



in Argentina, Belgium, Brazil, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Italy, India, Mexico, Netherlands, Poland, Spain, South Africa, South Korea, United Kingdom, United States  
[www.WageIndicator.org](http://www.WageIndicator.org)

## WIBAR Report No. 6 WORK-RELATED STRESS

05/03/2007

Final version

Maarten van Klaveren, Kea Tijdens

**WAGEINDICATOR SUPPORT FOR TRADE UNION BARGAINING IN EUROPE (WIBAR)**

Supported by the European Commission in its Industrial Relations and Social Dialogue Program,  
Budget Heading 04030301. Nr 2006/VP001/10017, runs from 08/2006-08/2007<sup>1</sup>

### Table of contents

1. Introduction .....	2
2. The EU debate on the quality of work .....	3
3. Quality of work regulation in Europe .....	5
4. Work-related stress: definitions.....	6
5. Work-related stress: outcomes.....	8
5.1 EWCS outcomes.....	8
5.2 <i>WageIndicator</i> outcomes .....	10
References .....	23

<sup>1</sup> Sole responsibility lies with the University of Amsterdam/AIAS. The European Commission is not responsible for any use that may be made of the information in this particular or in any other publication or communication.

## 1. Introduction

This is a report in the framework of the WIBAR project. This project aims to promote the input of cross-country, comparative analyses at the level of themes and industries using the *WageIndicator* survey data about wages, working conditions and working hours. The Amsterdam Institute of Advanced Labour Studies (AIAS) / University of Amsterdam has developed the WIBAR project in co-operation with the European Trade Union Confederation (ETUC): the project is focused on the European trade union involvement in developing workplace industrial relations and Europe-wide bargaining. ETUC has formulated four major bargaining spearheads and related guidelines for 2006: wages in general and low pay work; working time; gender equality; training and lifelong learning.<sup>2</sup> For the ETUC, the European industrial secretariats and their national trade unions, the need for detailed and industry-specific comparisons is more urgent than ever. The WIBAR project should produce usable tools and intensify dissemination and debate on Europe-wide bargaining.

One of the key objectives of the Lisbon Strategy of the European Union is to secure more and better jobs, as well as fighting social exclusion and poverty. Since then, as the European Commission stated, at least formally "Quality is at the heart of the European social model. It is a key element in promoting employment in a competitive and inclusive knowledge economy".<sup>3</sup> The link between 'quality' and 'knowledge society' on the one hand and better jobs and workplace rights on the other as such is definitely challenging, and distinctively European as well.

In the last decade the issue on which this report focuses, work-related stress, has aroused a lot of interest across Europe. According to the 2000 European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS) and the European Agency for Safety and Health at Work in Bilbao it was, after back pain, the second most common work-related health problem, affecting 28% of the workers in the then 15 member states of the EU.<sup>4</sup> Work-related stress has been associated with quite some negative health outcomes, and its potential outcomes are rather diverse.<sup>5</sup> We will argue that work-related stress is closely to other issues in the wider field of the quality of work.<sup>6</sup> Therefore it is necessary to provide a short overview of European debates concerning this wider field; we do so in Section 2. Then, Section 3 goes into the regulation concerning the quality of work that is relevant for (limiting) work-related stress. As we will see, national legislation and national agreements between the social partners are still relevant here. Section 4 deals more precisely with definitions of work-related stress. A major source besides the *WageIndicator* survey is the European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS) of the European Foundation in Dublin, of which the fourth wave has just been published.<sup>7</sup> Section 5 presents results of calculations based on both sources concerning quality of work and work-related stress.

---

<sup>2</sup> Keune, 2005; ETUC, 2005a.

<sup>3</sup> EC, 2001, 2.

<sup>4</sup> Bouwman, 2002.

<sup>5</sup> EF, 2006, 2.

<sup>6</sup> In EU documents sometimes called 'quality *in* work' (cf. EC, 2001, 2003); the older usual denomination, derived from Scandinavia, is 'quality of working life', while the current American expression is 'job quality'.

<sup>7</sup> Parent-Thirion *et al*, 2007

## 2. The EU debate on the quality of work

Already before the 2000 Lisbon Declaration, the European Commission explored the relation between 'more and better jobs' and related this to the modernization of work organisations. Following the first debates in which the high levels of unemployment in Europe were connected with the Europe-wide dominance of inflexible forms of work organisation.<sup>8</sup> First, in 1997 the Commission's Green Paper on Partnership for a new organization of work appealed for change towards the flexible firm and away from mass production, including showing linkages with issues like flexibility and social security, life-long learning, payment systems, and equal opportunities. Second, in 1998 the European Employment Strategy (EES) was created, defining Employment Guidelines based on four pillars: stimulating employability, adaptability, entrepreneurship and equality. In 2000 in Lisbon a set of concrete goals and indicators was added to the EES, and the 2003 Employment Guidelines revision formulated three overarching goals: full employment, quality of labour and productivity, and social inclusion.

After the Lisbon Summit, European policy-makers have reconfirmed the 'more and better jobs' goal at various occasions, like in the conclusions of the Spring 2004 European Summit: "Delivering more and better jobs is the most urgent issue to be addressed over the coming year".<sup>9</sup> In the 2005 Commission's guidelines for growth and jobs a number of employment guidelines have been linked with the 'better jobs' goal: improving quality and productivity at work; promote a life-cycle approach to work; enhance work attractiveness; promote flexibility combined with employment security and reduce labour market segmentation; expand and improve investment in human capital.<sup>10</sup>

In 2001, under the Belgian presidency, the Commission published a Communication focusing on the goal of promoting quality in work. One of its aims was to establish a coherent, broad set of indicators. Quality in work was described as a relative and multi-dimensional concept, including a) objective characteristics related to employment (both of the job and of the wider work environment); b) worker characteristics; c) the match between worker characteristics and job requirements, and d) the subjective evaluation of these characteristics by the worker. This description seemed to open the door for the deliberate choice of indicators concentrating on objective job characteristics as well as on the match ('fit') between worker and job characteristics. Notably the first would have allowed assessing the structural basis of opportunities to improve jobs and to limit health risks, following the seminal work of Robert Karasek to be traced in work organisations.<sup>11</sup> Yet, after concluding that "There is no standard or agreed definition of quality in work in the academic and expert literature", the Commission ended up in proposing a 'coherent and broad' set of indicators, within two dimensions covering 10 main elements of quality in work<sup>12</sup>:

- under dimension I, characteristics of the job itself: intrinsic job quality; skills, lifelong learning and career development;
- under dimension II: gender equality; health and safety at work; flexibility and security; inclusion and access to the labour market; work organisation and

---

<sup>8</sup> Bouwman, 2004.

<sup>9</sup> Presidency Conclusions, 2004, 6.

<sup>10</sup> EC, 2005b.

<sup>11</sup> Karasek, 1979; cf. Van Klaveren, 1994.

<sup>12</sup> EC, 2001, 7, 11 ff.

work-life balance; social dialogue and worker involvement; diversity and non-discrimination, and overall work performance.

The Commission mentioned as possible indicators for intrinsic job quality: job satisfaction; the proportion of workers advancing to higher paid employment over time, and low wage earners, working poor and the distribution of incomes. Indeed, in the subsequent 2003 Communication, the Commission in treating intrinsic job quality focused on self-reported job satisfaction, transitions between non-employment and employment and within employment by pay level, and on transitions by type of contract.<sup>13</sup> This measurement has been separated from measuring health and safety at work, although the Commission in the 2001 Communication noted that “new risks and pressures related to changing forms of employment and ever tighter rhythms of work have emerged”, pointing at outcomes of the first three European Surveys on Working Conditions.<sup>14</sup>

It can be questioned whether the Commission’s 10 indicators live up to the claim of consistency. The choice of indicators is very broad, easily leading to open-endedness in policy decision-making, and hardly or not allowing for links with the issue of the modernization of work organization. The latter weakness is the more remarkable as at the time the strand of literature on this issues swelled, also stimulated by research commissioned through the Commission.<sup>15</sup> Some studies explicitly addressed the relationship between new forms of work organization and the quality of work.<sup>16</sup> The relative isolation of the ‘better jobs’ theme, combined with the broad and rather elusive approach chosen, may have contributed to its demise in EU policy-making. It may have been a vague sign that in the 2005 Commission’s Communication on the Social Agenda ‘better jobs’ as such are no longer mentioned. Only the four priorities of the Kok Task Force on Employment in 2003 (‘Jobs, jobs, jobs’) are repeated, the priority that comes closest being ‘invest more, and more effectively, in human capital’.<sup>17</sup>

On the other hand, in the early 2000s the European Council of Health Ministers and the Commission undertook various activities to promote the awareness of the causes and consequences of work-related stress. In 2001, the health ministers invited the member states “to give special attention to the increasing problem of work-related stress and depression”.<sup>18</sup> The 2000 Commission’s “Guidance on work-related stress” defined the phenomenon as “a pattern of emotional, cognitive, behavioural and physiological reactions to adverse and noxious aspects of work content, work organisation and work environment. It is a state characterised by high levels of arousal and distress and often by feelings of not coping.” The EC publication emphasized that work-related stress is often maladaptive and disease-provoking, and mentioned as appropriate actions the prevention or counteraction by job redesign (e.g. by empowering the employees, and avoiding both over- and underload), by improving social support, and by promoting reasonable reward for the effort invested.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>13</sup> EC, 2003, 9.

