

Working in times of corona in distribution or meat processing

survey among Polish and Romanian workers in the
Netherlands

Lisa Berntsen

with the cooperation of Natalia Skowronek, Daniela Trifu and Paul de Beer

Working Paper

Amsterdam, January 2022

De Burcht, Wetenschappelijk Bureau voor de Vakbeweging (Scientific Research Institute for
the Labour Movement)



Content

<i>List of tables</i>	2
Main findings of the impact of corona-related measures on Polish and Romanian meat and distribution workers in the Netherlands	4
Working in times of Corona in distribution or meat processing: overview of survey results among Polish and Romanian workers in the Netherlands	6
<i>Introduction</i>	6
<i>Method</i>	6
<i>Demographic characteristics</i>	8
<i>Employment situation in the Netherlands</i>	11
<i>Work in times of corona</i>	15
<i>Housing conditions</i>	19
<i>Travel conditions</i>	22
<i>Corona-related risks at the workplace, living accommodation and during travel from and to work</i>	24
<i>Health</i>	27
<i>Corona measures and support structures</i>	31
Appendix	33

List of tables

Table 1 Gender distribution survey respondents by sector and nationality.....	8
Table 2 Age composition survey respondents by sector	8
Table 3 Level of education survey respondents by sector and nationality.....	9
Table 4 Arrival during or before corona of survey respondents by sector and nationality	10
Table 5 Start current job survey respondents by sector and nationality.....	11
Table 6 Corona-related workplace measures taken per sector	16
Table 7 Social distancing possible at the workplace by sector and nationality	17
Table 8 Feeling safe at work due to corona-measures taken by sector and nationality	18
Table 9 Corona-related measures in shared accommodation.....	21
Table 10 Corona-related measures during employer-arranged work-home commute	22
Table 11 Travel abroad during corona-pandemic by sector and nationality	23
Table 12 Average score on corona-risk scales by nationality, sector, contract and length of stay in the Netherlands	25
Table 13 Linear regression of corona-related risks.....	26
Table 14 Did you do a corona-test the last time you had corona-related symptoms?.....	27
Table 15 Preventive corona-testing by sector and nationality	28
Table 16 Vaccination by nationality.....	30
Table 17 Willingness to be vaccinated by sector and nationality	30
Table 18 Dutch language proficiency survey respondents by sector and nationality	33
Table 19 English language proficiency survey respondents by sector and nationality.....	33
Table 20 Marital status survey respondents by nationality.....	33
Table 21 Place of living children survey respondents by nationality	34
Table 22 Duration of current stay in the Netherlands survey respondents by sector and nationality.	34
Table 23 Companies survey respondents by sector and nationality	35

Table 24 Language temporary agency contract survey respondents by sector and nationality	37
Table 25 Overview of TWA employers survey respondents by sector and nationality	37
Table 26 Average working week survey respondents by sector and nationality.....	38
Table 27 Working hours survey respondents by sector and nationality	39
Table 28 Guaranteed working hours survey respondents by sector and nationality	39
Table 29 Contract termination period by length of stay in the Netherlands.....	39
Table 30 Gross hourly wage survey respondents by sector and nationality	40
Table 31 Sufficient income to support family by sector and nationality	40
Table 32 Which PPE is used in the workplace by survey respondents by sector and nationality.....	41
Table 33 Reasons for inadequate use of PPE at the workplace by sector	41
Table 34 Reasons inadequate follow-up corona-related workplace measures by sector and nationality	42
Table 35 Instructions corona-related workplace measures by sector	42
Table 36 Work team composition survey respondents by sector	42
Table 37 Where to address non-compliance corona workplace measures by sector and nationality ..	43
Table 38 Municipal registration survey respondents by sector and nationality.....	44
Table 39 Duration of stay current accommodation survey respondents by sector and nationality	44
Table 40 Who arranged accommodation by sector and nationality	45
Table 41 Duration of stay current accommodation by self- and agency-arranged accommodation ...	45
Table 42 Type of accommodation by sector and nationality.....	45
Table 43 Type of accommodation by self- and agency-arranged accommodation	46
Table 44 Co-habitants survey respondents by sector and nationality.....	46
Table 45 Co-habitants survey respondents by who arranged the accommodation by nationality	46
Table 46 Number of co-habitants of survey respondents in shared housing	47
Table 47 Shared facilities in shared accommodation survey respondents by sector and nationality ..	47
Table 48 Monthly rent by who arranged accommodation and sector	47
Table 49 Monthly rent by bedroom share.....	48
Table 50 Rent reasonable by who arranged the accommodation and sector	48
Table 51 Work-home commute time by sector and nationality.....	49
Table 52 Mode of transport work-home commute by sector and nationality	49
Table 53 Family doctor registration by who arranged accommodation and nationality.....	50
Table 54 Information sources on quarantine rules in the Netherlands by nationality.....	50
Table 55 Quarantine experience during current job by sector and nationality.....	51
Table 56 Main sources of information corona-related measures by nationality	51
Table 57 Main sources of support in case of non-payment by nationality.....	52
Table 58 Main sources of support in case of job loss because of need to quarantine by nationality ..	53
Table 59 Why are you not a trade union member by nationality.....	54

Main findings of the impact of corona-related measures on Polish and Romanian meat and distribution workers in the Netherlands

This report presents the results of a survey among 153 Polish and Romanian meat and distribution workers. The survey explored the workers' experiences with corona and corona-related measures both within and outside the workplace. The survey study was part of Working Package 2a of the ZonMW funded research project 'Migrants in the Frontline'.

During the three months of fieldwork (May-July 2021), we surveyed 153 Polish and Romanian meat and distribution workers. The majority – 85 per cent – of this sample worked on agency contracts. Half of the respondents lived in employer-arranged housing, whereas the others arranged their (own or shared) accommodation by themselves or via their social network. While the majority of Romanian respondents arrived during the corona-pandemic, more than half of the Poles surveyed lived in the Netherlands for more than three years. Compared to other survey studies, our sample was quite diverse in terms of living situation and length of residency in the Netherlands.¹

Our survey results indicated that contracts in the meat sector were of longer duration (most of the meat workers surveyed started their current job before the corona-pandemic broke out) than in distribution. Although the working hours seemed relatively stable and predictable (more so for meat workers than for distribution workers), uncertainty about contract termination periods or an expected one-day notice period, was prevalent among a large share of the workers surveyed. The latter is especially problematic in times of a corona-pandemic, as termination of contract coincides with termination of accommodation for workers in employer-arranged housing. When we asked respondents where they would turn to for help if they would lose their job because of a need to quarantine, several respondents said they would not seek help, but search for another job instead; or would not know where to turn to.

One third of our respondents said that personal protection equipment in the workplace was not adequately used – mostly because co-workers were not using it properly. This was more often mentioned by distribution workers than meat workers. Half of the meat workers and two thirds of the distribution workers indicated that keeping a safe (1.5 meters) distance from colleagues was not always possible. This percentage is higher than the 20 per cent the Dutch Labour Inspectorate demonstrated in their survey. In distribution, 40 per cent indicated that the composition of work teams changed daily or every few days, increasing possible transmission risks. Seven respondents indicated that colleagues of theirs were asked to come to work, even though they should have stayed home because of the coronavirus (because of quarantine rules or having corona-related symptoms).

Our analysis showed that the risks of corona-contamination within the housing environment and on the way from and to work were significantly higher for agency workers than for respondents with a permanent or temporary company contract. This is, obviously, related to the often-shared employer-arranged accommodation and employer arranged work-home commute. Yet, in terms of workplace corona-risks, our results showed no significant difference between workers employed on agency contracts and those on temporary or permanent company contracts. This implies that employers ensure that corona-measures are in place for all people working at the company regardless of their

¹ The majority of respondents in the Dutch Labour Inspectorate's survey lived for instance in employer-arranged accommodation: Inspectorate SZW, *Rapport Arbeidsmigranten* (The Hague: Dutch Labour Inspectorate, 2021).

contractual status, as they are required by Article 3 of the Working Conditions Act to ensure a safe and healthy working environment for everyone working within the company. Nevertheless, the risks of corona-contamination at the workplace were significantly higher in distribution centers than in meat processing. Our analysis showed that the corona-risks decreased with length of residency in the Netherlands and age. Male respondents faced higher corona-related risks at the residential location, this is probably because men more often live in shared housing. Also, the Romanian respondents indicated to face lower corona-risks than the Polish respondents. However, we suspect that this finding was influenced by socially desired answers by Romanians (see methods section).

In total, 19 respondents had tested positive on a corona test. Ten worked in distribution; nine in meat. According to our survey, preventive testing was more common in meat than in distribution. Still, one quarter of the meat workers said preventive testing was not done. During their current employment, 47 workers had corona-related symptoms (26 got tested, while 21 did not; most because they did not take it seriously or thought it was not corona). While having these symptoms, and not being tested, 12 respondents went to work anyways without saying anything to their employer; one reports to have called in sick but being forced to come in to work by the employer. One third of the survey respondents (53 people) had quarantined themselves during their current employment; mostly after having traveled; or because of having corona, or having been in contact with someone with corona. Five respondents, who were in quarantine during employment, were not paid during quarantine; two did not know; three received salaries but less than normal; one person had to use vacation days to cover the quarantine period; while ten respondents were paid.

The majority of respondents – 85 per cent– was not vaccinated at the time of the survey². Half of the unvaccinated respondents did not plan to get vaccinated, 10 per cent was not sure yet and forty per cent said they would get vaccinated when they would be eligible. These numbers are not surprising, if compared to the overall vaccination degrees in Poland (55 per cent) and Romania (29 per cent)³.

According to our survey, workers got most of their corona-related information from the internet or from their employer. While most respondents indicated that they did not miss much corona-related information that was relevant to their situation as migrant worker in the Netherlands, a couple said that they would have preferred information available to non-Dutch speakers. Overall, these findings indicate that items in Dutch newspapers or tv shows, may not often reach these groups of workers and that employers are an important source for corona-related information.

The results of this survey confirm, in line with other (international) studies, that corona-related risks faced by Polish and Romanian distribution and meat workers, are indeed related to the organization of their work. Especially the employer-arranged shared housing and shared work-home commute, create significantly higher corona-transmission risks for agency workers compared to Polish and Romanian workers on temporary and permanent company contracts. In addition, our survey findings point towards a higher corona-transmission risk at the workplace in distribution centers compared to meat processing. Furthermore, employers also seem to play an important role in disseminating general corona-related information among this group of workers.

² Please note that the survey was conducted during a time (May-July 2021) that not all age groups were eligible yet for corona-vaccination in the Netherlands.

³ Data on full and partial vaccinations on date 27 September 2021 from <https://ourworldindata.org/covid-vaccinations> [accessed 28 November 2021].

Working in times of Corona in distribution or meat processing: overview of survey results among Polish and Romanian workers in the Netherlands

Introduction

This report presents the results of a survey among 153 Polish and Romanian meat and distribution workers. The survey explored the workers' experiences with corona and corona-related measures both within and outside the workplace. The survey study was part of Working Package 2a of the ZonMW funded research project 'Migrants in the Frontline'. The survey structure was informed by a targeted literature review identifying potentially contributing factors to migrant workers' vulnerabilities.⁴

This report is structured as follows. After a brief presentation of the survey method, we discuss the demographic characteristics of the survey sample, the work experiences, housing conditions, travel experiences, the corona-risks faced, the health situation and experiences with corona-related measures and support channels.

