The association between sedentary leisure and physical activity in middle-aged adults

Burton, Nicola W.; Khan, Asaduzzaman; Brown, Wendy J.; Turrell, Gavin

Published in:
British Journal of Sports Medicine

DOI:
10.1136/bjsm.2010.081430

The Association Between Sedentary Leisure and Physical Activity in Mid-Aged Adults

Nicola W Burton[1], Asaduzzaman Khan[2], Wendy J Brown[1], Gavin Turrell[3]

[1] The University of Queensland School of Human Movement Studies, St Lucia, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia.

[2] The University of Queensland School of Health and Rehabilitation Sciences, St Lucia, Brisbane, Queensland 4072, Australia.

[3] QUT School of Public Health, Kelvin Grove Brisbane, Queensland 4059, Australia.

Corresponding Author: Nicola Burton, The University of Queensland School of Human Movement Studies, St Lucia, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia, 4059. Tel: 61-7-3365 6282; Fax 61-7-33365 6877, email nburton@hms.uq.edu.au.

Keywords: sitting, exercise, television, recreation, time use, adults

Text word count (excluding title page, abstract, acknowledgements, references, tables): 3450

Number of tables: 6

Number of figures: 0

ABSTRACT

It unclear if adults who are engage in sedentary leisure are also physically inactive.

Aim. The aim of this study was to examine the association between time spent in sedentary leisure and physical activity **level** in mid-aged men and women.

Methods. Data were from the 2007 HABITAT study in Brisbane Australia. A mail survey sent to 17,000 adults (40-65 years) provided 11,037 responses (68.5%), and 9121 (82.6%) were analyzed. Sedentary leisure was quantified as hours/day spent sitting watching television, in home computer use, in general leisure, and overall, on a usual week and weekend day. Physical activity level (no activity, low, recommended, high, very high) included walking, moderate, and vigorous activity combined into a measure of MET.mins/week. Data were analyzed separately for men and women using multi-level multinomial logistic regression with adjustment for sociodemographic and health variables.

Results. The only significant *negative* associations were between watching television on a week day and high activity in men (0.91; 0.83-0.98), and home computer use on a weekend day and very high activity in men (0.89; 0.81-.98). For both men and women, there were significant *positive* associations between overall sedentary leisure time on a week day and very high activity (men: 1.07, 1.02-1.13; women: 1.10, 1.04-1.16), home computer use on a week day and very high activity (men: 1.11, 1.01-1.22; women: 1.15, 1.04-1.27), and general leisure on a week day and most activity levels.

Conclusions. Sedentary leisure is mainly independent of physical activity and does not preclude meeting physical activity recommendations.

248 words

This article has been accepted for publication in British Journal of Sports Medicine, following peer review, and the Version of Record can be accessed online at https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsm.2010.081430

The Association Between Sedentary Leisure and Physical Activity in Mid-Aged Adults

The risks associated with physical inactivity are well documented, and include obesity, cardiovascular disease, and type 2 diabetes.[1, 2] Cardiovascular and metabolic health may also be compromised by high levels of sedentary behavior i.e., activities of low energy expenditure (1-1.5 metabolic equivalents) such as sitting. Several prospective studies have shown a positive association between sedentary behavior and obesity, diabetes, cardiovascular risk biomarkers [3-6] and premature mortality [3, 7, 8] independent of inactivity,

It could be speculated that people who spend a lot of time in sedentary behaviour also do little physical activity. Few researchers have, however, purposively examined this association. Data from the Scottish Health Survey indicated that time spent watching television and in other screen based entertainment was negatively associated with meeting recommendations of $\geq$150 minutes/week of moderate to vigorous activity.[9] An Australian study, however, found no significant association between time spent watching television and meeting recommendations.[10] Other studies with a more sensitive measure of activity (i.e., multiple categories based on e.g., MET.mins/week, time/day) have demonstrated negative associations between watching television and activity.[3, 5, 11, 12]

Few researchers have examined associations between physical activity and sedentary leisure other than watching television. Vandelanotte et al. reported that leisure time spent in internet/computer use was largely independent of physical activity, although those with low computer use (<3 hours/week) were significantly more likely to have high levels of activity (>3 hours/week) than non-users.[13] van Uffelen et al. used a measure of sitting time that