<sup>14</sup> EC, 2001, 9.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Business Decisions Ltd, 1999; Ennals, 2002.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Savage, 2001; Wiezer *et al*, 2001.

<sup>17</sup> EC, 2005a.

<sup>18</sup> Council, 2001.

<sup>19</sup> EC, 2000, 5, 17.

The European Parliament (EP) and the ETUC have been active in counteracting the demise of the quality of work theme in EU policy-making. For example, back in 2000 the EP<sup>20</sup> called for work to be adapted to people's abilities and needs and not vice-versa, and urged the Commission to investigate "new problem areas which are not covered by current legislation, such as stress and burnout". The Parliament also noted that (along with muscular-skeletal diseases) psycho-social factors constitute the greatest modern threat to workers' health. It drew attention to the problems resulting from a lack of autonomy at the workplace, monotonous and repetitive work and work with a narrow variety of content (features which are typical of women's work in particular, according to the resolution). In 2002, the chair of the EP's Employment and Social Affairs Committee recalled the importance of modernising work organisations as a key element in the approach of work-related stress.<sup>21</sup>

In 2003 its Xth Congress committed the ETUC to seek a EU built, among other things, on "full employment and quality jobs (.....) A high level of physical and mental health" and, under the heading 'The road from Lisbon: towards more and better jobs', "Promote high quality and stable jobs through EU legislative and collectively agreed provisions, in terms of issues such as working time, pay and conditions, health and safety, and access to training (.....)".<sup>22</sup> A 2004 ETUC declaration emphasized that Europe needs to strengthen its social dimension by improving working conditions, and mentioned four negative trends related to quality of labour and productivity.<sup>23</sup> In June 2006, addressing the Finnish Presidency, the ETUC declared: "Improving the quality of working life in order to increase the employment rate, the productivity levels and innovation depends on the way work is organised but also on the skill levels of the workforce (....) Europe needs to invest more and better on skills and competences, on research, development and innovation".<sup>24</sup> In its document "The coordination of collective bargaining 2007", ETUC confirms its attachment to policies ensuring quality at work. In this respect, the ETUC draws attention to the fact that, as the fourth EWCS proves (see Section 4), work intensity is rising throughout the EU.<sup>25</sup>

It has to be added that already since a decade unions throughout Europe display activities in raising the consciousness of workers about the causes and dangers of work-related stress. They do so mainly by campaigning and information-spreading activities, but there is a growing tendency to combat stress also by collective bargaining.<sup>26</sup>

### **3. Quality of work regulation in Europe**

In many EU member states especially employers' associations indicate that nowadays 90% of the executive decrees on the quality of work are based on EU regulation or ILO treaties. Until recently, EU regulation has been limited to the 'classical' issues of health and safety at work while the organisational and mental dimensions of quality of work, like autonomy and work-related stress, remain peripheral. As such stress is not mentioned in the EU legislative framework. The Framework health and safety Directive (89/391/EEC) lays down the employer's general obligations to ensure the health and safety of workers in every aspect

---

<sup>20</sup> in Resolution A4-0050/99.

<sup>21</sup> Bouwman, 2002.

<sup>22</sup> ETUC, 2003, 12, 16.

<sup>23</sup> ETUC, 2004.

<sup>24</sup> ETUC, 2006a.

<sup>25</sup> ETUC, 2006b.

<sup>26</sup> Koukoulaki, 2002, 8; various EIRO information.

related to the work, including requiring the employer to “adapt the work to the individual especially as regards (...) the choice of working and production methods, with a view, in particular, to alleviating monotonous work and work at a pre-determined work rate and to reducing the effect on health” (art. 6). This can be read as an indirect provision for stress-related aspects.<sup>27</sup>

The formal non-existence of work-related stress at EU level changed when in October 2004, in the framework of the European Social Framework, the social partners at EU level agreed upon a voluntary Framework Agreement on Work-Related Stress. Among other things, this agreement lays down that “If a problem of work-related stress is identified, action must be taken to prevent, eliminate or reduce it. The responsibility for determining the appropriate measures rests with the employer. These measures will be carried out with the participation and collaboration of workers and/or their representatives”.

In 2001, the EIRO observatory found that concerning the then 15 EU member states and Norway, “No country examined has specific regulations on psycho-social risk factors and/or work-related stress. In the general health and safety regulations (for all sectors) or the specific ones (for a particular sector, occupational category or job) there are no clauses referring directly and specifically to work-related stress. Nor are there explicit references to work-related stress in regulations on work organisation (covering working time, performance control, assignment of tasks, power of the employer/control of workers, pay, or reconciling work with family and social life)”. This study goes on in stating that, despite this lack of specific regulations, the general legal frameworks of all countries refer to psycho-social risk factors that are the cause of work-related stress, most of them paraphrasing the 1989 Framework health and safety Directive. Following EIRO, only in Belgium, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Norway and Sweden do legal provisions go further than the Directive by specifying the need for employers to act against other factors which are considered by experts to be psycho-social risks and to cause work-related stress, and by relating health and safety at work to detailed aspects of work organisation. Moreover, in some countries tripartite arrangements at national level or in various industries focus on combating the risks of work-related stress. This is notably the case in the Netherlands, in a number of so-called Working Conditions Covenants, and in Sweden. The same holds for bipartite arrangements in collective agreements, which is the case in Belgium, Denmark, Germany, the Netherlands, Sweden and the UK.<sup>28</sup>

#### **4. Work-related stress: definitions**

The causal model that we will summarize here, looks as follows:

stressors ----> job strain (work pressure) -----> work-related stress ----> burnout

Work-related stress can be described as a pattern of reactions occurring when workers are confronted with demands concerning their work that are not matched to their competencies and resources, and with which they have problems to cope. When a worker perceives an imbalance between work (job) demands and his/her competencies and resources, this can cause emotional, cognitive, behavioural and physiological reactions. The long-term consequences on the worker in case of prolonged exposure may be serious, and may well include musculoskeletal disorders,

---

<sup>27</sup> Koukoulaki, 2002, 6.

<sup>28</sup> EF, 2001; various EIRO information.

particularly backaches and muscular pains in neck and shoulders, RSI (repetitive strain injuries), and burnout as most notorious stress reactions<sup>29</sup> Thanks to extensive epidemiological research, the interrelations between stress reactions, symptoms and long-term consequences for workers have become relatively well-known.

The determinants of work-related stress (stressors) and of the situation mostly regarded as its porch, mental (job) strain, are much less clear and subject to heated academic debates. The 'classical' explanation, based on Karasek's job control-demand model, focuses on the conflict between high job demands and low job control (low decision latitude and low social support), leading to 'high strain jobs'. These jobs are characterized by complex tasks and high work intensity (in turn made up of high pace of work and working under high time pressure). The more recent literature, however, distinguishes no less than about 20 clusters of causes of mental strain, on the one hand indicating high strain jobs, but on the other hand also low strain or (Karasek) 'passive' jobs, characterized by monotonous, short-cyclical work, and lack of career opportunities.<sup>30</sup> Moreover, the combination of task 'passivity' and (sudden, unpredictable) high strain, which is spreading among the workforce of most EU countries, turns out to include important risk categories like process operators, police officers, health care workers, and others.<sup>31</sup>

Recent research on the causes of work-stress (stressors) brings nearly the whole, broad field of job quality to the fore. Analyses on data from the third EWCS and from a large Dutch survey pointed at the following determinants of mental strain: physically heavy work; task complexity, unpredictability; repetitive work; lack of autonomy; work behind VDU screens, and emotionally demanding work (including violence and bullying in the workplace).<sup>32</sup> Moreover, these and many other analyses show the importance of many aspects of the organizational context: besides the job content, working time (overtime!), wages, (lack of) career prospects and training, (lack of) support from colleagues and managers, (lack of) job security, they may all play substantial roles. Against this backdrop, it makes sense to rely on a broad definition of quality of work, including: skill use and task variety; autonomy at work; job strain, work-related stress; wages; training and career prospects, and worker representation. The practical advantages seem obtrusive. With stressors omnipotent, a broad range of policy options may seem effective, notably aiming at decreasing job demands (higher staffing levels, adjusting norms, supportive leadership) and increasing control options (redesign of ICT, more training, participation, information). Yet, the abundance of options may be deceptive: coherent organizational development, including fundamental organizational redesign, will most likely be more rewarding and lasting than specific measures.<sup>33</sup>

In section 5 our first step will be to give, based on the fourth EWCS (2005), an impression of the spread of factors eventually determining job strain and work-related stress, for the seven EU member states (plus Hungary and Poland) for which we will also present *WageIndicator* data, like the incidence of complex work, autonomous work, monotonous work, and repetitive work.<sup>34</sup> We finally present the

---

<sup>29</sup> EF, 2002, 17-18; EF, 2006.

<sup>30</sup> Kompier, 1999.

