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Abstract

Purpose – The purposes of this paper are to 1) give an overview of the prevalence of HR practices that are used to retain vital older workers in health organizations, 2) to examine the evaluations of those HR practices, and 3) to determine the wishes for HR practices in three different target groups: older workers, line managers and HR professionals.

Design/methodology/approach - An inventory case study was conducted based on 51 interviews with older workers, line managers and HR professionals working in 15 hospitals and nursing and care organizations.

Findings - Our results showed that maintenance HR practices focused on retaining older workers in their current jobs, in comparison with development HR practices, are by far more prevalent. In addition, maintenance and development HR practices, in general, are assessed being successful. Although wishes appeared to be strongly related to development HR practices, maintenance HR practices are mentioned as well.

Originality/value - This paper aims to give an overview of the prevalence of HR practices used to retain older workers in health care organizations vital at work, which practices are evaluated as successful from not only line managers’ and HRM perspective, but from the older workers themselves as well.
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Introduction

In the face of rapid population ageing and dejuvenization during the 21st century across most of the developed countries in the world (Van der Heijden, Kümmerling, Van Dam, Van der Schoot, Estryn-Béhar, & Hasselhorn, 2010; Shultz & Adams, 2007; Kanfer & Ackerman, 2004; Schalk et al., 2010), there is a need to promote better employment opportunities for
older people (OECD, 2010). Earlier research points to the trend of fewer older workers in employment while the birth rates decline and life expectancy has increased in many developed countries (Kooij, De Lange, Jansen, & Dikkers, 2008). Internationally, age groups containing the largest number of people has developed from 20-24 years in 1980, via 30-34 years in 1990 to 40-44 years in 2010 (Steemers, 2010). In a similar vein, in member states of the European Union, an average increase of 12% in the proportion of the 50-59 age group has been predicted over the next 10 years (Inceoglu, Segers, & Bartram, 2011, p.1). Therefore, due to the expected workforce shortage work life must be lengthened for the sake of society (Ilmarinen, 2005). The growth of economy may be threatened due to the lack of young employees that will not be enough to replace the ones who retire. The issue will be to do more with fewer workers, referring to a work force consisting of more women, minorities, and older workers (Collins, 2003). Retention of older workers can be of great value in this respect to organizations (Ng & Feldman, 2008).

Although a pressure is on both employers, employees and governments to find appropriate solutions to retain older workers engaged at work, most HRM practices are focused on HR practices that focus on sparing the elderly and try to prevent them from dropping out (Kluijtmans, 2010). To examine HR practices carefully in context we conceptually distinguished between HR bundles of development and maintenance. Furthermore, we will discuss the Job Demands-Resources model as a balance model in relation to work outcomes. Although a considerable amount of studies has been conducted focusing on the older workers the last decade there is still lack of a, or scattered, profound insight of actual implemented HR practices related to different target groups including older workers themselves and their wishes (De Lange, Van Yperen, Van der Heijden, & Bal, 2010; Bal, De Lange, Jansen, & Van der Velde, 2008; Warr & Fay, 2001; Greller & Simpson, 1999). This corresponds to balancing ‘what employers want’ with ‘what employees want’ which
suggests the relevance of a multi-actor approach explicitly including individual employee and employer input (Boselie, 2010, p. 117; Van de Voorde, 2009; Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007). In an attempt to partly fill this gap the objective of this explorative empirical study was to improve our knowledge of which (kind of) HR practices are actually deployed and whether these actual practices are aligned to the wishes of three different target groups. We will argue that most HR solutions are aimed at maintenance HR practices whereas development HR practices seem to be more appropriate. In addition, the vast majority is focused on non-age specific issues. Before addressing the main research questions of our study, we will first discuss the main concepts (i.e. aging, HR practices and older workers, Job Demands-Resources Model and Success) and related theories in more detail.

**Theoretical Framework**

**Ageing**

Although the importance of deployment of HR practices for workers in various age categories is carried out more and more, there is a serious lack of HR practices specifically focused on keeping older employees’ vitality at work. As Thunnissen (2005) stated, in the past only ‘senior policy’ was carried out by using calendar age as a watershed between old and young and which was curative in nature. This approach focuses on empirically investigating the value of HR practices in the light of coping with possible competence gaps and weaknesses in the functioning of the older worker which have arisen in the past. This contrasts with the more recent forms of ‘age-conscious HRM’ policy or ‘life phase driven HR policy’ in which active, or healthy aging plays an essential role and. After all, vital ageing already starts at the beginning of life (Van Vuuren, 2011). We see both strategies being deployed in organizations.

For the purpose of this study, it was decided to define older workers as all workers from age 55 and up. Although in many countries, the age of 50 indicates the beginning of a
decline in participation rates by age (OECD, 2010) in this study the limit of 55 is used. This is in line with the collective agreements where 55 is habitually applied to indicate a distinction between older and younger workers (Collective Agreements Hospitals (2009-2010) and Nursing and Caring (2008-2010). In addition, several reports and studies focus on 55 as a dividing line between the older and younger employees (Stecr, 2004). The age of 55 is not meant to be a threshold in and of itself in terms of defining who is old and who is not. The term ‘older worker’ may refer to workers from age 40 to 75, depending on the kind of job and on the worker (De Lange et al., 2006; Collins, 2003). Perceptions about being old are inherently subjective and only loosely connected with chronological age (Kooij, De Lange, Jansen, & Dikkers, 2008; Avolio, Waldman, & McDaniel, 1990). As Nauta, De Lange, and Görtz (2010) stated, chronological age certainly does not appear to be sufficient to significantly and reliably predict employees’ competences, ambitions and shortcomings. Chronological age appears to function as a proxy indicator for a broad constellation of age-related processes (Kanfer & Ackerman, 2004). Other operationalizations are more important, which are functional age (that refers to workers’ performance), psychosocial age (that is related to subjective age and is based on self and social perception), organizational age (referring to job and organizational tenure) and life-span age (that refers to the life stage or family status (Kooij, De Lange, Jansen, & Dikkers, 2008).

Nevertheless we know that, in previous research, significant correlations between (chronological) age and changes in work motives have been found as the following theories clarify. As Baltes, Staudinger, and Lindenberger (1999) set out, ageing is associated with (cognitive and physical) gains and losses which should change HR practices (Kooij et al., 2009b). According to aforementioned the life span theory of Selection Optimization and Compensation (SOC) (Baltes et al., 1999) implies successful life span development is about maximizing age-related gains and minimizing age-related losses. This process involves selecting outcomes, optimizing resources to reach these desirable outcomes, and
compensating for the loss of outcome-relevant means. In a similar vein, Carstensen (1992) and Löckenhoff and Carstensen (2004) also assumed that changes occur during life span which is captured in the Socioemotional Selectivity Theory. As people age and boundaries on time are perceived, the more present-oriented goals related to emotional meaning are prioritized over future-oriented goals aimed at acquiring information and expanding horizons. Similarly, the Regulatory Focus Theory of Higgins (1997, 2000) distinguishes between self-regulation with a focus on promotion, and self-regulation with a prevention focus. He proposes that aspirations, accomplishment, growth and development involve and induce a promotion focus whereas responsibilities, safety, and security involve and induce prevention focus. Therefore, generally we can say that although age involves much more than only chronological age, several theories have been developed in which significant associations between age and motives, behavior, perspectives are revealed.