This article has been accepted for publication in British Journal of Sports Medicine, following peer review, and the Version of Record can be accessed online at https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsm.2010.081430

encompassed visiting friends, driving, reading, and working at a desk/computer, and found inconsistent relationships with activity in women, with slight downward trends in sitting time for low and moderately active women, as well as long sitting times among high active women.[14] This inconsistency was attributed in part to combining occupational and non-occupational sitting time in one measure. Proper et al. reported a negative association between physical activity and a combined measure of occupational and non-occupational sitting time on both week and weekend days, but no association between physical activity and time spent in sedentary leisure that included computer use, reading, socialising, watching television, and riding in a car.[15]

There is some evidence to suggest that patterns of sedentary leisure may differ in men and women. Studies have indicated that men spend more time than women watching television and using a computer,[9, 10, 16-19] and sitting to relax,[17] while women spend more time than men reading and socializing,[18, 19] and talking on the telephone.[17] Sugiyama et al. however, reported an negative association between time spent watching television and physical activity in women, but not men.[11] It is therefore, justifiable for studies in this area to conduct separate analyses for men and women.

The aim of this study was to examine the associations between time spent in sedentary leisure and physical activity level in mid-aged adults, and if there was a negative association between time spent in sedentary leisure and meeting physical activity recommendations. This study builds on and extends previous research by focusing on leisure (vs occupational) sedentary time, assessing several contexts of sedentary leisure (watching television, home computer use, general leisure), differentiating between week and weekend day sedentary leisure time, using

a multi-category (vs dichotomous) measure of physical activity level, and conducting separate analyses for men and women. As previous research has demonstrated negative associations between time spent watching television and physical activity[3, 5, 11, 12], and that men spend more time than women watching television and using a computer[9, 10, 16-19], it was hypothesized that among men, there would be negative associations for physical activity with time spent watching television and time spent in home computer use. As weekend days may provide more discretionary time for both sedentary and active leisure than week days, it was also hypothesized that there would be fewer associations between physical activity and sedentary leisure in all contexts on weekend days than week days.

METHOD

Data were collected as part of the 2007 HABITAT (How Areas in Brisbane Influence healTh and AcTivity) study in Brisbane, Australia. This study was awarded ethical clearance by the Queensland University of Technology Human Research Ethics Committee. Survey return was taken as informed consent.

Sample Design and Data Collection

Details on the design, sampling and data collection for HABITAT have been published elsewhere.[20] A multi-stage probability sampling design was used to select a stratified random sample of 200 (from 1625) Census Collector's Districts (CCD) in Brisbane, Australia. From within each CCD, a random sample of 85 people aged 40-65 years was selected (N=17,000), using data from the Australian Electoral Commission (registration with the commission is mandatory for Australians $\geq$18 years of age). A mail survey was administered

during May-July 2007 using a method that included advance mail notice, personalized mail, a thank you/reminder notice, resending to non-respondents, and a final letter to non respondents.[21]

Measures

Physical Activity **Level**

We used items from the Active Australia Survey to assess time spent in the previous week (i) walking "continuously for at least 10 minutes for recreation, exercise, or to get to or from places", (ii) doing "vigorous physical activity which made you breathe harder or puff or pant", such as jogging, cycling, aerobics (excluding household chores, gardening or yardwork), and (iii) doing "moderate physical activities" such as gentle swimming, social tennis, golf (excluding household chores, gardening or yardwork).[22] These items have acceptable levels of reliability and validity in Australian samples[23, 24] and have been recommended for use in Australian population based research.[25] As walking and moderate activity require less energy expenditure than vigorous activity, a weighted measure (MET.min/week) was used to obtain an index of total physical activity level: ([walking minutes*3 METS] + [moderate minutes*3 METS] + [vigorous minutes*7.5 METS]). This was categorized into five levels: *no activity* (PA<90), *low* ($\geq$90$\leq$PA <450), *recommended* ($\geq$450$\leq$PA <900), *high* ($\geq$900 $\leq$PA<1800) and *very high* (PA$\geq$1800). The recommended category is comparable with recommendations to achieve 5x30 minutes of moderate intensity activity, or 3x20 minutes of vigorous intensity activity, to expend 450-750 MET.min/week.[26]

Sedentary Leisure Time

Respondents indicated the time (hours and minutes) spent sitting on a usual week day and a usual weekend day (a) watching television (including DVDs, videos, video games) (b) using a computer at home, and (c) in leisure time (excluding watching television and using a computer e.g., hobbies, reading, dining out). This measure has acceptable levels of reliability and validity for Australian mid-aged Australian adults[27], and is more detailed than other measures that use simple descriptive categories (e.g., all of the time, sometimes), or that do not differentiate among contexts or between weekend and week days. To minimize potential error associated with over-reporting, responses for each sitting context >480 minutes/day were excluded from analyses (1-5% of cases in different contexts). This value was chosen as a maximum of 8 hours/day in each of the three contexts equals one complete day. Data were converted to hours/day for each context. A measure of overall sedentary leisure time was derived by summing the time across the three contexts, for those cases with compete data on all three contexts.

