

The Contribution of Work Engagement to Self-Perceived Health, Work Ability, and Sickness Absence Beyond Health Behaviors and Work-Related Factors

Anne Rongen, MSc, Suzan J. W. Robroek, PhD, Wilmar Schaufeli, PhD, and Alex Burdorf, PhD

Objective: To investigate whether work engagement influences self-perceived health, work ability, and sickness absence beyond health behaviors and work-related characteristics. **Methods:** Employees of two organizations participated in a 6-month longitudinal study ($n = 733$). Using questionnaires, information was collected on health behaviors, work-related characteristics, and work engagement at baseline, and self-perceived health, work ability, and sickness absence at 6-month follow-up. Associations between baseline and follow-up variables were studied using multivariate and multinomial logistic regression analyses and changes in R^2 were calculated. **Results:** Low work engagement was related with low work ability (odds ratio: 3.68; 95% confidence interval: 2.15 to 6.30) and long-term sickness absence (odds ratio: 1.84; 95% confidence interval: 1.04 to 3.27). Work engagement increased the explained variance in work ability and sickness absence with 4.1% and 0.5%, respectively. **Conclusions:** Work engagement contributes to work ability beyond known health behaviors and work-related characteristics.

The rapidly aging workforce forces employers and policymakers to think about how to keep the workforce healthy and productive. Several studies indicate that unhealthy behaviors and unfavorable work-related characteristics affect sustainable employability. In research, sustainable employability is often operationalized by measuring health status, work ability—defined as the balance between employees' resources and work demands,¹ sickness absence, and premature exit from the labor force. These studies revealed that obese employees, those with insufficient vigorous physical activity, and smokers are at increased risk of ill health, poor or moderate work ability, and sickness absence.^{2–8} Furthermore, high work demands, low skill discretion, low decision authority, and physically demanding jobs seem to be associated with ill health, a decreased work ability, sickness absence, and a higher risk of premature labor force exit.^{2,3,6,9–13}

Work engagement, defined as “a positive, fulfilling work-related state of mind that is characterized by vigor, dedication, and absorption,” has emerged in the field of occupational psychology as a potentially important independent risk factor for ill health and a low work ability.^{14–16} Engaged employees have “high levels of energy, are enthusiastic about their work and are often fully immersed in their job so that time flies.”^{17(p.188)} These employees are also more likely to experience their working conditions positively, to have a higher work productivity, and to have less sickness absence.^{18–22}

From the Department of Public Health (Miss Rongen and Drs Robroek and Burdorf), Erasmus MC, Rotterdam; and Department of Psychology (Drs Schaufeli), University of Utrecht, the Netherlands.

This study was supported by a grant from the Netherlands Organization for Health Research and Development (ZonMw project number 208010002).

The authors declare no competing interests.

Supplemental digital contents are available for this article. Direct URL citation appears in the printed text and is provided in the HTML and PDF versions of this article on the journal's Web site (www.joem.org).

Address correspondence to: Suzan J. W. Robroek, PhD, Department of Public Health, Erasmus MC, PO Box 2040, 3000 CA, Rotterdam, the Netherlands (s.robroek@erasmusmc.nl).

Copyright © 2014 by American College of Occupational and Environmental Medicine

DOI: 10.1097/JOM.0000000000000196

Research on how work engagement influences sustainable employability is scarce, and evidence on the explanatory contribution of work engagement for sustainable employability beyond health behaviors and work-related characteristics is lacking.^{14,23} This insight may increase our knowledge on how to maintain a healthy and productive workforce. This study aimed at investigating (1) the influence of work engagement, health behaviors, and work-related characteristics on self-perceived health status, work ability, and sickness absence, and (2) whether work engagement contributes to explaining self-perceived health status, work ability, and sickness absence beyond employees' health behaviors and work-related characteristics.

METHODS

Study Population

The population of this longitudinal study consisted of employees of a plastics manufacturer (organization 1, $n = 874$) and a paint manufacturer (organization 2, $n = 1281$).

Between 2010 and 2012, all employees were invited by e-mail to fill in the following two online questionnaires: a baseline questionnaire and a follow-up questionnaire 6 months later. For this study, we included all employees who completed both the baseline and follow-up questionnaires.