**HR practices and older workers**

Based on the aforementioned aging concept of Higgins (1997, 2000) and Carstensen (1992, 2004), on the one hand, we conceptualized maintenance HR practices that are focused on protection, safety and responsibility in order to retain the employees in their current level of functioning, or focused on recovery to previous levels after a loss. An example is flexible working schedules (Kooij, Jansen, Dikkers, & De Lange, 2009a). (See more examples in Table 1, column 1). On the other hand development HR practices are focused on addressing the physical and mental strains by applying resources in both work as personal context. These are related to advancement, growth, and accomplishment that foster individual workers to achieve other and new levels of functioning. An example of development HR practices is training to develop knowledge and skills for future jobs, or in which new competences are learned or to improve operational skills (see more examples in Table 1,
column 2), related to advancement, growth, and accomplishment that help individual workers to achieve other and new levels of functioning.

Table 1: An overview of maintenance / development HR practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance (1)</th>
<th>Development (2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>➢ Extra leave</td>
<td>➢ Job enrichment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Early retirement (part-time)</td>
<td>➢ Participation in decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Demotion</td>
<td>➢ Horizontal job change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Exemption from overtime</td>
<td>➢ Second career / job movement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Working part-time</td>
<td>➢ Job redesign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Ergonomic adjustments and safety and health training</td>
<td>➢ Mentor roles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Performance appraisal</td>
<td>➢ Career planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Flexible working conditions (workweek of 4x9)</td>
<td>➢ Continuous development of the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Courses to keep up-to-date</td>
<td>➢ Promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>➢ Job alleviation</td>
<td>➢ Training in which new things are learned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Sabbatical leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Job development interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>➢ Health checks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Correspondingly, Gong, Law, Chang, and Xin (2009) have developed a dual-concern model of HR systems where performance-oriented HR subsystems focus primarily on developing HR and providing motivation and opportunities for the productive use of such resources, whereas maintenance-oriented HR subsystems focus primarily on employee protection and equality. Contemporary research is focused on these ‘high-performance, high commitment, high involvement, progressive, and human-capital-enhancing human resource management (Kuvaas, 2008, p. 1) in which developmental needs are being supported by the organization’s HR practices. This ideal outlined situation implies that HR practices should be rooted into a so-called ‘conservation model’ wherein employees, regardless of their age, are seen as long-lasting valuable organizational assets instead of the long-adhered ‘depreciation
model’ (Yeats, Folts, & Knapp, 2000). The expectation is that a world is to gain within HRM since HR practices appear to be focused mainly on maintenance HR practices according to the depreciation model and less on development HRM practices (Van der Heijden, De Lange, Demerouti, & Van der Heijde, 2009).

Job Demands-Resources Model and Success

For analyzing successfulness of the HR practices under study, we applied the Job Demands-Resources model (JD-R model: Demerouti, Bakker, Nachreiner, & Schaufeli, 2001; Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) in which two simultaneous processes are affecting occupations: job demands that can cause a health impairment process and job resources that can cause the motivational process. Job demands refer to those physical, psychological, social or organizational aspects of the job that require sustained physical and/or psychological (cognitive and emotional) effort or skills and are therefore associated with certain physiological and/or psychological costs. Examples are a high work pressure, an unfavorable physical environment, emotionally demanding interactions with clients. Although job demands may not be negative they may turn into job stressors when meeting those demands requires high effort from which the employee has not adequately recovered (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). These job demands are related to maintenance HR practices such as additional leave, no compulsory night shifts, demotion, early retirement, working scheduling.

In contrast, job resources refer to those physical, psychological, social or organizational aspects of the job that are a) functional in achieving work goals, b) reduce job demands and the associated physiological and psychological costs, and c) stimulate personal growth, learning and development. Examples are autonomy, feedback, task significance. Resources may be located at organizational (e.g. salary, career opportunities), interpersonal and social relations (e.g. supervisor and coworker support), the organization of work (e.g. role clarity,
participation in decision making) and the task (e.g. performance feedback, skill variety) (Bakker, Hakanen, Demerouti, & Xanthopoulou, 2007). These job resources are added with personal resources which are aspects of the self and generally linked to resiliency and refer to individuals’ ability to successfully control and impact on their environment (Hobfoll, Johnson, Ennis, & Jackson, 2003). Typical examples are optimism, self-esteem, stress resistance and self-efficacy (Xanthopoulou, Bakker, Demerouti, & Schaufeli, 2007). Related to development HR practices some examples are coaching, career coaching, job development interviews, team building sessions, and mindfulness. Job resources might help employees to cope with high job demands: in case high demands are accompanied by appropriate job resources employees are able to balance these two (Evers, Kreijns, Van der Heijden, & Gerrichhauzen, 2011).

In this paper, we refer to demands and resources as ‘JD-R issues’ in which job demands are the most crucial predictors of job strain, whereas job resources are the most crucial predictors of work motivation, learning, commitment, and work engagement including vitality (Bakker, Van Veldhoven, & Xanthopoulou, 2010).

This JD-R model –which has not been comprehensively age-specific yet- suggests that focusing on the positive features rather than on the negative aspects is more rewarding and effective (Schaufeli & Dijkstra, 2010). We therefore expect job demands, executed by maintenance HR practices to result in higher scores on job alleviation and low scores on job and personal resources. On the other hand we expect job resources, executed by development HR practices to result in higher scores on job and personal resources and in lower scores on job alleviation. Overall, we expect development HR practices to be assessed as more successful than maintenance HR practices (Zhang, Wan, & Jia, 2008; Bakker & Demerouti, 2008).

In addition, to measure success of HR practices and therefore the added value of distinguishing between both maintenance and development HR practices following Roman,
Smeenk, Van Wersch and De Muijnck, (2009), we have evaluated various criteria for relevance and usefulness: are the practices effective, efficient, actually implemented and are these considered relevant. In this paper, we call these issues 'content issues'. Effectiveness is described as the extent to which the desired goal is achieved. With efficiency we mean the ratio between the effort, time and/or money to the target yield. Being implemented and considered relevant do not need further explanation. In line with Zhang et al. (2008) and Bakker and Demerouti (2008) we expect maintenance HR practices to be less successful on these issues than development HR practices.

**Research Questions**

Overall, it appears that there has not been a closer look at ageing, HRM, and the evaluation of HR practices by conducting a multi-perspective stance. Although research is conducted from the employers’ point of view (Roman et al., 2009) there’s a serious lack of studies conducted from the employees’ position. In addition, we would expect wishes focused rather on job and personal resources to foster employee engagement than on job alleviation, and therefore focused more on development HR practices than on maintenance HR practices. Therefore, a fourth research question was added to look at the wishes from the employee perspective, in contrast to the management and HR professional perspectives. This study therefore aims to construct an overview of the prevalence of (different kind of) HR practices used to retain older workers vital at work. Even though this is of interest to all branches, for reasons set out below we confined this study to the health sector.

Since the share of employees in the health care is 9.9% (OECD, 2008) of total labor market, health care is one of the main pillars of the economy. Due to the increase of the elderly and consequently chronically ill persons this branch will increase. The scarcity in the labor market will notably concern nurses and caregivers. In order to be and remain an attractive employer it will be essential for an organization, even more than nowadays, to
compete with other branches. In addition, considering that working in the health care industry is mentally and physically demanding as well, a major challenge is looming for the Human Resource Management in this area. As a consequence we chose to conduct this research in this sector, although this study would be of interest in all branches.

Given this lack of data we examine in this paper the following research questions:

1. Which HR practices tend to prevail for older workers?

2. To what extent are the deployed HR practices focused on maintenance or development?

3. To what extent are the deployed HR practices successful in terms of
   a) satisfying the purpose for which they are intended
   b) being in balance to time, money and effort
   c) are they actually implemented
   d) considered relevant
   e) contributing to job alleviation
   f) contributing to job enrichment
   g) contributing to personal enrichment

4. Which HR practices for older workers are wanted by those affected by the older workers, the line managers, and the HR professionals?