Sociodemographic and Health Variables

Questionnaire items were used to assess sex, date of birth, country of birth, level of education completed, household composition, employment status, general health, cigarette smoking status, physical activity restrictions, and weight and height (used to derive body mass index [kg/m^2] and categorized using the World Health Organization classification system [28]).

Analyses

To reflect the multistage sample selection, a multilevel approach was used which allows partitioning error variance in the outcome (physical activity level) across models so that the variance due to clustering is assessed and accounted for in estimating model parameters. A

random intercept for CCD was considered in the model to account for clustering within CCDs. Multilevel multinomial logistic regression analyses with random effects were conducted using GLLAMM (generalized linear latent and mixed models) commands of Stata version 10.1 (StataCorp, College Station, TX, USA). The assumption of parallel regression, essential for ordinal logistic regression, was assessed using Brant test. The estimation procedure used was numerical integration (10 integration points) with adaptive quadrature, in order to obtain more reliable estimates of parameters.[29]

Preliminary analyses indicated country of birth, household composition, and employment status were not significantly associated with physical activity level. These variables were therefore subsequently dropped from the analyses. Separate analyses were conducted for men and women, and models were adjusted for age, general health, BMI, smoking status, and education. No activity was the reference category. We report the estimates of association (odds ratios and 95% confidence intervals) between sedentary leisure time and physical activity level from eight fitted models (four models for women and four models for men).

In addition to estimating and testing the fixed effects of different individual level covariates, we examined the presence of additional variability across CCDs by estimating random intercept models, using a likelihood ratio (LR) test.[30] This LR test with a statistical significant result provides evidence that the likelihood of physical activity level varies from CCD to CCD and introducing a random intercept allows us to account for this unobserved variability in estimating the model parameters.

RESULTS

Participants

Of the 17,000 people originally sampled, 869 were subsequently identified as ineligible (i.e., deceased, living overseas). A total of 11,037 people returned surveys with data (68.4% response rate). Cases were excluded if respondents reported that their health restricted physical activity all or most of the time (n=817), there was no physical activity data (n=341), sitting time in any of the contexts was >480 minutes/day, or sitting time for week day and weekend day pairwise data were not available across the three contexts (n=758). This provided 9121 cases (4083 men, 5038 women). The sociodemographic and health profile of the analytic sample is provided in Table 1.

Table 1

Sociodemographic and Health Characteristics of Analytic Sample

	Males (n=4083)		Females (n=5038)	
	n	%	n	%
Age Group (years)[c]				
40-44	992	24	959	19
45-49	947	23	1100	22
50-54	806	20	1072	21
55-59	740	18	972	19
60-64	598	15	935	19
Country of Birth				
Australia	2991	74	3836	76
Other	1077	26	1182	24

Highest Educational Qualification				
School only (up to 12 years)	1231	30	2140	43
Certificate/Diploma	1393	34	1315	26
University degree	1448	36	1567	31
Employment Status				
Full time paid	3076	75	1975	39
Part time/Casual paid	465	11	1682	34
Not in paid work (unemployed, retired, home duties)	532	13	1359	27
Household Composition				
Single, living alone	607	15	651	13
Single, living with others	478	12	821	16
Single parent	1045	26	1398	28
Couple, no children	1924	47	2120	42
Couple, with children	607	15	651	13
General Health Status				
Excellent/Very good	1804	44	2503	50
Good	1700	42	1882	38
Fair/Poor	559	14	609	12
Body Mass Index				
<25	1289	32	2485	52
≥25 - <30	1865	47	1408	29
≥30	826	21	906	19
Tobacco Smoking Status				
Never smoked	702	17	620	12

Ex smoker	1421	35	1512	30
Current smoker	1927	48	2863	57
Physical Activity Level (MET.min/week)				
No activity (<90)	540	13	667	13
Low (≥90 - <450)	797	20	1146	23
Recommended (≥450 - <900)	626	15	922	18
High (≥900 - <1800)	892	22	1119	22
Very high (≥1800)	1228	30	1184	24

Sedentary Leisure Time Across Contexts

The average time spent sitting in each sedentary leisure context and overall, is presented in Table 2. Both men and women spent approximately four hours on a week day, and five hours on a weekend day in sedentary leisure. Watching television tended to account for at least half of this time. Time spent in sedentary leisure tended to be higher on a weekend day than on a week day.

