

# Netherlands: Employment opportunities for people with chronic diseases

---

Date of last publication:

20 November 2014

## About

Country:

Netherlands

Author:

Wendela Hooftman and Irene Houtman

Institution:

TNO

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

There is no clear national definition of a chronic disease in a work situation in the Netherlands. Questionnaire data shows that between 25% and 30% of all workers are affected by a chronic disease. Worker with a chronic disease have slightly different working conditions as compared to workers without a chronic disease but differences may be also due to age, gender or sectoral differences between workers with and without a chronic disease. On a policy level the focus in the Netherlands is on participation. The latest regulation regarding this is the introduction of the 'Participatiewet' (participation law) which is expected to come into force on 1 January 2015.

## Block 1: Concept, definitions, sources of information and methodological issues on chronic diseases and work from the national perspective

### 1.1. National definition of chronic disease

In the Netherlands there is no generally used definition of a chronic disease in an employment status. However, in the legislative system a number of laws are relevant regarding the definition of a chronic disease.

The first is the Equal treatment on grounds of disability or chronic illness Act. ( WGB disability or chronic illness )

The WGB disability or chronic illness came into force in 2003 and prohibits unequal treatment of people with a disability or chronic illness. The terms "disability " and "chronic illness" are not defined in the Act .The act states that there should be no discrimination on grounds of disability or chronic

illness in conditions of employment and employers need to make the necessary work adaptations in order to enable effective work participation of disabled and chronically ill.

The second is the legislation regarding work disability, the work and Income according to the ‘Work and Income according to Working Capacity Act’ (WIA). This law does not specifically aim at defining chronic diseases, and no specific diseases are mentioned. However a timeframe is: one is eligible for a work disability benefit if he or she is unable to fully or partially work on a long-term or permanent basis due to an illness after 2 years of sickness absence. Whether or not someone qualifies for benefit payments under the WIA depends on the extent of their incapacity to work (and the resulting loss of income). The assessment for the benefit may include a full (80-100% disability) or a partial disability (35-80%).

The third is the WSW (sheltered employment). Sheltered employment is available for persons with a physical, psychological or mental impairment that are unable to work in a regular workplace. Again no specific diseases or timeframe had been mentioned.

## **1.2. Information on national sources of statistical information dealing with the issue of chronic diseases and their relation to employment and working conditions**

Next to the above mentioned information regarding chronic diseases and work there are several large national questionnaires that aim to measure chronic disease. Table 1 gives an overview of these questions.

The Netherlands organisation for Applied Scientific research (TNO) in collaboration with Statistics Netherlands measures chronic disease in the Netherlands Working Conditions Survey (NWCS). It is asked whether one has a chronic disease and if so what this disease is. Furthermore it is asked whether this disease hinders work and whether it is caused by the work and if workplace adaptations have been made because of the chronic disease of further workplace adaptations are needed.

<b>TABLE 1 - QUESTIONS REGARDING CHRONIC DISEASES AND WORK IN LARGE NATIONAL SURVEYS</b>					
<b>SOURCE</b>	<b>METHODOLOGY</b>	<b>DEFINITION OF CHRONIC DISEASE (QUESTION ASKED)</b>	<b>DISEASES INCLUDED</b>	<b>QUESTIONS IN RELATION TO WORK AND EMPLOYMENT</b>	

TABLE 1 - QUESTIONS REGARDING CHRONIC DISEASES AND WORK IN LARGE NATIONAL SURVEYS

SOURCE	METHODOLOGY	DEFINITION OF CHRONIC DISEASE (QUESTION ASKED)	DISEASES INCLUDED	QUESTIONS IN RELATION TO WORK AND EMPLOYMENT	
<b>Labour force Survey (Enquête beroepsbevolking, EBB), Statistics Netherlands</b>	Yearly cross-sectional questionnaire, among about 18.000 households (max 8 persons per household). Since 2010 by,	Do you have one or more long-term illnesses or conditions	-	Employment status  Does this hinder you in your work  Does this hinders you in obtaining work	
<b>Health Questionnaire (Gezondheidsvragenlijst ), Statistics Netherlands</b>	Yearly, cross-sectional questionnaire among about 15.000 persons (responds 60-65 percent)	Do you have one or more long-term illnesses or conditions	-	Employment status	
<b>Netherlands working conditions survey (Nationale Enquete Arbeidsomstandigheden, NEA/ NWCS), TNO</b>	Yearly, cross-sectional, questionnaire among about 25.000 employees. First questionnaire was executed in 2005 (after a pilot in 2003)	Do you have one or more of the following long-term illnesses, disorders or disabilities, and if so,	Diabetes  Problems with arms or hands (including arthritis, rheumatism, RSI)  Serious skin problems  Problems	Employment status  Does your illness, disease or disability hinder you in performing your job?  Does your illness,	Were – because of your health-adjustments made in your workplace or your work in the last 12

TABLE 1 - QUESTIONS REGARDING CHRONIC DISEASES AND WORK IN LARGE NATIONAL SURVEYS

SOURCE	METHODOLOGY	DEFINITION OF CHRONIC DISEASE (QUESTION ASKED)	DISEASES INCLUDED	QUESTIONS IN RELATION TO WORK AND EMPLOYMENT	
		<p>please indicate which one? (multiple answers possible)</p>	<p>with legs or feet (including arthritis, rheumatism)</p> <p>Psychiatric symptoms / diseases</p> <p>Problems with back and neck (including arthritis, rheumatism, RSI)</p> <p>Hearing Problems</p> <p>Migraine or severe headache</p> <p>Epilepsy</p> <p>Cardiovascular disease</p> <p>life-threatening diseases (eg cancer, AIDS)</p> <p>Asthma, bronchitis,</p>	<p>disease or disability result from the work you did?</p>	<p>months?</p> <p>Do you think that further adjustments in your workplace or your work are necessary because of your health</p>

TABLE 1 - QUESTIONS REGARDING CHRONIC DISEASES AND WORK IN LARGE NATIONAL SURVEYS

SOURCE	METHODOLOGY	DEFINITION OF CHRONIC DISEASE (QUESTION ASKED)	DISEASES INCLUDED	QUESTIONS IN RELATION TO WORK AND EMPLOYMENT	
			emphysema Problems seeing Stomach or intestinal problems Other		
<b>National Employer Work Survey (Werkgevers Enquete Arbeid; WEA)</b>	Every other year since 2008; since 2012 it will be every four years. Every time a (cross-sectional) representative sample of employers is approached. In the response weighting takes place to have a response that is representative for company size and sector. It is a paper & pencil (PAPI) questionnaire for employers. The survey is aimed	Employers are asked whether they have an explicit policy in place for specific target groups amongst which precarious workers.	Not specified	Not specified	

TABLE 1 - QUESTIONS REGARDING CHRONIC DISEASES AND WORK IN LARGE NATIONAL SURVEYS

SOURCE	METHODOLOGY	DEFINITION OF CHRONIC DISEASE (QUESTION ASKED)	DISEASES INCLUDED	QUESTIONS IN RELATION TO WORK AND EMPLOYMENT	
	to have a net response of 5000 employer.				

