1 TITLE PAGE

How Weak Relational Ties and Counterproductive Communication Sustain Collaborative Challenges in Vocational Rehabilitation for People on Long-term Sick Leave due to Common Mental Disorders: A Case Study in Denmark

Frederik Martiny[1,2]*, Marius Brostrøm Kousgaard[1], Christian Jauernik[1,2], Pia Kürstein Kjellberg[3], Maarten Rozing[1], Frans Waldorff[1], Mads Aage Toft Kristensen[1,4]

Affiliations:

1) The Research Unit for General Practice and Section of General Practice, Department of Public Health, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark
2) Department of Social Medicine, Copenhagen University Hospital Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg, Copenhagen, Denmark
3) VIVE The Danish Center for Social Science Research, Copenhagen, Denmark
4) Department of Occupational and Social Medicine, Copenhagen University Hospital Holbæk, Denmark

*Corresponding author:

Frederik Martiny, fhm@sund.ku.dk

Word Count: 8578

2 ABSTRACT

Purpose

Explore why collaborative challenges emerge in vocational rehabilitation for citizens on long-term sick leave due to common mental disorders (CMDs), and how they are experienced and navigated by key actors in the Danish sick leave system: citizens, caseworkers (CWs), and general practitioners (GPs).

Methods

A case study in two Danish municipalities, including semi-structured interviews with seven citizens, seven GPs and six focus group interviews with 31 CWs. The data were inductively analysed via systematic text condensation followed by abductive analysis using relational coordination theory.

Results

The lack of shared goals among key actors led them to campaign for their agendas, turning collaboration into a competition over the agenda. Limited shared knowledge resulted in repeated efforts to clarify expectations, making collaboration feel "colossally labouring." A lack of mutual trust and respect triggered distancing communication strategies, resulting in a relational divide.

Conclusion

Lack of relational coordination, marked by weak relational ties and counterproductive communication, explains how collaborative challenges emerge and persist in vocational rehabilitation for people on long-term sick leave due to CMDs. The self-perpetuating nature of these dynamics highlights the need for rethinking how organisational structures can promote relational coordination. Future research should investigate the contextual factors influencing relational coordination.

3 KEYWORDS (5-8)

1) Vocational rehabilitation
2) Common mental disorders
3) Sick leave
4) Return to work
5) Qualitative research
6) Relational coordination
7) Primary care
8) Intersectoral collaboration

4 INTRODUCTION

The prevalence of common mental disorders (CMDs), including anxiety, mild to moderate depression, adjustment disorders, and stress-related illnesses (1), has increased globally in recent years, placing a significant burden on societies through healthcare costs, lost productivity, and social care expenses (2–5). In turn, living with CMDs has serious personal consequences, including reduced quality of life, disability, and stigma (3,6,7).

Globally, CMDs account for 40% of sick leave and are the leading cause of absenteeism (3,8). In turn, individuals on sick leave due to CMDs are three times less likely to return to work (RTW) than those without mental disorders (3,9). Unemployment is a strong social determinant of health, adding to the burden of suffering from CMDs (10–12). In turn, the dual burden of being unemployed and having a mental disorder is exacerbated by stigma, e.g., shame and guilt for not contributing to the labour market, having a "lifestyle disease" or feeling like "a burden to society" (13–15), which further deteriorates people's chances of re-entering the labour market (7). Resultantly, long-term unemployment among people with CMDs aggravates their health and social conditions, causing vicious cycles between poor health outcomes and reduced chances of RTW (3,12,16–20). In addition, unemployment exacerbates existing health inequities related to mental illnesses, e.g., socioeconomically deprived people have a higher risk of mental illnesses, which further worsens their social position due to the consequences of unemployment and ill health for their ability to sustain themselves financially (3,16,21).

Therefore, it is a priority for public health to provide access to employment, health, and social care services for people who are unemployed due to health concerns (22). The purpose of vocational rehabilitation is to improve work participation among working-age individuals with health-related impairments, limitations, or restrictions affecting work functioning through collaboration among the individual, various stakeholders across sectors, institutions, and professional disciplines, including health, social, and employment areas (22–30). Importantly, vocational rehabilitation is a collaboration among multiple stakeholders. Consequently, its effectiveness depends on the quality of this collaboration, including high-quality communication and effective task coordination (3,30,31)

Unfortunately, many barriers impede effective collaboration in vocational rehabilitation. On a political and administrative level, differing legal frameworks can hinder collaboration, as can incongruent IT systems, shifting political goals, and conflicting paradigms among professional institutions (26–28,32,33). Furthermore, at both an intra- and interorganizational level, staff turnover, time constraints, power imbalances between professionals, incompatible working

procedures, and uncertainties concerning roles and responsibilities can limit professionals' ability to coordinate their tasks effectively (24–28,34–36). At the intra- and interpersonal levels, collaborative challenges can arise when professionals' usual roles are being challenged. These challenges can arise from differences in professional cultures and views on the role and autonomy of citizens on sick leave, the use of differing professional language, doubts about the value of collaboration, and conflicting perspectives on goals, roles, and responsibilities (24,25,27,28,36). Furthermore, efforts to improve collaboration regarding vocational rehabilitation for individuals on sick leave have yielded sparse results (28,32,37–40).

Although the organisation of vocational rehabilitation services differs substantially between countries (3,41), the strikingly similar findings from studies across time, target groups, and countries suggest that findings about the collaborative issues in vocational rehabilitation are to some extent transferable across different contexts (27–29,42–44). However, to our knowledge, previous studies in this area have not offered a theoretical explanation of why and how these collaborative challenges emerge, or how stakeholders attempt to navigate them in everyday practice. This knowledge could potentially support the advancement of the field towards more effective solutions to the abundance of identified barriers and facilitators for collaboration in vocational rehabilitation.

To this end, this study aimed to explore why collaborative challenges emerge in vocational rehabilitation for citizens on long-term sick leave due to CMDs, and how they are experienced and navigated by key actors in the Danish sick leave system.

5 METHODS

5.1 METHODOLOGY

We conducted a case study using qualitative methods in two municipal settings in the Capital Region of Denmark, including the perspectives of citizens, CWs, and GPs concerning collaborative challenges in vocational rehabilitation for citizens on long-term sick leave due to CMDs.

5.2 SETTING

5.2.1 THE DANISH SICK LEAVE SYSTEM

In Denmark, vocational rehabilitation for people on sick leave is coordinated across health, social, and employment sectors. The five Danish regions provide healthcare services, including both

hospital-based (secondary) and general/specialist practice (primary) services. Municipalities are responsible for social, preventive health, and employment services. Denmark's 98 municipalities are legally required to deliver employment services through a job centre, which is commonly organised separately from their preventive health and social services. The municipal job centres employ CWs responsible for coordinating the vocational rehabilitation process and supporting citizens throughout their sick leave.

At the time of the study, citizens were entitled to sickness benefits for up to 22 weeks, contingent on their participation in vocational rehabilitation. CWs could grant extensions if criteria such as severe illness or unclear prognosis were met. Citizens must meet with their assigned CW in the first eight weeks of sick leave. Before the meeting, citizens submitted a brief self-report on the cause of their sick leave absence. CWs could request additional medical documentation from GPs via formal sick leave certificates before or after the meeting. Four follow-up meetings were required during the 22 weeks of sick leave. These meetings primarily focused on citizens' ability to work and whether any health or social issues should be addressed to promote this goal (45). Furthermore, meetings aimed to promote work participation through work-related and healthcare activities, such as advising on dialogue with the employer, job-seeking activities, and training or treatment (46).

In Denmark, vocational rehabilitation for sick leave recipients primarily involves collaboration between three key actors: the citizen, a case worker (CW) employed by the municipal job centre and the citizen's general practitioner (GP). The distribution of responsibilities among citizens, CWs, and GPs reflected the intersectoral nature of the system. Citizens were expected to participate in agreed-upon activities to facilitate their return to work and maintain eligibility for benefits. CWs held a dual role, supporting return-to-work and determining eligibility for benefits and services. Similarly, GPs served as citizens' primary care providers and certifiers of citizens' health status, i.e., their documentation influenced decisions about continued benefit entitlement.

5.2.2 CASE STUDY SETTING: SELECTION OF MUNICIPALITIES

The study was conducted in two municipalities (MPs) in the Capital Region of Denmark, purposefully selected to assess whether similar patterns would emerge across different contexts, i.e., literal replication logic (47). Municipalities were recruited based on the following criteria: (1) gaining access to a diverse sample of participants for interviews due to a differing sociodemographic profile, (2) enhancing transferability of findings given a varied municipal approach to vocational rehabilitation. Compared to MP1, the population served in MP2 was less affluent, and the provision of vocational rehabilitation services relied more heavily on private contractors, such as work placements, resulting

in fewer in-house services and a lower level of interdisciplinarity. Both municipalities were approached by the first author (FM) via email, and an in-person meeting was scheduled with management to discuss the study's purpose, access to the field, and mutual expectations before the study's commencement.

5.3 DATA GENERATION

We primarily generated data using semi-structured individual interviews with citizens and GPs, as well as focus group interviews with CWs. Interviews were preceded by participant observations of citizens and CWs in the sickness benefits section of the job centre, which served to recruit and build rapport with participants, inform the interview guide, and contextualise the analysis of interviews.

5.3.1 SAMPLING AND RECRUITMENT FOR INTERVIEWS

We recruited citizens and CWs for interviews through participant observations, concurrently recruiting GPs via various means.

Citizens were eligible for an interview if they were on sick leave due to CMDs and had either been sick-listed for more than three months or were judged to have a high risk of long-term unemployment by their CW. Citizens were recruited via CWs, who identified potential candidates through their case files and either invited FM to attend the citizen's next meeting or shared the citizen's contact details. Citizens were strategically sampled for variation in age, sex, sick leave duration, education, and labour market history.

CWs were selected based on age and experience with sick leave cases. Recruitment was coordinated through meetings with the job centre management. CWs were divided into groups according to their work experience to minimise potential hierarchical barriers and promote open discussion.

GPs were recruited to ensure diversity in age, sex, experience, and clinic size through multiple strategies, including outreach via union websites, research network contacts, CW referrals, and direct contact.

FM conducted individual interviews with seven citizens, six focus group interviews with 31 CWs, and seven interviews with GPs across the two municipalities (**table 1a-1c**).

Data collection adhered to the principle of information power (48,49), with iterative analysis guiding the sampling process until sufficient depth, variation, and insight were achieved to address

the research question. Interviews were audio recorded, and FM took notes. Student assistants transcribed the interviews verbatim following a transcription guide. FM subsequently double-checked them.

