



Published in final edited form as:

*Am J Prev Med.* 2009 October ; 37(4): 330–339. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2009.06.008.

## Meta-Analysis of Workplace Physical Activity Interventions

Vicki S. Conn, PhD, RN, FAAN, Adam R. Hafdahl, PhD, Pamela S. Cooper, PhD, Lori M. Brown, MS, and Sally L. Lusk, PhD, RN, FAAN, FAAOHN

University of Missouri (Conn, Cooper, Brown), Columbia; Washington University (Hafdahl), St. Louis, Missouri; and University of Michigan (Lusk), Ann Arbor Michigan

### Abstract

**Context**—Most adults do not achieve adequate physical activity. Despite the potential benefits of worksite health promotion, no previous comprehensive meta-analysis has summarized health and physical activity behavior outcomes from these programs. This comprehensive meta-analysis integrated the extant wide range of worksite physical activity intervention research.

**Evidence acquisition**—Extensive searching located published and unpublished intervention studies reported from 1969 through 2007. Results were coded from primary studies. Random-effects meta-analytic procedures, including moderator analyses, were completed in 2008.

**Evidence synthesis**—Effects on most variables were substantially heterogeneous because diverse studies were included. Standardized mean difference (*d*) effect sizes were synthesized across approximately 38,231 subjects. Significantly positive effects were observed for physical activity behavior (0.21), fitness (0.57), lipids (0.13), anthropometric measures (0.08), work attendance (0.19), and job stress (0.33). The significant effect size for diabetes risk (0.98) is more tentative given small sample sizes. Significant heterogeneity documents intervention effects varied across studies. The mean effect size for fitness corresponds to a difference between treatment minus control subjects' means on  $\dot{V}O_{2\max}$  of 3.5 mL/kg/min; for lipids,  $-0.2$  on total cholesterol:HDL; and for diabetes risk,  $-12.6$  mg/dL on fasting glucose.

**Conclusions**—These findings document that some workplace physical activity interventions can improve both health and important worksite outcomes. Effects were variable for most outcomes, reflecting the diversity of primary studies. Future primary research should compare interventions to confirm causal relationships and further explore heterogeneity.

### Introduction

Although strong evidence shows that exercisers are healthier than nonexercisers, most adults do not perform enough physical activity to achieve health and well-being benefits.<sup>1</sup> Workplaces may implement physical programs in hopes of keeping workers healthy and reducing healthcare costs.<sup>2</sup> Since employed adults spend about half of their workday waking hours at workplaces, offering physical activity programs at work may be an efficient strategy to increase physical activity.<sup>3–5</sup> Convenience, group support, existing patterns of formal and informal communication among employees in a worksite, and possible corporate behavior norms are

---

Address correspondence and reprint requests to: Vicki S. Conn, PhD, RN, FAAN, University of Missouri, S317 Sinclair School of Nursing Columbia, MO 65211. conn@missouri.edu.

No financial disclosures were reported by the authors of this paper.

**Publisher's Disclaimer:** This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

potential advantages of worksite programs over other approaches.<sup>6–8</sup> Workplace programs may be especially important because the imbalance between physical activity and energy intake at work may contribute to the obesity epidemic.<sup>4</sup> This meta-analysis addresses the need to quantitatively synthesize the rapidly growing literature reporting workplace physical activity programs.

Despite the potential health and economic benefits of worksite health promotion,<sup>2</sup> no previous comprehensive meta-analysis has summarized health and physical activity behavior outcomes from these programs. Several previous narrative reviews were limited in scope and unable to address either the magnitude of outcomes or potential workplace moderators of outcomes,<sup>4, 5,9,10</sup> The broadest narrative review was conducted using studies published before 1995.<sup>11</sup> Two previous meta-analyses addressed physical activity behavior outcomes across some studies included in this project. One 1998 meta-analysis of 26 studies reported an effect size consistent with a standardized mean difference of 0.22, which was not significantly different from 0. The authors noted their attempted moderator analyses suffered from inadequate statistical power.<sup>3</sup> A 1996 meta-analysis synthesized data for diverse adults and reported a workplace effect size consistent with a standardized mean difference of 0.35.<sup>12</sup>

This meta-analysis moves beyond the previous reported quantitative syntheses by greatly expanding the search strategies to ensure a more comprehensive synthesis, addressing both physical activity behavior and health outcomes, examining work-related outcomes, and conducting exploratory moderator analyses. The research questions were:

1. What are the overall effects of interventions to increase physical activity on physical activity behavior, health (fitness, lipids, anthropometric measures, diabetes risk), well-being (quality of life, mood), and work-related outcomes (work attendance, healthcare utilization, job stress, and job satisfaction)?
2. Do interventions' effects on outcomes vary depending on workplace characteristics?
3. What are the effects of interventions on outcomes among studies comparing treatment subjects before versus after interventions?

## Methods

Standard strategies for quantitative systematic reviews were used to locate and secure potential primary studies, determine eligibility, extract data from research reports, meta-analyze primary study results, and interpret findings.

### Search Strategies to Locate Primary Reports

A comprehensive search was completed using multiple strategies to move beyond previous reviews and limit bias.<sup>13</sup> An experienced health sciences reference librarian used broad search terms in 11 computerized databases (e.g., MEDLINE, PsychINFO, EMBASE, Cochrane Controlled Trials Register, Dissertation Abstracts International). Multiple research registers were examined, including National Institutes of Health Computer Retrieval of Information on Scientific Projects; Australian/New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry; and mRCT, which has 14 active registers and 16 archived registers. Computerized database searches on principal investigators of funded studies and on the first three authors of eligible primary studies were completed. Hand searches were conducted in 114 journals. Ancestry searches were completed on previous reviews and eligible studies. These comprehensive search strategies yielded 7,251 papers, reports, and reviews that were examined to locate eligible primary studies.

## Inclusion Criteria

Primary studies of interventions to increase physical activity that were reported in English between 1969 and late 2007 were included. Reports with adequate data to calculate an effect size for at least 3 subjects were included. Studies focused on chronically ill workers were excluded. Published and unpublished studies were eligible because syntheses using only published studies may overestimate the effect size.<sup>14</sup> Small-sample studies, which often lack statistical power to detect treatment effects, were included because they may report on novel interventions or may include difficult-to-recruit subjects.<sup>14</sup>

Studies with varied designs were included. Randomized controlled trials may be especially difficult to implement at worksites because of employee resistance to randomization and potential contamination among workers with extensive contact.<sup>11</sup> Some pre-experimental studies compare programs developed at workplaces. Some investigators find it unethical to withhold treatment when interventions are thought to be beneficial.<sup>15</sup> Separate analyses were conducted for single-group and two-group comparisons. A richer variety of interventions and samples were included by using unpublished reports, small-sample studies, and pre-experimental research.

## Data Coding and Analysis

A coding frame to record primary study characteristics and results was developed, pilot tested, and refined. Workplace characteristics of company size, inclusion of multiple companies in the study, and profit versus nonprofit status were coded. The extent of worksite involvement in the intervention was coded in two ways: whether the interventionist was a workplace employee and if the worksite designed the intervention. Other data coded included whether interventions were delivered during employees' paid time, if data were collected at the workplace, if interventions included fitness facilities at worksites, and whether some form of organizational policy change occurred in association with interventions. Interventions could include motivational/educational sessions and/or supervised exercise sessions.

A priori lists of outcome measures were used to select among multiple possible measures reported in primary studies, as a way of avoiding coder or author bias. For example, if studies presented both objective ergometer (step-counter) measures and self-reports of physical activity, the ergometer values were coded. Physical activity behavior was recorded only if the study clearly measured physical activity behavior separate from any interventionist-supervised exercise. Fitness was coded as oxygen consumption ( $\text{VO}_{2\text{max}}$ ). Lipid measures included total cholesterol, high-density lipoproteins, or the ratio of total cholesterol to high-density lipoproteins. Body mass index (BMI), weight, abdominal girth, and percent body fat were coded for anthropometric measures. Both quality of life and mood (e.g., depression, anxiety) were assessed with self-report measures. Diabetes risk was measured as fasting glucose or insulin levels. Work attendance and health services utilization measures were derived from company records. Job satisfaction and stress were coded from self-report instruments. The data reported most distal from completion of the intervention were recorded, because persistence of intervention effects is most important for long-term benefits to health. To ensure analysis of only independent samples, author lists were crosschecked to locate reports that might contain overlapping samples. When possible, multiple papers describing the same study were used to code comprehensive data. Coding was not masked because evidence indicates it does not decrease bias.<sup>16</sup> To enhance coding reliability, two extensively trained coders independently extracted all data. A third PhD prepared coder provided validation of effect size data. The first author or another member of the research team resolved any coding discrepancies.