Of the 2155 employees invited, 1128 (52%) completed the baseline questionnaire. Of this group, 761 (68%) also completed the follow-up questionnaire after 6 months, and 748 employees (98%) provided informed consent. Four employees were excluded because of implausible or missing data on height, weight, or physical activity, and 11 employees because they missed information on self-perceived health at follow-up. The final study sample comprised 733 employees (organization 1, $n = 268$; organization 2, $n = 465$).

Informed consent was requested at the start of the questionnaire. The Medical Ethical Committee of the University declared that the Medical Research Involving Human Subjects Act did not apply to this study, and that the committee had no objection to the execution of this study.

Data Collection

Health behaviors, work-related characteristics, and work engagement were assessed at baseline. Self-perceived health, work ability, and sickness absence were questioned at 6-month follow-up.

Self-Perceived Health

At 6-month follow-up, self-perceived health was measured using the first question of the Short Form-12 (SF-12) questionnaire (“Overall, how would you rate your health during the past 4 weeks?”). The five possible answers were dichotomized into “poor or fair” and “good, very good or excellent.”²⁴

Work Ability

Work ability assesses the self-perceived capability to fulfill the mental and physical demands of the job and was measured at 6-month follow-up using the short version of the Work Ability Index (WAI). The WAI consists of nine questions and seven dimensions (general work ability, work ability in relation to physical and mental demands,

diagnosed diseases, impairment due to illness, sickness absence, prognoses of work ability, and psychological resources). The WAI is derived as the sum of the rating on these seven dimensions. The range of the summative index is 7 to 49 and categorizes work ability into poor (7 to 27), moderate (28 to 36), good (37 to 43), and excellent (44 to 49). A decreased work ability was defined as a WAI score lower than 37 (poor and moderate).¹

Sickness Absence

At 6-month follow-up, sickness absence was determined using the fifth dimension of the WAI (“How many whole days have you been off work because of a health problem [disease, health care, or for examination] during the past year?”). Employees were asked to indicate this on a five-point ordinal scale. Sickness absence was classified into the following three categories: no sickness absence, short-term sickness absence (1 to 9 days), and long-term sickness absence (10 or more days).¹

Work Engagement

Work engagement was measured using the nine-item Utrecht Work Engagement Scale (Cronbach $\alpha = 0.94$) and comprised the following three dimensions: vigor, absorption, and dedication. Each dimension was assessed using three statements (Cronbach $\alpha = 0.89, 0.87, \text{ and } 0.95$, respectively).¹⁶ Per statement, an employee had to rate the degree to which one had ever felt the feeling stated. The possible answers ranged on a six-point scale from *never* to *always*. Sum scores were calculated for work engagement and the three dimensions separately. The lowest quartile was defined as a low work engagement, low vigor, low absorption, and low dedication.

Psychosocial Work-Related Characteristics

Using an abbreviated version of a validated Dutch questionnaire about psychosocial job demands and job stress on the basis of the Job-Demand-Control model of the Karasek, the following three psychosocial work-related characteristics were measured: decision authority (five items, Cronbach $\alpha = 0.83$), skill discretion (three items, Cronbach $\alpha = 0.75$), and work demands (five items, Cronbach $\alpha = 0.83$).^{25,26} Questions on decision authority were related to influence on planning of tasks and work pace. Skill discretion related to creativity, varied work, and required skills and abilities. Work demands related to excessive work and insufficient time to complete the work. All questions were answered on a four-point scale (“never,” “sometimes,” “often,” and “always”). A standardized sum score was calculated for each characteristic separately, and the adverse quartile was defined as an unfavorable work-related characteristic.

Physical Work-Related Characteristics

Physical work-related characteristics concerned the regular presence of working in awkward postures and lifting heavy loads (more than 25 kg). The four possible answers were dichotomized into “seldom or never, now and then” and “quite a lot, a lot” with the latter classified as high exposure.²⁷

Health Behaviors

Body mass index (BMI = weight/height²) was calculated on the basis of self-reported height in meters and weight in kilograms and categorized into normal weight (BMI < 25 kg/m²), overweight (25 ≤ BMI < 30 kg/m²), and obesity (BMI ≥ 30 kg/m²).

Fruit and vegetable intake was measured using a slightly adapted version of the Dutch Food Frequency Questionnaire.²⁸ The six-item questionnaire asked about the monthly intake of different fruits (four items: tangerines, citrus fruits, other fruit, fruit juice) and vegetables (two items: raw and cooked vegetables). Dichotomization was based on the Dutch guidelines for healthy nutrition, which states that one needs to consume 200 g of fruits and 200 g of vegetables

daily. Employees who ate at least 400 g fruits and vegetables per day were considered those meeting the guidelines.