Table 2

Observed Mean (and 95% Confidence Intervals) Time (Hours/Day) Spent in Sedentary Leisure on a Usual Week day and Weekend day, for each Context and Overall, for Men and Women.

	Males		Females	
	Week day	Weekend day	Week day	Weekend day
Overall	3.96 (3.91-4.02)	4.93 (4.86-4.99)	3.96 (3.91-4.02)	4.81 (4.75-4.87)
Television	2.32 (2.28-2.37)	3.04 (2.99-3.10)	2.25 (2.21-2.29)	2.70 (2.66-2.74)

General Leisure	1.24 (1.20-1.28)	1.87 (1.82-1.92)	1.47 (1.43-1.51)	2.12 (2.08-2.16)
Home Computer Use	1.18 (1.13-1.22)	1.29 (1.28-1.34)	0.94 (0.90-0.97)	0.95 (0.92-0.99)

Note: Overall mean was derived using cases with complete data from all three contexts.

Associations Between Sedentary Leisure Time and Physical Activity Level

A summary of the results is presented in Tables 3-6. A significant Brent test provided evidence of violation of parallel regression assumption, and as such, unordered multinomial logistic regression models were used in the present analyses. None of the LR test results for variance components of random intercepts suggested statistical significance, and as such, the estimated variance components are not presented in the Tables.

Overall sedentary leisure. There were significant positive associations between overall time spent in sedentary leisure on week day and a very high physical activity level for both women and men (Table 3). There were no significant associations between overall sedentary leisure time on a weekend day and other levels of physical activity, or between overall sedentary leisure time on a weekend day and physical activity level.

Watching television. There was a significant negative association between time spent watching television on a weekend day and a high physical activity level among men (Table 4). There were no significant associations between time spent watching television on a weekend day and physical activity level for women, or between time spent watching television on a week day and physical activity level in men or women.

Home computer use. There were significant positive associations between time spent in home computer use on a week day and a very high physical activity level for both men and women (Table 5). There was a significant negative association between time spent in home computer use on a weekend day and a very high physical activity level among men. There were no significant associations between time spent in home computer use on a weekend day and physical activity level in women.

General leisure. There were significant positive associations between time spent in general leisure on a week day and all physical activity levels in men, and all but the recommended activity level in women (Table 6). There were no significant associations between time spent in general leisure on a weekend day and physical activity level in men or women.

Table 3

The Association (Odds Ratios and 95% Confidence Intervals) Between Week Day and Weekend Day Overall Sedentary Leisure Time and Physical Activity Level.

	Men		Women	
	Week day	Weekend day	Week day	Weekend day
No activity	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Low activity	1.00 (0.94-1.06)	0.99 (0.94-1.04)	1.04 (0.99-1.10)	0.98 (0.93-1.02)
Recommended	1.02 (0.96-1.08)	1.00 (0.95-1.06)	1.01 (0.96-1.07)	0.99 (0.94-1.04)
High activity	1.05 (0.99-1.11)	0.97 (0.92-1.02)	1.03 (0.97-1.09)	1.00 (0.95-1.05)
Very high activity	1.07 (1.02-1.13)*	0.98 (0.93-1.03)	1.10 (1.04-1.16)**	0.99 (0.94-1.04)

* $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.001$

Note. Adjusted for age, current health status, body mass index, smoking status and education.

Table 4

The Association (Odds Ratios and 95% Confidence Intervals) Between Week Day and Weekend Day Time Spent Watching Television and Physical Activity Level.

	Men		Women	
	Week day	Weekend day	Week day	Weekend day
No activity	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Low activity	0.96 (0.87-1.06)	0.95 (0.88-1.04)	1.02 (0.94-1.12)	0.97 (0.90-1.05)
Recommended	0.96 (0.87-1.07)	0.99 (0.91-1.08)	0.98 (0.90-1.08)	0.97 (0.90-1.06)
High activity	1.06 (0.96-1.16)	0.91 (0.83-0.98)*	0.99 (0.91-1.09)	0.97 (0.89-1.06)
Very high activity	1.05 (0.96-1.15)	0.95 (0.87-1.02)	1.07 (0.98-1.17)	0.98 (0.90-1.07)

* $p < 0.05$

Note. Adjusted for age, current health status, body mass index, smoking status and education.

