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Working-age population is getting older
EU25 working-age population trends, 2005 to 2050

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age groups</th>
<th>2005 to 2010</th>
<th>2010 to 2030</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Per 1000 000</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-24</td>
<td>-2.4</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-39</td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-54</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
15-24 and 50-64% of the 15-64 year age group in the European Union

Source: Eurostat, New Cronos 1998 (CD-ROM)
Employment rates of 55-64-years-old: too low worldwide
Employment rates **over 60%** of 55-64 year olds, of selected OECD countries, 2007 (both sexes)
Employment rates from 50 to 60% of 55-64 year olds from EU15 countries and Australia, 2007 (both sexes)
Employment rates (%) of 55 to 64 year olds in OECD and EU countries, 2007 (both sexes)
Employment rates (%) according to age and level of education in the EU25 countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>15-64</th>
<th>15-24</th>
<th>25-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>46,4</td>
<td>23,6</td>
<td>64,6</td>
<td>31,7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>68,6</td>
<td>48,8</td>
<td>78,7</td>
<td>43,6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher</td>
<td>82,8</td>
<td>61,1</td>
<td>88,0</td>
<td>62,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Exit ages too low from worklife
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Average Exit Age from the Labour Force</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iceland</td>
<td>66.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU 15</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU 25</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euro area</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Generations at work

- Youngest generation integrates too late
- Middle generation has non-solid work careers
  - Oldest generation exits too early

- Altogether: we are loosing 5-6 productive years/person, which has marked, negative effects on our society
Life Course from Youth to Retirement

Life course

Life cycle

JIC2012
New Concept for Solution:

A life course approach for a better and longer working life for all generations is urgently needed!
Age Management
LEVELS OF AGE MANAGEMENT

PROBLEMS / POSSIBILITIES

- functional capacity
- health
- competence
- work motivation
- work ability
- work exhaustion
- unemployment

MEANS / SOLUTIONS

- age management
  - promotion of physical, mental and social resources
  - improving health
  - developing competence
  - coping with changes
  - participating

RESULTS / AIMS

- better functional capacities
- better health
- better competence
- better work ability
- less exhaustion
- lower unemployment risk
- better quality of life

INDIVIDUAL

- productivity
- competitiveness
- sickness absence
- tolerance for change
- work organization
- work environment
- recruitment

ENTERPRISE

- age-management
  - individual solutions
  - co-operation between age groups
  - age-ergonomics
  - work-rest schedules
  - flexible working times
  - part-time work
  - tailored competence - training

- better total productivity
- better competitiveness
- less sick leaves
- better management
- competent manpower
- better image
- lower work disability costs

SOCIETY

- age-management
  - changing attitudes
  - preventing age-discrimination
  - improving age-conscious work policy
  - changing age-conscious exit policy

- less age-discrimination
- later retirement
- lower unemployment costs
- lower health care costs
- better national economy
- higher welfare
AGE MANAGEMENT

Definition

Consideration of age-related factors affecting both white and blue collar employees in the daily management, design, and organization of individual work tasks, as well as the work environment, so that everybody, regardless of age, feels empowered in reaching both personal and corporate goals.
Integration model of Age Management
Age Management: Visions

Age Management

Awareness

Good life

Organisation of work

Competence

Work Ability & Productivity

Attitudes

Manager's duty

Age strategy
1. Tackling problems of scarce resources
2. Decreasing work's demands
3. Enhancing individual resources
4. Intergenerational learning
5. Life-course approach

Mindset of organisations' preparedness

Proactive
(Solution based)

Problem solving

No age awareness
Ageing as a challenge
Ageing as an opportunity
Equal opportunities

EU Typology of age management practices,
Dr. Marjo Wallin FIOH, 2010
Innovations for longer work life

- Abloy, Finland
- Vattenfall, Sweden
- Sandnes municipality, Norway
### Abloy: Age Masters Free Days, Finland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Days/year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64+</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Permanent contract and Fitness tests/ year.
Free days max in 3 consecutive days, agreed by the supervisor.
Retirement ages increased about 3 years.
Vattenfall: The 80-90-100 programme, Sweden, (Nils Friberg)