## Block 2: Prevalence, recent evolution and effects of the problem of chronic diseases among workers and companies

### workers and companies

#### 2.1. People affected by chronic diseases and employment

Table 2 gives the percentage of persons with a chronic disease by employment status for the 2000-2011 period. Just under 1 in 4 persons (age 15-65) has a chronic disease, this percentage is higher among those who do not work than among those who do work. It is clear that in the last few years (2009-2011) this percentage has dropped quite a lot. This is probably due to the fact that the questions were asked in a different way in these years (by phone, and/or only in a single quarterly measure instead of 4 quarterly measures).

The NWCS (table 3) shows that among employees about 1 in 3 has a chronic disease. A percentage that fluctuates slightly over the years, but does not show a clear in- or decrease. Most prevalent are musculoskeletal problems (especially back problems), migraine/headache, and Asthma, bronchitis, emphysema

Patterns of chronic disease prevalence as well as in the type of conditions vary by age and gender. Women more often have a chronic disease. This is found for all types except for cardiovascular disease, hearing problems and problems with vision. Elderly workers (age 55-64) more often have a chronic disease than middle aged or young workers. However: migraine/headache is most often found among workers between 25 and 54. (table 4)



TABLE 2: PERCENTAGE OF PERSONS AGED 15-65 WITH A CHRONIC DISEASE OR A WORK HANDICAP (CHRONIC DISEASE THAT HINDERS WORK).

		2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
<b>population eligible to work</b>	% chronic condition	19,2 %	19,1 %	19,3 %	19,5 %	19,4 %	19,4 %	19,3 %		17,6 %	17,9 %	16,0 %	13,7 %
	% work handicap	11,2 %	11,2 %	11,3 %	11,2 %	11,2 %	10,7 %	10,2 %			9,8 %	8,2 %	7,2 %
<b>population actually working</b>	% chronic condition	18,8 %	18,8 %	18,8 %	19,1 %	18,8 %	18,8 %	18,5 %		17,1 %	17,5 %	15,6 %	13,2 %
	% work handicap	11,0 %	11,0 %	11,0 %	10,9 %	10,7 %	10,2 %	9,5 %			9,5 %	7,8 %	6,8 %
<b>unemployed population</b>	% chronic condition	28,9 %	27,4 %	29,5 %	27,3 %	28,2 %	28,6 %	31,1 %		28,3 %	25,0 %	23,5 %	22,2 %
	% work handicap	16,7 %	16,3 %	18,9 %	17,7 %	18,5 %	17,8 %	20,4 %			16,0 %	15,0 %	13,8 %

Source: Source EBB

TABLE 3: PREVALENCE OF CHRONIC DISEASE AMONG EMPLOYEES IN THE 2005-2012 PERIOD

	AVERAGE 2005- 2012	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>No chronic disease</b>	63,4%	66,3%	64,3%	64,7%	63,1%	61,9%	61,5%	64,2%	62,7%
<b>Problems with arms or hands (including arthritis, rheumatism, RSI)</b>	5,6%	5,7%	6,1%	5,5%	5,5%	5,4%	5,7%	5,3%	5,5%
<b>Problems with legs or feet (including arthritis, rheumatism)</b>	5,3%	4,8%	4,9%	4,3%	5,8%	5,9%	5,2%	5,8%	5,3%
<b>Problems with back and neck (including arthritis, rheumatism, RSI)</b>	10,4%	10,8%	10,9%	9,9%	10,2%	10,6%	11,0%	10,1%	10,1%

TABLE 3: PREVALENCE OF CHRONIC DISEASE AMONG EMPLOYEES IN THE 2005-2012 PERIOD

	<b>AVERAG E 2005- 2012</b>	<b>2005</b>	<b>2006</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2008</b>	<b>2009</b>	<b>2010</b>	<b>2011</b>	<b>2012</b>
<b>Migraine or severe headache</b>	5,6%	5,4%	5,3%	5,5%	5,5%	5,6%	6,1%	5,4%	5,7%
<b>Cardiovasc ular disease</b>	2,8%	2,6%	2,9%	2,5%	2,6%	3,1%	3,0%	2,8%	3,1%
<b>Asthma, bronchitis, emphyse ma</b>	5,3%	5,1%	5,3%	5,2%	5,3%	5,4%	5,4%	5,5%	5,5%
<b>Stomach or intestinal problems</b>	3,6%	3,6%	3,4%	3,4%	3,6%	3,8%	3,9%	3,5%	3,8%
<b>Diabetes</b>	2,1%	1,8%	1,9%	2,1%	2,0%	2,3%	2,0%	2,2%	2,2%
<b>• Serious skin problems</b>	0,9%	1,0%	0,9%	0,8%	0,7%	1,0%	0,9%	0,8%	0,8%
<b>Psychiatric symptoms / diseases</b>	2,7%	2,0%	2,4%	2,4%	2,4%	3,1%	3,1%	2,5%	3,0%
<b>Hearing problems</b>	2,1%	1,6%	2,1%	2,2%	2,2%	2,3%	2,1%	2,1%	2,2%

TABLE 3: PREVALENCE OF CHRONIC DISEASE AMONG EMPLOYEES IN THE 2005-2012 PERIOD									
	AVERAGE 2005- 2012	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012
<b>Epilepsy</b>	0,4%	0,3%	0,4%	0,4%	0,3%	0,5%	0,4%	0,4%	0,4%
<b>life-threatening diseases (eg cancer, AIDS)</b>	0,7%	0,5%	0,6%	0,7%	0,8%	0,7%	0,8%	0,7%	0,7%
<b>Problems seeing</b>	1,8%	0%	1,9%	2,1%	2,1%	2,0%	2,0%	2,1%	2,2%
<b>Other</b>	5,9%	5,6%	6,1%	5,6%	5,9%	5,9%	6,4%	5,7%	6,0%
<i>N</i>	205.181	23.320	23.500	21.962	21.208	22.025	23.007	22.456	24.801

Source NEA 2005-2012

Table 4: Prevalence of chronic diseases in employees by age and gender			
	Total	Gender	Age

Table 4: Prevalence of chronic diseases in employees by age and gender

	Total	Gender		Age		
		· Women	· Men	· 15-24 years	· 25-54 years	· 55-64 years
N:	25.223	11.973	13.250	3.849	17.398	3.975
%:		47%	53%	15%	69%	16%
<b>Year [N=25.223]</b>						
· 2012	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
<b>No chronic disease</b>	62,7%	60,0% ▼▼▼	65,2% ▲▲▲	74,8% ▲▲▲	63,5% ▲▲▲	47,4% ▼▼▼
<b>Problems with arms or hands (including arthritis, rheumatism, RSI)</b>	5,5%	6,9% ▲▲▲	4,3% ▼▼▼	1,7% ▼▼▼	5,2% ▼▼	10,6% ▲▲▲
<b>Problems with legs or feet (including arthritis, rheumatism)</b>	5,3%	5,7% ▲	5,0% ▼	2,2% ▼▼▼	4,6% ▼▼▼	11,5% ▲▲▲
<b>Problems with back and neck (including arthritis, rheumatism, RSI)</b>	10,1%	11,2% ▲▲▲	9,2% ▼▼▼	3,8% ▼▼▼	10,3%	15,6% ▲▲▲
<b>Migraine or severe</b>	5,7%	8,2% ▲▲▲	3,4% ▼▼▼	4,4% ▼▼▼	6,2% ▲▲▲	4,4% ▼▼▼

