

NIH Public Access

Author Manuscript

J Adolesc Health. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2010 March 1.

Published in final edited form as:

J Adolesc Health. 2009 March ; 44(3): 260–267. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2008.08.005.

Childhood and contemporaneous correlates of adolescent leisure-time physical inactivity: a longitudinal study

Rosalina Richards, Ph.D.¹, Richie Poulton, Ph.D.², Anthony I. Reeder, Ph.D.¹, and Sheila Williams, D.Sc.³

¹ Cancer Society Social and Behavioural Research Unit, Department of Preventive and Social Medicine, University of Otago, PO Box 913, Dunedin, NEW ZEALAND

² Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Research Unit, Department of Preventive and Social Medicine, University of Otago, PO Box 913, Dunedin, NEW ZEALAND

³ Department of Preventive and Social Medicine, University of Otago, PO Box 913, Dunedin, NEW ZEALAND

Abstract

Purpose—Although concurrent influences on adolescent physical activity are well documented, longitudinal studies offer additional insights about early life antecedents of participation. The aim of this study was to examine associations between childhood and contemporaneous factors and patterns of physical activity participation during adolescence.

Methods—Physical activity participation at ages 15 and 18 was assessed among members of the Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study cohort using the interview-based Minnesota Leisure Time Physical Activity Questionnaire. Logistic regression was used to examine associations between childhood factors (socioeconomic status, family 'active-recreation' orientation, home activities, motor ability, intelligence and psychiatric disorder), contemporaneous factors (parental health, BMI, predicted VO_{2max}, general health, television viewing, smoking and alcohol use) and 'Persistent Inactivity', 'Declining Participation' or 'Persistent Activity' during adolescence.

Results—In multivariate models, Persistent Inactivity during adolescence was associated with lower childhood family active-recreation orientation, and poorer cardiorespiratory fitness and general health during adolescence. Declining participation was more likely among those who reported fewer activities at home during childhood. Persistent Activity was associated with better cardiorespiratory fitness and watched less television during adolescence.

Conclusions—This study found that childhood and contemporaneous factors were associated with Persistent Inactivity, Persistent Activity and Declining Participation during adolescence. The findings highlight several factors from the family and home environment of potential importance in early intervention programs to support adolescent participation in physical activity.

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR/REPRINT REQUESTS: Rosalina Richards, Department of Preventive and Social Medicine, University of Otago, PO Box 913, 9015 Dunedin, NEW ZEALAND, Phone: 64 3 479 7206, Fax: 64 3 479 7298, Email: rose.richards@stonebow.otago.ac.nz.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

Introduction

The health benefits of physical activity participation are now well established, [1] with a broad range of concurrent determinants of adolescent physical activity identified, spanning intrapersonal factors, behavioral attributes/skills, social/cultural factors and the physical environment [2]. Life course epidemiology suggests that, in addition to these concurrent determinants, early life factors may also influence later outcomes [3]. Longitudinal studies offer unique insights into antecedents of adolescent physical activity participation and potential opportunities for early intervention.

The focus here is on four potential domains of influence, family environment, physical health/ ability, mental health/ability, and health risk behavior. Family factors may influence physical activity participation through a variety of environmental, cultural and genetic factors [4,5]. Evidence suggests antecedents of adolescent physical activity include higher SES [4,6] and parental modeling/support for participation [6,7]. In contrast studies have not reported associations between opportunities to be active at home and later physical activity [7,8]. Physical health and ability are another potentially important domain, with evidence that better self-report general health [9,10], physical fitness [9], adiposity [11] and motor ability [12] are antecedents of adolescent physical activity, though findings are mixed for the latter two factors [6,10,13]. An individual's mental health status and intellectual ability can potentially play a role in facilitating or limiting their capacity to enjoy and maintain participation in physical activity, though evidence for as an antecedent of adolescent activity is mixed [14–16] [10]. The final domain is health risk behavior, which is of interest because there is evidence that risk behaviors, including physical inactivity, may cluster or co-occur during adolescence [17]. There is inconsistent evidence about risk behaviors being antecedents of adolescent physical activity, with some studies reporting significant associations for less television viewing [6] and being a non-smoker [10] while others reported no associations [6,7]. Alcohol use has also been examined but no associations found with later physical activity [10].

Another important aspect of longitudinal research is that it allows examination of patterns of participation <u>during</u> adolescence, rather than participation at one point in time [18]. Studies examining *persistently low* participation in physical activity during late childhood/adolescence [6,10,19] found antecedents included SES, less parental support, poor perceived health, high BMI, smoking, perceptions of low physical competence and type of school attended (vocational or academically oriented). A study which examined a group with *declining* participation, in addition to a *persistently low* group [6], found several influences that were specific to the *declining* group, including associations with ethnicity, television viewing, and low self-efficacy.