Method

For testing and amending research expectations about the prevalence and success of HR practices and discovering which wishes exist, an inventory qualitative survey was conducted, based on semi-structured interviews with older workers, line managers and HR professionals. This study could be labeled as a research ‘between (or across) methods’ which uses quantitative and qualitative techniques to collect and interpret data (Jick, 1979, p. 603).
Sample and procedure

In order to collect the data we (developed an interview scheme including respondents cards, see Appendix). We asked for HR practices exclusively for older workers, i.e. 55+ employees. Interviews were planned for each organization with one representative of the HR department, one line manager and two older workers (in some cases we could not manage this and we endeavored to remain as close as possible to this ideal sample). The interviews were conducted in at the end of 2010 and were conducted by two persons; one researcher handling the interview questions, and the other recording and taking questions. These interviews were tape-recorded, transcribed, and in detail observed.

The interviews were semi-structured. Actually, the interviews all started rather unstructured, but nonetheless aimed at the collection of well-specified data. In order to provide some guidance, we made a distinction among labor conditions, labor contents, work relations, working conditions and broad-spectrum aspects (Roman et al., 2009). Whenever respondents could not shape a picture we gave a minor description. If an HR practice, unambiguously aimed at older workers, was mentioned, we elaborated this item in issues concerning the content (effectiveness, efficiency, the level of implementation and to what extent the HR practice was considered relevant), and issues concerning whether the mentioned HR practice fostered job and personal enrichment on the one hand, and contributed to job alleviation on the other hand. As we aimed at comparing the data we asked the respondents to assign marks from 1 to 10, half marks were allowed (1=not at all/very bad, continuously ascending to 5=neutral, and ending up to 10=fully/excellent). In this paper we follow this approach and consider 5 as a boundary. Both the outcomes of the interviews as their scores provided on rating as well, are taken into account as data since both sorts of data support each other. Subsequently these data were put in structures of HR practices with distinctive purposes. We counted how many times particular practices were
mentioned, how they were evaluated (both by means of text and marks), distinguished among older workers, line managers and HR professionals.

The participants

A total of 23 health organizations, in particular hospitals and care and cure organizations were, via an overarching health organization, invited to participate in this study. They were given information by telephone followed by an e-mail in which the objective of the study was explained. Of 23 organizations 15 reacted positively (response rate of 65%). Consequently 51 interviews were conducted with Dutch employees, divided in older workers (41%), line managers (24%) and representatives of HR department (35%) (See also Table 2). 80% was female (41). The mean age of the respondents was 50.7 (SD =8.81) years and since age was a condition for the older workers (55+) the mean age for them was 57 years. The mean job duration was 12.2 years for all respondents and 18.5 years for the older workers. All respondents work, on average, 30 hours a week and conducted several types of jobs, ranging from care-or cure employee to HR manager.

Table 2 Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Total group (N=51)</th>
<th>Older workers (n=21)</th>
<th>Line managers (n=12)</th>
<th>HRM professionals (n=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male n (%)</td>
<td>10 (.20)</td>
<td>1 (.05)</td>
<td>3 (.25)</td>
<td>6 (.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female n (%)</td>
<td>41 (.80)</td>
<td>20 (.95)</td>
<td>9 (.75)</td>
<td>12 (.67)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years M (SD)</td>
<td>50.7 (8.81)</td>
<td>57 (4.18)</td>
<td>47 (7.49)</td>
<td>46 (8.92)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present in this study n (%)</td>
<td>51 (1.00)</td>
<td>21 (.41)</td>
<td>12 (.24)</td>
<td>18 (.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job duration</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years M (SD)</td>
<td>12.09 (10.34)</td>
<td>18.50 (12.62)</td>
<td>7.40 (5.72)</td>
<td>7.75 (4.44)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Workweek</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours M (SD)</td>
<td>30.13 (7.74)</td>
<td>26.60 (8.71)</td>
<td>31.42 (7.22)</td>
<td>33.39 (5.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Salary</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Euro’s gross per month:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Range</th>
<th>1900-5800</th>
<th>1900-3600</th>
<th>2800-4800</th>
<th>2380-5800</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modus</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>2380</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td>3600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Home situation

| Is ‘in balance’ n (%) | 50 (.98) | 19 (.90) | 12 (1.00) | 18 (1.00) |
| Is ‘quite in balance’ n (%) | 1 (.02) | 2 (.10) |

### Married/ living together n (%)

| 42 (.82) | 17 (.81) | 10 (.83) | 15 (.83) |

### (Step)children

| Yes n (%) | 38 (.75) | 19 (.90) | 10 (.83) | 9 (.50) |
| Mean number of children pp. M | 1.8 | 2.3 | 1.9 | 1.3 |

### Caregiving (now) n (%)

| 9 (.18) | 5 (.24) | 4 (.33) | 0 (.00) |

### Interaction work-private

| Positive/no influence n (%) | 51 100% | 100% | 100% | 100% |

### Working longer

| OK (if body permits) n (%) | 31 (.61) | 14 (.67) | 7 (.58) | 10 (.56) |
| No n (%) | 16 (.31) | 6 (.29) | 4 (.33) | 6 (.33) |
| OK incl. reducing work n (%) | 3 (.06) | 1 (0.05) | 22 (.11) |
| Do not know n (%) | 1 (.02) | 1 (.08) |

### Feeling

| Younger n (%) | 34 (.67) | 17 (.81) | 5 (.42) | 12 (.67) |
| Mentally younger, physically not n (%) | 5 (.10) | 3 (.14) | 1 (.08) | 1 (.06) |
| Equals age | 9 (.18) | 1 (.05) | 4 (.33) | 4 (.22) |
| Ageless | 2 (.04) | 1 (.08) | 1 (.06) |
| No answer | 1 (.02) | 1 (.08) |

### Age others perceive them

| Younger n (%) | 39 (.76) | 18 (.86) | 8 (.67) | 13 (.72) |
| Equals age n (%) | 2 (.04) | 1 (.08) | 1 (.06) |
| Not younger n (%) | 1 (.02) | 1 (.08) |
| Depends on others age n (%) | 2 (0.4) | 1 (.05) |
| Older n (%) | 1 (.02) | 1 (.05) |
| No idea n (%) | 6 (.12) | 2 (.10) | 2 (.17) | 2 (.11) |

### Own health

| (very) good n (%) | 43 (.84) | 16 (.76) | 11 (.92) | 16 (.89) |
Results

Data provided by the respondents to the diverse questions are depicted in Table 1. We will discuss the outcomes by using the sequence of the research questions.

Research question 1: Which HR practices tend to prevail for older workers?

Before turning to the results we should stress in this respect that mere HR practices focused on particular older workers are taken into account. The effect of this restriction is that although nearly all respondents mentioned lifters and ergonomic coaches as a deployed HR practice, these were never used age-specific and consequently not elaborated.

An overview of the answer on research question 1 is displayed in Table 3. Distinctions between maintenance and development and among the different success items are reported which creates the opportunity to shine some light on the following research question.