<sup>31</sup> Smulders & Houtman, 2004; Houtman et al, 2006.

<sup>32</sup> Wiezer et al, 2005.

<sup>33</sup> Cf. Wiezer et al, 2001; Savage, 2001.

<sup>34</sup> The relation with the incidence of heavy work, working with computers, as well as with the exposure to job hazards needs further study, but we lacked the time for this as the results of the fourth EWCS were published quite recently.

incidence of work pressure (job strain). Work pressure has been measured by taking the mean score of two questions: *Does your job involve working at a very high speed?* and *Does your job involve working at tight deadlines?* As we already noted, this is used as a measure for work intensity and work intensification.

A second step will be a thorough exploration of the available *WageIndicator* survey data. The *WageIndicator* questioning on quality of work rather closely follows that of the EWCS. We also used scores on the questions indicating the intensity of work, on working at very high speed and to tight deadlines, but in first instance added scores on three other questions: whether the work is physically exhausting, mentally exhausting, and whether it cannot be finished in the allocated time. In a second round, we also added questions on monotonous tasks, whether the respondents finds the job stressful, and whether he/she perceives the job as sufficiently varied. By this operationalisation we hope to do justice to the evidence from recent research, pointing at the importance of heavy work and monotonous tasks as stressors.

## **5. Work-related stress: outcomes**

### **5.1 EWCS outcomes**

The subsequent EWCS's should allow for exploring long-term trends, although concerning the 2005 edition unfortunately a number of reported outcomes are incomparable with those from the earlier EWCS's, either by changes in the questioning or by changes in the way of reporting. We derived the following picture, partly based on Eurofound press releases.

We start with the most closely workstress-related issues. Based on the answers on the questions on working at very high speed and working at tight deadlines, it turns out that the perceived work intensification is on the increase in the EU. In 2005 26% of all workers in the EU-27 reported having to work at very high speed all or nearly all of the time. In 1991, the equivalent figure was 19% (for the EU-12). At the same time, the incidence of at least around three-quarters of the time working to tight deadlines grew with the same amount. Moreover, there has been a substantial reduction in the share of those reporting never working at very high speed (from 36% in 1990 to 21% in 2005) and of those never working at tight deadlines (from 31% to 19%).<sup>35</sup>

For the EU-27, in 2005 working at very high speed was highest in construction and in hotels et cetera, while working to tight deadlines was highest in (in this order) in construction, transport, various commercial services, and manufacturing. In the EU-27, the pace of work was determined in 68% by direct demands from people (customer, passengers, patients), and less by the work of colleagues (42%), by numerical and production targets (42%), direct control of the boss (36%) and automatic machine speed (19%). Obviously, the growing proportion of workers for which the pace of work is dependent on demands from people adds substantially to the overall figures on time pressure and pace of work. In the EWCS 2005 the share of 'pace of work dependent on direct demands from customers, patients etc.' was over 80% in three sectors: hotels et cetera, retail and health care.<sup>36</sup> More advanced

---

<sup>35</sup> Parent-Thirion *et al*, 2007, 59; EF, 2007b, 4.

<sup>36</sup> Parent-Thirion *et al*, 2007, 55; EF, 2007b, 2007c.

analysis showed the hotels and restaurants sector has the highest levels of work intensity.<sup>37</sup>

Table 1 presents scores on various indicators for the quality of work (incidence among the workforce) from the Fourth EWCS for the ten member states under study in these WIBAR series, comparing with averages for the EU27: shaded are those scores that from the viewpoint of quality of work deviate negatively from the EU27 average. We first show the scores on two indicators of 'good work' (although under certain conditions), i.e. the shares of complex work and of autonomous work, followed by two indicators of 'bad work', the shares of monotonous respectively of repetitive tasks. Then, we show the scores on the perceived health or safety risk because of the work, and finally the two more specific indicators for work intensity, working at very high speed and working to tight deadlines.

**Table 1 Indicators for quality of work, 9 EU member states, 2005**

	BE	DK	FI	GE	HU	NL	PL	ES	UK	EU27
1. % complex work	52.3	74.6	74.5	71.6	75.6	65.0	58.2	39.9	56.1	59.4
2. % autonomous work	59.5	68.2	63.4	55.9	53.9	64.4	54.0	48.1	54.3	53.7
3. % monotonous tasks	31.4	43.8	48.0	28.5	36.6	22.7	52.0	63.5	55.0	42.9
4. % repetitive tasks	16.7	27.4	35.7	21.7	12.2	16.3	12.6	39.9	29.7	24.7
5. % consider H & S risk because of work	23.7	23.2	24.3	18.0	33.2	22.6	47.3	37.2	19.1	28.6
6. % working at very high speed	60.5	75.5	77.7	72.2	64.4	60.9	42.8	60.0	46.7	59.6
7. % working to tight deadlines	62.1	68.8	73.6	70.9	58.5	61.2	56.0	55.1	63.5	61.8

Source: Parent-Thirion *et al*, 2007, Annex 3: Statistical tables:

% complex work: q23e

% autonomous work: average of (q24a+q24b+q24c+q24d+q24e)

% monotonous tasks: q23d

% repetitive tasks (short reptotive tasks less than 1 min.): q20a

% consider health and safety risks because of work: q32

% working at very high speed: q20\_a

% working to tight deadlines: q20\_b

It has to be noted that the shaded scores, seen in an organisational context at company level, are not always and necessarily 'bad'. In this respect, it is worth trying to integrate especially the findings on work intensity in Karasek's model, and to link them with the different forms of work organisation, like the authors of the fourth EWCS report did.<sup>38</sup> Yet, for the time being quite some outcomes seem puzzling: the low shares of complex work in Belgium and the UK, the comparatively high shares of complex and autonomous work in Hungary, the substantial percentage of monotonous and repetitive tasks in Denmark, Finland and the UK. Intriguing are also that the scores on the indicators for work intensity are widespread, also among the North-West European countries, with rather low values for Belgium, the Netherlands and the UK. Closer comparison with *WageIndicator* outcomes may shed new light on these results, but we yet lacked the time to do so (see footnote 34).

<sup>37</sup> Parent-Thirion *et al*, 2007, 59.

<sup>38</sup> Parent-Thirion *et al*, 2007, 59-60. See also Smulders, 2004, 283-284.

## 5.2 *WageIndicator* outcomes

As for measuring work-related stress based on *WageIndicator* data, we start in considering five indicators: Work physically exhausting; Work mentally exhausting; Working at very high speed; Work cannot be finished in allocated time; and Work to tight deadlines. All variables are measured on a five-point scale, ranging from 1=never to 5=daily, with the exception of 'Work cannot be finished in allocated time', that is measured as a dichotomous variable yes/no, that was recoded to fit the scales 1=no, 5=yes.<sup>39</sup> Table 2 (next page) presents the results for seven EU member states: Belgium, Denmark, Finland, Germany, the Netherlands, Spain, and the United Kingdom. For the last country, the questions on physically and mentally exhausting work have not been included in the survey during 2005-2006. Some questions have not been included for Hungary and Poland either, but we will integrate results for these two countries in our comments per item.

Table 2 shows that the work-stress variables do not vary much across the six member states. Working at high speed and working to tight deadlines is in almost all countries the most common reported variable. Spain ranks high on both mentally and physically exhausting work. The UK ranks high on working at very high speed, working to tight deadlines and work cannot be finished in allocated time, indicating a cluster of time-related pressure. Finland too has some pretty high scores on working at very high speed and working to tight deadlines. The spread around the average is also rather similar across countries, indicating that in hardly any country many workers reported the extreme values. The Spanish figures reveal the largest variation across the mean.

The last column in the table indicates the Cronbach alpha per country, which is a measure for the coherence across the five variables. It is highest in Spain, indicating that the five variables more often occur jointly in that country, whereas it is lowest in Finland, pointing to a greater impact of a single variable of work-stress.

---

<sup>39</sup> Factor analyses indicated that all five load on one factor (Cronbach's alpha = 0.67). The answers 'Don't know' and 'Not applicable' were not taken into account, and only cases with valid values on all variables were included in the analyses.