This report is written by Lisa Berntsen, fieldwork coordinator of WP2. The Polish surveys were conducted by Natalia Skowronek and the Romanian surveys were administered by Daniela Trifu. The statistical analysis for the section on corona-related risks were conducted and written up together with Paul de Beer. Lennert Wenner was involved for general fieldwork assistance.

Method

In May, June and July 2021, 153 Polish and Romanian workers were surveyed. Respondents worked either in meat-processing or in distribution centers. The geographical scope of our survey was limited to people working in the Dutch provinces of Gelderland, Noord-Brabant or Limburg.

The survey focused on these two sectors, as they were considered risk-sectors by the Dutch Labour Inspectorate in an early 2021 risk inventory. Moreover, the Labour inspectorate received many Corona-related notifications in 2020 concerning migrants working in these two industries.⁵ The survey included two nationalities: Poles and Romanians; the largest groups of migrant workers in both sectors. Furthermore, we applied a regional selection by focusing on migrants who work in the border regions (Gelderland, Noord-Brabant and Limburg), also in view of the additional research in the German border region.

Only Poles and Romanians that worked in meat or distribution during the three months we conducted the survey were eligible to participate. In the survey, respondents were asked about their experiences with corona-measures that were in place at time the survey was conducted. Reflections

⁴ these are related to related to the way migrant work is organized, the extent of adequate regulation and effective enforcement and migrants' limited social embeddedness in the country where they work, see Lisa Berntsen and Natalia Skowronek, *State-of-the-Art Research Overview of the Impact of COVID-19 on Migrant Workers in the EU and the Netherlands*, Nijmegen Sociology of Law Working Papers Series 2021/01 (Nijmegen, 2021).

⁵ *Rapport Arbeidsmigranten*.

on changes in corona-measures were collected through follow-up in-depth interviews with a selection of the survey respondents in the months September and October 2021.

The survey was administered via online video and audio calls, by telephone calls, and during face-to-face field visits.⁶ Respondents were recruited by placing posts in Polish and Romanian language on Facebook, both through paid advertisements and by active posts by our researchers in Facebook groups that were followed by the target group.⁷ The field visits that were conducted in the second half of the fieldwork period, not only provided an opportunity to conduct face-to-face surveys, they also served as moments to recruit potential respondents, to be able to conduct an online or telephone survey at a later point in time. Also, field visits were used to distribute flyers and information posters about the survey research, in Polish or Romanian stores, housing sites, or other places frequented by migrants. Snowballing techniques were used among survey respondents to recruit more respondents. The number of surveys conducted increased once our researchers were able to visit housing accommodations, stores, restaurants that workers frequent, as recruitment via Facebook did yield some respondents, yet by far not enough. The surveys were conducted in the native language of the workers by two peer interviewers.⁸ The administration of the survey took about 30-45 minutes. Respondents received a shopping voucher of 20 euros after participating in the survey.

The survey questions mapped the corona measures Polish and Romanian workers experienced in their work, at home, and during travel. We also asked corona-related health questions, and some questions to find out where workers would go to get support. To build on existing research and knowledge, some questions were based on existing surveys, such as the survey conducted by the Dutch Labour Inspectorate in the summer of 2020 among 380 migrant workers, and the survey conducted at the beginning of 2021 among migrant workers by the *Kenniscentrum Arbeidsmigranten*. The survey was piloted in April 2021, which led to improvements in the question flow and deletion of some questions.

During the course of fieldwork, we noticed, especially among the Romanian respondents, a tendency to provide socially desired answers. This may be related to the general higher levels of distrust among Romanians in government and fellow citizens: When the World Value Survey asked Romanians whether most people can be trusted, only 11 per cent in Romania answered yes; whereas almost 60 per cent of the Dutch did so and 24 per cent in Poland.⁹ The tendency for socially desirable answers was noticeable especially for questions concerning the adequate compliance with corona-related workplace measures and use of personal protection equipment. This tendency for socially desirable answers among migrant workers regarding questions on employer-taken measures to prevent workplace transmission was also noticed by the Dutch Labour Inspectorate.¹⁰ Mistrust is one of the known challenges for surveying migrant populations.¹¹ Through surveying the workers face-to-face (online and in the field) by peer researchers speaking the same language, we tried to minimize this issue.

⁶ Corona-measures prevented field visits in the first half of the fieldwork period. From the second half of June, when restrictions were lifted, fieldtrips were possible and respondents were also surveyed face-to-face. In the end, 65 surveys were conducted via the telephone, 31 surveys were administered via WhatsApp audio or video calls, 18 via Facebook audio or video call, and 27 surveys were conducted face-to-face.

⁷ See separate report on the Facebook use, where we report on our experiences using both paid advertisements and organic posts.

⁸ Two surveys were conducted in English, with Polish workers who were fluent in English.

⁹ According to World Values Survey Wave 7: 2017-2020, <https://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSONline.jsp>.

¹⁰ Inspectorate SZW, *Rapport Arbeidsmigranten* (The Hague: Dutch Labour Inspectorate, 2021).

¹¹ Guri Tyldum, 'Surveying Migrant Populations with Respondent-Driven Sampling. Experiences from Surveys of East-West Migration in Europe', *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 2020, 1–13.

Demographic characteristics

The majority of our survey respondents was male (93 male over 60 female respondents). Especially among the Romanian distribution workers, the number of females surveyed was low (30 Romanian males versus 8 females), see Table 1. During the field visits, pro-active recruitment of female respondents was tried, however, female workers were encountered less on field visits than males, making it harder to recruit them as survey participants.

Table 1 Gender distribution survey respondents by sector and nationality

		Male	Female	Total
Distribution center	Polish	32	30	62
	Romanian	30	8	38
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	Polish	14	9	23
	Romanian	17	13	30
	Total	31	22	53

From previous studies, we know that the age composition of migrant workers in general is lower than that of the average Dutch labour force, and that most workers are between 25 and 50 years old.¹² With over 70 per cent of respondents in these age categories, our sample reflects this as well. The average age of our respondents is higher among those working in meat – where half of the respondents is older than 35 – than among those working in distribution – where one third is older than 35, see Table 2.

Table 2 Age composition survey respondents by sector

		Distribution center	Meat processing	total
Age category	18-25	20	9	29
	26-35	46	16	62
	36-50	27	21	48
	> 50	7	7	14
Total		100	53	153

Secondary (high) school was the highest level of completed education for half of our survey respondents. We surveyed 17 Romanians and 6 Polish workers whose education stopped after finishing elementary school. A sectoral difference is noticeable: where 70 per cent of the workers surveyed in meat had finished up to secondary school; this was the case for 50 per cent of the workers surveyed in distribution, see Table 3.

¹² see among others Het Kenniscentrum Arbeidsmigranten, *Hoe Denken Arbeidsmigranten over Gezondheid En Zorg in Nederland?*, 2021, p. 36.

Table 3 Level of education survey respondents by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	Primary	2	5	7
	Secondary (high school, compulsory until 18)	29	19	48
	Vocational (post-high school, but not university)	17	4	21
	Higher education	14	10	24
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	Primary	4	12	16
	Secondary (high school, compulsory until 18)	11	11	22
	Vocational (post-high school, but not university)	8	4	12
	Higher education	0	3	3
	Total	23	30	53

The English language proficiency among respondents was higher than Dutch language proficiency. The majority (almost 80 percent) of Polish and Romanian respondents did not speak Dutch. However, many of them showed an interest in learning the Dutch language (74 respondents of the total 121 respondents who do not speak Dutch indicated this). English language proficiency, on the other hand, was much higher: 86 percent of Polish and Romanian respondents have a good to fair command of the English language (conversational level). This percentage was higher among Poles and Romanians working in distribution (92 percent), compared to workers in meat (75 percent), see Table 18 and Table 19 in the appendix.

About half of the Polish and Romanian respondents was single. Most respondents who were in a relationship indicated that their partner also lives in the Netherlands. The Romanian respondents more often had a partner in Romania, than the Polish respondents a partner in Poland. For a few, the partner lives in another country than Romania, Poland or the Netherlands, see Table 20 in the appendix. Slightly less than half of the survey respondents had children. In most cases, the children lived in Poland or Romania. We surveyed more Polish parents with children in the Netherlands than Romanian parents, see Table 21.

Duration of stay in the Netherlands

The time of arrival in the Netherlands was on average more recent for the Romanian respondents than the Polish respondents in our survey. Two-thirds of our Romanian respondents stayed in the Netherlands for 2 years or less, while more than half of the Poles we spoke to stayed in the Netherlands for more than three years. We spoke to 21 Poles who lived between 5 and 10 years in the Netherlands. Yet, we also surveyed three Romanian respondents living in the Netherlands for more than 10 years (2 of them worked in meat; 1 in distribution), see Table 22.

If we break down the time of arrival in the period before and during the corona pandemic (before and after March 2020), it is notable that the majority of Romanian respondents we spoke to came to the Netherlands during the corona pandemic. In total, we surveyed 24 Poles and 23 Romanians who came to the Netherlands during the corona pandemic and found work in distribution. We also spoke to 7 Poles and 14 Romanians who came to the Netherlands during the corona pandemic and found work in meat (see Table 4).

Table 4 Arrival during or before corona of survey respondents by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	During corona	24	23	47
	Before corona	38	15	53
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	During corona	7	14	21
	Before corona	16	16	32
	Total	23	30	53

Employment situation in the Netherlands

In the survey, we asked respondents about their current employment situation, to get an overview of the working conditions and corona-related measures at the time the survey was administered.

We surveyed 24 workers with a direct employment contract with the company where they physically worked (17 worked in distribution; 7 in meat), 14 of them had a permanent contract (11 Poles and 3 Romanians). The majority (85 per cent) of the survey respondents worked on an agency contract, 129 of 153 respondents. The temporary agency contracts were drawn up in different languages: in Dutch, English or in Polish or Romanian (see Table 24 in the appendix). The employment contracts with client companies were mostly drawn up in Dutch or English. A few indicated that the direct contract was drawn up in Polish, Romanian or German.

We surveyed respondents working at a variety of companies. In distribution, we counted 50 different companies where respondents physically worked. The largest number of respondents (15 respondents) working for the same distribution company, worked at Ingram Micro. The diversity in meat companies where respondents worked was lower: 27 of the 53 employees in meat worked for VION, though spread over different VION meat processing factories. A complete overview of the companies can be found in the appendix (see Table 23).

The majority of the respondents in distribution started their job at the company where they physically worked when we surveyed them during the corona pandemic.¹³ Conversely, a larger proportion of the meat workers we surveyed started before the corona pandemic broke out. This may indicate longer working relationships of migrant workers in meat, compared to distribution. Yet, also in the meat sector, many workers started their current jobs at different times during the already ongoing corona crisis (see Table 5).

Table 5 Start current job survey respondents by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	Before corona	16	7	23
	03-2020 tm 06-2020	5	2	7
	07-2020 tm 10-2020	12	7	19
	11-2020 tm 02-2021	5	6	11
	03-2021 tm 07-2021	24	16	40
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	unknown	0	1	1
	Before corona	9	11	20
	03-2020 tm 06-2020	0	4	4
	07-2020 tm 10-2020	4	3	7
	11-2020 tm 02-2021	3	4	7
	03-2021 tm 07-2021	7	7	14

¹³ This is the moment respondents started their current job (the one they did when we administered the survey), and therefore does not have to coincide with the time of arrival in the Netherlands, as discussed above. Many respondents had multiple jobs in the Netherlands before.