Based on previous findings reviewed here, it was hypothesized that childhood (socioeconomic status, family active-recreation orientation, home activities, motor ability, intelligence and psychiatric disorder) and contemporaneous (parental health, BMI, VO_{2max} , general health, television viewing, smoking and alcohol use) factors would be associated with patterns of physical activity participation from ages 15–18 years.

Methods

Subjects

The Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study is an ongoing longitudinal study of health and behavior among a cohort born in Dunedin, New Zealand between April 1972 and March 1973 [20]. Following collection of perinatal data, a cohort of 1037 Study members were first followed up at age 3 years (91% of those still resident in the greater Dunedin metropolitan area). The current study includes data from birth and subsequent assessments at

ages 3 (n=1037, 48% female), 5 (n=991, 48% female), 7 (n=954, 48% female), 9 (n=955, 48% female), 11 (n=925, 48% female), 13 (n=850, 49% female), 15 (n=976, 49% female) and 18 years (n=993, 49% female). Families of Study members represent the full range of socioeconomic status (SES) in the New Zealand population [20]. Furthermore, Study members appeared to be very similar to other New Zealand age matched peers across several health-related measures, including physical activity [21]. This study focuses on those with complete physical activity data at both assessments (n = 770). In comparisons (involving all independent variables) for those with complete and incomplete data, those with complete data had higher family SES, family active recreation orientation, motor scores, IQ scores and were less likely to smoke than those with incomplete data. All research procedures were approved by the Otago Ethics Committee and written informed consent was obtained prior to participation in the study at each age.

Procedures

At each assessment, Study members were invited to spend a day at the Dunedin Research Unit. Study members were assessed as close to their birthday as possible (i.e. usually within one or two months) and attempts were made to obtain at least partial data from those who were unable to attend the Dunedin Research Unit.

Measurements

Physical activity participation—Participation at ages 15 and 18 was assessed using the interview-based Minnesota Leisure Time Physical Activity Questionnaire (MLTPAQ) [22], modified to capture sporting and recreational activities carried out in New Zealand [23] [9]. Estimates of energy expenditure from this measure among adolescents have been shown to be correlated (r = 0.49) with energy expenditure from the doubly labeled water technique [24]. This study focuses on those with complete physical activity data at both assessments (n = 770). At each age physical activity participation was dichotomized to reflect attainment of recommended levels of participation for adolescents (one hour per day, seven days a week, of moderate to vigorous intensity) [1].

The present study examines three patterns of participation: the Persistent Inactivity group who did not meet the recommendations at either 15 and 18 years (females: n = 192, 24.9%; males: n = 117, 15.2%), the Persistent Activity group who met the recommendations at both ages 15 and 18 years (females: n = 45, 5.8%; males: n = 122, 15.8%) and those who met the recommendations at age 15 but not 18 years (Declining Participation: females: n = 119, 15.4%; males: n = 128, 16.6%). A fourth grouping was possible which included those who met the recommendations at age 18 but not at 15 years (Increasing Participation), however, given the limited number of Study members in this group (females: n = 16, 2.1%; males: n = 31, 4.0%), this study focused on the other three patterns of participation as outcome measures, with the Increasing Participation group included in the comparison groups only.

Childhood measures—The *SES* of families of study members was described using a sixpoint scale which assessed parents self-reported occupational status, based on the educational levels and income associated with that occupation in data from the New Zealand Census [25].

An average based on the higher SES of either parent at each assessment from birth to age 15 was calculated to reflect the cumulative influence of SES during childhood and early adolescence [26], with higher scores indicating lower SES. The *Family Active-Recreation Orientation* subscale of the Moos Family Environment Scale was used to measure family participation in social and recreational activities [27]. This subscale consists of 9 questions that include specific items about family participation in sport and recreational activities, for

example, 'Nobody in our family is active in sports, Little league, bowling etc', 'Family members are not very involved in recreational activities outside work or school', 'We often go to movies, sports events, camping etc.' For analysis, the Active-Recreation Orientation scale scores from ages 7 and 9 were combined and standardized. Finally, a *Home activities* measure was created to reflect opportunities for activity within the childhood home at ages 3, 5, 7 and 9. Parents were asked if Study members had been swimming/paddling in a pool, climbing trees or fences, playing on swings or bars, riding a trike/bike, or playing ball games (with the latter two activities measured at ages 3 and 5 only) at home during the previous 6 months. The number of activities was summed across ages and scores standardized.