Table 4: Prevalence of chronic diseases in employees by age and gender

	Total	Gender		Age		
<b>headache</b>						
<b>Cardiovascular disease</b>	3,1%	2,0%▼▼▼	4,0%▲▲▲	0,5%▼▼▼	2,3%▼▼▼	9,0%▲▲▲
<b>Asthma, bronchitis, emphysema</b>	5,5%	6,3%▲▲▲	4,7%▼▼▼	5,5%	5,2%▼	6,4%▲▲
<b>Stomach or intestinal problems</b>	3,8%	4,2%▲▲	3,5%▼▼	3,0%▼▼	3,9%	4,2%
<b>Diabetes</b>	2,2%	1,7%▼▼▼	2,6%▲▲▲	0,6%▼▼▼	1,7%▼▼▼	5,8%▲▲▲
<b>Serious skin problems</b>	0,8%	0,9%	0,8%	0,6%	0,9%	1,0%
<b>Psychiatric symptoms / diseases</b>	3,0%	3,3%▲▲	2,7%▼▼	2,3%▼▼	3,1%	3,0%
<b>Hearing problems</b>	2,2%	1,6%▼▼▼	2,8%▲▲▲	0,8%▼▼▼	1,8%▼▼▼	5,5%▲▲▲
<b>Epilepsy</b>	0,4%	0,3%▼	0,4%▲	0,2%	0,4%	0,5%
<b>life-threatening diseases (eg cancer, AIDS)</b>	0,7%	0,8%	0,6%	0,0%▼▼▼	0,6%▼▼	2,0%▲▲▲
<b>Problems seeing</b>	2,2%	1,9%▼▼	2,5%▲▲	1,8%	2,1%▼	3,3%▲▲▲

Table 4: Prevalence of chronic diseases in employees by age and gender						
	Total	Gender		Age		
<b>Other</b>	6,0%	6,9%▲▲▲	5,1%▼▼▼	5,1%▼	6,0%	6,7%▲
<b>No chronic disease</b>	62,7%	60,0%▼▼▼	65,2%▲▲▲	74,8%▲▲▲	63,5%▲▲▲	47,4%▼▼▼

Notes: . Percentages are column percentages, and are tested with the Pearson  $\chi^2$  test (horizontal comparisons). The contrast is subgroup vs other cases (weighted deviation contrast). ▲:  $p < 0,05$ , ▲▲:  $p < 0,01$ , ▲▲▲:  $p < 0,001$  (and ▼): significantly high (low) percentages (2-tailed). Symbols are based on significance only, not on effect size.

Source: NEA 2012

Table 5 - Prevalence of chronic conditions in employees by sector

Prevalence of chronic conditions in employees by sector

	Tot al	Sector, SBI2008, 13 categorieën. Partly based on registry
--	-----------	---

		· A (01-03). Agri cultu re, fore stry and fishi ng	· B-E (06-39). Manu factur ing	· F (41-43). Build ing and cons tructi on	· G (45-47). Tra de (ret ail and who lesa le)	· H (49-53). Tra nsp ort and stor age	· I (55-56). Ho re ca	· J (58-63). Infor mation and comm unicat ion	· K (64-66). Fin anc ial serv ices	· L- N (68-82). Pro fit serv ices and bro ker s	· O (84). Publi c Admi nistra tion	· P (85). Edu cati on	· Q (86-88). He alt h and so cia l car e	· R-U (90-99). Cultu ral, sport s and other servi ces
<b>N:</b>	25.2 23	278	2.769	1.198	4.284	1.189	1.01 6	767	1.008	4.111	1.706	1.692	4.31 3	89 2
<b>%:</b>		1,1%	11%	4,7%	17%	4,7%	4,0%	3,0%	4,0%	16%	6,8%	6,7%	17%	3,5 %
<b>Probl ems with legs or feet (inclu ding arthri tis, rheu matis m)</b>	5,3 %	3,8%	7,1%▲	6,0%	4,7% ▼	5,4%	4,5%	2,1%▼	3,2% ▼	5,1%	5,2%	5,6%	6,3% ▲	5,1 %

	Total	Sector, SBI2008, 13 categorieën. Partly based on registry												
		· A (01-03). Agri cultu re, fore stry and fishi ng	· B-E (06-39). Manu factur ing	· F (41-43). Build ing and cons tructi on	· G (45-47). Tra de (ret ail and wholesale)	· H (49-53). Tra nsp ort and stor age	· I (55-56). Ho re ca	· J (58-63). Inform ation and comm unicat ion	· K (64-66). Fin anc ial serv ices	· L- N (68-82). Pro fit serv ices and bro kers	· O (84). Publi c Admi nistrat ion	· P (85). Edu cati on	· Q (86-88). He alth and so cial care	· R-U (90-99). Cultu ral, sport s and other servi ces
<b>Problems with back and neck (including arthritis, rheumatism, RSI)</b>	10,1 %	7,2%	12,6% ▲	10,7%	8,7% ▼	12,4 %▲	7,5% ▼	7,7% ▼	9,5%	8,9% ▼	11,5%	10,0%	11,1 %▲	10,7 %
<b>Migra</b>	5,7	3,5%	5,1%	3,4% ▼	4,8%	3,9%	6,9%	5,8%	4,3%	5,6%	6,7%	6,9%	7,7%	4,5

		Sector, SBI2008, 13 categorieën. Partly based on registry												
Total		. A (01-03). Agri cultu re, fore stry and fishi ng	. B-E (06-39). Manu factur ing	. F (41-43). Build ing and cons tructi on	. G (45-47). Tra de (ret ail and who lesa le)	. H (49-53). Tra nsp ort and stor age	. I (55-56). Ho re ca	. J (58-63). Inform ation and comm unicat ion	. K (64-66). Fin anc ial serv ices	. L- N (68-82). Pro fit serv ices and bro kers s	. O (84). Publi c Admi nistra tion	. P (85). Edu cati on	. Q (86-88). He alt h and so cia l car e	. R-U (90-99). Cultu ral, sport s and other servi ces
<b>ine or severe head ache</b>	%				▼	▼						▲	▲	%
<b>Cardi ovasc ular diseas e</b>	3,1 %	2,6%	4,1%▲	3,7%	2,7%	4,4% ▲	1,1% ▼	2,8%	3,6%	2,8%	4,5%▲	2,8%	2,9%	1,2 % ▼
<b>Asth ma, bronc</b>	5,5 %	5,4%	5,7%	4,2%	5,0%	4,8%	4,9%	6,3%	5,0%	5,2%	5,5%	6,1%	6,2% ▲	5,9 %



	Total	Sector, SBI2008, 13 categorieën. Partly based on registry												
		· A (01-03). Agri cultu re, fore stry and fishi ng	· B-E (06-39). Manu factur ing	· F (41-43). Build ing and cons tructi on	· G (45-47). Tra de (ret ail and wholesale)	· H (49-53). Tra nsp ort and stor age	· I (55-56). Ho re ca	· J (58-63). Inform ation and comm unicat ion	· K (64-66). Fin anc ial serv ices	· L- N (68-82). Pro fit serv ices and bro kers	· O (84). Publi c Admi nistr ation	· P (85). Edu cati on	· Q (86-88). He alth and so cial car e	· R-U (90-99). Cultu ral, sport s and other serv ices
<b>Serious skin problems</b>	0,8 %	0,7%	0,6%	1,6%▲	0,7%	0,7%	0,8%	0,7%	0,9%	0,9%	1,1%	0,9%	0,9%	0,6 %
<b>Psychiatric symptoms / diseases</b>	3,0 %	0,6%▼	4,2%▲	2,3%	2,6%	2,6%	1,9%▼	2,8%	2,6%	3,0%	2,5%	3,9%▲	3,1%	3,9 %
<b>Hearing</b>	2,2 %	1,3%	3,5%▲	3,4%▲	1,6%▼	3,3%▲	0,8%▼	1,1%▼	1,1%▼	1,9%	2,7%	2,7%	2,1%	1,8 %

