



American Journal of
Industrial Medicine

Statement on National WorkLife Priorities

Journal:	<i>American Journal of Industrial Medicine</i>
Manuscript ID:	AJIM-09-0259
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Commentary
Keywords:	employee health, health promotion, occupational health, workplace, health policy



Review

ABSTRACT

The National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) WorkLife Initiative (WLI) [<http://www.cdc.gov/niosh/worklife>] seeks to promote workplace policies and practices for healthier employees through integrating disease prevention, health promotion, and accommodations to age, family, and life stage. The Initiative incorporates NIOSH's foundational commitment to hazard-free workplaces into broader consideration of the factors that affect workers' health and wellbeing. Occupational hazards, whether physical demands, chemical exposures, or organizational stressors, often interact with other factors such as family demands and health behaviors to increase health risks. New workplace interventions being tested by the first three NIOSH WLI Centers of WorkLife Excellence offer innovative models to reduce the human, social, and economic costs of compromised health and quality of life.

NIOSH convened a workshop in 2008 with representatives and advisors of the Centers of Excellence to develop a comprehensive, long-range strategy for the WLI. They developed recommendations for practice, research, and policy, based on goals shared by industry, labor, and government to improve employee health while controlling health care costs. Implementation of these recommendations would enable the WorkLife Center system to support effective programs by compiling and disseminating the practices developed at the Centers and elsewhere. NIOSH could also extend its customary scope by engaging NIH Institutes that support research-to-practice programs in chronic disease prevention and management. Their common goal is to succeed in translation of state-of-the-art research findings in occupational health, health promotion and chronic disease management to benefit working-age populations regardless of workplace size, work sector, or region of the country.

1
2
3 Recommendations
4
5
6

7
8 **PRACTICE**

9
10 1. Expand dissemination of practical, science-based information for improved
11 worksite programs and practices. Significantly increase the dissemination of
12 research information and practice models through national and regional
13 conferences and proceedings, web sites, and shared distance learning seminars
14 and other web-based educational offerings.
15

16
17 2. Develop an internet-based open source system for disseminating best
18 practices recommendations, validated assessment instruments, tool kits, and
19 model programs.

20
21 3. Provide cost utility information and other prevention cost metrics to assist
22 employers in financing preventive measures through insurers and vendors.

23 **RESEARCH**

24 4. Identify the characteristics of best practice programs with a particular
25 emphasis on programs that pay attention to differences in work settings and
26 differences in worker demographics and that engage employee participation.
27

28
29 5. Identify factors contributing to, or limiting, program adoption,
30 implementation, maintenance, and long-term sustainability.

31
32 6. Develop a conceptual framework useful to the academic and business
33 communities and to government in order to guide and coordinate research
34 directions and priorities.
35

36 7. Address key methodological barriers and challenges to this research

37 **POLICY**

38 8: Develop and communicate public policy options supporting integrated
39 employee health programs for adoption by Federal and State lawmakers,
40 employers and insurers, labor unions and pension funds, health care providers
41 and health and safety professionals.
42
43

44 9: Extend the current NIOSH WorkLife Center of Excellence program to every
45 region of the United States and fully fund all Centers to allow development of a
46 comprehensive research, translation and outreach program to all employment
47 sectors. . Engage other CDC Centers and the institutes of the NIH in support of the
48 National WorkLife Initiative.
49

50
51 10: Develop and fund integrated employee health demonstration projects in
52 several employment sectors to document organizational, economic and health
53 outcomes to guide further development of integrated employment-based health
54 care programs.
55
56
57
58
59
60

HISTORY AND INTRODUCTION

Ill health and injury, whether caused by work or resulting from off-work activities, reduces income, quality of life, and opportunity, for both the affected workers and those dependent on them. The protection, preservation, and improvement of the health and well being of people who work are goals shared by workers, their families, their employers, and the government.

The U.S. National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health (NIOSH) provides national and world leadership to understand and prevent work-related disease and injury. Traditionally, NIOSH has focused efforts almost exclusively on prevention of exposure to toxic substances and hazardous conditions at work. This approach has had substantial success in contributing to reductions in occupational disease and injury, especially asbestosis, silicosis, and lead poisoning and many work-related cancers. On average, workers are healthier and less likely to be injured than when NIOSH was established by the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 [Institute of Medicine 2000].

However, the overall health of Americans of working age is influenced by factors both inside and outside the workplace: demands at work and home, physical and chemical exposures, energy imbalance from diet and limited exercise, smoking, the use of medications, hypertension, and alcohol use, to name a few. The effects of the many social, cultural, and economic influences on health [Landsbergis, et al. 1998] cannot be artificially divided between “at work” and “non-work.” Just as workplace conditions can affect health and well-being, exposures, activities, and conditions outside of working hours can

1
2
3 substantially determine health, productivity, and responses to exposures during work
4
5 [Sorensen, et al. 2007, Albertsen, et al. 2006, Eakin 1997, Punnett, et al. 2009].
6
7

8
9 NIOSH has recognized the potential for improving workforce health and well-being
10
11 through improved worksite programs and policies. The NIOSH WorkLife Initiative (WLI)
12
13 was launched in 2004 to promote information dissemination, research, and policy
14
15 development relevant to the integration of worksite health protection and health
16
17 promotion programs and policies.
18
19