Intelligence was measured using the Wechsler Intelligence Scale for Children-Revised at ages 7, 9, 11 and 13 [28]. An average of scores across ages 7, 9, 11 and 13 years was calculated and standardized to give the final IQ measure. Those with an IQ less than 70 (n = 10) were excluded from the analysis.

Mental health during late childhood/early adolescence was also examined using the Diagnostic Interview Schedule for Children at ages 11, 13 and 15 years [29]. All psychiatric disorders were combined to create a single variable *Any psychiatric disorder* which included diagnoses of Anxiety, Depression, Attention deficit and hyperactivity, and Conduct/oppositional disorders diagnosed during the 12 months prior to the age 11, 13 and 15 assessments (any psychiatric disorder: females: n = 137, 36.8%; males: n = 155, 38.9%, in the analytic sample).

Childhood motor ability was assessed using the Basic Motor Ability Test ages 7 and 9 [30]. This test is comprised of nine subtests, which assess both gross motor (subtests: standing long jump, agility run, target throwing, chair push-ups, face down to standing) and fine motor (subtests: tapping board, static balance, bead stringing and hamstring stretch) ability. Scores for each of the subscales were standardized and an average of the standardized scores across the two ages calculated.

Contemporaneous measures (age 15)—At age 15, mothers of study members were asked to give a self-report rating of their own health and a proxy report rating of the Study member's father health as being either very good, good, fair or poor. As there were few instances of fair or poor health, the health status of both parents was combined and dichotomized to create a *Parental health* measure. This measure identified when neither parent had very good health (females: n = 87, 26.1%; males: n = 90, 25.3%) versus those where at least one parent was reported to have very good health (females: n = 247, 74.0%; males: n = 266, 74.7%), with higher scores indicating poorer parental health.

Each Study member's health status was also measured at age 15. Predicted maximal oxygen uptake (VO_{2max}) was included as an indicator of physical fitness. This score (measurement and correction details described elsewhere [31]) was standardized for the purposes of analysis. *General health* was measured by self-reports of general/overall health on a four point scale (range 1 poor – 4 very good). As few Study members reported poorer health status, responses to this question were dichotomized to give a measure of 'very good' health (females: n = 216, 58.2%; males: n = 226, 57.4%) compared to all other responses ('good', 'not too good' and 'poor'). *BMI* scores (measurement described elsewhere [32]) were divided into normal weight versus overweight/obese (females: n = 49, 13.3%; males: n = 34, 8.6%) using established cut-off points for age 15 [33].

At age 15 Study members were asked how many hours they usually spent watching television on weekdays and at the weekend [34]. These measures were combined to give an estimate of weekly time spent *Television viewing* and standardized, with higher scores indicating greater time spent watching television. Measures of tobacco smoking and alcohol use at age 15 were

categorized to give a *Tobacco smoking* measure that identified Study members who 'usually smoke one or more times a week' (females: n = 84, 22.7%; males: n = 57, 14.4%)[35], and an *Alcohol use* measure that identified whether Study members reported having experienced being drunk at least once by age 15 (females: n = 128, 34.8%; males: n = 130, 32.8%).[36]

Statistical analyses

Intercorrelation between independent variables was estimated using Spearman correlation coefficients. Univariate and multivariate logistic regression was used to examine associations between childhood and adolescent measures and patterns of participation between ages 15 and 18 years. Data were divided into strata that compared those patterns of participation that, from a public health perspective, were least desirable with the more desirable, using a continuation ratio model [37]. First, those with Persistent Inactivity were compared to those reporting Persistent Activity, Declining Participation and Increasing Participation. Second, the Declining participation. Third, the most desirable group (again from a public health perspective), those reporting Persistent Inactivity, Declining Participation and Increasing Participation). Sex was included in all models to account for differences between males and females in proportions reporting each pattern of participation. Additionally, we tested for sex interaction effects in the univariate associations and none were found. All analyses were conducted in Intercooled Stata 8.0 (STATA Corporation, Texas, 2003).

Results

Descriptive statistics for continuous independent variables are shown in Table 1 and spearman correlation coefficients for all independent variables in Table 2.

Results from the univariate analyses for the three groups are shown in Table 3. In terms of childhood risk factors, those with lower family SES, lower Moos Family Active-Recreation Orientation scale scores and who participated in fewer activities at home during childhood were more likely to be in the Persistent Inactivity group during adolescence. The likelihood of being in the Persistent Inactivity groups was higher among those with poorer general and parental health, lower cardiorespiratory fitness and higher rates of television watching at age 15. Participation in fewer activities at home during childhood was also associated with Declining Participation. No contemporaneous factors were associated with this pattern of participation.