**Table 2 Scores on five indicators for work-related stress in 7 EU member states, 2006 (mean scores, standard deviations and numbers of cases)**

	Work physically exhausting	Work mentally exhausting	Work at very high speed	Work to tight deadlines	Work cannot be finished in allocated time	Cronbach's alpha
<b>Belgium</b>						
Mean	2,67	3,20	3,47	3,39	2,65	0.69
Std. Deviation	1,21	1,10	1,20	1,23	1,97	
N	12430	17601	17050	16719	16214	
<b>Denmark</b>						
Mean	2,98	3,43	3,39	3,43	2,65	0.70
Std. Deviation	1,25	1,21	1,20	1,28	1,98	
N	123	123	120	122	114	
<b>Finland</b>						
Mean	2,67	3,45	3,64	3,61	2,47	0.62
Std. Deviation	1,22	1,04	1,09	1,13	1,93	
N	3163	3177	3123	3109	2965	
<b>Germany</b>						
Mean	2,67	3,49	3,38	3,41	2,59	0.69
Std. Deviation	1,21	1,04	1,10	1,13	1,96	
N	526	530	1848	1837	1394	
<b>Netherlands</b>						
Mean	2,59	2,98	3,53	3,10	2,24	0.64
Std. Deviation	1,16	1,11	1,12	1,27	1,85	
N	78542	78874	75006	71632	78606	
<b>Spain</b>						
Mean	3,29	3,90	3,32	3,40	2,49	0.73
Std. Deviation	1,30	1,12	1,27	1,32	1,93	
N	12557	12624	12277	12162	11600	
<b>United Kingdom</b>						
Mean	not available	not available	3,66	4,07	2,81	--
Std. Deviation	not available	not available	1,15	1,07	1,99	
N	-	-	352	353	609	

Source: *WageIndicator* dataset 2006

We were able to investigate in detail how the variables correlate for five countries and for four work-related stress variables: Table 3 (next page).<sup>40</sup> The table shows that in all five countries the correlation between the two variables related closely to time pressure, working to tight deadlines and working at high speed, is highest compared to other variables. Particularly in Germany and Spain workers report that tight deadlines and high speed occur jointly. However, working at high speed turns out to be hardly physically exhausting, and this is even more the case for working to tight deadlines. These two conditions are more often mentally exhausting. These patterns can be noticed in all five countries. In all countries except Finland mentally exhausting work goes along with physically exhausting work.

<sup>40</sup> For the remaining countries some variables had missing values, and for the variable 'Work cannot be finished in time' we could not calculate correlations because it was only measured as yes/no.

**Table 3 Correlation coefficients across four variables of work-related stress in 5 EU member states, 2006, breakdown by country.**

	Work mentally exhausting	Work at very high speed	Work to tight deadlines
<b>Belgium</b>			
Work physically exhausting	,445(**)	,247(**)	,195(**)
Work mentally exhausting		,305(**)	,300(**)
Work at very high speed			,665(**)
<b>Finland</b>			
Work physically exhausting	,285(**)	,263(**)	,171(**)
Work mentally exhausting		,271(**)	,265(**)
Work at very high speed			,619(**)
<b>Germany</b>			
Work physically exhausting	,405(**)	,267(**)	,173(**)
Work mentally exhausting		,305(**)	,278(**)
Work at very high speed			,740(**)
<b>Netherlands</b>			
Work physically exhausting	,434(**)	,249(**)	,142(**)
Work mentally exhausting		,265(**)	,257(**)
Work at very high speed			,588(**)
<b>Spain</b>			
Work physically exhausting	,475(**)	,326(**)	,267(**)
Work mentally exhausting		,361(**)	,338(**)
Work at very high speed			,709(**)

Source: *WageIndicator* dataset 2006

\*\* Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4 presents per industry the mean of the five factors and its ranking within the country. The table shows that in almost all countries work-related stress is highest in hotels / restaurants / catering, the same result as was found in the fourth EWCS. The public sector reveals in all countries the lowest work-related stress. At the next page, we now go into the single variables for which we have computed scores. This concerns Tables 5 – 12, which are presented from p. 13 onwards.

**Table 4 Total measure of work-related stress (mean of five factors\*), by country and by industries**

	BE		DK		FI		GE		NL		ES		UK	
Agriculture	2.9	2	2.9	1	4.4	13	2.9	2	2.9	4	3.1	2	3.8	11
Manufacturing	3.0	4	3.6	7	3.1	4	3.1	4	2.9	4	3.3	6	3.3	2
Utilities	2.9	2	-	-	3.3	9	3.0	3	2.8	2	3.2	3	4.2	13
Construction	3.1	7	3.1	3	3.0	1	3.3	12	2.9	4	3.3	6	3.5	5
Wholesale/retail	3.2	11	3.5	5	3.2	5	3.1	4	2.9	4	3.3	6	3.3	2
Hotels, rest., catering	3.3	13	-	-	3.5	12	3.4	13	2.9	4	3.5	13	3.7	8
Transport, commun.	3.2	11	3.0	2	3.3	9	3.1	4	2.9	4	3.3	6	3.5	5
Finance	3.1	7	-	-	3.0	1	3.2	8	2.9	4	3.3	6	3.8	11
Other comm. services	3.1	7	3.4	4	3.2	5	3.1	4	2.9	4	3.3	6	3.7	8
Public sector	2.8	1	-	-	3.0	1	2.8	1	2.7	1	2.9	1	3.7	8
Education	3.0	4	-	-	3.3	9	3.2	8	2.9	4	3.2	3	3.0	1
Health care	3.0	4	-	-	3.2	5	3.2	8	2.8	2	3.4	12	3.5	5
Other	3.1	7	3.5	5	3.2	5	3.2	8	3.0	13	3.2	3	3.3	2

\* for the UK mean of three factors

Source: *WageIndicator* data, September 2004-September 2006

### **Physically exhausting work**

As Table 5 shows, work is perceived as physically exhausting mostly in four industries, notably hotels / restaurants / catering, agriculture, wholesale / retail, and construction, the latter with somewhat lower ratings for Belgium and Spain. 'Other community and social services' scored very high in the Netherlands, which asks for further scrutiny.

As could be expected, physically exhausting work was consistently more widespread among the workers earning wages under the low wage threshold (two-third of the median gross hourly wage, see WIBAR Report No. 2 on Low Pay). The same holds true for those with low educational level compared to those with middle-level education and even clearer with the higher educated.

Extreme long working weeks, of over 48 hours usually, are related to a high incidence of physically exhausting work. For lower hours' categories the results are inconclusive.

Concerning age cohorts, the incidence of physically exhausting work varies widely across countries. In Germany this type of work is lowest for the 25-34 of age, in Belgium for the youngest cohort, but in the Netherlands, Spain and Denmark for the oldest.

### **Mentally exhausting work**

As Table 6 shows, work is perceived as mentally exhausting mostly in three industries, notably finance, other commercial services, and education. For almost all industries, Belgium and the Netherlands show somewhat lower averages than other countries.

Regarding the low wage threshold, mentally exhausting work does seem to occur equally under or over the threshold. Similarly, working hours do not seem to matter very much, except for the Netherlands, where the employees under 20 hours a week reveal lower levels of mentally exhausting work. Both the youngest and the oldest age cohort seem to work in jobs with lower levels of mental exhaustion than the middle age groups. Finally, the lowest educated seem to have lower stress levels than the middle and higher educated, though the differences are minor.

### **Work at high speed**

As Table 7 shows, work at high speed is reported most frequently in Finland and the UK, with slightly lower levels reported in the remaining countries. Three industries rank high on this measure of work-related stress, notably hotels / restaurants / catering, wholesale / retail, and transport / communication. Levels are low in agriculture (with the exception of Finland), the public sector and education.

Regarding the low wage threshold, work at high speed does seem to occur equally under or over the threshold, with the exception of Finland, where working at high speed occurs more frequently for employees under the threshold. Very long working hours are associated with working at high speed. Middle-aged workers report more often to be working at high speed, compared to both younger and older workers. Educational levels do not reveal much variation concerning working at high speed.

### **Work cannot be finished in allocated time**

As Table 8 shows, employees in Belgium and Germany report most frequently that work cannot be finished in allocated time. In construction in Belgium this often occurs, whereas it hardly occurs in construction in Finland. Compared to the other work-related stress measures, the industry ranking of scores on 'work cannot be finished in the allocated time' shows large variation across countries.

Regarding the low wage threshold, employees working above the threshold much more often report that their work cannot be finished in the allocated time. Similarly,

the employees working very long hours report more often that work cannot be finished in the allocated time. The middle age groups report most often that their work cannot be finished in the allocated time, and so do the higher educated.

### **Work to tight deadlines**

As Table 9 shows, employees in UK and Finland report most frequently that they work to tight deadlines, whereas employees in the Netherlands report this the least often. In 'other commercial services' and in transport / communication working to tight deadlines is most frequently reported in most countries under study. Working to tight deadlines happens least frequently in the public sector and in education.

Regarding the low wage threshold, employees working above the threshold more often report to work to tight deadlines. Similarly, employees with very long hours report more frequently working to tight deadlines. The middle age groups report most often to work to tight deadlines, and so do the higher educated.

### **Monotonous tasks**

As Table 10 shows, employees in Spain and Finland most frequently report performing monotonous tasks, whereas employees in the Netherlands and Belgium report this least so. In most countries, monotonous tasks most frequently are reported by employees in hotels / restaurants / catering and in transport / communication. In education employees in all countries report least frequently to perform monotonous tasks.

Regarding the low wage threshold, employees working under the threshold more often report to perform monotonous tasks. Similarly, employees working part-time hours report more often to work in this fashion. The youngest age cohort reports most often to perform monotonous tasks, and so do the lower educated.

### **Stressful job**

As Table 11 shows, employees in Belgium and the Netherlands most frequently report performing stressful jobs, whereas employees in Denmark and Finland report this least so. In most countries, stressful jobs most frequently are reported by employees in hotels / restaurants / catering, transport / communication, and wholesale / retail. In agriculture, employees in all countries report least frequently to perform stressful jobs.

