

# The Art of Health Promotion

practical information to make programs more effective



July/August 2005

## Meta-evaluation of Worksite Health Promotion Economic Return Studies: 2005 Update

Larry S. Chapman, MPH

### Setting the Stage

Activity and interest in the worksite health promotion and prevention fields continue to heat up. Rising health care costs, increasing awareness of presenteeism losses, and aging populations are all conspiring to increase the demand for health promotion, particularly for working populations. However, questions about the economic return associated with these types of efforts are also a continued reality. All work organizations must justify their resource investment decisions in health promotion and prevention in primarily economic terms. In an earlier edition of *The Art of Health Promotion*, published in 2003, a formal meta-evaluation of economic return studies of worksite health promotion programs was reported.<sup>1</sup> This original report highlighted the meta-evaluation of 42 peer review articles that met the study inclusion criteria.

In this edition, we are updating the original report with 16 additional peer review articles. However, the author of one of the originally reported studies in 2003 requested that it be withdrawn from the analysis, as it was not ultimately published in a peer review journal. Another study was dropped because of its age and weak methodology. Therefore, this updated meta-evaluation includes a total of 56 peer review journal articles. The term "meta-evaluation," as used in this review article, is defined as . . . "the application of a systematic review process to a set of evaluation studies with a similar purpose and focus in order to determine their quality and summarize their findings."<sup>2</sup>

The contents of this edition include excerpts from the book *Proof Positive: An Analysis of the Cost-Effectiveness of Worksite Wellness* (6th ed., revised and expanded in May of 2005).<sup>3</sup> The book applies the formal meta-evaluation review process and methodology developed and refined by Windsor and Orleans and Boyd and Windsor<sup>4,5</sup> to studies of multicomponent worksite health promotion programs, as defined by Heaney.<sup>6</sup> The highlights of the meta-evaluation are reprinted here with permission.

### Overview of the Literature Search Process

As observed previously, the research and evaluation literature on health promotion and wellness programs in



#### *In This Issue*

Meta-evaluation of Worksite Health Promotion Economic Return Studies: 2005 Update	
by Larry S. Chapman, MPH .....	1
References .....	10
Selected Abstracts .....	11
Closing Thoughts, by Michael P. O'Donnell, PhD, MBA, MPH .....	15

#### *Editorial Team*

Editor .....	Larry S. Chapman, MPH
Publisher .....	Michael P. O'Donnell, Ph.D., MBA, MPH

workplace settings is both complex and voluminous. The literature is characterized by more than 500 formal program evaluation studies of varying quality and methodology, a large number of secondary descriptions of program results, a variety of summary articles reviewing multiple studies, and a growing number of well-designed scientific studies of evaluation findings for programs implemented in workplace settings.<sup>7</sup> For the purposes of this review and analysis, the literature was again divided into original and secondary reports of worksite health promotion program evaluation efforts, and the secondary literature was then discarded. In addition, a distinction continued to be made in this analysis between evaluation studies of single program components or intervention (e.g., a smoking cessation program evaluation) vs. multiple or more comprehensive program interventions (e.g., including a program with smoking cessation, physical activity, cardiovascular health, weight management, and stress management interventions, etc.). Another element of the original meta-evaluation approach that was maintained included a search process using the terms “health promotion” and “wellness.” The study selection or inclusion criteria used remained the same and are described below.

## Study Inclusion Criteria

For the purposes of this updated meta-evaluation, articles reporting program evaluation studies were included that met all of the following criteria.

1. **Multi-component Programming:** Qualifying articles must report on programs that include any combination of a minimum of three of the following types of programs: smoking prevention and cessation, physical fitness, nutrition, stress management, medical self-care, high blood pressure control, cholesterol reduction, cardiovascular disease prevention, prenatal care, seat belt use, back injury prevention, back pain prevention, weight management, and nutrition education.
2. **Workplace Setting Only:** Qualifying articles must report on evaluation of organized program efforts conducted only in workplace settings for working populations and/or their spouses.
3. **Reasonably Rigorous Study Design:** Qualifying articles must include the use of a comparison or control group; however, participants can be used as their own controls in order to meet this criteria.
4. **Original Research:** Qualifying articles must represent the initial or original publication of research findings and results.
5. **Examination of Economic Variable:** Qualifying articles must evaluate one or more economic parameters associated with working populations or characteristics of organizational life as part of the evaluation design and measurement strategy. This typically includes any one or a combination of the following: health benefit plan costs, health care utilization indicators, sick leave absenteeism, workers’ compensation costs, disability management costs, pension effects, or presenteeism effects.
6. **Publication In a Peer-reviewed Journal:** Qualifying articles must be published in a peer-reviewed journal and follow traditional methods of peer review and scientific inquiry.
7. **Use of Statistical Analysis:** Qualifying articles must include some appropriate form of statistical analysis of observed changes.
8. **Sufficient Sample Size:** Qualifying articles must have large enough samples to allow meaningful analysis.
9. **Replicable Interventions:** Qualifying articles must use replicable interventions that can be conducted in typical worksite settings.
10. **Minimum Length of Intervention Period:** Qualifying articles must include an experimental or intervention period that is a minimum of 12 months in duration.

