



UNIVERSITY OF HELSINKI



<https://helda.helsinki.fi>

Helda

Chronic workplace stress and insufficient physical activity : a cohort study

Kouvonen, Anne

BMJ PUBLISHING GROUP

2013-01

Kouvonen, A, Vahtera, J, Oksanen, T, Pentti, J, Vaananen, A K P, Heponiemi, T, Salo, P, Virtanen, M & Kivimäki, M 2013, 'Chronic workplace stress and insufficient physical activity : a cohort study', *Occupational and Environmental Medicine*, vol. 70, no. 1, pp. 3-8. <https://doi.org/10.1136/oemed-2012-100808>

<http://hdl.handle.net/10138/234096>

10.1136/oemed-2012-100808

acceptedVersion

Downloaded from Helda, University of Helsinki institutional repository.

This is an electronic reprint of the original article.

This reprint may differ from the original in pagination and typographic detail.

Please cite the original version.

OCCUPATIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL MEDICINE

Chronic workplace stress and insufficient physical activity: a cohort study

Journal:	<i>Occupational and Environmental Medicine</i>
Manuscript ID:	oemed-2012-100808.R2
Article Type:	Original Article
Date Submitted by the Author:	10-Aug-2012
Complete List of Authors:	Kouvonen, Anne; Queen's University Belfast, School of Sociology, Social Policy & Social Work; Queen's University Belfast, Centre of Excellence for Public Health (NI) Vahtera, Jussi; Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, ; University of Turku, Department of Public Health Oksanen, Tuula; Finnish Institute of Occupational Health Pentti, Jaana; Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Vaananen, Ari; Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Work Organizations Heponiemi, Tarja; National Institute for Health and Welfare, Salo, Paula; Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Finland, Virtanen, Marianna; Finnish Institute of Occupational Health, Department of Psychology Kivimaki, Mika; University College London, Department of Epidemiology and Public Health; University of Helsinki, Institute of Behavioral Sciences
Keywords:	Psychology < General expertise, Public health < General expertise, Longitudinal studies < Methodology, speciality, Organisation of work < Methodology, speciality

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Chronic workplace stress and insufficient physical activity: a cohort study

Anne Kouvonen,^a Jussi Vahtera,^{b,c,d} Tuula Oksanen,^b Jaana Pentti,^b Ari Väänänen,^b Tarja Heponiemi,^e Paula Salo,^{b,f} Marianna Virtanen,^b Mika Kivimäki,^{b,g,h}

^aSchool of Sociology, Social Policy & Social Work, Queen's University Belfast, Belfast, UK

^bFinnish Institute of Occupational Health, Turku and Helsinki, Finland

^cDepartment of Public Health, University of Turku, Turku, Finland

^dTurku University Hospital, Turku, Finland

^eNational Institute for Health and Welfare, Helsinki, Finland

^fDepartment of Psychology, University of Turku, Turku, Finland

^gResearch Department of Epidemiology and Public Health, University College London, London, UK

^hInstitute of Behavioral Sciences, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

Address correspondence to: Anne Kouvonen, PhD, School of Sociology, Social Policy & Social Work, Queen's University Belfast, 6 College Park, Belfast, BT7 1LP, UK. E-mail: a.kouvonen@qub.ac.uk; Tel: +44 28 9097 5371.

Word count: 3507 (text); 247 (abstract); number of tables: 2; number of figures: 0; number of references: 35

Keywords: workplace stress; job strain; effort-reward imbalance; physical activity; prospective cohort study

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To examine whether exposure to workplace stressors predicts changes in physical activity and the risk of insufficient physical activity.

Methods: Prospective data from the Finnish Public Sector Study. Repeated exposure to low job control, high job demands, low effort, low rewards, and compositions of them (job strain and effort-reward imbalance) were assessed at Time 1 (2000-02) and Time 2 (2004). Insufficient physical activity (<14 Metabolic-Equivalent-Task hours per week) was measured at Time 1 and Time 3 (2008). The effect of change in workplace stressors on change in physical activity was examined using fixed-effects (within-subject) logistic regression models ($N=6665$). In addition, logistic regression analysis was applied to examine the associations between repeated exposure to workplace stressors and insufficient physical activity ($N=13,976$). In these analyses, co-worker assessed workplace stressor scores were used in addition to individual level scores.

Results: The proportion of participants with insufficient physical activity was 24% at baseline and 26% at follow-up. Nineteen percent of the participants who were sufficiently active at baseline became insufficiently active at follow-up. In the fixed-effect analysis an increase in workplace stress was weakly related to an increase in physical inactivity within an individual. In between-subjects analysis, employees with repeated exposure to low job control and low rewards were more likely to be insufficiently active at follow-up than those with no reports of these stressors; fully adjusted odds ratios ranged from 1.11 (95%CI=1.00-1.24) to 1.21 (95% CI=1.05-1.39).

Conclusions: Workplace stress is associated with a slightly increased risk of physical inactivity.

Keywords: workplace stress; physical activity; prospective cohort study

INTRODUCTION

Insufficient physical activity is a widespread public health problem. Globally, around one third of adults are insufficiently active.[1] The current recommendation is that adults should take part in physical activities of moderate intensity for at least 30 minutes on at least five days a week or in vigorous-intensity aerobic physical activity for a minimum of 20 minutes on three days each week. Combinations of moderate- and vigorous-intensity activity can be performed to meet this recommendation.[2] However, many fail to achieve the recommended levels, and workplace stress may contribute to this. Stressful working conditions can result in fatigue and incomplete recovery. In addition, they may limit the individual's ability to make positive changes to their lifestyles,[3] and impede the implementation of exercise intentions.[4]

To date, evidence on the status of workplace stressors as a risk factor for insufficient physical activity is mixed, with some studies supporting this association,[4-11] while others reporting null findings.[12,13] Methodological limitations including the use of cross-sectional design in many studies, may have contributed to some of the inconsistencies in earlier studies. The assessment of workplace stress has typically been based on measurement at a single time point which may fail to capture the effects of change and longer-lasting exposure.[14] In addition, most studies have assessed job strain stressors only whereas research on the relationship between effort-reward imbalance and physical activity is scarce.