Regarding the low wage threshold, in Germany employees working under the threshold more often report to perform stressful jobs, whereas in Belgium and Netherlands the opposite holds true. Employees working extreme long hours report more often to work in a stressful job. Regarding age, until 55 of age the older the more employees report having a stressful job; the oldest report less stressful jobs. Regarding education, no clear pattern can be revealed.

### **Sufficiently varied job**

As Table 12 shows, employees in Germany most frequently report performing sufficiently varied jobs, whereas employees in Spain report this least so. In most countries, sufficiently varied jobs are not reported more often in particular industries than in others.

Regarding the low wage threshold, in all countries employees working above the threshold more often report to perform sufficiently varied jobs. Employees working extreme long hours report more often to work in a sufficiently varied job. Regarding age, the older the more employees report having a sufficiently varied job. A similar pattern occurs with education, as the higher educated report more often to have a sufficiently varied job.

**Table 5 Work physically exhausting**

	BE		DK		FI		GE		NL		ES		UK	
Total (mean)	2.67		2.98		2.67		2.67		2.59		3.29			
<i>By gender</i>														
Male	2.6		3.1		2.7		2.7		2.6		3.2			
Female	2.7		2.8		2.7		2.7		2.6		3.4			
<i>By industries (13, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
Agriculture	3.0	12	3.0	4	5.0	13	3.5	12	3.0	11	3.5	10		
Manufacturing	2.6	3	3.6	6	2.8	7	2.7	6	2.6	5	3.3	7		
Utilities	2.6	3	-	-	3.3	11	2.5	3	2.3	1	3.2	2		
Construction	2.8	7	3.9	7	3.0	10	3.1	11	2.8	10	3.4	8		
Wholesale/retail	2.9	11	3.0	4	2.9	8	2.9	10	2.7	8	3.5	10		
Hotels, rest., catering	3.2	13	-	-	3.5	12	3.5	12	3.0	11	3.8	13		
Transport, commun.	2.7	5	2.7	3	2.9	8	2.5	3	2.6	5	3.2	2		
Finance	2.5	1	-	-	2.4	1	2.6	5	2.3	1	3.2	2		
Other comm.services	2.5	1	2.6	2	2.4	1	2.4	2	2.4	4	3.2	2		
Public sector	2.7	5	-	-	2.4	1	2.3	1	2.3	1	3.0	1		
Education	2.8	7	-	-	2.6	4	2.8	7	2.6	5	3.4	8		
Health care	2.8	7	-	-	2.7	5	2.8	7	2.7	8	3.5	10		
Other	2.8	7	1.3	1	2.7	5	2.9	7	3.5	13	3.2	2		
<i>Under / over low-wage threshold</i>														
Under LW threshold	2.9		3.9		3.3		3.1		2.8		-			
Over LW threshold	2.6		2.9		2.6		2.6		2.5		-			
<i>By length of working week (4, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
0-20 hrs pw	2.8	2	5.0	4	2.5	1	2.8	2	2.7	2	3.3	2		
20.1 – 35 hrs pw	2.8	2	1.5	1	2.9	3	2.9	3	2.7	2	3.1	1		
35.1 – 48 hrs pw	2.6	1	3.0	2	2.7	2	2.6	1	2.6	1	3.3	2		
48.1 – 99 hrs pw	2.9	4	3.2	3	3.0	4	3.1	4	2.8	4	3.9	4		
<i>By age group (5, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
< 25 yr	2.6	1	4.1	5	2.9	5	2.6	2	2.8	5	3.3	2		
25-34 yr	2.7	3	3.0	3	2.6	1	2.5	1	2.6	4	3.3	2		
35-44 yr	2.7	3	3.0	3	2.7	2	2.8	3	2.5	1	3.3	2		
45-54 yr	2.7	3	2.8	1	2.7	2	2.8	3	2.5	1	3.3	2		
>=55 yr	2.6	1	2.0	1	2.7	2	2.8	3	2.5	1	3.2	1		
<i>By educational level (3, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
low	3.1	3	3.1	2	3.0	3	3.0	3	2.8	3	3.6	3		
middle	2.7	2	3.2	3	2.6	2	2.6	2	2.6	2	3.3	2		
high	2.6	1	2.6	1	2.2	1	2.4	1	2.4	1	3.2	1		3
<i>Sample size</i>														
N	12430		123		3163		526		78542		12557			

Source: WageIndicator data, September 2004-September 2006

**Table 6 Work mentally exhausting**

	BE		DK		FI		GE		NL		ES		UK	
Total (mean)	3.20		3.43		3.45		3.49		2.98		3.90			
<i>By gender</i>														
Male	3.2		3.5		3.5		3.5		3.0		3.8			
Female	3.2		3.4		3.5		3.5		3.0		4.0			
<i>By industries (13, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
Agriculture	3.0	1	3.0	3	4.0	13	3.5	6	2.8	1	3.7	2		
Manufacturing	3.1	3	3.8	7	3.4	3	3.5	6	2.9	3	3.8	3		
Utilities	3.0	1	-	-	3.3	2	3.0	1	3.0	6	3.8	3		
Construction	3.1	3	2.6	1	3.2	1	3.3	2	2.9	3	3.9	8		
Wholesale/retail	3.2	5	3.7	5	3.5	9	3.3	2	2.9	3	4.0	9		
Hotels, rest., catering	3.2	5	-	-	3.4	3	3.7	12	2.8	1	4.0	9		
Transport, commun.	3.2	5	2.8	2	3.4	3	3.4	4	3.0	6	3.8	3		
Finance	3.3	11	-	-	3.4	3	3.5	6	3.1	11	3.9	6		
Other comm.services	3.3	11	3.3	4	3.6	12	3.6	11	3.1	11	4.0	9		
Public sector	3.2	5	-	-	3.4	3	3.5	6	3.0	6	3.6	1		
Education	3.3	11	-	-	3.5	9	3.8	13	3.1	11	4.0	9		
Health care	3.2	5	-	-	3.5	9	3.5	6	3.0	6	3.9	6		
Other	3.2	5	3.7	51	3.4	3	3.4	4	3.0	6	4.0	9		
<i>Under / over low-wage threshold</i>														
Under LW threshold	3.1		4.1		3.5		3.3		2.9		-			
Over LW threshold	3.2		3.4		3.5		3.5		3.0		-			
<i>By length of working week (4, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
0-20 hrs pw	3.2	1	5.0	4	3.5	3	3.4	1	2.7	1	3.8	1		
20.1 – 35 hrs pw	3.2	1	2.5	1	3.4	1	3.6	3	2.9	2	3.8	1		
35.1 – 48 hrs pw	3.2	1	3.4	2	3.4	1	3.4	1	3.0	3	3.9	3		
48.1 – 99 hrs pw	3.3	4	4.6	3	3.8	4	3.8	4	3.1	4	4.2	4		
<i>By age group (5, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
< 25 yr	3.1	2	3.1	2	3.2	1	3.5	3	2.9	2	3.8	3		
25-34 yr	3.3	5	3.6	4	3.5	3	3.6	5	3.1	5	4.0	5		
35-44 yr	3.2	4	3.6	4	3.5	3	3.4	2	3.0	4	3.9	4		
45-54 yr	3.1	2	3.4	3	3.5	3	3.5	3	2.9	2	3.7	2		
>=55 yr	3.0	1	2.5	1	3.3	2	3.3	1	2.8	1	3.6	1		
<i>By educational level (3, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
low	3.1	1	3.3	1	3.4	1	3.4	1	2.9	1	3.9	1		
middle	3.1	1	3.4	2	3.5	2	3.5	2	3.0	2	3.9	1		
high	3.2	3	3.5	3	3.6	3	3.6	3	3.1	3	3.9	1		
<i>Sample size</i>														
N	17601		123		3177		5306		78874		12624			