Table 3 Deployed HR practices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance/ Development</th>
<th>HR practice n (%)</th>
<th>Effectiveness</th>
<th>Efficiency</th>
<th>Implemented</th>
<th>Considered relevant</th>
<th>Job alleviation</th>
<th>Personal efficacy</th>
<th>Job enrichment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>No compulsory night shifts 55+</td>
<td>37 (.73)</td>
<td>37 (.73)</td>
<td>4.58 (2.73)</td>
<td>7.67 (1.48)</td>
<td>7.03 (1.74)</td>
<td>5.67 (4.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37 (.73)</td>
<td>37 (.73)</td>
<td>4.58 (2.73)</td>
<td>7.67 (1.48)</td>
<td>7.03 (1.74)</td>
<td>5.67 (4.95)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Additional leave 55+</td>
<td>25 (.49)</td>
<td>25 (.49)</td>
<td>4.21 (2.66)</td>
<td>7.50 (1.38)</td>
<td>6.09 (2.12)</td>
<td>5.86 (2.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25 (.49)</td>
<td>25 (.49)</td>
<td>4.21 (2.66)</td>
<td>7.50 (1.38)</td>
<td>6.09 (2.12)</td>
<td>5.86 (2.49)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Personal lifespan Budget: the older the more hours</td>
<td>14 (.27)</td>
<td>14 (.27)</td>
<td>5.67 (3.54)</td>
<td>7.00 (3.54)</td>
<td>7.00 (3.54)</td>
<td>5.67 (3.54)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14 (.27)</td>
<td>14 (.27)</td>
<td>5.67 (3.54)</td>
<td>7.00 (3.54)</td>
<td>7.00 (3.54)</td>
<td>5.67 (3.54)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Early (parttime) retirement</td>
<td>6 (.12)</td>
<td>6 (.12)</td>
<td>4.60 (4.04)</td>
<td>7.64 (1.91)</td>
<td>7.64 (1.91)</td>
<td>4.60 (4.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6 (.12)</td>
<td>6 (.12)</td>
<td>4.60 (4.04)</td>
<td>7.64 (1.91)</td>
<td>7.64 (1.91)</td>
<td>4.60 (4.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Transition consultant</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>7.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Flexible scheduling to meet demands older workers</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>No more job rotation behind 50</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Sessions for 55+ to maintain health and motivate 55+</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Development</td>
<td>8.67</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.83</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Mentorship (mentoring youngsters by the older workers)</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>7.50</td>
<td>8.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.71</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Additional course for the older workers on time recording/ICT</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Attention for health of the employee</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td></td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: with two figures in 1 cell the first figures result from the perspective of the employee and the second from the perspective of the organization.

Note: scores can vary from 1-10
Research question 2: To what extent are the HR practices focused on maintenance or development?

The totality of 12 kinds of HR practices that were measured entailed four (33.33%) that fit in development HR practices. From Table 3 it is apparent as well that of the totality of 97 HR practices that were mentioned, only 7 (7.22%) fit in development HR practice. This brings us to one of the most striking results: maintenance HR practices are mentioned by far the most. We found participants emphasizing two issues: No compulsory night shifts for 55+ workers (73%) and Additional leave/Personal lifespan budget\(^1\) (76%). These are followed at great distance by Early retirement (12%). Other maintenance and development HR practices are only mentioned between two and six percent.

Research question 3 To what extent are the deployed HR practices successful in terms of

\begin{itemize}
  \item [a)] satisfying the purpose for which they are intended
  \item [b)] being in balance to time, money and effort
  \item [c)] are they actually implemented
  \item [d)] considered relevant
  \item [e)] contributing to job alleviation
  \item [f)] contributing to personal enrichment
  \item [g)] contributing to job enrichment
\end{itemize}

Table 3 shows the elaboration of success of HR practices by working out maintenance HR practices followed by development practices. This table shows elaborations of success items as well: effectiveness, efficiency, implemented, considered relevant, job alleviation, job enrichment and personal efficacy. Out of the total of 12 distinguished deployed HR practices 84 HR practices successes were measured. The mean score on general success (i.e. content

\(^1\) PLB’s starting point is to abolish the additional leave but is still in a transitional phase which the older workers face.
issues and JD-R issues taken together) was 6.68 (employee perspective on some success issues) and 6.67 (organization perspective on some success issues) which means overall (ample) sufficient. At the bottom of the results we see Flexible scheduling to meet demands older workers with a score of 5.36 which is narrowly sufficient. At the top we perceive Additional course for the older workers on time recording/ICT with a score of 8.43, mentioned by merely one respondent. Just below the top score is a 7.81 for HR practice Annual/job development interviews focused on career/life after retirement. Of a totality of 84 possible results on success items we could discern 70 results that were assessed as successful and 13 assessed as not successful (one score was not provided).

Assessed Success regarding the Maintenance HR practices

The results of the success items of most frequently mentioned HR practices - No compulsory night shifts for 55+ workers (73%) and Additional leave / Personal lifespan budget (76%) - show the same pattern. Whereas the scores on all items were assessed as being sufficient, job alleviation scored insufficiently, and job enrichment narrowly under and above the neutral demarcation. These two HR practices can be considered as being successful, except for reduction of job demands (surprisingly) and, to some lesser extent, for increasing job enrichment. As we expected job demands executed by maintenance HR practices would produce high scores on job alleviation and low scores on personal efficacy and job enrichment – related to job resources and therefore development HR practices, this appeared not to be the case for job alleviation. Further inspection of the data provides more detailed results.

Although these above mentioned HR practices score rather high on effectiveness additional leave to some extent less which is due to the high degree of part-timers: they hoard their hours and do not use these hours to enhance their vitality. As a respondent said:
“For the full timers I gave an eight, but the effectiveness for the part-timers is only a four. Part-timers work less and do not need additional leave to build an additional reservoir of additional leave hours.”

These two maintenance HR practices score slightly lower on efficiency than on effectiveness. It is often stated that the implementation of these HR practices can be difficult for employers, especially when many employees are over 55. Adjusted schedules must be constructed which takes some effort. For the employees concerned it can be convenient but the younger colleagues have to pay for it. This HR practice is called Personal Lifespan Budget (PLB) at hospitals in which older workers get more hours for leisure time. PLB scored lower with a 6.10 than additional leave (6.86/6.45) and no compulsory night shifts (7.15/6.86). The background is aptly described by one respondent: “Employees are positive but managers fear the banking of the additional hours and a prediction of a shortage of employees in the longer run.” Moreover, the current older workers still face transitional arrangements and are awarded extra hours. This will change in future when employees, regardless of age, will receive the same number of hours which will be granted upon request when needed.

As Table 3 shows these HR practices are actually sufficiently implemented (7.62/7.55, 7.48/7.38, 7.00) and these HR practices were considered relevant as well (7.67/7.61, 7.5/7.29, 6.56), although the relevance for PLB scored one point lower than No compulsory night shifts and additional leave. This difference could imply that hospitals have less necessity of additional hours for 55+ employees than the care and cure branch. Another reason of this discrepancy could be due to a somewhat different content of PLB with respect to additional leave for over 55+: currently, PLB is an instrument for all employees but the hours incur the older the employee gets.

---

3 The first figure is the result from the perspective of the employee and the second from the perspective of the organization.
All the mentioned HR practices show little job alleviation (4.58/4.21/4.00). Reduction of job demands was said to be the most used HR practice (Van der Heijden et al, 2009). These maintenance HR practices do not appear to be associated with job alleviation. Although exemption from night shifts includes fewer tasks, employees in the night shifts work alone and are responsible for a substantial number of clients. This individual responsibility can be experienced as extraordinary stressful. Consequently job alleviation has a low score which was expressed by a respondent as follows: “The older employee can get other tasks, but no fewer tasks.”