5.3.2 INTERVIEWS WITH CITIZENS, CASE WORKERS, AND GENERAL PRACTITIONERS

Based on participant observations at the job centre, we developed and pilot-tested an interview guide with two GPs having expert knowledge about the collaboration between general practice and municipal job centres and one CW from MP2. The pilot revealed the need for tailored interview guides for each actor group (**Interview guide**). Furthermore, the individual interviews with CWs and participant observations revealed that CWs were more accustomed to and comfortable discussing complex cases with one another. Therefore, we judged that focus groups would be better suited to engage CWs in discussions about the aim.

We conducted individual semi-structured interviews with citizens and GPs and focus group interviews with CWs. All participants were asked about their experiences with collaboration in vocational rehabilitation for people on long-term sick leave due to CMDs. To support reflection, three structured exercises were included in interviews: (1) discussing predefined conceptual pairs, e.g., Trust/Distrust, Security/Insecurity, as sensitizing concepts to guide reflection on potential tensions in vocational rehabilitation, (2) comparing real-world collaboration with the ideal definition of vocational rehabilitation, and (3) completing a matrix assessing involvement (high or low) and contributions (positive/negative) of key actors in vocational rehabilitation (**Interview exercises**).

Interviews with citizens began with open questions about their experience transitioning from work to sick leave, followed by a semi-structured discussion based on the interview guide and exercises. Interviews took place at a location of the citizens' choice, typically the job centre or the interviewer's workplace.

Focus groups with CWs were held at the job centre. The sessions were moderated by FM, who began by setting ground rules to ensure a safe discussion space. This was followed by group reflections and semi-structured dialogue guided by visible topic cards (**Interview guide**).

Interviews with GPS took place in their clinic. They began with open reflections about their role and tasks related to the target group, followed by a semi-structured interview based on the interview guide.

5.3.3 PARTICIPANT OBSERVATIONS AND DOCUMENT ANALYSIS

FM conducted participant observations for 32 days in the two job centres, observing daily routines, participating in meetings and informal discussions among CWs, and participating in CWs' sick leave meetings with citizens. Additionally, FM analysed documents, e.g., CWs' conversation templates, doctors' sick leave certificates, and judicial documents. Findings were compiled in field notes.

5.4 ANALYSIS OF DATA

The analytical approach was rooted in pragmatism, prioritising practical relevance, contextual understanding, and flexible use of qualitative methods, e.g., making methodological decisions based upon what was considered most relevant for practice (50). Importantly, our analysis focused on explaining how citizens, CWs, and GPs experienced collaborative challenges in vocational rehabilitation for people on long-term sick leave due to common mental disorders (CMDs). Therefore, we did not address aspects of the collaboration that worked well.

Interview transcripts were coded in NVIVO ver15 by FM using systematic text condensation, an inductive cross-case method (51). We adapted the method by organising meaning units into subthemes based on the embedded sub-units of the case, e.g., citizens, CWs, and GPs, to explore differences in how each group experienced vocational rehabilitation for long-term sick leave due to CMDs. Field notes from observations, document analyses, and interview notes were compiled in a Word document, which was used to contextualise interview findings through iterative comparison, supporting the production of context-sensitive knowledge (50).

Emerging findings highlighted that collaborative challenges among the key actors were relational and resulted in certain communication practices. Therefore, we searched the scientific literature for theoretical knowledge to connect and refine our inductive themes as a secondary abductive analytical step. We applied the relational coordination theory (52,53), viewing collaboration as a mutually reinforcing interaction between communication and work relationships to facilitate task integration (54). The theory has proven suitable for describing contexts characterised by interdependent tasks, uncertainty, and time sensitivity, which we found was well aligned with the context of vocational rehabilitation (53).

In our continued analysis, emerging findings aligned well with the theory's relational dimensions, e.g., shared goals, shared knowledge, and mutual trust and respect. Consequently, our final themes were structured around these, each explaining why and how distinct aspects of collaborative challenges emerged, and how these were experienced among the key actors. However,

the theory's four aspects of high-quality communication, i.e., frequency, timeliness, accuracy and problem-solving communication, did not fully explain our findings. Therefore, we used these aspects of communication as sensitising concepts to examine how stakeholders navigated collaborative challenges through distinct communication strategies.

5.5 ETHICS

We applied for ethical approval of the study to the Regional Committee on Health Research Ethics in Denmark for the Capital Region, deciding that the current study did not require ethical approval (case number F-22051534). Still, the study was conducted in compliance with the Helsinki Declaration (55), and written consent was obtained from all participants after they received oral information about the aims and methods of the research project**.** Citizens were informed that choosing to participate in interviews or not would not affect their sick leave process and that nothing would be shared with CWs from their interviews. CWs' participation in focus group interviews was supported by management, yet it was explicitly voluntary, allowing for withdrawal or non-attendance without explanation. Likewise, GPs were free to choose whether they would like to participate or not.

6 RESULTS

6.1 WE FOUND THAT COLLABORATIVE CHALLENGES BETWEEN RELATIONAL TIES AMONG THEM, INCLUDING A LACK OF DEGREE OF MUTUAL TRUST AND RESPECT. THE KEY ACTORS DISTINCT COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES, SUCH AS HOWEVER, RATHER THAN RESOLVING RELATIONAL CONTRIBUTING TO SELF-SUSTAINING CYCLES OF STRAINED QUALITY COMMUNICATION (**FIGURE 1**)TABLE 2

Table 2. Means and ends in vocational rehabilitation

Actor	Principle/Logic	Means	End (Functional goal)
Citizen	"Care trumps workfare"	Access to care-related activities and exemption from workfare	Improved functioning leading to return to work to the extent possible.
CW	"Workfare thinking improves care practices"	Workfare principles in care activities	Motivation and readiness for work-related activities

			during care
GP	"Care thinking improves workfare practices"	Care considerations in workfare practices	Consciousness about implications of citizens' health on work-related activities and vice versa

table .

Figure 1 Collaborative Challenges in Vocational Rehabilitation Due to Weak Relational Ties and Counterproductive Communication: A Conceptual Model



Findings are presented in three themes corresponding to the three relational dimensions (**figure 1**). Each theme is structured in three parts: (1) why collaborative challenges emerged due to low quality of the specific type of relational dimension, e.g., lack of shared goals, (2) how citizens, CWs, and GPs experienced the resulting collaborative challenges, and (3) how citizens, CWs, and GPs attempted to navigate the challenges through distinct communicative strategies.

6.2 THEME 1: LACK OF SHARED GOALS TURNED COLLABORATION INTO A COMPETITION FOR THE AGENDA

At first glance, it appeared that citizens, CWs, and GPs collaborated to increase citizens' work participation, i.e., they shared a common goal. However, this apparent consensus concealed underlying disagreements about the means and ends of vocational rehabilitation (**table**). Below the surface, the key actors pursued diverging functional goals to optimise their agendas at the expense of working towards a shared goal, i.e., subgoal optimisation, resulting in collaborative challenges among them (**table**). In general, a conflict arose between the logic of care, i.e., supporting people according to their needs, vs. the logic of workfare, i.e., making benefits conditional on work or activation in work-related activities.

6.2.1 CITIZENS PURSUED ACCESS TO CARE AND EXEMPTION FROM WORKFARE

All interviewed citizens expressed a desire to return to work. However, they often found work-related activities, e.g., job placements or sanctions, too demanding to manage due to their health issues. As a result, citizens experienced workfare as coercive and counterproductive to RTW. Instead, citizens sought access to care-related activities, such as illness management support, which they perceived as superior to workfare as a means of getting back to work. Thus, citizens believed that access to care-related and exemption from work-related activities were the best means to improve their functioning and, ultimately, to be rehabilitated, i.e., for citizens, “care trumped workfare”. However, this logic conflicted with work-related demands embedded in the Danish sick leave system, e.g., having to attend various meetings and other work-related activities to receive sickness benefits, which led to a dilemma for citizens between wanting peace and the time to heal on the one hand and the desire to RTW and make progress on the other hand as exemplified by the following reflection from a sick-listed citizen:

I like that I get the time to have peace for myself to heal. But sometimes it takes a bit too long before the next thing... Sometimes it's three to four weeks before the next meeting with anyone... where I just sit and do nothing. Where I could have healed... and got a job again, and be useful... Yes, it could be a bit more frequent, but on the other hand, I also think I need that peace. (Citizen 43, MP1)

6.2.2 CASE WORKERS USED WORKFARE PRINCIPLES TO CARE FOR CITIZENS

The agenda for CWs was to improve citizens' chances of returning to work by encouraging citizens and GPs to shift their mindset from focusing on illnesses, limitations, and problems towards seeing possibilities for enhancing work ability through internships, training, and other work-related activities, i.e., a workfare logic. Many CWs described their key task as *finding people's resource tracks* and *preventing passiveness, e.g.:*

... but then we found that she had some motivation for something, and that was to study Asian culture. So, there is always something you can work with… Everyone has a resource track. I believe it. You must move them from the problem track to the resource track... there must be something, right? I believe that. Everyone can do something… everyone has some resources. It just needs to be found. (Less experienced CWs, MP1)

Notably, CWs recognised the importance of facilitating access to care-related activities to improve citizens' health, for instance, by accompanying them to health services or reminding them of scheduled appointments. Still, CWs, caring primarily meant supporting citizens' motivation and capacity to engage with workfare, e.g., by helping them develop the skills to manage illness while participating in internships. In this sense, for CWs, doing workfare was a way to care.

6.2.3 GENERAL PRACTITIONERS PROMOTED CARE TO MAKE SENSE OF WORKFARE

Although GPs shared CW's emphasis on supporting citizens to return to work, their approach differed from that of CWs, i.e., GPs adopted an approach other than workfare logic. Unlike CWs, GPs' agenda was to promote care considerations in workfare by highlighting the interconnection between health and work, e.g.:

Citizens need some "counterbalancing" to understand that staying at home, waiting until you're well enough doesn't make you healthy...we help them by saying that they need to be a little more exploratory... returning to work is something you can do gently and gradually… start by having a cup of coffee with your colleagues. That's how we dedramatize and demystify getting back to work. That's good medicine… I turn it around and say that it's not the municipality that should test you, but rather it's about finding something that you think you might be curious about. (GP33, MP1)

Thus, GPs' logic was to promote care considerations in workfare by reconceptualising work-related measures, i.e., using care as the method to reach the goals of workfare.