Total	23	30	53
-------	----	----	----

The respondents worked for a multitude of temporary employment agencies. In most cases we surveyed a couple of respondents working for the same agency firm. In some cases, we spoke to a larger group of respondents who worked for the same employment agency. For example, we spoke to a total of 18 respondents who worked for Otto Workforce (10 Poles, and 8 Romanians) and 21 respondents who worked for SBA Flex, 14 of whom worked in distribution (5 Poles and 9 Romanians) and 7 in meat (2 Poles and 5 Romanians). SBA Flex is also one of the few temporary employment agencies in our sample that places people in both the distribution and meat sector. In the meat sector, we spoke with 11 respondents who worked for Flexcraft (9 Poles and 2 Romanians), 5 for Horizon (3 Poles and 2 Romanians) and 4 for Interkosmos (all four Romanian). During the fieldwork we went to several housing locations that are arranged by temporary agency firms, these included locations of Otto Workforce, SBA Flex, E&A, and Flexcraft. For a complete overview of the names of the temporary agency firms included in our survey, see Table 25 in the appendix.

Most survey respondents had done several jobs in the Netherlands. In total, we spoke to 27 distribution workers (15 Poles and 12 Romanians) and 18 meat workers (3 Poles and 15 Romanians) that were working in their first job in the Netherlands when we surveyed them. Among those who had been working in the Netherlands for a longer period of time, distribution workers were more likely to have had several different employment contracts in distribution. Respondents working in meat at the time of the survey had had a smaller number of employment contracts before in the meat sector. This may indicate that respondents are employed for shorter durations of time in distribution compared to meat and/or that there are fewer changes of employer/workplace in meat compared to distribution. Respondents that also worked in other sectors in the Netherlands, beside distribution or meat, mentioned work in industry or production (mentioned 62 times); in agriculture and horticulture (mentioned 42 times); or in logistics and distribution (mentioned 32 times).

Working conditions

Most respondents worked a more or less full-time working week. Seven Romanian distribution workers had an average working week of less than 32 hours in the month prior to being surveyed, one of them even worked less than 20 hours per week on average. In addition, it is notable that respondents in meat were more likely to report average long work weeks: one-third reported working more than 45 hours per week on average (see Table 26). The on average longer working weeks among meat workers was also noted by the Dutch Labour Inspectorate.¹⁴

Besides having a more or less full-time work week, many respondents worked more or less the same number of hours per week. Here, we noticed sectoral differences: whereas almost 80 percent of respondents in meat reported to have stable working hours; this percentage was at 60 per cent among distribution workers (see Table 27 in the appendix). The majority of respondents (about 75 percent) indicated that they had a guaranteed number of hours in their contract (we did not ask how many hours this was): this proportion was the same in distribution and in meat. However, about 10 percent indicated that they do not know whether a guaranteed number of hours is included in their employment contract (see Table 28 in the appendix).

¹⁴ Inspectorate SZW.

About a third of the respondents did not know how quickly their contractual employer could terminate their employment contract. Another third of the respondents reported that their contracts could be dissolved within one day. Another third of the respondents reported termination periods varying between a week and several months. Thus, where the working hours seemed relatively stable and predictable (more so for meat workers than distribution workers), uncertainty about contract termination periods and contract dissolution within one day was prevalent among a large share of the workers surveyed. Although short contract termination periods or uncertainty about that may be expected among workers who recently came to work in the Netherlands on agency contracts, our survey results did not indicate that this improves with length of stay in the Netherlands. Table 29 shows that one third of the 35 workers that lived four years or more in the Netherlands still worked on a contract that could be dissolved within one day, and another third of them did not know how quickly their contract could be terminated.

The gross hourly wage earned varied, see Table 30. Most of the respondents mentioned their hourly wage to the penny exactly, with a lot of variation. The ability to specify their hourly wage so exactly, contrasted with the general lack of knowledge on contract termination periods. This potentially signals workers' material motivation for working in the Netherlands. Comparing the wages to the statutory minimum wage, and minimum wage in the meat sector, we noticed that one third of the meat workers indicated to earn less than the minimum gross hourly wage of 10,81 euros as set in the collective bargaining agreement for the meat sector at that time. In distribution, half of the workers surveyed earned between 10 and 10,79 euros an hour. Whether this is below or above the minimum wage, depends on the number of hours in the work week.¹⁵ Nevertheless, these respondents earn around the statutory minimum wage. Five meat workers and one distribution worker said to earn less than 10 euros per hour. We did not encounter any Romanian who earned more than 13 euros per hour, while both in meat and in distribution, six Poles earned more than 13 euros per hour. More than half of the respondents, about 60 percent, earned enough to support themselves and any financially dependent family. Some (15 percent of respondents) indicated that it is enough to support themselves and any dependents, but that it is difficult. For 28 respondents, their income is not enough to support themselves and any family: this was the case for 20 Romanians and 6 Polish workers, see Table 31 in the appendix.

We also asked respondents whether they are entitled to continued payment during illness. One fifth of the respondents said that they would not be paid in case they would become ill and unable to come to work for a week. Another fifth of the respondents did not know whether they would be paid in case of illness.¹⁶ About one third indicated that they would be paid from the first day of illness onwards. Around 25 percent of the respondents that they would be paid from either the second or third day of illness onwards.

Employment relations at the work floor

Most respondents communicated with their immediate supervisor on the work floor in English, followed by Polish or Romanian. A minority of nine respondents communicated mostly in Dutch (six

¹⁵ The statutory minimum hourly wage was 9.72 Euros (for a 40-hour work week; for a 38-hour work week, it was 10,24 Euros; for a 36-hour work week, it was 10.80 Euros; see <https://www.rijksoverheid.nl/onderwerpen/minimumloon/bedragen-minimumloon/bedragen-minimumloon-2021> . Sectoral minimum wages may be higher. In meat, the gross minimum hourly wage is 10,84 Euros per 1 March 2021 (CAO Vlees 2021-2022).

¹⁶ This resembles the Dutch Labour Inspectorate findings: in their survey, 16 per cent indicated not to be paid when ill, and 30 per cent was unsure whether sick-days were paid.

of them worked in meat). Communication with people from the temporary employment agency, on the other hand, was in general more often done in Polish or Romanian, followed by English. The language of communication appeared to differ between sector and nationality. Romanian distribution workers, for example, hardly communicated with their supervisors in Romanian on the work floor, and mostly used English. Polish meat workers, on the other hand, indicated to primarily communicate with the temporary agency firm in Polish, only four of them also used English.

There are indications that migrant workers are more likely to be involved in occupational accidents. While the majority of respondents never had an accident at their current place of work themselves, a group of 16 workers indicated that they had had a workplace injury at their current job. This is ten percent of our survey sample. Five respondents even reported to have been injured at work more than once; for the other 11 respondents this had happened once. Moreover, respondents were only asked if this happened in their current job. It is thus possible that more respondents experienced occupational accidents in other, previous jobs. Since this response only covered the current workplace, ten percent is a rather high percentage. Moreover, our survey did not include questions concerning health related problems at work, such as repetitive strain injuries, emotionally straining work or heavy physical work, that are common problems faced by migrant workers.¹⁷

¹⁷ Het Kenniscentrum Arbeidsmigranten.

Work in times of corona

PPE usage in the workplace

As the migrants we surveyed continued their work at the workplace during the corona pandemic, we inquired what kind of personal protection equipment (PPE) was available to them in the workplace. Almost all respondents in meat used face masks and sanitizing hand gel in the workplace. Sanitizing hand gel was also commonly used among respondents in distribution centers, while face masks were less frequently used, if compared to their use in the meat sector (see Table 32 in the appendix). Several respondents indicated that the size of distribution centers allows them to generally keep a safe (more than 1.5 meters) distance at the work floor.

Most respondents did not miss any personal protection equipment at the workplace. Eleven respondents indicated that they did miss certain PPE (such as sanitizing gel; proper face masks; paper towels (instead of airdrying machines); or splash screens). Two thirds of the respondents indicated that personal protection equipment at the workplace is adequately used; one third says it is not adequately used. Interestingly, most Romanian respondents indicated that PPE is adequately used. We suspect that these questions may be answered socially desirable by the Romanians. Also, the Dutch Labour Inspectorate noticed the tendency for socially desirable answers regarding questions on employer-taken measures to prevent workplace transmission of the coronavirus.¹⁸ That PPE was not adequately used, was particularly felt among workers in distribution centers; and to a lesser extent in meat. Most mentioned that the PPE is improperly used by co-workers (31 workers). Five respondents in distribution mentioned that the employer does not supply sufficient material; five indicated that they themselves do not find it important; 4 workers in distribution said that PPE is only adequately used in those places where it is compulsory (see Table 33 in the appendix).

The majority of respondents had been instructed on the usage of PPE. Eight distribution workers had not received any instructions on the usage of PPE. In meat, almost all workers (48 respondents) received oral instructions on how to use PPE; and this information was also supplied in writing or digitally. In distribution, 75 percent of the workers received oral instructions on the usage of PPE. In distribution, the instructions are most commonly supplied in English or in Polish or Romanian, and to a lesser extent in Dutch. In meat, most respondents indicated that they received instructions on PPE use in their mother tongue (Polish or Romanian); yet information was also supplied in English, and to a lesser extent in Dutch.

Corona-related workplace measures

Besides personal protection equipment, companies may arrange the physical workspace and work processes differently to protect workers from workplace transmission risks. We asked respondents which measures were taken at their respective workplaces (see Table 6). Designated walking routes were, according to the majority of our respondents, present at their workplace. Eighty percent of the meat workers indicated that they had a designated work area, whereas this was the case for half of the distribution workers (who, especially as order pickers, often have to cover quite some ground in distribution halls; whereas the job position of production workers in the meat factory is usually restrained to a particular spot on a conveyor belt, or area in the factory). Also, the use of splash shields was more often mentioned by meat than distribution workers. Roughly half of our respondents mentioned that staggered start and end times of shifts were implemented; and sixty

¹⁸ Inspectorate SZW.

percent indicated that break and lunch times were staggered. Two thirds of meat workers mentioned that preventive testing was done at their workplace; whereas one third of distribution workers indicated this. Twelve respondents mentioned temperature checks taking place at the worksite; and twelve workers mentioned the check (triage) forms that needed to be filled in. One respondent in distribution mentioned a vaccine promotion taking place at the worksite. If preventive testing took place, we asked respondents how often this was done. The answers vary: from once, to daily (yet only for a brief period); couple times a week; once a month; once every two months. Some indicated that this happened in the past, yet not anymore at the moment we surveyed them.

Table 6 Corona-related workplace measures taken per sector

	Distribution center	Meat processing
Designated walking routes	81	50
Designated work areas	51	44
Splash shields	35	41
Staggered start/end times	46	23
Staggered break/lunch times	64	32
Preventive testing	34	36
Distancing	8	7
Cleaning / Disinfection	2	0
Distancing & Disinfection	1	2
Temperature checks	8	4
Measure controlling	5	7
Filling out forms	0	2
Temperature checks & forms	0	1
Preventive testing	2	1
Distancing & preventive testing	1	0
Handing out gloves	1	0
Screens / Signs	4	0
Handing out masks	0	2
Quarantine	2	0
Distancing & masks	1	0
Controlling, separation & signs	0	1
Temperature checks & controlling	1	0
Wash hands	0	1
Vaccine promotion	1	0
Sending home workers with symptoms	0	1

When asked if workers followed such corona-related workplace measures adequately, half of the distribution workers felt the measures were adequately followed. This means that a little less than half felt that the measures were not adequately followed. In meat, one third of the workers we surveyed felt the measures were not adequately followed. Here again, the majority of Romanian workers indicated that the measures were adequately followed in the workplace (which may very well be a socially desirable answer). When asked why measures were not followed, one of the advanced reasons was that workers were not following the measures. Another often-mentioned reason was that the physical worksite structure made it difficult to comply with the measures. Some indicated that the measures were not sufficiently enforced by the company (see Table 34 in the appendix).