20 21 22 **The Case for Change** 23

24
25 Despite obvious interactions and effects on worker health from sources on and off
26
27 the job, there has been a longstanding separation in the public health and employment
28
29 communities between those interested in control of health risks and hazards from work
30
31 and those focused on individual and community health risk reduction outside the
32
33 workplace [Institute of Medicine 2005, Sorensen and Barbeau 2004]. On the one hand,
34
35 members of the labor and occupational health communities sometimes regard health
36
37 promotion in the workplace as a diversion of employers' attention from their legal
38
39 responsibility to provide workplaces free of recognizable hazards¹ and of scarce resources
40
41 from occupational health strategies that involve investment in safer equipment and work
42
43 processes. At worst, there is risk of distracting attention from the occupational health
44
45 needs of most workers by emphasizing an individualized focus on a high-risk few
46
47
48
49 [Levenstein 1989, Barbeau, et al. 2004, Blewett and Shaw 1995].
50
51
52
53

54
55 On the other hand, some morbidity, such as musculoskeletal disorders, can be
56
57 attributed to a mix of work exposures and individual worker characteristics such as obesity
58
59
60

1
2
3 and lack of physical fitness. Prevention of chronic disease risk factors, as well as efforts to
4 maintain high function and effectiveness, can not be confined to a 40-hour work week. It is
5 also clear that a high functioning safety culture alone cannot eliminate some injuries or
6 prevent many chronic diseases.
7
8
9
10
11

12
13
14 Those concerned with promoting health and controlling health care costs have
15 viewed the workplace as a convenient and valuable venue to provide important services to
16 a high priority population (and their families). However, many of these efforts have
17 overlooked work exposures and the work environment (e.g., food choices, walking trails,
18 ergonomic design of tasks and equipment, work organization) and have focused instead on
19 individual behavioral change [Golaszewski 2001, Aldana 2001, Harris, et al. 2001, Sexner,
20 et al. 2001].
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30

31 Considerable innovative rethinking of the relationships between work and health is
32 needed. The divide between disciplines, among practitioners as well as scientists, could be
33 bridged by developing better policies and communication, but there is also a need to
34 inculcate a commitment to shared responsibility for improving health among employers
35 and employees [Blix 1999].
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 This new approach is resonating throughout the industrial world and anticipates
45 the current emphasis on evidence-based practice and research-to-practice initiatives. A
46 growing body of evidence justifies coordinated workplace interventions to diminish health
47 threats to workers both in and out of work [Punnett, et al. 2009, Institute of Medicine 2005,
48 Sorensen, et al. 1992, Baker, et al. 1996, DeJoy and Southern 1993, Israel, et al. 1996,
49 LaMontagne and Keegel in press, Henning, et al. 2009] and documents the benefits of these
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 approaches [Maes, et al. 1998, Sorensen, et al. 2005, Sorensen, et al. 1998, Sorensen, et al.
4
5 2002, Sorensen, et al. 1996]. The World Health Organization and the Institute of Medicine
6
7 have each concluded that both worksite health promotion and occupational health and
8
9 safety are integral to good employee health management practices [Institute of Medicine
10
11 2005, World Health Organization 1999].
12
13
14
15

16 The need for this new approach is further underscored by several important trends.
17
18 With costs of health insurance outpacing wage and profit growth, many employers are
19
20 cutting back on health benefits and families are paying more out-of-pocket for their care
21
22 [Medoff, et al. 2000, Ni and Cohen 2001]. As the US workforce ages, employers are
23
24 increasingly recognizing the importance of maintaining the health and well-being of the
25
26 workforce [Institute of Medicine and Committee on Communication for Behavior Change in
27
28 the 21st Century: Improving the Health of Diverse Populations 2002, Gobble 2002]. With
29
30 the rising trend toward corporate restructuring, mergers, and outsourcing, as well as the
31
32 growing reliance on contingent workers, increasing numbers of workers are facing job loss
33
34 and concomitant pressures such as increased work load or hours [Dooley, et al. 1987, Lee,
35
36 et al. 2004, Landsbergis, et al. 1999].
37
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 Facing these needs are several obstacles to comprehensive worksite health
45
46 programs. Access to relevant information about best and promising practices to sustain
47
48 and improve worker health and wellbeing is limited, particularly for managers and
49
50 workers in small and medium-sized workplaces. Also missing is objective analyses of the
51
52 generalizability of practices that have worked in limited settings. Nevertheless, while new
53
54 research is being conducted, there are opportunities for improved practice based on
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 current proven best practices, and for new occupational health care policy developments to
4
5 support a healthier workforce for years to come.
6
7
8
9

10 11 12 **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PRACTICE** 13

14
15 Workplace health promotion programs need to incorporate recent research findings
16
17 on the influence of the occupational environment on individuals' health behaviors and on
18
19 the effectiveness of current programs. The workplace is a complex environment with many
20
21 features presenting opportunities for interventions that can affect program success or
22
23 failure. The workplace should not be treated merely as the venue for individual behavior
24
25 change interventions but as an environment that may have direct impact on the same risk
26
27 factors and diseases targeted by workplace health promotion (WHP) programs [Henning,
28
29 et al. 2009, MacDonald, et al. 2008]. Perhaps the starkest affirmation of this perspective
30
31 has come from the prospective Whitehall studies, which have linked cardio-vascular
32
33 disease events and metabolic syndrome with work organization stressors to a degree that
34
35 equals or exceeds all commonly recognized physiologic and biologic risk factors [Chandola,
36
37 et al. 2005].
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 Participants in the 2008 workshop strongly recommended that NIOSH and the
46
47 Centers within the WorkLife Initiative develop a (virtual) resource center to address these
48
49 needs by providing information, technical assistance, and education (Figure 1). An
50
51 organized network of WLI Centers would serve multiple purposes for enhancing practice,
52
53 especially facilitating communication among the various WLI stakeholders as well as
54
55 developing and evaluating guidelines and benchmarking tools, outreach materials and
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 programs. Successful examples of such models on a state or regional basis can be found in
4
5 the historical function of agricultural extension services, as well as in the NIOSH
6
7 Educational Resource Centers and agricultural health and safety centers.
8
9