6.2.4 CAMPAIGNING AND DIFFERING IDEAS OF HIGH-QUALITY COMMUNICATION

The lack of shared goals led key actors to engage in campaigning, a communication strategy focused on persuading others of their logic regarding the means and ends of vocational rehabilitation (**table**), e.g.,:

> *… some citizens say things like: "I just need peace and quiet". Then we need to have that conversation about it's not passive support... and they say: "my doctor has said that I just need to take it easy". But you can't do that. That's not part of Sick leave legislation. (Less experienced CWs MP1)*

Interestingly, the key actors described their communication in terms that aligned with the characteristics of high-quality communication in relational coordination theory, i.e., frequent, timely, accurate, and problem-solving communication. However, comparing the key actors' examples of campaigning illuminated that high-quality communication from one perspective was often perceived as low-quality communication from others' perspectives. For example, citizens described their campaigning efforts to convince others about access to care and exemption from workfare as high-quality communication. However, this agenda was frustrating for CWs who perceived it as low-quality communication. Similarly, what CWs perceived as poor or unhelpful communication in sick leave certificate responses from GPs was conversely considered good communication quality by many GPs.

6.3 THEME 2: LIMITED SHARED KNOWLEDGE MADE COLLABORATION FEEL 'COLOSSALLY LABOURING'

Collectively, citizens, CWs, and GPs felt that their collaborators lacked sufficient knowledge about them, e.g., their working conditions, roles, and areas of expertise, highlighting a lack of shared knowledge (**table**). As a result, the key actors experienced collaborative challenges related to unclear role distribution, misunderstandings, and being tasked with things perceived as outside their capabilities or areas of expertise.

6.3.1 CITIZENS FELT BURDENED BY TRYING TO BRIDGE KNOWLEDGE GAPS

Citizens were often unsure who to contact about specific issues or how professionals coordinated their cases, expressing a need for clearer role definitions among the many actors involved:

… What is your role for me? You shouldn't play half psychologist, half doctor or half caseworker. That's who you are. And that's your role, rather than everyone overlapping. (Citizen 27, MP1)

Further, citizens often reported a mismatch between the high cognitive demands of navigating the sick leave system and their reduced cognitive capacity due to stress and mental illness. These experiences were exacerbated by the poor continuity in case workers responsible for their sick leave case, forcing citizens to explain and repeat their sick leave story multiple times without knowing how their story would be received, i.e., whether they would feel understood and helped:

It was just that during the same case, I could have a new caseworker every month. And then I had to explain things again. And then it was almost like winning the lottery if someone was sympathetic to the story. And it wasn't because I wanted to leech off society, I just wanted help. (Citizen 43, MP1)

6.3.2 CASE WORKERS COMPENSATED FOR OTHER PEOPLE'S SCARCE KNOWLEDGE

From the CWs' perspective, citizens and GPs had limited knowledge about the sick leave system, placing an added burden on CWs to repeatedly explain rules and regulations alongside their regular duties.

We have legislation that we must follow. Sometimes we feel that people try to sneak around it. There's nothing better than talking about yourself and your illness. But our conversations are not meant to concern illness. It's about how to get back to work. And people say things like: 'Well, I'm ill'. Yes - but what does it take for you to get back to work? ... We don't focus on how many band aids they're wearing. That's the first thing they need to understand. (Experienced CW, MP2)

Although explaining rules related to sick leave was formally part of CWs' role, they felt it became unfair and time-consuming when they had to do much more than they thought reasonable. In addition, CWs sometimes felt that citizens were trying to hide certain information from them or bypass the rules regarding sick leave, adding a controlling component to their workload. In addition, CWs often experienced that citizens and GPs blamed or disrespected them for the system's rigid bureaucracy, which they indirectly represented:

... most people meet us with prejudices. Especially if it's their first time here or if they've had a previous bad experience. (Experienced CW, MP1)

6.3.3 GENERAL PRACTITIONERS SET BOUNDARIES TO MANAGE EXPECTATIONS

GPs often felt that citizens and CWs had unrealistic expectations of them, e.g., CWs requesting definitive answers to complex conditions like stress or mild depression. In such cases, GPs struggled to convey what they felt were the necessary nuances of sick leave cases, being concerned that their assessment would be interpreted as definitive answers:

Predicting when people's treatment will be optimised, if all treatment options have been tried, and when people can return to full work ability... Whatever that means… It's like we're supposed to be the oracle in Delphi, right? The idea that case workers think they can use us for that... It's a symbol of a general juridification of society… thinking that everything can be answered just by asking... I don't mind being asked, but don't use it as a fact. Use it as an opinion, as an information piece. Then they must judge what it means for people's work ability. (GP 49, MP2)

A similar concern for GPs was when citizens expected validation of their perceived care needs and exemption from workfare, which did not align with GPs' clinical judgment, pushing GPs towards setting clear boundaries around their professional role:

My role is to be a doctor... I'm not the judicial power. Sometimes, citizens tell me that the job centre has advised me to write that they need an early retirement pension. Then I tell them: "No, I'm not going to do that. I must examine you and explain what's wrong with you, as well as what we can do to make you as well as possible. It's not my job to find jobs for them or to judge them. (GP 42, MP2)

6.3.4 CLARIFYING COMMUNICATION ONLY PARTIALLY COMPENSATED FOR LIMITED SHARED KNOWLEDGE

The key actors tried to navigate the low degree of shared knowledge via *clarifying* communication strategies. These strategies served to reduce ambiguity and confusion within the collaboration by explaining one's situation, perspectives, self-perceived role, and one's expectations about roles and tasks from others, i.e. to clarify mutual expectations. However, *clarifying* communication strategies only partially compensated for the low degree of shared knowledge among the key actors. Further, the price of these strategies was extra work and a collective experience of the collaboration as *"colossally labouring",* as one CW exclaimed during an interview.

The primary clarification strategy for citizens was to act as *messengers* by relaying their stories of sick leave to the various stakeholders involved in their case. Paradoxically, this "citizen work" reduced citizens' energy to engage in rehabilitative activities such as socialising, exercise, or hobbies:

... I focus on all this stuff with the job centre, doctors and what's going to happen, and work, and I put my energy into that. But when I get home, I don't have the energy for doing anything else... there's simply no room for it. I feel sad to say it out loud. It's just hard to be honest about it. It takes me a great deal of mental effort... I'm just completely exhausted, right? (Citizen 27, MP1)

In turn, CWs adopted the role of "bureaucracy guides", feeling responsible for repeatedly explaining sick leave rules to citizens and GPs and for guiding them about services and regulations beyond their formal responsibilities:

It can be very difficult to wear both hats, offering support, guidance and counselling, but also wearing the authority hat and advising about consequences and sanctions. It can make it difficult to build trust. Less experienced (CWs, MP1)

For GPs, clarifying communication involved a more narrowly focused and standardised approach towards people on sick leave than they typically took when dealing with patients in primary care. Here, their first step was to explain to citizens or CWs what they considered were the medical versus the non-medical problems related to sick leave, which many GPs described as "closing the somatic door for the patient":

... the reason I take all these blood tests is that they often fear something serious is wrong with them. At the follow-up appointment, we can say: See, you're not seriously ill, you're not dying... and then we can get back to the psychological part. (GP 42, MP2)

Second, GPs zoomed in on managing medical issues:

My role is to clarify what's going on. Optimise as quickly as possible... And if there's something wrong, we need to find out what it is. And is it something we can do better? (GP 33, MP2)

Third, GPs signposted citizens to other professionals for non-medical concerns:

I think we help them by explaining that this isn't a medical issue. If it's stress, or something psychological, or something related to their employer. An imbalance in their lives ... it's about separating the wheat from the chaff to find out what's medical in this and take care of that. (GP 49, MP2)

This three-step strategy helped GPs maintain professional boundaries and avoid being misunderstood.

6.4 THEME 3: LOW LEVELS OF MUTUAL TRUST AND RESPECT TURNED COLLABORATORS INTO ADVERSARIES

Low levels of trust and respect among citizens, CWs, and GPs emerged as a major driver of collaborative challenges. The main consequences of mistrust and disrespect were that the key actors began to perceive their collaborators as obstacles or adversaries due to experiences of being ignored, dismissed, misunderstood, or actively opposed in their needs, views, contributions, or recommendations for the sick leave case (**table**).

6.4.1 CITIZENS WARRANTED SICK LEAVE VALIDATION FROM PROFESSIONALS

From the citizens' perspective, a low degree of trust and respect primarily stemmed from professionals who did not validate their experiences, opinions, or needs. For example, professionals who were unwilling to support their requests for access to care or pressured them into work-related activities, which they felt unable to perform, contributed to this perception. After sharing their stories about sick leave, many citizens explained how they sometimes felt misunderstood or blamed. As a result, they sought trustworthy professionals who were good at listening to their story, offering support, taking the required time, and believing their account, e.g.:

They care for me and support me. It's not that I need them to echo my words, but they agree with my assumptions... It just feels safe... They confirm that what I'm feeling, thinking and experiencing is okay. (Citizen 31, MP2)

Citizens described this as a human approach that affirmed the legitimacy of their experiences, which they contrasted to a system-driven approach where citizens sometimes felt that the system's priorities superseded their needs.

6.4.2 CASE WORKERS FELT MISTRUSTED, DISRESPECTED AND UNDERVALUED

The narrative about job centres portrayed by the media had a significant impact on CWs, feeling that their intentions were mistrusted due to their role as job centre representatives:

… the media is just out to get us, right? Whether it's social media... on TV... or wherever it is... oh my God, we're so reviled. Do you think there's anyone in Denmark who doesn't know what the job centre's victims are (patient organisation)? Where do all the good stories go, I wonder, because God knows there are many of those also. (Less experienced CWs, MP1)

The challenge related to gaining trust from GPs and citizens was especially pronounced for less experienced CWs, who struggled to balance their dual role of providing support and guidance while assessing and deciding on eligibility for sickness benefits and other services:

It can be very difficult to wear both hats, offering support, guidance and counselling, but also wearing the authority hat and advising about consequences and sanctions. It can make it difficult to build trust. (Less experienced CWs, MP1)

Some CWs even hesitated to discuss their work with friends or family due to fear of criticism. Further, many CWs expressed that they felt at the bottom of a professional hierarchy, with their judgments frequently dismissed in favour of those from health professionals, even on matters within the caseworkers' expertise:

… if your GP says you should never work again, they can't hear anything else. If we say something else, then there is no respect for that... Or if it's a doctor at the hospital or something, they'll always rank higher than us. It's like it's the law if the doctor has said so, but here at the job centre... No, they won't listen to us. (Experienced CWs, MP1)

Conversely to CWs' experience of mistrust and disrespect from others, they tended to lose trust and respect in GPs who were perceived as uncritical about how they handled sick leave certificates. In such cases, CWs questioned whether GPs genuinely assessed cases or merely echoed citizens' accounts, which was described as *"holding the microphone for the patient" (Experienced CWs, MP2)*. CWs' trust and respect for citizens and GPs were further strained when GPs or citizens appeared to disregard their contributions or when citizens and GPs focused solely on illness and limitations instead of possibilities for return to work.