When the survey data was collected, 'social' distancing rules (of 1.5 meters) were in place. Yet, keeping a safe distance at work was not always possible according to our respondents. One third of respondents in distribution indicated that this was not possible, another third specified that this was sometimes possible, and thus not always. In meat, almost half of the respondents could always keep a safe distance from their colleagues, the other half mentioned that this is not possible or not always possible (see Table 7). This percentage is higher than what the Dutch Labour Inspectorate found: in their survey around 20 per cent indicated that they could not keep a 1.5 meters distance from others.¹⁹ The most frequent reasons why distancing was not possible were: because the work is performed in physical proximity to colleagues; because colleagues help each other (e.g. lifting); or because colleagues do not pay attention to it. Nine workers mention that the work floor is too crowded to keep a safe distance, or that corridors are too narrow. Seven Polish respondents working in distribution mentioned that the employer is not paying attention to whether workers keep their distance.

Table 7 Social distancing possible at the workplace by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	Yes, always	22	16	38
	Sometimes	22	9	31
	No	18	13	31
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	Yes, always	9	16	25
	Sometimes	7	8	15
	No	7	6	13
	Total	23	30	53

Most respondents received an oral instruction about the corona-related workplace measures. Instructions were also provided, yet to a lesser extent in writing or digitally. Ten workers in distribution indicated that they received no instructions about the workplace measures. None of the meat workers mentioned this (see Table 35 in the appendix). Instructions were either communicated in English (especially in distribution), in Polish or Romanian (particularly in the meat sector), or in Dutch.

¹⁹ Inspectorate SZW.

We asked whether respondents felt that the measures taken at the workplace were enough so that they could do their job safely without risking to contract the coronavirus. Most workers said that they felt they could do their job safely without risking to contract the coronavirus. In meat, 10 workers indicated that they did not feel safe. In distribution, 33 workers signaled that they did not feel safe from contracting the coronavirus at work.

Table 8 Feeling safe at work due to corona-measures taken by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	Yes	34	30	64
	No	25	8	33
	Don't know	2	0	2
	Don't want to answer	1	0	1
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	Yes	15	28	43
	No	8	2	10
	Total	23	30	53

When the workforce composition changes more frequently, workplace transmission risks are higher and less easy to trace back. According to our survey respondents, the composition of work teams changed more frequently in the distribution sector than in meat: two thirds of the meat workers worked with the same team of people during the week; while almost 40 per cent of distribution workers indicated that their colleagues change daily or every few days (see Table 36 in the appendix).

We asked our respondents whether there had ever been a situation when a colleague of theirs was asked to come to work, even though he/she should have stayed home because of the coronavirus (because of quarantine rules, or because they have symptoms that might be related to the coronavirus). The majority indicated that this had not happened (137 of 153 respondents). Three respondents in distribution and two in meat indicated that this happened more than once. And four respondents in distribution indicate that this happened once. The others said they did not know.

We also asked what respondents would do in case they felt the measures to avoid the spread of the coronavirus at the workplace were not sufficiently complied by. Many respondents mentioned that, if this were to happen, that they would address this with their workplace supervisor. A group of 31 workers indicated that they would not address this if that would be the case. Another 28 respondents would address this with their contact person at the temporary agency. Seven would consult the trade union; four would consult the GGD; three Romanians working in distribution would consult a lawyer (see Table 37 in the appendix).

Housing conditions

Around half of our respondents indicated that they went to the municipality to register themselves as resident. Ten mentioned that they registered at a RNI office. Sixty respondents were not registered at a municipality; one was not sure if he was registered (see Table 38 in the appendix). Those who registered at the municipality, mostly did this by themselves. Others did so together with a representative of the employer (26 respondents); or together with a co-national friend (5 respondents).

Half of our respondents lived in employer-arranged housing. Yet we also surveyed a sizeable group of workers who arranged their housing themselves, 43 of them worked in distribution and 14 in meat (see Table 40 in the appendix).

The length of stay at the accommodation where respondents lived at the time of the survey varied. Some only recently moved to their current living address: 27 distribution workers and 8 meat workers lived less than a month at their current accommodation. One quarter of the distribution workers and one third of the meat workers lived at their current place for a year or longer (see Table 39 in the appendix).

If we compare the duration of stay at the current living accommodation, it is no surprise that the majority of the people who lived less than one month at their current accommodation, live in agency-arranged housing. On the other hand, the ones that lived longer than a year at their current place, had mostly arranged the accommodation themselves. Yet, 9 respondents lived longer than a year in the same agency-arranged housing (see Table 41 in the appendix).

More than half of our survey respondents lived in a house or apartment, 41 respondents lived in a large building complex or hotel, and 23 lived in a holiday parc (see Table 42 in the appendix). All respondents who arranged their accommodation themselves, lived in a house or apartment, for 23 respondents, the temporary employment agency arranged the accommodation, and 11 respondents arranged this via friends, acquaintances or a family member (see Table 43 in the appendix).

We surveyed 17 respondents who lived alone in the Netherlands. The majority we talked with (83 respondents) lived with other migrant workers in shared accommodation. Around one third of our respondents lived with a partner or spouse (44 respondents), with their partner and children (9), or only with children (6). Another 14 respondents indicated to live with other people, such as family members or co-nationals. We spoke with 28 workers in the meat sector (20 Romanian, 8 Polish) and 55 distribution workers (26 Romanian, 29 Polish) who live together with other migrant workers that are neither their partner nor family members (see Table 44 in the appendix).

Respondents who live in the Netherlands with their partners found housing by themselves, yet also lived in agency-arranged housing. Also, 5 Romanian respondents arranged their accommodation via their social network. The nine Polish respondents who live with partner and children, all arranged their housing by themselves (see Table 45 in the appendix).

Those who shared their accommodation with fellow migrant workers or others were asked with how many people, besides family members, they lived together²⁰: 16 respondents lived with one other

²⁰ We did not ask how many people lived in the whole building, if someone lived in a hotel for instance, but with how many people they shared their living unit, including facilities.

person; 20 with two or more people; 37 with three to five people; 6 with six to ten people; and 12 with more than 10 people in the same accommodation (see Table 46 in the appendix). In meat, we encountered no workers that arranged shared accommodation themselves; in distribution, 17 workers arranged a shared accommodation with fellow migrants themselves, with a maximum of 5 housemates. Two respondents in meat lived in shared accommodation with one other person that was arranged by people in their social network; in distribution, six respondents indicated to have arranged shared housing via their social network, with two to five housemates.

All the workers that shared their accommodation with fellow migrants, shared a kitchen, and in most cases, they also shared sanitary facilities, except for two Romanian distribution workers. The majority of respondents we surveyed had their own bedroom in their shared accommodation; 23 respondents shared their bedroom with one other person; two respondents shared their bedroom with two other people and three respondents shared their bedroom with three to five people (see Table 47 in the appendix). Thus, the majority of workers we surveyed living in shared housing, had, in line with the Roemer suggestions, their own bedroom. Yet, on the other hand, among the 28 respondents who shared their bedroom, 11 indicated that the people with whom they shared a bedroom changed in the past month.²¹

We also asked about the size of the bedroom when respondents lived in shared housing that was agency-arranged: 39 of 68 respondents indicated that their bedroom was smaller than 15 m² (12 respondents had a bedroom smaller than 10 m²). This is below the minimum threshold of 15 m² that Roemer advised.

Most respondents paid between 300 and 500 euros a month for their accommodation. For those who arranged their accommodation by themselves, the monthly rent was at times higher. Besides two distribution workers, who paid between 500 and 600 euros a month for their accommodation, all respondents in employer-arranged housing paid less than 500 euros a month for their accommodation (see Table 48 in the appendix). Still, we surveyed 18 respondents (12 working in distribution; 6 in meat) who paid between 400-499 euros per month for a shared bedroom, that was smaller than 15 m² for eight of them; and 7 respondents (4 working in meat; 3 in distribution) who paid between 300-399 euros per month for a shared bedroom, that was smaller than 15 m² for one of them (see Table 49 in the appendix).

All respondents who lived in employer-arranged housing indicated that their rent (and any additional costs) was deducted from their salary; one Romanian respondent indicated that this was not the case and two Romanian respondents did not know whether this happened. Half of our respondents indicated that they believed the monthly rent they paid was reasonable; the other half believed the rent was too high. Around two thirds of the respondents who lived in employer-arranged housing believed the rent they paid was too high: 32 of the 48 distribution workers and 20 of the 32 meat-workers that lived in employer-arranged housing (see Table 50 in the appendix). The rent they paid was between 400-499 euros a month (36 of the 52 respondents who lived in employer-arranged housing and indicated the rent is too high; 14 paid between 300-399 a month).

All but three respondents indicated that they had to leave their accommodation once their employment contract ends; two said that they do not know whether they have to leave their accommodation, and one person said they do not have to leave. When asked how quickly they would

²¹ The Labour Inspectorate noted that 40 per cent of the surveyed migrants that shared a bedroom, shared a room of less than 10 m²; whereas 50 per cent indicated that the shared room size varied between 10 and 20 m², see Inspectorate SZW, pp. 23–24.

have to leave their accommodation, almost all indicated that they have to leave within a week: 19 respondents indicated they have to leave within a day's notice; 17 within 2 days; 8 indicated between 3-5 days; 17 indicated they have a week's time; one person said he has a month.; one person said that they have to leave as soon as possible but would be given time to search for a room somewhere else.; one indicated that they can stay longer as long as they continue to pay rent. If this would happen most respondents would look for another job in the Netherlands or return to Poland or Romania, some would seek help from friends, acquaintances or family in the Netherlands, some would look for a job in another country.

Corona-related measures in shared accommodation

Respondents sharing their accommodation with other migrant workers, were asked about the measures taken in their accommodation to minimize the spread of the coronavirus. Around half of the respondents indicated that there is no space in their accommodation to quarantine themselves from co-habitants. On the other hand, the majority indicated that shared facilities are cleaned regularly. Also, most said that they were able to keep a 1.5 meter distance from co-habitants in their current accommodation (29 respondents said they cannot keep a safe distance in their accommodation for co-habitants), see Table 9.

Table 9 Corona-related measures in shared accommodation

	Yes	No
Space to quarantine yourself	39	36
Shared facilities cleaned regularly	52	21
1.5m distance of co-habitants	46	29

Travel conditions

The majority of our respondents lived within half an hour commute from their work (one way); 23 respondents (15 distribution workers; 8 meat workers) had to travel between half an hour and an hour; and 4 (two Romanian distribution workers and two Polish meat workers) have more than an hour travel time between their home and work (see Table 51 in the appendix).

The common mode of transportation varied: 42 respondents drove together with colleagues in employer-arranged transport; 52 respondents drove with their own car (mostly distribution workers); 45 respondents biked to work; nine respondents walked; nine drove together with colleagues and arranged this by themselves; four used public transport; four used a scooter. Around half of the respondents who biked to work, rode on a bicycle that was their own, the others had an employer provided bicycle (see Table 52 in the appendix).