To overcome these limitations, we conducted a large-scale study in Finnish employees to investigate the association between change in workplace stressors and change in physical activity among those with a change in both the exposure and outcome across the 3 survey

1
2
3 phases. In addition, we examined whether repeated exposure to workplace stressors was
4
5 associated with an increased risk of insufficient physical activity.
6
7

8 9 **METHODS**

10 11 12 **Sample and design**

13
14
15 Data were obtained from the Finnish Public Sector Study, which is an on-going cohort study
16
17 of employees in the service of ten municipalities and 21 hospitals in Finland.[15] A total of
18
19 48,598 employees responded to the first survey in 2000-02 (Time 1) (response rate 68%). Of
20
21 these respondents 36,440 were alive and still employed by the target organisations at the time
22
23 of the second survey in 2004 (Time 2), and of them, 29,180 responded (response rate 80%).
24
25 At Time 3 (2008), 18,431 participants responded (response rate 87% among those who were
26
27 still employed by the target organisations and responded both at Time 1 and Time 2). The
28
29 employers' records were used to identify the eligible populations for surveys and the work
30
31 unit code for each employee. Using unique national ID numbers, the respondents were linked
32
33 to comprehensive national health registers from 1994 through 2005. To determine workplace
34
35 stressors, each participant's work unit at the lowest level of organisational hierarchy, such as a
36
37 kindergarten or a hospital ward, was identified from employers' records. The study was
38
39 approved by the Ethics Committee of the Finnish Institute of Occupational Health.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 Participants with missing information on any study variables ($N=3695$) were excluded. The
50
51 final sample with repeated measures of workplace stressors therefore included 13,976
52
53 participants. The final cohort did not substantially differ from those who had participated at
54
55 earlier phases but had left the organization or did not respond to the follow-up surveys
56
57 ($N=10,749$) in terms of mean age (44.0 years in the sample vs. 46.2 years in the excluded
58
59
60

1
2
3 population), the proportion of women (82% vs. 81%), and socio-economic status (SES) (16%
4
5 vs. 20% low).
6
7

8 9 **Measures**

10 11 12 13 14 Workplace stressors

15
16
17
18 Multiple workplace stressors based on two leading stress models, the job strain model (also
19 known as the demand-control model),[16] and the effort-reward imbalance (ERI) model,[17]
20 were measured. As previously,[18] workplace stressors were assessed in two ways: (a) using
21 each individual's own assessment, and (b) summing up the assessments of co-workers and
22 linking that score to each employee in the work unit. In other words, in addition to workplace
23 stressor scores based on self-report, every participant was linked to scores that were compiled
24 from all co-workers' responses in the same work unit but excluded the participant's own
25 response. Co-worker assessed scores were constructed to address potential reporting bias, i.e.
26 to eliminate artificial inflation of associations due to common methods to assess the exposure
27 and the outcome.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41
42
43 Assessment of job strain was based on the modified Job Content Questionnaire.[16] Three
44 questions addressed job demands, that is, having high workload and working at a high pace
45 and not having enough time to complete work tasks (Cronbach's alpha = 0.76). Job control
46 was assessed with nine questions about the worker's ability to use and develop skills and
47 exert decision authority (Cronbach's alpha = 0.82). The responses were given on a Likert
48 scale ranging from 1 = "very little" to 5 = "very much". To construct a job strain measure, the
49 means of job demand scores were subtracted from the means of job control scores.[19] As in
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 previous studies,[18,20] for both self-reported and co-worker assessed job control, demands
4
5 and strain, scores were further divided into tertiles for between-subjects analysis. Repeated
6
7 exposure to workplace stress over Time 1 and Time 2 was measured by adding together the
8
9 number of times (0, 1, or 2) the participant was in a low control, high demands, or a high
10
11 strain job, respectively. In within-subject analyses, job strain stressors were dichotomised
12
13 using the median split (high vs. low).
14
15

16
17
18 Effort was measured with the following item: "How much do you feel you invest in your job
19
20 in terms of skill and energy?" Rewards were assessed with a scale containing three questions
21
22 about feelings of getting in return from work in terms of income and job benefits, recognition
23
24 and prestige, and personal satisfaction (Cronbach's alpha = 0.64).[21] Response format for all
25
26 the questions was a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1="very little" to 5="very much". The
27
28 indicator of ERI was obtained by calculating the ratio between the response score in the effort
29
30 scale and the mean response score in the reward scale. The present measure of ERI has been
31
32 shown to be an independent measure of workplace stress and has been associated with health
33
34 and health behavioural outcomes in earlier cross-sectional studies.[11,21,22] As in previous
35
36 studies, the distributions of the individual and co-worker assessed effort, rewards, and ERI
37
38 scores were divided into tertiles for between-subjects analysis.[11,20] The accumulation of
39
40 exposure to low effort, low rewards, and high ERI over the two measurement points was
41
42 computed by adding together the number of times the participant was in the most
43
44 unfavourable tertile. In within-subject analyses, ERI stressors were dichotomised using the
45
46 median split (high vs. low).
47
48
49
50
51

52
53
54 Insufficient physical activity
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Participants reported the average amount of time spent per week on leisure and on the
4 journey to and from work in physical activity corresponding to the activity intensity of
5 walking, vigorous walking, jogging, and running. The time spent at each activity in hours per
6 week was multiplied by its typical energy expenditure, expressed in metabolic equivalent
7 tasks (METs). We used the following MET values (work metabolic rate divided by resting
8 metabolic rate): 4 (for exercise intensity corresponding to walking), 6 (vigorous walking to
9 jogging), 10 (jogging), and 13 (running) and express the activity MET index as the sum score
10 of MET-hours/week.[23] Moderate-intensity physical activity for about 30 minutes at least
11 five times a week is recommended by physical activity guidelines;[2] approximately 14 MET
12 hours per week correspond to the energy expenditure (1000 kcal, e.g. brisk walking for 2.5
13 hours/week equals 15 MET hours) needed for reducing health risks. Therefore the
14 respondents whose volume of activity was <14 MET-hours/week were classified as being
15 insufficiently active.[24] This cut-point was further used in the fixed effects analysis to assess
16 change in physical activity (i.e. from physically active to insufficiently active).
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 Covariates