Physical activity was measured by first asking employees about the number of days a week they participated in sports and, second, how many minutes on average were spent on sports per occasion. Someone participated sufficiently in sports when he or she participated in sports for at least 20 minutes on at least three occasions per week.

Smoking was assessed using a single-item question, “Do you smoke?” The possible answers were as follows: “yes,” “now and then,” and “no.” Employees answering the question with “yes” or “now and then” were defined as being a “current smoker.”

Individual Characteristics

The following individual characteristics were assessed: age, sex, and educational level. Age was categorized into three age groups: 18 to 39 years, 40 to 49 years, and 50 to 65 years. Educational level was determined by asking the employees about their highest level of education, which was then categorized into the following three categories: low (primary school, lower and intermediate secondary schooling, or lower-vocational training), intermediate (higher secondary schooling or intermediate-vocational schooling), and high (higher-vocational training or university).

Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were used to report on the characteristics of the study population. The Spearman rank coefficient was used for studying the correlations between the measured variables. Factors associated with loss to follow-up were studied using logistic regression analysis.

Logistic regression analyses, adjusted for age, sex, educational level, and organization, were used to study associations between the independent variables health behavior, work-related characteristics, and work engagement and self-perceived health and work ability. Multinomial logistic regression analyses, adjusted for age, sex, educational level, and organization, were used to examine the associations between the independent variables and short- and long-term sickness absence. Thereafter, all health behaviors and work-related characteristics associated with the outcome measure at $P < 0.20$ were entered into one model simultaneously (ie, enter method), while also controlling for potential confounders (ie, age, sex, educational level, and organization). In addition, the latter analysis was repeated, now also work engagement was included as an independent variable. The change in the Nagelkerke R^2 was calculated to assess the contribution of work engagement besides health behaviors and work-related characteristics to the explained variance in outcome measures. The chi-square tests on the goodness-of-fit were performed to examine whether the contribution of work engagement statistically significantly improved the models.

The odds ratio (OR) was estimated as measure of association with a corresponding 95% confidence interval (95% CI). All analyses were carried out using the IBM SPSS Statistics version 20 for Windows (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL).

RESULTS

Description of the Study Population

The study population consisted of 733 employees with a mean age of 45.0 (SD = 9.2) years and a mean work ability of 42.2 (SD = 4.2). Further details are presented in Table 1.

The psychosocial work-related characteristics “decision authority” and “skill discretion” were moderately correlated with each other (Spearman $\rho = 0.34$), and both were also moderately correlated with work engagement (Spearman $\rho = 0.31$ and 0.45, respectively). Furthermore, there was a moderate correlation between work ability and self-perceived health (Spearman

TABLE 1. The Characteristics of the Study Population (*n* = 733)

	<i>n</i> (%)
Baseline	
Individual characteristics	
Age, yrs	
18–39	209 (28.5)
40–49	269 (36.7)
50–65	255 (34.8)
Male	542 (73.9)
Educational level	
Low	145 (19.8)
Intermediate	201 (27.4)
High	387 (52.8)
Health behaviors	
Body mass index	
Normal weight (BMI < 25 kg/m ²)	350 (47.7)
Overweight (BMI = 25–30 kg/m ²)	298 (40.7)
Obese (BMI = 30 kg/m ² and higher)	85 (11.6)
Insufficient sports participation (less than 3 days a week for 20 min)	563 (76.8)
Insufficient fruit and vegetable intake (less than 400 g a day)	485 (66.2)
Current smoker	138 (18.8)
Work-related characteristics	
High work demands	189 (25.8)
Low decision authority	210 (28.6)
Low skill discretion	159 (21.7)
Awkward postures	39 (5.3)
Lifting heavy loads (>25 kg)	26 (3.5)
Work engagement	
Low work engagement	186 (25.4)
6-mo follow-up	
Health	
Less than good self-perceived health	42 (5.7)
Work ability	
Less than good work ability	65 (8.9)
Sickness absence	
1–9 days	320 (43.7)
10 or more days	67 (9.1)

BMI, body mass index.

$\rho = 0.46$) (see Supplemental Digital Content Appendix 1, available at <http://links.lww.com/JOM/A161>).