## Literature Search Process

The search process used to identify the relevant literature that is analyzed in this update remained the same as the earlier meta-evaluation and was as follows:

**Step 1. Back-search of References from Primary Articles.** This aspect of the literature search involved the review and use of generally well-known evaluation articles for a back-search process for cited or identified references in the area of evaluation of worksite health promotion programs.

**Step 2. Computerized Search of the Business Literature Database.** This component of the literature search involved a computerized search of the business literature using the University of Washington’s computer database entitled *Business Index—1989 to the Present*. This search was conducted in early February 2005 and utilized four



*The Art of Health Promotion* is published bi-monthly as part of the American Journal of Health Promotion, by the American Journal of Health Promotion, Inc., 4301 Orchard Lake Road, #160-201, West Bloomfield, MI 48323. Annual subscriptions to the combined publication are \$99.95 for individuals, \$119.95 for institutions in the United States, and \$19 higher for Canada and Mexico and \$29 higher for Europe and other countries. Copyright 2005 by American Journal of Health Promotion; all rights reserved. To order a subscription, make address changes, or inquire about editorial content, contact the *American Journal of Health Promotion*, P.O. Box 15265, North Hollywood, CA 91615, Phone: 800-783-9913.

For information on submission of articles for *The Art of Health Promotion*, please contact the editor at 206-364-3448.

search terms—health promotion, cost-effectiveness, worksite, and evaluation—in an expanded string search format. As a result, this report includes studies published between August 1982 and January 2005.

**Step 3. Computerized Search of Health and Social Sciences Database.** This component of the literature search involved the use of selected topic searches in a variety of databases. These databases included Medline, 1966 to present; Nursing & Allied Health, 1982 to present; PsycINFO: Psychology, 1967 to present; Expanded Academic Index, 1989 to present; ERIC, 1982 to present; and Health Plan, 1986 to present.

The key words used in various combinations in the search process included the following: Cost/benefit, Cost-effectiveness, Disability Experience, Economic Analysis, Evaluation, Health Care Cost, Health Promotion, Health and Productivity Management, Presenteeism, Prevention, Program, Sick Leave Absenteeism, Wellness, Workers' Compensation, and Worksite.

**Step 4. Review of Selected Publications for Program Evaluation Findings.** This component of the literature search included review of the technical periodicals identified below, which were reviewed manually for the last 3 years of their publication for articles on the evaluation of worksite health promotion programs: *American Journal of Health Promotion*, *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *American Journal of Public Health*, *Annals of Public Health*, *Health Affairs*, *Health Values*, *Inquiry*, *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA)*, *Journal of Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, *Health Services Research*, *Medical Care*, *Preventive Medicine*, and *Public Health Reports*.

**Step 5. Colleague Inquiry.** A variety of professional colleagues were approached in early 2005 to determine if any applicable articles may be in publication that were likely to meet the study inclusion criteria. The literature search process described above identified 56 qualifying evaluation studies of the economic impact and return associated with worksite health promotion programs and are formally analyzed in this meta-evaluation. The studies included in this meta-evaluation are identified in Table 1.

## Description of Meta-evaluation Approach

The purpose of the meta-evaluation of the 56 peer review studies identified in this publication is to provide a useful assessment of the overall validity of the research and evaluation studies that met the study selection criteria. The methodology used to perform this meta-evaluation remained the same as the original and is described below. The approach used is an adaptation of the methodology developed by Windsor and Orleans,<sup>4</sup> and further refined by Boyd and Windsor,<sup>5</sup> as cited earlier. The basic methodology involves a systematic review of research studies using a standardized set of design and methodo-

logical criteria to estimate the relative degree and strength of the internal validity and external validity of the studies reviewed. Points are then assigned for each of the seven meta-evaluation criteria used for each study.

The methodological criteria adapted for use in this meta-evaluation included the areas of research design, sample adequacy, quality of baseline delineation, quality of measurements used, appropriateness and replicability of interventions, length of observational period, and recency of experimental time period. The scoring rules are listed in Table 2.

In the meta-evaluation process for each criterion, a specified number of points are assigned to each study based on the characteristics of the evaluation study. Within this methodological approach, the higher the number of total points from all the methodological criteria, the greater likelihood of internal and external validity, and therefore the greater the significance of the research findings. Once the studies are ranked in terms of the total number of points from application of the seven meta-evaluation criterion, their results are then summarized, with particular attention to the selected economic variables. The points defining Criteria 7 (Experimental Time Period) were updated to reflect the change in the time period of this analysis, which did create some modifications in point totals and the ultimate rankings of individual studies.