6.4.3 GENERAL PRACTITIONERS' FEAR OF BEING MISUSED FOR QUESTIONABLE CLAIMS

Unlike CWs and citizens, GPs rarely felt that others mistrusted their intentions. However, they did feel their contributions were sometimes disrespected, particularly when their medical assessments were misunderstood or misused. For example, GPs discussed encounters with citizens who appeared to exaggerate symptoms or attempt to influence the content of sick leave certificates to avoid work-

related activities, leaving GPs feeling misused in legitimising questionable claims. In turn, GPs sometimes felt that CWs misused their assessments to justify untimely or unjustified closures of sick leave cases, or that their care-related recommendations were ignored. In more extreme cases, GPs could lose respect for CWs when they received sick leave certificate requests that seemed automated, uncritical or unethical. Likewise, GPs had little respect for CWs who asked uncritical questions or returned GPs' certificates seeking more critical assessments, i.e., implying the GP had not been sufficiently thorough or was biased in their assessment. In such cases, many GPs felt compelled *"to put their foot down"* or *"to stand up for what was right for their patient"*, e.g.:

*I've had a patient who was on sick leave due to stress and anxiety, and then she got breast cancer… And you could tell that the caseworker was just sick and tired of the process and questioned whether my patient was ill and asked when we could send her back to work… I had to write back… she has cancer. Back the f*** off. She had family, friends, and two small children at home. Everything was disintegrating… I had to write it so the social worker on the other end understood that it's not one size fits all. (GP 58, MP2)*

6.4.4 DISTANCING COMMUNICATION STRATEGIES

When trust and respect among citizens, CWs, and GPs were lacking, they engaged in various distancing communication strategies to protect themselves, e.g., citizens safeguarding their eligibility for receiving sickness benefits, or GPs protecting their professional identity. However, these *distancing* communication strategies unintentionally weakened relationships among the key actors, undermining effective coordination concerning the sick leave case.

Citizens primarily distanced themselves via *camouflaging*, i.e., carefully curating what to say and to whom. This strategy served to safeguard their relationships with CWs and GPs and to ensure that a) the citizens' sick leave story aligned with demands for receiving sick leave benefits, b) adequate access to care-related activities, e.g., speaking to a psychologist, or c) exemption from work-related activities, e.g., being unable to take part in work placements. Importantly, citizens felt compelled to navigate the system this way, by putting up a façade or performing a role, which was an approach they found unwanted and burdensome, e.g.:

… well, when I said I feel okay, I mean I do have periods where I feel good sometimes, but then the next day, I go completely downhill… When I told my caseworker, they wrote it down and thought they could send me to all kinds of work-related activities. So, I'm very careful about what I say now… And it's uncomfortable that you must sit there and keep quiet, not expressing your honest

feelings. I want to express how I feel, but I'm afraid that what I say will be used against me. (Citizen 75, MP2)

Of note, this type of communication could unintentionally cause distancing between citizens and professionals if professionals felt that citizens were withholding or masking important information from them.

For CWs, challenges related to obtaining timely, accurate, and solution-oriented information from citizens and GPs hindered effective case management. In turn, CWs oftentimes found that GPs focused too much on disease-related work limitations and too little on how citizens could be supported to return to work, i.e., being more loyal to their patients' narrative than to their official role as certifiers of sick leave. This made CWs feel forced to act as if *"offence is the best defence"*, being *"more direct and stricter"* in their communication to protect and reinforce their professional authority and legal mandate. This included reframing conversations with citizens or GPs to focus on return to work instead of talking about citizens' health issues, challenging vague medical documentation from GPs by requesting "more objective assessments", or reiterating the requirements of receiving sickness benefits for citizens:

It's not uncommon for us to send a medical certificate back to the GP saying: "Fine, now we can see that you've written what the citizen says, but what do you think? What is your assessment?" It is a medical assessment... can you give us one of those? Instead of what the citizen thinks. (Experienced CW, MP2)

For GPs, distancing communication strategies were more varied. Some GPs used vague or *"elastic language*" in sick leave certificates to protect their professional integrity and advocate for their patients' needs:

...We often write a bit in "elastic terms" ... Because we're a bit afraid that this must be understood as being closer to an opinion than a fact - because if there's a field in the medical certificate like how many months and weeks until expected full working capacity, then you can't answer, 'probably around... and must be reassessed continuously'. (GP 49, MP2)

In addition to the *"elastic language*", these GPs tended to adopt what they called an "*ostrich approach*," which aimed to align their recommendations with their patients' preferences to preserve the therapeutic relationship with their patient, e.g., extending the sick leave period solely based on how citizens experienced their limitations:

... Often you sound like a bully just mentioning return to work - So sometimes I stick my head in the sand... I'm a bit of an ostrich about it. Because people don't have to lose their GP in the process... (GP 33, MP1)

Conversely, other GPs described specific sick leave cases where they had felt obliged to *"put their foot down"* or *"stand up for what was right*", even if it meant stepping into CWs' domain, e.g., by recommending early retirement pension or provision of social services for citizens. Consistent with this approach, these GPs often left the decision about sick leave to the patient to safeguard their professional role as medical experts, i.e., delegating the decision about sick leave to the citizen, a strategy they referred to as "*passing the buck*":

We no longer put people on sick leave. I certainly don't. I tell citizens that going on sick leave is their decision – not mine. (GP 49, MP2)

Although the approaches from GPs differed, the shared unintended consequence of these distancing communication strategies was that they jeopardised GPs' relationships with CWs and citizens.

7 DISCUSSION

This study demonstrates that the absence of relational coordination, characterised by weak relational ties and counterproductive communication, among citizens, CWs, and GPs, explains why and how collaborative challenges emerge and persist in vocational rehabilitation for individuals on long-term sick leave due to CMDs. First, divergent perspectives on means and ends in vocational rehabilitation can lead to *campaigning* strategies for one's own agenda, resulting in an experience of competing with one's collaborators over the agenda instead of collaborating towards a shared goal. Second, a low degree of shared knowledge resulted in continuous efforts to align expectations, i.e., *clarifying* communication, which made collaboration feel burdensome. Third, the lack of trust and respect led to distancing communication as a means of self-protection, which in turn deepened the sense of relational divide.

Many other studies have investigated the barriers and facilitators to optimal collaboration regarding vocational rehabilitation for individuals who are unemployed due to CMDs (24–28,32–36). Interestingly, several studies have found that actors in vocational rehabilitation tend to have different goals, limited knowledge about each other, and issues related to interpersonal trust (26–28,44,56,57).

However, to our knowledge, this study is the first to apply relational coordination theory to analyse why collaborative challenges emerge in vocational rehabilitation, and how they are experienced and navigated through counterproductive communication strategies that inadvertently sustain negative relational dynamics. By applying relational coordination theory in this manner, the study offers an overarching explanatory framework for understanding the nature of collaborative challenges in vocational rehabilitation.

7.1.1 ARE SHARED GOALS FOR VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OBTAINABLE?

Arguably, stakeholders in vocational rehabilitation share many common views, and previous studies have outlined what can be expected from their different roles (29,44). Still, we found that stakeholders' differing perspectives on the means and ends of vocational rehabilitation can hinder successful collaboration, corroborating findings from previous studies (24,25,58). For example, we found that citizens preferred access to care and exemption from workfare to improve their health and functioning, making a return to work a secondary goal. Similar findings in the Danish sick leave system have shown that citizens do not view workfare measures, e.g., work-first initiatives or sanctions, as helpful for rehabilitation or return to work (59,60).

In turn, we found that a lack of shared goals among stakeholders leads to campaigning strategies aimed at persuading others of one's view, i.e., competing for the agenda. This undermines agreement on shared goals and sustains subgoal optimisation instead of collective coordination. This insight has important implications for common recommendations to increase stakeholder involvement in designing and implementing vocational rehabilitation services. The logic of such recommendations is typically that more involvement of stakeholders will reduce the risk of implementation failure of new initiatives (28,40,61–63), lead to shared goals and alignment of expectations regarding the distribution and coordination of tasks, and result in a workflow that is compatible with local work procedures (24,61). However, based on our findings, more involvement will not necessarily lead to these outcomes, as disagreement about the means and ends of vocational rehabilitation hinders the foundation for effective collaboration. The extent to which consensus on means and ends in vocational rehabilitation is achievable is debatable, and perhaps even naïve, highlighted by Franche et al. through their concept of paradigmatic dissonance (64). They argue that friction among stakeholders in vocational rehabilitation is inevitable due to the fundamentally different paradigms shaped by stakeholders' varying societal roles and professional backgrounds. For example, long-term unemployment can result in conflict between employers'

“paradigm of productivity”, citizens’ “paradigm of access to health services and benefits,” and insurers’ “paradigm of cost containment and cause determination” when the causes of work disability and prognosis for RTW are unclear. Rather than aiming for full alignment of means and ends in vocational rehabilitation, Franche et al. suggest we should aim to increase stakeholders’ tolerance of paradigmatic dissonance. For this, they propose three strategies, including: (1) clarifying stakeholder roles, (2) improving the frequency and quality of communication, and (3) fostering understanding of each other’s perspectives (64). These strategies, grounded in a comprehensive literature review, resonate well with our findings, suggesting broader relevance beyond the Danish context and applicability to other stakeholder groups, including citizens, CWs, and GPs.

7.1.2 DO RETURN-TO-WORK COORDINATORS HOLD THE KEY TO SHARED KNOWLEDGE?

Recent studies from Sweden and Denmark highlight both the importance and the challenges of creating an informative collaborative environment with clear roles and responsibilities among vocational rehabilitation stakeholders (24, 25). Our findings support this call to strengthen shared knowledge, which could reduce the burden on citizens to act as messengers between professionals —a problem identified in earlier studies (65,66).