	Total	Sector, SBI2008, 13 categorieën. Partly based on registry												
		· A (01-03). Agri cultu re, fore stry and fishi ng	· B-E (06-39). Manu factur ing	· F (41-43). Build ing and cons tructi on	· G (45-47). Tra de (ret ail and wholesale)	· H (49-53). Tra nsp ort and stor age	· I (55-56). Ho re ca	· J (58-63). Inform ation and comm unicat ion	· K (64-66). Fin anc ial serv ices	· L- N (68-82). Pro fit serv ices and bro kers	· O (84). Publi c Admi nistrat ion	· P (85). Edu cati on	· Q (86-88). He alth and social care	· R-U (90-99). Cultu ral, sport s and other servi ces
<b>Problems</b>														
<b>Epilepsy</b>	0,4 %	0%	0,8%▲	0,3%	0,3%	0,3%	0,1%	0,3%	0,5%	0,4%	0,3%	0,4%	0,2%▼	0,4 %
<b>life-threatening diseases (eg cancer, AIDS)</b>	0,7 %	0,5%	0,6%	0,5%	0,5%▼	0,6%	0,5%	0,6%	1,3%▲	0,6%	1,0%	1,2%▲	0,9%	1,2 %

	Total	Sector, SBI2008, 13 categorieën. Partly based on registry												
		· A (01-03). Agri cultu re, fore stry and fishi ng	· B-E (06-39). Manu factur ing	· F (41-43). Build ing and cons tructi on	· G (45-47). Tra de (ret ail and who lesale)	· H (49-53). Tra nsp ort and stor age	· I (55-56). Ho re ca	· J (58-63). Inform ation and comm unicat ion	· K (64-66). Fin anc ial serv ices	· L (68-82). Pro fit serv ices and bro kers	· O (84). Publi c Admi nistr ation	· P (85). Edu cati on	· Q (86-88). He alth and so cial care	· R-U (90-99). Cultu ral, sport s and other servi ces
<b>Problems seen</b>	2,2 %	2,7%	2,4%	2,5%	2,2%	1,7%	1,3% ▼	4,1% ▲	2,6%	2,1%	3,1% ▲	2,6%	1,6% ▼	1,9 %
<b>Other</b>	6,0 %	4,7 %	6,6%	4,5% ▼	5,8 %	6,5 %	5,2 %	3,9% ▼	4,9 %	5,9 %	5,0%	6,6 %	6,7 % ▲	7,8 % ▲

Notes: Percentages are column percentages, and are tested with the Pearson  $\chi^2$  test (horizontal comparisons). The contrast is subgroup vs other cases (weighted deviation contrast). ▲:  $p < 0,05$ , ▲▲:  $p < 0,01$ , ▲▲▲:  $p < 0,001$  (and ▼): significantly high (low) percentages (2-tailed). Symbols are based on significance only, not on effect size.

Source: NEA 2012

Table 6: Transitions in employment for workers with and without a chronic disease in the 2003-2009 period; employment status one year later

Transitions in employment for workers with and without a chronic disease in the 2003-2009 period;  
employment status one year later

		2003	2004	2005	2006	2008	2009
<b>Employed</b>	Total	93%	93%	94%	95%	93%	92%
	chronic disease	90%	90%	92%	93%	90%	89%
	no chronic disease	94%	94%	95%	95%	94%	93%
<b>Unemployed</b>	Total	12%	13%	14%	15%	14%	14%
	chronic disease	6%	7%	8%	8%	7%	8%
	no chronic disease	14%	16%	17%	19%	18%	17%

Source: EBB

Table 7: Employers vision on hiring 'fragile' or precarious workers

Source: NEA 2012

Table 6: Transitions in employment for workers with and without a chronic disease in the 2003-2009 period;  
employment status one year later

Transitions in employment for workers with and without a chronic disease in the 2003-2009 period;  
employment status one year later

		2003	2004	2005	2006	2008	2009
<b>Employed</b>	Total	93%	93%	94%	95%	93%	92%
	chronic disease	90%	90%	92%	93%	90%	89%
	no chronic disease	94%	94%	95%	95%	94%	93%
<b>Unemployed</b>	Total	12%	13%	14%	15%	14%	14%
	chronic disease	6%	7%	8%	8%	7%	8%
	no chronic disease	14%	16%	17%	19%	18%	17%

Source: EBB

Table 7: Employers vision on hiring 'fragile' or precarious workers

Employers vision on hiring 'fragile' or precarious workers

		Total	Agriculture	Manufacturing	Building and construction	Trade	Hotels and catering	Transport & communication	Financial services	Profit services	Public Administration	Education	Health and social care	Other
	N:	5230	504	351	420	1254	404	216	145	1090	16	103	384	345
	%:		9,6%	6,7%	8,0%	24%	7,7%	4,1%	2,8%	21%	0,3%	2,0%	7,3%	6,6%

		Total	Agricu lture	Manufa cturing	Buildin g and constru ction	Trad e	Hore ca	Transpo rt & commun ication	Finan cial servic es	Profit servic es	Public Adminis tration	Educa tion	Healt h and social care	Other
<b>Hiring fragile/precarious workers is an explicit part of the mission</b>														
- Yes		4%	3%	7%	1%	4%	2%	5%	2%	4%	14%▲	6%	4%	3%
- No		89%	86%	85%	93%	88%	88%	86%	87%	91%	77%	85%	92%	90%
- Don't know		7%	11%	8%	6%	9%	10%	9%	11%	4%	9%	9%	4%	7%
<b>Hired fragile/precarious workers in the past 2 years</b>														
- Yes		13%	15%	23%▲	10%	12%	18%	23%▲	10%	10%	20%	13%	14%	9%
- No		85%	85%	76%▼	89%	85%	81%	72%▼	90%	88%	69%	85%	83%	88%
- Don't know		2%	0%	1%	1%	3%	2%	5%▲	0,2%	2%	10%▲	2%	3%	3%
<b>obstacles in hiring fragile/precarious workers</b>														
- a. Expect ed costs of		13%	12%	16%	21%▲	10%	11%	6%▼	12%	15%	11%	9%	7%	15%

		Total	Agriculture	Manufacturing	Building and construction	Trade	Hotels	Transport & communication	Financial services	Profit services	Public Administration	Education	Health and social care	Other
guidance														
- b. Financial risks due to productivity loss		13%	18%	15%	21%▲	9%	19%	10%	10%	15%	7%	4%▼	7%▼	10%
- c. expected organizational trouble		14%	23%▲	16%	15%	12%	18%	12%	11%	15%	7%	6%▼	8%	14%
- d. it does not fit the work done here in this organization		54%	60%	51%	65%▲	50%	54%	53%	46%	48%	48%	52%	68%▲	53%
- e.		3%	3%	4%	3%	3%	6%	3%	2%	3%	2%	5%	1%	4%