## Results of Meta-evaluation

The results of the meta-evaluation are shown in Table 3. The larger number of study subjects, more recent, longer duration, and better-designed studies obviously rank higher, and their results deserve more weight in assessing the quality of the research literature regarding the economic impact and return associated with multicomponent worksite health promotion programs.

## Summary of Individual Study Findings

Table 4 below summarizes the percent change in economic variables reported in each of the 56 studies reviewed in this meta-evaluation. The percent change noted in Table 4 reflects the magnitude of change associated with the groups receiving the most intensive intervention for the longest observational time period cited in the study. This approach was taken to try and simplify the maximum program effect (intensity times length of time) examined in each study included in the meta-evaluation. The measurement methodology used in each study, even around a common economic variable such as sick leave absenteeism, does include differences. The area of health plan cost comparisons reflects the largest variance in measurement methodology. However, the general magnitude of observed change continues to remain one of the

**Table 1**  
**Studies Meeting Meta-evaluation Study Inclusion Criteria**

1. Aldana, SG, et al. Influence of a mobile worksite health promotion program on health care costs. *Am J Prev Med.* 1993;9:378-383.
2. Aldana, SG, et al. Financial impact of a comprehensive multisite workplace health promotion program. *Prev Med.* 2005;40:131-137.
3. Baun, WB, et al. A preliminary investigation: effect of a corporate fitness program on absenteeism and health care cost. *J Occup Med.* 1986;28:18-22.
4. Bertera, RL. The effects of workplace health promotion on absenteeism and employment costs in a large industrial population. *Am J Public Health.* 1990;80:1101-1105.
5. Bertera, RL. Behavioral risk factor and illness day changes with workplace health promotion: two-year results. *Am J Health Promot.* 1993;7:365-373.
6. Blair, SN, et al. Health promotion for educators: impact on absenteeism. *Prev Med.* 1986;15:166-175.
7. Bly, JL, et al. Impact of worksite health promotion on health care costs and utilization: evaluation of Johnson & Johnson's Live for Life Program. *JAMA.* 1986;256:3235-3240.
8. Bowne, DW, et al. Reduced disability and health care costs in an industrial fitness program. *J Occup Med.* 1984;26:809-816.
9. Cady, LD, et al. Program for increasing health and physical fitness of fire fighters. *J Occup Med.* 1985;27:110-114.
10. Chapman, L, et al. Ten-year economic evaluation of an incentive-based worksite health promotion program. *Am J Health Promot.* 2005. In press.
11. Conrad, KM, et al. Effect of worksite health promotion programs on employee absenteeism. *AAOHN J.* 1990;38:573-580.
12. Dalton, BA, Harris, J. A comprehensive approach to corporate health management. *J Occup Med.* 1991;33:338-348.
13. Erfurt JC, et al. The cost-effectiveness of work-site wellness programs for hypertension control, weight loss, and smoking cessation. *J Occup Med.* 1991;33:962-970.
14. Fries JF, et al. Health risk changes with a low-cost individualized health promotion program: effects at up to 30 months. *Am J Health Promot.* 1992;6:364-371.
15. Fries, JF, et al. Two-year results of a randomized controlled trial of a health promotion program in a retiree population: the Bank of America study. *Am J Med.* 1993;94:455-462.
16. Fries, JF, et al. Randomized controlled trial of cost reductions from a health education program: the California Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS) study. *Am J Health Promot.* 1994;8:216-223.
17. Fries, JF, McShane, D. Reducing need and demand for medical services in high risk persons. *West J Med.* 1998;169:201-207.
18. Gibbs, JO, et al. Work-site health promotion; five year trend in employee health care costs. *Occup Med.* 1985;27:826-830.
19. Goetzel, RZ, et al. Differences between descriptive and multivariate estimates of the impact of Chevron Corporation's Health Quest program on medical expenditures. *J Occup Environ Med.* 1998;40:538-545.
20. Goetzel, RZ, et al. Health care costs of worksite health promotion participants and non-participants. *J Occup Environ Med.* 1998;40:341-346.
21. Golaszewski, T, et al. A benefit-to-cost analysis of a work-site health promotion program. *J Occup Med.* 1992;34:1164-1172.
22. Hall-Barrow, J, Hodges, L, Brown, P. A collaborative model for employee health and nursing education: successful program. *AAOHN J.* 2001;49:429-436.
23. Harvey, MR, et al. The impact of a comprehensive medical benefits cost management program for the city of Birmingham: results at five years. *Am J Health Promot.* 1993;7:296-303.
24. Haynes, G, Dunnagan, T, Smith, V. Do employees participating in voluntary health promotion programs incur lower health care costs? *Health Promo Int.* 1999;14:43-51.
25. Henritze, J, Brammell, HL. Phase II cardiac wellness at the Adolph Coors Company. *Am J Health Promot.* 1989;4:25-31.
26. Henritze, J, et al. LIFE CHECK: a successful, low touch, low tech, in-plant, cardiovascular disease risk identification and modification program. *Am J Health Promot.* 1992;7:129-136.
27. Hodges, LC, Harper, TS, Hall-Barrow, J, Tatom, ID. Reducing overall health care costs for a city municipality: A real life community based learning model. *AAOHN J.* 2004;52:247-257.
28. Jeffery, RW, et al. Effects of work-site health promotion on illness-related absenteeism. *J Occup Med.* 1993;35:1142-1146.
29. Jones, RC, et al. A study of a work site health promotion program and absenteeism. *J Occup Med.* 1990;32:95-99.
30. Knight, KK, et al. An evaluation of Duke University's LIVE FOR LIFE health promotion program on changes in worker absenteeism. *J Occup Med.* 1994;36:533-534.

