Unie	Contract catering	221 (In 2002: 500 ³)	100.000 ³	0,06%	Yes	Unie MHP	EFFAT, UNI
ABGP	Catering	-	10.000 ⁵	-	Yes	-	-

Source: Jossart, A. & Walthery, P. (2001). Elaboration: TNO Work and Employment

¹ Density is the ratio between affiliates or employees members of an organization and the total number of employees in the sector.

² Source: CBS Statline

³ Source: www.unie.nl

⁴ Figure refers to the CNV in total. CNV Horeca (2.750 members) is a part of the CNV Bedrijvenbond (which has got 90.000 members and is a subdivision of CNV).

⁵ Source: www.abgp.nl

The most important Collective Agreement (CA; In Dutch: Collectieve Arbeids-overeenkomst, CAO), is the agreement that applies to the catering (horeca) sub-sector. The latest CA in the catering (horeca) sub-sector applied to almost 292.000 employees (De Wit, 2001). This CA ended on the first of July 2002. Since then, social partners have been negotiating on a new agreement for the next two years (2002-2004). However, at the moment these negotiations between the KHN, FNV and CNV have come to a complete standstill. The main point of difference in the negotiations between KHN, FNV and CNV relates to the wage increase¹⁷. Whereas trade unions want to carry out a wage increase for all the employees in the sub-sector, the employers' organizations only agree to a wage increase for employees that earn the exact CAO-wage (about a third of the total number of employees). Another point of controversy is the payment of extra allowances for working on Sundays.

The Collective Agreement for the lodging sub-sector is concluded for the period July 2002-July 2004, the agreement for the contract catering sub-sector is valid for the period March 2001-March 2003.

Especially within the catering (horeca) sub-sector the compliance with the CAO's is an important issue. According to the trade union key informer, a substantial number of companies don't comply with, for example, agreements related to the payment of extra allowances. Some companies seem to deliberately do so (often this is related to undeclared work), while others don't comply out of ignorance.

Finally, separate collective agreements are made in the Fondsen-CAO (agreements on contributions to Social Funds) and the SOHOR-CAO (agreement related to early retirement-Fund). See paragraph 4.3 for more information about these funds.

The social partners meet in the LBC (Landelijke Bedrijfscommissie voor het Horecabedrijf; joint sectoral committee) to consult about terms of employment / negotiate Collective Agreements.

Occupational safety and health policies¹⁸

Covenant on Health and Safety at Work

Most agreements in the CAO refer to terms of employment and are not directly related to the quality of work itself. Agreements that relate to the quality of work are laid down in so-called Covenants on Health and Safety at Work (Arboconvenanten). Since 2000, the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment actively stimulates (also financially) the conclusion of such covenants. The Covenants on Health and Safety at Work are directly aimed at reducing exposure of employees to risky and unfavourable working conditions. Within a process framework where a starting situation is formulated (mostly by way of

¹⁷ Sources: interviews with KHN and FNV, www.horeca.cms.fnv.nl

¹⁸ Source: Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid. (2000). Arboconvenant Werkdruk Horeca.

both quantitative as well as qualitative research), goals are formulated for a period of 2-4 years, plans are made and carried out, and evaluated at the end, the Ministry stimulates social partners to decide within the specific contexts of the sector, to actively start primary and secondary prevention. The catering (horeca) sub-sector concluded such a covenant in June 2000. Initially the covenant was valid until June 2003, but it has been extended until 2004. Apart from the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment participants in the covenant are the KHN, FNV Horeca, CNV Bedrijvenbond and the BHC. The main goal of the covenant is a 10% reduction of the work pressure in the sector.

Several measures and instruments have been developed to achieve this goal:

- The Quick Scan Work Pressure Horeca. This Quick Scan is a short electronic checklist for employees, that helps to determine what factors (e.g. working hours, lack of consultation) lead to work pressure within their company. The Quick Scan has to be performed by at least 1000 big and medium sized companies (40% of the total number of employees in the sector) before the end of the covenant.
- Brochure providing information on possible measures for companies to reduce work pressure.
- Website that provides information on the covenant and monitors the progression being made.
- An instrument, developed for small companies (less than 20 employees), to conduct a health and safety risk assessment regarding the quality of working conditions.
- A training on handling aggression and violence in the workplace has been developed for employees.
- A standardised 'model' agreement (model contract) between companies and Occupational Health and Safety Services, providing statutory regulations concerning mandatory services for companies, and background information on optional services. Furthermore there is benchmarking taking place on quality and prices of services provided by the different Health and Safety Services. The main goal of the model agreement is to help companies choose between different service packages.
- Development of 'best practices'. In several companies the implementation of measures that are aimed at a reduction of work pressure is being supervised and monitored by several professionals in occupational health. Information obtained from these monitoring activities can be used by other companies. Within the framework of this project a toolkit is being developed, which can be used to improve working conditions.
- A manual that helps employers to induct new employees and provides information on working conditions and occupational safety (emergency procedures/calamities, handling aggressive behaviour by customers, hygiene, environment, handling dangerous substances, lifting weights etc). The subjects in the manual are categorized by occupational group.

The total costs of the Covenant on Health and Safety at Work are 3,6 million euro (Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, 2002a), 50% of these costs are financed by The Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment.

Another covenant has been concluded for the contract catering sub-sector and is valid for the period October 2001-July 2004. Participants in this covenant are Veneca, FNV

Horeca, CNV Bedrijvenbond and De Unie. The Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment however is not involved in this covenant.

Sector organization

The plans that are agreed to in the Covenant on Health and Safety at Work for the catering (horeca) sub-sector are, for the greater part, being carried out by the Board for the Hotel and Catering Industry (BHC). This public-law sector organization is an example of an occupational health and safety measure itself. Both employer organizations (KHN, Veneca, Recron) and trade unions are represented in the BHC (FNV Horecabond, CNV Horeca). The BHC is a knowledge and innovation centre that provides information on, among other things, trends in the quality of work and employment in the sector.