38
39
40
41 Sex, age, employer type (municipality vs. hospital), and SES were obtained from employers'
42 records. SES was assessed using the occupational-title classification of Statistics Finland:
43 high (e.g. physicians, teachers), intermediate (e.g. technicians, registered nurses), and low
44 (e.g. cleaners, maintenance workers).[25] Marital status (married or cohabiting vs. other) was
45 obtained from the survey. Working hours were summed from the respondent's reports of their
46 (i) official working hours per day and (ii) mean hours of paid or unpaid overtime and their
47 mean hours in another job per day. The daily working hours were multiplied by 5 to obtain
48 the weekly hours in paid work and then dichotomised as less than 40 hours vs. 40 hours or
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 more per week. Standard questionnaires were used to assess heavy drinking (>210 g of
4 absolute alcohol per week vs. less), and smoking status (current smoker vs. non-smoker). The
5 respondents self-reported their weight and height. Body mass index (BMI) was calculated as
6 self-reported weight (kilograms) divided by self-reported height (meters) squared.
7
8
9

10
11
12
13
14 The presence of chronic physical illness was derived from the Drug Reimbursement Register
15 which contains information on persons entitled to special reimbursement for the treatment of
16 chronic conditions and diseases, and the date when the special reimbursement is granted.
17
18

19
20 Patients who apply for special reimbursement must submit a detailed medical statement
21 prepared by the treating physician confirming the diagnoses. All participants with
22 hypertension, cardiac failure, ischemic heart disease, diabetes, asthma or other chronic
23 obstructive lung disease, and rheumatoid arthritis at the end of the baseline survey year were
24 identified.[26] Data on cancer diagnosed during the baseline survey year or four preceding
25 years were obtained from the Finnish Cancer Registry.[27] The presence of any of these
26 illnesses was coded (yes/no). Sub-optimal self-rated health was assessed with the question
27 “In general, would you say your health is very good, good, fair, poor, or very poor?” (fair to
28 very poor indicated sub-optimal health).[28] The presence of common mental disorders was
29 assessed with the 12-item version of the General Health Questionnaire (scores ≥ 4 indicated
30 common mental disorder).[29] The selected covariates have been associated with physical
31 activity in earlier studies.[24,30]
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47

48 **Statistical analysis**

49
50
51
52 To analyse within-subject changes, the fixed-effects methods using conditional logistic
53 regression with time-discrete variables was applied to model the effect of change in
54 workplace stress on change in physical activity among those with a change in both the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 exposure and outcome across the 3 survey phases (N=6665). In relation to the exposure,
4
5 'change' refers to moving from the low-stress group to the high-stress group during the
6
7 follow-up; or from the high-stress group to the low-stress group. In a similar way, in relation
8
9 to the outcome, 'change' refers to moving from the insufficiently active group to the
10
11 sufficiently active group, or vice versa. In within-subjects analysis the aim is to examine
12
13 whether in repeated measurements the changes in the exposure and outcome variables of
14
15 interest are in the same direction. Fixed effects methods can be applied in cohort studies
16
17 using a case-control design, in which the individual is at the same time his/her own case and
18
19 control. This is possible with repeated measurements when the same individual is, for
20
21 example, insufficiently active (case) at one study phase and sufficiently active (control) at
22
23 another study phase. The research question is whether the individual reports high workplace
24
25 stress when he/she is a case compared to when he/she is a control. More specifically, this
26
27 analysis enabled us to examine whether physical activity decreases when workplace stress
28
29 increases. In the analysis of longitudinal data, the fixed-effects method offers the advantage
30
31 of controlling for stable characteristics of individuals, whether measured or not, by using
32
33 within-subject variation only to estimate the regression coefficients.[31] Because the case
34
35 and the control share all stable (e.g. sex, genes) and non-measured (e.g. personality)
36
37 characteristics, all examined exposures and covariates need to be time variant.
38
39
40
41
42
43

44 In addition, logistic regression analysis was applied to examine the associations between
45
46 repeated exposure to workplace stressors at Time 1 and Time 2 and insufficient physical
47
48 activity at Time 3. The results are presented as adjusted odds ratios (ORs) and their 95%
49
50 confidence intervals (CIs). The contribution of the covariates to the associations between
51
52 workplace stressors and insufficient physical activity was examined by including each of the
53
54 following sets of factors in turn: baseline insufficient physical activity, socio-demographics
55
56 (sex, age, SES, marital status, working hours, and employer type), and health status and
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 health behaviours (chronic illness, sub-optimal self-rated health, common mental disorders,
4
5 BMI, smoking and heavy drinking). Finally, the analysis was conducted with a simultaneous
6
7 adjustment for all these factors. To test the robustness of our findings and to further examine
8
9 the temporality between the variables, a sensitivity analysis excluding those participants who
10
11 were insufficiently active at baseline was run.
12
13

14
15
16 The analyses were conducted in the combined sample of men and women, and in all SES
17
18 groups together, since the sex and SES interactions were not significant (all $p > 0.05$ in the
19
20 final models).
21
22

23
24
25 SAS 9.2 program package was used for all analyses (SAS Institute Inc, Cary, North
26
27 Carolina).
28
29