The question whether older workers became more resilient (personal efficacy) due to the HR practices was responded by scores from 6.09 (PLB) till 7.36 (no compulsory night shifts). Respondents indicate a higher personal efficacy due to particularly the balanced combination of work and private which provides more relaxation. They get more job satisfaction. More leisure time also has his disadvantages: “It is sometimes difficult to keep up the skills. Due to many days off you walk behind the other employees” (respondent) and someone gets accustomed to additional leave hours as well.

Whether the job became more purposeful (job enrichment), scores were respectively 5.34, 4.91 and 5.86. The results have a large range and often the answer ‘not applicable’ is given. In general these HR practices do not cause changes in the job and although older workers prefer being exempted from night shifts, this could be due to another perception as well which is related to personal efficacy. A respondent: “No, work is not getting more interesting when you turn 55”. Turning now to the other mentioned maintenance HR practices we see some other results.

As stated before, Early retirement (12%) has the same patterns as the above mentioned HR practices but different explanations. The aim (early full-/part-time retirement) is certainly achieved (effectiveness: 7.80) but unfortunately at the cost of finance: “High
premiums employees must pay when they wish to retire early”. Efficiency consequently scored a 7.00. The background on the low score on job alleviation (5.67) is legitimate since an employee retires part-/or fulltime but in case of part-time retirement nothing will be altered in the job. The same reasoning applies for job enrichment.

Transition consultant – i.e. a mentor who supports women who enter the life phase of menopause - is mentioned three times (6%) and scored high on implementation (8.00). Respondents differed widely on their responses in terms of need even though they work in the same organization. In any case no job alleviation was found (4.50) but personal efficacy and job enrichment scored high (7.50 and 8.00). Employees gain knowledge how to deal with and get attention for their problem resulting in feeling better. Job enrichment scored high due to the linkage with personal efficacy. As stated by one of the respondents: “Work comes to a better advantage by a more appropriate alignment of combination work/private life”.

Flexible scheduling to meet demands older workers (4%) involves employees who can specify their preferences which will be taken into account. Less frequent and less prolonged absence are the (intended) consequences. Nevertheless, this HR practice scored lowest on all mean scores (5.36). It does apparently contribute to the aim of the practice – it has an ample sufficient (7.00) on effectiveness – that exposes in less absence. The same goes for efficiency (5.50). The reason for not always implementing (4.50) is related to the alignment of the schedules; it should also be possible to meet the demands in the planning process. The score of 6.50 on considered relevant is in fairly line with the explanation: “Yes, the need for this is great”. The ground for a 4.00 on job alleviation is the job does not change itself. Hence, job enrichment (4.50) was assessed for the same reason with an insufficient score. Very different scores were given to personal efficacy (8.00 and 3.00) that has an outcome just on the edge of neutral. As it was stated an employee becomes more
resilient when they are involved in the planning. Employees appreciate that. The other respondent however does not see any improvement in personal efficacy.

Two respondents (4%) mentioned HR practice *No more job rotation behind 50*. That implies heavier tasks need not to be executed by older workers. Consequently there are high scores on effectiveness (9.00) and on job alleviation (8.00) and personal efficacy (8.00) as well. This is at the expense of the younger employees who have to deal with heavier tasks. That explains the 5.00 on actual implementation: this HR practice is at the expense of other team members and the aim is to find a match which is also dependent of other colleagues.

*Sessions for older workers to maintain health and motivate them* (2%) miss their aim and score on effectiveness a 3.00: of the employees over 55 there are only two out of ten who participate. So it is implemented but it is apparently not considered relevant. It takes little effort to organize (efficiency is an 8.00). Strikingly are the 7.00 and 8.00 scores for, respectively, job alleviation and job enrichment as we would expect no changes in the job due to these sessions. A respondent explains: "Employees can learn from it which results through more motivation and pleasure in job alleviation and more job enrichment".

*Development HR practices*

None of the development HR practices are mentioned more than three times. A vigilant attitude about the results is appropriate but nevertheless we can mention some highlights especially related to the wishes of the respondents. Furthermore we agree that development HR practices are practices focused on older workers and provide perspective on other tasks, development of work, and growth in a broad sense. Although this definition has some stretch, only four HR practices can be discerned.
Annual job development interviews (6%) focused on career/life after retirement has high scores on every aspect but job alleviation to a somewhat lesser extent. Strikingly this HR practice is only mentioned three times. This appears to be a somewhat distorted picture of the job development interviews: in general they seem to be conducted but not aimed specifically at the older workers whereby they are not included in this study. This HR practice specifically aimed at the older worker is mentioned most frequently with the wishes (see below).

The same pattern of high scores applies to Mentorship (4%) but to a much lesser extent. On all aspects but job alleviation (4.5) added with job enrichment (5.5) this HR practice has sufficient scores and is mentioned three times with the wishes.

An additional course for the older workers on time recording/ICT (2%) has very high scores on effectiveness, efficiency, implementation and considered relevant (10). It does not provide job alleviation (3), in contrast: more tasks get included, but employees become more resilient (8) and the job becomes more significant as well (8).

About Attention for health of the employee (2%) that is deployed in one hospital we cannot say much about the effect of, in this case, the measuring of the workability since this practice is still in its infancy.

Overall, we could say that for most HR practices the respondents gave sufficient or higher scores, although some variances are relatively high. Furthermore, we have found that nearly 20% (19.64%) of the Maintenance HR practices are assessed as being insufficient, again with a considerable variance. With regard to development HR practices we have found that only 7.14% of the Development HR practices are evaluated as being insufficient.

Differences among three target groups
No significant differences in prevalence of HR practices among the three target groups have been found. Table 4 shows HR practices which are mentioned more than once. No compulsory night shifts and additional leave are mentioned by far the most by all groups. Older workers were expected to mention fewer HR practices, which appeared the case. The most prominent HR practices were mentioned by HR professionals and line managers much more frequently (92%/78% versus 57% and 75%/89% versus 67%). With regard to the success scores we can conclude that the different target groups do not show considerable differences (see Table 4) except for Early Retirement where considered relevant and job alleviation were given insufficient scores by older workers, and the HR professionals gave lower scores on job enrichment.
Table 4 Deployed HR practices per target group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HR practice</th>
<th>Older workers 21 (.41)</th>
<th>Line managers 12 (.24)</th>
<th>HR professionals 18 (.35)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practice</td>
<td>n (%) / targetgroup</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No compulsory</td>
<td>12 (.57)</td>
<td>11 (.92)</td>
<td>14 (.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>night shifts</td>
<td>37 (.73)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>1. 8.32 (1.31)</td>
<td>2. 7.18 (1.17)</td>
<td>3. 7.25 (1.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 7.45 (2.02)</td>
<td>5. 4.64 (2.69)</td>
<td>6. 7.91 (1.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. 6.25 (1.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional</td>
<td>14 (.67)</td>
<td>9 (.75)</td>
<td>16 (.89)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>leave incl Personal Life Budget (PLB)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>1. 7.57 (1.28)</td>
<td>2. 7.46 (1.27)</td>
<td>3. 7.20 (2.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 7.58 (1.36)</td>
<td>5. 4.91 (3.08)</td>
<td>6. 7.36 (1.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. 6.11 (2.13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early retirement</td>
<td>2 (.10)</td>
<td>1 (.08)</td>
<td>3 (.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>1. 6.75 (1.73)</td>
<td>2. 6.25 (1.73)</td>
<td>3. 7.47 (1.53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. 6.63 (1.53)</td>
<td>5. 5.50 (1.82)</td>
<td>6. 6.36 (2.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. 6.75 (1.82)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
<td>M (SD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition consultant</td>
<td>1 (.05)</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2 (.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 5.00</td>
<td>2. 5.00</td>
<td>3. 5.00</td>
<td>4. 5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behind 50 no more job rotation</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>2 (.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 9.00</td>
<td>2. 7.00</td>
<td>3. 9.00</td>
<td>4. 9.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual/Job development interviews focused on career/life after retirement</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>1 (.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 8.00</td>
<td>2. 8.00</td>
<td>3. 8.00</td>
<td>4. 8.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note: with two figures in 1 cell the first figures result from the perspective of the employee/fulltime worker and the second from the perspective of the organization.