	Total	Agriculture	Manufacturing	Building and construction	Trade	Home care	Transport & communication	Financial services	Profit services	Public Administration	Education	Health and social care	Other
Don't know where to find these precarious workers													
- f. Precarious worker does not try to get a job at our organization	15%	18%	12%	20%	16%	19%	10%	17%	15%	13%	14%	12%	14%
- g. There are no barriers	18%	8% ▼	19%	13%	20%	17%	15%	18%	26% ▲	20%	13%	14%	10% ▼
- h. Other	8%	9%	6%	4%	7%	10%	11%	9%	9%	11%	19% ▲	9%	11%
- i.	8	4%	8%	6%	12	6	10%	5%	8%	11%	4%	4%	13%

	Total	Agriculture	Manufacturing	Building and construction	Trade	Home care	Transport & communication	Financial services	Profit services	Public Administration	Education	Health and social care	Other
Don't know	%				%	%							

Note: Percentages are column percentages, and are tested with the Pearson  $\chi^2$  test (horizontal comparisons). The contrast is subgroup vs other cases (weighted deviation contrast). ▲:  $p < 0,05$ , ▲▲:  $p < 0,01$ , ▲▲▲:  $p < 0,001$  (and ▼): significantly high (low) percentages (2-tailed). Symbols are based on significance only, not on effect size.

Source: WEA (NEWS; Netherlands Employer Work Survey; 2012)

## 2.2. Working conditions of employed people affected by chronic diseases

The purpose of this section is to analyse whether there are any distinctive characteristics of the working conditions of the people affected by chronic diseases in comparison to the average (national, sectorial), considering the four EF's WC categories (Health and well-being; Reconciliation of working and non-working life; Career and employment security issues; Skills development) :

- Health and well-being: Are certain occupations/jobs/sectors associated to certain chronic diseases? Possible relation between occupations and chronic diseases; what are the factors behind this (exposure to risks and hazards, job intensity, type of work, etc.); are special H&S measures implemented at workplace level to avoid/palliate this?
- Reconciliation of working and non-working life: are people with chronic diseases allowed special conditions in terms of work-life balance, flexibility at work to cope with the diseases/attend treatment, ability to set their own working time arrangements, etc.?
- Career and employment security: to which extent and how is the employment status of people with chronic diseases affected by their health situation?; is there an impact in their remuneration levels/conditions?; in what measure is there a repercussion on their employment security and working career?; are they allowed/forced to changes in their jobs?
- Skills development: in what measure have chronic diseases an impact in the access of workers to training activities promoted by the employer? Has the training anything to do with the disease situation?

- Are there any significant differences in these working conditions according to different groups of affected workers (type of disease, gender, age, sector, etc.)?
- Are there any significant changes in recent years? Possible effects of the economic crisis on these situations, if any.

Table 5 showed that chronic conditions are more prevalent in some sectors and that this seemed at least partly related to the exposure to risks. Table 8 shows exposure to physical and psychological risks at work. Workers with a chronic condition report a higher exposure to both physical and psychological risk factors. Although there are differences between specific diseases this pattern is found for all chronic diseases. Table 9 shows that workers with a chronic disease more often feel that (additional) health and safety measures need to be taken regarding exposure to risk factors. About 20% of the workers with a chronic disease report that a personal measure was taken because of their health (7% for workers without a chronic disease). About 25% feels that additional personal health and safety measures are necessary. (table 10)

There is no specific regulation that workers with a chronic disease are allowed to receive more flexibility at work regarding working times or work-life balance. Table 11 shows that workers with a chronic condition report the possibility to determine ones working times slightly to be more important than workers without a chronic disease. However this is not found for the possibility to work from home. People with chronic disease are less satisfied with the actual situation regarding influencing working times and working from home. Workers with a chronic disease slightly more often report problems with work-life balance.

Workers with a chronic disease are more concerned about keeping their job than workers without a chronic disease. However, there are no clear clues that workers with a chronic disease indeed more often are forced to change jobs. They more often have a permanent job and have had this job for more years than workers without a chronic disease. Although no official numbers about income differences between workers with or without a chronic disease are available, workers with a chronic disease more often state that in their household there is a lack of money. (Table 12)

Access to training is slightly lower for employees with a chronic disease. About 1 out of 3 workers without a chronic disease are stimulated by their supervisor to develop their knowledge and skills; about 1 in 2 has actually had any form of training in the previous 2 years. Despite that workers with a chronic disease feel less stimulated to develop their knowledge and skills their training is more often initiated and (partially) paid for by the employer. The aim of the training slightly differs between workers with and without a chronic disease. For workers with a chronic disease the training slightly more often aimed at 'being able to deal with future changes in their current employment' while workers without a chronic disease more often received training in order to enlarge their chances of a job in the future. (Table 13).

Table 8: Exposure to physical and psychosocial risk factors reported by employees with and without chronic disease

Exposure to physical and psychosocial risk factors reported by employees with and without chronic disease

	<b>Totaal</b>	<b>No chronic disease</b>	<b>A chronic disease</b>
<b>N:</b>	25.223	15.555	9.247
<b>%:</b>		63%	37%
<b>Dangerous work</b>			
· <b>Yes, often</b>	4,2%	4,2%	4,3%
· <b>Yes, sometimes</b>	18,7%	17,5%▼	20,6%▲
· <b>No</b>	77,1%	78,3%▲	75,1%▼
<b>Use of force</b>			
· <b>Yes, often</b>	20,4%	19,2%▼	22,4%▲
· <b>Yes, sometimes</b>	23,5%	23,3%	23,4%
· <b>No</b>	56,1%	57,5%▲	54,2%▼
<b>Use of tools</b>			

	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease
· Yes, often	8,8%	8,5% ▼	9,2% ▲
· Yes, sometimes	9,1%	9,1%	9,2%
· No	82,0%	82,5%	81,5%
<b>Uncomfortable working postures</b>			
· Yes, often	9,8%	8,1% ▼	12,5% ▲
· Yes, sometimes	28,0%	26,5% ▼	30,4% ▲
· No	62,1%	65,3% ▲	57,1% ▼
<b>Repetitive movements</b>			
· Yes, often	35,7%	32,2% ▼	41,1% ▲
· Yes, sometimes	22,5%	22,5%	22,5%
· No	41,9%	45,3% ▲	36,5% ▼
<b>Loud noises</b>			
· Yes, often	6,8%	6,3% ▼	7,7% ▲
· Yes, sometimes	18,2%	16,7% ▼	20,5% ▲

	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease
• No	75,0%	77,0%▲	71,8%▼
Water or watery substances	1,55	1,52▼	1,60▲
5g2. Do you get substances on your skin while working? (Like glue, paint, cleaning materials, medicine, detergents) [Average] [N=24.959]	1,44	1,41▼	1,48▲
5g3. Do you inhale substances while working? (Like vapour of detergents, exhaust fumes, welding vapor, dust from grain or rock and concrete) [average] [N=24.947]	1,35	1,32▼	1,39▲
5g4. While working, do you get in contact with contagious people, animals or material? [Average] [N=24.895]	1,34	1,30▼	1,39▲
• 5h. Autonomy/control (range: 1=little-3=a lot; 5 items) [average] [N=25.122]	2,46	2,48▲	2,43▼
Autonomy			
• low	43,7%	42,2%▼	45,7%▲
• high	56,3%	57,8%▲	54,3%▼
• 5h. Autonomy/control regarding time (range: 1=no - 3=Yes, often; 6 items; incl. 'being able to determine working time oneself') [Average] [N=25.114]	2,33	2,35▲	2,30▼
• 5i. Time pressure: high workplace, high time pressure (range:	2,14	2,12▼	2,17▲