Data calculations were handled by standard meta-analytic approaches using standardized mean difference ( $d$ ) effect size weighted by inverse of variance. Exploratory moderator analyses were

conducted among two-group post-intervention comparisons. Many potential moderators could not be analyzed because too few studies reported the necessary information (e.g., company focus, such as manufacturing). Analysis details are available from the authors.

## Results

Approximately 38,231 subjects participated in the studies included in the meta-analysis ( $k=206$  comparisons,  $s=138$  reports).<sup>17–155</sup> Independent two-group post-test effect sizes included data from 24,520 subjects ( $k=94$ ,  $s=71$ ); two-group pre–post effect sizes, from 14,630 subjects ( $k=80$ ,  $s=59$ ); and pre–post treatment group comparisons, from 22,413 subjects ( $k=192$ ,  $s=125$ ). Sample sizes varied dramatically from 12 to 5,038 subjects.<sup>78,155</sup> Multiple treatment groups were common: 34, 10, 3, and 1 paper(s) reported on two, three, four, and six treatment groups, respectively. Twelve unpublished dissertations and one unpublished presentation paper were included. Many studies reported funding ( $s=59$ ). One report was disseminated before 1970, 5 in the 1970s, 35 in the 1980s, 49 in the 1990s, and 48 were disseminated after 2000. The earliest study was reported in 1969 and the most recent study in 2007. Analyses were completed in 2008.

Among the studies that reported details about worksites, 55 were for-profit and 50 were not-for-profit companies. Most papers did not report company size ( $s=80$ ). Among the papers reporting this information, the vast majority were large companies (at least 750 employees), with only five described as small (fewer than 100 employees). Most studies were conducted in single companies at one location ( $s=87$ ), 17 used multiple locations of one company, and 23 conducted studies at multiple companies. The most common types of companies were education/health services ( $s=37$ ), government ( $s=32$ ), and manufacturing ( $s=17$ ). Few studies reported whether study data were collected at the worksite; among those providing this information, 51 collected data at the workplace and 14 did not. Interventions were more often delivered at the workplace ( $s=51$ ) than in other locations ( $s=21$ ). Nearly all of the studies recruited subjects at the worksite ( $s=121$ ). Only 32 papers reported that interventions were delivered during employees' paid time. Most studies used interventionists employed by the research project ( $s=101$ ) instead of workplace employees. Only six studies reported including an organizational-level policy change, such as providing free or reduced memberships to fitness centers not located at the worksite. Twenty-six studies involved workplace employees in designing interventions. Thirty-eight papers reported on interventions that included fitness facilities at the worksite. Supervised exercise was used in 27% of the studies while 80% employed motivational/educational sessions. Further details about interventions are found in Table 1.

Visual and statistical assessment of funnel-plot asymmetry, as indicators of possible publication bias, suggested substantial evidence of asymmetry for physical activity, fitness, lipids, and diabetes risk, especially for single-group comparisons. Evidence of asymmetry was weaker but still notable for anthropometric measures and mood. Due to the relatively few effect sizes on quality of life, health services utilization, work attendance, job stress, and job satisfaction, evidence for or against funnel-plot asymmetry was inconclusive for these variables.

### Effects of Interventions on Physical Activity Behavior, Health, and Well-Being

Table 2 presents the overall effects of interventions on physical activity, health, and well-being outcomes. The findings should be interpreted with caution given the small number of studies or subjects for some outcomes. For physical activity behavior, the mean overall effect at post-test comparison in two-group studies was 0.21. The two-group pre–post effect and treatment group pre–post comparisons were of comparable magnitude. The Common Language Effect Size (CLES) of 0.56 for the two-group post-test effect size indicates that 56% of the time a

random treatment subject would have a higher physical activity score than a random control subject (all CLES values reported are based on a random-effects mean effect size for two-group post-test comparisons). To enhance interpretability, mean physical activity effect sizes were transformed to steps/day using means and standard deviations from appropriate reference groups. For two-group post-test comparisons, the raw mean difference was 612, which corresponds to a final steps/day mean of 8,869 for treatment subjects versus 8,257 for control subjects. The homogeneity test and estimated between-studies standard deviation ( $Q$  and  $\hat{\sigma}_\delta$  in Table 2) demonstrated significant heterogeneity for all physical activity behavior comparison types. The  $I^2$  value (Table 2), the percentage of total variation among studies' observed effect sizes that is due to heterogeneity rather than sampling of participants, also documents significant heterogeneity.

Fitness outcomes also were significantly better among treatment than control subjects, and better at post-test when treatment subjects' pre- and post-intervention scores were compared. Mean effect sizes ranged from 0.47 to 0.57 (CLES=0.66). As with steps/day for physical activity, the mean effect size on fitness was transformed to maximal oxygen consumption ( $VO_{2max}$ ). For two-group comparisons, the raw mean difference was 3.5, which corresponds to, for example, a final  $VO_{2max}$  mean of 37.7 mL/kg/min for treatment subjects versus 34.2 mL/kg/min for control subjects. Fitness effect sizes were significantly heterogeneous which indicates some studies found significantly better fitness outcomes than other studies.

Diabetes risk was significantly reduced by interventions. Mean effect sizes for the two-group comparisons were 0.90 to 0.98 (CLES=0.76). For two-group studies, the calculated raw mean difference was -12.6, which corresponding to a post-intervention fasting glucose mean of 81.0 mg/dL for treatment subjects versus 93.6 mg/dL for control subjects. Both mean values are within the range considered normal fasting glucose levels. Diabetes risk effect sizes exhibited significant substantial heterogeneity. Diabetes risk findings should be considered tentative given the small number of studies that reported this variable ( $k=6$ ).

Lipid and anthropometric effect sizes were more modest but positive, indicating better scores following interventions among treatment subjects. Lipids mean effect sizes ranged from 0.12 to 0.17 (CLES=0.54). In terms of the ratio of total cholesterol to HDL, the raw mean difference was -0.2, such as from a mean post-intervention ratio of 4.6 for treatment versus 4.8 for control. All of the lipids effect sizes were significantly heterogeneous. Anthropometric mean effect sizes for treatment subjects varied from 0.07 to 0.13 (CLES=0.52). For the two-group comparison in terms of BMI, the raw mean difference was -0.3, which would occur if the post-intervention BMI mean were 25.0 for treatment versus 25.3 for control. Anthropometric effect sizes were significantly heterogeneous, except the two-group pre-post comparisons.

Mean effect sizes for both quality of life (0.23) and mood (0.13) two-group comparisons were positive, indicating better outcomes among treatment subjects, but these did not reach statistical significance. Effect sizes for two-group pre-post and pre-post effects were significant with improved quality of life and mood scores following interventions. Most of the quality of life and mood effect sizes exhibited significant heterogeneity.

### Effects of Physical Activity Interventions on Work-Related Variables

Estimates and tests for work-related outcomes are reported in Table 3. The two-group post-test comparison of work attendance documented that, on average, treatment subjects had lower mean absenteeism than control subjects (effect size=0.19, CLES=0.55). Although the direction of the effect was similar, mean effect sizes were smaller for both two-group pre-post effects and treatment group pre-post comparisons. Job stress was significantly lower at follow-up among treatment subjects than control subjects (effect size=0.33, CLES=0.59). Job stress effect sizes were positive for other comparisons but were not significant. Job satisfaction was

significantly greater following interventions among treatment subjects than controls in the two-group pre–post effect analysis (effect size=0.20, CLES=0.54), but similar findings did not achieve statistical significance for the two-group post-test analysis. Effect sizes for most comparison types on most outcomes were significantly heterogeneous, as documented by  $Q$ , estimated between-studies standard deviations, and  $I^2$  values.

Healthcare utilization two-group post-test analyses revealed significantly higher healthcare utilization among treatment subjects than among control subjects (effect size=−0.17, CLES=0.45). The two-group pre–post effect estimate was of similar magnitude (−0.18) but not significant. The pre–post comparison for treatment subjects revealed no utilization differences. Healthcare effect sizes were more homogeneous than most other variables in the project. Findings regarding job stress, job satisfaction, and healthcare utilization should be viewed as tentative given the small numbers of studies which reported these variables ( $k$  in Table 3).