Note: Scores can vary from 1-10.
Overall, it seems that actually a large emphasis is existent on maintenance HR development practices whereas the most successful scores are to discover in development HR practices. On completion of the actual depiction of the deployed HR practices we will observe the existing wishes of the distinguished target groups.

1. **Research question 4: Which HR practices for older workers are wanted by those affected by the older workers, the line managers, and the HR professionals?**

Table 5 shows that 51 respondents provided 10 maintenance, mentioned in total 25 times and 7 development HR practices, mentioned 35 times that are wished/needed. The expectation that older workers would want to be fostered by deployment of development HR practices focused on enforcing job resources is partly supported.

Results of the wishes show that *Career coaching and/or interviews manager-employee* is mentioned most frequently (11). This development HR practice can take many forms. Sometimes it is referred to as interviews with the manager with the employee, and sometimes refined with a focus on the current (growth) possibilities of the employee. It is also mentioned to resolve why some older workers do/cannot change. The mindset of management and line managers should change as well in order to be more responsive to older workers. In addition career coaching outside the organization is mentioned.

Less often development HR practices as *Attention for health of the employee* is mentioned (7) but taken together with *Sport facilities* (4), this is mentioned as often as Career coaching. As a respondent states it: “Management should pay more attention to the health of employees and not just for the patients”. Aspects as annual health tests and inspection, and measuring of work ability are included. Once the presence of an industrial psychologist was stated as a wish. Sport facilities can be considered as sporting at a reduced rate.
Nine times the need for *Flexible schedules and better working hours* which are maintenance HR practices and therefore aiming to reduce job demands was mentioned. Schedules should be adapted to the capacity of the employee, and management should look how to deal with additional leave of older workers. Dealing flexibly with questions as starting later is a wish as well.

*Job alleviation/adaptation* is mentioned 9 times as well. Seconding older workers to workplaces which are less demanding physically and mentally is an option. This aspect can take the form of maintenance (alleviation) and development (adaptation to new job circumstances) as well.

Table 5 shows all HR practices which are mentioned four times or less as well. Carousel is defined by more mobility, for instance up to five years in one department. Computer courses for older workers in case of changes in ICT which can lead to other job content with more responsibilities. In order to ensure continuity contact persons may be imported.

*Table 5 Wishes per target group*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maintenance/development</th>
<th>HR practice</th>
<th>Mentioned as a deployed HR practice</th>
<th>Times mentioned</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>Flexible scheduling, better hours</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OW=5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LM=2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HR=2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job alleviation</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>OW=4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LM=2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>HR=1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*On the one hand instruments are mentioned which are known from Table 3. On the other hand new HR practices are mentioned.*
|   | 3 Early retirement | Yes | 2 OW=1  
|   |                   |     | LM=1  
|   | 4 Additional leave | Yes | 1 OW=1  
|   |                   |     | LM=1  
|   | 5 More paid breaks | No  | 1 OW=1  
|   |                   |     |  
|   | 6 Increased salary | No  | 1 OW=1  
|   |                   |     |  
|   | 7 Working more     | No  | 1 OW=1  
|   |                   |     |  
|   | 8 Reducing workload| No  | 1 OW=1  
|   |                   |     |  
|   | 9 Facilitating hobby which is not necessarily linked to job to find passion | No | 1 HR=1  
|   |                   |     |  
|   | 10 Peer conversation/communication with colleagues | No | 1 OW=1  
|   |                   |     |  
| Development | 11 Career coaching and/or interviews manager-employee | Yes | 11 OW=3  
|   |                   |     | LM=2  
|   |                   |     | HR=6  
|   | 12 Attention for health of the employee | Yes | 7 OW=3  
|   |                   |     | LM=1  
|   |                   |     | HR=3  
|   | 13 Sport facilities | No<sup>5</sup> | 4 OW=1  
|   |                   |     | LM=1  
|   |                   |     | HR=2  
|   | 14 Carousel        | Yes<sup>6</sup> | 4 OW=1  
|   |                   |     | HR=3  
|   | 15 Computer course for older workers in case of changes | Yes | 4  

<sup>5</sup> It was not mentioned age-specific.  
<sup>6</sup> This is mentioned the other way around: no job rotation for older workers. Apparently a need exists for job rotation for older workers.
Differences among three target groups

Interestingly, older workers provided most of all wishes (28) whereas HR professionals presented 21 ideas followed at great distance by line managers (11). Older workers emphasize flexible scheduling (5) and job alleviation (4). On the other hand HR professionals accentuate career coaching and/or interviews manager-employee (6) whereas older workers mention that HR practice three times and line managers twice. Older workers come across with solutions in attention for health of the employee/sport facilities and computer courses for older workers in case of changes as well. HR professionals appear to aim their solutions at development HR practices like career coaching and/or interviews manager-employee (6), and to some lesser extent at attention for health of employee/together with sport facilities (5) and carousel (3).

Overall we can state that solutions appear to be found in deploying development HR practices but flexible scheduling and job alleviation still need attention to retain older workers’ work engagement.

Discussion

7 This is about being a mentor for younger colleagues.
Reflection upon the Outcomes

In this study, we aimed to construct an overview of deployed HR practices, how their assessments were experienced by three different target groups, and which wishes exist in those groups.

Deployed HR practices

First, we found maintenance HR practices mentioned by far most of the times, in all target groups. This is in line with the JD-R model in which the balance currently tends to reduce the job demands (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007; Van der Heijden et al., 2009). Furthermore we found relative high to sufficient scores in these practices except for job alleviation and job enrichment. The lower scores on job enrichment are in line with JD-R model whereas job alleviation was expected to be higher. Those HR practices focused on sparing the elderly were considered to cause job alleviation.

Interestingly, respondents provided (ample) sufficient scores on personal efficacy which was not expected. It might be that employees feel better, more resilient due to a better balance between their work and private environment which is in line with the quite high scores on effectiveness, efficiency, implementation and considered relevant. Those maintenance HR practices do not instigate job alleviation since HR practices themselves do not entail lighter duties, but more other duties or fewer hours with the same tasks.

Although we must be cautious in our conclusions about the development HR practices, as they are not mentioned frequently, we can discover a main theme. In line with our expectations the results show more (ample) sufficient scores with an accent on all success issues, except job alleviation. Also we found in line with our expectations, development HR practices obtained in general higher scores on personal efficacy and job enrichment which foster job resources.
Wishes

Strikingly, whereas we miss maintenance HR practices which have to do with working relations at all, and it is only mentioned once with the development HR practices, on the other hand we see career coaching and/or (development) interviews between manager and employee mentioned most often. Apparently a lot could be gained deploying this (more often). Although annual development interviews are often deployed for all ages, there seems to be an opportunity to design annual job interviews tailored for older workers.

Furthermore, in case of sport facilities and attention for the health of the employee are deployed –which is seldom the case- it is always offered to all ages. It seems that as sport facilities are required for all ages, attention for health of the employee might be focused on the older workers. Often this is mentioned by respondents with a refinement to older (and long sick) workers.

