

**WORK, HEALTH, AND WELFARE:
THE ASSOCIATION BETWEEN WORKING CONDITIONS,
WELFARE STATES, AND SELF-REPORTED
GENERAL HEALTH IN EUROPE**

Clare Bambra, Thorsten Lunau, Kjetil A. Van der Wel,
Terje A. Eikemo, and Nico Dragano

This article is the first to examine the association between self-reported general health and a wide range of working conditions at the European level and by type of welfare state regime. Data for 21,705 men and women ages 16 to 60 from 27 European countries were obtained from the 2010 European Working Conditions Survey. The influence of individual-level sociodemographic, physical, and psychosocial working conditions and of the organization of work were assessed in multilevel logistic regression analyses, with additional stratification by welfare state regime type (Anglo-Saxon, Bismarckian, Eastern European, Scandinavian, and Southern). At the European level, we found that “not good” general health was more likely to be reported by workers more exposed to hazardous working conditions. Most notably, tiring working positions, job strain, and temporary job contracts were strongly associated with a higher likelihood of reporting “not good” health. Analysis by welfare state regime found that only tiring or painful working conditions were consistently associated with worse self-reported health in all regimes. There was no evidence that the Scandinavian welfare regime protected against the adverse health effects of poor working conditions. The article concludes by examining the implications for comparative occupational health research.

It is well established that work is an important social determinant of health and health inequalities (1, 2). Hazardous physical working conditions (e.g., ergonomic problems), stressful psychosocial work environments (e.g., high job demands and

low job control), and some elements of the organization of working life (e.g., long working hours, poor job security, and shift work) have all been associated with adverse health outcomes, including psychological ill health, coronary heart disease, and musculoskeletal problems (2). Previous European research in this field has been largely based on single-country studies, and has often focused on only one aspect of working conditions (most notably, the psychosocial work environment or job insecurity). In this article, we are the first to examine the association between working conditions and health at the European level and to do so using a wide range of working conditions covering key elements of the physical and psychosocial work environment as well as the organization of work. Additionally, as previous comparative studies of health in Europe have found variation by welfare state regime (3–6) and because there are potentially important cross-national variations in workplace regulation, the labor market context, and social protection systems (7), this article is also the first to compare a wide range of working conditions, and their association with health, by welfare state regime.

WORKING CONDITIONS AND HEALTH

Hazardous Physical Working Conditions and Health

Recent research into the physical work environment has focused on ergonomic hazards, including vibration exposure, lifting heavy loads, work involving painful positions, and repetitive work. Epidemiological evidence has accumulated demonstrating an association between exposure to vibration (e.g., by regular and frequent use of vibrating hand-held tools, driving heavy vehicles, or operating certain machines) and musculoskeletal disease as well as hand-arm vibration syndrome and carpal tunnel syndrome (8). For example, a systematic review found that lower back pain was more frequent in workers exposed to whole-body vibration (9). Work tasks such as lifting and carrying heavy loads or people is also known to be a risk factor for the development of musculoskeletal disorders, particularly of the lower back (10). Similarly, work involving repetitive movements has been associated with an increased prevalence of musculoskeletal symptoms involving the neck, shoulders, and upper extremities (11). There is also tentative evidence to suggest that mental health conditions tend to be more frequently reported by workers exposed to repetitive work (12). Working in strenuous, painful, and static postures is also associated with musculoskeletal symptoms (13–14).

Psychosocial Work Environment and Health

The “psychosocial work environment” is a collective way of referring to psychological and social influences on health, such as time pressure, social reciprocity, job control and autonomy, fairness, and work demands. In public health research, the most popular contemporary conceptual framework of the relationship between

the psychosocial work environment and health is the job strain (or demand-control-support) model (15). This asserts that jobs with high psychological demands (e.g., time pressure, high work pace, high work load, and conflicting demands) coupled with low levels of control (i.e., control over workload, the variety of work, skill development, and utilization) are “high-strain” jobs that can lead to an increased risk of stress-related morbidity and mortality (2). There is strong evidence of relationships between job strain and adverse health outcomes, including coronary heart disease (16) and associated risk factors (17–18), musculoskeletal pain, and psychological ill health (20). For example, a systematic review found that the increased relative risk of coronary heart disease ranged from 1.5 to 4.95 for employees experiencing adverse psychosocial work characteristics (16). Cohort studies have identified dose-response relationships between job strain and obesity (17), metabolic syndrome (18), and psychiatric disorders (20). Apart from job strain, other concepts of psychosocial stressors at work, such as the effort-reward-imbalance model, have been widely tested and yielded comparable results (21).

Organization of Work and Health

The nature of work in Europe has altered considerably in recent decades, with a rise in flexible, or precarious, employment: increasing numbers of people are working on either temporary contracts or no contracts, characterized by lower levels of security and poorer working conditions (22). Precarious employment is usually associated with low income, long and unsociable working hours, and high job strain (23). A number of adverse physical and mental health indicators are associated with precarious employment, including stress, fatigue, backache and muscular pains, self-reported health, minor psychiatric morbidity, high blood pressure, health-related behaviors, and mortality (24–26). There is also a sizable body of evidence that demonstrates the negative effects of shift work, particularly night work, on health and well-being (27, 28). Reported health problems include sleep disturbances, fatigue, digestive problems, emotional problems, cardiovascular problems, and stress-related illnesses, as well as increases in general morbidity and sickness absence (29, 30). Long working hours have also been shown to have negative health impacts (31). In addition, shift work, long hours, and abnormal hours may result in work-life balance problems that can, in turn, result in poorer health (32).

WORK, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

Welfare State Regimes and Health

It is now widely acknowledged that welfare states are important macro-level determinants of health (19). Even in its most narrow definition—as the state’s role in education, health, housing, poor relief, social insurance, and other social

services—the welfare state clearly plays a mediatory role in the influence of the material and social determinants of health. This is most obvious in terms of the strong relationship between universal health care systems, higher levels of health care de commodification, better population health, and lower health inequalities (for an overview, see Beckfield and Kreiger, 2009) (34). However, as has been argued elsewhere (2), the welfare state cannot merely be reduced to a set of specific social benefits and welfare services: it is a complex system of stratification and regulation that sets the broader parameters in which all the other social determinants of health (including the work environment) take place.

Social epidemiology has increasingly used welfare state variation to frame analyses of cross-national differences in population health. Welfare state provision varies extensively across Europe, but typologies have been put forward to categorize them into distinctive types, or welfare state regimes (19). Welfare state regimes place those welfare states that are the most similar (in terms of political tradition, principles, levels of provision, etc.) together, emphasizing within-regime coherence and between-regime differences (33). Ferrera's (1996) (35) four-fold typology, which focuses on different dimensions of how social benefits are granted and organized, has been highlighted as one of the most empirically accurate welfare state regime typologies (33). Ferrera makes a distinction between the Scandinavian, Anglo-Saxon, Bismarckian, and Southern countries. More recently, the Eastern European countries have been added as a distinct regime type (36, 37).