### Moderator Analyses

Analyses of potential workplace moderators were conducted for variables with sufficient cases: physical activity behavior, fitness, lipids, and anthropometric variables. Dichotomous moderator results are presented in Table 4. Profit versus nonprofit company status was not significantly linked with mean effect size for any variable ( $Q_B$  in Table 4). Neither company size nor whether multiple companies were included in the study were significant moderators of mean effect sizes on physical activity behavior, fitness, lipids, or anthropometric outcomes. Three-level moderator analyses were conducted for numbers of companies and locations (results available from first author): The only significant effect was for anthropometric effect size, with significantly higher mean effect size for interventions conducted in one multi-location company (0.22) than in other combinations of numbers of companies and locations (both 0.04).

Intervention delivery at the worksite or elsewhere was significant only for anthropometric effect sizes, such that interventions delivered at workplaces yielded a larger mean effect size (0.17) than those delivered elsewhere (0.05). Whether employees received interventions on company paid time was significant for two of the four outcomes: Studies with employees paid during intervention reported larger mean effect sizes than those with employees receiving interventions outside company paid time on both fitness (0.92 vs 0.49) and anthropometric measures (0.22 vs 0.02). Interventions with employee interventionists were more effective than those with others as interventionists for fitness (1.03 vs 0.50), lipids (0.59 vs 0.09), and anthropometric measures (0.32 vs 0.05). Workplace participation in designing the interventions, as compared to interventions designed by people not employed by the worksite, was significant for fitness (1.18 vs 0.49) and anthropometric outcomes (0.22 vs 0.06) but not for lipids or physical activity behavior. Neither recruitment nor data collection location (workplace versus elsewhere) were related to variables with adequate data for moderator analyses.

The presence of a fitness facility onsite in the workplace did not affect mean effect sizes on fitness or physical activity behavior. Studies with onsite fitness facilities reported larger mean effect sizes on lipids (0.32) than studies without such facilities (0.07). Anthropometric outcomes also yielded larger mean effect sizes among studies with onsite facilities (0.24) than those without facilities (0.05). Organizational policy change could be analyzed for lipids and anthropometric outcomes only. Lipid effect sizes were unrelated to policy changes while anthropometric outcomes yielded significantly larger mean effect sizes in studies with policy changes (0.24) than those without policy changes (0.03). Whereas for physical activity behavior, fitness, and lipids nearly all moderators left significant residual heterogeneity ( $Q_W$  in Table 4), all but two moderators left nonsignificant residual heterogeneity for anthropometric

outcomes. Results of exploratory multiple moderator analyses are available from the corresponding author.

## Discussion

These findings document that some interventions improve physical activity in some subjects, and these changes may in turn improve selected health outcomes, work culture, and job stress. However, significant heterogeneity requires cautious interpretation of findings.

The physical activity mean effect size of 0.21 is similar to that reported in 26 worksite studies ( $r=0.11$ ,  $d=0.22$ )<sup>3</sup> and smaller than the effect size reported of 33 workplace studies ( $r=0.17$ ,  $d=0.35$ ).<sup>12</sup> This might reflect more comprehensive searching that could have located more studies with small effect sizes. Previous workplace quantitative syntheses have not addressed health, well-being, or work-related outcomes of improved physical activity; so the present study therefore constitutes the first published report of the impact of physical activity interventions on these variables. This meta-analysis moved beyond previously reported syntheses by comprehensively searching to obtain far more studies, separating effect sizes for one- and two-group designs, and conducting moderator analyses on two-group studies.<sup>3</sup> The results of single-moderator analyses should be interpreted cautiously given the potential for confounding of moderators.

Improvement in fitness was documented with an effect size of 0.57.<sub>[CV2]</sub> The magnitude of physical activity, fitness, and health benefits appear modest, and it is unclear if the physical activity dose was sufficient to improve health to meet public health goals.<sup>5</sup>

This meta-analysis was limited by the number of studies located with sufficient data to calculate effect sizes and substantial heterogeneity among studies. Physical activity interventions varied widely, as did methods for assessing some variables. For example, physical activity was rarely objectively measured, leading to difficulties in comparisons across interventions.

Although findings on improved work attendance, job satisfaction, and job stress were mixed, this study suggests that some physical activity programs are effective beyond direct health benefits. Even modest reductions in absenteeism may result in substantial fiscal savings when multiplied by many employees. The findings regarding health utilization should be interpreted cautiously given the very small sample size and the inadequate time between interventions and utilization measurement among these studies. Some programs may have conducted health screening prior to encouraging subjects to begin exercising, which might have prompted needed health care.<sup>156</sup> Longer follow-up studies could determine the enduring economic impact of programs.

## Conclusion

Well-designed studies evaluating worksite physical activity promotion programs are needed. Direct comparisons between programs that allow employees to participate on paid work time versus those that do not should be investigated. Also necessary are direct comparisons of programs with and without worksite fitness facilities to determine whether the cost of providing onsite facilities is justified by improvements in employee health and productivity. Investigations targeting at-risk subjects would determine whether interventions need to be tailored to specific subgroups of employees. Investigations should also examine the impact of interventions on important worksite-related outcomes that influence worker productivity including absenteeism, stress levels, and job satisfaction.

## Acknowledgments

Financial support provided by a grant from the National Institutes of Health (R01NR009656) to Vicki Conn, principal investigator. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

## References

1. Troiano RP, Berrigan D, Dodd KW, et al. Physical activity in the United States measured by accelerometer. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2008;40(1):181–8. [PubMed: 18091006]
2. Golaszewski T. The limitations and promise of health education in managed care. *Health Educ Behav* 2000;27(4):402–16. [PubMed: 10929748]
3. Dishman RK, Oldenburg B, O'Neal H, Shephard RJ. Worksite physical activity interventions. *Am J Prev Med* 1998;15(4):344–61. [PubMed: 9838977]
4. Engbers LH, van Poppel MN, Paw MJ, van Mechelen W. Worksite health promotion programs with environmental changes: a systematic review. *Am J Prev Med* 2005;29(1):61–70. [PubMed: 15958254]
5. Proper KI, Koning M, van der Beek AJ, Hildebrandt VH, Bosscher RJ, van Mechelen W. The effectiveness of worksite physical activity programs on physical activity, physical fitness, and health. *Clin J Sport Med* 2003;13(2):106–17. [PubMed: 12629429]
6. Marcus BH, Forsyth LH. How are we doing with physical activity? *Am J Health Promot* 1999;14(2):118–24. [PubMed: 10724723]
7. Shephard R. Worksite fitness and exercise programs: a review of methodology and health impact. *Am J Health Promot* 1996;10:436–52. [PubMed: 10163310]
8. Pratt CA. Findings from the 2007 Active Living Research conference implications for future research. *Am J Prev Med* 2008;34(4):366–8. [PubMed: 18374254]
9. Janer G, Sala M, Kogevinas M. Health promotion traits at worksites and risk factors for cancer. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2002;28(3):141–57. [PubMed: 12109553]
10. Matson–Koffman DM, Brownstein JN, Neiner JA, Greaney ML. A site-specific literature review of policy and environmental interventions that promote physical activity and nutrition for cardiovascular health: what works? *Am J Health Promot* 2005;19(3):167–93. [PubMed: 15693346]
11. Shephard RJ. Worksite fitness and exercise programs: a review of methodology and health impact. *Am J Health Promot* 1996;10(6):436–52. [PubMed: 10163310]
12. Dishman RK, Buckworth J. Increasing physical activity: a quantitative synthesis. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1996;28(6):706–19. [PubMed: 8784759]
13. Conn VS, Isaramalai S, Rath S, Jantarakupt P, Wadhawan R, Dash Y. Beyond MEDLINE for literature searches. *J Nurs Scholarsh* 2003;35(2):177–82. [PubMed: 12854300]
14. Conn VS, Valentine JC, Cooper HM, Rantz MJ. Grey literature in meta-analyses. *Nurs Res* 2003;52(4):256–61. [PubMed: 12867783]
15. Brown SA, Upchurch S, Anding R, Winter M, Ramirez G. Promoting weight loss in type II diabetes. *Diabetes Care* 1996;19(6):613–24. [PubMed: 8725861]
16. Berlin JA. Does blinding of readers affect the results of meta-analyses? University of Pennsylvania Meta-analysis Blinding Study Group [see comment]. *Lancet* 1997;350(9072):185–6. [PubMed: 9250191]
17. Eight-year follow-up results from the Rome Project of Coronary Heart Disease Prevention. Research Group of the Rome Project of Coronary Heart Disease Prevention. *Prev Med* 1986;15(2):176–91. [PubMed: 3606739]
18. Adams TD, Yanowitz FG, Chandler S, et al. A study to evaluate and promote total fitness among fire fighters. *J Sports Med Phys Fitness* 1986;26(4):337–45. [PubMed: 3560906]
19. Aittasalo M, Miilunpalo S, Suni J. The effectiveness of physical activity counseling in a work-site setting. A randomized, controlled trial. *Patient Educ Couns* 2004;55(2):193–202. [PubMed: 15530754]
20. Aldana S, Barlow M, Smith R, et al. A worksite diabetes prevention program: two-year impact on employee health. *AAOHN J* 2006;54(9):389–95. [PubMed: 17001837]