As only 2% have mentioned attention for the health of the employee as a deployed development HR practice it makes us cautious in the relationship, especially with the knowledge this measure has just been introduced.

In addition, flexible scheduling and better working hours are mentioned nine times. Especially wishes such as starting later, and flexible but regular schedules are mentioned primarily by the target group of older workers. Finally, whereas we found ‘Behind 50 no more job rotation’ as a deployed maintenance HR practice (Table 3) with good scores on job alleviation this HR practice is mentioned seven times as a wish/need. The idea of learning and doing new things might appear challenging, but on the other hand the knowledge of being secure of the current job with which an employee is familiar is seductive as well.

In sum, although the majority of employees are quite healthy, their work engagement including vitality might improve by deploying more development HR practices, alongside the existing maintenance HR practices.
Limitations of the study and recommendations for future research

Firstly, although the distinction between maintenance and development HR practices is an elaborated one (Kooij, 2010), there is no one accepted theory for classifying various practices into different bundles or categories (Boselie, Dietz, & Boon, 2005). As we argued some HR practices were not uniformly subject to maintenance or development HR practices which have dependency of the interpretation of the HR practice. We have chosen to align those under development HR practices with the vision that even mere prospect of growth and development of the job or employee’s competences leads to the category of development HR practices.

Secondly, all data is mostly based upon a feminine sample in a quite feminine environment whereas results would be interesting in a more gender-balanced environment (Verdonk, Benschop, De Haes, & Lagro-Janssen, 2009). Research into generalizability of our findings to other occupational settings and/or countries is recommended.

Thirdly, in our study, the distinction between older (>55) and younger workers is mere based on chronological or calendar age, whereas chronological age appears to function as a proxy indicator for a broad constellation of age-related processes (Kooij et al., 2008; Kanfer & Ackerman, 2004).

Future research should be focused on deployment of development HR practices, possibly tailor-made, whereas the focus should remain on maintenance HR practices as well.

Theoretical contributions

The findings of this study contain two main theoretical contributions. First, we found support that the current HR practices are mainly focused on the maintenance side, and more specifically, by reducing employees’ job demands. However, these practices were assessed as being effective, efficient, regarded as relevant and implemented in the organizations. Far fewer development HR practices were mentioned but they had higher scores on job
enrichment and personal efficacy. Most wishes mentioned were closely linked to development HR practices. So we have found support for the JD-R model which states to vitalize employees should be done by putting in more job resources (Bakker et al., 2007).

Second, we have added a list of wishes of the relevant target group (see also Roman et al., 2009). Thereby we offered a list of deployed HR practices, a state-of-the-art, while relating this to an ability to revitalize (older) workers. We know now to focus on which HR practices.

**Practical implications**

HR practices focused on retention of older workers are experienced as being effective. Although governments are breaking down these practices by law (such as no compulsory nightshifts, extra leave for older workers and early retirement), these are appreciated by the older workers.

Development HR practices are deployed much less, but nevertheless scored high, in particular on job enrichment and personal efficacy (job and personal resources). More attention for career coaching and/or development interviews between manager and older worker, attention for health of the employee together with sport facilities and job adaptation are practical HR practices which could be deployed to revitalize older workers. Nevertheless, for the Maintenance HR practices that are evaluated positively in terms of success, wide considerable variances are existent.
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Appendix

Interview scheme (English version will be provided at the Dutch HRM Network Conference).
INTERVIEWSCHEMA VOOR ONDERZOEK NAAR MAATREGELEN OM 55+‘ERS VITAAL AAN HET WERK TE HOUDEN BINNEN DE ZORGBRANCHE

Naam interviewer:

Nummer organisatie:

Nummer respondent (1-4):

Datum interview: Tijdstip aanvang:

Plaats:
Interviewschema – LIJST A

a) Open het interview (uit: www.silius.nl)

Na de begroeting en de gebruikelijke koetjes-en-kalfjes ("Een hele reis, zeker?", "Hebt u het gemakkelijk kunnen vinden?", "Wat een prachtig locatie voor uw kantoor" enz. enz.) maak je een formele start met het interview.

b) Leid het interview in met een paar woorden over de volgende aspecten:

- Wat is het onderwerp van het interview: het onderwerp is de vitaliteit van de oudere medewerker in de Zorg en mee in het bijzonder de rol van HRM in het bevorderen van dit vitaliteit.
- Welk hoofddoel dient het interview: het hoofddoel is: We willen zo objectief mogelijke informatie over de inzet van maatregelen om medewerkers en mn 55+érs vitaal aan het werk te houden binnen de Zorgbranche.

Welke maatregelen worden ingezet, wat zijn de ervaringen met die maatregelen en welke behoeftes/ideeën bestaan er aan/over beleid op het gebied van vitalisering van oudere medewerkers?
We stellen de vragen aan de hand van 4 rubrieken over arbeidsvoorwaarden, - omstandigheden, - inhoud en – verhoudingen.

- Op welke wijze wordt het interview uitgewerkt? De uitwerking wordt gedaan m.b.v. opnameapparatuur, maar dat blijft geheel anoniem.
- Wat gebeurt er met de aldus verkregen resultaten? De resultaten worden per organisatie uitgewerkt en opvallendheden worden per soort organisatie genoemd.
- Hoe lang zal het interview duren? Het zal ongeveer één uur duren.

c) Vraag vervolgens expliciet of geïnterviewde je verhaal heeft begrepen.


d) Start het interview door de eerste vraag van de eerste rubriek uit je globale interviewschema te stellen.

e) Werk netjes alle rubrieken van je interviewschema af, waarbij je:
- juist geformuleerde vragen stelt
- goed luistert naar het antwoord van geïnterviewde
- het antwoord van geïnterviewde evalueert tegen de gestelde (sub)doelen
- in geval van een negatief resultaat van de evaluatie doorvraagt
- de antwoorden noteert (ook als opnameapparatuur meeloopt)
I ARBEIDSVOORWAARDEN

Wat wordt er zoal gedaan vanuit de CAO op het gebied van 55+? Wat wordt er zoal gedaan aan arbeidsvoorwaarden voor 55+?
Zie de respondentkaart Arbeidsvoorwaarden.
Steekwoorden:

Als minimaal een maatregel voorkomt dan lijst B Arbeidsvoorwaarden erbij om de maatregel(en) meer uit te werken!
II ARBEIDSOMSTANDIGHEDEN

Wat wordt gedaan op het gebied van arbeidsomstandigheden voor 55+ ers?
Zie de respondentkaart Arbeidsomstandigheden.
Steekwoorden:

Als minimaal een maatregel voorkomt dan lijst B Arbeidsomstandigheden erbij om de maatregel(en) meer uit te werken!
III ARBEIDSINHOUD

Wat wordt er zoal gedaan aan Arbeidsinhoud om 55+’ers vitaal aan het werk te houden.
Zie de respondentkaart Arbeidsinhoud.
Steekwoorden:

Als minimaal een maatregel voorkomt dan lijst B Arbeidsinhoud erbij om de maatregel(en) meer uit te werken!
IV ARBEIDSVERHOUDINGEN

Wat wordt er zoal gedaan aan arbeidsverhoudingen/relaties, communicatie, overleg om 55+ ers vitaal aan het werk te houden?
Zie de respondentkaart Arbeidsverhoudingen.
Steekwoorden:

Als minimaal een maatregel voorkomt dan lijst B Arbeidsverhoudingen erbij om de maatregel(en) meer uit te werken!
V ALGEMEEN