There are various ways to establish and maintain an informative environment. One approach that appears to be gaining traction is the use of return-to-work coordinator schemes, which have been shown to improve collaboration and communication and help neutralise power imbalances among stakeholders (24,44). Still, the impact of these schemes on work participation remains mixed. Although RTW coordinators are generally perceived positively by citizens and professionals, they sometimes challenge professional identities by imposing collaborative demands, which might negatively affect implementation (24,44).

7.1.3 SHOULD THE SICKNESS CERTIFICATION PROCESS BE REVISED TO FOSTER MUTUAL TRUST AND RESPECT?

Former studies have highlighted the importance of establishing a supportive collaborative environment among vocational rehabilitation actors (25). Our findings corroborate this recommendation but raise the question of whether the sickness certification process is optimally designed to this end. For example, is it fair to expect citizens’ GPs to act as neutral external experts?

In this regard, a study from the Netherlands has highlighted that doctors are not simply rational, external experts but bring subjective and normative judgments to the sick leave certification process (67). Similarly, studies from Malaysia and Norway have demonstrated that sickness certification is a complex, value-laden, and professionally challenging process for GPs, who must navigate tensions between their societal role as medical experts and their loyalty to their patients (68,69). These findings resonate with ours, illustrating how GPs must navigate conflicting priorities and dilemmas by employing distinct communication strategies, such as campaigning for their perspective, clarifying their professional boundaries, or distancing themselves from claims they perceive as illegitimate or demands they consider unfair. These insights suggest that the GP's role in the Danish sick leave scheme may warrant critical reconsideration to address these challenges more effectively. Of note, it is possible that doctors in other roles or the use of coordinators would face similar tensions, which warrants further research.

Likewise, it is debatable whether CWs have the required resources and influence to effectively coordinate the sick leave process when stakeholders are spread across multiple sectors and hold differing views about the best means and goals in vocational rehabilitation. Previous studies have shown that a strong legislative and political focus on work ability, i.e., workfare logics, has shifted caseworkers' approach from supporting citizens' health to emphasising citizens' resources and potential for return to work (70,71). Our findings suggest that this approach to vocational rehabilitation may conflict with the preferred approach of citizens and GPs, potentially leading to mistrust and disrespect for CWs. Indeed, in our interviews with CWs, it was noteworthy how often and to what extent CWs experienced being mistrusted and disrespected, feeling at the bottom of a professional hierarchy, a phenomenon also observed in other studies (72).

7.2 METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

Our analytical ambition was to understand collaborative challenges among citizens, caseworkers (CWs), and general practitioners (GPs) in vocational rehabilitation for people on long-term sick leave due to common mental disorders (CMDs). This emphasis arguably comes at the expense of describing what does work well. While this methodological choice limits the breadth of our findings, it deepens understanding of the dynamics of collaborative challenges. As a result, our findings do not represent the overall state of the Danish sick leave system, where many cases arguably proceed smoothly. Below, we outline our methodological considerations, guided by the four pillars of trustworthiness in qualitative research: credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability (73).

Credibility, i.e., how well the findings reflect participants' actual experiences (73), was strengthened by collecting data over an extended period and using multiple sources. Furthermore, the interviewer (FM) established in-depth access to the field and a strong rapport with participants in both municipalities, gaining what we consider an insider perspective (47). We attribute this to FM's medical background, practical experience as a medical consultant, and prior professional relationships with participants from MP2. However, these same characteristics could also challenge the credibility of findings if not addressed reflexively. To mitigate this, FM noted his preconceptions before data collection, kept reflective notes in a research diary throughout the study, and discussed these regularly with a multiprofessional research group and clinical colleagues from different professional backgrounds to avoid conceptual blindness and promote ongoing reflexivity about his role and its implications for the findings.

Transferability of findings, i.e., the extent to which findings can be applied or transferred to other contexts or groups (73), was promoted by purposive sampling of two municipalities with differing sociodemographic and organisational practices, i.e., literal replication logic (47), and high variation sampling of citizens, CWs, and GPs. This makes findings relevant to other settings, even though the study only included two of the 98 Danish municipalities.

Dependability, i.e., consistency and reliability of the research process over time (73), was supported by systematic and transparent reporting of methods using known reporting guidelines (74,75) and having a detailed audit trail of analytic decisions and coding revisions in a reflexive diary kept by the first author.

Confirmability, i.e., the degree to which findings are shaped by participants and not the researcher's preconceptions (73), was enhanced through by 1) iterative coding of interviews and comparison to field notes and interview transcripts to promote alignment with participants' perspectives, 2) reflexive journaling by FM, 3) peer debriefing, e.g., presenting and discussing emerging findings with colleagues from various professional background in the field, e.g., case workers, psychologists, and doctors, and 4) member checking and ongoing discussion of emerging findings in the group of authors, facilitating a transparent progression from data to themes.

7.3 CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

We studied how citizens, CWs, and GPs experienced collaborative challenges in vocational rehabilitation for individuals on long-term sick leave due to CMDs within the Danish sick leave system. Still, our findings align so closely with previous studies in other contexts and populations

that they suggest broader applicability beyond this specific setting. Therefore, we argue that collaborative challenges among stakeholders in vocational rehabilitation can be understood as the result of self-reinforcing cycles of poor relational coordination, consisting of weak relational ties and counterproductive communication. First, the lack of shared goals, e.g., diverging perspectives on the best means and desired ends of vocational rehabilitation, leads to campaigning communication strategies that prioritise individual agendas over consideration for the whole, making collaboration feel like a competition about setting the agenda. Second, a low degree of shared knowledge can result in laborious clarifying communication among stakeholders, making collaboration feel "colossally labouring". Third, a lack of trust and respect among stakeholders can lead to distancing communication strategies, which deepen the relational divide and undermine collaboration.

The self-reinforcing nature of weak relational ties, counterproductive communication, and resultant collaborative challenges highlights the need for external intervention to break these negative cycles in vocational rehabilitation. In this regard, RTW coordinators may offer a promising pathway, though a shared understanding of best practice and goals is still lacking (44,76,77). Moreover, the organisation of the sickness certification process may require revision to address these negative dynamics within the collaboration among stakeholders.

To our knowledge, this is the first study to apply relational coordination theory to intersectoral and interdisciplinary collaboration in vocational rehabilitation, positioning our work as an example of its potential utility in this field. However, we did not examine contextual contingencies that shape relational dynamics, e.g., societal resources, training, or organisational culture, arguably influencing collaborative behaviour. Future research should investigate how these structural factors influence relational coordination and explore potential strategies to address them, thereby promoting more effective collaboration in vocational rehabilitation.

8 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the participating caseworkers, general practitioners, people on sick leave, and the management teams in the municipal job centres for generously sharing their time and experiences as part of this study.

Use of Generative AI

During the preparation of this manuscript, the authors utilised OpenAI's ChatGPT to support language editing, enhance clarity, and improve readability. The authors reviewed and take full responsibility for the content.

Funding

This work was supported by the Centre for General Practice at the University of Copenhagen, the Department of Social Medicine at Frederiksberg Hospital, the Novo Nordisk Foundation (grant no. NNF23OC0083729), Tværspuljen (project no. P-2023-1-18), and Yngre Lægers Studiefond at Bispebjerg and Frederiksberg Hospital.

9 DECLARATION OF INTEREST STATEMENT

The authors report there are no competing interests to declare.

10 REFERENCES

1. Mental disorders [Internet]. [cited 2024 Sep 26]. Available from: https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/mental-disorders

2. Sharac J, McCrone P, Clement S, Thornicroft G. The economic impact of mental health stigma and discrimination: a systematic review. Epidemiol Psichiatr Soc. 2010;19(3):223–32.

3. Fitter Minds, Fitter Jobs: From Awareness to Change in Integrated Mental Health, Skills and Work Policies | en | OECD [Internet]. [cited 2024 May 10]. Available from: https://www.oecd.org/health/fitter-minds-fitter-jobs-a0815d0f-en.htm

4. Arias D, Saxena S, Verguet S. Quantifying the global burden of mental disorders and their economic value. eClinicalMedicine [Internet]. 2022 Dec 1 [cited 2024 Aug 13];54. Available from: https://www.thelancet.com/journals/eclinm/article/PIIS2589-5370(22)00405-9/fulltext

5. Health TLG. Mental health matters. Lancet Glob Health. 2020 Nov 1;8(11):e1352.

6. Sharac J, McCrone P, Clement S, Thornicroft G. The economic impact of mental health stigma and discrimination: a systematic review. Epidemiol Psichiatr Soc. 2010;19(3):223–32.

7. Brouwers EPM. Social stigma is an underestimated contributing factor to unemployment in people with mental illness or mental health issues: position paper and future directions. BMC Psychol. 2020 Apr 21;8:36.

8. Hoff A. During sick leave with common mental disorders: Should assessments be specialized and should vocational rehabilitation, health care and case handling services be integrated? 2022 Jan 28 [cited 2024 May 10]; Available from: https://research.regionh.dk/da/publications/during-sick-leave-with-common-mental-disorders-should-assessments

9. Nigatu YT, Liu Y, Uppal M, McKinney S, Rao S, Gillis K, et al. Interventions for enhancing return to work in individuals with a common mental illness: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. Psychol Med. 2016 Dec;46(16):3263–74.

10. Kirkbride JB, Anglin DM, Colman I, Dykxhoorn J, Jones PB, Patalay P, et al. The social determinants of mental health and disorder: evidence, prevention and recommendations. World Psychiatry. 2024 Feb;23(1):58–90.

11. World Report on Social Determinants of Health Equity [Internet]. [cited 2025 May 14]. Available from: https://www.who.int/teams/social-determinants-of-health/equity-and-health/world-report-on-social-determinants-of-health-equity

12. Franke AG, Schmidt P, Neumann S. Association Between Unemployment and Mental Disorders: A Narrative Update of the Literature. Int J Environ Res Public Health. 2024 Dec;21(12):1698.

13. Krug G, Drasch K, Jungbauer-Gans M. The social stigma of unemployment: consequences of stigma consciousness on job search attitudes, behaviour and success. J Labour Mark Res. 2019 Jul 12;53(1):11.

14. Stangl AL, Earnshaw VA, Logie CH, van Brakel W, C. Simbayi L, Barré I, et al. The Health Stigma and Discrimination Framework: a global, crosscutting framework to inform research, intervention development, and policy on health-related stigmas. BMC Med. 2019 Feb 15;17(1):31.

15. Best RK, Arseniev-Koehler A. The Stigma of Diseases: Unequal Burden, Uneven Decline. Am Sociol Rev. 2023 Oct 1;88(5):938–69.