21. Aldana SG, Jacobson BH, Harris CJ, Kelley PL, Stone WJ. Influence of a mobile worksite health promotion program on health care costs. *Am J Prev Med* 1993;9(6):378–83. [PubMed: 8311988]
22. Aldana SG, Jacobson BH, Kelley PL, Quirk M. The effectiveness of a mobile worksite health promotion program in lowering employee health risk. *Am J Health Promot* 1994;8(4):254–6. [PubMed: 10146707]
23. Alexy B. Goal setting and health risk reduction. *Nurs Res* 1985;34:283–8. [PubMed: 3850489]
24. Allen JG, Delistraty DA. Influence of a hospital-based wellness program on employee fitness. *Health Values* 1987;11(6):11–4. [PubMed: 10284475]
25. Altekruise EB, Wilmore JH. Changes in blood chemistries following a controlled exercise program. *J Occup Med* 1973;15:110–3. [PubMed: 4685420]
26. Anderson RC, Anderson KE. Positive changes and worksite health education. *Psychol Rep* 1994;74(2):607–10. [PubMed: 8197297]
27. Angotti CM, Chan WT, Sample CJ, Levine MS. Combined dietary and exercise intervention for control of serum cholesterol in the workplace. *Am J Health Promot* 2000;15(1):9–16. [PubMed: 11184120]
28. Atlantis E, Chow CM, Kirby A, Singh MF. An effective exercise-based intervention for improving mental health and quality of life measures: a randomized controlled trial. *Prev Med* 2004;39(2):424–34. [PubMed: 15226056]
29. Baer JT. Improved plasma cholesterol levels in men after a nutrition education program at the worksite [see comment]. *J Am Diet Assoc* 1993;93(6):658–63. [PubMed: 8389779]
30. Barfield, BR. Evaluation of the effects of health risk appraisals and health promotion teaching on lifestyle behaviors [Dissertation]. Birmingham Alabama: University of Alabama; 1992.
31. Bassey EJ, Patrick JM, Irving JM, Blecher A, Fentem PH. An unsupervised “aerobics” physical training programme in middle-aged factory workers: feasibility, validation and response. *Eur J Appl Physiol* 1983;52:120–5.
32. Bauer RL, Heller RF, Challah S. United Kingdom heart disease prevention project: 12-year follow-up of risk factors. *Am J Epidemiol* 1985;121(4):563–9. [PubMed: 4014145]
33. Bennett B, Schlichting C, Bondi K. Cardiorespiratory fitness and cognitive performance before and after confinement in a nuclear submarine. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 1985;56(11):1085–91. [PubMed: 4074262]
34. Bjurström LA, Alexiou NG. A program of heart disease intervention for public employees. A five year report. *J Occup Med* 1978;20(8):521–31. [PubMed: 690735]
35. Blair SN, Smith M, Collingwood TR, Reynolds R, Prentice MC, Sterling CL. Health promotion for educators: impact on absenteeism. *Prev Med* 1986;15(2):166–75. [PubMed: 3714669]
36. Blissmer B, McAuley E. Testing the requirements of stages of physical activity among adults: the comparative effectiveness of stage-matched, mismatched, standard care, and control interventions. *Ann Behav Med* 2002;24(3):181–9. [PubMed: 12173675]
37. Boudreau F, Godin G, Pineau R, Bradet R. Health risk appraisal in an occupational setting and its impact on exercise behavior. *J Occup Environ Med* 1995;37(9):1145–50. [PubMed: 8528724]
38. Bowne D, Russell M, Morgan J, Optenberg S, Clarke A. Reduced disability and health care costs in an industrial fitness program. *J Occup Med* 1984;26(11):809–16. [PubMed: 6502284]
39. Brand R, Schlicht W, Grossmann K, Duhnsen R. Effects of a physical exercise intervention on employees' perceptions of quality of life: a randomized controlled trial. *Soz Präventivmed* 2006;51(1):14–23. [PubMed: 16898234]
40. Brownell KD, Bachorik PS, Ayerle RS. Changes in plasma lipid and lipoprotein levels in men and women after a program of moderate exercise. *Circulation* 1982;65(3):477–84. [PubMed: 7055869]
41. Brox JI, Froystein O. Health-related quality of life and sickness absence in community nursing home employees: randomized controlled trial of physical exercise. *Occup Med (Lond)* 2005;55(7):558–63. [PubMed: 16251373]
42. Bruno R, Arnold C, Jacobson L, Winick M, Wynder E. Randomized controlled trial of a nonpharmacologic cholesterol reduction program at the worksite. *Prev Med* 1983;12(4):523–32. [PubMed: 6622436]

43. Campbell MK, Tessaro I, DeVellis B, et al. Effects of a tailored health promotion program for female blue-collar workers: health works for women. *Prev Med* 2002;34(3):313–23. [PubMed: 11902848]
44. Cardinal BJ, Sachs ML. Effects of mail-mediated, stage-matched exercise behavior change strategies on female adults' leisure-time exercise behavior. *J Sports Med Phys Fitness* 1996;36(2):100–7. [PubMed: 8898515]
45. Cash, TL. Effects of different exercise promotion strategies and stage of exercise on reported physical activity, self-motivation, and stages of exercise in worksite employees. Temple University; 1997.
46. Chaney, C. Effects of an employee fitness and lifestyle modification program upon health care costs, absenteeism, and job satisfaction. University of Utah; 1988.
47. Cohen RY, Stunkard AJ, Felix MR. Comparison of three worksite weight-loss competitions. *J Behav Med* 1987;10(5):467–79. [PubMed: 3430589]
48. Coleman KJ, Raynor HR, Mueller DM, Cerny FJ, Dorn JM, Epstein LH. Providing sedentary adults with choices for meeting their walking goals. *Prev Med* 1999;28(5):510–9. [PubMed: 10329342]
49. Cook C, Simmons G, Swinburn B, Stewart J. Changing risk behaviours for non-communicable disease in New Zealand working men—is workplace intervention effective? *N Z Med J* 2001;114(1130):175–8. [PubMed: 11396664]
50. Cook, RF.; Back, AS.; Trudeau, J.; McPherson, T. Integrating substance abuse prevention into health promotion programs in the workplace: a social cognitive intervention targeting the mainstream user. In: Bennett, JB.; Lehman, WEK., editors. Preventing workplace substance abuse: beyond drug testing to wellness. Washington DC: American Psychological Association; 2003. p. 97-133.
51. Cook RF, Billings DW, Hersch RK, Back AS, Hendrickson A. A field test of a web-based workplace health promotion program to improve dietary practices, reduce stress, and increase physical activity: randomized controlled trial. *J Med Internet Res* 2007;9(2):e17. [PubMed: 17581811]
52. Croteau KA. A preliminary study on the impact of a pedometer-based intervention on daily steps. *Am J Health Promot* 2004;18(3):217–20. [PubMed: 14748310]
53. Croteau KA, Young CJ. Effectiveness of a Navy remedial exercise intervention. *Mil Med* 2000;165:786–90. [PubMed: 11050877]
54. Dennis KE, Pane KW, Adams, Qi BB. The impact of a shipboard weight control program. *Obes Res* 1999;7(1):60–7. [PubMed: 10023731]
55. Eddy JM, Eynon D, Nagy S, Paradossi PJ. Impact of a physical fitness program in a blue-collar workforce. *Health Values* 1990;14(6):14–23. [PubMed: 10107726]
56. Elliot DL, Goldberg L, Duncan TE, et al. The PHLAME firefighters' study: feasibility and findings. *Am J Health Behav* 2004;28(1):13–23. [PubMed: 14977155]
57. Fardy P, Ilmarinen J. Evaluating the effects and feasibility of an at work stairclimbing intervention program for men. *Med Sci Sports* 1975;7(2):91–3. [PubMed: 1152630]
58. Fukahori M, A H, S I, I T, O H. Program of exercise training as total health promotion plan and its evaluation. *J Occup Health* 1999;41(2):76–82.
59. Furukawa F, Kazuma K, Kawa M, et al. Effects of an off-site walking program on energy expenditure, serum lipids, and glucose metabolism in middle-aged women. *Biol Res Nurs* 2003;4(3):181–92. [PubMed: 12585782]
60. Furuki K, Honda S, Jahng D, Ikeda M, Okubo T. The effects of a health promotion program on body mass index. *J Occup Health* 1999;41:19–26.
61. Geise, JM. The relation of a health promotion program to the cardiovascular health of fire fighters. Los Angeles: University Of California-Los Angeles; 1995.
62. Gerdle B, Brulin C, Elert J, Eliasson P, Granlund B. Effect of a general fitness program on musculoskeletal symptoms, clinical status, physiological capacity, and perceived work environment among home care service personnel. *J Occup Rehabil* 1995;5(1):1–16.
63. Gettman L, Pollock M, Ward A. Adherence to unsupervised exercise. *Phys Sportsmed* 1983;11:56–64.
64. Goetzel R, Sepulveda M, Knight K, et al. Association of IBM's "A Plan for Life" health promotion program with changes in employees' health risk status. *J Occup Med* 1994;36(9):1005–9. [PubMed: 7823211]