The percentage of employees aged 50 years or older was higher in the group who completed both questionnaires than in the group who only completed the baseline questionnaire (34% vs 26%), but sex and educational level distribution were similar. Employees lost to follow-up did not differ from those completing both questionnaires with regard to their work engagement, health behaviors, and psychosocial work-related characteristics at baseline. Nevertheless, the percentage of employees reporting unfavorable physical work-related characteristics was higher among the employees lost to follow-up (lifting heavy loads: 6% vs 3%; awkward postures: 9% vs 5%) (data not shown).

Health Behaviors and Work-Related Characteristics

Insufficient sports participation was statistically significantly related with a less than good self-perceived health (OR: 4.30; 95%

CI: 1.31 to 14.14), a less than good work ability (OR: 2.50; 95% CI: 1.15 to 5.44), and long-term sickness absence (OR: 2.59; 95% CI: 1.13 to 5.93) at 6-month follow-up. Obesity was statistically significantly related with long-term sickness absence (OR: 2.44; 95% CI: 1.12 to 5.35) at 6-month follow-up. All other health behaviors showed no relations with the outcome measures. Work-related characteristics were only related with work ability. High work demands (OR: 2.23; 95% CI: 1.24 to 3.99) and low skill discretion (OR: 2.19; 95% CI: 1.23 to 3.90) statistically significantly predicted a less than good work ability at 6-month follow-up (Table 2).

Work Engagement

A low level of work engagement statistically significantly predicted a less than good work ability (OR: 3.68; 95% CI: 2.15 to 6.30) and long-term sickness absence (OR: 1.84; 95% CI: 1.04 to 3.27) at 6-month follow-up (Table 2). Concerning the three dimensions of work engagement, only low vigor was statistically significantly related with all three outcome measures—less than good self-perceived health (OR: 2.66; 95% CI: 1.40 to 5.05), less than good work ability (OR: 4.84; 95% CI: 2.78 to 8.43), and short-term sickness absence (OR: 1.58; 95% CI: 1.12 to 2.25). Scoring unfavorably on absorption (OR: 2.33; 95% CI: 1.37 to 3.97) or dedication (OR: 3.05; 95% CI: 1.79 to 5.21) was only statistically significantly related with a less than good work ability at 6-month follow-up (see Supplemental Digital Content Appendix 2, available at <http://links.lww.com/JOM/A161>).

When employees' health behavior and work-related characteristics were taken into account, work engagement was still statistically significantly related with work ability (OR: 3.51; 95% CI: 1.85 to 6.68) but not with self-perceived health (OR: 1.70; 95% CI: 0.87 to 3.31) and sickness absence (short-term: OR: 1.26; 95% CI: 0.83 to 1.91 and long-term: OR: 1.76; 95% CI: 0.89 to 3.46) at 6-month follow-up. The explained variance after including also work engagement increased by 0.8% (7.0% to 7.8%) for self-perceived health, 4.1% (16.5% to 20.6%) for work ability, and 0.5% (10.2% to 10.7%) for sickness absence. The relative improvement of the models was 11% for self-perceived health, 25% for work ability, and 5% for sickness absence. Adding work engagement to the models improved the overall goodness-of-fit statistically significant of the models for work ability ($P < 0.001$) and sickness absence ($P < 0.001$) but not for self-perceived health ($P = 0.13$).

DISCUSSION

Self-perceived health and sickness absence were most strongly predicted by health behaviors, whereas work ability was mostly predicted by work-related characteristics. Work engagement was related to work ability and long-term sickness absence. Taking into account employees' work engagement besides health behaviors and work-related characteristics improved the explained variance in work ability at 6-month follow-up.

Influence of Health Behaviors and Work-Related Characteristics

Employees insufficiently engaging in sports were over four times more likely to report a poor to moderate health status at 6-month follow-up. Previous cross-sectional studies also reported the importance of this health behavior for maintaining a good health status.^{4,11,29} In this study, none of the work-related characteristics influenced employees' perception of their health status, in contrast to previous studies that found associations between high job demands and low job control, and ill health.^{11,29,30} Nevertheless, when a distinction was made between mental and physical health status, unfavorable work-related characteristics were only associated with employees' mental health status.⁴ In this study, only a limited number of employees (*n* = 42) reported a less than good self-perceived health, which might have led to finding no significant associations.