These comparative studies of welfare states and health have often concluded that Infant Mortality Rates (IMR) are improved by the relatively generous and universal welfare provision of the Scandinavian countries, especially when contrasted to the Anglo-Saxon welfare states (3–6, 38). IMR are lowest in the social democratic Scandinavian countries and highest in the liberal Anglo-Saxon and Southern regimes. For example, Chung and Muntaner (2007) (38) found that around 20 percent of the difference in IMR between countries could be explained by the type of welfare state, with Scandinavian countries having significantly lower rates compared to all other welfare state regimes. However, research findings are less consistent in terms of the benefits of the Scandinavian welfare state regime in outcomes such as life expectancy or self-rated health. For example, in their review of studies of the association between welfare states and health, Muntaner and colleagues (2011) (39) found that only 61 percent of studies found a positive advantage to Scandinavia.

Working Conditions, Welfare States, and Health

Siegrist and Theorell (2006) (40) argue that it is critical to take account of wider society-level economic, political, and social contexts when thinking about the effect of working conditions on health. In this way, welfare state regimes—with their varying levels of social protection and workplace health and safety

regulation—may be important influences on the work environment and on the impact of adverse working conditions on health (2). Although regulation of working conditions in the countries of the European Union is under the general guidance of the European Union (e.g., the 1989 EU Council Directive 89/391/EEC set out the general principles guiding EU and member state policies), there is still considerable variation. For example, only Norway and Sweden have explicit legislation relating to the psychosocial work environment (i.e., the 1991 Swedish Work Environment Act). As another example, the United Kingdom operates an opt-out clause for workers in regard to the EU Working Time Directive (more commonly referred to as the 48-hour work week).

Reflecting this, epidemiological work has started to compare whether working conditions and their relationships with health vary by welfare state regime. To date, this research has focused on the psychosocial work environment, finding a lower prevalence of job strain and work-related stress in countries with more comprehensive welfare states (and in more regulated work environments, such as Sweden or Norway) and reduced impacts on health in these countries (7, 41). For example, Dragano and colleagues (2011) (7) found that job strain was highest in the Southern welfare states and that welfare state regime type accounted for almost 75 percent of the differences between countries. In terms of the association between job strain and health, there were significant variations by welfare state regime type: highest in the Anglo-Saxon welfare state regime and lowest in the Scandinavian one. This suggested that the health impacts of stressful work environments are less pronounced in welfare states with higher levels of social protection. Similarly, a comparative study of Britain, Finland, and Japan by Sekine and colleagues (2009) (41) concluded that the smaller inequalities in work characteristics and mental ill health in the Finnish cohort “may be attributable to the universal and egalitarian policies of Social Democratic countries because . . . policies such as extensive welfare and social services, full employment policies, wealth redistribution through tax and transfer systems are considered to result in less inequalities in working conditions and health.” Further, the relationship between job insecurity and poor health is less pronounced in countries with more extensive social security systems, which improve individuals’ ability to cope with stressful events (42). Comparative studies of the effects of unemployment on health have also identified important differences in the magnitude of the relationship by welfare state regime, with relative inequalities largest in the Anglo-Saxon countries (37).

Theoretical Framework

Existing studies therefore suggest that the effect of working conditions on health may be modified by welfare arrangements. Dragano and colleagues (2011) (7) and Sekine and colleagues (2009) (41) outline a general resource model that assumes that generous social protection schemes help individuals

cope with stressful life events and conditions. We extend this perspective to propose that the welfare state has the potential to buffer against the health consequences of both physical and psychosocial work strains. This “modifying effect” of the welfare state may operate through two basic mechanisms: control and resilience. Within a “welfare resources” perspective, it is hypothesized that universal and generous welfare states give individuals the opportunity to have “command over resources in terms of money, possessions, knowledge, psychological and physical energy, social relations, security and so on by means of which the individual can control and consciously direct her conditions in life” (44). This perspective emphasizes control (“command over resources”) and the way that resources enable individual decisions and action in a manner resembling Sen’s capability approach (45). Individual and collective resources that strengthen individual capability may, in turn, enhance individual resilience: “the process of avoiding adverse outcomes or doing better than expected when confronted with major assaults on the developmental process” (46). A comprehensive welfare state may therefore modify the adverse effects of working conditions on health by increasing capabilities and resilience in the working population and making it less vulnerable to health hazards at work. This may occur in the following ways.

First, universal access to generous sickness absence compensation during self-certified shorter sickness spells may enhance labor force participation among the chronically ill and individuals with marginal health resources. Having the opportunity to take a few days off work without significant loss of income might prevent temporary work-related health problems from becoming permanent sickness. In the opposite scenario, with no benefits or fairly low replacement ratios for short-term sickness absence, many workers may exhaust their health potential to avoid the short-term economic penalty of absence (“presenteeism”). This behavior has the potential of amplifying health problems. Also, many chronic conditions fluctuate in intensity. Hence, universal and generous sickness absence schemes may install a kind of flexibility in working life that makes the health-work environment interaction less pronounced.

Second, generous out-of-work benefits and active labor market policies may enhance a better match between individual health resources and job demands/working conditions. For instance, Tatsiramos (2009) (47) shows that the duration of the first job after a spell of unemployment is longer among individuals living in countries with more generous unemployment benefits than those living in countries with lower replacement ratios. More generous out-of-work benefits give individuals time to find an appropriate job, rather than having to jump into the first available offer because of economic necessity. At the same time, generous benefits and spending on active labor market policies are highly correlated (48). Up-skilling and re-skilling of the benefit population may also enhance job match. If more people have a job that fits their manifest and latent health potential, one might assume the observed health effect of a given working condition would be

smaller than if people were given less choice or fewer opportunities to learn appropriate skills.

Third, countries with generous welfare benefits (i.e., the Scandinavian countries) also have higher minimum wages and narrower wage distributions. Minimum wages must be significantly higher than social benefits to install work incentives. This improves workers' bargaining position and exerts a pressure from below on wage distribution (49). This way, generous welfare states redistribute material resources not only through out-of-work benefits, but also through the effect on wage formation. A low-status job with a given exposure profile would be relatively better paid in a redistributive society than in other countries. As income has been found to have an independent effect on self-rated health (Geyer et al., 2006) (50), higher minimum wages may increase resilience to occupational exposures, particularly in lower status occupations—for example, by enabling low-end employees to secure better material living conditions (such as a car or a decent dwelling) and better opportunities to buy services (vacations, health services, practical help, etc.) and by improving the effort-reward balance through a comparably higher reward. Health and resilience may also be improved by a relatively smaller perceived income inequality and a sense of better social standing (51).