65. Gold DB, Anderson DR, Serxner SA. Impact of a telephone-based intervention on the reduction of health risks. *Am J Health Promot* 2000;15:97–106. [PubMed: 11194702]
66. Gomez-Merino D, Chennaoui M, Drogou C, Bonneau D, Guezennec CY. Decrease in serum leptin after prolonged physical activity in men. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2002;34(10):1594–9. [PubMed: 12370560]
67. Grandjean PW, Oden GL, Crouse SF, Brown JA, Green JS. Lipid and lipoprotein changes in women following 6 months of exercise training in a worksite fitness program. *J Sports Med Phys Fitness* 1996;36(1):54–9. [PubMed: 8699839]
68. Griffin, CS. Evaluation of social cognitive versus motivationally-tailored self-help physical activity interventions. University of Georgia; 2001.
69. Gronningsaeter H, Hytten K, Skauli G, et al. Improved health and coping by physical exercise or cognitive behavioral stress management training in a work environment. *Psychol Health* 1992;7(2):147–63.
70. Hager RL, Hardy A, Aldana SG, George JD. Evaluation of an Internet, stage-based physical activity intervention. *Am J Health Educ* 2002;33(6):328–35.
71. Hallam JS, Petosa R. The long-term impact of a four-session work-site intervention on selected social cognitive theory variables linked to adult exercise adherence. *Health Educ Behav* 2004;31(1):88–100. [PubMed: 14768660]
72. Halvorsen, DK, I. The effects of power circuit exercise training and health education on fitness and health status, and on risk factors for cardiovascular disease in a worksite health promotion program for men and women in the exercise deficient state [dissertation]. University of Minnesota; 1996.
73. Hanlon P, McEwen J, Carey L, et al. Health checks and coronary risk: further evidence from a randomised controlled trial. [see comment]. *Brit Med J* 1995;311(7020):1609–13. [PubMed: 8555805]
74. Hannah TE, Kozma A, Stones M, Mosher D, Vardy L. Effects on mood of a life-styles program for the rehabilitation of injured workers. *J Occup Med* 1989;31(5):454–7. [PubMed: 2715854]
75. Harma M, Ilmarinen J, Knauth P, et al. Physical training intervention in female shift workers: I. The effects of intervention of fitness, fatigue, sleep, and psychosomatic symptoms. *Ergonomics* 1988;31(1):39–50. [PubMed: 3359987]
76. Harrell JS, Griggs TR, Roskin EW, Meibohm AR, Williams OD. Impact of a 12-week aerobic exercise and weight program for law enforcement trainees. *Am J Health Promot* 1993;7(6):410–2. [PubMed: 10146816]
77. Harvey HL. An evaluation of RMH Health Club. *Worksite Wellness*. 1999
78. Heath GW, Broadhurst CB. Effects of exercise training and dietary behavior modification on weight reduction and lipoprotein lipids in female hospital employees. *Health values* 1984;8(6):3–9. [PubMed: 10268963]
79. Hendriksen IJM, Zuiderveld B, Kemper HCG, Bezemer PD. Effect of commuter cycling on physical performance of male and female employees. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2000;32(2):504–10. [PubMed: 10694139]
80. Henritze J, Brammell HL, McGloin J. LIFE CHECK: a successful, low touch, low tech, in-plant, cardiovascular disease risk identification and modification program. *Am J Health Promot* 1992;7(2):129–36. [PubMed: 10148717]
81. Horowitz SM. Effects of a worksite wellness program on absenteeism and health care costs in a small federal agency. *Fitness in Business* 1987:167–72.
82. Horowitz SM, Kissam T, Riegel M, Laflin MT, Sonne L. Results of a pilot health promotion program on non-facility based sales personnel. *J Health Educ* 1998;29(5):282–8.
83. Hubball. Development and evaluation of a worksite health promotion program: application of critical self-directed learning for exercise behavior change [dissertation]. University of British Columbia; 1996.
84. Ilmarinen J, Ilmarinen R, Koskela A, et al. Training effects of stair-climbing during office hours on female employees. *Ergonomics* 1979;22(5):507–16. [PubMed: 520283]
85. Jette M, Bishop D, Baron R. Effects of Project Health on the lifestyle of senior government officials. *Can J Public Health* 1981;72(2):97–9. [PubMed: 7237350]

86. Jette M, Sidney K. The benefits and challenges of a fitness and lifestyle enhancement program for correctional officers. *Can J Public Health* 1991;82(1):46–51. [PubMed: 2009486]
87. Kerr JH, Vos MC. Employee fitness programmes, absenteeism and general well-being. *Work Stress* 1993;7(2):179–90.
88. Kerr NA, Yore MM, Ham SA, Dietz WH. Increasing stair use in a worksite through environmental changes. *Am J Health Promot* 2004;18(4):312–5. [PubMed: 15011931]
89. King AC, Talyor CB, Haskell WL, DeBusk RF. Influence of regular aerobic exercise on psychological health: a randomized, controlled trial of healthy middle-aged adults. *Health Psychol* 1989;8(3):305–24. [PubMed: 2767021]
90. Knapik J, Hauret KG, Arnold S, et al. Injury and fitness outcomes during implementation of physical readiness training. *Int J Sports Med* 2003;24(5):372–81. [PubMed: 12868050]
91. Knapik JJ. The influence of physical fitness training on the manual material handling capability of women. *Appl Ergon* 1997;28(5–6):339–45. [PubMed: 9414374]
92. Kneip JK, Fox HM, Fruehling JK. A weight-control program for bank employees. *J Am Diet Assoc* 1985;85(11):1489–91. [PubMed: 4056268]
93. Kraemer WJ, Vescovi JD, Volek JS, et al. Effects of concurrent resistance and aerobic training on load-bearing performance and the Army physical fitness test. *Mil Med* 2004;169(12):994–9. [PubMed: 15646194]
94. Lampman RM, Santinga JT, Savage PJ, et al. Effect of exercise training on glucose tolerance, In vivo insulin sensitivity, lipid and lipoprotein concentrations in middle-aged men with mild hypertriglyceridemia. *Metabolism* 1985;34(3):205–11. [PubMed: 3883095]
95. Lane A, Mills M, Terry P. Mood regulation among corporate workers: effects of exercise on mood. *J Sports Sci* 1998;16(1):87.
96. Leaf DA, Parker DL, Schaad D. Changes in VO<sub>2</sub>max, physical activity, and body fat with chronic exercise: effects on plasma lipids. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1997;29(9):1152–9. [PubMed: 9309625]
97. Li CL, Tseng HM, Tseng RF, Lee SJ. The effectiveness of an aerobic exercise intervention on worksite health-related physical fitness—a case in a high-tech company. *Chang Gung Med J* 2006;29(1):100–6. [PubMed: 16642733]
98. Loughlan C, Mutrie N. An evaluation of the effectiveness of three interventions in promoting physical activity in a sedentary population. *Health Educ J* 1997;56(2):154–65.
99. Love M, Morphis L, Page P. Model for an employee wellness project. *J Am Coll Health Assoc* 1981;29(4):171–3. [PubMed: 7264077]
100. Maes S, Verhoeven C, Kittel F, Scholten H. Effects of a Dutch work-site wellness-health program: the Brabantia Project. *Am J Public Health* 1998;88(7):1037–41. [PubMed: 9663150]
101. Maloney JP, Cheney R, Spring W, Kanusky J. The physiologic and psychological effects of a 5-week and a 16-week physical fitness program. *Mil Med* 1986;151(8):426–33. [PubMed: 3093925]
102. Marshall AL, Leslie ER, Bauman AE, Marcus BH, Owen N. Print versus website physical activity programs: a randomized trial. *Am J Prev Med* 2003;25(2):88–94. [PubMed: 12880874]
103. Mayo MJ, Grantham JR, Balasekaran G. Exercise-induced weight loss preferentially reduces abdominal fat. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2003;35(2):207–13. [PubMed: 12569205]
104. McKenzie, PF. Dissertation Abstracts International. Vol. 48. 1988. Effects of a nutrition-based health promotion program on nutritional adequacy, planned physical activity, body composition, job performance, and absenteeism among female airline reservationists; p. 2610B-2611B.
105. Murphy MH, M E, Boreham CAG, Hare LG, Nevill AM. The effect of a worksite based walking programme on cardiovascular risk in previously sedentary civil servants. *BMC Public Health* 2006;6:136–43. [PubMed: 16716211]
106. Musich S, Adams L, DeWolf G, Edington D. A case study of 10-year health risk appraisal participation patterns in a comprehensive health promotion program. *Am J Health Promot* 2001;15(4):237–40. [PubMed: 11349344]
107. Muto T, Yamauchi K. Evaluation of a multicomponent workplace health promotion program conducted in Japan for improving employees' cardiovascular disease risk factors. *Prev Med* 2001;33(6):571–7. [PubMed: 11716652]