Table 1  
Continued

31. Lechner, L, et al. Effects of an employee fitness program on reduced absenteeism. *J Occup Environ Med.* 1997;39: 827-831.
32. Leigh, J, et al. Randomized controlled study of a retiree health promotion program: the Bank of America study. *Arch Int Med.* 1992;152:1201-1206.
33. Leutzinger, J, Hawes, C, Hunnicutt, D, Richling, D. Predicting the ratio of benefit to cost in a cardiovascular disease prevention program. *Manag Employee Health Benefits.* 1995:1-10.
34. Lorig, K, et al. A workplace health education program that reduces outpatient visits. *Med Care.* 1984;23:1044-1054.
35. Lynch, WD, et al. Impact of a facility-based corporate fitness program on the number of absentees from work due to illness. *J Occup Med.* 1990;32:9-12.
36. 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;88:1037-1041.
37. Maniscalco, P, Lane, R, Welke, M, Mitchell, J, Husting, L. Decreased rate of back injuries through a wellness program for offshore petroleum employees. *J Occup Environ Med.* 1999;41:813-820.
38. Musich, SA, et al. Effectiveness of health promotion programs in moderating medical costs in the USA. *Health Promot Int.* 2000;15:5-15.
39. Ozminkowski, RJ, et al. A return on investment evaluation of the Citibank, N.A., Health Management Program. *Am J Health Promot.* 1999;14:31-43.
40. Ozminkowski, RJ, et al. Long term impact of Johnson & Johnson's Health & Wellness Program on health care utilization and expenditures. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2002;44:21-29.
41. Pelletier, B, Boles, M, Lynch, W. Changes in health risks and work productivity. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2004;46:746-754.
42. Schultz ALC, Barnett, T, et al. Influence of participation in a worksite health promotion program on disability days. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2002;44:776-780.
43. Sciacca, J, et al. The impact of participation in health promotion on medical costs: a reconsideration of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield of Indiana study. *Am J Health Promot.* 1993;7:374-395.
44. Serxner, S, et al. The impact of a worksite health promotion program on short term disability usage. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2001;43:25-29.
45. Serxner, S, Gold, D, Grossmeier, J, Anderson, D. The relationship between health promotion program participation and medical costs: a dose response. *J Occup Environ Med.* 2003;45:1196-1200.
46. Shephard, RJ. Twelve years experience of a fitness program for the salaried employees of a Toronto Life Assurance Company. *Am J Health Promot.* 1992;6:292-301.
47. Shephard, RJ, et al. The influence of an employee fitness and lifestyle modification program upon medical care costs. *Can J Public Health.* 1982;73:259-263.
48. Shi, L. Health promotion, medical care use, and costs in a sample of worksite employees. *Eval Rev.* 1993;17:475-487.
49. Shi, L. Worksite health promotion and changes in medical care use and sick days. *Health Values.* 1993;17:9-17.
50. Shimizu, T, Nagashima, S, Mizoue, et al. A psychosocial-approached health promotion program at a Japanese worksite. *J UOEH.* 2003;25:23-34.

most important characteristics that can be derived from the economic return literature. In addition, the studies that report cost benefit analysis are also a critical part of the meta-evaluation because of their reflection of the net economic return associated with the studies reported in the peer review literature.

## Discussion of Findings

This meta-evaluation illustrates the general lack of standardization in the methodology used in economic analysis of worksite health promotion programs. Different measurement methods, varying categories of economic vari-

ables used for measuring economic return, and use of alternative research designs and statistical tests all highlight the lack of methodological consensus within the field for the evaluation of economic impact. However, in spite of the use of these widely varying methods and approaches to the determination of economic impact and return, the results continue to show a surprising amount of congruence. Additional findings and a few observational comments about each are below.