- Targets: longer work careers (65-67-70), decrease of sickness absence, transfer of tacid knowledge
- Decrease the work load and work time for 58+
- Concept: 80-90-100:
  - Worktime 80 %
  - Salary 90 %
  - Pension 100 %
- Open for everybody – pilot 6 months- back to old or wish to continue
- Employer`s decision
- From 1300 employees about 330 in programme
- Retirement ages increased about 3 years
- Employees and employer satisfied
Reduced workload with 100% salary

Focus group: employees aged 62 - 66 years old who do not choose
1 - Senior bonus or 2 - Senior support to the workplace

62 years - 100 % salary for working 90 % of the working hours
63 years - 100 % salary for working 85 % of the working hours
64 years and older - 100 % salary for working 80 % of the working hours

Reduced workload should normally be organised as fixed weekly reductions in working hours and tasks. When enrolled in the program, it will last till retirement and cannot be combined with early age pension (AFP)

Special rules applies for teachers
Sandnes Municipality, Norway ( Mykletun, 2009 )
Pension Reform

until the end of 2004

Old age pension

23 y  50 y  60 y  65 y

0.5% /y  1.5% /y  2.5% /y

from 2005

Old age pension

18 y  53 y  63 y  68 y

1.5% /y  1.9% /y  4.5% /y

Work disability pension

23 y  50 y  60 y  65 y

0.5% /y  1.2% /y  0.8% /y

Work disability pension

50 y  63 y

1.5% /y  1.3% /y
Work Ability
Work Ability - Milestones of research and praxis in Finland

1. WAI-Follow-up studies 1981-2009 (FIOH)

2. WAI-Promotion concepts 1990-1996 (FIOH)

3. WAI-Translations 1990- (28 languages in 2009)
Work Ability- Mile stones of research and praxis

4. WAI- in occupational health services (FIOH 1992- )

5. WAI- International Co-operation 1992- (the Netherlands, Austria, Germany ...)

Work Ability - Milestones of research and praxis

7. WAI-Training, Coaching and Consulting (Germany, Austria)

8. WAI- Networks (Germany, Austria, the Netherlands)

9. WAI – Data Banks (Finland, Germany, Austria, the Netherlands)

10. Work Ability House – new concept 2002- (FIOH)
Work Ability model

Society:  culture  legislation  education policy  social and health policy

external operational environment

immediate social environment

family

WORK ABILITY
- work
- work community leadership
- values
- attitudes
- motivation
- competence
- health and functional capacities
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AGE POWER
WORK ABILITY INDEX

Kaija Tuomi
Juhani Ilmarinen
Antti Jahkola
Lea Katajarinne
Arto Tulkki
Work Ability Index
7 Items

- Current work ability compared with the lifetime best
- Work ability in relation to the demands of the job
- Number of current diseases diagnosed by physician
- Estimated workimpairment due to diseases
- Sick leave during the past year (12 months)
- Own prognosis of work ability two years from now
- Mental resources
## Work Ability Index

Scoring of the Questionnaire (range 7 - 49 points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Work ability</th>
<th>Objective of measures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 - 27</td>
<td>POOR</td>
<td>RESTORE WORK ABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 - 36</td>
<td>MODERATE</td>
<td>IMPROVE WORK ABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37 - 43</td>
<td>GOOD</td>
<td>SUPPORT WORK ABILITY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 - 49</td>
<td>EXCELLENT</td>
<td>MAINTAIN WORK ABILITY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work Ability and Ageing
Work ability index in 1981

- disability pension 1992
- death 1992
Work ability index (WAI)

WAI

WAI Class
excellent
good
moderate
poor

Carrot project 1998, N=729

Age, yrs
Work Ability Index by age groups

- < 35 years (n=256): 47 excellent, 44 good, 7 moderate, 14 poor
- 35-44 years (n=372): 41 excellent, 43 good, 14 moderate, 10 poor
- 45-54 years (n=406): 32 excellent, 35 good, 23 moderate, 10 poor
- 55+ years (n=135): 25 excellent, 32 good, 30 moderate, 13 poor
Health2000 Survey on Work Ability
Raija Gould,
Juhani Ilmarinen,
Jorma Järvisalo,
Seppo Koskinen, eds.