Those with higher family SES, higher scores on the Moos Family Active-Recreation Orientation scale, participation in more activities at home during childhood and better childhood motor ability were more likely to show later Persistent Activity than those with less supportive family environments. Subsequent analyses also suggest that the gross motor components (Odds ratio: 1.41, 95% Confidence Interval: 1.12–1.79) of the overall motor score were more strongly related to later Persistent Activity gross than the fine motor scores (Odds ratio: 1.12, 95% Confidence Interval: 0.89–1.41). Additionally, those with better parental and general health, better cardiorespiratory fitness and lower rates of television watching at age 15 were more likely to display Persistent Activity during adolescence.

Multivariate logistic regressions were carried out separately for the three patterns of activity and included those variables where p<0.20 in the univariate analyses [38]. As shown in Table 4, after controlling for all other factors in the model, those with lower scores on the Moos Family Active-Recreation Orientation scale during childhood, and poorer contemporaneous cardiorespiratory fitness and general health were more likely to be in the Persistent Inactivity group. In the multivariate model for Declining Participation, one childhood factor remained

significant associations with two contemporaneous factors in the multivariate models. Those with better cardiorespiratory fitness and watched less television were more likely to be in the Persistent Activity group (albeit at borderline significance in the latter case, p = 0.05).

Discussion

Three patterns of physical activity during adolescence were examined: Persistent Inactivity, Persistent Activity and Declining Participation. The childhood and contemporaneous (age 15) factors associated with these patterns in univariate and multivariate analyses are now discussed, beginning with the most 'at risk' group, those with Persistent Inactivity between ages 15 and 18 years.

Consistent with previous longitudinal studies [4,6], Persistent Inactivity was associated with lower family SES. A unique aspect of the current study is the inclusion of a measure of SES from birth to adolescence, as it is likely to be a better reflection of the cumulative experience of socioeconomic disadvantage over time than a single measurement [26]. Persistent Inactivity was also associated with lower family active-recreation orientation during childhood, even after other factors were controlled for. While this is consistent with other studies that have found associations between activity and parental modelling or support for participation [6,7], the current measure reflects a broader family dynamic where regular participation in social and recreational activities is part of the normal family environment. A third measure of family environment during childhood, activities at home, was also associated with later activity. Persistent Inactivity was associated with less participation in activities at home, such as climbing fences/trees, playing on swings, playing in paddling pools, riding bikes and playing ball games. This is in contrast to two previous longitudinal studies [7,8] where no associations were reported, and mixed evidence from cross-sectional studies [2]. Some of contrast observed here may reflect differences in the measures of home environment, with the current study examining opportunities at younger ages and over multiple assessments.

The association between family and home environments and Persistent Inactivity also continued with the contemporaneous measures examined. Persistent Inactivity was more likely among Study members whose parents had poorer health (as reported by the mother of Study members). Parental health has been a relatively unexplored influence on physical activity until now, but is potentially important in determining a parent's ability to either model or provide support for participation in physical activity. The observed association between television viewing and Persistent Inactivity was consistent with previous research [6]. Although television viewing has not been traditionally considered a 'family environment' measure, if it is assumed that the majority of television viewing occurs at home, family norms and rules regarding appropriate viewing times are likely to be an important influence on this behaviour. Finally, Persistent Inactivity was also associated with contemporaneous measures of health status. Consistent with findings from previous research [9,10], Study members with Persistent Inactivity were more likely to have poorer self-reported health and lower cardiorespiratory fitness.

The associations found for the other two patterns of physical activity participation (Declining participation and Persistent Activity) shared several commonalities with those for Persistent Inactivity. Declining Participation in physical activity was associated with participation in fewer activities at home during childhood. An additional finding, unique to the pattern of Declining Participation, was a significant association (albeit marginal) with activities at home, after controlling for other factors in the multivariate model.

Richards et al.

The univariate findings for the Persistent Activity group mirrored those described for the Persistent Inactivity group, with one exception. Persistent Activity was more likely among Study members with better childhood motor ability. This is consistent with some previous work examining the influence of childhood motor ability on physical activity during adolescence [12], though in contrast with other findings [13]. It is possible that having better motor skills, either through opportunities to practice or via genetic determined advantage, facilitates enjoyment and mastery of physically active tasks. The current study suggests that the gross motor components of the Basic Motor Ability Test may be of greater importance than fine motor components in determining later physical activity participation. It may be that skills related to 'large body' movement are of greater relevance for ongoing physical activity participation than fine motor abilities.