TABLE 2. Adjusted Association Between Health Behaviors, Work-Related Characteristics, and Work Engagement and Self-Perceived Health, Work Ability, and Sickness Absence at 6-Month Follow-Up Among Employees (*n* = 733)*

	Less Than Good Self-Perceived Health (<i>n</i> = 42)	Less Than Good Work Ability (<i>n</i> = 65)	1–9 Sickness Absence Days (<i>n</i> = 320)	10 or More Sickness Absence Days (<i>n</i> = 67)
Health behaviors				
Body mass index				
Normal weight	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Overweight	1.25 (0.59–2.63)	0.93 (0.51–1.70)	0.96 (0.68–1.35)	1.83 (0.97–3.45)†
Obese	2.41 (0.99–5.84)†	1.12 (0.51–2.46)	0.60 (0.34–1.04)†	2.44 (1.12–5.35)‡
Insufficient sports participation	4.30 (1.31–14.14)‡	2.50 (1.15–5.44)‡	0.83 (0.58–1.19)	2.59 (1.13–5.93)‡
Insufficient fruit and vegetable intake	0.90 (0.46–1.73)	0.95 (0.54–1.65)	0.73 (0.52–1.01)†	0.79 (0.45–1.39)
Current smoker	1.29 (0.62–2.71)	0.89 (0.47–1.70)	1.17 (0.78–1.76)	0.92 (0.46–1.85)
Work-related characteristics				
High work demands	1.44 (0.71–2.95)	2.23 (1.24–3.99)‡	1.00 (0.70–1.44)	1.14 (0.62–2.13)
Low decision authority	0.79 (0.38–1.61)	1.60 (0.93–2.76)†	1.38 (0.97–1.96)†	0.94 (0.51–1.73)
Low skill discretion	0.96 (0.45–2.06)	2.19 (1.23–3.90)‡	1.35 (0.92–1.99)†	1.53 (0.81–2.88)†
Awkward postures	1.31 (0.42–4.07)	2.07 (0.91–4.75)†	0.70 (0.33–1.51)	2.18 (0.87–5.46)†
Lifting heavy loads	1.49 (0.41–5.45)	2.00 (0.76–5.25)†	0.96 (0.38–2.40)	2.34 (0.77–7.17)†
Work engagement				
Low work engagement	1.66 (0.86–3.21)†	3.68 (2.15–6.30)‡	1.36 (0.95–1.95)†	1.84 (1.04–3.27)‡

*All analyses are adjusted for age, sex, educational level, and organization. Values represent odds ratio (95% confidence interval).

†Statistically significant at *P* < 0.20 and included in fully adjusted models.

‡Statistically significant at *P* < 0.05.

As self-perceived health, reporting long-term sickness absence was also predicted by unhealthy behavior and not by any work-related characteristic. Obese employees and those not engaging sufficiently in sports were more likely to report long-term sickness absence, which was also concluded by previous studies.^{2,3,7,31} Regarding work-related characteristics, previous studies have identified unfavorable psychosocial work-related characteristics and physically strenuous working conditions as risk factors for sickness absence.^{6,13,32} Although not statistically significant, the effect estimates of awkward postures and lifting heavy loads point to the same direction with ORs more than 2.

Unfavorable work-related characteristics did predict a poor to moderate work ability. In line with the results of a systematic review, high work demands and low skill discretion were associated with a less than good work ability.⁵ A lack of sports participation was also related to less than good work ability, showing the multifactorial character of work ability.

Work Engagement

In contrast to previous research, this study showed no significant association between a low work engagement and ill health.³³ Nevertheless, employees reporting low on the vigor dimension of work engagement were more likely to have a poor to moderate health status. The finding might be explained by the similarity between how the vigor component of work engagement and self-perceived health is defined. Nevertheless, we found a low correlation between vigor and self-perceived health (Spearman $\rho = 0.13$). Thus, the vigor component partly predicts employees' health status.

Our finding that employees with a low work engagement were more likely to report long-term sickness absence (ie, 10 or more days) is in line with previous research.²¹ In this study, information on cumulative sickness absence days was collected. Long-term sickness absence could be driven by either the frequency or the duration of sickness absence. Previous studies have shown that work engagement more strongly predicted the frequency of sickness absence than the duration.²¹ It is hypothesized that being absent from

work because of illness for a longer period is often involuntary and caused by serious illness and not by unfavorable work-related characteristics. Reporting sick from work frequently is assumed to be “voluntary absence” and the result of a lack of motivation.²¹ Of the dimensions of work engagement, a low vigor was most strongly related to sickness absence. Previous studies found that the exhaustion dimension of burnout—which could be considered as the opposite of the vigor dimension of work engagement—significantly predicted sickness absence.^{31,34}

Employees with a low work engagement were more likely to have a less than good work ability. This finding confirms previous studies.^{14,35} Of the three dimensions of work engagement, the vigor dimension had the strongest association with work ability. Employees who felt vigorous at work had a five times higher likelihood of reporting a good work ability. It could be argued that the concepts of work engagement and work ability are closely related. Nevertheless, the correlation between both was low (Spearman $\rho = 0.22$).