Dimensions of Work Ability
Results of the Health 2000 Survey
Helsinki 2008
Work Ability by age in Finland

Good and Excellent
Moderate
Healthy worker effect
Poor
Blik op Werk
WAI-database analyse

Update grafieken
Verschillen in ontwikkeling WAI-score naar sector

![Graph showing differences in WAI-score development across sectors over different ages. The graph includes lines representing Industrie, Financiële instellingen, Landelijk, and Onderwijs. The x-axis represents age in years (15 to 75), and the y-axis represents WAI-score (35 to 45).]
Average WAI by sector, adjusted by age and gender (n=3704)
Farming
Wood industry
Electronics industry
Metal industry
Building industry
Other industry
Trade
Transport
Telecommunication
Financing, insurance
Education
Health services
Social services
Civil service
Other services

Work Ability Index classes by industrial branch, (n=3704)
Work ability index (7-49) among working men and women by older age groups
Gould and Polvinen, 2006
Proportion (%) of those with limited work ability and the mean work ability score for those chronically ill and those with no chronic illness.
## Work ability among 30–64-year-olds without and with diseases of the circulatory system (age adjusted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease</th>
<th>Mean work ability score</th>
<th>Persons with limited work ability</th>
<th>Prevalence of disease (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion (%)</td>
<td>Odds Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Coronary heart disease</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women: Without disease</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disease</td>
<td>6.3***</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>7.1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men: Without disease</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disease</td>
<td>6.1***</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.5***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hypertension</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women: Without disease</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disease</td>
<td>8.0**</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>1.7***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men: Without disease</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disease</td>
<td>7.5***</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1.6***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work ability among 30–64-year-olds without and with diabetes (age adjusted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease</th>
<th>Mean work ability score</th>
<th>Persons with limited work ability</th>
<th>Prevalence of disease (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion (%)</td>
<td>Odds Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women: Without disease</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disease</td>
<td>7.2***</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.7***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men: Without disease</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disease</td>
<td>6.7***</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.3***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work ability among 30–64-year-olds without and with back or neck disorder (age adjusted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease</th>
<th>Mean work ability score</th>
<th>Persons with limited work ability</th>
<th>Prevalence of disease (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion (%)</td>
<td>Odds Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Back disorder</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women: Without disease</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disease</td>
<td>7.8***</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2.2**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men: Without disease</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disease</td>
<td>7.5***</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>1.8***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Neck disorder</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women: Without disease</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disease</td>
<td>7.8***</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2.1***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men: Without disease</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disease</td>
<td>7.2***</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.6***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Work ability among 30–64-year-olds without and with mental disorders (age adjusted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease</th>
<th>Mean work ability score</th>
<th>Persons with limited work ability</th>
<th>Prevalence of disease (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion (%)</td>
<td>Odds Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without disease</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disease</td>
<td>6.7***</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>5.7**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without disease</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disease</td>
<td>6.2***</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5.9***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychosis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without disease</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disease</td>
<td>6.5***</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>11.7***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Without disease</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disease</td>
<td>6.8***</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21.4***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Work ability among 30–64-year-olds without and with **Anxiety** (age adjusted)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disease</th>
<th>Mean work ability score</th>
<th>Persons with limited work ability</th>
<th>Prevalence of disease (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proportion (%)</td>
<td>Odds Ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women: Without disease</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.9***</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4.4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disease</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men: Without disease</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With disease</td>
<td>6.1***</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6.9***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Work ability by age group among employed 50-64-year-olds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender and age</th>
<th>Work ability estimate: those with limited work ability (%)</th>
<th>Physical work ability: those with very good work ability (%)</th>
<th>Mental work ability: those with very good work ability (%)</th>
<th>Mean work ability score</th>
<th>Mean work ability index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Women</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>5*</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8.1**</td>
<td>37.0**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>27***</td>
<td>17*</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>7.8***</td>
<td>35.4***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Men</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60-64</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>7.8*</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The consequences of reduced work ability for productivity loss

T.I.J. van den Berg, A.Burdorf
Erasmus MC, Rotterdam
The Netherlands
What is productivity loss?