Source: WageIndicator data, September 2004-September 2006

**Table 7 Work at very high speed**

	BE		DK		FI		GE		NL		ES		UK	
Total (mean)	3.47		3.39		3.64		3.38		3.53		3.32		3.66	
<i>By gender</i>														
Male	3.4		3.4		3.5		3.4		3.5		3.3		3.6	
Female	3.5		3.3		3.7		3.5		3.5		3.0		3.8	
<i>By industries (13, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
Agriculture	3.0	1	3.5	2	4.0	12	3.2	3	3.5	4	3.0	2	3.8	7
Manufacturing	3.5	6	3.8	5	3.5	3	3.4	5	3.5	4	3.3	6	3.6	5
Utilities	3.2	4	-	-	3.5	3	3.3	4	3.3	1	3.1	3	3.8	7
Construction	3.5	6	3.5	2	3.2	1	3.6	12	3.5	4	3.3	6	3.5	4
Wholesale/retail	3.7	12	4.0	6	3.9	10	3.4	5	3.6	11	3.4	9	3.9	12
Hotels, rest., catering	3.8	13	-	-	4.2	13	3.7	13	3.9	13	3.8	13	4.2	13
Transport, commun.	3.6	11	3.3	1	3.9	10	3.4	5	3.6	11	3.4	9	3.3	2
Finance	3.5	6	-	-	3.7	8	3.4	5	3.5	4	3.5	11	3.8	7
Other comm.services	3.5	6	3.5	2	3.6	6	3.4	5	3.5	4	3.3	6	3.8	7
Public sector	3.0	1	-	-	3.4	2	3.0	1	3.3	1	2.8	1	3.7	6
Education	3.0	1	-	-	3.5	3	3.0	1	3.4	3	3.1	3	3.1	1
Health care	3.5	6	-	-	3.7	8	3.5	11	3.5	4	3.6	12	3.4	3
Other	3.4	5	4.7	7	3.6	6	3.4	5	3.5	4	3.2	5	3.8	7
<i>Under / over low-wage threshold</i>														
Under LW threshold	3.5		3.7		4.0		3.5		3.5		-		3.7	
Over LW threshold	3.5		3.4		3.6		3.4		3.5		-		3.7	
<i>By length of working week (4, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
0-20 hrs pw	3.4	1	1.0	1	3.6	1	3.2	1	3.4	1	3.3	2	2.8	1
20.1 – 35 hrs pw	3.4	1	3.0	2	3.7	3	3.3	2	3.5	2	3.1	1	3.2	2
35.1 – 48 hrs pw	3.5	3	3.4	3	3.6	1	3.3	2	3.5	2	3.3	2	3.7	3
48.1 – 99 hrs pw	4.2	4	4.2	4	4.0	4	3.9	4	3.9	4	3.8	4	4.0	4
<i>By age group (5, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
< 25 yr	3.3	1	3.7	5	3.8	5	3.3	3	3.5	3	3.2	3	3.5	3
25-34 yr	3.5	3	3.5	4	3.6	3	3.4	4	3.6	5	3.4	5	3.9	5
35-44 yr	3.5	3	3.4	3	3.7	4	3.4	4	3.5	3	3.3	4	3.7	4
45-54 yr	3.5	3	3.2	1	3.5	1	3.2	1	3.3	1	3.0	1	3.4	1
>=55 yr	3.3	1	3.3	2	3.5	1	3.2	1	3.3	1	3.0	1	3.4	1
<i>By educational level (3, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
low	3.5	1	3.1	1	3.6	2	3.4	1	3.5	1	3.4	3	3.4	1
middle	3.5	1	3.5	2	3.7	3	3.4	1	3.5	1	3.3	1	3.8	3
high	3.5	1	3.5	2	3.4	1	3.4	1	3.6	3	3.3	1	3.6	2
<i>Sample size</i>														
N	17050		120		3123		1848		75006		12277		352	

Source: WageIndicator data, September 2004-September 2006

**Table 8 Work cannot be finished in allocated time**

	BE		DK		FI		GE		NL		ES		UK	
Total	2.6		2.6		2.5		2.6		2.2		2.5		2.8	
<i>By gender</i>														
Male	2.7		2.7		2.5		2.6		2.3		2.5		2.9	
Female	2.6		2.6		2.5		2.5		2.2		2.4		2.6	
<i>By industries (13. incl. ranking per country)</i>														
Agriculture	2.7	6	1.0	1	5.0	13	1.0	1	2.2	5	2.3	2	3.4	12
Manufacturing	2.6	3	2.8	5	2.3	3	2.5	4	2.3	9	2.5	6	2.7	5
Utilities	2.4	2			2.5	6	3.0	11	2.1	2	2.4	4	4.0	13
Construction	2.8	1	2.5	4	2.0	1	2.7	5	2.2	5	2.6	10	2.9	7
Wholesale/retail	2.7	4	3.5		2.4	4	2.7	5	2.2	5	2.5	6	2.2	2
Hotels. rest., catering	2.6	3			2.6	7	2.7	5	2.0	1	2.4	4	2.5	3
Transport, commun.	2.7	7	3.0	6	2.6	7	2.7	5	2.2	5	2.5	6	3.1	10
Finance	2.7	8			2.0	1	2.9	10	2.3	9	2.7	13	3.0	8
Other comm.services	2.7	3	3.4	7	2.6	7	2.4	3	2.3	9	2.6	10	2.8	6
Public sector	2.2	1			2.4	4	2.2	2	2.1	2	2.1	1	3.3	11
Education	2.8	2	1.0	1	3.3	12	3.3	13	2.6	13	2.5	6	2.5	3
Health care	2.6	3	1.0	1	2.7	10	2.7	5	2.3	9	2.6	10	3.0	8
Other	2.7	5	3.7	8	2.7	10	3.1	12	2.1	2	2.3	2	2.1	1
<i>Under / over low-wage threshold</i>														
Under LW threshold	2.4		3.4		2.5		2.4		1.9				2.3	
Over LW threshold	2.7		2.6		2.5		2.6		2.3				2.9	
<i>By length of working week (4. incl. ranking per country)</i>														
0-20 hrs pw	2.5	1	1.0	1	2.6	3	2.4	1	2.0	1	2.4	2	2.5	2
20.1 – 35 hrs pw	2.5	1	3.0	3	2.2	1	2.4	1	2.0	1	2.2	1	2.4	1
35.1 – 48 hrs pw	2.6	3	2.6	2	2.5	2	2.5	3	2.3	3	2.5	3	2.8	3
48.1 – 99 hrs pw	3.8	4	5.0	4	3.6	4	3.9	4	2.8	4	3.2	4	3.8	4
<i>By age group (5, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
< 25 yr	2.2	1	1.8	1	2.2	1	2.4	1	1.8	1	2.1	1	1.8	1
25-34 yr	2.6	2	2.8	4	2.3	2	2.6	3	2.3	2	2.6	5	2.8	3
35-44 yr	2.8	5	3.0	5	2.7	5	2.6	3	2.4	4	2.5	4	3.2	5
45-54 yr	2.7	4	2.4	3	2.6	4	2.7	5	2.4	4	2.3	3	3.1	4
>=55 yr	2.6	2	2.3	2	2.5	3	2.4	1	2.3	2	2.2	2	2.4	2
<i>By educational level (3, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
low	2.3	1	2.0	1	2.3	1	2.4	1	2.0	1	2.3	1	2.5	2
middle	2.4	2	3.1	3	2.5	2	2.7	2	2.1	2	2.3	1	2.4	1
high	2.9	3	2.5	2	2.8	3	2.7	2	2.5	3	2.6	3	3.1	3
<i>Sample size</i>														
N	16214		114		2965		1394		78606		11600		609	

Source: WageIndicator data, September 2004-September 2006

**Table 9 Work to tight deadlines**

	BE		DK		FI		GE		NL		ES		UK	
Total	3.39		3.43		3.61		3.41		3.10		3.30		4.07	
<i>By gender</i>														
Male	3.4		3.4		3.6		3.4		3.2		3.4		4.1	
Female	3.3		3.4		3.6		3.4		2.9		3.4		4.0	
<i>By industries (13, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
Agriculture	3.0	2	4.0	5	4.0	13	3.5	9	2.8	2	3.1	2	4.3	9
Manufacturing	3.4	6	3.8	4	3.5	1	3.5	9	3.3	11	3.5	9	3.9	2
Utilities	3.2	5	-	-	3.8	10	3.3	4	3.2	8	3.3	4	4.8	13
Construction	3.5	10	3.0	1	3.8	10	3.7	13	3.2	8	3.5	9	3.9	2
Wholesale/retail	3.4	6	3.5	3	3.5	1	3.3	4	2.9	3	3.3	4	4.1	7
Hotels, rest., catering	3.5	10	-	-	3.7	7	3.2	3	2.9	3	3.5	9	4.3	9
Transport, commun.	3.6	12	3.3	2	3.8	10	3.3	4	3.3	11	3.5	9	3.9	2
Finance	3.4	6	-	-	3.5	1	3.5	9	3.2	8	3.4	7	4.7	12
Other comm.services	3.6	12	4.1	7	3.7	7	3.5	9	3.4	13	3.5	9	4.3	9
Public sector	3.0	2	-	-	3.5	1	3.0	1	3.0	5	2.9	1	4.1	7
Education	2.9	1	-	-	3.5	1	3.1	2	3.0	5	3.1	2	3.5	1
Health care	3.1	4	-	-	3.5	1	3.3	4	2.7	1	3.4	7	3.9	2
Other	3.4	6	4.0	5	3.7	7	3.3	4	3.0	5	3.3	4	3.9	2
<i>Under / over low-wage threshold</i>														
Under LW threshold	3.2		3.9		3.5		3.3		2.8		-		3.8	
Over LW threshold	3.4		3.4		3.6		3.4		3.2		-		4.1	
<i>By length of working week (4, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
0-20 hrs pw	3.4	2	1.0	1	3.6	1	3.1	1	2.7	1	3.3	2	3.6	1
20.1 – 35 hrs pw	3.2	1	2.5	2	3.6	1	3.3	2	2.8	2	3.1	1	3.6	1
35.1 – 48 hrs pw	3.4	2	3.4	3	3.6	1	3.4	3	3.1	2	3.4	3	4.1	3
48.1 – 99 hrs pw	4.0	4	5.0	4	3.9	4	4.0	4	3.6	4	3.9	4	4.3	4
<i>By age group (5, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
< 25 yr	3.2	1	3.3	1	3.4	1	3.1	1	2.8	1	3.1	2	3.9	2
25-34 yr	3.4	3	3.4	4	3.6	2	3.4	4	3.2	4	3.5	5	4.1	4
35-44 yr	3.4	3	3.6	5	3.7	5	3.5	5	3.2	4	3.4	4	4.2	5
45-54 yr	3.4	3	3.3	1	3.6	2	3.3	2	3.1	3	3.2	3	4.0	3
>=55 yr	3.3	2	3.3	1	3.6	2	3.3	2	3.0	2	3.0	1	3.8	1
<i>By educational level (3, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
low	3.2	1	3.3	1	3.5	1	3.3	1	2.9	1	3.3	1	3.8	1
middle	3.3	2	3.4	2	3.6	2	3.4	2	3.0	2	3.3	1	4.2	3
high	3.5	3	3.5	3	3.7	3	3.5	3	3.4	3	3.5	3	4.0	2
<i>Sample size</i>														
N	16719		122		3109		1837		71632		12162		353	