The current study did not find evidence for associations between patterns of physical activity and BMI, tobacco smoking, alcohol use, psychiatric disorder or IQ. This is consistent with previous research regarding alcohol use [10] and with the mixed evidence available for BMI [6,10], tobacco smoking [6,10] and psychiatric disorder [15,16]. In terms of IQ, this was the first study to exploring the potential of IQ as a possible underlying factor in reported associations between type of school attended (academic versus vocational) and patterns of physical activity participation [10]. Given the lack of association reported here, it suggests that there may be other aspects of academic achievement other than intellectual ability that are underpinning previously observed relationships with physical activity.

The life course epidemiology perspective examines the long-term effects of physical and social exposures that have been encountered during the life course [3,39]. In the current study several factors from early life were associated with multiple patterns of adolescent physical activity participation, with implications for policy and practice focusing on early intervention programs in the family and home environment. Factors from childhood associated with later adolescent physical activity included family SES, family active recreation orientation and home activities. Thus, future research might consider the potential of interventions targeting families with low SES, encouraging family-wide involvement in physical recreation, and assessing the provision of home-based opportunities for active outdoor play.

There are limitations in this study that should be borne in mind when interpreting the longitudinal findings. This study examined individuals who were adolescents during the late 1980s/early 1990's, and the context for physical activity is likely to have changed for contemporary adolescents. Another potential issue is the impact of data loss resulting from measurement at multiple ages. In the current study those with complete physical activity data at ages 15 and 18 had higher SES, family active recreation orientation, motor scores and were more likely to be non-smokers than those with incomplete data. As these factors tend to be associated with higher physical activity participation, the estimates of association with physical activity participation may be conservative. Data loss also occurred in the multivariate analysis due to missing values in the independent variables, however, no substantial alterations in the results were found when multivariate analyses were re-run with imputed missing values (analysis not shown). Finally, given the self-report nature of many of the measures (e.g. physical activity, general health) these findings need to be replicated using more extensive, objective measurement techniques.

Other suggestions for future research include further exploration of opportunities to be active within the home and neighbourhood environment. There have been significant advances in techniques for describing neighbourhood environments [40], yet few have been applied in long-term longitudinal studies. Also of interest is if the childhood and adolescence factors identified here continue to be associated with physical activity into adulthood.

Strengths of this study included the ability to examine a) childhood and contemporaneous correlates of adolescent physical activity in the same individuals, b) patterns of participation over time as an outcome (rather than at one point in time), and c) the associations between a range of factors, some novel, and physical activity patterns during adolescence. While observational longitudinal studies do not provide definitive evidence of causal pathways, studies such as this can provide unique insights about associations after controlling for other factors and for hypothesis generation for further research. The findings highlight several factors from the family and home environment of potential importance in early intervention programs to support adolescent participation in physical activity.

Acknowledgments

¹ The Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Research Unit is supported by the Health Research Council of New Zealand. Data reported in this study were partially supported by US-NIMH grant MH45070. Ms Richards, Dr Reeder and the Social and Behavioural Research in Cancer Unit receive support from the Cancer Society of New Zealand and the University of Otago. We thank Dr Phil Silva, the Study founder, and the Study members, their friends and families for their past and ongoing support.