Fourth, a hallmark of Scandinavian social democratic welfare states is their taxation-financed service provision. These services, particularly in the form of care for children and the elderly, may reduce the physical and mental strain experienced by individuals with care responsibilities. For instance, a subsidized, full-time child care service, compared to an expensive private or part-time child care, may reduce stress in parents and make them less prone to the adverse consequences of poor working conditions. A recent multilevel study by Esser and Ferrarini (2010) (52) suggested that perceived stress and work-family conflict were lower in countries pursuing dual-earner family policies. A parallel argument may be made in the case of elderly care or care for impaired children.

Finally, generous social protection is also accompanied by greater bargaining power for labor unions, which they use to not only enhance wages but also to improve regulation of working conditions. Accordingly, the Scandinavian countries have stronger and more comprehensive workplace regulations than other European countries (especially in terms of the psychosocial work environment in Norway and Sweden). It is expected that the health of workers exposed to potentially damaging working conditions in these countries will benefit from these additional regulations (e.g., workers exposed to noise may be required to wear additional protection or workers exposed to repetitive work may be entitled to additional or longer rest breaks than workers in other countries). Enhanced enforcement of such regulations with more regular inspections may also reduce the relationship between hazardous working conditions and ill health. Similarly, the state will try to limit expenses to the social security system by forcing—and incentivizing—employers to reduce work-related health damage: the gap between

tax *income* per average worker and the average *expenses* per disabled worker is much greater in generous welfare states because of high minimum wages and generous benefits. Hence, the state has a very strong incentive to keep people in the workforce.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This article therefore examines two research questions:

1. What is the association between working conditions and health in Europe?
2. Do the associations between working conditions and health vary by welfare state regime?

Based on the research reviewed above and our theoretical framework, we would expect to find a negative relationship between hazardous working conditions and health in Europe, although we would expect variation by welfare state type, with a weaker association between working conditions and health in the social democratic Scandinavian countries.

METHODS

Data and Variables

Data were obtained from the 2010 European Working Conditions Survey (EWCS). This survey is conducted every five years by the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions, an autonomous EU agency. The survey included more than 100 questions on a wide range of issues regarding employment and working conditions. It is a unique source of comparative information and this is the first academic study to utilize the data in relation to the association between work and health. The survey has been conducted five times between 1990 and 2010.

For our analyses, we used the most recent (fifth) survey from 2010, analyzing data from 27 countries. The survey sample is representative of all residents of the included countries age 15 or older who are employed. In each country, a multistage, stratified random sampling method was used. The survey interviews were conducted in person at respondents' homes. The overall response rate was 44 percent for the fifth EWCS, with considerable variation by country (ranging from 31% in Spain to 74% in Latvia). Further details on the survey design and sampling frame are available elsewhere (53, 54).

Details of the sample are provided in Table 1. The sample for this analysis is restricted to men and women ages 16 to 60 to include only persons below the typical European retirement age of 60 years. Although the mean retirement age is higher than 60 in some countries, a considerable part of the workforce retires

around age 60. To avoid selection processes in relation to retirement (e.g., healthy worker effect), we restricted our analyses to those under age 60. We also excluded persons working less than 15 hours a week, those working in the armed forces, and the self-employed. After excluding persons with missing data on the exposure, outcome, and covariates, a total of 21,705 participants were available for the final analysis.

Health was measured in terms of self-reported general health. Self-reported general health was constructed from a variable asking “How is your health in general? Would you say it is . . . very good, good, fair, bad, very bad?” The variable was dichotomized into “very good or good” health versus “not good” health. Sex and age (in categories of 16–29, 30–39, 40–49, 50–60) were included as individual-level demographic variables. We also included variables to measure occupation, coded with the International Standard Classification of Occupations (ISCO), the standard industrial classification (NACE), and education. Education was measured according to the International Standard Classification of Education (ISCED-97) in four categories: no education/primary, secondary, post-secondary, or tertiary. To assess physical and psychosocial working conditions, several indicators were used in the analyses. Five indicators were used to assess physical working conditions: (1) vibrations from hand tools, machinery, etc.; (2) tiring or painful positions; (3) lifting or moving people; (4) carrying or moving heavy loads; and (5) repetitive hand or arm movements. If the respondent stated that he or she works more than 50 percent of the time under these conditions, the respondent is classified as having poor physical working conditions. To measure psychosocial working conditions, we used the established demand-control model (15). Job strain was defined by the combination of high demands (two items) and low control (seven items). The demand and control scales were dichotomized at the median to define high and low levels of demand and control. Respondents with high demand scores and low control scores were defined as having job strain. We also included several variables to measure the organization of work: public, private, or third sectors; temporary or indefinite contract; shift work (yes/no); working at night (how many times per month); working on weekends (how many times per month); and average working hours per week. Sample characteristics are shown in Table 1.

The classification of European countries into welfare state regimes follows that proposed by Bambra and Eikemo (2009) (37) and based on Ferrera (1996) (35). This typology divides European countries into five types of welfare state regime: Scandinavian, Anglo-Saxon, Bismarckian, Southern Europe, and Eastern Europe (see Box 1).

Statistical Analysis

After basic sample description, calculations of country-specific prevalence of “not good” self-reported health, and calculations of the prevalence of working

Table 1
Sample sociodemographic, work environment, and
work organization characteristics