Source: WageIndicator data, September 2004-September 2006

**Table 10 Monotonous tasks**

	BE		DK		FI		GE		NL		ES		UK	
Total	2.4		3.1		3.2		2.6		2.3		3.6			
<i>By gender</i>														
Male	2.4		2.8		3.2		2.5		2.1		3.6			
Female	2.4		3.5		3.2		2.8		2.2		3.7			
<i>By industries (13, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
Agriculture	2.4	4	3.0	4	5.0	13	2.8	13	2.4	10	3.7	10		
Manufacturing	2.4	4	2.6	2	3.3	8	2.5	1	2.4	10	3.5	2		
Utilities	2.4	4	-	-	2.9	2	2.5	1	2.3	4	3.6	7		
Construction	2.2	1	2.6	2	3.1	6	2.5	1	2.3	4	3.5	2		
Wholesale/retail	2.4	4	4.2	7	3.5	11	2.7	9	2.5	3	3.8	12		
Hotels, rest., catering	2.5	9	-	-	3.3	8	2.8	3	2.6	13	4.1	13		
Transport, commun.	2.5	9	3.2	6	3.5	11	2.7	9	2.5	12	3.7	10		
Finance	2.5	9	-	-	2.9	2	2.6	5	2.3	4	3.6	7		
Other comm.services	2.5	9	3.1	5	3.3	8	2.6	5	2.3	4	3.5	2		
Public sector	2.6	13	-	-	2.9	2	2.7	91	2.2	3	3.5	2		
Education	2.2	1	-	-	2.7	1	2.5	1	2.0	1	3.4	1		
Health care	2.2	1	-	-	3.0	5	2.7	9	2.1	2	3.6	7		
Other	2.4	4	1.3	7	3.2	7	2.6	5	2.3	4	3.5	2		
<i>Under / over low-wage threshold</i>														
Under LW threshold	2.6		3.3		3.5		2.8		2.7		-			
Over LW threshold	2.3		3.1		3.2		2.6		2.2		-			
<i>By length of working week (4, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
0-20 hrs pw	2.5	4	5.0	4	3.0	1	2.7	41	2.5	4	3.6	2		
20.1 – 35 hrs pw	2.4	2	3.0	1	3.4	4	2.6	2	2.4	3	3.6	2		
35.1 – 48 hrs pw	2.4	2	3.1	2	3.2	2	2.6	2	2.3	2	3.6	2		
48.1 – 99 hrs pw	2.0	1	3.2	3	3.3	3	2.4	1	2.2	1	3.5	1		
<i>By age group (5, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
< 25 yr	2.6	5	3.1	3	3.4	5	2.9	5	2.7	5	3.9	5		
25-34 yr	2.5	4	3.7	5	3.3	4	2.7	4	2.4	4	3.6	3		
35-44 yr	2.3	1	2.8	1	3.2	3	2.6	3	2.2	3	3.5	1		
45-54 yr	2.3	1	2.9	2	3.0	2	2.4	2	2.1	1	3.6	3		
>=55 yr	2.3	1	3.2	4	2.8	1	2.2	1	2.1	1	3.5	1		
<i>By educational level (3, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
low	2.5	3	3.0	2	3.2	2	2.6	2	2.5	3	4.0	3		
middle	2.4	1	3.4	3	3.3	3	2.7	3	2.4	2	3.8	2		
high	2.4	1	2.9	1	2.9	1	2.5	1	2.2	1	3.3	1		
<i>Sample size</i>														
N	17334		120		3150		31556		7434		12541			

Source: WageIndicator data, September 2004-September 2006

**Table 11 Finds job stressful**

	BE		DK		FI		GE		NL		ES		UK	
Total	3.8		3.3		3.5		3.6		3.7		3.6		3.6	
<i>By gender</i>														
Male	3.8		3.3		3.5		3.7		3.8		3.6		3.6	
Female	3.7		3.3		3.5		3.6		3.6		3.6		3.6	
<i>By industries (13, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
Agriculture	3.4	1	3.5	4	2.0	1	3.0	1	3.4	1	3.3	1	3.4	1
Manufacturing	3.8	8	3.7	6	3.4	3	3.6	4	3.8	9	3.6	5	3.6	6
Utilities	3.7	7	-	-	3.6	7	3.7	7	3.7	5	3.4	3	3.5	3
Construction	3.8	8	3.1	2	3.2	2	3.6	4	3.7	5	3.5	4	3.5	3
Wholesale/retail	3.9	11	3.6	5	3.5	4	3.8	8	3.6	3	3.7	8	3.8	11
Hotels, rest., catering	4.0	12	-	-	3.6	7	3.9	13	3.8	9	3.9	12	3.5	3
Transport, commun.	4.0	12	3.0	1	3.7	11	3.6	4	3.9	13	3.7	8	3.8	11
Finance	3.8	8	-	-	3.6	7	3.8	8	3.8	9	3.7	8	3.8	11
Other comm.services	3.8	8	3.2	3	3.6	7	3.5	2	3.8	9	3.6	5	3.7	9
Public sector	3.4	1	-	-	3.5	4	3.5	2	3.7	5	3.3	1	3.7	9
Education	3.5	5	-	-	3.7	11	3.8	8	3.6	3	3.7	8	3.4	1
Health care	3.8	8	-	-	3.9	13	3.8	8	3.7	5	3.9	12	3.6	6
Other	3.6	6	3.9	7	3.5	4	3.8	8	3.5	2	3.6	5	3.6	6
<i>Under / over low-wage threshold</i>														
Under LW threshold	3.6		3.9		3.5		3.8		3.5		-		3.6	
Over LW threshold	3.8		3.3		3.5		3.6		3.8		-		3.6	
<i>By length of working week (4, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
0-20 hrs pw	3.7	1	4.0	3	3.5	1	3.5	1	3.4	1	3.5	1	3.9	3
20.1 – 35 hrs pw	3.7	1	2.5	1	3.5	1	3.5	1	3.5	2	3.5	1	3.4	1
35.1 – 48 hrs pw	3.8	3	3.3	2	3.5	1	3.6	3	3.7	3	3.6	3	3.6	2
48.1 – 99 hrs pw	4.2	4	4.4	4	4.0	4	4.1	4	4.1	4	4.1	4	4.1	4
<i>By age group (5, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
< 25 yr	3.6	1	3.2	2	3.4	1	3.6	1	3.5	1	3.4	1	3.7	3
25-34 yr	3.8	3	3.2	2	3.5	3	3.6	1	3.7	3	3.6	2	3.7	3
35-44 yr	3.8	3	3.6	5	3.6	4	3.7	3	3.8	4	3.6	2	3.7	3
45-54 yr	3.9	5	3.3	4	3.6	4	3.7	3	3.8	4	3.7	4	3.6	2
>=55 yr	3.7	2	2.5	1	3.4	1	3.7	3	3.6	2	3.7	4	3.5	1
<i>By educational level (3, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
low	3.8	1	3.4	2	3.4	1	3.7	3	3.6	1	3.7	3	3.5	1
middle	3.8	1	3.2	1	3.6	2	3.6	1	3.7	2	3.6	1	3.9	3
high	3.8	1	3.4	2	3.6	2	3.6	1	3.8	3	3.6	1	3.6	2
<i>Sample size</i>														
N	17773		123		3168		1629		79427		12598		537	