References

- Strong WB, Malina R, Blimkie JR, et al. Evidence based physical activity for school-age youth. J Pediatr 2005;146(6):732–737. [PubMed: 15973308]
- Sallis JF, Prochaska JJ, Taylor WC. A review of correlates of physical activity of children and adolescents. Med Sci Sports Exerc 2000;32:963–975. [PubMed: 10795788]
- Lynch J, Smith GD. A life course approach to chronic disease epidemiology. Ann Rev Public Health 2005;26:1–35. [PubMed: 15760279]
- Aarnio M, Kujala UM, Kaprio J. Associations of health-related behaviors, school type and health status to physical activity patterns in 16 year old boys and girls. Scand J Soc Med 1997;25(3):156–167. [PubMed: 9360271]
- 5. Wolfarth B, Bray MS, Hagberg JM, et al. The human gene map for performance and health-related fitness phenotypes: the 2004 update. Med Sci Sports Exerc 2005;37(6):881–903. [PubMed: 15947712]
- 6. Barnett TA, O'Loughlin J, Paradis G. One- and two-year predictors of decline in physical activity among inner-city schoolchildren. Am J Prev Med 2002;23(2):121–128. [PubMed: 12121800]
- 7. Trost SG, Pate RR, Saunders R, et al. A prospective study of the determinants of physical activity in rural fifth-grade children. Prev Med 1997;26:257–263. [PubMed: 9085396]
- DiLorenzo TM, Stucky-Ropp RC, Vander Wal JS, et al. Determinants of exercise among children. II. A longititudinal analysis. Prev Med 1998;27:470–477. [PubMed: 9612838]
- Dovey SM, Reeder AI, Chalmers DJ. Continuity and change in sporting and leisure time physical activities during adolescence. Br J Sports Med 1998;32(1):53–57. [PubMed: 9562165]
- Aarnio M, Winter T, Kujala UM, et al. Associations of health related behaviour, social relationships, and health status with persistent physical activity and inactivity: a study of Finnish adolescent twins. Br J Sports Med 2002;36(5):360–364. [PubMed: 12351335]
- Kimm SY, Glynn NW, Kriska AM, et al. Decline in physical activity in black girls and white girls during adolescence. N Engl J Med 2002;347(10):709–715. [PubMed: 12213941]
- 12. Baquet G, Twisk JWR, Kemper HCG, et al. Longitudinal follow-up of fitness during childhood: interaction with physical activity. Am J Hum Biol 2006;18(1):51–58. [PubMed: 16378341]
- McKenzie TL, Sallis JF, Broyles SL, et al. Childhood movement skills: predictors of physical activity in Anglo American and Mexican American adolescents? Res Q Exerc Sport 2002;73(3):238–244. [PubMed: 12230330]
- McDermott RJ, Hawkins WE, Marty PJ, et al. Health behavior correlates of depression in a sample of high school students. J Sch Health 1990;60:414–422. [PubMed: 2255199]

¹I confirm that I have listed everyone who contributed significantly to the work in the acknowledgements. R Richards, 1 Nov 2007.

J Adolesc Health. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2010 March 1.

- Motl RW, Birnbaum AS, Kubik MY, et al. Naturally occurring changes in physical activity are inversely related to depressive symptoms during early adolescence. Psychosom Med 2004;66(3): 336–342. [PubMed: 15184692]
- Gillander Gadin K, Hammarstrom A. Can school-related factors predict future health behaviour among young adolescents. Public Health 2002;116:22–29. [PubMed: 11896632]
- Pate R, Heath GW, Dowda M, et al. Associations between physical activity and other health behaviours in a representative sample of US adolescents. Am J Public Health 1996;86(11):1577– 1581. [PubMed: 8916523]
- Telama R, Yang X, Viikari J, et al. Physical activity from childhood to adulthood: a 21 year tracking study. Am J Prev Med 2005;28(3):267–273. [PubMed: 15766614]
- Butcher J, Sallis JF, McKenzie TL, et al. A longitudinal study of children's participation in organised sport and instructional programs. Avante 2001;7:86–96.
- 20. Silva, PA.; Stanton, WR. From Child to Adult: The Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study. Auckland: Oxford University Press; 1996.
- 21. Poulton R, Hancox RJ, Milne B, et al. The Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study: are its findings consistent with the overall New Zealand population? N Z Med J 2006;119(1235):1–11.
- Taylor HL, Jacobs DRJ, Schucker B, et al. A questionnaire for the assessment of leisure time physical activities. J Chronic Dis 1978;31:741–755. [PubMed: 748370]
- 23. Reeder AI, Stanton WR, Langley JD, et al. Adolescents' sporting and leisure time physical activities during their 15th year. Can J Sport Sci 1991;16:308–315. [PubMed: 1663833]
- 24. Slinde F, Arvidsson D, Sjoberg A, et al. Minnesota leisure time activity questionnaire and doubly labeled water in adolescents. Med Sci Sports Exerc 2003;35(11):1923–1928. [PubMed: 14600560]
- 25. Elley WB, Irving JC. Revised socio-economic index for New Zealand. N Z J Educ Stud 1976;11:25–26.
- Poulton R, Caspi A, Milne BJ, et al. Association between children's experience of socioeconomic disadvantage and adult health: a life-course study. Lancet 2002;360:1640–1645. [PubMed: 12457787]
- 27. Moos, R.; Moos, B. Family Environment Scale manual. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press; 1981.
- 28. Weschler, D. Wechsler intelligence scale for children revised. New York: Psychological Corp; 1974.
- 29. Costello, A.; Edelbrock, C.; Kalas, R., et al. Diagnostic interview schedule for children DISC. Bethesda: National Institute of Mental Health; 1982.
- 30. Arnheim, DD.; Sinclair, WA. The Clumsy Child. St. Louis: C.V. Mosby; 1974. p. 97-167.
- Richards R, Williams S, Poulton R, et al. Tracking club sport participation from childhood to early adulthood. Res Q Exerc Sport 2007;78(5):413–419. [PubMed: 18274213]
- 32. Williams S. Overweight at age 21: the association with body mass index in childhood and adolescence and parents' body mass index. A cohort study of New Zealanders born in 1972–1973. Int J Obes 2001;25:158–163.
- Cole TJ, Bellizzi MC, Flegal KM, et al. Estabilishing a standard definition for child overweight and obesity worldwide: international survey. BMJ 2000;320(7244):1240. [PubMed: 10797032]
- Hancox RJ, Milne BJ, Poulton R. Association between child and adolescent television viewing and adult health: a longitudinal birth cohort study. Lancet 2004;364(9430):257–262. [PubMed: 15262103]
- Stanton WR, McClelland M, Elwood C, et al. Prevalence, reliability and bias of adolescents' reports of smoking and quitting. Addiction 1996;91(11):1705–1714. [PubMed: 8972928]
- Casswell S, Zhang J-F. Access to alcohol from licensed premises during adolescence: a longitudinal study. Addiction 1997;92(6):737–745. [PubMed: 9246801]
- Armstrong BG, Sloan M. Ordinal regression models for epidemiologic data. Am J Epidemiol 1989;129:191–204. [PubMed: 2910061]
- 38. Hosmer, W.; Lemeshow, S. Applied logistic regression. New York: John Wiley and Sons; 1989.