30 31 32 **RESULTS** 33 34

35
36
37 The characteristics of the study cohort and the associations between the study variables at
38
39 baseline (Time 1) and insufficient physical activity at baseline (Time 1) and at follow-up
40
41 (Time 3) are displayed in Table 1. The majority (81%) of the participants were women and
42
43 53% represented intermediate SES group. Eighty-two percent were contracted to
44
45 municipalities. The proportion participants with insufficient physical activity was 24% at
46
47 baseline and 26% at follow-up. Nineteen percent of the participants who were sufficiently
48
49 active at baseline became insufficiently active at follow-up. Both at Time 1 and Time 3,
50
51 insufficient physical activity was more prevalent in men, increased with age, and was related
52
53 to low SES. Participants with chronic illness, common mental disorder, suboptimal self-rated
54
55 health, and current smokers reported significantly more often insufficient physical activity
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 both at Time 1 and Time 3 than their counterparts. Moreover, participants living without a
4
5 partner, municipal employees and heavy drinkers reported more insufficient physical activity
6
7 at Time 3. Mean BMI at baseline was higher in insufficiently active employees both at Time
8
9 1 and Time 3.
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

Confidential: For Review Only

Table 1 Baseline (Time 1) characteristics of the participants and the prevalence of insufficient physical activity (<14 MET hours/week) at baseline (Time 1) and follow-up (Time 3), the Finnish Public Sector Study, 2000-2008 (N=13,976)

Characteristic at Time 1	N (%)	Insufficiently active participants at Time 1 N (%)	<i>p</i> value ^a	Insufficiently active participants at Time 3 N (%)	<i>p</i> value ^a
Age			<.0001		<.0001
Mean (SD)	44.0 (7.2)	44.5 (7.1)		45.1 (7.1)	
Sex			.04		.0003
Women	11,352 (81)	2636 (23)		2844 (25)	
Men	2624 (19)	660 (25)		747 (28)	
Married or cohabiting			.4		.001
Yes	10,860 (78)	2578 (24)		2720 (25)	
No	3116 (22)	718 (23)		871 (28)	
Socio-economic status (SES)			<.0001		<.0001
High	4372 (31)	1001 (23)		969 (22)	
Intermediate	7343 (53)	1632 (22)		1839 (25)	
Low	2261 (16)	663 (29)		783 (35)	
Employer Municipality			0.6		<.0001
Municipality	11,436 (82)	2733 (24)		3046 (27)	

Hospital district	2540 (18)	563 (22)	545 (21)	
Self-rated health				<.0001
Very good or good	10,835 (78)	2211 (20)	2441 (23)	
Suboptimal	3141 (22)	1085 (35)	1150 (37)	
Chronic illness				<.0001
No	12,444 (89)	2849 (23)	3082 (25)	
Yes	1532 (11)	447 (29)	509 (33)	
Current smoking				<.0001
No	11,479 (82)	2540 (22)	2720 (24)	
Yes	2497 (18)	756 (30)	871 (35)	
Heavy drinking				.9
No	12,737 (91)	3002 (24)	3228 (25)	
Yes	1239 (9)	294 (24)	363 (29)	
Common mental disorder				<.0001
No	10,544 (75)	2376 (23)	2625 (25)	
Yes	3432 (25)	920 (27)	966 (28)	
Weekly working hours				.9
>40	9130 (65)	2155 (24)	2373 (26)	
40+	4846 (35)	1141 (24)	1218 (25)	
Insufficiently active at				N/A

Time 1				
No	10,680 (76)	N/A		1990 (19)
Yes	3296 (24)	N/A		1601 (49)
Body mass index, kg/m ²			<.0001	<.0001
Mean (SD)	25.0 (4.1)	26.1 (4.7)		26.3 (4.7)

MET, metabolic equivalent task; SD, standard deviation

- a. For heterogeneity from Chi-square test (percentages) or analysis of variance (means).

1
2
3 Table 2 presents the results from the within-individual analyses among the 6665 participants
4 who had a change in physical activity between the study phases. As the table shows, slightly
5 higher odds ratios of insufficient physical activity at Time 3 were observed among those who
6 had experienced an increase in workplace stress while these odds were lowered among those
7 who had experienced a decrease in workplace stress, measured as low job control, high strain
8 and low effort. These associations changed little after adjustment for self-rated health.
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 When workplace stressors were assessed by co-worker reports, higher odds ratios of
19 insufficient physical activity at Time 3 were observed among those whose co-workers
20 reported decrease in job control.
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

Table 2 Within-individual analyses of the effect of workplace stressors on insufficient physical activity. Odds ratios (95% confidence intervals) of insufficient physical activity by workplace stress derived from conditional logistic regression models among the participants who had a change in physical activity between the surveys, the Finnish Public Sector Study, 2000-2008

Workplace stressors	N^a	Odds Ratio (95% CI): unadjusted	Odds Ratio (95% CI): adjusted for self-rated health
<i>Job control</i>	6625		
High		1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Decreased (individual)		1.14 (1.04-1.24)	1.12 (1.03-1.22)
Decreased (co-worker assessed)		1.09 (1.00-1.19)	1.09 (1.00-1.18)
<i>Job demands</i>	6622		
Low		1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Increased (ind.)		1.08 (1.00-1.16)	1.06 (0.98-1.14)
Increased (co-w.)		1.03 (0.95-1.10)	1.02 (0.94-1.09)
<i>Job strain</i>	6616		
Low		1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)

Increased (ind.)		1.13 (1.05-1.22)	1.11 (1.03-1.20)
Increased (co-w.)		0.97 (0.90-1.05)	0.97 (0.89-1.04)
<i>Effort</i>	6602		
High		1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Decreased (ind.)		1.09 (1.01-1.18)	1.09 (1.01-1.18)
Decreased (co-w.)		0.97 (0.91-1.04)	0.98 (0.91-1.05)
<i>Rewards</i>	6431		
High		1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Decreased (ind.)		1.06 (0.98-1.14)	1.04 (0.96-1.12)
Decreased (co-w.)		1.01 (0.94-1.09)	1.01 (0.94-1.09)
<i>ERI</i>	6404		
Low		1.00 (reference)	1.00 (reference)
Increased (ind.)		1.05 (0.97-1.13)	1.04 (0.96-1.12)
Increased (co-w.)		0.99 (0.92-1.06)	0.98 (0.92-1.05)

ERI, effort-reward imbalance

^a*N* when using self-reported workplace stressors.