10
11 -- INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE --
12
13

- 14 • **Recommendation #1:** *Expand dissemination of practical, science-based information for*
15 *improved worksite programs and practices. Significantly increase the dissemination of*
16 *research information and practice models through national and regional conferences and*
17 *proceedings, web sites, and shared distance learning seminars and other web-based*
18 *educational offerings.*
19
20
21

22 This would be realized through:
23

- 24 ○ *Expanded dissemination of research information and practice models, including*
25 *research-to-practice, practice-to-research, and practice-to-practice.*
26
27
- 28 ○ *Networking among employers and professionals to share experiences and*
29 *resources, including regional “brown bag” distance learning programs to advance*
30 *working life skill levels among health and safety and employee services personnel.*
31
32
- 33 ○ *Feedback and evaluation from practitioners to the centers and to NIOSH.*
34

35 There is a general need for “research-to-practice dissemination,” i.e., sharing of
36
37 research findings and instruments in a form that is useful to employers, unions and other
38
39 labor advocates, worklife wellness and employee safety professionals, and other
40
41 practitioners. Good practice can only be achieved if the information and services are
42
43 available to effect behavior and workplace change, and if employers understand how to
44
45 distinguish effective from ineffective programs. It is essential to ensure that occupational
46
47 health and safety obligations are addressed first, before employers seek to introduce health
48
49 promotion activities. Employers should be encouraged to develop a culture of health based
50
51 on a reference model of safety culture. The VPP system and the NASA culture of safety are
52
53 two models that might be considered.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Communication among stakeholders should be a two-way street: researchers can share the evolving evidence base for good practice, while practitioners can share experiences and raise questions that researchers might investigate. Field experience with variations in effectiveness among different settings will generate new research questions. Thus, a feedback loop should be built into the process of providing technical assistance for continuous improvement. In addition to responding to solicitations, the Centers would track what questions are being asked and develop a Frequently Asked Questions list.

The practice paradigm should include peer-to-peer activities. The center network could serve as a broker among employers, and also among different constituencies: employers, employees, unions, insurance companies, state health departments, etc. The Centers could facilitate “practice to practice” networking through documenting of case studies, sharing written and on-line resources, etc. The goals would be both to develop an employer practice network and to bring new content to existing networks.

The Centers could also develop ongoing mechanisms for communicating program experiences with each other and for circulating feedback from field sites, trainees, etc. This would serve to keep the research-practice feedback loop intact and viable. It presupposes a national network of regionally based centers. A NIOSH WorkLife news bulletin could include content from the Centers and external partners. Centers would also promote networking around shared goals with other health professionals and practitioners, including professional organizations such as the American College of Sports Medicine or the Society of Human Resource Managers.

- **Recommendation #2.** *Develop an internet-based open source system for disseminating targeted best practices recommendations, validated assessment instruments, tool kits, and model programs.*

Different communication strategies are likely to be needed for multiple audiences. Useful outreach materials might include a set of selling points for taking an evidence-based integrated approach to achieving a health-promoting company culture with a high degree of employee participation; and distance learning and other packages addressed directly to human resources and health and safety personnel. Examples of effective electronic communication include adaption and web-distribution of the IOM Integrated Employee Health Model by the Washington Business Group on Health, convening and disseminating results of two national NIOSH WorkLife Conferences, and regional conferences like *A Healthier Workforce: Perspectives for Iowa and the Nation* (October 2008) which will made web-available.

Centers would evaluate and compare a variety of strategies for engaging different functions within an organization (e.g., employee benefits, employee assistance, risk management, human resources, etc.) to join in an integrated approach. Cross-disciplinary teams (ranging from nurses to economists) sponsored by the Centers could provide outreach to multiple audiences. Centers based in academic environments could also utilize students and future professionals, who in turn would benefit from the training opportunities.

Some types of employee health programs and activities should be customized to smaller enterprises that have fewer resources, including technical personnel, or sector-specific where there are very distinctive features affecting occupational safety and health

1
2
3 (OSH) and the general work climate, such as healthcare or construction. Programs must be
4
5 affordable and accessible to small employers, unions, public sector and non-profit groups.
6
7
8 It is also necessary to consider different employee socioeconomic levels and the effects of
9
10 telecommuting and home work on disparities in access to flexibility and program
11
12 participation.
13