108. Napolitano MA, Fotheringham M, Tate D, et al. Evaluation of an Internet-based physical activity intervention: a preliminary investigation. *Ann Behav Med* 2003;25(2):92–9. [PubMed: 12704010]
109. Nilsson PM, Klasson EB, Nyberg P. Life-style intervention at the worksite—reduction of cardiovascular risk factors in a randomized study. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2001;27(1):57–62. [PubMed: 11266148]
110. Nisbeth O, Klausen K, Andersen LB. Effectiveness of counselling over 1 year on changes in lifestyle and coronary heart disease risk factors. *Patient Educ Couns* 2000;40(2):121–31. [PubMed: 10771366]
111. Norris R, Carroll D, Cochrane R. The effects of aerobic and anaerobic training on fitness, blood pressure, and psychological stress and well-being. *J Psychosom Res* 1990;34(4):367–75. [PubMed: 2376838]
112. Oden G, Crouse SF, Reynolds C. Worker productivity, job satisfaction, and work-related stress: Influence of an employee fitness program. *Fitness in Business* 1989;3:198–204.
113. Ohta M, Okufuji T, Matsushima Y, Ikeda M. The effect of lifestyle modification on physical fitness and work ability in different workstyles. *J UOEH* 2004;26(4):411–21. [PubMed: 15624353]
114. Okada K. Effects of long-term corporate fitness program on employees' health. *J Nutr Sci Vitaminol (Tokyo)* 1991;37S:S131–8. [PubMed: 1820440]
115. O'Loughlin J, Renaud L, Paradis G, Meshfedjian G. Screening school personnel for cardiovascular disease risk factors: short-term impact on behavior and perceived role as promoters of heart health. *Prev Med* 1996;25(6):660–7. [PubMed: 8936567]
116. Orr, N. The effects of a university based employee health promotion program on cardiovascular risk profiles (exercise). University of Pittsburgh; 1997.
117. Osteras H, Hammer S. The effectiveness of a pragmatic worksite physical activity program on maximal oxygen consumption and the physical activity level in healthy people. *J Bodyw Mov Ther* 2006;10(1):51–7.
118. Ostwald SK. Changing employees' dietary and exercise practices: an experimental study in a small company. *J Occup Med* 1989;31(2):90–7. [PubMed: 2709166]
119. Partonen T, Leppamaki S, Hurme J, Lonnqvist J. Randomized trial of physical exercise alone or combined with bright light on mood and health-related quality of life. *Psychol Med* 1998;28(6):1359–64. [PubMed: 9854277]
120. Patton J, et al. Response of age forty and over military personnel to an unsupervised, self-administered aerobic training program. *Aviat Space Environ Med* 1983;54(2):138–43. [PubMed: 6838450]
121. Pescatello LS, Murphy D, Vollono J, Lynch E, Bernene J, Costanzo D. The cardiovascular health impact of an incentive worksite health promotion program. *Am J Health Promot* 2001;16(1):16–20. [PubMed: 11575051]
122. Peterson, PM. The relationship between wellness program participation, job satisfaction, health perceptions and physical symptoms of stress. University of Kentucky; 1993.
123. Peterson TR, Aldana SG. Improving exercise behavior: an application of the stages of change model in a worksite setting. *Am J Health Promot* 1999;13(4):229–32. [PubMed: 10351853]
124. Plotnikoff RC, McCargar LJ, Wilson PM, Loucaides CA. Efficacy of an E-mail intervention for the promotion of physical activity and nutrition behavior in the workplace context. *Am J Health Promot* 2005;19(6):422–9. [PubMed: 16022206]
125. Pohjonen T, Ranta R. Effects of a worksite physical exercise intervention on physical fitness, perceived health status, and work ability among home care workers: five-year follow-up. *Prev Med* 2001;32:465–75. [PubMed: 11394950]
126. Pritchard JE, Nowson CA, Billington T, Wark JD. Benefits of a year-long workplace weight loss program on cardiovascular risk factors. *Nutr Diet: J Diet Assoc of Australia* 2002;59(2):87–96.
127. Proper KI, Hildebrandt VH, Van der Beek AJ, Twisk JWR, Van Mechelen W. Effect of individual counseling on physical activity fitness and health: a randomized controlled trial in a workplace setting. *Am J Prev Med* 2003;24(3):218–26. [PubMed: 12657339]
128. Purath J, Miller AM, McCabe G, Wilbur J. A brief intervention to increase physical activity in sedentary working women. *CJNR* 2004;36(1):76–91. [PubMed: 15133920]

129. Puterbaugh JS, Lawyer CH. Cardiovascular effects of an exercise program: a controlled study among firemen. *J Occup Med* 1983;25(8):581–6. [PubMed: 6886866]
130. Rhodes EC, Dunwoody D. Physiological and attitudinal changes in those involved in an employee fitness program. *Can J Public Health* 1980;71(5):331–6. [PubMed: 7448688]
131. Roberts MA, O'Dea J, Boyce A, Mannix ET. Fitness levels of firefighter recruits before and after a supervised exercise training program. *J Strength Cond Res* 2002;16(2):271–7. [PubMed: 11991781]
132. Robison JI, Rogers MA, Carlson JJ, et al. Effects of a 6-month incentive-based exercise program on adherence and work capacity. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 1992;24(1):85–93. [PubMed: 1549001]
133. Rodnick JE. Health behavior changes associated with health hazard appraisal counseling in an occupational setting. *Prev Med* 1982;11(5):583–94. [PubMed: 7156065]
134. Saltin B, Hartley IH, Kilbom A, Astrand I. Physical training in sedentary middle-aged and older men: II. Oxygen uptake, heart rate, and blood lactate concentration at submaximal and maximal exercise. *Scand J Clin Lab Invest* 1969;24(4):323–34. [PubMed: 5383327]
135. Schultz AB, Lu C, Barnett TE, et al. Influence of participation in a worksite health-promotion program on disability days. *J Occup Environ Med* 2002;44(8):776–80. [PubMed: 12185799]
136. Sherman JB, Clark L, McEwen MM. Evaluation of a worksite wellness program: impact on exercise, weight, smoking, and stress. *Public Health Nurs* 1989;6(3):114–9. [PubMed: 2813254]
137. Simmons D, Fleming C, Cameron M, Leakehe L. A pilot diabetes awareness and exercise programme in a multiethnic workforce. *N Z Med J* 1996;109(1031):373–6. [PubMed: 8890876]
138. Spate-Douglas T, K RE. Exercise intensity: its effect on the high-density lipoprotein profile. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil* 1999;80(6):691–5. [PubMed: 10378497]
139. Speck BJ, Looney SW. Effects of a minimal intervention to increase physical activity in women: daily activity records. *Nurs Res* 2001;50(6):374–8. [PubMed: 11725940]
140. Stein RA, Michielli DW, Glantz MD, et al. Effects of different exercise training intensities on lipoprotein cholesterol fractions in healthy middle-aged men. *Am Heart J* 1990;119:277–83. [PubMed: 2301216]
141. Stone WJ, Rothstein DE, Shoenhair CL. Coronary health disease risk factors and health related fitness in long-term exercising versus sedentary corporate executives. *Am J Health Promot* 1991;5(3):169–75. [PubMed: 10146832]
142. Stonecipher LJ, Hyner GC. The effects of a comprehensive health risk appraisal, basic screening, and interpretation session on employee health practices: differences between participants and nonparticipants. *Am J Health Promot* 1993;7(3):167–9. [PubMed: 10146809]
143. Talvi AI, Jarvisalo JO, Knuts LR. A health promotion programme for oil refinery employees: changes of health promotion needs observed at three years. *Occup Med (Lond)* 1999;49(2):93–101. [PubMed: 10436561]
144. Tate DF, Wing RR, Winett RA. Using Internet technology to deliver a behavioral weight loss program. *JAMA* 2001;285(9):1172–7. [PubMed: 11231746]
145. Van Rhenen W, Blonk RWB, van der Klink JJJ, van Dijk FJH, Schaufeli WB. The effect of a cognitive and a physical stress-reducing programme on psychological complaints. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health* 2005;78(2):139–48. [PubMed: 15761748]
146. Vazquez JMM, Garcia Alcon JL, Campillo Alvarez JE. Influence of diet and physical exercise on plasma lipid concentrations in an homogeneous sample of young Spanish Air Force pilots. *Eur J Appl Physiol Occup Physiol* 1994;69(1):75–80. [PubMed: 7957160]
147. Von Schlumperger, B. Formation and maintenance of an exercise habit: an exploratory study of a self-management approach [Dissertation]. University of Oregon; 1985.
148. Williams AG. Effects of basic training in the British Army on regular and reserve army personnel. *J Strength Cond Res* 2005;19(2):254–9. [PubMed: 15903358]
149. Williams AG, Rayson MP, Jones DA. Resistance training and the enhancement of the gains in material-handling ability and physical fitness of British Army recruits during basic training. *Ergonomics* 2002;45(4):267–79. [PubMed: 12028724]
150. Wilson, LFM. The effects of an exercise conditioning program on reducing the stress response in nurses [dissertation]. Detroit: Wayne State University; 1985.