Note. *N* in adjusted models ranged from 6381 to 6598 depending on the number of missing values in the exposure and covariate variables. *N* in models using co-worker assessed workplace stressors ranged from 6385 to 6611.

1
2
3 Table 3 (Web Only) summarises the results from logistic regression analyses on the
4
5 associations between repeated exposure to job strain stressors at Time 1 and Time 2, assessed
6
7 by individuals and co-workers, and insufficient physical activity at Time 3. In unadjusted
8
9 model, the odds ratio for insufficient physical activity was 1.5-fold higher in employees with
10
11 repeated reports of low individual job control compared with their counterparts with no
12
13 reports of low job control. Adjustments led to attenuation in the odds ratio but the relationship
14
15 remained statistically significant (OR=1.18, 95% CI: 1.06-1.31; Model 5). The result was
16
17 replicated when repeated exposure to low job control was assessed using co-worker reports
18
19 (OR=1.11, 95%: 1.00-1.24; Model 5). Job strain and high job demands were not associated
20
21 with insufficient physical activity.
22
23
24
25
26

27
28 When those who were insufficiently active at baseline ($N=3296$) were excluded from the
29
30 analysis, the weak dose-response association between repeated exposure to low job control at
31
32 Time 1 and Time 2 and insufficient physical activity at Time 3 remained statistically
33
34 significant (OR=1.15; 95% CI: 1.01-1.31 in the final model, at the individual level; data not
35
36 shown).
37
38
39

40
41 The associations between repeated exposure to ERI stressors at Time 1 and Time 2 and
42
43 insufficient physical activity at Time 3 are presented in Table 4 (Web Only). After adjustment
44
45 for all covariates, those participants who reported repeated exposure to low rewards had a
46
47 slightly higher likelihood of insufficient physical activity compared to those participants who
48
49 did not report any low rewards at Times 1 and 2 (OR=1.14, 95% CI: 1.02-1.28; Model 5), and
50
51 the association was to the same direction when co-worker assessed scores were used.
52
53

54
55 Experiencing low effort at one time point was associated with an increased likelihood of
56
57 insufficient physical activity (OR=1.19, 95% CI: 1.06-1.34; Model 5) but this result was not
58
59
60

1
2
3 replicated when co-worker assessments were used. ERI was not associated with insufficient
4
5 physical activity.
6
7

8
9 The weak dose-response relationship between repeated exposure to low rewards at Time 1 and
10
11 Time 2 and subsequent insufficient physical activity at Time 3 remained after exclusion of
12
13 participants who were physically inactive at baseline (OR=1.21; 95% CI: 1.05-1.39 in the final
14
15 model, at the individual level; data not shown).
16
17
18
19

20 21 22 **DISCUSSION** 23 24

25
26
27
28 The present study investigated the relationship of repeated exposure to and a change in
29
30 workplace stressors, and insufficient physical activity in a large sample of Finnish public
31
32 sector employees. The results from the fixed-effect analyses suggest that an increase in
33
34 workplace stress is related only to a very slight increase in insufficient physical activity
35
36 within an individual. Moreover, the between-individual comparisons showed that repeated
37
38 exposure to low job control and low rewards were weakly associated with an elevated
39
40 likelihood of insufficient physical activity in a dose-response manner. c effects were obtained
41
42 using both individual and co-worker assessed scores, which supports the assumption that the
43
44 health behavioural consequences of workplace stress may not depend only on the perceptions
45
46 of an individual but also on external working conditions. However, again the effect sizes
47
48 were small.
49
50
51
52

53
54
55 Previous research on workplace stress and leisure-time insufficient physical activity
56
57 predominantly relates to the job strain model. Some earlier cross-sectional,[6,8] and
58
59
60

1
2
3 prospective[9] studies have demonstrated an association between low job control and low
4
5 physical activity.
6
7

8
9 We found evidence for a weak association between chronic exposure to low job control and
10
11 low rewards and the risk of insufficient physical activity. Lack of control at work may spill
12
13 over to leisure time and be connected to feelings of helplessness, which may make
14
15 participation in physical activities more challenging.[9] Furthermore, it has been suggested
16
17 that employees with low job control may have less time to plan opportunities or adjust their
18
19 leisure time for participating in physical activities.[9] Repeated exposure to low rewards may
20
21 be associated with insufficient physical activity potentially through its association with
22
23 fatigue. Low rewards have predicted fatigue in previous studies.[32]
24
25
26
27
28

29 **Study strengths and weaknesses**

30
31
32 To our best knowledge, this is the first large-scale study which examined the relationship
33
34 between repeated exposure to both job strain and ERI stressors in relation to insufficient
35
36 physical activity. A particular strength of this study is its longitudinal design where we can
37
38 employ analysis of change. Other merits of this study include simultaneous inclusion of a
39
40 number of covariates, non-response patterns that are unlikely sources for major selection bias,
41
42 and the operationalisation of insufficient physical activity corresponding to the contemporary
43
44 recommended guidelines of minimum level of physical activity for adults.[2]
45
46
47
48
49

50
51
52 Moreover, co-worker assessment was used to measure workplace stress. The advantage of
53
54 using co-worker assessment is that common method bias, which of particular concern when
55
56 both the independent and dependent variables are perceptual measures derived from the same
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 respondent, can largely be avoided. A further strength was the use of fixed-effects regression,
4
5 which examines the effect of change in workplace stressors to a change in physical activity
6
7 within an individual, a robust method to take into account all the observed and unobserved
8
9 variables that are constant over time, thereby controlling for potential omitted time-invariant
10
11 variables that could confound the associations.[31]
12