14
15
16 New informational “toolkit” resources will be developed, emphasizing and defining
17
18 the integrated approach of combining workplace health and safety with wellness. The
19
20 essential content features would be assessment, priorities, and goal setting. For example,
21
22 one item in the toolkit might address organizational readiness, i.e., the company’s baseline
23
24 preparation for implementation of change. Another form of outreach would be the
25
26 development of course curricula and teaching cases for nursing students, MBA programs,
27
28 and future wellness professionals. There is also an opportunity to train insurance
29
30 representatives and health underwriters in how to integrate health and wellness with OSH,
31
32 through a “broker’s institute.” This could be an effective dissemination channel to potential
33
34 WLI audiences, especially if these professionals were provided with a practical tool kit.
35
36
37
38
39

- 40
41 • **Recommendation #3.** *Provide cost utility information and other prevention cost metrics*
42
43 *to assist employers in financing preventive insurances through insurers and vendors.*
44

45 Work organization interventions could be presented in relation to productivity and
46
47 economic competitiveness. For example, a calculator or toolkit could enable quantification
48
49 of benefits for a private sector employer, with analogous economic calculators for the
50
51 public sector. Calculations would include program impact on both workers’ compensation
52
53 and group health costs, to insure that these tools go beyond conventional metrics (lost
54
55 time, premium costs) to assess whether programs are effective in improving health and
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 productivity. Return on Investment (ROI) and other calculators would also be desirable to
4
5 assist employers in choosing services and vendors.
6
7

8
9 Implicit in recommendations 1-3 is the development of assessment guidelines and
10
11 other benchmarking tools for assessing whether or not WHP services utilize a beneficial-
12
13 integrated approach to worker health. WLI Centers would not take on the task of
14
15 evaluating and recommending specific consultants or service providers but would seek to
16
17 ass that services offered to employers are based on the best available evidence, for example
18
19 by disseminating criteria for evaluating quality and comprehensiveness of a given
20
21 approach. Annotated checklists or other practical guides are possibilities. It is not foreseen
22
23 that Centers would take on a certification or quasi-regulatory function.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 **RECOMMENDATIONS FOR RESEARCH**

33
34

35
36 A growing body of evidence from research points to the importance of
37
38 comprehensive and coordinated worksite programs, policies and practices for improving
39
40 worker health. This research, however, is in its infancy, and there remains a broad range of
41
42 research questions that need to be addressed in order to maximize the potential impact of
43
44 workplace interventions [Sorensen and Barbeau 2004]. Research plays an important role
45
46 at many junctures. Efficacy and effectiveness studies can provide rigorous approaches to
47
48 evaluating interventions, allowing researchers to determine the extent to which observed
49
50 outcomes can be directly attributed to the intervention being tested, and providing a means
51
52 of controlling for secular trends [Flay 1986, Rabin, et al. 2006, Koepsell, et al. 1992, Susser
53
54 1995, Goldenhar, et al. 2001, Murray 1998, Sorensen, et al. 1998, Shadish, et al. 2002]. In
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 addition, research can illuminate the intersecting relationships among the physical and
4
5 organizational work environment, individual health behaviors, and worker health
6
7 outcomes. As tested interventions are moved into practice, research can help to identify
8
9 effective strategies and tools for broad-based dissemination and adoption of programs,
10
11 policies and practices across diverse workplace settings.
12
13

14
15
16 Together, researchers across a range of disciplines can create broad-based
17
18 partnerships with industry and labor in the design and evaluation of feasible, innovative,
19
20 and comprehensive interventions. The development and dissemination of effective
21
22 intervention methods will be enhanced with implementation across a broad research
23
24 spectrum, from methods development studies through dissemination research. Through
25
26 careful planning and purposeful and strategic operations, advances in the field will follow
27
28 the application of rigorous research methodologies to evaluate the efficacy,
29
30 generalizability, sustainability, and dissemination of integrated interventions across a
31
32 range of worksite settings [Sorensen and Barbeau 2004, Stokols, et al. 2005].
33
34
35
36
37
38

- 39
- 40 • **Recommendation #4:** *Identify the characteristics of best practice programs, with*
41 *particular attention to:*
 - 42 ○ *The characteristics of best practices and processes across different work settings,*
43 *industry sectors, worksite size, and related worksite characteristics;*
44
 - 45 ○ *The characteristics of best practices and programs for different workers, based on*
46 *occupation, race/ethnicity, wage, age, and other relevant worker characteristics;*
47
 - 48 *and*
49
50
51
52
53
54
- 55
56
57
58
59
60

- *The effect of employee participatory processes on program content and design, employee access, effectiveness, and long-term sustainability.*

Evidence to date has focused on interventions tested within a relatively narrow set of worksites. Tested interventions need to be adapted to assure that there is an appropriate fit between tested methods and the context, setting, and circumstances of the population [Wandersman 2003]. For example, effective programs are needed for the growing service sector; approaches shown to be effective in manufacturing settings may not be presumptively transferrable without adaptation. Lessons learned from programs that address different types of workplace hazards (chemical, ergonomic, etc.) may also not be completely transferable. Similarly, the changing demographics of the workforce, including the growing number of immigrant workers and older workers and rising income inequalities and related social disparities in risk-related behaviors and hazardous occupational exposures [d'Errico, et al. 2007, Boyer, et al. 2009], underscores the need for practices and programs that are responsive to the specific concerns and work experiences of our increasingly diverse workforce.