Health and Safety Audits

According to the Working Conditions Act (Arbowet) all companies are obligated to perform a health and safety risk assessment (Risico-inventarisatie en -evaluatie: RIE), either by themselves or by an Occupational Health and Safety Service. Furthermore, the results of this assessment (action plan) have to be checked by an Occupational Health and Safety Service.

However, no more than 30% of the companies in the Hotels and Restaurant Sector have complied to this obligation (BHC, 2002d). According to the BHC key informers this can be partly explained by the fact that small companies are reluctant to call in a certified Occupational Health and Safety Service to carry out a risk assessment, because they are too expensive. Furthermore, many companies lack the in-house expertise to carry out a risk assessment themselves, because they are too small to employ an Occupational Health and Safety-specialist.

According to the Covenant on Health and Safety at Work discussed above at least 1000 companies should have performed a Quick Scan Work Pressure by October 2001 (Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment, 2002b). However, this target has not yet been achieved. Up to now between 200 and 300 companies have carried out the Quick Scan.

Preventive Services

Since 1998 all companies (that employ personnel) in the Netherlands are obligated to conclude a contract with an Occupational Health and Safety Service (possibly in-company) according to the Working Conditions Act (Arbowet). Consequently all companies (and all employees) in the sector should receive preventive services from Occupational Health and Safety Services. However, no detailed information was available as to whether this is the case. Also, no detailed statistics were available regarding the number of Occupational Health and Safety Services that are active in the sector.

The main (obligatory) services provided by Occupational Health and Safety Services are:

- Health and safety risk assessment (Risico-inventarisatie en -evaluatie: RIE);
- Periodic Occupational Health Examination (Periodiek Arbeidsgezondheidskundig Onderzoek: PAGO);
- Consultation on Working conditions (Arbeidsomstandighedenspreekuur);

- Sickness Absence Guidance;
- Pre-employment medical examination, if necessary for specific occupation (Aanstellingskeuring).

Inspecting and enforcing organizations¹⁹

The main inspecting and enforcing organization regarding the quality of working conditions is the Labour Inspectorate. The Labour Inspectorate controls the compliance of companies with the regulations on occupational health and safety. The Inspectorate has several means of enforcement: the authority to close down business in case of danger, and imposing warrants/fines/serving summons in case of not complying with the Working Conditions Act. In 2001 the Inspectorate there were 868 company visits in the sector (Arbeidsinspectie, 2002a). One hundred of the organisations visited (12%) received at least one ‘administrative fine’ (bestuurlijke boete). This percentage is equal to the national percentage (11%). In total there were 168 offences in 2001 that led to a fine. Table 4.3 shows the reasons for companies to receive a fine.

Table 4.3 (5.7 in guidelines): Means for enforcement regarding Occupational Safety and Health: fines by the Labour Inspectorate

Companies that received fine because of:	Number and % of companies in sector NACE 55	
No health and safety risk assessment	115	68%
No affiliation with certified Occupational Health and Safety Service (OHSS)	9	5%
Incorrect use of (OHSS)	8	5%
No action plan regarding health and safety ¹	7	4%
Dangerous placement of equipment	3	2%
No report of work related accident to Labour Inspectorate	3	2%
Other	23	14%
Total	168	100%

Source: Arbeidsinspectie, 2002a

¹ Action plan=Plan van aanpak

Other important inspecting organizations are The Inspectorate for Health Protection and Veterinary Public Health (Keuringsdienst van Waren), fire-department, local governments and the Environmental Inspectorate (Milieuinspectie). However, for these organizations quality of work and employment is of secondary interest.

Company strategies, examples of good and bad practices²⁰

Most of the company strategies and best practices regarding the quality of working conditions take place within the framework of the above-mentioned Covenant on Health and Safety at Work. However several other initiatives are being developed within the sector regarding the quality of working conditions:

¹⁹ Source: Arbeidsinspectie (2002b).

²⁰ Partially this paragraph is based on information obtained from www.cao-horeca.nl.

Action Programmes and Projects

- Recent development of an ergonomically-designed kitchen unit for cooks so they can sit down during their (preparatory) work.
- See also paragraph 'Funds, prizes and subsidies' below

Training and Education Programmes and Projects

- The jointly represented sector organization SVH (Stichting Nationaal Onderwijscentrum van de Bedrijfstak Horeca) provides a great number of products and services related to examination, educational tools and education. The LOB/HTV Landelijk Orgaan Beroepsonderwijs Horeca, Toerisme en Voeding (LOB HTV) is another jointly represented organization that controls and safeguards the quality of education in the sector. The sector stimulates the incorporation of occupational health and safety issues in educational programmes.
- A training on handling aggression and violence in the workplace has been developed for employees. This training is partly subsidized by the Covenant on Health and Safety at Work.
- See also paragraph 'Funds, prizes and subsidies' below.

Research Programmes and Projects

- Continuous research on the quality of working conditions, the sector structure, mobility, labour market, job satisfaction etcetera is being done (or coordinated) by the BHC sector organization.
- The BHC also conducts research on the communication of the sector with small catering establishments (small bars, hotels, restaurants, etc), while a lot of information on occupational health and safety doesn't seem to adequately reach these small companies. Possibilities to better communicate typical OSH-related issues are explored.
- Within the framework of the Covenant on Health and Safety at Work many research has been done on the quality of working conditions as well (in particular research on work pressure).

Guidelines or codes

- Code of conduct: anti-discrimination, developed by the BHC in collaboration with the SVH and SBH (see funds, prizes and subsidies). It comprises statutory regulations as well as intentions to prevent and combat race discrimination.
- Guideline/handbook for new employees regarding occupational health and safety (see 4.2).