	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease
1=no - 3=Yes, often; 2 items) [Average] [N=24.961]			
• 5j. Job demands (range: 1=never - 4=always; 4 items) [average] [N=25.106]	2,29	2,26 ▼	2,33 ▲
• 5k. Emotionally I heavy work (range: 1=never - 4=always; 3 items) [average] [N=25.101]	1,66	1,61 ▼	1,74 ▲
• 5l. Difficulty/complexity (range: 1=never - 4=always; 3 items) [Average] [N=25.073]	2,96	2,92 ▼	3,02 ▲
• 5m. Skill discretion (range: 1=never - 4=always; 3 items) [Average] [N=25.047]	2,72	2,73 ▲	2,70 ▼
• 6a. Social support supervisor (range: 1=little - 4=much; 4 items) [Average] [N=23.751]	2,85	2,90 ▲	2,77 ▼
• 6b. Social support colleagues (range: 1=little - 4=much; 4 items) [Average] [N=24.388]	3,24	3,26 ▲	3,19 ▼
• 6d. Violence and harassment (incl. bullying) [N=25.118]			
• No, never	76,1%	78,2% ▲	72,4% ▼
• Once or more often	23,9%	21,8% ▼	27,6% ▲

Notes: Percentages are column percentages, and are tested with the Pearson  $\chi^2$  test (horizontal comparisons). The contrast is subgroup vs other cases (weighted deviation contrast). ▲:  $p < 0,05$ , ▲▲:  $p < 0,01$ , ▲▲▲:  $p < 0,001$  (and ▼): significantly high (low) percentages (2-tailed). Symbols are based on significance only, not on effect size.

Source: NEA 2012

Table 9: Employees with and without chronic disease report that (additional) measures directed at risk management at work are necessary

Table 9: Employees with and without chronic disease report that (additional) measures directed at risk management at work are necessary

Employees with and without chronic disease report that (additional) measures directed at risk management at work are necessary

(additional) Measures needed which are directed at:	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease
<b>N:</b>	25.223	15.555	9.247
<b>%:</b>		63%	37%
<b>10a. Work pressure/psychological job demands [N=25.002]</b>			
· Not necessary, risk is not present	22,5%	24,1%▲	19,5%▼
· Not necessary, enough measures taken	40,0%	42,0%▲	36,7%▼
· Necessary, current measures are not sufficient	27,7%	25,2%▼	32,0%▲
· Necessary, no measures taken yet	9,9%	8,6%▼	11,9%▲
<b>10b. Emotionally heavy work [N=24.964]</b>			
· Not necessary, risk is not present	49,3%	51,4%▲	46,0%▼
· Not necessary, enough measures taken	36,1%	36,5%	35,6%

(additional) Measures needed which are directed at:	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease
- Necessary, current measures are not sufficient	11,1%	9,4% ▼	14,0% ▲
- Necessary, no measures taken yet	3,4%	2,7% ▼	4,5% ▲
<b>10c. Repetitive Strain InjuriesI [N=24.557]</b>			
- Not necessary, risk is not present	46,4%	48,0% ▲	43,3% ▼
- Not necessary, enough measures taken	37,2%	37,9%	36,7%
- Necessary, current measures are not sufficient	12,1%	10,6% ▼	14,7% ▲
- Necessary, no measures taken yet	4,3%	3,6% ▼	5,4% ▲
<b>10d Physically heavy work [N=24.978]</b>			
- Not necessary, risk is not present	50,5%	52,2% ▲	47,7% ▼
- Not necessary, enough measures taken	34,9%	35,7% ▲	33,5% ▼
- Necessary, current measures are not sufficient	12,0%	9,9% ▼	15,3% ▲
- Necessary, no measures taken yet	2,7%	2,2% ▼	3,5% ▲
<b>10e. Noise [N=24.955]</b>			
- Not necessary, risk is not present	60,4%	61,1% ▲	59,2% ▼

(additional) Measures needed which are directed at:	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease
- Not necessary, enough measures taken	31,0%	31,4%	30,3%
- Necessary, current measures are not sufficient	6,9%	6,1% ▼	8,2% ▲
- Necessary, no measures taken yet	1,7%	1,4% ▼	2,3% ▲
<b>10f. Smoking by colleagues or customers [N=25.014]</b>			
- Not necessary, risk is not present	52,8%	53,1%	52,4%
- Not necessary, enough measures taken	40,0%	40,4%	39,2%
- Necessary, current measures are not sufficient	5,6%	4,9% ▼	6,6% ▲
- Necessary, no measures taken yet	1,6%	1,5%	1,8%
<b>10g. Violence or harassments by customers (or patiënts, pupils or passengers, e.d.) [N=24.999]</b>			
- Not necessary, risk is not present	60,6%	61,9% ▲	58,3% ▼
- Not necessary, enough measures taken	32,0%	31,6%	32,7%
- Necessary, current measures are not sufficient	6,2%	5,5% ▼	7,5% ▲
- Necessary, no measures taken yet	1,2%	1,1% ▼	1,5% ▲

(additional) Measures needed which are directed at:	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease
<b>10h. Violence or harassment by supervisor or colleagues</b> [N=25.004]			
· Not necessary, risk is not present	70,4%	71,7%▲	68,2%▼
· Not necessary, enough measures taken	24,5%	24,4%	24,7%
· Necessary, current measures are not sufficient	3,7%	2,8%▼	5,2%▲
· Necessary, no measures taken yet	1,4%	1,1%▼	1,9%▲
<b>10i. Dangeorus substances [N=25.032]</b>			
· Not necessary, risk is not present	68,8%	69,0%	68,5%
· Not necessary, enough measures taken	26,9%	27,2%	26,3%
· Necessary, current measures are not sufficient	3,6%	3,2%▼	4,2%▲
· Necessary, no measures taken yet	0,7%	0,6%▼	1,0%▲
<b>10j. Safety, occupational accidents [N=24.988]</b>			
· Not necessary, risk is not present	46,9%	47,5%▲	45,9%▼
· Not necessary, enough measures taken	45,1%	45,3%	44,9%

(additional) Measures needed which are directed at:	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease
- Necessary, current measures are not sufficient	7,0%	6,2% ▼	8,2% ▲
- Necessary, no measures taken yet	1,1%	1,0%	1,1%
<b>10k. Viruses, bacteria, fungi [N=24.984]</b>			
- Not necessary, risk is not present	59,6%	61,5% ▲	56,7% ▼
- Not necessary, enough measures taken	32,4%	32,3%	32,6%
- Necessary, current measures are not sufficient	6,4%	5,1% ▼	8,4% ▲
- Necessary, no measures taken yet	1,6%	1,2% ▼	2,2% ▲

Notes: Percentages are column percentages, and are tested with the Pearson  $\chi^2$  test (horizontal comparisons). The contrast is subgroup vs other cases (weighted deviation contrast). ▲: p<0,05, ▲▲: p<0,01, ▲▲▲: p<0,001 (and ▼): significantly high (low) percentages (2-tailed). Symbols are based on significance only, not on effect size.

Source: NEA 2012

Table 10: OHS measures taken by employees with and without chronic disease

O&S measures taken by employees with and without chronic disease: more measures taken for employees with a chronic disease. In addition also more measures/adaptations needed by these workers. This is the case for almost all types of measures asked about: more measures are taken for employees with a chronic disease. No or few differences in measures regarding access to/adaptations in training/schooling or the building one works in.