Productivity loss at work

Absence

Time

Sickness

Recovery
### Relationship between productivity loss and work ability score

Productivity loss (Cross sectional sample of 11,318 employees in Holland)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work ability score (0-10)</th>
<th>Productivity loss (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Reference Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>- 4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>- 12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>- 26.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Tilja Vandenberg, Finse, 28.5.2009)
Produktivität/Qualität
Beurteilung durch Vorgesetzte (Tuomi et al., 1992)

Arbeitsbewältigung nach Klassen

- Exzellent (n=105)
  - Qualität: 65,7
  - Produktivität: 59,4

- Gut (n=269)
  - Qualität: 40,5
  - Produktivität: 53

- Mäßig (n=466)
  - Qualität: 40,9
  - Produktivität: 59,1

- Nieder (n=176)
  - Qualität: 34,3
  - Produktivität: 40,6

Hohe Qualität und/oder Produktivität
Qual/Produktivität NICHT hoch
Midlife work ability predicts disability in old age – A 28-year prospective study

Mikaela B. von Bonsdorff¹
Jorma Seitsamo²
Juhani Ilmarinen²
Clas-Håkan Nygård³
Monika E. von Bonsdorff¹,²
Taina Rantanen¹

¹ Gerontology Research Centre, Department of Health Sciences, University of Jyväskylä,
² Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Helsinki
³ Tampere School of Public Health, University of Tampere

9 June 2010, Tampere
IADL disability at follow-up in 2009 according to professional class and work ability in midlife in the year 1981

Women

White-collar

Excellent work ability

Moderate work ability

Poor work ability

Excellent work ability

Moderate work ability

Poor work ability

Blue-collar

(von Bonsdorff et al. submitted)

Men

White-collar

Excellent work ability

Moderate work ability

Poor work ability

Excellent work ability

Moderate work ability

Poor work ability

Blue-collar

No difficulties

Some difficulties in at least 1 of the 3 hardest tasks

Some difficulties in at least 1 of the 4 easiest tasks

A lot of difficulties in at least 1 of the 3 hardest tasks

A lot of difficulties in at least 1 of the 4 easiest tasks

(von Bonsdorff et al. submitted)
New Toolbox based on Work Ability House
Good work – longer career

Common project of Federation of Finnish Technology Industry and trade Unions

Federation of Finnish Technology Industries
Metalworkers’ Union
Federation of Professional and Managerial Staff YTN
Union of Salaried employees TU
Federation of Special Service and Clerical Employees ERTO

Written into the collective agreement between Unions
Work Ability model

Society: culture legislation education policy social and health policy

external operational environment

immediate social environment

family
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AGE POWER

WORK ABILITY
work work community leadership
values attitudes motivation
competence
health and functional capacities
New Work Ability Tool Box

1. Work Ability Index (WAI)
2. Work Well-being Index (WWI) (PersonRadar)
3. Work Ability House – Model (CompanyRadar)
   - Priorisation of floors
   - Identification of actions by floor
   - Priorisation of actions
   - Making a concrete plan for each action
PersonRadar: Work Well-being Index
Personal radar | Results of your well-being at work

Below you will find your personal feedback. The personal results are anonymous and will stay with the answering person only. The respondent can use the results if needed in connections of importance to him/her. These could include visits to the occupational health services or personal development discussions with the supervisor.

Classification: **below 5** (poor), **5-6.99** (average), **7-8.99** (good), **9-10** (excellent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health and functional capacity</th>
<th>av.</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functional capacity</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Competence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional competence</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational sufficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Possibility to learn new things and skills</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results (2/4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values, attitudes, motivation</th>
<th>av.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation received</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust in employer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to work</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work motivation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair treatment</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work, working conditions, work community, management</th>
<th>av.</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of work organization</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervisor feed-back</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work community support</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Results (3/4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work and family life</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working time flexibility</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work and family life</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends and hobbies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work ability</strong></td>
<td>6.83</td>
<td>average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sufficiency of resources</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work ability</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical ability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental ability</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two year prognosis of work ability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enough energy until retirement</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results (4/4)