13
14
15
16 Nevertheless, some limitations need to be taken into account. First, physical activity was
17
18 measured by self-reports. This method is common practice in large-scale epidemiological
19
20 studies,[24] but is affected by reporting bias. Second, the use of co-worker assessed scores in
21
22 measuring workplace stress may reduce self-report bias, but at the same time it is insensitive
23
24 to true differences in workplace stressors between the employees within a work unit. Third,
25
26 even if prospective data were used it is not possible to fully exclude the possibility of reverse
27
28 causation, that is, if employees experience more workplace stress because of lack of physical
29
30 activity. Lastly, although the large size and diversity of the sample guarantees a certain
31
32 generalisation of the results, the present data were female-dominated and from the Finnish
33
34 public sector and cannot be assumed to represent the general population.
35
36
37
38
39

40 41 **CONCLUSIONS** 42 43 44 45

46 This large-scale prospective study shows that an increase in workplace stressors, such as low
47
48 control, high job strain and low effort, was weakly associated with an increase in insufficient
49
50 physical activity within an individual. In addition, we found a weak dose-response
51
52 association between repeated exposure to workplace stressors and the likelihood of
53
54 insufficient physical activity. Our findings provide one plausible mechanism mediating the
55
56 previously observed effects of workplace stressors on morbidity, such as depression[33] and
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 heart disease.[34] This study suggests that interventions to support physical activity among
4
5 stressed employees could prevent from some of the adverse health effects of chronic
6
7 workplace stress, but job stress intervention studies are needed to confirm this. The fact that
8
9 in the present study the effect sizes were small indicates that other factors such as physical
10
11 inactivity in childhood[35] may be more important predictors of insufficient physical activity
12
13 in working populations.
14
15

16 17 18 **COMPETING INTERESTS** 19

20
21
22
23
24 None declared.
25
26
27

28 **FUNDING** 29

30
31
32
33
34 The Finnish Public Sector Study is supported by the Academy of Finland (projects 124271,
35
36 124322, 129262, and 132944) and the participating organisations.
37
38
39

40 41 **WHAT THIS PAPER ADDS?** 42 43 44 45

- 46 • Many fail to achieve the recommended levels of physical activity, and workplace
47 stress may contribute to this
- 48 • However, the evidence on the status of workplace stress as a risk factor for physical
49 inactivity is mixed, and the assessment of workplace stress has typically been based
50 on a measurement at a single time point and/or an assessment of job strain stressors
51 only
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- Our study shows that an increase in workplace stressors was weakly related to an increase in insufficient physical activity in within-individual analysis
- Moreover, our study showed a weak dose-response association between chronic exposure to workplace stressors and the likelihood of insufficient physical activity
- Interventions to support physical activity among stressed employees might prevent from some of the adverse health effects of chronic workplace stress

Licence statement: The Corresponding Author has the right to grant on behalf of all authors and does grant on behalf of all authors, an exclusive licence (or non-exclusive for government employees) on a worldwide basis to the BMJ Publishing Group Ltd and its Licensees to permit this article (if accepted) to be published in Occupational and Environmental Medicine and any other BMJPGl products to exploit all subsidiary rights, as set out in our licence (<http://group.bmj.com/products/journals/instructions-for-authors/licence-forms>) and the Corresponding Author accepts and understands that any supply made under these terms is made by BMJPGl to the Corresponding Author.

REFERENCES

1. World Health Organization. Physical inactivity. A global public health problem. http://www.who.int/dietphysicalactivity/factsheet_inactivity/en/index.html (accessed 24 October 2011).
2. Haskell WL, Lee IM, Pate RR, et al. Physical activity and public health: updated recommendation for adults from the American College of Sports Medicine and the American Heart Association. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2007;**39**:1423-34.
3. Noblet A, Lamontagne AD. The role of workplace health promotion in addressing job stress. *Health Promot Int* 2006;**21**:346-53.
4. Payne N, Jones F, Harris P. The impact of working life on health behaviour: the effect of job strain on the cognitive predictors of exercise. *J Occup Health Psychol* 2002;**7**:342-53.
5. Bennett GG, Wolin KY, Avrunin JS, et al. Does race/ethnicity moderate the association between job strain and leisure time physical activity? *Ann Behav Med* 2006;**32**:60-7.
6. Kouvonen A, Kivimäki M, Elovainio M, et al. Job strain and leisure-time physical activity in female and male public sector employees. *Prev Med* 2005;**41**:532-9.
7. Johansson G, Johnson JV, Hall EM. Smoking and sedentary behaviour as related to work organization. *Soc Sci Med* 1991;**32**:837-46.

- 1
2
3 8. Choi B, Schnall PL, Yang H, et al. Psychosocial working conditions and active leisure-time
4 physical activity in middle-aged US workers. *Int J Occup Med Environ Health* 2010;**23**:239-
5 53.
6
7
8
9
10
11 9. Smith P, Frank J, Bondy S, et al. Do changes in job control predict differences in health
12 status? Results from a longitudinal national survey of Canadians. *Psychosom Med*
13 2008;**70**:85-91.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 10. Yang X, Telama R, Hirvensalo M, et al. The benefits of sustained leisure-time physical
22 activity on job strain. *Occup Med (Lond)* 2010;**60**:369-75.
23
24
25
26
27
28 11. Kouvonen A, Kivimäki M, Elovainio M, et al. Effort/reward imbalance and sedentary
29 lifestyle: an observational study in a large occupational cohort. *Occup Environ Med*
30 2006;**63**:422-7.
31
32
33
34
35
36
37 12. Lallukka T, Sarlio-Lähteenkorva S, Roos E, et al. Working conditions and health
38 behaviours among employed women and men: the Helsinki Health Study. *Prev Med*
39 2004;**38**:48-56.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46 13. van Loon AJM, Tijhuis M, Surtees PG, et al. Lifestyle risk factors for cancer: The
47 relationship with psychosocial work environment. *Int J Epidemiol* 2000;**29**:785-92.
48
49
50
51
52 14. Gimeno D, Elovainio M, Jokela M, et al. Association between passive jobs and low levels
53 of leisure-time physical activity: the Whitehall II cohort study. *Occup Environ Med*
54 2009;**66**:772-6.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 15. Kivimäki M, Hamer M, Batty GD, et al. Antidepressant medication use, weight gain, and
6 risk of type 2 diabetes: a population-based study. *Diabetes Care* 2010;**33**:2611-6.
7

8
9
10
11 16. Karasek RA, Brisson C, Kawakami N, et al. The job content questionnaire (JCQ): an
12 instrument for internationally comparative assessments of psychological job characteristics. *J*
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
Occup Health Psychol 1998;**3**:322-55.