| Characteristic | N ^a (%) or mean (SD) | Characteristic | N ^a (%) or mean (SD) |
|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Sex | | Tiring positions | |
| Male | 10,352 (47.7%) | One quarter of the time or less | 14,673 (67.6%) |
| Female | 11,353 (52.3%) | One half of the time or more | 7,032 (32.4%) |
| Age | | Lifting people | |
| 16–29 | 4,028 (18.6%) | One quarter of the time or less | 20,375 (93.9%) |
| 30–39 | 5,910 (27.2%) | One half of the time or more | 1,330 (6.1%) |
| 40–49 | 6,318 (29.1%) | Moving heavy loads | |
| 50–60 | 5,449 (25.1%) | One quarter of the time or less | 17,633 (81.2%) |
| Education | | One half of the time or more | 4,072 (18.8%) |
| No/primary education | 758 (0.4%) | Repetitive movements | |
| Secondary | 12,791 (58.9%) | One quarter of the time or less | 9,849 (45.4%) |
| Post-secondary | 1,203 (5.5%) | One half of the time or more | 11,856 (54.6%) |
| Tertiary | 6,953 (32.03%) | Job strain | |
| NACE ^b | | Low | 15,286 (70.4%) |
| Agriculture, hunting, forestry, and fishing | 444 (2.1%) | High | 6,419 (29.6%) |
| Industry | 5,495 (25.3%) | Contract | |
| Services | 8,057 (37.1%) | Indefinite | 18,152 (83.6%) |
| Public administration | 1,628 (7.5%) | Temporary | 3,553 (16.4%) |
| Other services | 6,081 (28.0%) | Sector | |
| ISCO ^c | | Private | 13,615 (30.5%) |
| Legislators, senior officials, and managers | 1,298 (6.0%) | Public | 6,625 (30.5%) |
| Professional | 3,343 (15.4%) | Other | 1,465 (6.8%) |
| Technicians and associate professionals | 3,693 (17.0%) | Work at night, times a month | 1.3 (3.6) |
| Clerks | 2,713 (12.5%) | Work on weekend, times a month | 1.6 (2.2) |
| Service workers and shop/ market sales workers | 3,831 (17.7%) | Shift work | |
| Skilled agricultural and fishery workers | 193 (0.9%) | No | 17,140 (79.0%) |
| Craft and related trades workers | 2,647 (12.2%) | Yes | 4,565 (21.0%) |
| Plant and machine operators and assemblers | 1,937 (8.9%) | Average working hours per week | 38.7 |
| Elementary occupations | 2,050 (9.4%) | | |
| Vibrations | | | |
| One quarter of the time or less | 18,274 (84.2%) | | |
| One half of the time or more | 3,431 (15.8%) | | |

^aN = 21,705 in 27 European countries.

^bNACE = standard industrial classifications.

^cISCO = International Standard Classification of Occupations.

Box 1

European Welfare State Regimes, Ranked by Levels of Social Protection
(1 = High, 5 = Low)1. Scandinavian (Denmark, Finland, Norway, Sweden)

Characterized by universalism, comparatively generous social transfers, a commitment to full employment and income protection, and a strongly interventionist state. The state is used to promote social equality through a redistributive social security system. Unlike other welfare state regimes, the Scandinavian regime promotes an equality of the highest standards, not an equality of minimal needs, and provides highly decommodifying programs.

2. Bismarckian (Austria, Belgium, Germany, France, Luxembourg, Netherlands)

Distinguished by its “status-differentiating” welfare programs in which benefits are often earnings-related, administered through the employer, and geared toward maintaining existing social patterns. The role of the family is also emphasized and the redistributive impact is minimal. However, the role of the market is marginalized.

3. Anglo-Saxon (Ireland, United Kingdom)

State provision of welfare is minimal; social protection levels are modest and often attract strict entitlement criteria; and recipients are usually means-tested and stigmatized. In this model, the dominance of the market is encouraged both passively, by guaranteeing only a minimum, and actively, by subsidizing private welfare schemes. The Anglo-Saxon welfare state regime thereby minimizes the decommodification effects of the welfare state and a stark division exists between those, largely the poor, who rely on state aid and those who are able to afford private provision.

4. Southern (Greece, Italy, Portugal, Spain)

The southern welfare states have been described as “rudimentary” because they are characterized by their fragmented system of welfare provision, which consists of diverse income maintenance schemes that range from the meager to the generous and of welfare services, particularly the health care system, that provide only limited and partial coverage. Reliance on the family and voluntary sector is also a prominent feature.

5. Eastern (Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland, Slovenia, Slovakia)

The formerly Communist countries of East Europe have experienced the demise of the universalism of the Communist welfare state and a shift toward policies associated more with the Anglo-Saxon welfare state regime, notably marketization and decentralization. In comparison with other member states of the European Union, they have limited welfare services.

Source: Adapted from Bamba (2007) and Eikemo and Bamba (2008).

conditions by welfare state regime, logistic regression models of associations were calculated with adjustments for age, sex, and gross domestic product. Given the multilevel structure of the data, we applied multilevel fixed effects logistic regression methods with individuals (Level 1) nested within countries (Level 2) (55). This accounts for between-country variation. To assess the association between working conditions and health in Europe, we first included individual-level sociodemographic variables (Model 1). Next, we separately added the physical work environment (Model 2), the psychosocial work environment (Model 3), and the organization of work variables (Model 4). In the final model, all the working condition variables were combined (Model 5). The final Model 5 analysis was repeated separately for each of the five welfare state regimes. Sensitivity analysis was carried out to adjust for response rates. We also checked against over-adjustment by redoing the analysis with only age and sex as the confounders. All calculations were made using Stata 11.

RESULTS

Working Conditions and Health in Europe

The results of the multilevel fixed effects logistic regression models of the association between working conditions and “not good” health in Europe are presented as odds ratios and 95 percent confidence intervals in Table 2. This shows that in Europe, members of the working-age population exposed to adverse working conditions are more likely to report “not good” health than those who experience better working environments. Model 1 (sociodemographic characteristics) shows that self-reported “not good” health is more likely among women (OR = 1.22, 95% CI 1.18–1.38) than men (1.0), older workers (age 50–60, OR = 4.43, 95% CI 3.94–4.97) than younger workers (1.0), primary educated (1.0) than higher educated (OR = 0.52, 95% CI 0.42–0.63), and lower occupations (elementary occupations OR = 2.3, 95% CI 1.90–2.78) compared to higher occupations (legislator OR = 1.0). There were no significant differences in self-reported health by employment sector (NACE).

In terms of working conditions, analysis controlling for the sociodemographic covariates found a clear influence of the physical work environment on self-reported health (Table 2, Model 2): workers exposed to vibrations (OR = 1.1, 95% CI 1.01–1.23), tiring or painful positions (OR = 1.87, 95% CI 1.72–2.02), heavy loads (OR = 1.24, 95% CI 1.13–1.36), and repetitive movement (OR = 1.28, 95% CI 1.18–1.38) were all more likely to report “not good” health. There was no significant association with health for lifting people.

The psychosocial work environment analysis (Table 2, Model 3) found that workers exposed to high levels of job strain were significantly more likely to report “not good” health than those with low levels (OR = 1.72, 95% CI 1.60–1.85).

The association between health and the organization of work was more varied (Table 2, Model 4). There were significant associations for employment contract (temporary contract workers were more likely than indefinite contract workers to report “not good” health, OR = 1.26, 95% CI 1.14–1.39), employment sector (worse health was reported by those in the third sector, OR = 1.20, 95% CI 1.04–1.37), shift work (OR = 1.11, 95% CI 1.01–1.21), and frequency of weekend working (OR = 1.03, 95% CI 1.01–1.05). However, there was no association between health and number of working hours or frequency of night work.