Funds, prizes and subsidies

Funds

Employers and/or employees are obligated to contribute to four collective nationwide sector/sector funds:

- Pensioenfonds Horeca & Catering: Pension/retirement Fund: every employee (either part-time or fulltime), older than 25 is obligated to pay a contribution to this fund. However, there are some exceptions to this rule. For example employees or managers employed at a Public Limited Company or a Private Limited Company/LTD that is not

(anymore) obligated to insure itself for social security (according to social security laws) are not obligated to pay a contribution. Over 35.000 employers participate in the fund.

- Stichting Fonds Bevordering Intreding in het Horecabedrijf (FBI): finances labour market research and schooling projects within companies. Furthermore it stimulates specific groups of job-seekers to find a so called (temporarily, subsidized) job-experience place within the sector (werkervaringsplaats). Target groups of the fund are: students/apprentices, long-term unemployed, immigrants, people re-entering the labour market (returners), partially disabled workers, etc. Finally the fund realized an arrangement regarding child care facilities.
- Stichting Sociaal Fonds voor het Horecabedrijf (SFH): Social Fund, finances costs of implementation of the Collective Agreements (CAO-afspraken, see 4.1) and activities that stimulate the compliance with the agreements by companies. The fund also finances education programmes for employers and employees.
- Stichting Overgangsregeling voor het Horecabedrijf (SOHOR): (temporary) arrangement for early retirement: this arrangement is meant for people born in 1954 or before and only applies under certain conditions.

The Stichting Beheer Horecasecretariaten (SBH) is a jointly represented organization that provides administrative support for the above-mentioned funds (and for the LBC, see 4.1). The SBH also collects the premiums/contributions for the funds and provides information on CLA(CAO)-regulations/terms of employment on behalf of the funds.

Prizes

- At the moment the sector is developing an award regarding best practices in Occupational Health and Safety in the sector.
- 'Innovation awards' have been presented for the development of a machine that automatically polishes glass and for a machine that pulverizes glass.

Subsidies

The sector provides (e.g. by means of the FBI Fund and the Social Fund):

- Subsidies for recruitment of disabled, unemployed persons (receiving a WAO disability benefit) and immigrants;
- Subsidies for schooling of personnel.

The government first of all subsidizes the Covenant on Health and Safety at Work (Arboconvenant). It also stimulates the investment of companies in 'innovative Occupational Health and Safety-friendly' capital equipment (e.g. cutting machines, lifting equipment etc; Farbo arrangement²¹), by letting companies choose for themselves when to write off those investments (which offers interest and liquidity benefits)

Finally the sector organization BHC subsidizes and facilitates research on Occupation Health and Safety.

²¹ Source: www.arbeidsinspectie.nl

Other examples

- Information on quality of working conditions is provided by the BHC via internet and journals.
- The appointment of a confidential adviser by the LBC (See 4.1).

Overall analysis and conclusions

The nationwide regulatory framework on occupational health and safety is quite extensive. According to the Working Conditions Act all companies are obligated to take precautionary measures to protect their employees against occupational hazards. The compliance to these obligations is controlled by the Labour Inspectorate.

Collective bargaining parties in the sector are the employers' organizations KHN, NHG, Recron and Veneca, and the trade unions FNV Horecabond, CNV Horeca (CNV Bedrijvenbond), De Unie and ABGP. The sector is characterised by a low union membership. There are three collective sub-sector agreements: hotels & restaurants (horeca), lodging and contract catering. Furthermore there are agreements on the (contributions to the) Social Funds and on arrangements regarding early retirement. Social partners meet in several bipartite organizations such as:

- Bedrijfschap Horeca en Catering (BHC);
- Stichting Nationaal Onderwijscentrum van de Bedrijfstak Horeca (SVH);
- Landelijk Orgaan Beroepsonderwijs Horeca, Toerisme en Voeding (LOB HTV);
- Stichting Beheer Horecasecretariaten (SBH);
- The joint sectoral committee LBC (Landelijke Bedrijfscommissie voor het Horeca-bedrijf).

Whereas collective bargaining is mainly focused on wages and other terms of employment, separate agreements on occupational health and safety are made in a Covenant on Health and Safety at Work (Arboconvenant). Two covenants are concluded in the sector: one for the horeca sub-sector and one for the contract catering sub-sector. The covenants are of great importance in decreasing occupational risks for employees.

A great point of concern however is the compliance of companies with collective agreements and the covenant. For example, many companies haven't performed a mandatory Health and Safety Risk Assessment (RIE), or carried out a quickscan Work Pressure (not obligatory). According to the key informers this problem is related to the fact that many (small) companies lack the in-house expertise to carry out these assessments themselves and are reluctant to call in the help of an expensive Occupational Health and Safety Service. Furthermore a substantial number of companies don't comply with, for example, agreements related to the payment of extra allowances. Some companies seem to do so on purpose (often this is related to undeclared work), while others don't comply out of ignorance. According to the key informers the sector experiences difficulties in reaching individual companies. Partly this can be explained by the fact that there is high turnover of companies (in particular small companies). Every year many entrepreneurs start a new business in the sector, while others leave the sector. This situation seriously hampers the professionalization of the sector.

Issues and Challenges

In this chapter the points of view and ideas of the key informers representing the social partners and the sector organization on the social dialogue and quality of work in the sector are briefly presented. The chapter ends with some conclusions on the main points of consensus and dissent between the social partners.