Table 5

The Association (Odds Ratios and 95% Confidence Intervals) Between Week Day and Weekend Day Time Spent in Home Computer Use and Physical Activity Level.

	Men		Women	
	Week day	Weekend day	Week day	Weekend day
No activity	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Low activity	0.95 (0.86-1.05)	1.04 (0.94-1.15)	1.04 (0.94-1.15)	0.91 (0.82-1.01)
Recommended	1.05 (0.94-1.17)	0.94 (0.85-1.05)	1.05 (0.94-1.16)	0.92 (0.82-1.02)
High activity	1.04 (0.94-1.15)	0.91 (0.83-1.01)	1.10 (0.99-1.22)	0.93 (0.83-1.03)

This article has been accepted for publication in British Journal of Sports Medicine, following peer review, and the Version of Record can be accessed online at https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsm.2010.081430

Very high activity	1.11 (1.01-1.22)*	0.89 (0.81-0.98)*	1.15 (1.04-1.27)**	0.91 (0.82-1.01)

* p <0.05; ** p <0.01

Note. Adjusted for age, current health status, body mass index, smoking status and education.

Table 6

The Association (Odds Ratios and 95% Confidence Intervals) Between Week Day and Weekend Day Time Spent in General Leisure and Physical Activity Level.

	Men		Women	
	Week day	Weekend day	Week day	Weekend day
No activity	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Low activity	1.15 (1.02-1.30)*	1.00 (0.91-1.10)	1.13 (1.03-1.24)*	0.96 (0.88-1.04)
Recommended	1.18 (1.04-1.34)*	1.03 (0.93-1.14)	1.04 (0.94-1.16)	1.06 (0.97-1.15)
High activity	1.21 (1.08-1.37)**	1.02 (0.93-1.12)	1.12 (1.02-1.24)*	1.04 (0.95-1.12)
Very high activity	1.28 (1.14-1.44)****	1.04 (0.95-1.14)	1.26 (1.15-1.39)****	0.99 (0.91-1.07)

* p <0.05; ** p <0.01; *** p <0.0001

Note. Adjusted for age, current health status, body mass index, smoking status and education.

DISCUSSION

Overall, men and women reported spending approximately four hours on a usual week day, and five hours on a usual weekend day in sedentary leisure. Watching television tended to account for at least half of this time, with approximately 2.3 hours/week day for men and women, and 2.7 hours/weekend day for women and 3.0 hours/weekend day for men. This is comparable with data from the 2006 Australian Time Use Survey which indicated that men

spent an average of 2.4-2.7 hours/day and women 1.7-2.6 hours/day watching television.[16] Time use surveys from other countries have also indicated that watching television accounts for at least half of all leisure time.[16, 18, 19] In our study, time spent in general leisure (e.g., hobbies, socializing, reading) (1.2-2.1 hours/day), was slightly higher than for home computer use (0.9-1.3 hours/day). Data from the UK Time Use Survey indicated that among those aged 45-64 years, men spent approximately 1.9 hours/day and women spent 2.2 hours/day in social activities, hobbies and reading,[18] and data from the USA Time Use Survey indicated that adults aged 55-64 years spent an average of 0.29 hours/week day and 0.31 hours/week end day using a computer for leisure.[19] As our measure of home computer use did not specify for leisure only, it may have also included "work" use, which could account for the longer time in our study. Approximately 13% of men and women (aged 40-64 years) were physically inactive, and 52% of men and 64% of women were categorized as meeting or exceeding physical activity recommendations. One West Australian survey in 2006 indicated 12.5% of adults aged 45-59 years were inactive, and 61% met or exceeded activity recommendations,[31] which is comparable with our results.

Overall, there were few associations between time spent in sedentary leisure and physical activity level. There were no negative associations between time spent in sedentary leisure time in any context and meeting physical activity guidelines. Our hypotheses were mostly supported. There was a negative association for time spent watching television and physical activity level among men, although this was only for watching television on a week day and the high activity level. Similarly, there was a negative association between time spent in home computer use and physical activity level among men, although this was only for home computer use on a weekend day and the highest activity level. There was only one significant

association between sedentary leisure time on a weekend day and physical activity level – this was for home computer use among men.