Out of the 42 people who commuted to work with employer-arranged transport, half traveled with 1-3 colleagues in a car or minivan; whereas the other half traveled with 4-8 colleagues. 13 of the 17 meat workers indicated to travel with 4-8 colleagues; and 9 of the 25 distribution workers that traveled in employer-arranged transport.

Regarding corona-measures during the drive, 26 respondents indicated that passengers did not wear a face mask during the drive and 15 indicated that they do; the majority said they could not keep a 1.5-meter distance from other passengers during the drive. Most people drove with the same group of people from and to work; 14 indicate that this happened sometimes or never (grouped as ‘no’ in the Table 10). Six respondents indicated that there were plastic screens placed between passenger seats. Most respondents did not miss any measures during travel from and to work, three indicated that they would prefer face masks, plastic screens or distancing in the car. One remarked that he does not miss measures as the people he travels with are the same people he spends his free time in the kitchen with anyway. If workers indeed traveled only together with their housemates, additional protection measures in the car may not be needed. However, we did not ask that specifically.

Table 10 Corona-related measures during employer-arranged work-home commute

	Yes	No
Wear face mask during drive	15	26
1.5m distance during travel	3	39
Travel together with the same people	28	14

We asked if the measures such as wearing face masks were in their opinion adequately followed: 18 respondents said this was the case, and 22 said it was not. The 22 respondents who mentioned the measures were not adequately followed, were asked why this was not done: because colleagues are improperly following the measures (19 times mentioned); it is difficult to comply with due to the means of transportation (14 times mentioned); respondent him/herself does not find it important (12 times mentioned) or the employer is not sufficiently enforcing or supervising it (4 times mentioned).

Cross-border travel

Two thirds of our respondents traveled abroad since the outbreak of the coronavirus. While most of the Polish workers we surveyed had been able to travel abroad; half of the Romanian respondents had not travelled abroad since the corona pandemic (see Table 11). Around half of the respondents, both Romanian and Polish nationals, had postponed a trip to Poland or Romanian because of corona-related travel restrictions in Europe. Most that had to postpone a trip indicated that it was hard to accept that.

Table 11 Travel abroad during corona-pandemic by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	Yes	53	20	73
	No	9	18	27
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	Yes	18	15	33
	No	5	15	20
	Total	23	30	53

Corona-related risks at the workplace, living accommodation and during travel from and to work

Three scales were constructed for the risks of corona contamination that migrant workers faced at work, in their housing location, and on the way to and from work.

The 'work risk' scale runs from 0-15 and counts the number of protective measures (personal protective equipment, such as face masks, and workplace measures, such as 1.5-meter distance) that do *not* apply to the respondent's work situation²². When a respondent indicates that personal protective equipment is not used adequately and workplace measures are not followed adequately, the score for both items is increased by 1.

The 'housing risk' scale runs from 0-5 and is constructed as follows: any respondent who lives with co-workers and/or migrant workers is scored 1. Those who live alone or only with family members, or other relatives, are scored 0. For each of the three items in question 48 (whether there is space to quarantine yourself from roommates; whether the shared facilities (kitchen, sanitary facilities) are cleaned regularly; and whether it is possible to keep 1.5 meters distance from each other in the house) that is not answered with 'yes', the score is increased by 1. Also, the score is increased by 1 if the respondent does not have his/her own bedroom in the accommodation, but shares it with 1 or more persons.

The scale 'travel risk' runs from 0-4 and concerns the risk of contamination during transport to and from work. Those who travel alone are scored 0 and those who travel together with others (including by public transport) are scored 1. For both items in question 54.3 (whether mouth masks are worn and whether 1.5 meters distance can be maintained during the journey) that are not answered with 'yes', the score is increased by 1. If the respondent indicates that the travel measures are not adequately followed, the score is increased by 1.

The 'corona risk' scale is the sum of the three separate risk scales and thus runs from 0-24.

Table 12 shows that the Polish respondents face more risks than the Romanians and that the risks at work but also in the residential location are greater for workers in distribution centers than in meat processing. In addition, we see that temporary workers face more risks than respondents with temporary or permanent employment with the company. This is because agency workers face more risks within their housing location and on the way to and from work. Notable is the higher risk in the workplace for respondents with permanent or temporary employment compared to agency workers. The overall risk of infection decreases with longer duration of stay in the Netherlands. This is mainly due to the fact that those with a longer stay are less at risk on their way to and from work and also because those who stay in the Netherlands for four years or more are also less at risk in their homes.

²² i.e. the number of times that questions 21 ('are there face masks; face splash shields; sanitizing gel; or other PPE at your workplace') and 24 ('are there designated walking routes; designated work areas; splash shields between colleagues or work stations; staggered start and end times of shifts; staggered break and lunch times; preventive corona tests among workers; other workplace measures taken at your workplace') are *not* answered with 'yes' (except for item 5 of question 21 ('is there any PPE that you miss at your workplace?') if it is not answered with 'no')

Table 12 Average score on corona-risk scales by nationality, sector, contract and length of stay in the Netherlands

	work risk	housing risk	travel risk	corona risk
total	6,3	1,4	0,9	8,7
Polish	7,6	1,3	1,0	9,9
Romanian	4,7	1,7	0,8	7,3
Distribution center	7,3	1,5	0,9	9,7
Meat processing	4,6	1,4	0,9	6,9
Agency contract	6,2	1,6	1,1	8,9
Temporary/Permanent contract	7,2	0,5	0,1	7,8
Length of stay				
<1 year	6,7	1,7	1,4	9,8
1-<2 years	5,9	2,1	1,4	9,4
2-<3 years	6,3	1,6	0,5	8,3
3-<4 years	5,6	1,4	0,6	7,6
4 years or more	6,7	0,6	0,5	7,7

Using a linear regression analysis, we examine which characteristics of migrant workers and of their work significantly affect the risks they face when controlling for other characteristics, including age and gender.

Table 13 shows that Romanians face significantly lower risks both at work and on the road than Poles.²³ The regression also shows that the risks of contamination within the housing environment and on the way from and to work are significantly higher for agency workers than for respondents with a permanent or temporary company contract. In terms of workplace risks, we see no significant difference between the contract forms (agency versus temporary/permanent employment): this is in line with expectations, as employers are required by Article 3 of the Working Conditions Act to ensure a safe and healthy working environment for everyone working within the company, including temporary agency workers. In addition, the risks of contamination in the distribution centers are significantly higher than in meat processing, but the differences in housing and travel risk are not significant. The longer one stays in the Netherlands the lower the risks become. Age does not play a significant role for the separate corona risks identified, but the total corona risks faced decrease with age. Striking is the significantly higher risk that men indicate to face at the housing location, this is probably because men more often live in shared housing.

²³ This is likely related to the greater feelings of mistrust generally present among Romanians, which may cause Romanians to be less 'honest' and more likely to give socially desirable answers. When the World Value Survey asks people whether they agree with the statement 'most people can be trusted,' in the Netherlands almost 60 per cent agrees; in Poland, 24 per cent agree; while in Romania, 11 per cent do so.

Table 13 Linear regression of corona-related risks

	Work risk	Housing risk	Travel risk	Corona risk
constant	8,45***	1,91***	1,02*	11,38***
Polish (ref.)				
Romanian	-2,72***	-0,02	-0,52**	-3,26***
Meat processing (ref.)				
Distribution center	1,83***	-0,01	-0,16	1,65***
Temporary/permanent contract (ref.)				
Agency contract	-0,74	0,74**	0,81**	0,80
Length of stay (years)	-0,19**	-0,11**	-0,08*	-0,38***
Age (years)	-0,03	-0,01	-0,01	-0,05*
Male (ref.)				
Female	0,04	-0,70***	-0,04	-0,70

Note: Significance: * p<0,1; ** p<0,05; * p<0,01.**

Health

Most respondents (n=135) had a Dutch health insurance card; 7 respondents had an international health insurance card that was valid in the Netherlands; 10 had no Dutch nor international health insurance card; 1 Polish distribution worker did not know whether he had health insurance. The Dutch insurance was arranged for 84 respondents by their current (contractual) employer; 41 respondents arranged health insurance themselves; 10 respondents arranged it either via friends, or with an accountant or a former agency arranged it.

The majority of the survey respondents was not registered with a family doctor in the Netherlands (89 respondents are not registered; 58 respondents are registered with a family doctor).²⁴ Interestingly, 31 of the 34 Polish respondents who were registered with a family doctor had arranged their accommodation themselves; whereas 15 of the 24 Romanians that were registered with a family doctor lived in agency-arranged housing (see Table 53 in the appendix).

Corona testing

Among our survey respondents, 47 had corona-related symptoms in their current employment: 26 of them got a corona-test done; while 21 did not. In the meat sector, 10 of the 17 workers with corona-related symptoms did not get tested (6 Romanians; 4 Polish). In distribution, 11 of the 30 workers with corona-related symptoms did not get tested (5 Romanians; 6 Polish), see Table 14. Most did not get tested because they did not take it seriously or thought it was not covid (12 respondents); three Romanians did not get tested because they were afraid of the consequences of having covid; three distribution workers (1 Polish, 2 Romanians) were not tested because there were no tests available, during spring 2020.

While having these symptoms, and not being tested, 12 of the 47 respondents with corona-related symptoms went to work anyways without saying anything to their employer; three called in sick and stayed at home; one reports to have called in sick and was forced to come in to work by the employer. The three people who stayed home, did receive payment during their absence: 2 received pay from day one; one from day two.

Table 14 Did you do a corona-test the last time you had corona-related symptoms?

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	Yes	12	7	19
	No	6	5	11
	Total	18	12	30
Meat processing	Yes	4	3	7
	No	4	6	10
	Total	8	9	17

²⁴ Interestingly, a recent panel study found a much higher share of low-skilled Central and Eastern European workers (primarily Polish nationals) to be registered with a Dutch family doctor, see Het Kenniscentrum Arbeidsmigranten, p. 12. The panel may have included more respondents with longer residency in the Netherlands, explaining the higher share of family doctor registrations.

We asked those 26 respondents who got tested the last time when they had corona-related symptoms, who had made the test appointment: 12 respondents (9 Polish; 3 Romanian) made the appointment themselves and signaled that making the appointment was very easy; seven respondents got their appointment via their contractual employer; three via the company where they worked; two respondents had friends who made the appointment for them. Nine of the respondents who made the test appointment themselves, were registered with at family doctor in the Netherlands.

The amount of time before receiving the result of the corona test varied: 10 got the results within 24 hours; 9 respondents had to wait longer than a day for the results; and 7 respondents took a quick test, with gave the results immediately. The respondents who had to wait longer than a day for their test results all stayed at home till they received the test results: two of them did not get paid during this period they had to stay home and await their test results.

In total 19 respondents in our survey tested positive on a corona test. Ten worked in distribution (7 Polish; 3 Romanian), nine in meat (6 Polish; 3 Romanian).

According to our survey responses, preventive testing was more common in the meat sector than in distribution (see Table 15). Half of our respondents in distribution never had a preventive corona-test (without having corona-related symptoms), whereas 39 of the 53 meat workers surveyed were tested preventively. In the meat sector, more respondents indicated that preventive testing is done regularly: 22 of the 38 respondents who had preventive tests, indicated they were tested preventively more than ten times in their current employment period. In distribution, preventive testing seems to happen less frequently: 17 respondents of the 46 that experienced preventive testing were tested once preventively; 22 indicated that they were tested preventively between 2 and 10 times; 7 mention that this happened more than 10 times in their current employment period.