The Contribution of Work Engagement

Reason for conducting this study was to investigate whether work engagement improved the explained variance in self-perceived health, work ability, and sickness absence beyond known health behaviors and work-related characteristics. Our findings showed that work engagement improved the explained variance in work ability and sickness absence. Known health behaviors and work-related characteristics explained only 10% of the variance of sickness absence among the employees. Including work engagement into the models led to a relatively 5% increase in the total explained variance. Possibly including other factors such as having health problems or factors related to the organization might improve the explained variance in sickness absence.^{32,36} In contrast, adding work engagement improved the explained variance in work ability by 4%, a relative improvement of 25% in the total explained variance. The 4% added explained variance is greater than the 1% found by Airila and colleagues.¹⁴ This difference might be due to the fact that they included work ability at baseline in the model, which answers

the question whether a change in work ability is predicted by work engagement.

Our aim was to investigate whether work engagement is a determinant of self-perceived health, work ability, and sickness absence. As said previously, an alternative, and different, question is whether a *change* in these outcomes is predicted by work engagement. In this study, self-perceived health, work ability, and sickness absence were also measured at baseline. To investigate how the results might differ, we performed additional analyses in which we also adjusted for the baseline value of the outcome measure besides demographics, health behaviors, and work-related characteristics. Work engagement in these analyses statistically significantly predicted a *change* in work ability (OR: 2.75; 95%CI: 1.28 to 5.91). Association between work engagement and changes in self-perceived health (OR: 1.01; 95% CI: 0.46 to 2.24) and sickness absence (short-term: OR: 1.09; 95% CI: 0.69 to 1.71 and long-term: OR: 1.51; 95% CI: 0.71 to 3.14) was not statistically significant.

Intervention Implications

A recent meta-analysis concluded that workplace health promotion programs aiming to increase health, work ability, or sickness absence by improving health behavior have modest effects.³⁷ On the basis of this study, health promotion programs at the workplace may potentially have more impact by also promoting work engagement.³⁸ Recently, two randomized controlled trials have been conducted aiming to increase *inter alia* work engagement as a measure of sustainable employability. Hengel et al³⁹ implemented an intervention involving reducing physical load, increase awareness of the importance of taking breaks, and increasing empowerment. Strijk et al⁴⁰ tried to improve work engagement by improving physical activity and fruit intake.^{39,40} Nevertheless, both intervention studies found no significant effects on work engagement demonstrating that more research is needed to investigate what positively changes employees' work engagement and how this can be targeted by interventions. Perhaps, work engagement can better be addressed by improving psychosocial work-related characteristics.³⁸

Limitations

The strength of this study is the longitudinal design. Nevertheless, the relative short follow-up period might be a limitation. Sickness absence was measured over the past year, whereas the follow-up period was a half-year; therefore, it might be that sickness absence days were taken before the baseline measurement. Furthermore, sickness absence was operationalized by one of the dimensions of the WAI; therefore, the results for work ability and sickness absence are not completely independent, although the correlation was low (Spearman $\rho = 0.26$). The study population was rather healthy with only few employees doing physically demanding work as compared to previous studies.^{11,41} Therefore, we need to be cautious to generalize our results to other populations. The relative small sample size limited the statistical power and made it impossible to stratify the analysis by, for example, organization or sex. Because it was an online survey, employees with limited Internet access might not have participated, and selective participation based on health might have occurred. Nevertheless, concerning loss to follow-up, there were no differences between the respondents and those lost to follow-up with regard to demographics, health behaviors, psychosocial work-related characteristics, self-perceived health, and Internet access at home or work. Furthermore, a review on workplace health promotion program participation concluded that there is no evidence that healthier employees are more likely to participate.⁴²

CONCLUSIONS

Employees with a low work engagement were more likely to report a low work ability and long-term sickness absence. Ill health and long-term sickness absence among employees was most

strongly predicted by poor health behaviors, whereas a low work ability among employees was mostly determined by experiencing unfavorable work-related characteristics. Work engagement contributes to work ability beyond health behaviors and work-related characteristics among employees at follow-up. These findings give direction for future policy or interventions of companies aiming to promote sustainable employability.