View of the employers' association

According to the key informer of the employer's organization KHN the cooperation with trade unions has always been quite reasonable as far as occupational health is concerned. Although collective bargaining is quite controversial in the sector, both employers' organizations and unions realize their interests are not incompatible. That's why working conditions and quality of work are no part of the collective agreement (CAO), where negotiating parties have opposite interests, but are included in a separate Covenant on Health and Safety at Work. This covenant is an important instrument to further improve working conditions in the sector. Further, in the view of the KHN informer collective agreements should only serve as a general framework, whereas employers should be highly autonomous in organizing their own businesses. Direct interference with company policies is not desirable. According to the informer the Dutch regulatory framework on social security and occupational health and safety is quite excessive and complex, which makes it harder for small companies to comply with all the, often ambiguous, regulations (because they miss the legally demanded overall expertise; though they do have specific sector expertise). Therefore these regulations should be simplified and made more unambiguous. The obligations and regulations regarding social security and occupational health and safety (e.g. the purchase of services from a certified Occupational Health and Safety Service, the continued payment of wages in the event of sickness) place a considerable financial burden on small companies. Furthermore, the Working Hours Act regulations are perceived as quite rigid at times. For example, in accordance with the act employees are obligated to take off a certain amount of Sundays per year, whereas employees don't always consider working on Sundays as a problem. Also, regulations on breaks are perceived as very rigid. Finally, employers are willing to employ more people with a permanent contract, but want more flexibility in scheduling personnel.

View of the trade union

The trade union key informer also emphasizes that the cooperation between employer's organizations and trade unions on issues related to the quality of work is quite good. Both parties consider a good policy on occupational safety and health as a win-win situation. However, opinions differ as to what extent trade unions should interfere with the policies of individual companies. According to employers' unions should not interfere at all, whereas unions would like to make 'custom-made' arrangements on health and safety with individual companies because of the high level of ramification in the sector. The informer further emphasizes the lack of compliance with collective agreements by companies. Although the Labour Inspectorate controls the compliance of companies with the agreements, companies still have a small chance of being caught. The union fears the attempts to reduce the number of regulations and the administrative burden for employers, because it then becomes even harder to control compliance with regulations.

The compliance with the Covenant on Health and Safety at Work is also problematic, all the more since they are merely intentions. The sector lacks a sanctioning organization that controls company compliance. Furthermore, it is very difficult to communicate central agreements to individual companies. This is one of the main reasons of the delay of the Covenant on Health and Safety at Work. The unions acknowledge the fact that it is harder for smaller organizations to carry out the occupational health and safety regulations because of financial restrictions and the complexity of the regulatory framework. Often small companies confine themselves to a minimum package of purchased preventive services. Another problem carrying out occupational health and safety measures is the 'catering-culture'. For example, cooks are used to doing their work standing and are reluctant of using an ergonomically-designed kitchen unit (even though they are aware of possible health complaints related to long periods of standing). This is why the sector decided to promote the use of ergonomic equipment during education (other occupational health issues are incorporated in schooling as well). Another issue is that unions oppose to high levels of flexibility for employees, desired by employers. The unions try to prevent that regulations on flexibility are laid down in collective agreements. Finally, whereas employers' organizations only agree to a wage increase for employees that earn the exact CA (CAO)-wage (only about a third of the total number of employees) the unions want to carry out a wage increase for all the employees in the sub-sector.

View of the public authorities/sector organization

Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment

Although the social dialogue in the sector is quite laborious, the cooperation between the social partners has improved since the early nineties. At the moment however there is great disagreement on collective agreement-issues such as wage increase, payment of extra allowances and flexibility. The attention to the quality of work in the sector is behind compared to other sectors. Also the implementation of measures on occupational health and safety advances with difficulties, and the compliance of companies with regulations is low. To a large extent this is caused by the great variety of companies and employment contracts, and a large turnover of employers and employees. This situation seriously hampers the professionalization of the sector. The sector tries to employ more permanent staff to tackle this problem. It's very hard to get a hold on the sector, while it is not centrally controlled. This makes it difficult to make new initiatives public and implement these initiatives. A lot of information on the quality of work is still unknown to many employers. For example a sizeable part of the employers is not familiar with the content of the Covenant on Health and Safety at Work.

Sector organization

The BHC key informers emphasize their neutral role in the social dialogue. The BHC does not play a significant role in the collective agreements. According to the informers a specific problem in the sector regarding the quality of work and employment is the fact that many (small) entrepreneurs lack the understanding that a better quality of work leads to better trading results. Another problem mentioned by the key informers is that small companies have problems with the compliance to regulations because of the complexity of these regulations. Furthermore, the BHC also experiences difficulties in

communicating information to small companies and to individual employees. However, the situation has improved a lot. Ten years ago the attention to quality of work in the sector was far less. In general, quality of work receives more attention when the economy is booming, like in recent years. According to the key informers the Covenant on Health and Safety at Work is a better approach to improve working conditions than imposing external regulations in the framework of the Occupational Health and Safety legislation. Finally, because of the shortage of personnel the sector focuses on productivity.

Overview of consensus and dissents

In general the cooperation between social partners is quite reasonable. The social partners meet in various bipartite organizations and there are few dissents regarding issues related to the quality of work. All parties emphasize having the same interests regarding the quality of working conditions and stress the importance of keeping the social dialogue going. The social partners stress the importance of the Covenant on Health and Safety at Work and acknowledge the problems with the implementation of health and safety measures/regulations, especially for small companies. Also they acknowledge the problems in finding qualified personnel (especially cooks and supervisory staff).

A point of dissent is the extent of the regulatory framework. The employers' organizations wish to lessen the amount of regulations. The unions fear that compliance with regulations will get even lower in that case. Furthermore, unions urge for 'custom-made' arrangements with the companies, while employers' organizations oppose any interference of unions on a company level.

Finally, collective bargaining in the sector is quite controversial. There are great dissents on wage increases (whom they should apply to), the payment of extra allowances (e.g. for working on Sundays) and flexibility of working hours. Organisations did reach a collective agreement by January 1st 2003 including wage increases with a limited scope, no extra allowances for working on Sundays and flexible on working hours.

Overall discussion and conclusions

The objective of this research project has been to provide a general overview of quality of work and employment in the Hotels and Restaurants sector in The Netherlands. In this chapter the main conclusions of this study are discussed.