151. Wittmann A. Body composition in an employee health improvement program. *Coll Antropol* 1998;22(2):447–50. [PubMed: 9887600]
152. Wood E, Olmstead G, Craig J. An evaluation of lifestyle risk factors and absenteeism after two years in a worksite health promotion program. *Am J Health Promot* 1989;4:128–33.
153. Yarovote PM, McDonagh TJ, Goldman ME. Organization and evaluation of a physical fitness program in industry. *J Occup Med* 1974;16:589–98. [PubMed: 4853489]
154. Zandee GL, Oermann MH. Effectiveness of contingency contracting: component of a worksite weight loss program. *AAOHNJ* 1996;44(4):183–8.
155. Blair SN, Collingwood TR, Reynolds R, Smith M, Hagan RD, Sterling CL. Health promotion for educators: impact on health behaviors, satisfaction, and general well-being. *Am J Public Health* 1984;74(2):147–9. [PubMed: 6691526]
156. Musich S, Adams L, DeWolf G, Edington D. A case study of 10-year health risk appraisal participation patterns in a comprehensive health promotion program. *Am J Health Promot* 2001;15:237–40. [PubMed: 11349344]

Table 1

## Intervention characteristics

Variable	s	Min	Q <sub>1</sub>	Median	Q <sub>3</sub>	Max
Minutes/session of supervised exercise	44	7	32	50	60	160
Number supervised exercise sessions	45	4	28	36	60	2028
Frequency/week of supervised exercise	47	1	3	3	3	14
Minutes/session of motivational content	32	10	30	60	60	240
Number of motivational sessions	101	1	1	4	9	390
Days over which intervention delivered	145	1	42	84	183	4179
Recommend frequency of unsupervised physical activity	47	2	3	4	5	7
Recommend minutes/session of unsupervised physical activity	36	5	30	30	45	90

s= reports, min=minimum, max=maximum, Q<sub>1</sub>=first quartile, Q<sub>3</sub>=third quartile; interventions could include supervised exercise and/or motivational/educational content to increase physical activity.



**Table 2**  
Random effects health and well-being outcome estimates and tests

Dependent variable	<i>k</i>	$\hat{\mu}_0$ (mean of true ESSs)	$\mu_0$ 95% CI	<i>Q</i> (heterogeneity)	$\hat{\sigma}_0$ (SD of ESSs)	<i>I</i> <sup>2</sup> (heterogeneity index)
<b>Physical activity</b>						
Two-group post-test	41	<b>0.21</b> ****	(0.11, 0.31)	<b>102.8</b> ****	0.206	0.61
Two-group pre-post	27	<b>0.22</b> ****	(0.14, 0.29)	<b>86.3</b> ****	0.146	0.70
Treatment pre-post	56	<b>0.26</b> ****	(0.20, 0.32)	<b>728.4</b> ****	0.206	0.92
<b>Fitness</b>						
Two-group post-test	35	<b>0.57</b> ****	(0.40, 0.73)	<b>75.3</b> ****	0.306	0.55
Two-group pre-post	35	<b>0.51</b> ****	(0.39, 0.63)	<b>77.6</b> ****	0.258	0.56
Treatment pre-post	85	<b>0.47</b> ****	(0.38, 0.56)	<b>1656.8</b> ****	0.367	0.95
<b>Diabetes risk</b>						
Two-group post-test	6	<b>0.98</b> *	(0.06, 1.90)	<b>84.0</b> ****	1.100	0.94
Two-group pre-post	6	<b>0.90</b> **	(0.27, 1.53)	<b>76.0</b> ****	0.748	0.93
Treatment pre-post	19	<b>0.31</b> ****	(0.16, 0.47)	<b>223.2</b> ****	0.301	0.92
<b>Lipids</b>						
Two-group post-test	27	<b>0.13</b> *	(0.02, 0.24)	<b>51.3</b> **	0.164	0.49
Two-group pre-post	26	<b>0.17</b> *	(0.01, 0.33)	<b>299.2</b> ****	0.358	0.92
Treatment pre-post	69	<b>0.12</b> ****	(0.08, 0.17)	<b>623.9</b> ****	0.158	0.89
<b>Anthropometric</b>						
Two-group post-test	44	<b>0.08</b> *	(0.02, 0.15)	<b>59.3</b> *	0.086	0.27
Two-group pre-post	41	<b>0.07</b> ****	(0.03, 0.11)	42.1	0.030	0.05
Treatment pre-post	126	<b>0.13</b> ****	(0.10, 0.17)	<b>708.8</b> ****	0.143	0.82
<b>Quality of life</b>						
Two-group post-test	7	0.23	(-0.09, 0.56)	<b>19.8</b> **	0.340	0.70
Two-group pre-post	6	<b>0.35</b> †	(-0.03, 0.73)	<b>39.9</b> ****	0.446	0.87

Dependent variable	$k$	$\hat{\mu}_\delta$ (mean of true ESSs)	$\mu_\delta$ 95% CI	$Q$ (heterogeneity)	$\hat{\sigma}_\delta$ (SD of ESSs)	$I^2$ (heterogeneity index)
Treatment pre-post	10	<b>0.24</b> <sup>****</sup>	(0.15, 0.32)	<b>18.7</b> <sup>*</sup>	0.087	0.52
<b>Mood</b>						
Two-group post-test	12	0.13	(-0.05, 0.31)	14.9	0.146	0.26
Two-group pre-post	7	<b>0.21</b> <sup>**</sup>	(0.07, 0.36)	7.9	0.096	0.24
Treatment pre-post	21	<b>0.31</b> <sup>****</sup>	(0.22, 0.40)	<b>123.6</b> <sup>****</sup>	0.169	0.84

Note. Under homogeneity ( $H_0: \delta_j = \delta$  for all studies)  $Q$  is distributed approximately as chi-square with  $df = k - 1$ , where  $k$  is the number of observed effect sizes; this tests also applies to the between-studies variance component,  $\sigma_\delta^2 (H_0: \sigma_\delta^2 = 0)$ . Treatment group pre-post and two-group pre-post effects assume  $p|2=0.8$ .

<sup>†</sup>  $p < 0.10$ ,  
<sup>\*</sup>  $p < 0.05$ ,  
<sup>\*\*</sup>  $p < 0.01$ ,  
<sup>\*\*\*\*</sup>  $p < 0.001$  (for  $Q$  and  $I^2$ ).