Table 15 Preventive corona-testing by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	Yes	30	18	48
	No	32	19	51
	Don't want to answer	0	1	1
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	Yes	17	22	39
	No	6	8	14
	Total	23	30	53

Various reasons were listed for why respondents were tested preventively: regular preventive testing procedures at the workplace was mentioned most often (47 times); 21 respondents mentioned that they were tested because they came back from travel abroad; 14 because they wanted to travel abroad; 12 respondents got tested without symptoms because the employer asked them to; five because they were in contact with someone that was infected with corona. The travel related reasons for preventive testing were mentioned mostly by distribution workers (29 respondents in distribution (15 Polish, 14 Romanians), versus 6 in meat).

Respondents that experienced preventive testing at the workplace were asked how important they thought regular preventive corona testing at the workplace was. The majority (37 of 47 respondents) thought this was important; four that it is somewhat important; and five thought it was not important. The five respondents that indicated that preventive testing was not important, were asked why they thought so; Three did not take corona very seriously; one said: 'it's been enough, not anymore'; and one believes that testing once a week is enough.

Seven respondents mentioned that testing was well organized in the Netherlands. Three mentioned that testing should be done more. Twelve said that testing was not properly done or that testing was not accurate. Two mentioned that the price of testing was too high. Four thought that testing was not well organized. Three felt testing was a waste of time. Five felt they were tested too much.

Quarantine

The main channels via which respondents informed themselves on quarantine rules in the Netherlands were: the internet²⁵ (77 respondents) and the employer (51 respondents). Other sources that were frequently mentioned were colleagues (18 respondents); Facebook (15 respondents, 12 Polish, 3 Romanian); television (11 respondents), family or relatives (9 respondents), Dutch government website (7 respondents). Five respondents indicated they were not informed on the quarantine rules in the Netherlands (three Polish; 2 Romanian), see Table 54 in the appendix.

One third of the survey respondents (53 people) had quarantined themselves during their current employment (see Table 55)²⁶. The most mentioned reasons for quarantine were: because the respondent came (back) from abroad or a country in the orange zone (32 respondents; 14 of them quarantined before they started their current job); 14 respondents quarantined because they had corona; one because of corona symptoms; two because a housemate had corona(symptoms); three because they were in close contact with someone with corona; and one because a classmate of the respondent's child had corona. Three of the 14 respondents who quarantined before they started their current job, had to pay for their accommodation during this quarantine period; the others did not have to pay rent. For the ones who had to quarantine during employment, five respondents were not paid during quarantine; two were unsure; three received salaries, but less than normal; one person used vacation days to cover the quarantine period; nine were paid from the first day of quarantine; one from the second day of quarantine.

Twelve respondents mentioned that quarantine was badly organized or controlled; whereas five indicated that it was well arranged. Two mentioned that they should have quarantined, but did not.

Vaccination

The survey was conducted between May and July 2021, when vaccination possibilities opened up, but were not accessible yet for all age categories during the three months the survey was administered; vaccination possibilities for younger age categories were possible earlier in Romania and Poland than in the Netherlands. We asked all respondents whether they had been vaccinated at the moment we administered the survey. The majority of respondents were not vaccinated at the

²⁵ Social media was listed as a separate answer category, also specifying the social media channel used (Facebook was predominantly mentioned).

²⁶ We did not ask about quarantine experiences during previous job postings.

time (127 respondents); 12 got their vaccine in Poland; seven in Romania and five in the Netherlands (three Poles, two Romanians).

Table 16 Vaccination by nationality

	Polish	Romanian	Total
Vaccinated in Poland Romania	12	7	19
Vaccinated in the Netherlands	3	2	5
Not vaccinated	69	58	127
Don't want to answer	1	0	1
Total	85	67	152

The 127 respondents who were not vaccinated, were asked whether they would get vaccinated when they would be eligible: 47 said they would get the vaccine (24 Polish; 23 Romanians); 67 respondents said they would not (42 Polish; 25 Romanians); and 12 respondents (3 Polish; 9 Romanian) did not know (see Table 17). The 47 respondents who wanted to get vaccinated when they would be eligible, thought they would be able to get the vaccination: in the Netherlands (39 respondents); in Poland (9 respondents); in Romania (9 respondents); five respondents did not know where they would be able to get the vaccine; two thought they could get it anywhere; and two thought they would get it in Germany.

Table 17 Willingness to be vaccinated by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	Yes	19	14	33
	No	28	12	40
	Don't know	2	5	7
	Don't want to answer	0	1	1
	Total	49	32	81
Meat processing	Yes	5	9	14
	No	14	13	27
	Don't know	1	4	5
	Total	20	26	46

Corona measures and support structures

Most respondents indicated that in general they felt there was enough information available about the corona measures that was relevant to their personal situation as migrant worker in the Netherlands; 17 respondents felt there was not enough relevant information available. When asked what they missed: 7 respondents said they missed information for people who don't speak Dutch; four respondents missed more accessible info in general; four missed information about corona measures; three were not interested in more information; two missed honest information (against misinformation); one missed info on the consequences of the virus on your health; one missed information about payment; and one missed information about vaccines.

Similar to the main sources of information on quarantine rules, the main source for general corona-related information was the internet²⁷ (84 respondents, with a particular mention for google) and the second most-mentioned source, mentioned by 33 respondents, was the employer (20 Polish and 13 Romanian respondents). Other important sources for information were: Facebook (mentioned by 23 respondents, 15 Polish; 7 Romanians); colleagues (17 respondents); government website (9 Polish, 6 Romanian respondents); Dutch television (6 Polish, 8 Romanian respondents); family members or relatives (11 Polish, 1 Romanian respondents); and 8 respondents mentioned Polish radio or television (see Table 56 in the appendix).²⁸

In our survey, we also asked some questions about the sources respondents would turn to for support. We asked what respondents would do if their current employer would not pay the hours they had worked last month (see Table 57 in the appendix). In that case, the agency employer itself is, interestingly, the most mentioned as a source of help – by 43 respondents (26 Polish; 17 Romanian); Also the client firm scores relatively high and is mentioned by 23 respondents (13 Polish, 10 Romanian). Thirty respondents would call in the help of a lawyer (15 Polish; 15 Romanian). 23 respondents would call in the help of a trade union: 15 respondents would call the FNV (11 Polish; 4 Romanian); 1 Polish respondent CNV; 1 Polish respondent CNV or FNV; and 7 don't know which trade union (6 Polish; 1 Romanian). Seven respondents would call the Labour Inspectorate (3 Polish; 4 Romanian respondents); seven would call a friend or relative in the Netherlands. Five respondents would not seek the help from anyone (1 Polish; 4 Romanian).

We also asked respondents where they would turn to for help in (the hypothetical) case they would lose their job because they would need to quarantine themselves (see Table 58 in the appendix). The employer is mentioned fewer times as a source for support. Nevertheless, 35 respondents mentioned that they would not seek help, but search for another job instead. Also 21 respondents said they would not seek help from anybody and 18 respondents (10 Polish; 8 Romanian) indicated that they would not know where to turn for help in such a case. 22 respondents (21 Polish) indicated they would turn to a trade union for help, mostly mentioning FNV. Also 22 respondents would call in

²⁷ Social media was listed as a separate answer category, also specifying the social media channel used (Facebook was predominantly mentioned).

²⁸ A similar question posed in another recent survey, identified differences in the main information sources used. Low-skilled Central and Eastern European workers (primarily Polish nationals) indicated in that survey that the main sources for corona-related information were: Dutch media 51 per cent, the employer 41 per cent; social media 38 per cent; (internet in general was not an option listed in this survey); the company where I work 34 per cent; media own country 31 per cent; Dutch government 29 per cent, see Het Kenniscentrum Arbeidsmigranten, p. 17. Differences in outcome may be explained by the fact that the latter survey was a self-report survey, where respondents could tick the sources consulted from a pre-provided list; whereas we asked the respondents to list the main sources of information consulted themselves.

the help of a lawyer (13 Polish, 9 Romanian), whereas 18 respondents would call in the help from a friend or relative in the Netherlands (6 Polish, 12 Romanian).

Finally, we asked whether respondents were trade union members. 18 respondents (14 Polish; 4 Romanian) in our survey indicated that they were a member of a trade union. 13 were members of FNV (11 Polish, 2 Romanian); 1 Polish respondent was a member of CNV; 1 Polish respondent was both a member of CNV and of FNV; 2 respondents did not know which trade union they were members of; 1 Romanian respondent did not want to answer this question.

The main reasons for not being a trade union member is that respondents never seriously thought about becoming a member, a lack of knowledge on what trade unions are or can mean for them and a lack of interest in trade unions. Some are interested, but simply have not joined a trade union because of language issues or a lack of time. The responses for non-union membership are listed in Table 59 in the appendix.

Appendix

Table 18 Dutch language proficiency survey respondents by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	Yes, I speak it very well	1	0	1
	Yes, I speak it a little (conversational level)	13	4	17
	No, I don't speak it, but I want to learn it	22	26	48
	No, I don't speak it, and I don't want to learn it	26	8	34
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	Yes, I speak it a little (conversational level)	10	4	14
	No, I don't speak it, but I want to learn it	5	21	26
	No, I don't speak it, and I don't want to learn it	8	5	13
	Total	23	30	53

Table 19 English language proficiency survey respondents by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	Yes, I speak it very well	38	23	61
	Yes, I speak it a little (conversational level)	18	13	31
	No, I don't speak it	6	2	8
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	Yes, I speak it very well	8	4	12
	Yes, I speak it a little (conversational level)	8	20	28
	No, I don't speak it	7	5	12
	Don't know	0	1	1
	Total	23	30	53

Table 20 Marital status survey respondents by nationality

	Polish	Romanian
Single	38	21
In a relationship and partner lives in the Netherlands	38	27
In a relationship and partner lives in Poland/Romania	8	15

In a relationship and partner lives in Belgium	0	2
In a relationship and partner lives in Germany	1	0
In a relationship and partner lives in Republic Moldova	0	2
In a relationship and partner lives in United Kingdom	0	1
Total	85	68

Table 21 Place of living children survey respondents by nationality

	Polish	Romanian
No children	49	36
Children live in Poland/Romania	22	19
Children live in the Netherlands	9	1
Children live in the Netherlands and Romania	0	2
Children live in the Netherlands and Poland	3	0
Children live in Poland and United Kingdom	1	0
Children live in United Kingdom and Spain	1	0
Children live in Estonia and Romania	0	1
Children live in Germany	0	1
Children live in Germany and Romania	0	1
Children live in Republic Moldova	0	3
Children live in Romania and United Kingdom	0	1
Total	85	65

Table 22 Duration of current stay in the Netherlands survey respondents by sector and nationality

	Polish	Romanian	Total	
Distribution center	6 months or less	16	12	28
	7 months tm 1 year	4	8	12
	2 years	9	7	16
	3 years	8	6	14
	4 years	10	1	11
	5 years	2	3	5
	5-10 years	13	0	13
	10+ years	0	1	1
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	6 months or less	1	7	8
	7 months tm 1 year	5	6	11
	2 years	3	6	9

3 years	4	3	7
4 years	1	5	6
5 years	1	0	1
5-10 years	8	1	9
10+ years	0	2	2
Total	23	30	53