In the first place it should be mentioned that the sector is quite difficult to get a hold on. Data is difficult to interpret because of differences in definitions. For example, in surveys on the quality of work and employment from the Central Bureau of Statistics information is only collected for employees who work at least 12 hours/week on a yearly basis average. For this reason, information on these topics is 'missed' for about one third of the employees in the sector. Also, black work and seasonal influences make it difficult to estimate the exact amount of employees. Furthermore, sector organizations sometimes use another sector categorization than the Central Bureau of Statistics. Also, there are different viewpoints on what the exact definition of a company should be.

Compared to national figures the sector is characterized by high numbers of small sized companies, self-employed, female employees, young employees, small contracts (part time work), temporary assistants and low-educated employees. Furthermore personnel turnover is high as well.

In terms of health and well being a considerable number of factors can be improved in the sector. First of all high work/time pressure, low control and aggressive behaviour by clients is relatively high compared to national data. These factors have a serious impact on the well being of employees. Furthermore the high physical load (especially long periods of standing) and working in ergonomically poor designed workplaces can also lead to health complaints. Other problems are the high levels of exposure to noise.

A specific problem in the sector is the payment system. In general, wages are low compared to the national average. Also the payment of extra allowances is problematic. On top of this a considerable amount of employees is forced to do undeclared work (Klein Hesselink et al, 2000) as a result of which employees aren't insured for social security benefits. Another specific problem is related to working hours. Split shifts and irregular working hours are very common in the sector. These factors can have an important influence on health and well being, especially in relation to the combination of work and non-working life.

The main risk groups in the sector Hotels and Restaurants are receptionists, waiters, dish washers and cooks/kitchen aides. They often have to work under high work/time pressure in combination with a high physical work load. Moreover, waiters (and other personnel working in bars, discotheques and restaurants) are frequently exposed to aggressive behaviour by customers. Employees working in the contract catering sub-sector are a specific risk group.

Whereas the overall WAO (disability benefit)-influx is relatively low in the sector, the influx among the mostly female, middle aged workers in the contract catering sub-sector is high. Possibly problems of combining work and non-working life can explain the high level of influx. In general employees working fulltime and employees working in bigger companies are more at risk than other employees. An interesting trend regarding risk

groups is the fact that many companies outsource several activities to specialized enterprises. Especially cleaning and security services are being outsourced. Because of the outsourcing potential risk groups like cleaning and security personnel are no longer under the direct attention of the sector.

Minimum term workers and workers doing undeclared work will have problematic or no access to the social security benefits for employees . Only part of the self-employed are insured against sickness and disability because of the high costs of these insurances.

On a sector level the awareness of above-mentioned problems resulted in the conclusion of a Covenant on Health and Safety at Work that is mainly focused on the reduction of work pressure. However, this awareness does not always exist on a company level which slows down the implementation of the Covenant on Health and Safety at Work. The sector experiences difficulties in reaching (small) companies, especially because of the high level of ramification. The compliance of companies with nationwide covenant and collective labour agreements is low.

References

Arbeidsinspectie (2002a). *De bestuurlijke boete in de Arbowet: evaluatie 2001*. Den Haag: Arbeidsinspectie.

Arbeidsinspectie (2002b). *Jaarplan 2002*. Den Haag: Arbeidsinspectie.

Bedrijfschap Horeca en Catering (2002a). *Horeca in cijfers*. Zoetermeer: Bedrijfschap Horeca en Catering.

Bedrijfschap Horeca en Catering (2002b). *Barometer Horeca*. Zoetermeer: Bedrijfschap Horeca en Catering.

Bedrijfschap Horeca en Catering (2002c). *Thermometer Horeca*. Zoetermeer: Bedrijfschap Horeca en Catering.

Bedrijfschap Horeca en Catering (2002d). *Jaarverslag 2001*. Zoetermeer: Bedrijfschap Horeca en Catering.

Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (2001). *Arbeidsomstandigheden 2001*. Monitoring via personen. Den Haag: Elsevier.

Clarenbeek, J.& Cox-Woudstra, E. (2000). *Werkdrukmaatregelen in de Horeca: Stand der techniek*. Hoofddorp: TNO Arbeid.

European Agency for Safety and Health at Work (2002). *Systems and programs: How to tackle psychosocial issues and reduce work-related stress*. Bilbao: European Agency for Safety and Health at Work.

Haan, F. de & Verboon, F. (2000). *Integrated approaches to active welfare and employment strategies: The Netherlands*. Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Working and living Conditions/TNO Work and Employment (electronic document).

Houtman, I.L.D. & De Vroome, E.M.M. (2001). *Arbeidsrisico's, gezondheidsklachten en ziekteverzuim in branches: secundaire analyses op POLS 1997, 1998 en 1999*. Hoofddorp: TNO Arbeid.

Houtman, I.L.D., Van Deursen, C.G.L., Gründemann, R.W.M. & Haanstra, G.A. (1992). *Oorzaken van en maatregelen bij ziekteverzuim in de horeca: een onderzoek onder bedrijven met een hoog en laag verzuim*. Leiden: NIPG-TNO.

Jossart, A. & Walthery, P. (2001). *Sectoral Unions and Employers Organisations in the EU Hotels, Restaurants and Cafés sector (NACE55)*. Louvain: Université Catholique de Louvain, Institut des Sciences du Travail.

Klein Hesselink, D.J., Dhondt, S. en Vaas, S. (2000). *Werkdrukmaatregelen in de Horeca: Stand van Zaken*. Hoofddorp: TNO Arbeid.

Laitinen-Krispijn, S. en Bijl, R. (2002). *Werk, psyche en ziekteverzuim: aard en omvang van psychische stoornissen, ziekteverzuim en zorggebruik in de beroepsbevolking*. Utrecht: Trimbos-Instituut.

Lisv (2001). *Ontwikkeling arbeidsongeschiktheid: Jaaroverzicht WAO, WAZ en Wajong 2000*. Amsterdam: Lisv.

Martens, P.J.M. (2001). *Arbeidsongevallen met dodelijke afloop. Cijfers over de jaren 1997-1998-1999-2000*. Den Haag: Arbeidsinspectie/SZW.

Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid. (2000). *Arboconvenant Werkdruk Horeca*. Den Haag: Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid.

Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid. (2002a). *Arboconvenanten nieuwe stijl: Rapportage over de periode 1999-2002*. Den Haag: Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid.

Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid. (2002b). *Tussenbalans Arboconvenant Horeca*. Den Haag: Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid.

Nederlands Centrum voor Beroepsziekten (2002). *Signaleringsrapport Beroepsziekten 2002*. Amsterdam: NCvB/AMC.

Stam, C. & Bloemhoff, A. (2001). *Arbeidsongevallen in 1999 op basis van het Letsel Informatie Systeem*. Amsterdam: Stichting Consument en Veiligheid (SCV).

Wit, P. de (2001). *Trendrapport 2001: Werkgelegenheidsstructuur bedrijfstak Horeca 1994-2000*. Zoetermeer: Bedrijfschap Horeca en Catering

Wit, P. de & Rijnders, R (2001). *Trendrapport 2001: In- door- en uitstroom horeca, verblijfsrecreatie en contract catering 2000-2001*. Zoetermeer: Bedrijfschap Horeca en Catering.

Websites

www.abgp.nl

(ABGP, Trade Union)

www.BHenC.nl

(Board for the Hotel and Catering Industry)

www.cao-horeca.nl

(General information on Collective Agreements, funds, institutes, etc, within the sector)

www.eiro.eurofound.eu.int

(European Foundation: EIRO database)

www.horeca.cms.fnv.nl

(Dutch Trade Union Federation)

www.horecagilde.nl
www.kvk.nl
www.arbeidsinspectie.nl
www.unie.nl
www.szw.nl

(Dutch Catering Guild)
(Chamber of Commerce)
(Labour Inspectorate)
(De Unie, Trade Union)
(Ministry of Social Affairs and
Employment)

Databases

CBS Statline

(Online statistics by the Central
Bureau of Statistics, based on
different databases)

Labour Force Survey
Permanent Quality of Life Survey

(Enquête Beroepsbevolking; EBB)
(Periodiek Onderzoek Leefsituatie;
POLS)

Injury Information System

(Letsel Informatie Systeem; LIS)

List of key informers

Sector Organization

Bedrijfschap Horeca en Catering
(Board for the Hotel and Catering Industry)

Mr R. Rijnders, Ms P. Boskamp

Trade Union

FNV Horecabond
(Dutch Trade Union Federation, sector Horeca)

Mr P. Penders

Employers' association

Koninklijke Horeca Nederland
(Royal Catering Netherlands)

Mr P. Schoormans

Government

Ministerie van Sociale Zaken en Werkgelegenheid
(Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment)

Mr J. Hooiveld

Annex A Sector characteristics

Table 2.1, Table 2.2, Table 2.3
- see chapter 2, page 11/12

Table 2.4 Market share/degree of concentration by company size
- no detailed statistics available

Table 2.5 Number and percentages of closings over the last 10 years

Closings	Sectoral				National ² (total)	
	Sub-sector ¹		Total sector ¹		N	%
	N	%	N	%		
2001			3.072 ²			
1996			800	2,1	13.000	3,2
1995			1.200	3,3	14.300	3,7
1994			1.200	3,2	15.000	3,9
1993			1.200	3,2	15.100	4,0

Source: CBS Statline

¹ NACE 55

² Source : www.kvk.nl

Table 2.6 Number and percentages of bankruptcies over the last 10 years

Bankruptcies	Sectoral				National (total)	
	Sub-sector ¹		Total sector ¹		N	%
	N	%	N	%		
2001			192		4329	
2000			195		3579	
1999			179		3238	
1998			296		4015	
1997			332		4409	
1996			338		4534	
1995			383		4783	
1994			340		5333	
1993			335		5512	

Source: CBS Statline

¹ NACE 55

Table 2.7 Number and percentages by company status (public/private)

Company status ¹	Sectoral		National (total)	
	Total NACE 55		N	%
	N	%		
2002 ²				
1. Public Limited Company	15	0,04		0,15
2. Private Limited Company/LTD	5.525	14,24	1.055	24,67
3. Cooperative society	45	0,12	176.070	0,29
4. Foundation	275	0,71	2.095	3,03
5. Sole proprietorship	17.310	44,60	21.630	39,80
6. Non-stock corporation	5	0,01	284.055	1,01
7. Partnership	14.830	38,21	7.185	16,59
8. Government	0	0,00	118.420	0,24
9. Other	805	2,07	1.680	14,22
Total	38.810	100,00	101.525713.710	100,0
1994				
1. Public Limited Company	660	0,05	130.890	0,17
2. Private Limited Company/LTD	20	10,52	1.035	21,05
3. Cooperative society	3.950	0,11	128.445	0,33
4. Foundation	40	0,85	2.005	3,07
5. Sole proprietorship	320	55,14	18.705	39,05
6. Non-stock corporation	20.700	0,01	238.275	0,88
7. Partnership	5	31,54	5.375	13,67
8. Government	11.840	0,01	83.395	0,33
9. Other	5	1,76	2.005	21,45
Total	37.540	100,00	610.135	100,0

Source: CBS Statline

¹ Dutch terms (respectively): 1. Naamloos Vennootschap, 2. Besloten Vennootschap, 3. Coöperatieve vereniging, 4. Stichting, 5. Eenmanszaak, 6. Maatschap, 7. Vennootschap onder Firma, 8. Overheid, 9. Overig

² Temporary figures

Table 2.8

- see chapter 2, page 13

Table 2.9 Percentage and number of people employed according to age/seniority

Age/seniority ¹	Sectoral				National (total)	
	Sub-sector 1		Total sector ²		N(x1000)	%
	N(x1000)	%	N(x1000)	%		
2001						
• 15-24 years			60	30,9	854	12,1
• 25-44 years			99	51,0	3.973	56,2
• 45-64 years			35	18,0	2237	31,7
• 65 years or older			-	-	-	-
1996						
• 15-24 years			50	24,5	771	12,5
• 25-44 years			88	43,1	3.673	59,4
• 45-64 years			66	32,4	1.742	28,2
• 65 years or older			-	-	-	-