These associations with “not good” self-rated health all remained significant (except for vibrations and shift work) in the combined analysis, albeit with reduced effect sizes (e.g., the heavy loads OR reduced from 1.24 to 1.19) (Table 2, Model 5). In particular, tiring or painful working positions (OR = 1.78, 95% CI 1.64–1.94), job strain (OR = 1.42, 95% CI 1.32–1.54), and temporary job contracts (OR = 1.24, 95% CI 1.13–1.37) were still strongly associated with a higher likelihood of reporting “not good” health.

Sensitivity analysis found that adjusting for response rates and confounders did not change the results.

Welfare State Regimes, Working Conditions, and Health

These combined analysis associations at the European level differed considerably when the analysis was stratified by welfare state regime (Table 3). For example, only the conditions of working in tiring and painful positions had a consistently negative association with “not good” health in all five of the welfare state regime types, and job strain was significantly negatively associated with “not good” health in all except for the Anglo-Saxon type (OR = 1.26, 95% CI 0.87–1.83). In contrast, significant associations with health for vibrations were found only in Southern Europe (OR = 1.55, 95% CI 1.14–2.10); lifting or moving people (OR = 1.35, 95% CI 1.02–1.79) and shift work (OR = 1.27, 95% CI 1.10–1.46) only in the Eastern regime; third-sector employment only in the Bismarckian regime (OR = 1.32, 95% CI 1.07–1.62); heavy loads only in the Bismarckian (OR = 1.32, 95% CI 1.13–1.55) and Southern (OR = 1.50, 95% CI 1.10–2.03) regimes; temporary contracts in the Bismarckian (OR = 1.36, 95% CI 1.15–1.61) and Eastern (OR = 1.29, 95% CI 1.10–1.51) regimes; and weekend work only in the Scandinavian (OR = 1.07, 95% CI 1.01–1.13) and Bismarckian (OR = 1.05, 95% CI 1.02–1.08) welfare states. Repetitive movements had no association with health in the Anglo-Saxon (OR = 1.18, 95% CI 0.81–1.72) or Southern (OR = 1.24, 95% CI 0.96–1.60) regimes. Most notably, the association between health and working conditions was less pronounced in the Anglo-Saxon regime, where only tiring or painful positions had a significant association with “not good” health (OR = 2.04, 95% CI 1.33–3.13).

In terms of comparing the association between working conditions and health by welfare state regime, there were some notable differences in the size of

Table 2
 Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals for the association between working conditions and self-reported health in Europe (27 countries)

| | Model 1 (covariates) | Model 2 (Model 1 + physical work environment) | Model 3 (Model 1 + psychosocial work environment) | Model 4 (Model 1 + work organization) | Model 5 (Model 1 + 2 + 3 + 4) |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|--|--|--|----------------------------------|
| Sex | | | | | |
| Male | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] |
| Female | 1.28 [1.18, 1.38] | 1.22 [1.13, 1.32] | 1.23 [1.14, 1.33] | 1.30 [1.20, 1.41] | 1.20 [1.11, 1.31] |
| Age | | | | | |
| 16–29 | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] |
| 30–39 | 1.61 [1.43, 1.81] | 1.65 [1.46, 1.86] | 1.64 [1.45, 1.85] | 1.68 [1.48, 1.89] | 1.72 [1.52, 1.95] |
| 40–49 | 2.67 [2.38, 3.00] | 2.78 [2.47, 3.12] | 2.74 [2.45, 3.08] | 2.81 [2.50, 3.16] | 2.93 [2.61, 3.31] |
| 50–60 | 4.43 [3.94, 4.97] | 4.67 [4.16, 5.26] | 4.59 [4.08, 5.16] | 4.70 [4.18, 5.30] | 4.99 [4.42, 5.63] |
| Education | | | | | |
| No/primary education | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] |
| Secondary | 0.62 [0.52, 0.74] | 0.67 [0.56, 0.80] | 0.63 [0.53, 0.75] | 0.62 [0.52, 0.74] | 0.67 [0.56, 0.81] |
| Post-secondary | 0.65 [0.52, 0.82] | 0.73 [0.58, 0.92] | 0.67 [0.53, 0.84] | 0.65 [0.51, 0.81] | 0.73 [0.58, 0.92] |
| Tertiary | 0.52 [0.42, 0.63] | 0.61 [0.50, 0.75] | 0.54 [0.44, 0.66] | 0.52 [0.43, 0.64] | 0.62 [0.51, 0.76] |
| NACE ^a | | | | | |
| Agriculture | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] | 1.00 [1.00, 1.00] |
| Industry | 0.93 [0.72, 1.21] | 0.91 [0.70, 1.18] | 0.87 [0.67, 1.12] | 0.98 [0.75, 1.26] | 0.90 [0.69, 1.17] |
| Services | 0.90 [0.70, 1.17] | 0.93 [0.72, 1.20] | 0.86 [0.66, 1.11] | 0.92 [0.72, 1.20] | 0.92 [0.70, 1.19] |
| Public administration | 0.94 [0.72, 1.24] | 0.98 [0.74, 1.29] | 0.92 [0.70, 1.21] | 0.96 [0.72, 1.28] | 0.98 [0.73, 1.31] |
| Other services | 0.91 [0.70, 1.18] | 0.91 [0.70, 1.18] | 0.89 [0.68, 1.15] | 0.91 [0.70, 1.18] | 0.90 [0.69, 1.18] |

Table 3

Odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals for the association between working conditions and self-reported health by European welfare state regime (adjusted for covariates, physical working conditions, psychosocial working conditions, and work organization)

| | Scandinavian | Anglo-Saxon | Bismarckian | Southern Europe | Eastern Europe | Comparison by welfare state regime (<i>p</i> value) |
|----------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|--|
| Vibrations from machinery, etc. | 1.25 (0.88–1.77) | 1.05 (0.58–1.92) | 0.97 (0.81–1.15) | 1.55* (1.14–2.10) | 1.12 (0.95–1.31) | 0.52 |
| Tiring or painful positions | 2.09* (1.63–2.69) | 2.04* (1.33–3.13) | 2.09* (1.82–2.40) | 1.67* (1.30–2.14) | 1.70* (1.49–1.93) | 0.11 |
| Lifting or moving people | 0.80 (0.53–1.22) | 1.40 (0.76–2.56) | 0.97 (0.77–1.21) | 1.11 (0.66–1.87) | 1.35* (1.02–1.79) | 0.59 |
| Carrying or moving heavy loads | 1.12 (0.82–1.52) | 0.99 (0.61–1.61) | 1.32* (1.13–1.55) | 1.50* (1.10–2.03) | 1.16 (1.00–1.35) | 0.25 |
| Repetitive hand or arm movements | 1.34* (1.07–1.67) | 1.18 (0.81–1.72) | 1.30* (1.14–1.49) | 1.24 (0.96–1.60) | 1.27* (1.12–1.44) | 0.60 |
| Job strain | 1.67* (1.36–2.04) | 1.26 (0.87–1.83) | 1.89* (1.68–2.14) | 1.79* (1.43–2.23) | 1.58* (1.40–1.78) | 0.06 |