- ***Recommendation #5: Identify factors contributing to, or limiting, program adoption, implementation, and maintenance:***

Examples of factors that should be assessed include,

- *Barriers to and facilitators of program adoption (e.g., economic indicator, regulations, worker satisfaction);*
- *Outcomes of value to different stakeholders (e.g., employers, unions, workers, insurers);*

- *Factors contributing to the transferability and sustainability of programs, policies, and practices influencing worker health outcomes.*

Research is needed to explicate the process of moving evidence-based interventions into practice [Bowen, et al. 2009]. It is important that research identify motivators and facilitators as well as barriers to adoption of evidence-based interventions from the perspectives of employers, labor unions, insurers, workers, and other key stakeholders. In addition, it is important to explore factors contributing to the sustainability of these interventions, in order to assure that they can supported, maintained, and enhanced over time, especially in light of changing markets, labor practices, technologies, economies, etc [Kottke and Pronk 2006]. Intervention studies by the three NIOSH-funded national Work Life Centers are already providing valuable and unanticipated insights into program contouring to specific workforces.

Recommendation #6: *Develop a conceptual framework useful to the academic and business communities and to government in order to guide and coordinate research directions and priorities.*

Such a framework would help to

- *Articulate and synthesize diverse approaches for coordinating and integrating programs, policies and practices to promote and protect worker health;*
- *Outline shared outcomes and pathways through which programs, policies and practices may effectively influence worker health;*
- *Stimulate a dialogue across disciplinary boundaries; and*

- *Reflect a systematic review of the literature highlighting key gaps.*

Comprehensive approaches to worker health require coordination and collaboration across multiple disciplines, with representation from occupational health and safety, behavioral and social sciences, health promotion, labor education, economics, and other areas. Such approaches offer the ability to apply both quantitative and qualitative research methods [Sorensen and Barbeau 2004, Israel, et al. 1996]. Development of a shared conceptual framework is needed to guide future research, stimulate discussion and harmonize new collaborations across disciplines, ultimately contributing to improved programs, policies, and practices. This conceptual framework must additionally identify the range of underlying work conditions influencing worker health and those participatory features of programs which enable employees to take a more active role as the primary stakeholders [Henning, et al. 2009, Macdonald, et al. 2008].

Recommendation #7: *Address key methodological barriers and challenges to this research.*

The approach to addressing methodological barriers would include,

- *Assessment of the extent to which currently available tools adequately capture work exposures and their responsiveness to change, and develop or identify measures to assess work exposures across levels (e.g., worksite, supervisory, and worker levels);*
- *Identification of measurable outcomes that may motivate key stakeholders to adopt programs and assure broad-based application of standard measures (e.g, health, economic, product quality, and related outcomes);*

- *Development of tools and methods for observational research that can be applied as opportunities arise (e.g., to capture the effects of new policies or changes within vanguard companies); and*
- *Incorporation of mechanisms by which lessons learned from research and practice are used to inform the evolving WLI research program.*

As this new field of research grows, it will be necessary to develop measurement tools that allow researchers to capture the impact of tested interventions across diverse settings using standardized, reliable, and valid measures. In addition, it may be necessary to diversify the research methods use, with particular attention to the development and adaptation of methods that bridge across disciplines. Observational methods must be fine-tuned for use as opportunities for natural experiments arise.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR POLICY

Focusing on a healthy workforce and worker well being presents a different direction from traditional occupational safety and health protection programs. It requires a paradigm shift in defining employee health and safety goals, in organizing employee health programs, and a willingness to recognize and adapt to trends being set by leading US employers. The case for change from the traditional approach to an integrated employee health model has been summarized by the IOM in 2005 [Institute of Medicine 2005], reproduced here in Table 1.

- Table 1 about here -

1
2
3 While several major employers have already taken initial steps to implement these
4 changes, there is no single model that can be readily transported. Many large international
5 employers have idiosyncratic cultures that are entirely *sui generis*. There is a great need to
6 elevate and emphasize public policies to drive the case for change among all US employers,
7 not just among the largest and wealthiest American corporations.
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 ***Recommendation #8:*** *Develop and communicate public policy options supporting*
21 *integrated employee health programs for adoption by Federal and State*
22 *lawmakers, employers and insurers, labor unions and pension funds, health care*
23 *providers and health and safety professionals.*
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 An example of such a policy option would be federal legislation that would provide
31 employers tax credits (or state-based workers' compensation premium reductions) if they
32 were to adopt a comprehensive, integrated employee health program that would assure
33 worker protection while also providing integrated health promotion and prevention
34 incentives and targeted chronic disease management services.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 Implementation of public policy through health care reform legislation may be the
44 most efficient approach to achieve the needed paradigm shift, but passage of any federal or
45 state-based health care reform is a difficult and often adversarial process. A less
46 challenging and complementary policy approach would be to enhance significantly
47 dissemination of currently available published research, case studies of current corporate
48 models, and conference proceedings engaging stakeholders nationally and regionally.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 **Recommendation #9.** *Extend the current NIOSH WorkLife Center of Excellence*
4 *program to every region of the United States and fully fund all Centers to allow*
5 *development of a comprehensive research, translation and outreach program to all*
6 *employment sectors.*
7
8
9
10
11