Age/seniority ¹	Sectoral				National (total)	
	Sub-sector 1 N(x1000) %		Total sector ² N(x1000) %		N(x1000)	%
2000 ³						
• < 1 year experience			72,8	25		
• 1-3 years experience			93,3	32		
• 4 years or more experience			125,4	43		
Total			291,6	100		
1995 ³						
• < 1 year experience			36,5	17		
• 1-3 years experience			87,9	41		
• 4 years or more experience			90,1	42		
Total			214,5	100		

Source: CBS Statline

¹ Figures include the Dutch working population in the age category 15-64 years that work at least 12 hours a week

² NACE 55

³ Excluding contract catering and lodging, source: De Wit, 2001.

Table 2.10 Percentage and number of employees by EU or non-EU status

EU versus non-EU ¹	Sectoral						National (total)	
	Sub-sector 1 N(x1000)%		Sub-sector 2 N(x1000)%		Total sector ² N(x1000)%		N(x1000)%	
1998								
• EU					5	27,8	103	46,0
• Non-EU					13	72,2	121	54,0
• Total					18	100,0	224	100,0
1993								
• EU					4	30,8	91	41,6
• Non-EU					9	69,2	128	50,4
• Total					13	100,0	219	100,0
1988								
• EU					3	38,5	85	48,3
• Non-EU					5	61,5	91	51,7
• Total					8	100,0	176	100,0

Source: CBS Statline

¹ Employees with an other than Dutch nationality.

² NACE 55

Table 2.11 Number and percentage of employees by company size
- no detailed statistics available

Table 2.12 Status of contracts in percentage and number of people employed in the sector¹

Employment status/type of contract	Sectoral				National (total)	
	Sub-sector 1		Total sector ²		N(x1000)	%
	N(x1000)	%	N(x1000)	%		
2001						
self employed			46	22,4	774	11,0
among the employed:						
- Indefinite			122	59,5	5.783	81,9
- Flexible			37	18,0	506	7,2
1996						
self employed			39	23,2	728	11,8
among the employed:						
- Indefinite			94	56,0	4.920	79,5
- Flexible			35	20,8	538	8,7

Source: CBS Statline

¹ Figures include the Dutch working population in the age category 15-64 years that work at least 12 hours a week

² NACE 55

Table 2.13 (see chapter 2) Percentage and number of people employed according to educational level (Dutch classification)

Initial educational level	Sectoral				National (total)	
	Sub-sector 1		Total sector ¹		N(x1000)	%
	N(x1000)	%	N(x1000)	%		
2001						
Basisonderwijs			32	15,8	592	8,4
Mavo			22 ²	10,8	466	6,6
Vbo			39	19,2	976	13,8
Havo/vwo			25 ²	12,3	403	5,7
Mbo			71	35,0	2677	37,9
Hbo			12 ²	5,9	1297	18,4
Wo			2 ²	1,0	650	9,2
1996						
Basisonderwijs			20	12,0	476	7,7
Mavo			19	11,4	409	6,6
Vbo			32	19,3	908	14,7
Havo/vwo			17	10,2	323	5,2
Mbo			63	38,0	2456	39,8
Hbo			15	9,0	1092	17,7
Wo			-	-	511	8,3

Source: CBS Statline

¹ NACE 55

² Year 2000 (figures for 2001 not available)

Table 2.14

- see chapter 2, page 16

Table 2.15 Number and percentage of full/part-time workers

Full/part-time	Sectoral				National (total)	
	Sub-sector 1		Total sector ¹		N(x1000)	%
	N(x1000)	%	N(x1000)	%		
2001						
Full time ²			115	55,8	4757	67,3
Part time ³			91	44,2	2307	32,7
Involuntary part-time						
1996						
Full time ²			99	59,3	4448	71,9
Parttime ³			68	40,7	1739	28,1
Involuntary part-time						

Source: CBS Statline

¹ NACE 55

² Fulltime= Working 35 hours per week or more

³ Part-time= Working 12-34 hours per week

Table 2.16

- see chapter 2, page 15

Table 2.17 (see chapter 4, paragraph 4.1) Specific directives/regulations on or relevant as a background to the improvement of quality of work and employment in the sector

Name of directives/regulation and brief content	Issues addressed
1. Working Conditions Act 2. Working Hours Act 3. Works Council Act 4. Gatekeeper Improvement Act	See chapter 4, paragraph 4.1

Source: www.swz.nl

Table 2.18, 2.19

- see chapter 4, page 32

Table 2.20 (see chapter 4, paragraph 4.1) Number of current collective agreements relevant as background for issues of quality of work & employment.

Number of agreements	Number of employees involved
Supra sector level	See chapter 4, paragraph 4.1
(sub)Sector level:	
Company level:	

Table 2.21 (see chapter 4, paragraph 4.1) Specification of the quality of work & employments issues in these collective agreements

Level	Regulation/recommendation/other*	Specific issue addressed
Supra sector level: (sub) sector level: Company level:	See chapter 4, paragraph 4.1	See chapter 4, paragraph 4.1
* please specify below (remarks/discussion); if more information is relevant and easily obtainable		

Annex B Quality of work and employment: Descriptive features

Table 3.1

- see chapter 3, page 18

Table 3.2 Ergonomic conditions¹

	Sector	National
- static working postures, working with equipment or machines that cause vibrations, sweating or heavy breathing because of work		
• total	0,23	0,23
• male	0,23	0,25
• female	0,22	0,20
• age < 35 years	0,22	0,26
• age 35-49 years	0,26*	0,22
• age 50+ years	0,18	0,19

Source: Houtman & De Vroome, 2002

* p<0,05

¹ see note Table 3.1

Table 3.3 Safety conditions

- no detailed statistics available

Table 3.4 Number and percentage of employees who have access to specific equipment/technology

- no detailed statistics available

Table 3.5

- missing in guidelines!