**Table 3**  
Random effects work-related outcome estimates and tests

Dependent variable	$k$	$\hat{\mu}_\delta$ (mean of true ESSs)	$\mu_\delta$ 95% CI	$Q$ (heterogeneity)	$\hat{\sigma}_\delta$ (SD of ESSs)	$I^2$ (heterogeneity index)
<b>Work attendance</b>						
Two-group post-test	12	<b>0.19</b> ****	(0.11, 0.27)	7.3	0	0.00
Two-group pre-post	9	0.05	(-0.19, 0.29)	<b>74.1</b> ****	0.328	0.89
Treatment pre-post	10	0.02	(-0.08, 0.13)	<b>34.8</b> ****	0.135	0.74
<b>Job stress</b>						
Two-group post-test	3	<b>0.33</b> †	(-0.06, 0.73)	3.4	0.224	0.41
Two-group pre-post	3	0.53	(-0.15, 1.22)	<b>21.1</b> ****	0.575	0.91
Treatment pre-post	5	0.14	(-0.07, 0.34)	<b>20.7</b> ****	0.204	0.81
<b>Job satisfaction</b>						
Two-group post-test	6	0.15	(-0.10, 0.40)	9.0	0.202	0.44
Two-group pre-post	5	<b>0.20</b> **	(0.06, 0.35)	3.3	0	0.00
Treatment pre-post	6	0.08	(-0.09, 0.25)	<b>26.3</b> ****	0.181	0.81
<b>Healthcare utilization</b>						
Two-group post-test	5	<b>-0.17</b> **	(-0.29, -0.06)	0.2	0	0.00
Two-group pre-post	3	-0.18	(-0.54, 0.17)	<b>7.9</b> *	0.264	0.75
Treatment pre-post	3	-0.04	(-0.11, 0.02)	0.9	0	0.00

Note. Under homogeneity ( $H_0: \delta_j = \delta$  for all studies)  $Q$  is distributed approximately as chi-square with  $df = k - 1$ , where  $k$  is the number of (possibly dependent) observed effect sizes; this tests also applies to the between-studies variance component,  $\sigma_\delta^2$  ( $H_0: \sigma_\delta^2 = 0$ ). Treatment group pre-post and two-group pre-post effects all assume  $\rho_{12} = 0.8$ .

†  $p < 0.10$ ,

\*  $p < 0.05$ ,

\*\*  $p < 0.01$ ,

\*\*\*\*  $p < 0.001$  (for  $Q$  and  $I^2$ ).

**Table 4**  
Independent-groups comparisons mixed-effects analysis on four major variables

Moderator	$k_0$	$k_1$	$\hat{\mu}_{00}$ (mean of true ESs)	$\hat{\mu}_{01}$ (mean of true ES)	$Q_{\text{Between groups}}$ (heterogeneity)	$Q_{\text{Within groups}}$ (heterogeneity)	$\hat{\sigma}_\theta$ (SD of ESs)	$I^2$ (heterogeneity index)
<b>Physical Activity</b>								
Profit status	16	16	0.12	0.22	0.9	89.2 <sup>***</sup>	0.223	0.66
Large company	4	15	0.29	0.22	0.2	41.6 <sup>***</sup>	0.228	0.58
Multiple companies	24	13	0.25	0.15	1.1	109.5 <sup>***</sup>	0.222	0.68
Data collected at work (WP)	5	11	0.27	0.18	0.3	38.9 <sup>***</sup>	0.246	0.63
Intervention delivered at WP	19	22	0.22	0.17	0.4	113.6 <sup>***</sup>	0.217	0.65
Paid during intervention	37	4	0.21	0.01	1.3	112.2 <sup>***</sup>	0.209	0.65
Employee interventionist	33	7	0.19	0.13	0.3	106.7 <sup>***</sup>	0.211	0.64
WP designed intervention	38	3	0.18	0.29	0.5	105.9 <sup>***</sup>	0.205	0.63
Fitness facility onsite	32	9	0.19	0.22	0.1	113.2 <sup>***</sup>	0.211	0.65
<b>Fitness</b>								
Profit status	17	9	0.68	0.66	0.0	53.9 <sup>***</sup>	0.401	0.55
Large company	5	5	0.58	0.66	0.1	13.9 <sup>†</sup>	0.272	0.38
Multiple companies	21	5	0.54	0.61	0.1	48.0 <sup>**</sup>	0.338	0.49
Data collected at WP	3	10	0.47	0.52	0.0	11.9	0.104	0.00
Intervention delivered at WP	19	16	0.56	0.61	0.1	65.5 <sup>***</sup>	0.331	0.49
Recruitment at WP	5	30	0.50	0.59	0.2	65.5 <sup>***</sup>	0.332	0.49
Paid during intervention	27	8	0.49	0.92	5.4 <sup>*</sup>	53.9 <sup>*</sup>	0.267	0.38
Employee interventionist	27	5	0.50	1.03	6.4 <sup>*</sup>	49.4 <sup>*</sup>	0.265	0.38
WP designed intervention	28	4	0.49	1.18	10.5 <sup>**</sup>	45.1 <sup>*</sup>	0.235	0.32
Fitness facility onsite	23	12	0.53	0.68	0.8	62.8 <sup>**</sup>	0.318	0.47
<b>Lipids</b>								
Profit status	11	13	0.20	0.11	0.5	46.4 <sup>**</sup>	0.165	0.52
Large company	3	7	-0.04	0.19	0.9	28.7 <sup>***</sup>	0.181	0.71
Multiple companies	17	4	0.10	0.12	0.0	29.9 <sup>†</sup>	0.142	0.34

Moderator	$k_0$	$k_1$	$\hat{\mu}_{00}$ (mean of true ESSs)	$\hat{\mu}_{01}$ (mean of true ES)	$Q_{\text{Between groups}}$ (heterogeneity)	$Q_{\text{Within groups}}$ (heterogeneity)	$\hat{\sigma}_\delta$ (SD of ESSs)	$I^2$ (heterogeneity index)
Intervention delivered at WP	11	16	0.10	0.17	0.3	48.8**	0.164	0.48
Recruitment at WP	3	24	0.03	0.15	0.7	44.6**	0.148	0.43
Paid during intervention	21	6	0.09	0.25	1.6	50.4**	0.170	0.49
Employee interventionist	20	3	0.09	0.59	6.6*	42.6**	0.152	0.50
Organizational policy change	24	3	0.11	0.22	0.7	50.0**	0.168	0.49
WP designed intervention	20	3	0.11	0.29	1.2	43.9**	0.176	0.51
Fitness facility onsite	16	11	0.07	0.32	3.8 <sup>†</sup>	48.3**	0.155	0.47
<b>Anthropometric outcome</b>								
Profit status	18	19	0.18	0.09	1.0	44.3	0.086	0.19
Large company	3	12	0.07	0.08	0.0	24.9*	0.116	0.46
Multiple companies	22	9	0.04	0.05	0.0	35.3	0.069	0.15
Intervention delivered at WP	24	20	0.05	0.17	3.1 <sup>†</sup>	48.9	0.063	0.12
Recruitment at WP	7	37	0.10	0.09	0.0	55.1 <sup>†</sup>	0.089	0.22
Paid during intervention	32	12	0.02	0.22	8.1**	44.5	0.038	0.03
Employee interventionist	34	6	0.05	0.32	6.1*	45.1	0.064	0.14
Organizational policy change	40	4	0.03	0.24	6.5*	45.9	0.047	0.06
WP designed intervention	33	7	0.06	0.22	3.9*	45.9	0.073	0.15
Fitness facility onsite	31	13	0.05	0.24	3.9*	49.1	0.063	0.13

Note.  $k_j$  = number of (possibly dependent) ES estimates in group coded  $j$ . Moderator levels: 0=no, 1=yes. Heterogeneity statistics:  $Q_B$  = between groups (distributed as chi-square on  $df = 1$  under  $H_0$ );

$\mu_{00} = \mu_{01}$ ,  $Q_W$  = combined within groups (distributed as chi-square on  $df = k_0 + k_1 - 2$  under  $H_0$ ;  $\sigma_{\delta_0}^2 = \sigma_{\delta_1}^2 = 0$ ). Weighted method of moments used to estimate between-studies variance component

$\sigma_\delta^2$

Analysis reported if  $k_0 \geq 3$  and  $k_1 \geq 3$ .

<sup>†</sup>  $p < 0.10$ ,

\*  $p < 0.05$ ,

\*\*  $p < 0.01$ ,

\*\*\*  
 $p < 0.0001$  (for  $Q_B$  and  $Q_W$ ).