12
13
14 It is widely appreciated by policy makers that improved health protection and
15 disease prevention programs together with better chronic disease management programs
16 are likely to improve health outcomes while controlling downstream health care costs.
17 Such employment-based programs are now increasingly available to American workplaces
18 through insurance companies and independent vendors, but typically they emphasize
19 individual behaviors rather than working conditions, may be limited in effectiveness, and
20 lack rigorous evaluation. Because of the presumed, but poorly documented, positive health
21 outcome and cost savings benefits of integrated health care programs, public policy
22 leadership is needed to further develop and evaluate model programs.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 The key to effective policy in the area of WorkLife is the development of a national
37 network of regional centers for excellence. This has proven to be a highly successful
38 strategy to promote comprehensive disease-specific research. An illustration is the
39 National Cancer Institute's (NCI) Comprehensive Cancer Centers. The approach has been
40 utilized by NIOSH to develop sector-specific occupational safety and health research
41 through the Agricultural Health and Safety Centers. The WorkLife Center of Excellence
42 program is a logical extension of this time-tested research program strategy, but it remains
43 in its infancy, being limited to three Centers, two in the northeast, and one in the mid-west.
44 To more fully respond to the many research needs and, most importantly, to disseminate
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 practices that improve health and reduce the chronic disease burden in the workforce, the
4
5 NIOSH Center of Excellence program should be fully developed. Because the scope of the
6
7 Centers will extend beyond traditional occupational safety and health and because the
8
9 Centers' activities will be mainstreamed into the broader discourse on health and chronic
10
11 disease prevention and management, the programmatic involvement of both the NIH and
12
13 national public health institutions will be essential.
14
15
16

17
18
19 ***Recommendation #10:*** *Develop and fund integrated employee health*
20
21 *demonstration projects in several employment sectors to document organizational,*
22
23 *economic and health outcomes to guide further development of integrated*
24
25 *employment-based health care programs. Engage the institutes of the NIH and*
26
27 *national public health institutions in the support of the National WorkLife*
28
29 *initiative.*
30
31

- 32
33
34 • Such a grant program would be a logical extension of the NIOSH WorkLife
35
36 Initiative and would have the advantage of engaging key stakeholders from
37
38 several employment sectors among both larger and smaller employers. A
39
40 major advantage of such a research approach would be to better understand
41
42 the organizational advantages and barriers together with collection of risk
43
44 factor and health and injury outcome data. One-sized programs do not fit all,
45
46 but effective pilot programs can offer a finite number of practical model
47
48 solutions.
49
50
51

52
53
54 Coordinated efforts across the Federal government hold great promise for efficient
55
56 and effective use of scarce resources in support of improved workforce health and well-
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 being. Development and strategic funding of a joint research agenda, for example, would
4
5 permit each Institute or Center to fund relevant projects within their own mission area
6
7 while filling critical knowledge gaps.
8
9

10 11 12 **Conclusions** 13

14
15
16 The American workforce is diverse in its demographics, its conditions of
17
18 employment, and its health status. The health of the American workforce extends far
19
20 beyond the workplace, affecting families, communities, and our social and political systems.
21
22 The impacts of impaired health on production and competitiveness can be measured with
23
24 some effectiveness; the human costs of ill health and the benefits of healthy workplaces for
25
26 longevity and quality of life are more elusive. A healthy workplace can extend life, limit the
27
28 impact of chronic disease, and contribute broadly to national life.
29
30
31
32
33

34 In the United States, many working age adults are insured through their
35
36 employment. A large part of waking hours for working age adults involve work and
37
38 workplaces. The costs of being unemployed, working under severe conditions, or working
39
40 for economically challenged organizations can add significantly to physical and mental
41
42 disease. The NIOSH WorkLife initiative is an acknowledgement of the important interplay
43
44 between work, health, and well-being. It is also an acknowledgement that the modern
45
46 American workplace is increasingly complex and is demanding ever higher cognitive skills,
47
48 management skills in workplace organization, and professional skills in health and safety.
49
50
51
52
53

54 The NIOSH WorkLife initiative is an opportunity to test, validate, and disseminate
55
56 innovative workplace programs, policies, and practices, thus empowering employers to
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 develop and implement health and safety programs that will sustain and promote the
4
5 health and wellbeing of the American workforce.
6
7
8
9

10
11 **Acknowledgments:** The authors thank Lorraine Wallace and Linnea Benson for their
12 instrumental role in organizing the workshop on which proceedings this paper is based.
13
14 The findings and recommendations expressed here are those of the authors and do not
15
16 necessarily represent the opinions of the US National Institute for Occupational Safety and
17
18 Health.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 Literature Cited

- 28
29 Albertsen K, Borg V, Oldenburg B. 2006. A systematic review of the impact of work
30 environment on smoking cessation, relapse and amount smoked. *Preventive Medicine* 43:
31 291-305.
32
33 Aldana SG. 2001. Financial impact of health promotion programs: A comprehensive review
34 of the literature. *American Journal of Health Promotion* 15: 296-320.
35
36 Baker E, Israel B, Schurman S. 1996. The integrated model: Implications for worksite health
37 promotion and occupational health and safety practice. *Health Education Quarterly* 23:
38 175-188.
39
40 Barbeau E, Roelofs C, Youngstrom R, Sorensen G, Stoddard A, Lamontagne AD. 2004.
41 Assessment of occupational safety and health programs in small businesses. *American*
42 *Journal of Industrial Medicine* 45: 371-379.
43
44 Blewett V, Shaw A. 1995. Health promotion, handle with care: Issues for health promotion
45 in the workplace. *Journal of Occupational Health Safety* 11: 461-465.
46
47 Blix A. 1999. Integrating occupational health protection and health promotion: theory and
48 program application. *AAOHN* 47: 168-171.
49
50 Bowen DJ, Sorensen G, Weiner BJ, Campbell M, Emmons K, Melvin C. 2009. Dissemination
51 research in cancer control: where are we and where should we go? *Cancer Causes and*
52 *Control* 20: 473-485.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Boyer J, Galizzi M, Cifuentes M, d'Errico A, Punnett L, Slatin C, Team PHaSEPiH. 2009.
4 Ergonomic and socioeconomic risk factors for hospital workers' compensation injury
5 claims. *American Journal of Industrial Medicine* (in press).