17. Siegrist J. Adverse health effects of high effort/low reward conditions. *J Occup Health*
Psychol 1996;**1**:27-41.

18. Virtanen M, Vahtera J, Pentti J, et al. Job strain and psychologic distress influence on
sickness absence among Finnish employees. *Am J Prev Med* 2007;**33**:182-7.

19. Landsbergis PA, Schnall PL, Warren K, et al. Association between ambulatory blood
pressure and alternative formulations of job strain. *Scand J Work Environ Health*
1994;**20**:349-63.

20. Kobayashi Y, Hirose T, Tada Y, et al. Relationship between two job stress models and
coronary risk factors among Japanese part-time female employees of a retail company. *J*
Occup Health 2005;**47**:
201-10.

- 1
2
3 21. Kivimäki M, Vahtera J, Elovainio M, et al. Effort-reward imbalance, procedural injustice
4 and relational injustice as psychosocial predictors of health: complementary or redundant
5 models? *Occup Environ Med* 2007;**64**:659-65.
6
7
8
9
10
11 22. Kouvonen A, Kivimäki M, Virtanen M, et al. Effort-reward imbalance at work and the
12 co-occurrence of lifestyle risk factors: cross-sectional survey in a sample of 36,127 public
13 sector employees. *BMC Public Health* 2006;**6**:24.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21 23. Kujala UM, Kaprio J, Sarna S, et al. Relationship of leisure-time physical activity and
22 mortality: the Finnish twin cohort. *JAMA* 1998;**279**:440-4.
23
24
25
26
27
28 24. Seiluri T, Lahti J, Rahkonen O, et al. Changes in occupational class differences in leisure-
29 time physical activity: a follow-up study. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2011;**8**:14.
30
31
32
33
34
35 25. Statistics Finland. Classification of occupations. Helsinki, Finland: Statistics Finland
36 1987.
37
38
39
40
41 26. Sjösten N, Vahtera J, Salo P, et al. Increased risk of lost workdays prior to the diagnosis of
42 sleep apnea. *Chest* 2009;**136**:130-6.
43
44
45
46
47
48 27. Teppo L, Pukkala E, Lehtonen M. Data quality and quality control of a population-based
49 cancer registry. Experience in Finland. *Acta Oncol* 1994;**33**:365-9.
50
51
52
53
54
55 28. Idler EL, Benyamini Y. Self-rated health and mortality: a review of twenty-seven
56 community studies. *J Health Soc Behav* 1997;**38**:21-37.
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5 29. Goldberg D, Williams P. A user's guide to the General Health Questionnaire. Windsor,
6
7 UK: NFER-Nelson 1988.
8
9
10
11 30. Trost, SG, Owen N, Bauman AE, et al. Correlates of adults' participation in physical
12 activity: review and update. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2002;**34**:1996-2001.
13
14
15
16
17 31. Allison PD. Fixed Effects Regression Methods in SAS. SUGI 31 Proceedings
18 San Francisco, California March 26-29, 2006. [http://www2.sas.com/proceedings/sugi31/184-](http://www2.sas.com/proceedings/sugi31/184-31.pdf)
19 31.pdf (accessed 14 December 2011).
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27 32. Sembajwe G, Wahrendorf M, Siegrist J, et al. Effects of job strain on fatigue: cross-
28 sectional and prospective views of the job content questionnaire and effort-reward imbalance
29 in the GAZEL cohort. *Occup Environ Med* 2012;**69**:377-84.
30
31
32
33
34
35 33. Netterstrøm B, Conrad N, Bech P, et al. The relation between work-related psychosocial
36 factors and the development of depression. *Epidemiol Rev* 2008;**30**:118-32.
37
38
39
40
41
42 34. Kivimäki M, Virtanen M, Elovainio M, et al. Work stress in the etiology of coronary heart
43 disease--a meta-analysis. *Scand J Work Environ Health* 2006;**32**:431-42.
44
45
46
47
48 35. Telama R, Yang X, Viikari J, et al. Physical activity from childhood to adulthood: a 21-
49 year tracking study. *Am J Prev Med* 2005;**28**:267-73.
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Table 3 (Web Only) Associations between repeated exposure to individual and work unit level job strain stressors over two phases (Time 1 and Time 2) and insufficient physical activity (<14 MET hours/week) at follow-up (Time 3) ($N=13,976$), the Finnish Public Sector Study, 2000-2008

		Odds Ratio (95% CI), Adjusted for—					
		N/cases	Unadjusted model (Model 1)	Baseline insufficient physical activity (Model 2)	Socio- demographics (Model 3)	Health status and health behaviours (Model 4)	All (Model 5)
<i>Individual</i>							
Low job control							
	None	7656/1778	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	1 phase	2996/777	1.16 (1.05-1.28)	1.12 (1.01-1.24)	1.06 (0.96-1.18)	1.08 (0.97-1.19)	1.01 (0.90-1.12)
	2 phases	3324/1036	1.50 (1.37-1.64)	1.43 (1.30-1.57)	1.26 (1.14-1.39)	1.33 (1.21-1.46)	1.18 (1.06-1.31)
High job demands							
	None	6979/1805	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