16. Yildiz B, Burdorf A, Schuring M. The influence of chronic diseases and multimorbidity on entering paid employment among unemployed persons - a longitudinal register-based study. Scand J Work Environ Health. 2021 Apr 1;47(3):208–16.

17. Nielsen MBD, Bültmann U, Madsen IEH, Martin M, Christensen U, Diderichsen F, et al. Health, work, and personal-related predictors of time to return to work among employees with mental health problems. Disabil Rehabil. 2012;34(15):1311–6.

18. Gedikli C, Miraglia M, Connolly S, Bryan M, Watson D. The relationship between unemployment and wellbeing: an updated meta-analysis of longitudinal evidence. Eur J Work Organ Psychol. 2023 Jan 2;32(1):128–44.

19. Rueda S, Chambers L, Wilson M, Mustard C, Rourke SB, Bayoumi A, et al. Association of returning to work with better health in working-aged adults: a systematic review. Am J Public Health. 2012 Mar;102(3):541–56.

20. Yang Y, Niu L, Amin S, Yasin I. Unemployment and mental health: a global study of unemployment's influence on diverse mental disorders. Front Public Health [Internet]. 2024 Dec 13 [cited 2025 Mar 2];12. Available from: https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/public-health/articles/10.3389/fpubh.2024.1440403/full

21. Barbalat G, Franck N. Ecological study of the association between mental illness with human development, income inequalities and unemployment across OECD countries. BMJ Open. 2020 Apr 1;10(4):e035055.

22. Escorpizo R, Brage S, Homa D, Stucki G, editors. Handbook of Vocational Rehabilitation and Disability Evaluation: Application and Implementation of the ICF. 2015th edition. Cham Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London: Springer; 2014. 582 p.

23. Corbière M, Mazaniello-Chézol M, Lecomte T, Guay S, Panaccio A. Developing a collaborative and sustainable return to work program for employees with common mental disorders: a participatory research with public and private organizations. Disabil Rehabil. 2022 Aug 28;44(18):5199–211.

24. Ladekjær Larsen E, Jensen JM, Pedersen KMH. Cross-sectorial collaboration in return to work interventions: perspectives from patients, mental health care professionals and case managers in the social insurance sector. Disabil Rehabil. 2022 Jun;44(11):2317–24.

25. Svärd V, Arapovic Johansson Z, Holmlund L, Hellman T, Kwak L, Björk Brämberg E. Collaboration in the return-to-work process after sick leave due to common mental disorders: a qualitative study of stakeholders' views on goals and roles. BMC Public Health. 2024 Jun 11;24(1):1567.

26. Holmlund L, Hellman T, Engblom M, Kwak L, Sandman L, Törnkvist L, et al. Coordination of return-to-work for employees on sick leave due to common mental disorders: facilitators and barriers. Disabil Rehabil. 2022 Jun 19;44(13):3113–21.

27. Andersson J, Ahgren B, Axelsson SB, Eriksson A, Axelsson R. Organizational approaches to collaboration in vocational rehabilitation – An international literature review. Int J Integr Care [Internet]. 2011 Nov 18 [cited 2025 Apr 24];11(4). Available from: https://ijic.org/articles/10.5334/ijic.670

28. Noteboom Y, Montanus AWA, van Nassau F, Burchell G, Anema JR, Huysmans MA. Barriers and facilitators of collaboration during the implementation of vocational rehabilitation interventions: a systematic review. BMC Psychiatry. 2024 Nov 1;24(1):759.

29. Corbière M, Mazaniello-Chézol M, Bastien MF, Wathieu E, Bouchard R, Panaccio A, et al. Stakeholders' Role and Actions in the Return-to-Work Process of Workers on Sick-Leave Due to Common Mental Disorders: A Scoping Review. J Occup Rehabil. 2020 Sep 1;30(3):381–419.

30. Maribo T, Ibsen C, Thuesen J, Vinther Nielsen C, Johansen JS, Vind A. Hvidbog om rehabilitering. Rehabiliteringsforum Danmark; 2022.

31. Higgins A, O'Halloran P, Porter S. Management of Long Term Sickness Absence: A Systematic Realist Review. J Occup Rehabil. 2012 Sep 1;22(3):322–32.

32. Andersen MF, Nielsen KM, Brinkmann S. Meta-synthesis of qualitative research on return to work among employees with common mental disorders. Scand J Work Environ Health. 2012;38(2):93–104.

33. Eriksson UB, Engström LG, Starrin B, Janson S. Falling between two stools; how a weak co-operation between the social security and the unemployment agencies obstructs rehabilitation of unemployed sick-listed persons. Disabil Rehabil. 2008;30(8):569–76.

34. Noordik E, Nieuwenhuijsen K, Varekamp I, van der Klink JJ, van Dijk FJ. Exploring the return-to-work process for workers partially returned to work and partially on long-term sick leave due to common mental disorders: a qualitative study. Disabil Rehabil. 2011;33(17–18):1625–35.

35. Audhoe SS, Nieuwenhuijsen K, Hoving JL, Sluiter JK, Frings-Dresen MHW. Perspectives of unemployed workers with mental health problems: barriers to and solutions for return to work. Disabil Rehabil. 2018 Jan;40(1):28–34.

36. Holmlund L, Sandman L, Hellman T, Kwak L, Björk Brämberg E. Ethical aspects of the coordination of return-to-work among employees on sick leave due to common mental disorders: a qualitative study. Disabil Rehabil. 2023 Jun;45(13):2118–27.

37. Hoff A, Bojesen AB, Fisker J, Poulsen RM, Hjorthøj C, Nordentoft M, et al. Does a specialized assessment improve vocational outcomes for people on sick leave with a suspected common mental disorder? Results from the Mental Health Assessment Study (MeHAS). PLOS Ment Health. 2024 Jun 4;1(1):e0000020.

38. Hoff A, Fisker J, Poulsen RM, Hjorthøj C, Rosenberg NK, Nordentoft M, et al. Integrating vocational rehabilitation and mental healthcare to improve the return-to-work process for people on sick leave with stress-related disorders: results from a randomized trial. Scand J Work Environ Health. 2022 Jul 1;48(5):361–71.

39. Hoff A, Poulsen RM, Fisker J, Hjorthøj C, Rosenberg N, Nordentoft M, et al. Integrating vocational rehabilitation and mental healthcare to improve the return-to-work process for people on sick leave with depression or anxiety: results from a three-arm, parallel randomised trial. Occup Environ Med. 2022 Feb 1;79(2):134–42.

40. Vogel N, Schandelmaier S, Zumbrunn T, Ebrahim S, Boer WE de, Busse JW, et al. Return-to-work coordination programmes for improving return to work in workers on sick leave - Vogel, N - 2017 | Cochrane Library. [cited 2025 May 14]; Available from: https://www.cochranelibrary.com/cdsr/doi/10.1002/14651858.CD011618.pub2/full

41. UWV 2023. Insight into work disability systems. An international inventory.

42. Baasner AL, Petrak S, Albersmann L, Gröhl S, Lemke S, Bethge M. A Meta-synthesis of Qualitative Research on Effective Return to Work Counseling for Individuals with Work Participation Restrictions - A Systematic Review. J Occup Rehabil. 2024 Nov 8;

43. Pinto AD, Hassen N, Craig-Neil A. Employment Interventions in Health Settings: A Systematic Review and Synthesis. Ann Fam Med. 2018 Sep;16(5):447–60.

44. Svärd V, Arapovic Johansson Z, Holmlund L, Hellman T, Kwak L, Björk Brämberg E. Collaboration in the return-to-work process after sick leave due to common mental disorders: a qualitative study of stakeholders' views on goals and roles. BMC Public Health. 2024 Jun 11;24(1):1567.

45. Andersen NA, Larsen F. Activation policy: bruised and battered but still standing. Policy Soc. 2024 Jul 13;43(2):127–40.

46. Beskæftigelsesministeriet. Bekendtgørelse af lov om sygedagpenge [Internet]. Jan 29, 2025. Available from: https://www.retsinformation.dk/eli/lta/2025/97

47. Yin RK. SAGE Publications Ltd. 2024 [cited 2024 Oct 2]. Case Study Research and Applications. Available from: https://uk.sagepub.com/en-gb/eur/case-study-research-and-applications/book250150

48. Braun V, Clarke V. To saturate or not to saturate? Questioning data saturation as a useful concept for thematic analysis and sample-size rationales. Qual Res Sport Exerc Health. 2021 Mar 4;13(2):201–16.

49. Malterud K, Siersma VD, Guassora AD. Sample Size in Qualitative Interview Studies: Guided by Information Power. Qual Health Res. 2016 Nov;26(13):1753–60.

50. Kelly LM, Cordeiro M. Three principles of pragmatism for research on organizational processes. Methodol Innov. 2020 May 1;13(2):2059799120937242.

51. Malterud K. Systematic text condensation: a strategy for qualitative analysis. Scand J Public Health. 2012 Dec;40(8):795–805.

52. gittell relational coordination transforming relationships - Google Search [Internet]. [cited 2025 Feb 1]. Available from: https://www.google.com/search?q=gittell+relational+coordination+transforming+relationships&sca_esv=577bb668e7e98e33&rlz=1C1WHAR_enDK1100DK1100&sxsrf=AHTn8zqLs6h4QQVwMex1928yis1HQBzv7g%3A1738397325917&ei=jdadZ93PN57QwPAP9-GioQQ&oq=gittell+relationel+coordination+trasforming+relationshi&gs_lp=Egxnd3Mtd2l6LXNlcnAiN2dpdHRlbGwgcmVsYXRpb25lbCBjb29yZGluYXRpb24gdHJhc2Zvcm1pbmcgcmVsYXRpb25zaGkqAggAMgcQIRigARgKMgcQIRigARgKMgcQIRigARgKSOQ-ULQEWKQ0cAF4AJABAJgBlgGgAeYVqgEFMTIuMTW4AQPIAQD4AQGYAhqgAooUwgIOEAAYgAQYsAMYhgMYigXCAgsQABiABBiwAxiiBMICCBAAGLADGO8FwgIHECMYsAIYJ8ICCBAAGIAEGKIEwgIFEAAY7wXCAgYQABgWGB7CAgsQABiABBiGAxiKBcICBBAhGBXCAgQQIRgKmAMA4gMFEgExIECIBgGQBgiSBwQ4LjE4oAezwwE&sclient=gws-wiz-serp

53. Bolton R, Logan C, Gittell JH. Revisiting Relational Coordination: A Systematic Review. J Appl Behav Sci. 2021 Sep 1;57(3):290–322.