Wat wordt er overkoepelend gedaan aan beleid om 55+’ers vitaal aan het werk te houden
Zie de respondentkaart Algemeen.
Steekwoorden:

Als minimaal een maatregel voorkomt dan lijst B Algemeen erbij om de maatregel(en) meer uit te werken!
LIJST B – I ARBEIDSVOORWAARDEN

Checklist:

1. Maatwerk/ à la carte
2. Deeltijdpensioen (partieel uittreden)
3. Maatwerkroosters (werktijden)
4. PAGO
5. Dispensatie nacht-weekenddienst (werktijden)
6. Overwerk voorkomen
7. Seniorendagen
8. Coaching
9. Psychosociale hulpverlening
10. Samenwerking met zorgverzekeraar
11. Programma ‘Leren grenzen aangeven’
12. Arbeidsparticipatie van oudere medewerkers
13. Overgangsconsulent
14. Faciliteren goede lifestyle
15. Vrije dagen niet uitbetalen
16. Stimuleren keuzepensioen
17. Langer doorwerken na 65
LIJST B – II ARBEIDSOMSTANDIGHEDEN

Checklist:

1. Programma fysieke belasting
2. Arbogesprekken
3. Opstellen functiebelastingprofiel
4. Aandacht voor veiligheid (VCA)
5. Opdrachten aanpassen aan het seizoen
6. Inzet hulpmiddelen
LIJST B – III ARBEIDSINHOUD

Checklist:

1. Taakroolatie
2. Interne overplaatsing
3. Benutten van EVC’s
4. Functieverbreiding
5. Opleidingsbeleid/POP
6. Employabilitybeleid
7. Demotie
8. Ad hoc brainstormsessies
LIJST B – IV ARBEIDSVERHOUDINGEN

Checklist:

1. Stijl van leidinggeven
2. Opzetten specifieke overlegvormen (bv. Seniorenraad of ambassadeursraad)
3. Verantwoordelijkheden delegeren (*KV teveel/weinig*)
4. Interne communicatie/gesprekken (individueel/groep)
5. Beleid in samenspraak (sociocratisch)
6. Creëren sfeer van veiligheid
7. Open organisatiestructuur
LIJST B – V ALGEMEEN

Checklist:

1. Functioneringsgesprekken
2. Jongeren vóór uitstroom aannemen
3. Mentorschap instellen
4. Goede beeldvorming ouderen/positieve benadering
5. Verzuimgesprekken
6. Geïndividualiseerde informatie
7. Nadruk op gezondheid
8. Brancheorganisaties: leden spiegel voorhouden
9. Benutten intersectorale netwerken
10. Samenwerking fysiotherapeut
11. Best practices communiceren
12. Sociaal gezicht management
13. Tevreden zijn met minder winst
14. Herplaatsingscommissie
15. Verzuim: computerprogramma met signalering
16. Ouderen op projecten inzetten
Oké, naar aanleiding van Arbeidsvoorwaarden/Arbeidsomstandigheden/Arbeidsinhoud/Arbeidsoverhoudingen/Algemene maatregelen:

u hebt .... maatregelen genoemd. Ik stel u nu vragen over de inhoud van de maatregel. Graag willen we weten hoe de maatregelen in de organisatie zijn uitgezet en wat uw ervaringen ermee waren/zijn.

Introductie van schaalvragen: 1 - 10

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lukt het om het gewenste doel te behalen??</td>
<td>Staan geld/tijd/moete in verhouding tot de beoogde opbrengst?</td>
<td>Werken alle partijen (werknemer/werkgever) goed mee? (gaat over implementatie)</td>
<td>Is er ook behoefte aan?</td>
<td>Reductie van taakeisen</td>
<td>Vergroten van persoonlijke effectiviteit (word je er weerbaarder van, ga je beter in je vel zitten)</td>
<td>Verrijking (zinvol, toekomstperspectief) van het werk (dat je in je werk beter tot je recht komt, dat je werk er beter van wordt, zich ontwikkelt)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1= totaal niet, 5 = neutraal, 10 volledig)

**Toelichting + Score 1-10**

**MAATREGEL**

Naam:

Doel:

Inhoud:
WENSEN/BEHOEFTE:

Wilt u wat meer vertellen over wensen en/of behoeftes die u hebt ten aanzien van beleid naar oudere medewerkers toe in de toekomst?
Als je alle rubrieken van je interviewschema hebt afgehandeld: sluit het interview af:

- Vraag expliciet aan het eind: zijn er thema’s niet aan de orde gekomen die hier wel aan de orde hadden moeten komen?

We willen graag nog enkele vragen stellen:

- Wat is uw geslacht?
- Wat is uw leeftijd?
- Wat is uw functie?
- Hoe lang oefent u uw functie uit?
- Hoeveel uur per week werkt u (van de 36)?
- Kunt u een indicatie geven van uw salaris(niveau) (schaal/€b.p.m./€b.p.j.)?
- Hoe is uw thuissituatie (in balans, of juist niet, door welke omstandigheden)?
- Heeft u een partner (getrouwd)?
- Heeft u kinderen? Zo ja, hoeveel?
- Heeft u te maken met mantelzorg?
- Hoe wordt uw werk (plezier) beïnvloed door de thuissituatie?
Hoe denkt u over (door)werken?

Kunt u aangeven hoe oud u zich voelt?

Hoe oud ervaren anderen u?

Hoe is uw gezondheid?

AFRONDING:

Reflecteer op het verloop van het interview
Vat kort samen wat volgens jou de belangrijkste resultaten zijn
Geef aan welke deelonderwerpen nadere aandacht verdienen (uiteraard alleen indien van toepassing; zo sla je meteen ook een 'bruggetje' naar het verzoek om een vervolginterview te mogen afnemen, indien van toepassing)
Bedank geïnterviewde voor zijn inzet en medewerking
Maak een afspraak voor een vervolginterview (indien van toepassing)
RESPONDENTKAARTEN:
ARBEIDSVOORWAARDEN

Het gaat hier om maatregelen met betrekking tot werktijden, beloning, werkduur, (pre)pensioen bijvoorbeeld in:

- een arbeidsovereenkomst
- een collectieve arbeidsovereenkomst (cao)
- een andere arbeidsvoorwaardelijke regeling, zoals een organisatieregeling
ARBEIDSOMSTANDIGHEDEN

Het gaat om aanpassingen in de werksituatie.

De Arbeidsomstandighedenwet (of kortweg Arbowet) is een Nederlandse wet die regels bevat voor werkgevers en werknemers om:

- de gezondheid
- de veiligheid
- het welzijn

van werknemers te bevorderen.
ARBEIDSINHOUD

Onder arbeidsinhoud wordt in het algemeen verstaan de omvang en samenstelling van individuele arbeidstaken in termen van concrete activiteiten/werkpakketten of de verzameling objectieve taakkenmerken:

- Bevoegdheden
- Verantwoordelijkheden
- Kenmerken van de voorschriften hoe de taken uitgevoerd dienen te worden

De arbeidsinhoud kan men ook wel samenvatten als:

- de psychische belasting en
- de fysieke belasting (fysieke belasting wordt ook wel ondergebracht bij arbeidsomstandigheden)
ARBEIDSVERHOUDINGEN

De relatie en de bejegening van de oudere medewerkers door het management.
ALGEMEEN

Denk aan bv:

- Functioneringsgesprekken
- Mentorschap
- Verzuimgesprekken
- Beeldvorming omtrent ouderen
- Gezondheid
- Ouderenprojecten