Table 23 Companies survey respondents by sector and nationality

	Polish	Romanian	Total
Action	1	0	1
Albert Heijn	5	0	5
Amazon	1	0	1
Apple	1	0	1
Aro Fashion Gear	1	0	1
Arrow	1	0	1
Bleckmann	0	1	1
Bol.com	2	0	2
Capri Holding	0	1	1
Ceva	0	2	2
Dentslpy Sirona	2	0	2
DHL	1	2	3
DPD	0	1	1
DSV	1	0	1
Distribution center Edco	0	2	2
Europe Pallet B.V.	1	0	1
Fruit Masters	0	1	1
Gefco Benelux	1	0	1
Hanos	1	0	1
Hessing	1	0	1
Ingram Micro	2	13	15
Jumbo	5	0	5
Lidl	2	0	2
Loving Potatoes	0	1	1
Mainfreight Zaltbommel Logistics Services	1	0	1
Michael Kors	1	0	1
Nunner Logistics	1	0	1
Olympia	1	0	1
Pick Pack	2	0	2

	Picnic	1	0	1
	Post NL	0	4	4
	PVH	2	0	2
	Renos Logistics	0	1	1
	Shop Apotheke	0	1	1
	Sinceron	1	0	1
	Stapper	0	1	1
	Stichd	3	0	3
	Syncreon Technology	1	0	1
	The Greenery	2	0	2
	Tommy Hilfiger	1	1	2
	Van Oers United	1	0	1
	Vetipak	1	0	1
	Viceversa	2	0	2
	Vida XL	1	0	1
	Vistaprint	1	0	1
	Vos Logistics	1	0	1
	Worldtech	1	0	1
	Xenos	1	0	1
	XPO Logistics	4	2	6
	Zimmer Biomet	0	1	1
	ZON Fruit & Vegetables	1	0	1
	Dont Know / No Answer	2	3	5
	Total	62	38	100
	Agro Merchant Barneveld	0	1	1
	Best Star Meat	1	0	1
	Compaxo	0	4	4
	Ekro	1	3	4
	Encebe	0	1	1
	Giebels	0	4	4
	Hanos	2	0	2
Meat processing	JVB Meat Insiders	1	0	1
	Kompaxo	0	1	1
	Plukon	0	1	1
	Van der Linden & Co	1	0	1
	Van Rooi Meat	2	1	3
	Vion	14	13	27
	Dont Know / No Answer	1	1	2
	Total	23	30	53

Table 24 Language temporary agency contract survey respondents by sector and nationality

	Distribution center		Meat processing	
	Polish	Romanian	Polish	Romanian
in Polish / Romanian	37	20	12	21
in English	17	24	4	7
in Dutch	27	16	10	16
in German	0	0	0	0
Has not received a contract	0	0	0	1

Table 25 Overview of TWA employers survey respondents by sector and nationality

	Polish	Romanian	Total
Adecco	3	0	3
Atik United	0	1	1
Beterbaan	1	0	1
Carriere	2	0	2
Cervo Group	2	2	4
Covebo	0	3	3
Crown Uitzendgroep	1	0	1
De Jong	2	0	2
DMFlex	1	0	1
E&A	3	0	3
Eurotem	1	0	1
Eurots	1	0	1
Flex specialisten	1	0	1
Distribution center Flexipool	1	0	1
Hessing B.V.	1	0	1
Interkosmos	0	1	1
Invite Jobs	2	0	2
JOSKO Smart Flexwork	1	0	1
Manpower	2	0	2
Otto Workforce	10	8	18
Randstad	1	0	1
SBA Flex	5	9	14
SEP Peeters Oirlo BV	1	0	1
SVK	0	2	2
T&S Flexwork	2	1	3
Tempo Team	0	3	3
Timing	1	1	2

	TNS Flexwork	0	1	1
	VDU	0	2	2
	Total	45	34	79
Meat processing	Flex (?)	0	1	1
	All-in Flex	1	0	1
	Bas uitzendbureau	0	2	2
	Bijstem	0	1	1
	Dutch Flex Group	0	1	1
	Flexcraft	9	2	11
	Flex service group	0	1	1
	Friendly Business	0	1	1
	Getwork	1	0	1
	Horizon	3	2	5
	Interkosmos	0	4	4
	Mona Personeelsdiensten B.V.	1	0	1
	Reyhan	0	2	2
	SBA Flex	2	5	7
	Timing	0	1	1
	TWG	0	4	4
	Workstead	0	2	2
	Total	17	29	46

Table 26 Average working week survey respondents by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	0-19	0	1	1
	20-31	0	6	6
	32-39	15	11	26
	40-44	37	17	54
	45-49	9	3	12
	50-54	1	0	1
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	20-31	1	3	4
	32-39	7	9	16
	40-44	7	8	15
	45-49	6	6	12
	50-54	1	1	2
	55-59	0	2	2
	60-69	1	0	1
	70+	0	1	1

Total	23	30	53
-------	----	----	----

Table 27 Working hours survey respondents by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	Yes	36	22	58
	No	24	15	39
	Don't know	2	1	3
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	Yes	18	23	41
	No	5	7	12
	Total	23	30	53

Table 28 Guaranteed working hours survey respondents by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	Yes	44	29	73
	No	12	5	17
	Don't know	6	4	10
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	Yes	21	19	40
	No	1	4	5
	Don't know	1	7	8
	Total	23	30	53

Table 29 Contract termination period by length of stay in the Netherlands

	<1 yr	1-<2 yrs	2-<3 yrs	3-<4 yrs	4 yrs or more	Total
Within 1 day	19	11	9	5	11	55
Within a week	4	1	3	1	1	10
Within a month	2	7	5	4	8	26
Within 2-3 months	0	1	0	1	4	6
Don't know	17	12	8	6	11	54
Don't want to answer	0	0	2	0	0	2
Total	42	32	27	17	35	153

Table 30 Gross hourly wage survey respondents by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	<10	1	0	1
	10-10.79	25	23	48
	10.80-10.99	2	6	8
	11.00-11.49	10	3	13
	11.50-11.99	7	2	9
	12.00-12.49	4	1	5
	12.50-12.99	1	2	3
	13 or more	6	0	6
	Total	56	37	93
Meat processing	<10	2	3	5
	10-10.79	4	8	12
	10.80-10.99	7	7	14
	11.00-11.49	2	3	5
	11.50-11.99	0	4	4
	12.00-12.49	1	0	1
	12.50-12.99	0	3	3
	13 or more	6	0	6
	Total	22	28	50

Table 31 Sufficient income to support family by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	Yes	45	20	65
	Yes, but it is difficult	11	4	15
	No	4	13	17
	Don't know	2	0	2
	Don't want to answer	0	1	1
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	Yes	13	20	33
	Yes, but it is difficult	6	2	8
	No	4	7	11
	Don't know	0	1	1

Total	23	30	53
-------	----	----	----

Table 32 Which PPE is used in the workplace by survey respondents by sector and nationality

	Distribution center		Meat processing	
	Polish	Romanian	Polish	Romanian
Face masks	34	29	20	30
Splash shields	6	2	6	17
Sanitizing hand gel	49	38	23	29
Gloves	18	6	4	5
Special clothes	0	2	1	3
Gloves & Special clothes	1	0	1	5
Cleaning Wipes	0	1	0	0
Disinfectant spray	1	0	1	1
Temperature checks	1	1	1	0
Gloves, special clothes & temperature measurement	0	0	1	0
Contact-less toilet flush	1	0	0	0
Ventilators	0	1	0	0
Towels	1	0	0	0

Table 33 Reasons for inadequate use of PPE at the workplace by sector

	Distribution center	Meat processing
Not sufficient material supplied by the employer	5	0
Improperly used by workers	27	5
I don't find it important	5	0
It is difficult to access the equipment	1	0
Does not believe in the virus	1	0
Equipment is harmful for your health	0	1
Everyone has their own ideas about corona	1	0
The equipment makes it hard to do the work right	2	0
Masks get wet	2	0
Supervisors do not wear it	0	1
Only in places where it is compulsory	4	0
It is too hot for the masks	1	0

Table 34 Reasons inadequate follow-up corona-related workplace measures by sector and nationality

	Distribution center		Meat processing	
	Polish	Romanian	Polish	Romanian
Not sufficiently enforced/supervised by the employer	11	0	2	0
It is difficult to comply with due to the work/building structure	31	0	10	0
Improperly followed by workers	27	3	8	3
I do not find it important	5	0	0	0
Many people do not believe in corona	0	3	0	0
Working with masks is annoying	0	0	0	1
People do not care	0	1	0	0
Makes working impossible	1	0	0	0
Lack of interest	0	0	0	1

Table 35 Instructions corona-related workplace measures by sector

	Distribution center	Meat processing
Yes, orally	80	46
Yes in writing	39	28
Yes, digitally	23	17
No instructions	10	0
Course / Training	0	3
Movie	1	0
Movie and Test	0	1
Posters	1	0
Security	0	1

Table 36 Work team composition survey respondents by sector

	Distribution center	Meat processing
I work with the same group of colleagues throughout the week	56	38
My group of colleagues changes every few days	19	7
My group of colleagues changes daily	14	4
My group of colleagues changes every week	5	1

My group of colleagues changes every three weeks	1	0
My group of colleagues is 30% stable, 70% gets changed every week	0	1
Depends on the season / workload	4	2

Table 37 Where to address non-compliance corona workplace measures by sector and nationality

	Distribution center		Meat processing	
	Polish	Romanian	Polish	Romanian
I would not address this	21	3	5	3
A work floor supervisor in charge of monitoring compliance with the measures	2	5	1	3
My workplace supervisor	22	17	12	14
My contact person at my temporary employment agency	14	6	3	5
The Dutch labour inspectorate	1	0	0	1
A Dutch trade union	5	1	1	0
An NGO	1	0	0	0
The GGD	1	2	1	0
The agency manager	0	1	0	0
A company manager second	0	1	0	0
With regular security	0	2	0	0
The director of the company	0	0	0	1
Does not believe in corona	0	1	0	0
The embassy	0	3	0	0
The factory manager	0	0	0	2
The flex coach (but often they do not listen)	0	1	0	0
The municipality	1	0	0	0
I would change my job	3	0	0	0
I would call in sick	0	0	1	0
A lawyer	0	2	0	0
The Ministry of Health	0	1	0	0
The RIVM	0	1	0	0
The SNCU	1	1	0	0
Fill out a suggestion form at the canteen	0	1	0	0
Supervisors are relaxt	0	1	0	0
Troubleshooter	0	1	0	0
The workers violence representative	0	0	0	1
With another colleague	1	0	0	0

Table 38 Municipal registration survey respondents by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	Yes, as resident	34	18	52
	Yes, as temporary/non-resident (at an RNI office (Registratie Niet-Ingezetenen))	7	2	9
	No	21	18	39
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	Yes, as resident	12	18	30
	Yes, as temporary/non-resident (at an RNI office (Registratie Niet-Ingezetenen))	1	0	1
	No	10	11	21
	Don't know	0	1	1
	Total	23	30	53

Table 39 Duration of stay current accommodation survey respondents by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	Less than 1 month	16	11	27
	Between 1 and 3 months	9	9	18
	Between 4 and 6 months	7	10	17
	Between 7 months and 1 year	8	4	12
	Between 1 year and 3 years	16	3	19
	More than 3 years	6	1	7
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	Less than 1 month	1	7	8
	Between 1 and 3 months	5	7	12
	Between 4 and 6 months	3	2	5
	Between 7 months and 1 year	4	4	8
	Between 1 year and 3 years	6	6	12
	More than 3 years	4	4	8
	Total	23	30	53