Although our results were for men and not women, other researchers have also found a negative association between watching television and physical activity.[3, 5, 9, 11-13, 32] We also found a negative association between home computer use on a weekend day and a high activity level among men. While these results could be interpreted as indicating that watching television and using a computer at home are competing time demands against physical activity for men, it should be emphasized that the negative relationship in our study was only significant at the higher levels of physical activity, comparable to *at least* two hours/week of vigorous activity, or five hours/week walking or moderate intensity activity. This is much higher than recommendations to achieve 3x20 minutes/week of vigorous intensity activity or 5x30 minutes/week of moderate activity.[26] Time spent by men watching television or for home computer use is, therefore, not incompatible with meeting activity recommendations. Among women, there was no association between time spent watching television and physical activity level. This may reflect that this type of sedentary leisure is less common among women than men.[9, 10, 16, 17] Our results contrast those of Hu et al. [5] and Sugiyama et al. [11] who found significant inverse associations between watching television and physical activity in women. However, neither of these other studies focused on mid-aged adults.

With one exception, there were no significant associations between weekend sedentary leisure time in any context and physical activity level. This may reflect that men and women have time on weekends to engage in both sedentary and active leisure. Interestingly, our results indicated *positive* associations for week day time spent in home computer use, time spent in

general leisure and overall sedentary leisure, with a very high level of physical activity, comparable with at least 4 hours/week of vigorous activity or 10 hours/week of moderate intensity activity or walking. This is consistent with other research indicating long sitting times among high active women.[14] It may be that these people have a strong achievement-orientation that precipitates a high level of engagement in multiple pursuits – including both sedentary leisure and physical activity. This result challenges assumptions of less discretionary time on week days (because of e.g., work and family/household obligations) and a forced choice between sedentary or active leisure.

There was a positive association between time spent in general leisure on a week day and all levels of physical activity for men, and all but the recommended level for women (which had a positive trend). For every one hour increase in time spent in general leisure on a week day, there was a 15% increase in the odds of a man being in the low activity group compared to the no activity group, an 18% increase in the odds of being in the recommended activity group, a 21% increase in the odds of being in the high activity group and a 28% increase in the odds of being in the very high activity group. It would seem therefore, that time spent in general sedentary leisure (e.g., hobbies, reading, dining out) does not preclude physical activity participation at *any* level. This may be because these types of sedentary pursuits are less substantive and more negotiable than other sedentary leisure such as watching television and home computer use.

Methodological Considerations

A comparison of the HABITAT respondent sample with census data suggests modest under-representation of those with school only education, not in the workforce, and living in

disadvantaged areas.[33] This under representation may have influenced our results as these sociodemographic groups have previously been reported as having high levels of sedentary behavior[3, 5, 34, 35] and low levels of physical activity.[35, 36] Self-report data are vulnerable to social desirability bias and measurement error, but pragmatic for large population-based studies. The unstructured nature of sedentary leisure, particularly on weekend days, may make it difficult for respondents to accurately recall the time spent in this type of behaviour. Our previous work indicated a lower level of test retest reliability and validity for the measure of time spent in general sedentary leisure (i.e., hobbies, dining out) than for the other contexts of watching television and home computer use, and for on weekend day than a week day. This study did not include time spent in travel or occupational sitting time, which can make considerable contributions to sedentary behaviour. Time in these other contexts was, however, considered to be less discretionary than time spent in sedentary leisure.

In this study we used a week as the referent period for physical activity so as to be consistent with current activity recommendations, but we used a usual week/weekend day for sedentary leisure. While we acknowledge that physical activity can vary between week and weekend days, current activity recommendations do not make this distinction and the survey items we used did not provide the data needed for us to examine this. To have a week as the referent period for the sitting time measures, we would need to manipulate the data (e.g., usual week day time*5 + usual weekend day*2) which would compound reporting errors. As the pattern of associations between sedentary leisure and physical activity differed on week and weekend days, a combined measure of week day and weekend day sedentary leisure time may have obscured associations.