Source: WageIndicator data, September 2004-September 2006

**Table 12 Job is sufficiently varied**

	BE		DK		FI		GE		NL		ES		UK	
Total														
<i>By gender</i>														
Male	4.1		4.0		3.8		4.3		4.1		3.6			
Female	4.0		3.7		3.8		4.1		4.0		3.4			
<i>By industries (13, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
Agriculture	4.2	1	5.0	1	5.0	1	4.2	7	3.9	9	3.9	1		
Manufacturing	4.0	6	4.2	4	3.6	10	4.3	3	4.0	5	3.6	5		
Utilities	4.0	6	-	-	4.0	6	4.3	3	4.0	5	3.7	2		
Construction	4.2	1	3.8	5	4.1	3	4.3	3	4.0	5	3.7	2		
Wholesale/retail	4.0	6	3.5	7	3.6	10	4.1	11	3.9	9	3.5	8		
Hotels, rest., catering	4.0	6	-	-	3.5	12	4.1	11	3.9	9	3.4	10		
Transport, commun.	4.0	6	4.4	3	3.5	12	4.1	11	3.9	9	3.4	10		
Finance	4.0	6	-	-	4.1	3	4.2	7	3.9	9	3.4	10		
Other comm.services	4.0	6	3.8	5	3.8	9	4.2	7	4.0	5	3.4	10		
Public sector	3.9	13	-	-	4.0	6	4.2	7	4.1	3	3.5	8		
Education	4.2	1	-	-	4.2	2	4.4	1	4.2	1	3.7	2		
Health care	4.2	1	-	-	4.1	3	4.3	3	4.2	1	3.6	5		
Other	4.1	5	5.0	1	4.0	6	4.4	1	4.1	3	3.6	5		
<i>Under / over low-wage threshold</i>														
Under LW threshold	3.8		3.7		3.6		3.9		3.8		-			
Over LW threshold	4.1		3.9		3.8		4.3		4.1		-			
<i>By length of working week (4, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
0-20 hrs pw	4.0	2	4.0	1	4.0	2	4.1	4	3.9	3	3.6	2		
20.1 – 35 hrs pw	4.0	2	4.0	1	3.7	4	4.2	2	3.9	3	3.5	4		
35.1 – 48 hrs pw	4.0	2	3.9	3	3.8	3	4.2	2	4.0	2	3.5	4		
48.1 – 99 hrs pw	4.5	1	3.8	4	4.1	1	4.5	1	4.3	1	3.8	1		
<i>By age group (5, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
< 25 yr	3.8	5	3.4	5	3.6	5	3.9	5	3.8	5	3.3	5		
25-34 yr	4.0	4	3.8	4	3.7	4	4.2	4	4.0	4	3.5	4		
35-44 yr	4.1	2	3.9	2	3.8	3	4.3	2	4.1	3	3.6	2		
45-54 yr	4.1	2	3.9	2	4.0	2	4.3	2	4.2	1	3.6	2		
>=55 yr	4.2	1	5.0	1	4.1	1	4.4	1	4.2	1	3.9	1		
<i>By educational level (3, incl. ranking per country)</i>														
low	4.0	2	4.0	1	3.7	3	4.1	3	4.0	2	3.4	2		
middle	4.0	2	3.8	3	3.8	2	4.2	2	4.0	2	3.4	2		
high	4.1	1	3.9	2	4.0	1	4.3	1	4.1	1	3.6	1		
<i>Sample size</i>														
N	17773		123		3168		1629		79427		12598			

## References

- Bouwman, T. (2002) *Preventing Psychosocial Risks at Work: European Perspectives – a hell of a job! Speech 25-11-2002 for Colloquium European Week for Safety and Health at Work 2002*
- Bouwman, T. (2004) *Quality of work and productivity: the Lisbon agenda and the ILPC research community. Keynote speech 22<sup>nd</sup> International Labour Process Conference (ILPC), Amsterdam. April 6*
- Business Decisions Ltd (1999) *New Forms of Work Organisation and Productivity. A study prepared by Business Decisions Ltd for DG Employment and Social Affairs* ([http://ec.europa.eu/employment\\_social/labour Law/docs](http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/labour Law/docs))
- Ennals, R. (2002) *The Existing Policy Framework to Promote Modernisation of Work: Its Weaknesses* (([http://ec.europa.eu/employment\\_social/labour Law/docs](http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/labour Law/docs)))
- European Commission (EC) (1997) *Partnership for a new Organisation of Work. Green Paper*. Brussels, COM(197) 128
- EC (2000) *Guidance on work-related stress. Spice of life or kiss of death?* Luxembourg: EC DG Employment & Social Affairs
- EC (2001) *Employment and social policies: a framework for investing in quality*. Brussels, 20.6.2001, COM(2001) 313 final
- EC (2003) *Communication Improving quality in work: a review of recent progress*. Brussels, 26.11.2003, COM(2003) 728 final
- EC (2005a) *Communication on the Social Agenda*. Brussels, 9.2.2005, COM(2005) 33 final
- EC (2005b) *'Growth and jobs', working together for Europe's future. Integrated guidelines for growth and jobs (2005-08)*. Brussels
- EC (2005c) *The Social Agenda 2005-2010*. Brussels
- European Council of Health Ministers (2001), *Conclusions 15 November 2001*
- ETUC (2003) *Make Europe Work for the People. Action Programme adopted at the ETUC 10th Statutory Congress, 26-29/05/2003*
- ETUC (2004) *Stressing the quality of work is key to reaching the Lisbon targets* ([www.etuc.org](http://www.etuc.org))
- ETUC (2005) *The coordination of collective bargaining in 2006, Resolution adopted by the ETUC Executive Committee in their meeting held in Brussels on 5-6 December 2005*
- ETUC (2006a) *Trade Union Memorandum to the Finnish Presidency of the European Union* ([www.etuc.org](http://www.etuc.org))
- ETUC (2006b) *The coordination of collective bargaining in 2007, Resolution adopted by the ETUC Executive Committee in their meeting held in Brussels on 7-8 December 2006*
- ETUC / UNICE / UEAPME / CEEP (2004) *Social Dialogue. Framework agreement on work-related stress* (8 October 2004).
- European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions (EF) / European Industrial Relations Observatory On-line (EIRO) (2001) *Work-related stress and industrial relations* (<http://eurofound.europa.eu/eiro/2001/11/study/tn0111109s.html>)
- EF (2002) *Quality of work and employment in Europe: Issues and challenges*. Dublin: EF. Foundation Paper No. 1.
- EF (2006) *Work-related stress* (<http://www.eurofound.eu.int/ewco/reports/TN0502TR01/TN0502TR01.htm>)
- EF (2007a) *Fourth European Working Conditions Survey. Resume* ([www.eurofound.eu.int/ewco/surveys/EWCS2005](http://www.eurofound.eu.int/ewco/surveys/EWCS2005))
- EF (2007b) *Fifteen Years of Working Conditions in the EU: Charting the Trends* ([www.eurofound.eu.int/ewco/surveys/EWCS2005](http://www.eurofound.eu.int/ewco/surveys/EWCS2005))

- EF (2007c) *Fourth European Working Conditions Survey. REV1. EU-25 aggregates* ([www.eurofound.eu.int/ewco/surveys/EWCS2005](http://www.eurofound.eu.int/ewco/surveys/EWCS2005))
- Houtman, I.L.D., P.G.W. Smulders, R. van den Berg (2006) Werkdruk in Europa: omvang, ontwikkelingen en verklaringen (Job strain in Europe: size, developments and explanations), *Tijdschrift voor Arbeidsvraagstukken*, 22(1), 7-25
- Karasek, R.A. (1979) Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: implications for job redesign, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 24, 285-308
- Keune, M. (2005) *The Coordination of Collective Bargaining in Europe, Annual Report 2005*. Brussels: ETUC
- Kompier, M.A.J. (1999) Geestelijke werkbelasting (Mental work pressure), in P.G.W. Smulders, J.M.J. op de Weegh (eds) *Arbeid en gezondheid: risicofactoren (Work and health: risk factors)* Utrecht/Heerlen: Elsevier/De Tijdstroom/Open University, 83-96
- Koukoulaki, T. (2002) Stress prevention in Europe: review of trade union activities – Obstacles and future strategies. *TUTB Newsletter*, no. 19-20, September
- Parent-Thirion, A., E. Fernandez Macias, J. Hurley, G. Vermeulen (2007) *Fourth European Working Conditions Survey*. Dublin: European Foundation
- Presidency Conclusions Brussels European Council 25/26 March 2004*
- Savage, P. (ed.) (2001) *New Forms of Work Organisation. Thematic Paper Presented to DG Employment & Social Affairs by the European Work Organisation Network (EWON)* ([http://ec.europa.eu/employment\\_social/labour\\_law/docs](http://ec.europa.eu/employment_social/labour_law/docs))
- Smulders, P. (2004) Work in 27 European Countries: Testing the North-South Hypothesis, *Tijdschrift voor Arbeidsvraagstukken*, 20(3), 275-287
- Smulders, P.G.W., I.L.D. Houtman (2004) Oorzaken van werkdruk: een onderbelicht thema (Causes of job strain: an underexposed theme), *Tijdschrift voor Arbeidsvraagstukken*, 20(1), 90-106
- Van Klaveren, M. (1994) *Trends en keuzes in het onderzoek naar kwaliteit van de arbeid (Trends and choices in quality of work research)*. Amsterdam: SISWO
- Wiezer, N., S. Dhondt, P. Oeij (2001) *The impact of new forms of work organisation on working conditions and health. Background paper to the European Union Presidency Conference 'For a better quality of work', Brussels, 20-21 September 2001*. Dublin: European Foundation
- Wiezer, N., P. Smulders, R. Nelemans (2005) De invloed van organisatiekenmerken op werkdruk in organisaties (The influence of organisational characteristics on work strain in organisations), *Tijdschrift voor Arbeidsvraagstukken*, 21(3), 228-244.