1 phase	3854/1000	1.00 (0.92-1.10)	0.99 (0.90-1.08)	1.06 (0.97-1.16)	0.99 (0.91-1.09)	1.01 (0.92-1.12)
2 phases	3143/786	0.96 (0.87-1.05)	0.92 (0.83-1.02)	1.03 (0.93- 1.14)	0.89 (0.80-0.98)	0.92 (0.83-1.03)
High job strain						
None	7553/1813	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
1 phase	3764/1002	1.15 (1.05-1.26)	1.12 (1.02-1.23)	1.13 (1.03-1.24)	1.11 (1.01-1.21)	1.09 (0.99-1.20)
2 phases	2659/776	1.31 (1.18-1.44)	1.24 (1.12-1.37)	1.23 (1.11-1.36)	1.17 (1.05-1.29)	1.11 (0.99-1.24)
<i>Co-worker assessed</i>						
Low job control						
None	7929/1848	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
1 phase	2466/666	1.22 (1.10-1.35)	1.23 (1.10-1.36)	1.11 (1.00-1.23)	1.12 (1.01-1.25)	1.09 (0.97-1.21)
2 phases	3432/1041	1.43 (1.31-1.57)	1.40 (1.28-1.54)	1.15 (1.04-1.27)	1.26 (1.15-1.38)	1.11 (1.00-1.24)
High job demands						
None	7821/2057	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00

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

1 phase	3752/938	0.93 (0.85-1.02)	0.92 (0.84-1.01)	1.01 (0.92-1.11)	0.98 (0.90-1.08)	1.00 (0.91-1.10)
2 phases	2255/561	0.93 (0.83-1.03)	0.90 (0.81-1.01)	1.05 (0.93-1.17)	1.00 (0.89-1.11)	1.03 (0.91-1.16)
High job strain						
None	8004/1989	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
1 phase	3292/868	1.08 (0.99-1.19)	1.08 (0.98-1.19)	1.06 (0.96-1.16)	1.08 (0.98-1.18)	1.06 (0.96-1.17)
2 phases	2531/698	1.15 (1.04-1.27)	1.13 (1.01-1.25)	1.09 (0.98-1.22)	1.13 (1.02-1.26)	1.07 (0.96-1.20)

MET, metabolic equivalent task

Socio-demographics include sex, age, marital status, socio-economic status, employer type and weekly working hours; health status includes self-rated health, chronic illness, common mental disorders, and body mass index; health behaviours include smoking and heavy drinking.

Note. N=13,827 in models using co-worker assessment.

Table 4 (Web Only) Associations between repeated exposure to individual and work unit level effort-reward imbalance (ERI) stressors over two phases (Time 1 and Time 2) and insufficient physical activity (<14 MET hours/week) at follow-up (Time 3) ($N=13,976$), the Finnish Public Sector Study, 2000-2008

		Odds Ratio (95% CI), Adjusted for—					
		<i>N</i> (cases)	Unadjusted model (Model 1)	Baseline insufficient physical activity (Model 2)	Socio- demographics (Model 3)	Health status and health behaviours (Model 4)	All (Model 5)
<i>Individual</i>							
Low effort							
	None	11455/2837	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
	1 phase	1877/564	1.31 (1.17-1.45)	1.26 (1.13-1.42)	1.24 (1.11-1.39)	1.24 (1.11-1.39)	1.19 (1.06-1.34)
	2 phases	644/190	1.27 (1.07-1.51)	1.17 (0.97-1.41)	1.18 (0.99-1.42)	1.19 (1.00-1.43)	1.09 (0.90-1.32)
Low rewards							

None	8253/2000	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
1 phase	3511/901	1.08 (0.99-1.18)	1.06 (0.96-1.16)	1.03 (0.93-1.13)	1.02 (0.93-1.12)	0.98 (0.89-1.08)
2 phases	2212/690	1.42 (1.28-1.57)	1.33 (1.20-1.49)	1.28 (1.15-1.42)	1.24 (1.11-1.38)	1.14 (1.02-1.28)
High ERI						
None	6701/1662	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
1 phase	4429/1142	1.05 (0.97-1.15)	1.04 (0.95-1.14)	1.02 (0.93-1.11)	1.01 (0.92-1.10)	0.98 (0.90-1.08)
2 phases	2846/787	1.16 (1.05-1.28)	1.13 (1.02-1.25)	1.10 (0.99-1.21)	1.04 (0.93-1.15)	1.00 (0.90-1.12)
<i>Co-worker assessed</i>						
Low effort						
None	7387/1830	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
1 phase	3781/950	1.02 (0.93-1.12)	1.00 (0.91-1.10)	1.01 (0.92-1.11)	0.98 (0.89-1.07)	0.97 (0.88-1.07)
2 phases	2689/776	1.25 (1.13-1.38)	1.22 (1.10-1.35)	1.08 (0.97-1.21)	1.11 (1.00-1.22)	1.04 (0.93-1.17)
Low rewards						

None	7026/1665	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
1 phase	4086/1072	1.15 (1.05-1.25)	1.14 (1.04-1.25)	1.06 (0.97-1.16)	1.09 (1.00-1.20)	1.05 (0.95-1.16)
2 phases	2714/819	1.39 (1.26-1.54)	1.38 (1.24-1.52)	1.13 (1.01-1.25)	1.20 (1.08-1.33)	1.09 (0.97-1.22)
High ERI						
None	6866/1667	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
1 phase	4447/1179	1.13 (1.03-1.23)	1.12 (1.02-1.23)	1.04 (0.95-1.14)	1.09 (1.00-1.19)	1.04 (0.95-1.15)
2 phases	2513/710	1.23 (1.11-1.36)	1.20 (1.08-1.34)	1.05 (0.94-1.17)	1.12 (1.01-1.25)	1.01 (0.90-1.14)

MET, metabolic equivalent task

Socio-demographics include sex, age, marital status, socio-economic status, employer type, and weekly working hours; health status includes self-rated health, chronic illness, common mental disorders, and body mass index; health behaviours include smoking and heavy drinking.

Note. $N=13,286$ in models using co-worker assessment.