- Nicolau B, Thomson WM, Steele JG, et al. Life-course epidemiology: concepts and theoretical models and its relevance to chronic oral conditions. Community Dentistry and Oral Epidemiology 2007;35:241–249. [PubMed: 17615010]
- 40. Reibel M. Geographic Information Systems and Spatial Data Processing in Demography: a Review. Population Research and Policy Review 2007;26(5–6):601–618.

~
_
_
_
- U
~
-
-
_
<u> </u>
_
_
-
()
-
_
_
-
\sim
01
<u> </u>
_
C .
0
~
\sim
_
0
<u> </u>

	sical activity
	measures and ph
÷	od and adolescent
Table	inuous childhoc
	standardised conti
	statistics for uns
	Descriptive

			Females					Males		
Variables	п	Mean	Std dev	Min	Max	u	Mean	Std dev	Min	Max
Childhood measures										
Socioeconomic status ^a	371	3.14	1.09	1.00	5.50	398	3.17	1.10	1.00	6.00
Family active-recreation orientation b	358	6.17	1.79	1.00	00.6	388	6.04	1.82	0.50	9.00
Home activities ^c	338	12.62	2.37	5.00	16.00	366	12.63	2.11	4.00	16.00
Childhood motor ability ^d	336	-0.07	0.96	-8.21	2.15	374	0.12	0.87	-4.42	2.39
IQ	362	107.25	12.83	70.00	140.50	395	108.69	13.14	74.75	136.50
Contemporaneous measures										
Predicted VO ₂ max	365	44.08	4.42	34.20	61.70	397	49.24	5.73	36.50	71.30
Television viewing (hours/week)	349	22.23	11.84	0.00	67.00	378	25.40	12.64	2.00	86.00
Physical activity ^e										
Age 15	401	7.56	5.90	0.00	36.02	431	11.28	8.18	0.00	41.27
Age 18	421	4.09	4.54	00.00	30.10	449	7.32	7.78	0.00	53.08
^a SES score on scale of 1–6 with higher score	es = lower SES									

 b Scores on scale from 0–9 with higher scores = higher family active-recreation orientation

 c Score out of a total of 16 available activities

 $d_{Average}$ of standardized motor scores from ages 7 and 9 years

 e Average hours per week

Richards et al.

script NIH-PA Author Manuscript

ript NIH-PA Author Manuscript

Richards et al.

 Table 2

 Spearman correlation coefficients for all childhood and adolescent predictor variables