6
7
8 Chandola T, Siegrist J, Marmot M. 2005. Do changes in effort-reward imbalance at work
9 contribute to an explanation of the social gradient in angina? *Occup Environ Med* 62: 223-
10 230.

11
12
13 DeJoy D, Southern D. 1993. An integrative perspective on worksite health promotion.
14 *Journal of Medicine* 35: 1221-1230.

15
16
17 d'Errico A, Punnett L, Cifuentes M, Boyer J, Tessler J, Gore R, Scollin P, Slatin C, Team PiH.
18 2007. Hospital injury rates in relation to socioeconomic status and working conditions.
19 *Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 64: 325-333.

20
21
22 Dooley D, Rook K, Catalano R. 1987. Job and non-job stressors and their moderators.
23 *Journal of Occupational Psychology* 60: 115-132.

24
25
26 Eakin JM. 1997. Work-related determinants of health behavior. In: Gochman DS editor.
27 *Handbook of health behavior research I: Personal and social determinants* New York, NY:
28 Plenum Press. p 337-357.

29
30
31 Flay BR. 1986. Efficacy and effectiveness trials (and other phases of research) in the
32 development of health promotion programs. *Preventive Medicine* 15: 451-474.

33
34
35 Gobble D. 2002. Aging and worksite health promotion. In: O'Donnell MP editor. *Health
36 promotion in the workplace*, 3rd edition Toronto, ON: Delmar Thomson Learning.

37
38
39 Golaszewski T. 2001. Shining lights: Studies that have most influenced the understanding of
40 health promotion's financial impact. *American Journal of Health Promotion* 15: 332-340.

41
42
43 Goldenhar LM, LaMontagne AD, Katz T, Heaney C, Landsbergis P. 2001. The intervention
44 research process in occupational safety and health: An overview for the National
45 Occupational Research Agenda Intervention Effectiveness Research Team. *Journal of
46 Occupational and Environmental Medicine* 43: 616-622.

47
48
49 Harris JR, Holman PB, Carande-Kulis VG. 2001. Financial impact of health promotion: We
50 need to know much more, but we know enough to act. *American Journal of Health
51 Promotion* 15: 378-382.

52
53
54 Henning RA, Warren N, Robertson M, Faghri P, Cherniack MG, CPH-NEW Research Team.
55 2009. Workplace health protection and promotion through participatory ergonomics: An
56 integrated approach for greater effectiveness and sustainability. *Public Health Reports*
57 2009; 124 (Suppl 1): 26-35.

1
2
3 Institute of Medicine. 2000. Promoting health: Intervention strategies from social and
4 behavioral research Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

5
6
7 Institute of Medicine. 2005. Integrating employee health: A model program for NASA
8 Washington, DC: National Academies Press. 200 p.

9
10
11 Institute of Medicine, Committee on Communication for Behavior Change in the 21st
12 Century: Improving the Health of Diverse Populations. 2002. Speaking of health: Assessing
13 health communication strategies for diverse populations Washington, DC: National
14 Academies Press.

15
16
17 Israel BA, Baker EA, Goldenhar LM, Heaney CA, Schurman SJ. 1996. Occupational stress,
18 safety, and health: conceptual framework and principles for effective prevention
19 interventions. *J Occup Health Psychol* 1: 261-286.

20
21
22 Koepsell TD, Wagner EH, Cheadle AC, Patrick DL, Martin DC, Diehr PH, Perrin EB, Kristal
23 AR, Allan-Andrilla CH, Dey LJ. 1992. Selected methodological issues in evaluating
24 community-based health promotion and disease prevention programs. *Annual Review of*
25 *Public Health* 13: 31-57.

26
27
28 Kottke TE, Pronk NP. 2006. Physical activity: optimizing practice through research.
29 *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*: 8-10.

30
31 LaMontagne AD, Keegel T. in press. Chapter 9. The work environment. In: Keleher H,
32 Murphy B editors. *Understanding health: A determinants approach*, second edition Oxford,
33 UK: Oxford University Press.

34
35
36 Landsbergis PA, Cahill J, Schnall PL. 1999. The impact of lean production and related new
37 systems of work organization on worker health. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*
38 4: 108-130.

39
40
41 Landsbergis PA, Schnall PL, Deitz DK, Warren K, Pickering TG, Schwartz JE. 1998. Job strain
42 and health behaviors: results of a prospective study. *Am J Health Promot* 12: 237-245.

43
44
45 Lee S, Colditz GA, Berkman LF, Kawachi I. 2004. Prospective study of job insecurity and
46 coronary heart disease in US women. *Annals of Epidemiology* 14: 24-30.

47
48
49 Levenstein C. 1989. Worksite Health Promotion. *American Journal of Public Health* 79: 11.

50
51
52 Macdonald LA, Harenstam A, Warren ND, Punnett L. 2008. Incorporating work organisation
53 into occupational health research: an invitation for dialogue. *Occup Environ Med* 65: 1-3.

