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### Structures
- **National Culture & Economic Status**
- **Education**
- **Health**
- **Housing**
- **Finances/Welfare**

### Approach

#### Inputs, Activities
- **MACRO LEVEL** – Large Systems with infrequent contact
- **GOVERNMENT POLICIES & INTERVENTIONS: TAX REGULATIONS**
  - Health Care
  - Housing
  - Labour Market
  - Technology
- **MESO LEVEL** – Community level systems with at least monthly contact
  - Labour Org
  - Community Services & Support
  - Educational Institution
  - Social Networks
- **MICRO LEVEL** – Home-based level with daily to weekly contact
  - Family
  - Individual

### Short-Medium term Outcome
- **INTERGENERATIONAL SOLIDARITY**
  - Affectual solidarity - quality of relationships
  - Associational solidarity - type and frequency of contact
  - Consensual solidarity - agreement in values
  - Functional solidarity - giving support
  - Normative solidarity - expectations and obligations
  - Structural solidarity - geographic proximity

### Long-term Outcome
- **WELL-BEING**
  - Physical
  - Mental
  - Spiritual
  - Social

### Change over time
It is wonderful that Marijn helps me out in the garden.

Every week I step into the world of a different generation.
Caribu: Senior – student matches
https://careibu.com/nieuws/our-doing-good-movement/

Organised at the national level by a social enterprise
23,000 students enrolled, screened by Caribu
Online applications
Seniors pay 12,50 euro per hour (can be funded by the local government)

Micro – level: matching students with older people
Senior: social support, practical assistance
Student: 7,75 – 10,50 euro per hour, age-dependent
Students volunteer 10 hours per week in social projects in their own neighborhood in exchange for housing.

They ‘adopt’ one family.

VoorUit works in 9 different neighborhoods in Amsterdam.

Different types of projects: language, social, garden, sports etc.
Foundation VoorUit – since 2008

Meso-level: community
Connects neighbors, students and organisations (housing cooperations, city council, universities)

Donations from various philanthropic organisations

Outcomes: social cohesion in neighborhood, individual wellbeing

Structural and long term project
Informal care-friendly policies at work: a requirement for intergenerational solidarity

National level: government funding for tool-kit on website and team
Meso-level: organisation
Solidarity = informal care
Outcome = individual wellbeing
Organizations implement caregiver friendly policy (www.werkenmantelzorg.nl) in 4 steps:

> Online questionnaire: how many caregivers, caregiver attitudes, organizational attitude

> Examples to discuss HRM-policy

> Flyers, workshops to increase awareness and use of formal leave and flexible work arrangements

> Training for managers to discuss the issue in their teams and come up with flexible solutions for their employees

‘We work caregiver friendly’
RESEARCH QUESTION

To what extent juggling work and informal caregiving by employees affects their levels of stress and intentions to alter work situation within the context of caregiver friendly policies

Quantitative: survey among 8,435 employers of 50 organizations, 22% was informal caregiver
RESULTS SURVEY: STRESS = OUTCOME

Average level of stress

- Caregiver: 2
- Non-caregiver: 1.85
RESULTS SURVEY: STRESS = OUTCOME

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caregiving (0,1)</td>
<td>0,22</td>
<td>0,20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (m,v)</td>
<td>0,07</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working fulltime (0,1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0,04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation: Income (0,1)</td>
<td>0,05</td>
<td>-0,06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social motivation (0,1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from organisation (% agree)</td>
<td>-0,13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from manager (% agree)</td>
<td>-0,04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from colleagues for caregivers (1-4)</td>
<td>-0,04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% women in organisation (19%-100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0,06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG*support from organisation</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0,04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG*able to discuss it with manager</td>
<td></td>
<td>0,03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All coefficients p < 0,05
## Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Senior-student</th>
<th>VoorUit</th>
<th>Toolkit caregiver at work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of organisation</strong></td>
<td>National</td>
<td>Neighborhood</td>
<td>National + organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of outcome</strong></td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>Neighborhood + individual</td>
<td>Organisation + individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IGS - dimension</strong></td>
<td>Affectional, associational, functional</td>
<td>Affectional, associational, functional, normative, consensual</td>
<td>Functional, opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>outcome</strong></td>
<td>wellbeing</td>
<td>Social cohesion + wellbeing</td>
<td>Wellbeing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>financed</strong></td>
<td>Private enterprise</td>
<td>Community and philanthropy</td>
<td>National government + organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation?</strong></td>
<td>Under evaluation</td>
<td>descriptives</td>
<td>Descriptives</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TAKE HOME MESSAGE

Developing an intervention;
- What is the objective (type of solidarity, wellbeing)
- What mechanism is used? Solidarity, reciprocity, opportunity
- Who is in charge?
- Who is the focus?
- Structural implementation
- Requires evaluation
- What is needed from policy?
QUESTIONS?