Table 3.6, 3.7, 3.8

- see chapter 3, page 19/20/21

Table 3.9 Relations with colleagues (see also Table 3.11)¹

	Sector	National
- conflicts with boss/colleagues		
• total	0,26	0,24
• male	0,29	0,26
• female	0,24	0,22
• age < 35 years	0,39	0,29
• age 35-49 years	0,25	0,23
• age 50+ years	0,10	0,16
- lack of good work climate		
• total	0,11*	0,18
• male	0,12	0,18
• female	0,11	0,17
• age < 35 years	0,11	0,15
• age 35-49 years	0,13	0,18
• age 50+ years	0,10	0,22

Source: Houtman & De Vroome, 2002

* p<0,05

¹ see note Table 3.1

Table 3.10 Relations with the management¹

	Sector	Country
- dissatisfaction with management		
• total	0,06*	0,09
• male	0,08	0,08
• female	0,04	0,10
• age < 35 years	0,07	0,11
• age 35-49 years	0,05	0,09
• age 50+ years	0,02	0,04

Source: Houtman & De Vroome, 2002

* p<0,05

¹ see note Table 3.1

Table 3.11: Relations with clients and the public¹

	Sector	Country
- discrimination due to gender and/or discrimination of coloured people at work ²		
• total		
• male	0,12	0,12
• female	0,15*	0,12
• age < 35 years	0,09*	0,11
• age 35-49 years	0,14	0,13
• age 50+ years	0,11	0,12
	0,02*	0,08

Source: Houtman & De Vroome, 2002

* p<0,05

¹ see note Table 3.1

² discrimination at work (colleagues and clients)

Table 3.12 Working hours in number and percentage of people employed in the sector¹

Working hours	Sector		National	
	N	%	N	%
national threshold < 20 hours				
20-34 hours	92	21*	1005	9
35-39 hours	114	26	2679	23
40-44 hours	237	53*	7835	68
45-48 hours				
49-54 hours				
55-59 hours				
60-64 hours				
65+ hours				

Source: Houtman & De Vroome, 2002

* p<0,05 (significantly different from national data)

¹ NACE 55

Table 3.13 Working hours in number and percentage of people employed in the sector¹ in 2000

	Sector	National
- average working hours usually per week (according to contract, excl. overtime hours)	22,9	30,8
- average working hours usually per week (according to contract, incl. overtime hours)	23,1	31,3

Source: CBS Statline

¹ NACE 55

Table 3.14 Non-standard working hours/working patterns in 2001

	Sector ¹ %	National ² %
- shift work (% yes)	19	9
- weekend work	86	56
- working evenings and nights	83	59

Source: CBS Statline

¹ NACE 55

² The working population of 15-64 years

Table 3.15 Number and percentage of employees who report to have access to working time arrangement

- no detailed statistics available

Table 3.16 Income level in the sector as related to the national level

Wage categories (Collective Agreement)	NACE 55 ¹		National
	N	%	
- group 1	14700	5	
- group 2	41200	14	
- group 3	58000	20	
- group 4-6	71400	24	
- group 7	29100	10	
- unclassified	77200	26	
- Total	291600	100	

Source: De Wit, 2001

¹ Excluding contract catering and lodging sub-sectors

Table 3.17 Wage payment and compensation systems

- no detailed statistics available

Table 3.18

- see chapter 3, page 22

Table 3.19: Professional categories with highest incidence of occupational accidents

- no detailed statistics available

Table 3.20

- see chapter 3, page 23

Table 3.21: Notified occupational diseases in 2001 (no sector specific information available)

Five main diseases and total in sector	Number of diseases		% of workers	
	sector	National	sector	national
1. Diseases of the musculoskeletal system		2698		
2. Psychological disorders		1517		
3. Hard of hearing caused by work		735		
4. Skin disorders		270		
5. Neurological disorders		115		

Source: NCvB, 2002

Table 3.22

- see chapter 3, page 23

Table 3.23, 3.24

- see chapter 3, page 24/25

Table 3.25 Number and percentage of workers ensured of income when they are on sickness leave

- no detailed information available/see paragraph 3.6

Table 3.26 Number and percentage of workers ensured of income when they are diagnosed to be disabled for work

- see table 3.8 (3.23 in guidelines), page 24

Table 3.27 Number and percentage of workers ensured of income when they become unemployed

- no detailed information available/see paragraph 3.6

Annex C Quality of work and employment: Policies and instruments

Table 5.1

- same as Table 2.17 (see chapter 4, paragraph 4.1)

Table 5.2

- same as Table 2.20 (see chapter 4, paragraph 4.1)

Table 5.3

- same as Table 2.21 (see chapter 4, paragraph 4.1)

Table 5.4 Percentage of the companies in the sector with (self-)audits on health and safety

Number and percentage of companies with OSH-audits	NACE 55		National	
	N	%	N	%
Hazard identification and risk evaluation (Risico-inventarisatie en -evaluatie: RIE)	?	less than 30%		

Source: BHC, 2002d

Table 5.5: Preventive services on health and safety and services directed at the improvement of the quality of work and employment

- no detailed statistics available

Table 5.6: Inspecting and enforcing organizations (see chapter 4)

Involved organizations*	Type**
governmental: Ministry of Social Affairs and Work name: Labour Inspectorate characteristics: see chapter 4	i/e see chapter 4
other: - name: - characteristics: -	

Source: Arbeidsinspectie, 2002b

* if more information is relevant and easily obtainable please specify

** I= inspecting; e= enforcing; i/e= both; o= other, please specify

Table 5.7

- See chapter 4, page 37