54
55
56 Maes S, Verhoeven C, Kittel F, Scholten H. 1998. Effects of a Dutch worksite wellness-health
57 program: The Brabantia project. *American Journal of Public Health* 88: 1037-1041.

1
2
3 Medoff J, Shapiro H, M. C. 2000. The impact of labor market trends on health care coverage
4 Washington, DC: The Center for National Policy.

5
6
7 Murray DM. 1998. Design and analysis of group randomized trials. New York, N.Y.: Oxford
8 University Press.

9
10 Ni H, Cohen R. 2001. Trends in health insurance coverage by race/ethnicity among persons
11 under 65 years of age: United States, 1997-2001 Washington, DC: U.S. Department of
12 Health and Human Services, Centers For Disease Control And Prevention, National Center
13 for Health Statistics.

14
15
16 Punnett L, Cherniack MG, Henning RA, Morse TF, Faghri P, CPH-NEW Research Team. 2009.
17 A conceptual framework for the integration of workplace health promotion and
18 occupational ergonomics programs. Public Health Reports 2009; 124 (Suppl 1): 16-25.

19
20
21 Rabin BA, Brownson RC, Kerner JF, Glasgow RE. 2006. Methodologic challenges in
22 disseminating evidence-based interventions to promote physical activity. Am J Prev Med
23 31: S24-34.

24
25
26 Sexner S, Gold D, Anderson D, Williams D. 2001. The impact of a worksite health promotion
27 program on short-term disability usage. Journal of Occupational and Environmental
28 Medicine 43: 25-29.

29
30
31 Shadish WR, Cook TD, Campell DT. 2002. Experimental and quasi experimental design for
32 generalized causal inference Boston, MA: Houghton.

33
34
35 Sorensen G, Barbeau E. 2004. Steps to a healthier US workforce. Integrating occupational
36 health and safety and worksite health promotion: state of the science Washington, D.C.:
37 Commissioned for The National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health Steps to a
38 Healthier US Workforce Symposium.

39
40
41 Sorensen G, Barbeau E, Stoddard AM, Hunt MK, Kaphingst K, Wallace L. 2005. Promoting
42 behavior change among working-class, multiethnic workers: results of the healthy
43 directions--small business study. Am J Public Health 95: 1389-1395.

44
45
46 Sorensen G, Emmons K, Hunt MK, Johnston D. 1998. Implications of the results of
47 community intervention trials. Annual Review of Public Health 19: 379-416.

48
49
50 Sorensen G, Hammond K, Youngstrom R, Himmelstein J, Hebert J, Hunt MK, Ockene J. 1992.
51 The WellWorks program: Integrating health protection and health promotion. American
52 Industrial Hygiene Conference & Exposition Boston, MA.

53
54
55 Sorensen G, Stoddard A, Dubowitz T, Barbeau EM, Berkman LF, Peterson KE. 2007. The
56 influence of social context on changes in fruit and vegetable consumption: Results of the
57 Healthy Directions Studies. American Journal of Public Health 97: 1216-1227.

1
2
3 Sorensen G, Stoddard A, Hunt MK, Herbert JR, Ockene JK, Spitz Avrunin J, Himmelstein JS,
4 Hammond SK. 1998. The effects of a health promotion-health protection intervention on
5 behavior change: The WellWorks Study. *American Journal of Public Health* 88: 1685-1690.
6
7

8 Sorensen G, Stoddard A, LaMontagne A, Emmons K, Hunt M, Youngstrom R, McLellan D,
9 Christiani D. 2002. A comprehensive worksite cancer prevention intervention: Behavior
10 change results from a randomized controlled trial in manufacturing worksites (United
11 States). *Cancer Causes and Control* 13: 493-502.
12
13

14 Sorensen G, Stoddard A, Ockene JK, Hunt MK, Youngstrom R. 1996. Worker participation in
15 an integrated health promotion/health protection program: Results from the WellWorks
16 Project. *Health Education Quarterly* 23: 191-203.
17
18

19 Stokols D, Harvey R, Gress J, Fuqua J, Phillips K. 2005. InVivo studies of transdisciplinary
20 scientific collaboration: Lessons learned and implications for active living research.
21 *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 28: 202-213.
22
23

24 Susser M. 1995. Editorial: The tribulations of trials - interventions in communities.
25 *American Journal of Public Health* 85: 156-158.
26
27

28 Wandersman A. 2003. Community science: Bridging the gap between science and practice
29 with community-centered models. *American Journal of Community Psychology* 31: 227-
30 241.
31

32 World Health Organization. 1999. Regional guidelines for the development of healthy
33 workplaces Shanghai: World Health Organization, Western Pacific Regional Office. p 66.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. WLI virtual extension center: Examples of partners and audiences




Table I. Relevant Domains for a Healthy and Productive Workforce and Current Trends in the United States

Perspective	Current State	Desired State
Function	Absenteeism	Performance
Cost Metrics	Medical Costs	Economic Outcomes
Care Model	Treatment Focused	Prevention/Behavior Focus
Medical Model	Individual	Population
Health Metrics	Disease Status	Health Status
Interventions	Single-Risk Focused	Multiple-risk Focused
Health Framework	Employer/Condition/Employee-Centric	Program-Centric
Management Systems	Segregated Programs	Integrated Programs