The 56 studies presented here provide a range of meta-evaluation quality scores from 12 to 28. Comment: This continues to demonstrate the wide range of quality

**Table 2**  
**Meta-evaluation Criteria**

Points	Meta-evaluation Criteria Subcomponents
<b>Criterion #1 Research Design (e.g., “Design”)</b>	
5	Randomized pretest and posttest, plus matched control group with multiple replications
4	Equivalent control group design, with pretest and posttest with multiple replications
3	Nonequivalent control group design, with pretest and posttest with multiple replications
2	Subjects as own controls, with pretest and posttest with multiple replications
1	Subjects as own controls, with pretest and posttest with single replication
1 pt bonus	For control vs. experimental group equivalence
<b>Criterion #2 Sample Size (e.g., “Sample”)*</b>	
5	Sample size >50,000
4	Sample size from 25,000 to 49,999
3	Sample size from 10,000 to 24,999
2	Sample size from 1000 to 9999
1	Sample size ≤999
1 pt bonus	For controlling for sample attrition
<b>Criterion #3 Quality of Baseline Delineations (e.g., “Baseline”)</b>	
5	Comprehensive baselines for risk factors, biometrics, and organizational indicators
4	Baseline measures for selected risk factors, biometrics, and organizational indicators
3	Comprehensive baselines for risk factors and biometrics
2	Selected multiple baseline measures for risk factors and biometrics
1	Selected baselines for risk factors and/or organizational indicators
1 pt bonus	For each additional year of baseline conducted prior to the intervention
<b>Criterion #4 Quality of Measurements Used (e.g., “Measurements”)</b>	
5	Self-report with independent objective verification for all measures, with use of standard measures
4	Self-report with independent objective verification for most measures
3	Self-report or independent objective verification for selected measures
2	Self-report only on risk factors and biometric measures
1	Limited consistency in measurement methodology
1 pt bonus	For completely equal measurement treatment of experimental vs. control groups
<b>Criterion #5 Appropriateness and Replicability of Interventions (e.g., “Interventions”)</b>	
5	Current comprehensive state-of-the-art programming, highly replicable, and described in detail
4	Current state-of-the-art programming and highly replicable
3	Current state-of-the-art programming and moderately replicable
2	Traditional programming and highly replicable
1	Traditional programming and moderately replicable
1 pt bonus	For very detailed description of intervention
<b>Criterion #6 Length of Observational Period (e.g., “Length”)</b>	
5	Observational period >120 mo
4	Observational period from 49 to 120 mo
3	Observational period from 25 to 48 mo
2	Observational period from 13 to 24 mo
1	Observational period = 12 mo
1 pt bonus	For equal observation period for experimental and control group observations
<b>Criterion #7 Experimental Time Period (e.g., “Recentness”)</b>	
5	Last year of intervention conducted after 2001
4	Last year of intervention conducted from 1997 to 2000
3	Last year of intervention conducted from 1993 to 1996
2	Last year of intervention conducted from 1989 to 1992
1	Last year of intervention conducted prior to 1989

\* Sample size was not used to independently “weight” the observed effect in each study. This varies from traditional meta-evaluation methods, but follows the approach advocated by Windsor, Orleans, and Boyd.