| | | | | | | |
|------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|---------------------|----------------------|------|
| Contract | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.32 |
| Indefinite | | | | | | |
| Temporary | 0.97 (0.71-1.34) | 1.24 (0.80-1.90) | 1.36* (1.15-1.61) | 1.25 (0.96-1.63) | 1.29* (1.10-1.51) | |
| Shift work | 0.98 (0.72-1.34) | 1.01 (0.62-1.61) | 1.12 (0.96-1.31) | 0.88 (0.66-1.19) | 1.27* (1.10-1.46) | 0.57 |
| Sector | | | | | | |
| Private | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.39 |
| Public | 1.26 (0.95-1.67) | 0.63 (0.37-1.07) | 0.96 (0.81-1.13) | 1.20 (0.82-1.73) | 1.02 (0.87-1.19) | |
| Other | 1.20 (0.74-1.94) | 1.11 (0.55-2.24) | 1.32* (1.07-1.62) | 1.03 (0.56-1.89) | 1.05 (0.84-1.31) | |
| Working hours | 0.98 (0.97-1.00) | 1.01 (0.99-1.03) | 1.00 (0.99-1.01) | 1.01 (1.00-1.03) | 1.01 (1.00-1.02) | 0.00 |
| Work at night | 1.00 (0.97-1.03) | 1.00 (0.96-1.04) | 1.01 (0.99-1.03) | 1.03 (1.00-1.05) | 0.99 (0.97-1.01) | 0.40 |
| Work at weekends | 1.07* (1.01-1.13) | 1.07 (0.99-1.16) | 1.05* (1.02-1.08) | 0.99 (0.94-1.05) | 1.01 (0.98-1.04) | 0.07 |

*Significant at the 5 percent level.

associations by welfare state (Table 3). For example, in terms of tiring or painful positions, while the association was significant in all welfare state regimes, the size of association was largest in the Scandinavian and Bismarckian regimes and smallest in the Southern one. Similarly, job strain had a stronger association with “not good” health in the Bismarckian and Southern regimes than the others. However, there was no clear or consistent pattern to these results. Only the differences in the association with working hours reach statistical significance ($p < 0.00$) when the welfare state regimes are compared, but the differences in association size are very small.

Sensitivity analysis found that adjusting for response rates and confounders did not change the results.

DISCUSSION

In summary, we found that in Europe, “not good” general health was more likely to be reported by workers more exposed to hazardous working conditions. Most notably, tiring working positions (OR = 1.78, 95% CI 1.64–1.94), job strain (OR = 1.42, 95% CI 1.32–1.54), and temporary job contracts (OR = 1.24, 95% CI 1.13–1.37) were strongly associated with a higher likelihood of reporting “not good” health. However, there were few significant differences by welfare state regime, although the association between health and working conditions was less pronounced in the Anglo-Saxon regime. These results, therefore, only partially confirm our expectations.

Our finding that hazardous working conditions are associated with worse health at the European level is in keeping with expectations from single-country studies that have shown strong adverse associations with physical, psychosocial, and work organization characteristics (2). The finding that tiring or painful working positions, job strain, and temporary job contracts were the most strongly associated with worse self-rated health in Europe is also in keeping with previous research. For example, a study by Fredriksson and colleagues (2001) (13) found that working in strenuous, painful, and static postures is associated with musculoskeletal symptoms, and there is evidence to suggest that mental health conditions such as anxiety, depression, and psychological tension tend to be more frequently reported by workers exposed to tiring work (12). In terms of job strain, Dragano and colleagues (2011) (7) found a consistently negative association between job strain and stress across Europe. There is also a well-established literature on the adverse effects on health of insecure and temporary work, most notably in terms of “precarious” employment (including informal work, temporary or fixed-term work, contract work, casual work, piece work, home-working, and part-time work)—basically, a lack of labor market regulation (56). Precarious work is associated with fatigue, injuries, musculoskeletal disorders, impaired psychological and physical well-being (23), self-reported health, minor psychiatric morbidity, physiological measures (e.g., high blood

pressure), health-related behaviors (25), and mortality (26). Work with little security can be as health-damaging as unemployment (56).

From a policy perspective, that these working conditions exist across Europe and adversely affect health should be a great concern. Precarious employment represents around 15 percent of all forms of paid employment across the European Union (24). Women and immigrants tend to be overrepresented in temporary forms of work (57). Precarious employment is usually associated with low income, long and unsociable working hours, and often high strain and stress (23). Despite great progress toward a post-war European Social Model in which working conditions were more highly regulated, job strain and temporary contracts have increased since the 1980s and “precarious” employment is becoming more commonplace (58). This is a result of a sustained period of neoliberalism in Europe (and beyond) in which European labor markets were “deregulated” and workers, job seekers, and unions disempowered. This trend continues today and is in fact being exacerbated by the austerity measures enacted since the “Great Recession” started in 2008 (59).

The results of previous cross-national research into differences among welfare states in the association between job strain and health (7, 41) and in unemployment and health (37), alongside the expectations from our theoretical framework, meant that we expected to find meaningful differences in the association between working conditions and health by welfare state regime, specifically that the association would be weaker in the Scandinavian countries. However, our empirical analysis does not support this hypothesis; there were few differences by welfare state regime in the association between working conditions and health and, if anything, the association was weaker in the Anglo-Saxon countries (where, for example, job strain was not significantly associated with health), not the Scandinavian ones.

This unexpected finding suggests that the welfare state regime approach may not be the best way to analyze the association between working conditions and health. There are other approaches that could be taken to examine the impact of macro-level policy variables on the social determinants of health. For example, legislation, gross domestic product, demand for labor, tertiarization/de-industrialization, social expenditure, or institutional measures could all be alternatives to the welfare regime approach. Indeed, work by Roskam (2009) (60) on the international regulation of working conditions has shown that workplace regulation does not divide neatly across welfare state regime lines. Roskam’s international typology of health and safety regulation found that countries clustered into four types: “Pacesetters,” “Pragmatists,” “Conventionals,” and “Much to be done.” European countries were categorized as Pacesetters (Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Italy, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, and Switzerland), Pragmatists (Austria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Slovakia, and United Kingdom) or Conventionals

(Bulgaria, Croatia, and Ukraine) (60). Pacesetter countries performed well in terms of legislative frameworks, implementation, and health and safety outcomes. Pragmatists did well in terms of health and safety outcomes, despite a poor legislative framework and slack implementation. Countries in the Conventional group performed well in terms of legislation, but poorly in terms of implementation and outcomes, suggesting that laws to protect workers' health were not translated into practice. This also suggests that the Anglo-Saxon countries of the United Kingdom and Ireland do well in terms of work-related health outcomes, despite their less developed regulation of working conditions. This suggests that other factors need to be considered when examining cross-national differences in the association between work and health and that the welfare state regimes approach is unable to offer as much insight as expected.