**Work Well-being Index**
- Average: 6.12 (6.41*)
- *Previous Work Well-being Index*

**Work-Ability Estimate**
- Average: 6.83

*Average*
Good work – Longer working life: Work Well-being at baseline

- 37 companies (November 2012)
- N = 5250
- Juhani and Ville Ilmarinen
Health and Capability

- Upper Employees (n=244-535 /per age group)
- Employees (n=258-406)
- Workers (n=352-673)
Attitudes and motivation

- Upper Employees (n=244-535 / per age group)
- Employees (n=258-406)
- Workers (n=352-673)
Work

Upper Employees (n=243-535 /per age group)
Employees (n=258-406)
Workers (n=352-672)
Work, family and hobbies

- Upper Employees (n=244-535 / per age group)
- Employees (n=258-406)
- Workers (n=352-672)
Work Ability (4)

- Upper Employees (n=244-535 /per age group)
- Employees (n=258-406)
- Workers (n=352-673)
Work Well-being index (16)

Upper Employees (n=244-535 /per age group)
Employees (n=258-406)
Workers (n=352-673)
Working until retirement: Change by age group (2011 \(\rightarrow\) 2012)

* Change statistically significant, \(p < .05\)
CompanyRadar: Priorisation Method
# Company radar: Priorisation of floors (example)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Floor</th>
<th>A: Importance (1-10)</th>
<th>B: Extension (1-10)</th>
<th>C: Possibility to influence (1-10)</th>
<th>Result AxBxC (1-1000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health and ability</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competence</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values, attitudes and motivation</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work, work arrangements, work community and management</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close community and hobbies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Company Radar: Priorisation of goals/targets by floor of Work (example)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work, work organisation, work community and management</th>
<th>Goal/Target</th>
<th>A: Importance (1-10)</th>
<th>B: Extension (1-10)</th>
<th>C: Possibility to influence (1-10)</th>
<th>Result A x B x C (1-1000)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Management skills</td>
<td>Management skills</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal feed-back</td>
<td>Personal feed-back</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foremen skills</td>
<td>Foremen skills</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change Management</td>
<td>Change Management</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age attitudes</td>
<td>Age attitudes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work time flexibility</td>
<td>Work time flexibility</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team support</td>
<td>Team support</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere</td>
<td>Atmosphere</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>360</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Company Radar: Plan for Personal feedback

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal/Target</th>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Time plan</th>
<th>Follow-up</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction with feedback improves</td>
<td>1. Feed-back training for supervisors</td>
<td>NN</td>
<td>9/2011</td>
<td>Personal Radar, Participation in training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Feed-back training for employees</td>
<td>MM</td>
<td>10/2011</td>
<td>Participation in training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Instructions and documents</td>
<td>PP</td>
<td>10/2011</td>
<td>Tested instructions and documents</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Enterprises for longer working life
Main challenges for enterprises

Globalisation
New Technology
Demographic change
Economic effects of globalisation on enterprises

Growing pressure to rationalize:
- Downsizing (work intensity)
- Merging (unsecurity of workplaces)
- Outsourcing (payment)

Work dissatisfaction, trust

Pressure of LLL

Overloading, psychosomatic disorders, severe health effects
Work Ability is a win-win concept

- Productivity and quality of work are dependent on work ability
- Work ability depend mostly on management and quality of work
- Good work is the most important factor for longer work life
Change of paradigm: what is the new quality of work?

- Work well-being:
  - Respect
  - Trust
  - Fair treatment
  - Support

- Society: culture, legislation, education policy, social and health policy

- External operational environment

- Immediate social environment

- Family
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Key factors of employees and workers towards a longer working life

If I may, others want me to
If I will
If I can
Where should we go together?

To 3rd floor:
My subjective picture about my work should be positive
Good age management policy for working life

- Awareness about ageing
- Reform of age attitudes
- Investment in age management
- Reform of working life
- Cooperation of key actors
- Reform of health services
- Reform of LLL services

**National Program for Ageing Workers**

Positive reforms first – Negative later!
Equal treatment or Individuality?

For the equal treatment, you get all the same qualification task: clime up the tree!