Conclusions

Overall, there were only two inverse associations between time spent in sedentary leisure and physical activity level, and these were for the highest level of physical activity, which was markedly higher than the recommended level of activity. Other significant associations between sedentary leisure and physical activity were actually positive. There was only one association between sedentary leisure time on a weekend day and physical activity level. Sedentary leisure should not therefore, be seen as the competing "enemy" of physical activity. It is instead, a separate and unrelated component of adults' leisure time use. Health promotion interventions could subsequently target time spent in sedentary leisure and time spent in physical activity, *without* pitting one against the other. By combining messages about recommended levels of physical activity and sedentary behaviour, advocates can contribute to promoting health-enhancing lifestyles across the many contexts of adult life.

What is Already Known on This Topic

Sedentary behavior and physical inactivity are health risks. Several studies have demonstrated a negative association between time spent watching television and physical activity, but few studies have examined other types of sedentary leisure.

What This Study Adds

Sedentary leisure and physical activity are largely unrelated, particularly on weekend days. The only significant negative associations between sedentary leisure and physical activity were for activity well above national recommendations. There were no significant negative associations between sedentary leisure and meeting recommended levels of physical activity**.**

This article has been accepted for publication in British Journal of Sports Medicine, following peer review, and the Version of Record can be accessed online at https://doi.org/10.1136/bjsm.2010.081430

Acknowledgements

The HABITAT study is supported by project grants from the (Australian) National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) (ID 339718, 497236), and includes Professor Billie-Giles Corti, Professor Brian Oldenburg, and Dr Katrina Giskes as chief investigators. During the time of this study, NB was supported by a Heart Foundation Research Fellowship (PH08B3905) and an NHMRC Program Grant (569940). GT is supported by a NHMRC Senior Research Fellowship (390109). We gratefully acknowledge Mr Martin O'Flaherty for his assistance with data coding and cleaning, and Ms Robyn Baguley and Ms Sophie Miller for project management.

Competing Interests

The authors declare there are no competing interests.

References

1. Bauman AE. Updating the evidence that physical activity is good for health: an epidemiological review 2000-2003. *J Sci Med Sport*. 2004;7(1):6-19.
2. Brown WJ, Burton NW, Rowan PJ. Updating the evidence on physical activity and health in women. *Am J Prev Med*. 2007;33(5):404-11
3. Dunstan DW, Barr ELM, Healy GN, et al. Television viewing time and mortality: The Australian Diabetes, Obesity and Lifestyle Study (AusDiab). *Circulation*. 2010;121(3):384-91.
4. Hamilton MT, Hamilton DG, Zderic TW. Role of low energy expenditure and sitting in obesity, metabolic syndrome, type 2 diabetes, and cardiovascular disease. *Diabetes*. 2007;56(11):2655-67.
5. Hu FB, Li TY, Colditz GA, et al. Television watching and other sedentary behaviors in relation to risk of obesity and type 2 diabetes mellitus in women. *JAMA*. 2003;289(14):1785-91.
6. van Uffelen JGZ, Wong J, Chau JY, et al. Occupational sitting and health risks: A systematic review. *Am J Prev Med*. 2010;39(4):379-88.
7. Patel AV, Bernstein L, Deka A, et al. Leisure time spent sitting in relation to total mortality in a prospective cohort of US adults. *Am J Epidemiol*. 2010;172(4):419-29.
8. Wijndaele K, Brage S, Besson H, et al. Television viewing time independently predicts all-cause and cardiovascular mortality: the EPIC Norfolk Study. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2010;doi: 10.1093/ije/dyq105.
9. Stamatakis E, Hillsdon M, Mishra G, et al. Television viewing and other screen-based entertainment in relation to multiple socioeconomic status indicators and area

deprivation: the Scottish Health Survey 2003 *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2009;63(9):734-40.