REFERENCES

1. Tuomi K, Oja G. *Work Ability Index*. Helsinki, Finland: Finnish Institute of Occupational Health Helsinki; 1998.
2. Alavinia SM, van Duivenbooden C, Burdorf A. Influence of work-related factors and individual characteristics on work ability among Dutch construction workers. *Scand J Work Environ Health*. 2007;33:351–357.
3. Robroek SJ, van den Berg TI, Plat JF, Burdorf A. The role of obesity and lifestyle behaviours in a productive workforce. *Occup Environ Med*. 2011;68:134–139.
4. van den Berg TI, Alavinia SM, Bredt FJ, Lindeboom D, Elders LA, Burdorf A. The influence of psychosocial factors at work and life style on health and work ability among professional workers. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*. 2008;81:1029–1036.
5. van den Berg TI, Elders LA, de Zwart BC, Burdorf A. The effects of work-related and individual factors on the Work Ability Index: a systematic review. *Occup Environ Med*. 2009;66:211–220.
6. Alavinia SM, Van Den Berg TIJ, Van Duivenbooden C, Elders LAM, Burdorf A. Impact of work-related factors, lifestyle, and work ability on sickness absence among Dutch construction workers. *Scand J Work Environ Health*. 2009;35:325–333.
7. Lehnert T, Stuhldreher N, Streltchenia P, Riedel-Heller SG, König HH. Sick leave days and costs associated with overweight and obesity in Germany. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2014;56:20–27.
8. van Duijvenbode DC, Hoozemans MJ, van Poppel MN, Proper KI. The relationship between overweight and obesity, and sick leave: a systematic review. *Int J Obes (Lond)*. 2009;33:807–816.
9. Alavinia SM, de Boer AG, van Duivenbooden JC, Frings-Dresen MH, Burdorf A. Determinants of work ability and its predictive value for disability. *Occup Med (Lond)*. 2009;59:32–37.
10. Niedhammer I, Chastang JF, Sultan-Taieb H, Vermeylen G, Parent-Thirion A. Psychosocial work factors and sickness absence in 31 countries in Europe. *Eur J Public Health*. 2013;23:622–629.
11. van den Berg T, Schuring M, Avendano M, Mackenbach J, Burdorf A. The impact of ill health on exit from paid employment in Europe among older workers. *Occup Environ Med*. 2010;67:845–852.
12. Pohjonen T. Perceived work ability of home care workers in relation to individual and work-related factors in different age groups. *Occup Med (Lond)*. 2001;51:209–217.
13. van den Heuvel SG, Geuskens GA, Hooftman WE, Koppes LL, van den Bossche SN. Productivity loss at work; health-related and work-related factors. *J Occup Rehabil*. 2010;20:331–339.
14. Airila A, Hakanen J, Punakallio A, Lusa S, Luukkonen R. Is work engagement related to work ability beyond working conditions and lifestyle factors? *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*. 2012;85:915–925.
15. Hakanen JJ, Schaufeli WB. Do burnout and work engagement predict depressive symptoms and life satisfaction? A three-wave seven-year prospective study. *J Affect Disord*. 2012;141:415–424.
16. Schaufeli WB, Bakker AB, Salanova M. The measurement of work engagement with a short questionnaire a cross-national study. *Educ Psychol Med*. 2006;66:701–716.
17. Bakker AB, Schaufeli WB, Leiter MP, Taris TW. Work engagement: an emerging concept in occupational health psychology. *Work Stress*. 2008;22:187–200.
18. Harter JK, Schmidt FL, Hayes TL. Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: a meta-analysis. *J Appl Psychol*. 2002;87:268–279.
19. Inoue A, Kawakami N, Tsuno K, Shimazu A, Tomioka K, Nakanishi M. Job demands, job resources, and work engagement of Japanese employees: a prospective cohort study. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*. 2013;86:441–449.
20. Schaufeli WB, Bakker AB. Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *J Organ Behav*. 2004;25:293–315.
21. Schaufeli WB, Bakker AB, Van Rhenen W. How changes in job demands and resources predict burnout, work engagement, and sickness absenteeism. *J Organ Behav*. 2009;30:893–917.