Our findings may, of course, be a matter of artifact—a byproduct of the limitations of the data, variables, and methods used to analyze working conditions and welfare states. The EWCS dataset is subject to a number of limitations, most notably in terms of its response rate of 44 percent (ranging from 31% in Spain to 74% in Latvia). The prevalence of ill health also varied considerably, from 8 percent in Ireland to 56 percent in Latvia. However, we did conduct sensitivity analyses (available from authors on request) adjusting for response rate differences and our results were unchanged. The health measures in this study are self-rated and it is only cross-sectional, so it is not possible to establish any causal relationship between poor working conditions and health. However, the EWCS also has a number of strengths, most notably that it is the only survey of its type conducted across Europe. By using data from the EWCS, we are able to conduct analyses for work-life balance and health in 27 European countries. The dataset has also been used by other epidemiologists to examine psychosocial working conditions (61). We also applied multilevel models to take account of the hierarchical structure of the data and the sample was large enough to conduct multivariate statistical analyses with appropriate confounder control.

CONCLUSION

This article is the first to examine the association between self-reported general health and a wide range of working conditions at the European level and by welfare state regime type. We have found that “not good” general health was more likely to be reported by workers more exposed to hazardous working conditions. Most notably, tiring working positions (OR = 1.78, 95% CI 1.64–1.94), job strain (OR = 1.42, 95% CI 1.32–1.54), and temporary job contracts (OR = 1.24, 95% CI 1.13–1.37) were strongly associated with a higher likelihood of reporting “not good” health. Analysis by welfare state regime found that only tiring or painful working conditions were consistently associated with worse self-reported health in all regimes. There was no evidence that the Scandinavian welfare regime protected against the adverse health effects of poor working conditions.

Acknowledgments — The authors gratefully acknowledge the European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions as the original data creators and sponsors and the United Kingdom Data Archive. The European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions and the United Kingdom Data Archive bear no responsibilities for the data analysis or interpretation. Van der Wel's participation was funded by The Research Council of Norway (Grant No. 217145). There was no other funding for the research and the authors have no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Marmot, M., Siegrist, J., and Theorell, T. Health and the psychosocial work environment. In *Social Determinants of Health*, ed. M. Marmot and R. G. Wilkinson. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006.
2. Bambra, C. *Work, Worklessness and the Political Economy of Health*. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2011.
3. Eikemo, T. A., et al. Welfare state regimes and differences in self-perceived health in Europe: A multi-level analysis. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 66:2281–2295, 2008.
4. Navarro, V., et al. The importance of the political and the social in explaining mortality differentials among the countries of the OECD, 1950–1998. *Int. J. Health Serv.* 33:419–494, 2003.
5. Navarro, V., et al. Politics and health outcomes. *Lancet* 368:1033–1037, 2006.
6. Coburn, D. Beyond the income inequality hypothesis: Class, neo-liberalism, and health inequalities. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 58:41–56, 2004.
7. Dragano, N., Siegrist, J., and Wahrendorf, M. Welfare regimes, labour policies and workers' health: A comparative study with 9,917 older employees from 12 European countries. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* 65:793–799, 2011.
8. Chetter, I. C., Kent, P. J., and Kester, R. C. The hand-arm vibration syndrome: A review. *Cardiovasc. Surg.* 6:1–9, 1998.
9. Lings, S., and Leboeuf-Yde, C. Whole-body vibration and low back pain: A systematic, critical review of the epidemiological literature, 1992–1999. *Int. Arch. Occup. Environ. Health* 73:290–297, 2000.
10. Parkes, K. R., Carnell, S., and Farmer, E. *Musculoskeletal Disorders, Mental Health and the Work Environment. Health and Safety Executive Research Report 316*. 2005. <http://www.hse.gov.uk/research/rrpdf/rr316.pdf> (accessed May 25, 2010).
11. Health and Safety Executive. *Reducing the Risk of Upper Limb Disorders (ULDs) in the Workplace*. 2010. <http://www.hse.gov.uk/msd/uld/whatareulds.htm> (accessed May 24, 2010).
12. Vinet, A., et al. Piecework, repetitive work and medicine use in the clothing industry. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 28:1283–1288, 1989.
13. Fredriksson, K., et al. The impact on musculoskeletal disorders of changing physical and psychosocial work environment conditions in the automobile industry. *Int. J. Ind. Ergon.* 28:31–45, 2001.
14. Ohlsson, K., et al. Repetitive industrial work and neck and upper limb disorders in females. *Am. J. Ind. Med.* 27:731–747, 1995.