**Table 3**  
**Summary of Meta-evaluation Scores and Ranking**

#	Author	Meta-evaluation Criterion Scores							Total	Rank
		#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7		
1	Aldana*	4	2	4	4	4	3	4	25	6
2	<i>Aldana</i>	3	2	5	1	3	3	5	24	11
3	Baun	1	1	2	3	2	2	1	12	53
4	Bertera	3	3	4	3	4	3	2	22	20
5	Bertera	4	4	3	3	5	3	1	23	14
6	Blair	4	3	5	4	3	2	1	22	21
7	Bly*	4	3	4	4	5	4	1	25	7
8	Bowne	3	2	4	3	1	4	1	18	35
9	Cady	2	2	4	3	1	4	1	17	40
10	Chapman*	3	2	4	3	4	5	4	25	8
11	Conrad	3	2	2	3	2	4	1	17	41
12	Dalton	2	2	4	3	4	3	1	19	31
13	Erfurt	5	2	2	2	3	3	1	18	36
14	Fries	2	5	2	2	4	3	2	20	29
15	Fries	5	2	4	3	5	2	2	23	15
16	Fries*	5	5	5	4	4	3	2	28	1
17	Fries*	3	5	3	2	5	2	3	25	9
18	Gibbs	2	2	2	3	2	4	1	16	46
19	Goetzel	5	2	0	4	4	3	4	23	16
20	Goetzel	3	2	2	4	4	3	4	23	17
21	Golaszewski	2	4	2	3	4	5	2	22	22
22	<i>Hill Barrow</i>	1	2	2	2	2	1	4	14	50
23	Harvey*	4	3	5	4	5	4	2	27	3
24	<i>Haynes</i>	2	2	2	3	3	3	2	17	42
25	Henritze	2	1	1	1	3	4	1	13	52
26	Henritze	1	1	1	3	3	1	2	12	54
27	<i>Hodges</i>	1	1	1	3	2	3	5	16	47
28	Jeffery	5	3	4	2	2	3	2	21	24
29	Jones	4	2	1	4	4	3	1	19	32
30	Knight	3	2	2	4	4	4	2	21	25
31	Lechner	1	1	4	4	3	1	3	17	43
32	<i>Leutzinger</i>	3	2	2	3	4	2	3	19	33
33	Leigh	5	2	5	4	5	1	2	24	12
34	Lorig	2	2	2	3	3	2	1	16	48
35	Lynch	3	2	3	4	2	3	1	18	37
36	<i>Maes</i>	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	17	44
37	<i>Maniscalco</i>	2	1	2	3	3	3	3	17	45
38	Musich	2	2	2	3	2	4	3	18	38
39	Ozminkowski	4	3	3	3	4	3	4	24	13
40	Ozminkowski*	2	3	5	4	4	4	4	26	4
41	<i>Pelletier</i>	1	1	1	3	3	1	5	15	49
42	<i>Schultz*</i>	3	2	4	4	4	4	4	25	10
43	Sciacca	3	1	3	4	2	4	1	18	39
44	Serxner	3	2	2	3	4	3	4	21	26
45	<i>Serxner*</i>	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	28	2
46	Shephard	3	1	2	3	1	1	1	12	55
47	Shephard	2	1	2	1	1	5	2	14	51
48	Shi	5	2	1	3	4	2	2	19	34
49	<i>Shi</i>	3	2	4	3	4	2	2	20	30
50	<i>Shimizu*</i>	4	2	4	4	4	4	4	26	5
51	<i>Stave</i>	3	2	4	3	4	3	4	23	18
52	<i>Stein</i>	3	2	4	3	4	3	3	21	27
53	<i>Stein</i>	3	2	4	3	4	3	4	23	19
54	<i>Trudeau</i>	4	1	4	4	3	2	4	22	23
55	Wheat	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	12	56
56	Wood	3	1	2	4	4	4	3	21	28

\*Top 10 ranked study. Names in italic represent new studies in this 2005 update of the meta-evaluation.

**Table 4**  
**Percent Reported Change in Economic Variables and Cost/Benefit Ratio**

#	Author	Study Rank	Percent Change in Sick Leave Absenteeism	Percent Change in Health Costs	Percent Change in WC/DM* Costs	Cost/Benefit Ratio
1	Aldana	6		-16.0†		3.60
2	<i>Aldana</i>	11	-20.0	-6.2		15.60
3	Baun	53	-33.4	-47.2		
4	Bertera	20	-12.2			
5	Bertera	14	-14.0			2.05
6	Blair	21	-24.0			
7	Bly	7		-7.4‡		
8	Bowne	35	-20.1	-45.7	-31.7	2.90
9	Cady	40			-25.6	
10	Chapman	8	-49.1	-32.4§		6.52
11	Conrad	41	-16.3			
12	Dalton	31		-18.4	-43.2	7.00
13	Erfurt	36				
14	Fries	29		-30.4		
15	Fries	15	-35.2	-48.8		5.96
16	Fries#	1				
17	Fries	9	-23.3	-26.7		6.00
18	Gibbs	46		-24.2		2.51
19	Goetzel	16		-14.2		
20	Goetzel	17		-32.4		
21	Golaszewski**	22	-19.0			3.40
22	<i>Hall-Barrow</i>	50				8.00
23	Harvey	3		-50.1		19.41††
24	<i>Haynes‡‡</i>	42		-21.7		
25	Henritze	52				10.10
26	Henritze§§	54	-68.2			
27	<i>Hodges</i>	47		-40.6	-59.8	
28	Jeffery	24	-22.0			
29	Jones	32	-31.6			
30	Knight	25	-33.5			
31	Lechner	43	-52.4			
32	<i>Leutzinger</i>	33				3.24
33	Leigh	12	-12.1	-32.0		4.73
34	Lorig	48		-7.2		
35	Lynch	37	-13.8			
36	<i>Maes</i>	44	-20.8			
37	<i>Maniscalco</i>	45				2.51
38	Musich	38		-19.6		
39	Ozminkowski	13		-41.0		4.64
40	Ozminkowski	4		-9.7		
41	<i>Pellitier¶¶</i>	49	-33.3			
42	<i>Schultz</i>	10			-36.5	2.30
43	Sciacca	39		-12.0		
44	<i>Serxner</i>	26		-16.0		
45	Serxner	2			-20.0	
46	Shephard	55		-34.5		
47	Shephard	51				4.85
48	Shi	34	-21.7	-28.4		3.07***
49	<i>Shi</i>	30	-11.0	-8.0†††		
50	<i>Shimizu</i>	5	-35.4			