54. Gittell JH. Relational Coordination. In: Wiley Encyclopedia of Management [Internet]. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2015 [cited 2025 Feb 1]. p. 1–6. Available from: https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781118785317.weom110025

55. World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki. Ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects. - PMC [Internet]. [cited 2024 Oct 2]. Available from: https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2566407/

56. Loisel P, Durand MJ, Baril R, Gervais J, Falardeau M. Interorganizational Collaboration in Occupational Rehabilitation: Perceptions of an Interdisciplinary Rehabilitation Team. J Occup Rehabil. 2005 Dec 1;15(4):581–90.

57. Russell E, and Kosny A. Communication and collaboration among return-to-work stakeholders. Disabil Rehabil. 2019 Oct 23;41(22):2630–9.

58. Schultz R, Brostrøm Kousgaard M, Davidsen AS. "We have two different agendas": the views of general practitioners, social workers and hospital staff on interprofessional coordination for patients with chronic widespread pain. J Interprof Care. 2021 Mar 4;35(2):284–92.

59. Danneris S, Caswell D. Exploring the Ingredients of Success: Studying Trajectories of the Vulnerable Unemployed Who Have Entered Work or Education in Denmark. Soc Policy Soc. 2019 Oct;18(4):615–29.

60. Andersen NA, Caswell D, Larsen F. A New approach to Helping the hard-to-place Unemployed: The promise of developing new knowledge in an interactive and collaborative process. Eur J Soc Secur. 2017 Dec 1;19(4):335–52.

61. Martin MHT, Moefelt L, Dahl Nielsen MB, Rugulies R. Barriers and facilitators for implementation of a return-to-work intervention for sickness absence beneficiaries with mental health problems: Results from three Danish municipalities. Scand J Public Health. 2015 Jun;43(4):423–31.

62. Aust B, Nielsen MBD, Grundtvig G, Buchardt HL, Ferm L, Andersen I, et al. Implementation of the Danish return-to-work program: process evaluation of a trial in 21 Danish municipalities. Scand J Work Environ Health. 2015 Nov;41(6):529–41.

63. Buch MS, Kjellberg J, Holm-Petersen C. Implementing Integrated Care – Lessons from the Odense Integrated Care Trial. Int J Integr Care [Internet]. 2018 Oct 29 [cited 2025 May 21];18(4). Available from: https://ijic.org/articles/10.5334/ijic.4164

64. Franche RL, Baril R, Shaw W, Nicholas M, Loisel P. Workplace-Based Return-to-Work Interventions: Optimizing the Role of Stakeholders in Implementation and Research. J Occup Rehabil. 2005 Dec 1;15(4):525–42.

65. Schultz R, Kousgaard MB, la Cour P, Davidsen AS. Between three chairs: Experiences of being a patient with chronic widespread pain in an intersectoral setting in Denmark. Health Psychol Open. 2019;6(1):2055102919852500.

66. Poulsen AG, Rolving N, Hubeishy MH, Ørtenblad L. Navigating between stakeholders in return-to-work processes: A qualitative study exploring experiences of workers on sick leave due to back pain. Work Read Mass. 2023;75(4):1277–87.

67. Meershoek A, Krumeich A, Vos R. Judging without criteria? Sickness certification in Dutch disability schemes. Sociol Health Illn. 2007 May;29(4):497–514.

68. Nantha YS, HS AS. Sickness Certification Behavior amongst Primary Care Physicians: A Descriptive Analysis of Indirect Measures Using the Theory of Planned Behavior. Korean J Fam Med. 2020 Jul;41(4):267–70.

69. Nilsen S, Malterud K, Werner EL, Maeland S, Magnussen LH. GPs' negotiation strategies regarding sick leave for subjective health complaints. Scand J Prim Health Care. 2015 Mar;33(1):40–6.

70. Johansen K, Andersen JS, Mikkelsen S, Pass O, Raffnsøe S, Lynge E. Controlling sickness absence: a study of changes in the Danish sickness absence legislation since 1973. Health Policy Amst Neth. 2008 Apr;86(1):109–18.

71. Larsen MR, Aust B, Høgelund J. Improving the effectiveness of sickness benefit case management through a public-private partnership? A difference-in-difference analysis in eighteen Danish municipalities. BMC Public Health. 2017 Apr 18;17(1):329.

72. Skals A. Uarbejdsdygtig og hvad så?: Et casestudie om faglige skøn i beskæftigelsesrettet socialt arbejde med sygemeldte i et jobcenter. 2016;

73. Ahmed SK. The pillars of trustworthiness in qualitative research. J Med Surg Public Health. 2024 Apr 1;2:100051.

74. O'Brien BC, Harris IB, Beckman TJ, Reed DA, Cook DA. Standards for reporting qualitative research: a synthesis of recommendations. Acad Med J Assoc Am Med Coll. 2014 Sep;89(9):1245–51.

75. Consolidated criteria for reporting qualitative research (COREQ): a 32-item checklist for interviews and focus groups | International Journal for Quality in Health Care | Oxford Academic [Internet]. [cited 2024 Sep 4]. Available from: https://academic.oup.com/intqhc/article/19/6/349/1791966

76. Svärd V, Berglund E, Brämberg EB, Gustafsson N, Engblom M, Friberg E. Coordinators in the return-to-work process: Mapping their work models. PLOS ONE. 2023 Aug 10;18(8):e0290021.

77. Svärd V, and Jannas S. Organisational prerequisites for coordinating the return-to-work process for people with multimorbidity and psychosocial difficulties. Disabil Rehabil. 2023 Aug 28;45(18):2915–24.

78. Relationships between Service Providers and Their Impact on Customers - Jody Hoffer Gittell, 2002 [Internet]. [cited 2025 Feb 2]. Available from: https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/1094670502004004007

79. Assafi L, Evaristi D, Trevino CS, Larsen T. It's all about presence: Health professionals' experience of interprofessional collaboration when mobilizing patients with hip fractures. J Interprof Care. 2022 Jul 4;36(4):483–91.

80. Faruquee CF, Khera AS, Guirguis LM. Family physicians' perceptions of pharmacists prescribing in Alberta. J Interprof Care. 2020 Jan 2;34(1):87–96.

81. Coordinating Mechanisms in Care Provider Groups: Relational Coordination as a Mediator and Input Uncertainty as a Moderator of Performance Effects | Management Science [Internet]. [cited 2025 Jan 22]. Available from: https://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/10.1287/mnsc.48.11.1408.268

82. RC Survey - Resources [Internet]. [cited 2025 Jan 22]. Available from: https://heller.brandeis.edu/relational-coordination/resource-directory/rc-survey.html

83. Cook KS, Santana JJ. Trust: Perspectives in Sociology. In: The Routledge Handbook of Trust and Philosophy. Routledge; 2020.

11 APPENDICES

11.1 INTERVIEW GUIDES

11.1.1INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR PEOPLE ON SICK LEAVE

Subject	**Question**
Transitioning from work to sick leave	In your own words, what were the main reasons for transitioning to sick leave? What happened then? Was there anything that could have prevented it? Can you talk me through it?
Meeting the job centre	How was it for you to get in touch with the job centre? How has it been since then for you to be in the sickness allowance system? Has it changed over time?
Self-understanding in relation to transition	Has becoming a sickness allowance recipient affected your self-understanding, i.e. how you see yourself? If so, how? People on sick leave due to CMDs have a higher-than-average risk of long-term sick leave, commonly referred to as being "vulnerable". Do you see yourself as a vulnerable person or as an ordinary person put in a vulnerable situation?
Thoughts	What thoughts has been triggered in you from being in the sickness benefit system? Has anything surprised you? Are there things you wish you had known earlier?
Emotions	What feelings has been triggered in you from being in the sickness benefit system?
Bodily sensations	Have you noticed any bodily sensations during your time as a sickness allowance recipient? Is the experience of being on sick leave connected to the body? If so, how?
Coping/Behavior	What do you do as a sickness benefit recipient? What kind of behavior does this require on your part? What skills do you need to have? Do you feel you have the required skill set and resources?
Opinion	Is there anything you would like to highlight as particularly good or bad about your sick leave process?
Time	How do you experience time? When is there enough time for recovery, when is there too little time? Too much time? What about waiting time?
System	Do you feel that the system is transparent and understandable?
Security/Trust	Are you comfortable with the people you have around you? Do you trust them to help you? Conversely, are there people whom you may find it difficult to trust?

Exercise 1	Talk about potential themes describing the experiences related to the sick leave process
Exercise 2	Discuss the ideal of vocational rehabilitation
Exercise 3	Do you have people around you who support you in your sickness allowance process? What role do they play and who helps you with what? Do you have any people around you who you feel oppose you?

11.1.2

11.1.3INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR GENERAL PRACTITIONERS

Theme	Subject	Question
The target group	Size of the problem	How much time and effort is required to handle people on sick leave due to CMDs in your practice? Has this changed over time? When and why do they come to you?
	Long term unemployment	Why do you think people on sick leave due to CMDs tend to become long-term unemployed? From your experiences, are there certain predictive factors for long-term unemployment? If yes, which?
	Vulnerability	People on sick leave due to CMDs have a higher-than-average risk of long-term sick leave, commonly referred to as being "vulnerable". Do you think vulnerability is something "you are", i.e., concerns personal characteristics, or is something "you become" in certain situations or both? What would you say characterizes those "that are" vulnerable? What is the opposite? How do we promote that instead?
Experience with the target group	Sick leave work in general practice	Which tasks are associated with sickness benefit recipients with mental health problems in your practice? What challenges do you face here?
	Role	How do you see your role in relation to the target group? What are your core tasks?
	Approach	Do you do anything special when you work with particularly vulnerable sickness benefit recipients with mental illness? What do you focus on?
	Context	Do you feel that you have the right conditions to help the target group as much as possible? What things promote or hinder you from making a positive difference?
	Knowledge and skills	Do you have sufficient knowledge and skills to work with the target group?
Interdisciplinary collaboration	Collaborators	Who do you see as your primary collaborators in a sick leave process? What is your role and experiences with collaborating with the person on sick leave, relatives, case managers, employers, and others? When do you feel that the collaboration works well and less well? What would you like more or less of in the collaboration?

Themes	Exercise 1	Which things are particularly prominent for you? How? Why?
Vocational rehabilitation	Exercise 2	Does practice live up to the ideal? Why/why not?
Wishes for the future	The future ideal sick leave system	What could be the goal of future employment-oriented rehabilitation? Do you have any ideas on what we could do in a better way?