15. Karasek, R., and Theorell, T. *Healthy Work: Stress, Productivity, and the Reconstruction of Working Life*. Basic Books, New York, 1990.
16. Hemmingway, H., and Marmot, M. Psychosocial factors in the aetiology and prognosis of coronary heart disease: Systematic review of prospective cohort studies. *BMJ* 318:1460–1467, 1999.
17. Brunner, E. J., Chandola, T., and Marmot, M. G. Prospective effect of job strain on general and central obesity in the Whitehall II study. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 165: 828–837, 2007.
18. Chandola, T., Brunner, E., and Marmot, M. Chronic stress at work and the metabolic syndrome: Prospective study. *BMJ* 332:521–524, 2006.
19. Bambra, C. Going beyond the three worlds: Regime theory and public health research. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* 61:1098–1102, 2007.
20. Stansfeld, S. A., et al. Work characteristics predict psychiatric disorder: Prospective results from the Whitehall II study. *Occup. Environ. Med.* 56:302–307, 1999.
21. Siegrist, J. Effort-reward imbalance at work and cardiovascular diseases. *Int. J. Occup. Med. Environ. Health* 23(3):279–285, 2010.
22. Benach, J., et al. The consequences of flexible work for health: Are we looking at the right place? *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* 56:405–406, 2002.
23. Quinlan, M., Mayhew, C., and Bohle, P. The global expansion of precarious employment, work disorganisation, and consequences for occupational health: A review of recent research. *Int. J. Health Serv.* 31:335–414, 2001.
24. Benavides, F. G., et al. How do types of employment relate to health indicators? Findings from the Second European Survey on Working Conditions. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* 54:494–501, 2000.
25. Ferrie, J. E., et al. Effects of chronic job insecurity and change in job security on self-reported health, minor psychiatric morbidity, physiological measures, and health-related behaviours in British civil servants: The Whitehall II study. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* 56:450–454, 2002.
26. Kivimäki, M., et al. Temporary employment and risk of overall and cause-specific mortality. *Am. J. Epidemiol.* 158:663–668, 2003.
27. Akerstadt, T. Psychological and psychophysiological effects of shift work. *Scand. J. Work Environ. Health* 16:67–73, 1990.
28. Monk, T., and Folkard, S. *Making Shift Work Tolerable*. Taylor and Francis, London, 1992.
29. Pilcher, J., Lambert, B., and Huffcutt, A. Differential effects of permanent and rotating shifts on self-report sleep length: A meta-analytic review. *Sleep* 23:155–163, 2000.
30. Bøggild, H. Shift Work and Heart Disease: Epidemiological and Risk Factor Aspects. PhD dissertation. Aalborg Regional Hospital, Centre for Working Time Research, Aalborg, 2000.
31. Sparks, K., et al. The effects of hours of work on health: A meta-analytic review. *J. Occup. Organ. Psychol.* 70:391–408, 1997.
32. Johansson, G. Work-life balance: The case of Sweden in the 1990s. *Soc. Sci. Inf.* 41:303–317, 2002.
33. Bambra, C. ‘Sifting the wheat from the chaff’: A two-dimensional discriminant analysis of welfare state regime theory. *Soc. Pol. & Admin.* 41:1–28, 2007.

34. Beckfield, J., and Krieger, N. Epi + demos + cracy: Linking political systems and priorities to the magnitude of health inequities—evidence, gaps, and a research agenda. *Epidemiol. Rev.* 31:152–177, 2009.
35. Ferrera, M. The southern model of welfare in social Europe. *J. Eur. Soc. Pol.* 6:17–37, 1996.
36. Aspalter, C. The East Asian welfare model. *Int. J. Soc. Welfare* 15:290–301, 2006.
37. Bambra, C., and Eikemo, T. A. Welfare state regimes, unemployment and health: A comparative study of the relationship between unemployment and self-reported health in 23 European countries. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* 63(2): 92–98, 2008.
38. Chung, H., and Muntaner, C. Welfare state matters: A typological multilevel analysis of wealthy countries. *Health Pol.* 80:328–339, 2007.
39. Muntaner, C., et al. Review article: Politics, welfare regimes, and population health: Controversies and evidence. *Sociol. Health Illn.* 33(6):946–964, 2011.
40. Siegrist, J., and Theorell, T. Socio-economic position and health: The role of work and employment. In *Social Inequalities in Health: New Evidence and Policy Implications*, ed. J. Siegrist and M. Marmot. Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006.
41. Sekine, M., et al. Socioeconomic inequalities in physical and mental functioning of British, Finnish, and Japanese civil servants: Role of job demand, control, and work hours. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 69:1417–1425, 2009.
42. Bartley, M., and Blane, D. Health and the life course: Why safety nets matter. *BMJ* 314:1194–1196, 1997.
43. Eikemo, T. A., and Bambra, C. The welfare state: A glossary for public health. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* 62:3–6, 2008.
44. Fritzell, J., and Lundberg, O. Health, inequalities, welfare and resources. In *Health Inequalities and Welfare Resources: Continuity and Change in Sweden*, ed. J. Fritzell and O. Lundberg. Policy Press, Bristol, 2007.
45. Sen, A. *Inequality Reexamined*. Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1992.
46. Schoon, I., and Bartley, M. The role of human capability and resilience. *Psychologist* 21(1):24–27, 2009.
47. Tatsiramos, K. Unemployment insurance in Europe: Unemployment duration and subsequent employment stability. *J. Eur. Econ. Assoc.* 7(6):1225–1260, 2009.
48. Van der Wel, K., Dahl, E., and Thielens, K. Social inequalities in sickness: European welfare states and non-employment amongst the chronically sick. *Soc. Sci. Med.* 73:1608–1617, 2011.
49. Barth, E., and Moene, K. O. *The Equality Multiplier: How Wage Setting and Welfare Spending Make Similar Countries Diverge*. IZA (The Institute for the Study of Labor) Discussion Paper No. 6494, 2012.
50. Geyer, S., et al. Education, income, and occupational class cannot be used interchangeably in social epidemiology: Empirical evidence against a common practice. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* 60:804–810, 2006.
51. Wilkinson, R. G. *Unhealthy Societies: The Afflictions of Inequality*. Routledge, London, 1996.
52. Esser, I., and Ferrarini, T. Family policy, perceived stress and work-family conflict: A comparative analysis of women in 20 welfare states. *Arbetsrapport/Institutet för Framtidsstudier* 4, 2010.

53. European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. *Fifth European Working Conditions Survey*. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2012.
54. Parent-Thirion, A., et al. *Fourth European Survey on Working Conditions*. Publications Office of the European Union, Luxembourg, 2007.
55. Rabe-Hesketh, S., and Skrondal, A. *Multilevel and Longitudinal Modeling Using Stata*, Ed. 2. Stata Press, College Station, TX, 2008.
56. Benach, J., and Muntaner, C. Precarious employment and health: Developing a research agenda. *J. Epidemiol. Community Health* 61:276–277, 2007.
57. Marshall, A. The sequel of unemployment: The changing role of part-time and temporary work in Western Europe. In *Precarious Jobs in Labour Market Regulation: The Growth of Atypical Employment in Western Europe*, ed. G. Rodgers and J. Rodgers. International Institute for Labour Studies, Geneva, 1989.
58. World Health Organization. *Closing the Gap in a Generation: Health Equity Through Action on the Social Determinants of Health. Report of the WHO Commission on the Social Determinants of Health*. Geneva, 2008.
59. Stuckler, D., and Basu, S. *The Body Economic: Why Austerity Kills*. Allan Lane, London, 2013.
60. Rosskam, E. Measuring the protection of workers' health: A national work security index. In *Unhealthy Work: Causes, Consequences, Cures*, ed. P. Schnall, M. Dobson, and E. Rosskam. Baywood, New York, 2009.
61. Niedhammer, I., et al. Exposure to psychosocial work factors in 31 European countries. *Occup. Med.* 62:196–202, 2012.

Direct reprint requests to:

Professor Clare Bambra
Department of Geography
Wolfson Research Institute for Health and Wellbeing
Queen's Campus, Durham University
Stockton on Tees, TS17 6BH
United Kingdom

clare.bambra@durham.ac.uk