22. Shimazu A, Schaufeli WB, Kubota K, Kawakami N. Do workaholism and work engagement predict employee well-being and performance in opposite directions? *Ind Health*. 2012;50:316–321.
23. Airila A, Hakanen JJ, Schaufeli WB, Luukkonen R, Punakallio A, Lusa S. Are job and personal resources associated with work ability 10 years later? The mediating role of work engagement. *Work Stress*. 2014;28:87–105.
24. Ware J Jr, Kosinski M, Keller SD. A 12-item Short-Form health survey: construction of scales and preliminary tests of reliability and validity. *Med Care*. 1996;34:220–233.
25. Karasek RA Jr. Job demands, job decision latitude, and mental strain: implications for job redesign. *Admin Sci Quart*. 1979;24:285–308.
26. Veldhoven MJPM, Meijman TF. *Het meten van psychosociale arbeidsbelasting met een vragenlijst: de vragenlijst beleving en beoordeling van de arbeid (VBBA)*. Nederlands Instituut voor Arbeidsomstandigheden NIA; 1994.
27. Elders LAM, Burdorf A. Interrelations of risk factors and low back pain in scaffolders. *Occup Environ Med*. 2001;58:597–603.
28. Bogers RP, Van Assema P, Kester AD, Westerterp KR, Dagnelie PC. Reproducibility, validity, and responsiveness to change of a short questionnaire for measuring fruit and vegetable intake. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2004;159:900–909.
29. Malinauskienė V, Leisyte P, Romualdas M, Kirtiklyte K. Associations between self-rated health and psychosocial conditions, lifestyle factors and health resources among hospital nurses in Lithuania. *J Adv Nurs*. 2011;67:2383–2393.
30. Grzywacz JG, Alterman T, Gabbard S, et al. Job control, psychological demand, and farmworker health: evidence from the national agricultural workers survey. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2014;56:66–71.
31. Proper KI, Koppes LL, Meijer S, Bemelmans WJ. The association between body mass index status and sick leave and the role of emotional exhaustion—a mediation analysis among a representative sample of Dutch employees. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2013;55:1213–1218.
32. Leijten FR, van den Heuvel SG, Ybema JF, Robroek SJ, Burdorf A. Do work factors modify the association between chronic health problems and sickness absence among older employees? *Scand J Work Environ Health*. 2013;39:477–485.
33. Schaufeli WB, Taris TW, Van Rhenen W. Workaholism, burnout, and work engagement: three of a kind or three different kinds of employee well-being? *Appl Psychol*. 2008;57:173–203.
34. Peterson U, Bergström G, Demerouti E, Gustavsson P, Åsberg M, Nygren Å. Burnout levels and self-rated health prospectively predict future long-term sickness absence: a study among female health professionals. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2011;53:788–793.
35. Mache S, Danzer G, Klapp BF, Groneberg DA. Surgeons' work ability and performance in surgical care: relations between organisational predictors, work engagement and work ability. *Langenbeck's Arch Surg*. 2013;398:317–325.
36. Elovainio M, Kivimäki M, Vahtera J. Organizational justice: evidence of a new psychosocial predictor of health. *Am J Public Health*. 2002;92:105–108.
37. Rongen A, Robroek SJ, van Lenthe FJ, Burdorf A. Workplace health promotion: a meta-analysis of effectiveness. *Am J Prev Med*. 2013;44:406–415.
38. Torp S, Grimsö A, Hagen S, Duran A, Gudbergsson SB. Work engagement: a practical measure for workplace health promotion? *Health Promot Int*. 2013;28:387–396.
39. Hengel KMO, Blatter BM, Joling CI, van der Beek AJ, Bongers PM. Effectiveness of an intervention at construction worksites on work engagement, social support, physical workload, and need for recovery: results from a cluster randomized controlled trial. *BMC Public Health*. 2012;12:1008.
40. Strijk JE, Proper KI, van Mechelen W, van der Beek AJ. A worksite vitality intervention for older hospital workers to improve vitality, work engagement, productivity and sick leave: results of a randomized controlled trial. *Scand J Work Environ Health*. 2012;66:1071–1078.
41. van den Berg TI, Robroek SJ, Plat JF, Koopmanschap MA, Burdorf A. The importance of job control for workers with decreased work ability to remain productive at work. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*. 2011;84:705–712.
42. Robroek SJ, van Lenthe FJ, van Empelen P, Burdorf A. Determinants of participation in worksite health promotion programmes: a systematic review. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2009;6:26.