11.1.4INTERVIEW GUIDE FOR CASE MANAGERS

Agenda:

1) Information, participant data etc.
2) Establishing ground rules
3) Talking about the target group: Defining them and how to approach them
4) Exercise 1 and 2
5) Intersectoral and -disciplinary collaboration (Exercise 3)
6) Rounding up

Ground rules

1) You are the expert → Say it as YOU see it
2) It's about different experiences → Contribute with your perspective
3) I disagree/doubt what we are talking about → Share it with the group
4) I really want to say something → Respect the speaking order
5) Can I really say that? YES, honesty above all
6) I think a topic/aspect of discussion is missing → Say it out loud
7) Other??

The target group

People on sick leave due to CMDs have a higher-than-average risk of long-term sick leave, commonly referred to as being "vulnerable".

1) What makes people vulnerable? Is it the people themselves or factors around them?
2) How much do they hold? How often do you deal with them?
3) Are you doing something different with vulnerable individuals with mental illness?
4) Is the system well set up for you to help them? How?
5) Are you missing something to better help the target group?
6) Other??

Exercise 1: Discuss how you relate to the suggested themes

Exercise 2: Discuss the ideal of vocational rehabilitation

Exercise 3: Place the main actors in the matrix and explain why

1) Add any missing actors
2) Associate the words that characterize each square/actor
3) Are there too many actors? Are they the right actors?
4) What would it look like in the ideal world?
5) Could a social medicine medical adviser make a difference? How?

11.2 INTERVIEW EXERCISES

11.2.1EXERCISE 1: CONCEPTUAL PAIRS CONCERNING COLLABORATION IN VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Trust / Distrust

Security / Insecurity

Cohesion / Division

Order / Chaos

Cooperation / Counter-operation

Support / Resistance

Predictable / Unpredictable

Meaningful / Meaningless

Week / Day

Flexibility / Rigidity

Inclusive/Exclusive

Vulnerability / Robustness

Constructive / Destructive

Logical / Illogical

Possibilities / Limitations

Activating / Paralyzing

Manageable / Unmanageable

Targeted / Unfocused

Hopeful / Despondent

Person focus / System focus

??

11.2.2EXERCISE 2 – THE IDEAL OF VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION

Rehabilitation

Rehabilitation is targeted **people**, which **experience or are at risk of experiencing limitations** in their **physical, psychological, cognitive and/or social functioning** and thus i **everyday life**.

The purpose of rehabilitation is a **meaningful life** with the best possible **activity and participation, coping and quality of life**.

Rehabilitation is one **collaborative process** between one **person, relatives, professionals and other relevant parties**.

Rehabilitation efforts is **targeted, coherent and knowledge-based** with **starting from the person's perspectives and entire life situation**.

Employment-oriented rehabilitation

Persons of working age with **health-related impairments and the following reduced ability to work**

The aim is to optimize work participation through **different activities delivered by different actors in different settings.**

How do the two definitions fit together? How can they not?

11.2.3EXERCISE 3: MAPPING STAKEHOLDERS INVOLVED IN VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION



0.1 **A 2-dimensionla matrix about how the person on sick leave being interviewed has experienced the involvement of stakeholders in his/her sick leave process. The person being interviewed was asked to rate how much each type of stakeholder, e.g., the general practitioner, had been involved (the horizontal axis) and whether this had had a positive or negative impact on the process (the vertical axis). There were about 15 common stakeholders in vocational rehabilitation that the interviewee could choose from and 4 blank "puzzles" that could be filled in during the interview if the interviewee felt that anyone was missing from the list. The arrows indicate how people described that the role of stakeholders changed over the course of the sick leave process. Arrows are examples and not general findings.**

12 TABLES

12.1 TABLE 1A-1C

Table 1a. Characteristics of citizens

Variable	MP1	MP2	Total
Sex (Female/Male)	2/2	3/0	5/2
Age, range (years)	45-61	35-54	35-61
Partner (yes/no)	1/3	2/1	3/4
Job status (sick leave/partial sick leave/laid off)	0/1/3	0/0/3	0/1/6
Sick leave duration, range (days)	113-209	195-1645	113-1645
Sick leave duration, median (days)	197	807	206
Job experience, range (years)	12-40	9-31	9-40
Job experience, median (years)	36	10	31
Former sick leave, range (N)	1-10	1-7	1-10
Former sick leave, average (N)	5	4	5
Physical comorbidities (yes/no)	2/2	0/4	2/6
Mental comorbidities (yes/no)	1/3	1/2	2/5
Former Job	Kindergarden teacher, Acconting assistant, High School secretary, Bar and shop manager	Case worker in unemployment insurance fund, On-call substitute at a shelter, Occupational Therapist in a rehabilitation centre	
Education	Pedagogue. Accounting, Secretary, 10th grade	Administration, painter, general upper secondary education	

Table 1b: Characteristics of CWs

	MP1			MP2			Total
Variable	EXP	INE	MIX	EXP	INE	JRC	

Participants, N	5	4	6	6	3	7	31
Age, range (years)	53-64	22-30	25-63	42-65	25-30	36-54	22-65
Age, median (years)	56	29	43	49	29	50	46
Job experience, range (years)	13-36	0-6	1-45	7-42	2-7	9-25	0-45
Job experience, median (years)	20	3	7	15	6	13	13
All CWs were female. EXP Experienced CWs, INE Inexperienced CWs, MIX Mixed group of CWs working exclusively with long-term sick leave cases, JRC Job retention specialists							

Table 1c. Characteristics of general practitioners

Variable	MP1	MP2	Total
Sex (Female/Male)	2/1	2/2	4/3
Age, range (years)	49-60	44-62	44-62
Job experience, range (years)	8-23	5-21	5-23
Job experience, median (years)	23	10	10
Organization (Partnership/solo practice)	3/0	2/2	5/2
Patients in practice, range (N)	3300-3883	1620-3300	1620-3883
Patients in practice, median (N)	3400	3250	3300

Non-participation

Six citizens originally interested in the study when approached by FM ended up not participating in interviews (46%). Most citizens did not respond following initial contact when FM tried to schedule interviews, and others replied that they did not having the energy. We contacted 16 GPs, of these 7 participated (44%). Most GPs simply did not get back to use after FM had informed about the study, most commonly through the GP's secretaries, and others declined due to lack of time. Focus groups with CWs included a total of 31 CW, corresponding to about 80-85% of the total number of CWs in the sickness benefits department. Those that did not attend did not provide reasons as this was not demanded.

12.2 TABLE 2

Table 2. Means and ends in vocational rehabilitation

Actor	Principle/Logic	Means	End (Functional goal)
Citizen	"Care trumps workfare"	Access to care-related activities and exemption from workfare	Improved functioning leading to return to work to the extent possible.
CW	"Workfare thinking improves care practices"	Workfare principles in care activities	Motivation and readiness for work-related activities during care
GP	"Care thinking improves workfare practices"	Care considerations in workfare practices	Consciousness about implications of citizens' health on work-related activities and vice versa

12.3 TABLE 3

Table 3 – Definition of theoretical concepts in themes

Concept	Definition and sources
Shared goals	*Shared goals concerns where people have mutual goals to achieve in agreement, which motivate them to move beyond* ***subgoal optimization*** *to act with greater regard for the whole, thus transcending their specific* ***functional goals*** (52–54,78). *The opposite of shared goals is functional goals or subgoal optimization where tasks are solved based on specialized work goals without reference to the overarching goals of the work process* (78,79).
Shared knowledge	*Shared knowledge concerns the level of knowledge collaborators have about each other's training, expertise, and role, which enables them to see how their specific tasks interrelate with the whole process, thus facilitating systems thinking about how their tasks and the tasks of others contribute to the whole* (52–54,80). *The opposite of shared knowledge is specialized knowledge where tasks are solved without having shared knowledge about each other* (79).
Mutual trust and respect	*Mutual respect concerns having respect for the work of others, i.e.,*

	recognizing each person's pride and status related to their role to overcome potential status barriers that prevent them from seeing and taking account of the work of others, to value their contributions, and to consider the impact of one's actions on others, thus acting with respect for the overall work process (52–54,78,81,82). *The opposite of mutual respect is disrespect where the work of others is disrespected* (79). *Trust can be viewed from an individual's perspective as a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based on positive expectations of the intentions or the behavior of another. From a more sociological viewpoint, trust is viewed less as a characteristic of an individual, and more as an attribute of a social relationship between two or more actors. From this relational perspective, trust is defined as existing when one party to the relation believes the other party has incentive to act in his or her interest or to take his or her interest to heart* (83). *Trust concerns* ***people's beliefs about the intentions of others.*** *Respect concerns* ***the degree to which people recognize the work of others and adapt their behaviour accordingly.*** *From this distinction, two distinct aims for the relationship between parties emerge: An ambition of trustworthiness, e.g., being trustworthy yourself or feeling that others are worth trusting, and an ambition of mutual respect, i.e., feeling that others value and take account of your contribution or trying to value and take account in your behaviour of other people's contributions. Both respect and trust can be mutual, i.e., coming from both parties of a relation, or unilateral, i.e., only coming from one of the parties of a relation. We view the relationship between trust and respect as bidirectional, i.e., they affect each other and can both result from the other.*

13 FIGURES (TIFF, POSTSCRIPT OR EPS FILES)

<u>List of figures:</u>

1) Figure 1 Caption: Collaborative Challenges in Vocational Rehabilitation Due to Weak Relational Ties and Counterproductive Communication: A Conceptual Model
2) Figure 1 Alt Text: A conceptual diagram showing how weak relational coordination sustains collaborative challenges in vocational rehabilitation. On the left, a blue circle labelled "Relational Dimensions" lists three factors: lack of shared goals, lack of shared knowledge, and lack of trust and respect. In the center, a red circle labelled "Collaborative Challenges" shows three outcomes: competing for the agenda, finding collaboration "colossally labouring," and seeing collaborators as obstacles. On the right, a yellow circle labelled "Counterproductive Communication Strategies" lists three strategies: campaigning, clarifying, and distancing. Arrows point in a cycle between the three circles, illustrating how relational dimensions, collaborative challenges, and counterproductive communication reinforce each other.


Relational Dimensions
Collaborative Challenges
Counterproductive Communication Strategies
Lack of shared goals
Lack of shared knowledge
Lack of trust and respect
Competing for the agenda
Finding collaboration "colossally labouring"
Seeing collaborators as obstacles
Campaigning
Clarifying
Distancing