10. Clark BK, Sugiyama T, Healy GN, et al. Socio-demographic correlates of prolonged television viewing time in Australian men and women: The AusDiab Study. *Physical Activity and Health*. 2010;7(5):595-601.
11. Sugiyama T, Healy GN, Dunstan DW, et al. Is television viewing time a marker of a broader pattern of sedentary behavior? *Ann Behav Med*. 2008;35(2):245-50.
12. Salmon J, Bauman A, Crawford D, et al. The association between television viewing and overweight among Australian adults participating in varying levels of leisure-time physical activity. *Int J Obes Relat Metab Disord*. 2000;24(5):600-6.
13. Vandelanotte C, Sugiyama T, Gardiner P, et al. Associations of leisure-time internet and computer use with overweight and obesity, physical activity and sedentary behaviors: cross-sectional study. *J Med Internet Res*. 2010;11(3):E28-E
14. van Uffelen J, Watson M, Dobson A, et al. Comparison of self-reported week-day and weekend-day sitting time and weekly time use: Results from the Australian Longitudinal Study on Women's Health. *International Journal of Behavioural Medicine*. in press.
15. Proper KI, Cerin E, Brown WJ, et al. Sitting time and socioeconomic differences in overweight and obesity. *Int J Obes*. 2007;31:169-76.
16. Australian Bureau of Statistics. How Australians Use Their Time 2006. Report No: 4153.0. Canberra: Australian Government Printing Service. 2008. 464pp.
17. Salmon J, Owen N, Crawford D, et al. Physical activity and sedentary behavior: A population-based study of barriers, enjoyment, and preference. *Health Psychol*. 2003;22(2):178-88.

18. Lader D, Short S, Gershuny J. The Time Use Survey, 2005: How We Spend Our Time. London: Office for National Statistics; 2006. Retreived on 5 November 2010 from from: http://www.statistics.gov.uk/articles/nojournal/time_use_2005.pdf.
19. U.S. Bureau of Labor Statistics. American Time Use Survey Summary 2009. Washington: United States Department of Labour; 2010 Retreived on 5 November 2010 from http://www.bls.gov/news.release/atus.t11.htm.
20. Burton NW, Haynes M, Wilson L, et al. HABITAT: A longitudinal multilevel study of physical activity change in mid-aged adults. *BMC Public Health*. 2009;9(1):76.
21. Dillman DA. Mail and internet surveys: the tailored design method. 2nd ed. Chichester: Wiley; 2000.
22. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). The Active Australia Survey: A guide and manual for implementation, analysis and reporting. Canberra: AIHW2003.
23. Brown WJ, Burton NW, Marshall AL, et al. Reliability and validity of a modified self-administered version of the Active Australia physical activity survey in a sample of mid-age women. *Aust N Z J Public Health*. 2008;32(6):535-41.
24. Brown W, Trost SG, Bauman A, et al. Test-retest reliability of four physical activity measures used in population surveys. *J Sci Med Sport*. 2004;28(2):128-34.
25. Brown WJ, Bauman A, Chey T, et al. Comparison of surveys used to measure physical activity. *Aust N Z J Public Health*. 2004;28(2):128-34.
26. 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. *Circulation*. 2007;116(9):1081-93.
27. Marshall AL, Miller YD, Burton NW, et al. Measuring total and domain-specific sitting: a study of reliability and validity. *Med Sci Sports Exerc*. 2010;42(6):1094-102.

28. World Health Organisation. Obesity: Preventing and Managing the Global Epidemic. Report of a WHO Consultation (WHO Technical Report Series 894). Geneva: World Health Organisation; 2000.

29. Rabe-Heskteh S, Skrondal A, Pickles A. Reliable estimation of generalized linear mixed models using adaptive quadrature. *The Stata Journal*. 2002;2(1):1-21.

30. Twisk JWR. Applied longitudinal data analysis for epidemiology-A practical guide. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2003.

31. Milligan R, McCormack GR, Rosenberg M. Physical Activity Levels of Western Australian Adults 2006. Results from the Adult Physical Activity Study. Perth, Western Australia: Western Australian Government.2007.

32. Jakes RW, Day NE, Khaw KT, et al. Television viewing and low participation in vigorous recreation are independently associated with obesity and markers of cardiovascular disease risk: EPIC-Norfolk population-based study. *Eur J Clin Nutr*. 2003;57:1089–96.

33. Turrell G, Haynes M, Burton NW, et al. Neighborhood disadvantage and physical activity: Baseline results from the HABITAT multi-level longitudinal study. *Ann Epidemiol*. 2010;20:171-81.

34. King AC, Goldberg JH, Salmon J, et al. Identifying subgroups of US adults at risk for prolonged television viewing to inform program development. *Am J Prev Med*. 2010;38(1):17-26.

35. Bauman A, Ma GS, Cuevas F, et al. Cross-national comparisons of socioeconomic differences in the prevalence of leisure-time and occupational physical activity, and active commuting in six Asia-Pacific countries. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2011;65(1):35-43.

36. Kavanagh AM, Goller JL, King T, et al. Urban area disadvantage and physical activity: a multilevel study in Melbourne, Australia. *J Epidemiol Community Health*. 2005;59(11):934-40.