	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease

	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease
N:	25.223	15.555	9.247
%:		63%	37%
<b>14d. In the last 12 months, have adaptations or changes been made at your workplace or in your activities because of your health? [N=24.877]</b>			
· a. No adaptations or changes	88,2%	93,0%▲	80,3%▼
· b. Adaptations or changes in resources or furniture	5,2%	3,4%▼	8,1%▲
· c. Adaptations or changes in working times	3,3%	1,5%▼	6,5%▲
· d. Adaptations or changes in the amount of work	2,3%	1,4%▼	3,8%▲
· e. Adaptations or changes in your function or job activities	2,8%	1,6%▼	5,0%▲
· f. Adaptations in education or schooling	0,6%	0,6%	0,7%
· g. Adaptations in access to the building	0,1%	0,1%▼	0,2%▲
· h. Other adaptations	1,8%	1,2%▼	2,8%▲
<b>14e. In your opinion, are there any (further) adaptations needed at your workplace or in your work activities because of your health? [N=24.803]</b>			

	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease
- a. No adaptations or changes needed	82,6%	87,0%▲	75,3%▼
- b. Adaptations or changes in resources or furniture needed	6,3%	5,1%▼	8,4%▲
- c. Adaptations or changes in working times needed	3,6%	2,3%▼	5,8%▲
- d. Adaptations or changes in the amount of work needed	5,4%	4,3%▼	7,0%▲
- e. Adaptations or changes in your function or job activities needed	3,0%	1,9%▼	4,8%▲
- f. Adaptations in education or schooling needed	1,5%	1,2%▼	1,9%▲
- g. Adaptations in access to the building needed	0,3%	0,2%	0,3%
- h. Other adaptations needed	4,0%	2,9%▼	5,7%▲

Notes Percentages are column percentages, and are tested with the Pearson  $\chi^2$  test (horizontal comparisons). The contrast is subgroup vs other cases (weighted deviation contrast). ▲:  $p < 0,05$ , ▲▲:  $p < 0,01$ , ▲▲▲:  $p < 0,001$  (and ▼): significantly high (low) percentages (2-tailed). Symbols are based on significance only, not on effect size.

Source: NEA 2012

Table 11: Work-life arrangements for employees with and without a chronic disease

Work-life arrangements for employees with and without a chronic disease

	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease

	<b>Totaal</b>	<b>No chronic disease</b>	<b>A chronic disease</b>
<b>N:</b>	25.223	15.555	9.247
<b>%:</b>		63%	37%
<b>2l. working from home (works at least 1 hour per week from home) [N=23.438]</b>			
<b>· No</b>	67,8%	67,0% ▼	69,0% ▲
<b>· Yes</b>	32,2%	33,0% ▲	31,0% ▼
<b>16a.h. Opportunity to determine your own working times [N=24.946]</b>			
<b>· Not important</b>	29,9%	30,6% ▲	28,7% ▼
<b>· Important</b>	47,3%	46,8% ▼	48,1% ▲
<b>· Very important</b>	22,8%	22,6%	23,2%
<b>16a.i. Opportunity to work from home [N=24.872]</b>			
<b>· Not important</b>	61,1%	60,4% ▼	62,0% ▲
<b>· Important</b>	26,8%	27,2%	26,1%
<b>· Very important</b>	12,1%	12,4%	11,9%

	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease
<b>16b.h. Opportunity to determine your own working time</b> [N=24.628]			
· Not satisfied	19,5%	17,8% ▼	22,0% ▲
· satisfied	58,9%	59,1%	58,6%
· Very satisfied	21,6%	23,1% ▲	19,4% ▼
<b>16b.i. Opportunity to work from home</b> [N=23.772]			
· Not satisfied	27,9%	26,2% ▼	30,6% ▲
· satisfied	55,8%	56,2%	55,2%
· Very satisfied	16,3%	17,6% ▲	14,2% ▼
<b>18a. Misses or neglects family or family activities because of your work?</b> [N=24.948]			
· No, never	52,7%	54,1% ▲	50,2% ▼
· Yes, now and then	38,7%	38,5%	39,4%
· Yes, often	7,1%	6,2% ▼	8,5% ▲

	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease
· Yes, very often	1,5%	1,2% ▼	1,9% ▲
- Average [N=24.948]	1,57	1,54 ▼	1,62 ▲
<b>18b. Misses or neglects work because of family or family responsibilities? [N=23.766]</b>			
· No, never	72,7%	73,5% ▲	71,3% ▼
· Yes, now and then	25,2%	24,8% ▼	26,0% ▲
· Yes, often	1,7%	1,5% ▼	2,2% ▲
· Yes, very often	0,4%	0,3% ▼	0,5% ▲
- Average [N=23.766]	1,30	1,29 ▼	1,32 ▲

Notes: Percentages are column percentages, and are tested with the Pearson  $\chi^2$  test (horizontal comparisons). The contrast is subgroup vs other cases (weighted deviation contrast). ▲: p<0,05, ▲▲: p<0,01, ▲▲▲: p<0,001 (and ▼): significantly high (low) percentages (2-tailed). Symbols are based on significance only, not on effect size.

Source: NEA 2012

Table 12: Career opportunities for employees with or without a chronic disease

Career opportunities for employees with or without a chronic disease

	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease

	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease
<b>N:</b>	25.223	15.555	9.247
<b>%:</b>		63%	37%
<b>2a. What kind of contract do you have? [N=25.081]</b>			
- permanent contract	77,3%	75,7% ▼	79,7% ▲
- temporary contract with expectations of a permanent contract	7,3%	8,1% ▲	6,0% ▼
- temporary contract (fixed time period)	8,6%	9,3% ▲	7,5% ▼
- temporary agency worker	2,3%	2,4%	2,1%
- On call	3,7%	4,1% ▲	3,1% ▼
- Working in sheltered work	0,8%	0,3% ▼	1,6% ▲
<b>2b. What is the number of hours worked per week according to your contract? (hours/week) [Average] [N=25.024]</b>	30,1	30,1	30,0
<b>2m.j. How long are you working for your present employer (years+months/12)? [Average] [N=25.047]</b>	9,88	8,95 ▼	11,4 ▲
<b>2n.j How long are you working in your present job (jeers+months/12)? [Average] [N=24.979]</b>	7,51	6,84 ▼	8,54 ▲
<b>18c. How is the financial situation of your household at this</b>			

	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease
moment? [N=24.840]			
· A considerable shortage of money	5,6%	4,6% ▼	7,2% ▲
· A small shortage of money	15,9%	14,6% ▼	17,9% ▲
· Exactly enough	27,5%	27,0% ▼	28,2% ▲
· Can save a little bit	41,7%	43,2% ▲	39,2% ▼
· Can save considerably	9,4%	10,6% ▲	7,6% ▼
- Average [N=24.840]	3,33	3,40 ▲	3,22 ▼
<b>19a. Are you at risk of losing your job? [N=25.042]</b>			
· Yes	28,1%	26,1% ▼	31,7% ▲
· No	71,9%	73,9% ▲	68,3% ▼
<b>19b. Are you concerned about keeping your job? [N=25.114]</b>			
· Yes	31,5%	28,2% ▼	37,3% ▲
· No	68,5%	71,8% ▲	62,7% ▼
<b>19c. Did you think about finding a job with another employer in the last year? [N=25.132]</b>			

	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease
· Yes	45,5%	45,2%	46,4%
· No	54,5%	54,8%	53,6%
<b>19d. Did you actually take actions to find another job in the last year? [N=25.129]</b>			
· Yes	22,9%	22,6%	23,5%
· No	77,1%	77,4%	76,5%
<b>19e. If it were up to you, would you still be working at this organization five years from now? [N=24.919]</b>			
· Yes	64,7%	64,6%	64,8%
· No	35,3%	35,4%	35,2%

Notes: Percentages are column percentages, and are tested with the Pearson  $\chi^2$  test (horizontal comparisons). The contrast is subgroup vs other cases (weighted deviation contrast). ▲: p<0,05, ▲▲: p<0,01, ▲▲▲: p<0,001 (and ▼): significantly high (low) percentages (2-tailed). Symbols are based on significance only, not on effect size.