Table 4  
Continued

#	Author	Study Rank	Percent Change in Sick Leave Absenteeism	Percent Change in Health Costs	Percent Change in WC/DM* Costs	Cost/Benefit Ratio
51	<i>Stave</i>	18				6.13
52	<i>Stein</i> ‡‡‡‡	27				
53	<i>Stein</i>	19	-11.7	-29.7	-7.6	
54	<i>Trudeau</i> §§§	23				
55	Wheat	56		-31.0		
56	Wood	28	-36.3			3.50
Number of Studies			25	28	7	22
Average			-26.8	-26.1	-32.0	5.81

\* WC/DM refer to workers' compensation costs and disability management claims cost. The names in italics represent new studies in this update of the meta-evaluation.  
† For consistency, whole integers reported in the literature have been written as a decimal with an "x.0", and for cost/benefit ratios, an additional significant number has been added ("x.y0").  
‡ An estimate of 56% for hospital costs, as a portion of overall costs, was made and then applied to the overall observed change to derive the measure of 7.4%.  
§ The comparison provided is for external controls.  
|| This number is the average found with two of the three studies. The third study found no significant change.  
¶ This article is included because it is one of the first to show a "dose-related" response with increasing intervention intensity and offers one of the few cost-effectiveness analyses in the economic cost/return literature.  
# This study was included because of its large population (i.e., >100,000 subjects) and its "virtual" style of interventions.  
\*\* This study also examined offsetting pension costs, decreased life insurance costs, increased productivity, and program revenue generation.  
‡‡ Imputed from data provided in the study.  
‡‡‡ This study showed that wellness program participants had higher health costs during the study period but had several major limitations.  
§§ Program also examined cardiac rehabilitation savings and savings from treadmill testing.  
||| Reductions were found in hourly employees only.  
¶¶ This study also documented a 29.8% reduction in presenteeism losses during the study period.  
## Applying more rigorous statistical methods found that participants did not have a statistically significant lower per capita cost, but the rate of cost growth for participants was 12% lower than for nonparticipants.  
\*\*\* This cost/benefit ratio was the highest of three different program intervention models.  
††† The 8.0% reported reduction was in doctor visit rate. There was also a reported reduction of 1.0% in hospitalizations, but this reduction was not significant.  
‡‡‡ This study provides an initial look at the relationship between an index of health risk (HQ) and per capita medical plan costs, sick leave, and STD days, but does not lend itself to percentage calculation. Data from this article was used to calculate selected percentages for the following article.  
§§§ This study found that health promotion program participants experienced higher behavioral health service costs than nonparticipants, indicating that they were more likely to seek help for mental health issues after the program. No meaningful percentages could be extracted from the article.  
||| Averages values reported are simple mathematical means of the average reported effect size of each study. They do not reflect the sample size of each study.

and rigor reflected in the current peer review literature that examines the economic return associated with multi-component worksite health promotion programs.

The median year of publication for all 56 studies was 1994. Comment: Exactly half of the 56 studies have been published since 1994, or within the past 11 years. The more recent studies continue to have larger average effects and higher cost benefit yields than the earlier literature.

The number of the combined subjects in all 56 studies was 483,232. Comment: This is a large number of study subjects and controls and represents a very diverse range of industries and types of organizations, including governmental and public sector agencies. Given that the average duration of the 56 studies was 3.66 years, it means that the number of person years of observation was close to 1.8 million. This represents a significant amount of experimentation and observation by any standard.

The use of health care utilization or cost analyses for the examination of a program's economic effect occurred

in 28 studies, or 50.0% of all studies. Comment: Persistent health care cost escalation will likely continue to make this economic variable the most significant for employers. As a consequence, it is likely to continue to be the most frequently examined economic variable in future program studies.

The 56 studies were conducted in virtually all sizes of organizations. Comment: The distribution of studies by organization size are presented in Table 5.

The use of sick leave absenteeism was measured in 25 studies, or 44.6% of all studies. Comment: This indicates that sick leave effects are the second most prevalent economic variable used to examine the economic return associated with worksite health promotion programs. This may decrease as more employers combine sick days and vacation time into combined leave approaches. However, the growing use of a health and productivity management approach may work in the opposite direction, leading to continued efforts to examine sick leave effects of worksite health management efforts.

**Table 5**  
**Distribution of Studies by Sample Size**

Size of Study Population	Number of Studies	Percent of Studies
1-200	5	8.9
201-500	5	8.9
501-1000	8	14.2
1001-5000	23	41.0
5001-10,000	8	14.2
10,001+	7	12.8
Total	56	100.0

The use of a single economic measure, such as sick leave or health costs, was used in 39 studies, or 69.6% of all studies. Comment: More than two thirds of the studies examined a single economic variable, so total economic impact and return is likely to be understated. The idea is for each study to examine the following: health plan cost, sick leave cost, workers' compensation cost, and disability management and presenteeism cost effects. This approach to economic return would provide a more realistic assessment of the economic return associated with the program under review.