Table 40 Who arranged accommodation by sector and nationality

	Distribution center		Meat processing	
	Polish	Romanian	Polish	Romanian
I have arranged it myself	37	6	10	4
The temporary employment agency arranged it	23	25	11	22
My direct employer has arranged that (not agency)	0	0	0	0
A Friend / Acquaintance	2	2	1	4
A (former) Colleague	0	2	0	0
A family member	0	1	1	0
My partner	0	2	0	0

Table 41 Duration of stay current accommodation by self- and agency-arranged accommodation

	I have arranged it myself	The temporary employment agency arranged it	Total
Less than 1 month	3	30	33
Between 1 and 3 months	7	18	25
Between 4 and 6 months	9	12	21
Between 7 months and 1 year	6	12	18
Between 1 year and 3 years	22	6	28
More than 3 years	10	3	13
Total	57	81	138

Table 42 Type of accommodation by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	Recreational / Holiday park	12	6	18
	Large building complex or hotel	8	15	23
	(container) House or apartment	42	17	59
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	Recreational / Holiday park	0	5	5
	Large building complex or hotel	8	10	18
	(container) House or apartment	15	15	30
	Total	23	30	53

Table 43 Type of accommodation by self- and agency-arranged accommodation

	I arranged it myself	The temporary employment agency arranged it	Arranged by a friend, acquaintance, or family	Total
Recreational / Holiday park	2	19	2	23
Large building complex or hotel	0	39	2	41
(container) House or apartment	55	23	11	89
Total	57	81	15	153

Table 44 Co-habitants survey respondents by sector and nationality

	Distribution center		Meat processing	
	Polish	Romanian	Polish	Romanian
I live alone	8	2	4	3
With partner/husband/wife	14	10	9	11
With partner and children	5	0	4	0
With child(ren)	2	1	1	2
With colleagues/other migrant workers in shared accommodation	29	26	8	20
With other people (not colleagues, not migrant workers)	11	1	1	1

Table 45 Co-habitants survey respondents by who arranged the accommodation by nationality

	I have arranged it myself		The temporary employment agency arranged it		arranged by friend, acquaintance, family	
	Polish	Romanian	Polish	Romanian	Polish	Romanian
I live alone	9	4	2	1	1	0
With partner/husband/wife	13	3	10	13	0	5
With partner and children	9	0	0	0	0	0
With child(ren)	3	1	0	1	0	1
With colleagues/other migrant workers in shared accommodation	7	2	29	38	1	6
With other people (not colleagues, not migrant workers)	9	2	0	0	3	0

Table 46 Number of co-habitants of survey respondents in shared housing

	Frequency
With 1 other person	16
With 2 more people	20
With 3-5 more people	37
With 6-10 more people	6
With more than 10 people	12
Other, namely:	3
Don't want to answer	1
Total	95

Table 47 Shared facilities in shared accommodation survey respondents by sector and nationality

		Distribution center		Meat processing	
		Polish	Romanian	Polish	Romanian
Shared kitchen?	Yes	29	26	8	20
	No	0	0	0	0
Shared sanitary facilities?	yes, shower and/or toilet	29	24	8	20
	No	0	2	0	0
Shared bedroom?	I have my own bedroom	30	20	6	12
	With 1 other person	6	8	3	6
	With 2 other people	0	0	0	2
	With 3-5 people	2	0	0	1

Table 48 Monthly rent by who arranged accommodation and sector

		I have arranged it myself	The temporary employment agency arranged it	Arranged by friend, acquaintance, family	Total
don't know		2	2	1	5
200-299		2	0	0	2
300-399		6	10	2	18
Distribution center	400-499	14	34	4	52
	500-599	7	2	0	9
	600-699	3	0	0	3
	700-799	4	0	0	4

	800-899	2	0	1	3
	900-999	2	0	0	2
	1.000+	1	0	1	2
	Total	43	48	9	100
Meat processing	don't know	0	2	2	4
	200-299	0	1	0	1
	300-399	1	11	1	13
	400-499	2	19	1	22
	500-599	4	0	0	4
	600-699	3	0	0	3
	700-799	0	0	1	1
	800-899	3	0	1	4
	900-999	1	0	0	1
	Total	14	33	6	53

Table 49 Monthly rent by bedroom share

	I have my own bedroom	Share with 1 other person	Share with 2 other people	Share with 3-5 people	Total
don't know	5	2	0	0	7
200-299	0	1	0	0	1
300-399	17	3	1	3	24
400-499	39	17	1	0	57
500-599	5	0	0	0	5
700-799	1	0	0	0	1
900-999	1	0	0	0	1
Total	68	23	2	3	96

Table 50 Rent reasonable by who arranged the accommodation and sector

		I have arranged it myself	The temporary employment agency arranged it	arranged by friend, acquaintance, family	Total
Distribution center	I think the amount is too high	13	32	1	46
	I think the amount is reasonable	29	15	7	51
	Don't know	0	1	0	1

	Don't want to answer	1	0	1	2
	Total	43	48	9	100
Meat processing	I think the amount is too high	4	20	1	25
	I think the amount is reasonable	10	12	5	27
	Don't know	0	1	0	1
	Total	14	33	6	53

Table 51 Work-home commute time by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	< 15 min	22	16	38
	16-30 min	31	14	45
	31-60 min	9	6	15
	> 2 hours	0	2	2
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	< 15 min	10	15	25
	16-30 min	4	14	18
	31-60 min	7	1	8
	61-90 min	2	0	2
	Total	23	30	53

Table 52 Mode of transport work-home commute by sector and nationality

	Distribution center		Meat processing	
	Polish	Romanian	Polish	Romanian
I am going with my own car	27	16	4	5
I drive together with colleagues (we arrange this ourselves)	4	1	2	2
I drive together with colleagues (employer arranges this)	14	14	8	10
I use public transport	4	0	0	0
I ride a bicycle	17	9	7	12
I walk	0	4	1	4
I ride a personal motorcycle	0	1	0	0
I use a scooter	2	1	1	0

Table 53 Family doctor registration by who arranged accommodation and nationality

		Family doctor	No family doctor	Don't know	Total
Polish	I have arranged it myself	31	16	0	47
	The temporary employment agency arranged it	3	28	3	34
	Arranged by friend, acquaintance, family	0	4	0	4
	Total	34	48	3	85
Romanian	I have arranged it myself	5	4	1	10
	The temporary employment agency arranged it	15	31	1	47
	arranged by friend, acquaintance, family	4	6	1	11
	Total	24	41	3	68

Table 54 Information sources on quarantine rules in the Netherlands by nationality

	Polish	Romanian
I did not get any information	3	2
Via my employer	28	23
Via colleagues	11	7
Via a member of your family/relative	8	1
Through social media: Facebook	13	5
Through social media: TikTok	0	1
Through social media: Instagram	1	2
Websites: Niedziela.nl; holandia.info	2	0
Through newspapers and magazines	1	3
Via television	4	7
Via internet	40	37
Via the embassy	2	3
Acquaintances / Friends	2	3
Agency supervisor	0	1
Website of taxes	2	0
Deutsches Gesundheitsamt	1	0
Colleagues	0	1
Dutch government website	3	4
GGD	3	0
Border authorities	1	4

Texted messages on phone	1	0
Polish information website	4	0
Niedziela.nl	2	0
Not; no answer from the embassy	0	1
Posters	1	0
TV news	0	1
User company	0	1
Municipality website	1	0
Housing site	1	0

Table 55 Quarantine experience during current job by sector and nationality

		Polish	Romanian	Total
Distribution center	Yes	19	11	30
	No	43	27	70
	Total	62	38	100
Meat processing	Yes	9	14	23
	No	14	16	30
	Total	23	30	53

Table 56 Main sources of information corona-related measures by nationality

		Polish	Romanian
Employer		20	13
Other colleagues		9	8
A member of my family/relative		11	1
Social media	Facebook	15	7
	Instagram	1	0
	Niedziela.nl	2	0
	Twitter	1	0
The internet (google)		47	37
Newspapers and magazines:	British papers	0	1
	different newspapers from different countries.	1	0
	gazeta wyborcza, newsweek, ...	1	0
	niedziela.nl	1	0
	online	0	1
	polonia.nl	1	0
	radio.zet, focus.pl	1	0

A trade union (such as:)	FNV	0	1
Embassy consulate		1	2
Dutch television		5	5
Nowhere		1	1
Agency		0	1
Company		0	1
Government website		9	6
Dutch colleagues		0	1
Dutch radio / television		1	3
Municipality		3	0
Word of mouth		0	1
Polish / Romanian radio or television		8	0
Not interested in the information		1	0
Medical publications		0	1
Polish friends / colleagues		2	0

Table 57 Main sources of support in case of non-payment by nationality

	Polish	Romanian
Nobody	1	4
A friend or relative in the Netherlands	5	2
A co-worker	2	1
The employer (temporary employment agency) that I work for (not physical workplace)	26	17
The company where I work (physical workplace)	13	10
The municipality	0	1
The Dutch labour inspectorate	3	4
NGO: Fairwork	1	1
NGO: I would need to find out which one	3	0
Trade Union: CNV	1	0
Trade Union: FVN	11	3
Trade Union: CNV, FNV	1	0
Trade Union: Don't know which one	6	1
Embassy consulate	2	2
Lawyer	15	16
Book keeper	7	0
Public employment agency (UWV)	3	4
Taxes authorities (Belastingdienst)	1	0
Department at IM regarding	0	1
FNV	0	1

Municipality	1	1
Organisation (doesn't know which one)	1	0
Help in Poland / Romania	1	0
Look for another job	2	1
Look for someone on Internet / Facebook	2	0
Job Coach	0	1
Pawnbroker	0	1
Planner agency	0	1
Police	0	1
Pomic.nl	1	0
SNCU	4	1
Supervisor	0	1
Translator	2	0
Not applicable	0	1

Table 58 Main sources of support in case of job loss because of need to quarantine by nationality

	Polish	Romanian
Look for another job	22	13
Nobody	15	6
A friend or relative in the Netherlands	6	13
A friend or relative in another country, namely:	1	2
A co-worker	0	2
The employer (temporary employment agency) that I work for (not physical workplace)	7	10
The company (main contractor) where I work (physical workplace)	3	4
The municipality	1	2
The Dutch labour inspectorate	4	1
An NGO	6	0
A trade union (such as: FNV)	11	1
A trade union (such as: CNV)	1	0
A trade union (such as: FNV/CNV)	1	0
A trade union (such as: would look up which one, if that would happen)	8	0
I would look for organisations that could help on the internet	3	0
I would look for organisations that could help via social media	1	0
Embassy consulate	2	2
Advocate	13	9
Book keeper	2	0
Public employment agency (UWV)	7	3

SNCU	3	0
an employer cannot fire you because of that	0	1
Ombudsman	0	1
I have insurance for that	1	0
LEVGroup	1	0
pomoc.nl	1	0
Dutch Government	0	1
Return to Romania	0	1
Don't know	10	8
Don't want to answer	1	1

Table 59 Why are you not a trade union member by nationality

	Polish	Romanian
Never seriously thought about becoming a member	56	6
Lack of knowledge about trade unions	3	17
Not interested in trade unions	2	16
Is interested, but hasn't managed to become member yet (due to language issues, lack of time, ...)	4	11
Trade unions do not represent my interests well	2	2
Thinks it is too expensive	2	0
Does not have a permanent contract	0	1
Thought membership was not possible	0	2
Has not found the right one	0	1
High mobility	0	1
Does not know anyone who is a member	1	0
Afraid for employer consequences	1	0
Don't know	2	4
Don't want to answer	0	3