Source: NEA 2012

Table 13: Training for employees with and without a chronic disease

Training for employees with and without a chronic disease

	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease
--	--------	--------------------	-------------------

	<b>Totaal</b>	<b>No chronic disease</b>	<b>A chronic disease</b>
<b>N:</b>	25.223	15.555	9.247
<b>%:</b>		63%	37%
<b>17f. Does your supervisor stimulate that you develop your knowledge and skills? [N=24.843]</b>			
<b>· No</b>	25,9%	24,4% ▼	28,5% ▲
<b>· Yes, in a limited way</b>	51,7%	52,3% ▲	50,6% ▼
<b>· Yes, considerably</b>	22,4%	23,3% ▲	20,9% ▼
<b>17g. Did you follow a course or education for your work in the last two years? [N=24.931]</b>			
<b>· No</b>	46,0%	45,6%	46,5%
<b>· Yes</b>	54,0%	54,4%	53,5%
<b>17i. How many days did you spend on this course or education? [Average] [N=13.048]</b>	22,4	23,1	21,3
<b>17l. What was the most important goal of this course or education? [N=13.277]</b>			
<b>· To become better at my present job</b>	61,5%	61,6%	61,4%

	Totaal	No chronic disease	A chronic disease
· To be able to cope with future changes in my present job	23,4%	22,7% ▼	24,5% ▲
· To improve my chances for work in the future	15,2%	15,7% ▲	14,1% ▼
<b>17m. Do you need a course or education at this moment?</b> [N=24.609]			
· a. No, no need	51,0%	51,3%	50,2%
· b. Yes, to become better at my present job	17,1%	17,2%	17,1%
· c. Yes, to better cope with future changes in my present job	18,0%	17,8%	18,6%
· d. Yes, to improve my chances for work in the future	26,0%	25,5% ▼	27,0% ▲

Notes: Percentages are column percentages, and are tested with the Pearson  $\chi^2$  test (horizontal comparisons). The contrast is subgroup vs other cases (weighted deviation contrast). ▲:  $p < 0,05$ , ▲▲:  $p < 0,01$ , ▲▲▲:  $p < 0,001$  (and ▼): significantly high (low) percentages (2-tailed). Symbols are based on significance only, not on effect size.

Source: NEA 2012

The working conditions if both employees with and without chronic health problems appear to be quite stable in the last decade (NWCS). Since the crisis job insecurity of all workers (with and without chronic health problems) has become worse. In addition for the Dutch employees work autonomy is slightly decreasing.

## **Block 3: Policies and measures adopted by public and private agents to favour the employment situation and working conditions of people with chronic diseases**

---

### **3.1. Description of main policy measures/initiatives developed by public authorities or social partners**

On a national level, next to Equal treatment on grounds of disability or chronic illness Act (see 1.1) there are no specific regulations for workers with a chronic disease, but there are policies regarding workers with a work handicap (chronic disease that hinders work performance). Employers can get financial compensation through a lower premium for the sickness/disability insurance and can be compensated for the costs they make for work adaptations.

In recent years the focus in the Netherlands is on participation (inclusion in the workforce by way of active participation). Everyone who can work should work and the focus is no longer on what people cannot do but on what they can do. This also has an effect on work handicapped. The latest regulation regarding this is the introduction of the 'Participatiewet' (participation law). With this law the government wants to ensure that more people with a work handicap get a job. The law has not yet been approved by the House and Senate and is expected to come into force on January 1<sup>st</sup> 2015. When this law comes into force this will have consequences for young people with a work handicap. They can only obtain a benefit if they have never worked and are expected never to be able to work. It also has an effect on sheltered employment. The Participatiewet will replace the Sheltered Employment Act and no more people can enroll in sheltered employment. (although sheltered employment will remain available for those who already work in a sheltered environment). For everyone else municipalities will be responsible to help one to work. Either for a regular employer or if necessary with a little extra help. Employers have agreed with the government to create employment for people with disabilities. That includes both sheltered jobs as non- sheltered jobs. The government itself will also create additional jobs. Should employers not provide enough jobs then the government will enforce a quota.

### **3.2. Examples of Employer s and/or collective agreements implementing initiatives or establishing clauses to support people with chronic diseases**

Not much information can be found regarding initiatives for workers with a chronic illness. The only thing that can be found focuses on sickness absenteeism. Chronic illness often comes with higher sickness absenteeism. In some collective labor arrangements (cao's) it is agreed that workers do not get paid the first day of their sickness absenteeism (waiting days) . In order to compensate workers with a chronic disease a number of cao's state that for workers with a chronic diseases these waiting days do not or only partly apply to workers with a chronic disease. The agreements where this is found are the cao for carpenters, in the fashion industry and the cao for furniture makers.

Each year, there is a week of the chronically ill. It starts with a national symposium with plenary presentations, and during the week, there are several workshops in different places throughout the Netherlands in which the focus is more on 'how to stimulate participation of the chronically ill' and

on good practices. The funding comes from grants from amongst others the Ministry of Social Affairs and Employment and the Ministry of Health.

## Commentary

---

NCs are requested to provide a brief commentary on the main results obtained.

The focus in politics, legislation, regulations or specific measures is not so much on the chronically ill but other topics, including 'participation to the labour market', or absenteeism as such, are more in focus.

Of all potential workers (age 15-64 of age) a quarter has chronic health problems (EBB/Labour Force Survey). Another survey, with a different operationalization of 'chronical illness' (NWCS), indicates that one third of the employees has one or more chronic health problems. The percentage of workers or potential workers with chronic health problems is quite stable in the last decade. Musculoskeletal problems are most prevalent, followed by migraine/headache and respiratory problems. Elderly and female employees have most chronic health problems.

Employees with chronic health problems report more OSH risks at work, both physical and psychosocial risks. They are also more concerned about keeping their job. This appears to be justified: in a longitudinal part of the NWCS employees with chronic health problems as compared to employees without chronic health problems have a larger risk of (future) unemployment.

Only few employers have an explicit policy on hiring 'fragile' or precarious workers (4%). About 13% of all employers did hire employees with chronic health problems in the last two years. Most prevalent obstacles for hiring precarious workers are that they do not fit the work done in the company (54%), they do not try to get a job there (15%) or the employer expects trouble (14%).

The employer less often stimulates employees with chronic diseases to take a course or training but when they do the aim is more often to deal with demands in the current employment. For employees without chronic disease the aim is more often to be better prepared for future employment.