Only seven studies examined workers' compensation and/or disability management costs. Comment: The limited number of studies that examine these two economic variables continues to indicate that few health promotion programs have included injury prevention or a concern for costs associated with injuries.

Of the 10 highest scoring studies in the meta-evaluation, only one was published before 1990, and the combined subjects for the 10 best studies included 271,490 subjects, or 56.1% of all the subjects involved in all 56 studies. Comment: The more recent and larger studies receive the most weight in the meta-evaluation methodology and do reflect the most important research efforts.

The more recent studies also tend to use the newer prevention technologies, including the following: use of the Transtheoretical Model, Internet-provided health information, tailoring, benefits-linked financial incentives, telephonic high-risk intervention coaching, self-directed change, and annual required morbidity-based health risk appraisals (HRAs) used for individual targeting of interventions. Comment: These newer prevention technologies are also associated with higher levels of economic impact and return. Their use in the studies that have been published in the last 10 years have resulted in slightly more than double the average cost/benefit ratio reported in studies of traditional program models; in other words, instead of the typical 1:3.0 cost/benefit ratio, they report a ratio of 1:6.3.

## Conclusion

This meta-evaluation update provides a systematic look at the quality of the economic return evaluation literature

for multicomponent worksite health promotion programs. The summary evidence is very strong for average reductions in sick leave, health plan costs, and workers' compensation and disability costs of slightly more than 25%. This continues to have profound implications for American as well as global employers in developed nations and should eventually lead to the institutionalization of appropriately designed and executed worksite health promotion programming for all working populations. Based on these results, worksite health promotion represents one of the most significant strategies for enhancing the productivity of American workers at a time when their average age is increasing faster than that of many of its global competitors.<sup>8</sup> This is particularly true within the context of a Health and Productivity Management (HPM) approach, in which health plan cost, sick leave cost, workers' compensation costs, disability management costs, and presenteeism costs are a primary objective.<sup>9</sup>

Within this 2005 update of the 2003 meta-evaluation, the earlier general findings have been confirmed with the findings and results of the 16 additional studies. It is clear that a growing body of scientific literature documents the importance of worksite health promotion initiatives for working populations. Additionally, the HPM perspective is becoming increasingly critical for American business and for our global trading partners. Abstracts of the newly included articles can be found in the Selected Abstracts section that follows.

## References

1. Chapman L. Meta-evaluation of worksite health promotion economic return studies. *Art Health Promot.* 2003;6:1-16.
2. Chapman L. *Proof Positive: An Analysis of the Cost-Effectiveness of Worksite Wellness.* Summex Corporation; 2002.
3. Chapman L. *Proof Positive: An Analysis of the Cost-Effectiveness of Worksite Wellness.* Summex Health Management; 2005.
4. Windsor RA, Orleans CT. Guidelines and methodological standards for smoking cessation intervention research among pregnant women: improving the science and art. *Health Educ Q.* 1986;13:131-161.
5. Boyd NR, Windsor RA. A meta-evaluation of nutrition education intervention research among pregnant women. *Health Educ Q.* 1993;20:327-345.
6. Heaney C, Goetzel R. A review of health related outcomes of multi-component worksite health promotion programs. *Am J Health Promot.* 1997;11:290-307.
7. Aldana S. Financial impact of health promotion programs: a comprehensive review of the literature. *Am J Health Promot.* 2001;15:296-320.
8. Chapman L. Health cost management (HCM) strategies for health promotion. *Art Health Promot.* 2001;6:12.
9. Chapman L, Sullivan S. Health and productivity management: an emerging paradigm for the workplace. *Art Health Promot.* 2003;7:1-12.

## Other Useful Resources

- Pelletier K. A review and analysis of the clinical and cost-effective outcome studies of comprehensive health promotion and disease prevention programs at the worksite: 1998-2000, Update (V). *Am J Health Promot.* 2001;16:107-126.
- Pelletier K. A review and analysis of the health and cost-effective outcome studies of comprehensive health promotion and disease prevention programs at the worksite: 1995-1998, Update (IV). *Am J Health Promot.* 1999;13:333-345.
- Pelletier KR. Clinical and cost outcomes of multifactorial, cardiovascular risk management interventions in worksites: a comprehensive review and analysis. *J Occup Environ Med.* 1997;39:1154-1169.
- Pelletier KR. A review and analysis of the health and cost-effective outcome studies of comprehensive health promotion and disease prevention programs at the worksite: 1993-1995 update, (III). *Am J Health Promot.* 1996;10:380-387.

Copyright of American Journal of Health Promotion is the property of American Journal of Health Promotion and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.