								Variables							
Variables	1	7	9	4	N	Q	٢	œ	6	10	11	12	13	14	15
1 Persistent Inactivity	1.00														
2 Declining Participation	·	1.00													
3 Persistent Activity	·		1.00												
4 Socioeconomic status	0.08^*	-0.05	-0.07	1.00											
5 Family Act. Rec. Orient.	-0.12^{*}	0.04	0.11^*	-0.26^{*}	1.00										
6 Home activities	-0.07	-0.04	0.14^*	-0.14^{*}	0.20^*	1.00									
7 Childhood motor ability	-0.06	-0.002	0.12^*	-0.12*	0.13^*	0.12^*	1.00								
8 IQ	-0.01	-0.03	0.07^*	-0.41^{*}	0.17^{*}	0.07^{*}	0.32^*	1.00							
9 Psychiatric disorder	0.01	-0.03	0.02	0.15^*	-0.02	-0.02	-0.07	-0.14^{*}	1.00						
10 Parent health	$^{*}60.0$	0.01	+0.09	0.15^*	-0.13^{*}	0.05	-0.03	-0.03	0.05	1.00					
11 Body mass index	0.01	0.002	-0.05	0.12^*	-0.04	-0.02	-0.11^{*}	-0.06	0.11^*	0.05	1.00				
12 Predicted VO ₂ max	-0.23^{*}	0.05	0.22^*	-0.05	0.08^*	0.05	0.17^{*}	0.10^*	-0.01	0.06	-0.24^{*}	1.00			
13 General health	0.11^*	-0.02	-0.11^{*}	0.10^{*}	-0.04	-0.06	-0.08	-0.07^{*}	0.16^*	0.09^*	0.15^*	-0.17^{*}	1.00		
14 Television viewing	0.07	-0.01	-0.10^{*}	0.29^*	-0.15^{*}	-0.07	-0.08	-0.26^{*}	0.06	0.18^*	0.12^*	-0.03	0.11^*	1.00	
15 Tobacco smoking	0.04	0.03	-0.04	0.14^*	0.06^*	-0.02	-0.001	-0.13^{*}	0.27^{*}	-0.03	0.03	-0.07^{*}	0.14^*	-0.05	1.00
16 Alcohol use	-0.01	0.04	-0.04	0.06	0.13^*	0.02	0.10^{*}	-0.01	0.19^*	-0.06	0.02	0.01	0.05	-0.02	0.41
* Correlation is significant at the 0.0	15 level														

J Adolesc Health. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2010 March 1.

Page 12

_
_
_
_
_
_
_
-
-
_
_
_
_
_
<u>ح</u>
ล
б
ğ
or
or
Nor N
or N
or M
or Ma
or Ma
or Mai
or Mar
or Man
or Manu
or Manu
or Manus
or Manus
or Manus
or Manusc
or Manusci
or Manuscr
nor Manuscri
or Manuscrip
or Manuscrip

Richards et al.

VariablesnChildhood measuresChildhood measuresSocioeconomic statusFamily Active Rec.Tamily Active Rec.Tamily Active Rec.Tamily Active Rec.Torient.	OR 1.19 0.74 0.85 0.90 1.01 1.01 1.07	95% CI 1.04–1.37 0.63–0.87 0.73–1.00 0.76–1.06 0.87–1.18	p-value	u	OR	95% CI	n-value	=	OR	95% CI	p-value
Childhood measures 769 1 Socioeconomic status ^a 769 1 Family Active Rec. 746 (Orient.b 710 (Anne activities ^c 704 (Childhood motor ability ^d 710 (Ino disorder 757 1 Psychiatric disorder 757 1 no disorder 770 1 no disorder 770 1 no disorder 770 1 no disorder 757 1 New pood 690 1 not very good 690 1 Body mass index 765 (normal weight 1 1	1.19 0.74 0.85 0.90 1.01 1.07 1.00	1.04–1.37 0.63–0.87 0.73–1.00 0.76–1.06 0.87–1.18						1			
Socioeconomic status ^{a} 769 1 Family Active Rec. 746 (Orient. ^{b} 704 (Home activities ^{c} 704 (Childhood motor ability ^{d} 710 (10^{e} 710 (10^{e} 757 1 Psychiatric disorder 770 1 no disorder 770 1 not very good 690 1 very good 765 (normal weight	1.19 0.74 0.85 0.90 1.01 1.07 1.00	1.04–1.37 0.63–0.87 0.73–1.00 0.76–1.06 0.87–1.18									
Family Active Rec.746(Orient. b Home activities c 704(Home activities c 704(Childhood motor ability d 710(IQ e 7571Psychiatric disorder7571no disorder7701no disorder7701no disorder7701no disorder7701no disorder7701no disorder7701no disorder7571Body mass index6901normal weight11	0.74 0.85 0.90 1.01 1.07 1.00	0.63–0.87 0.73–1.00 0.76–1.06 0.87–1.18	0.01	461	1.01	0.85 - 1.19	0.94	769	0.85	0.72 - 1.00	<0.05
Home activities ^c 704 (Childhood motor ability ^d 710 (IQ ^e 757 1 Psychiatric disorder 757 1 Psychiatric disorder 770 1 no disorder 770 1 Nortemporaneous measures 690 1 very good 690 1 Body mass index 765 (normal weight 1 1	0.85 0.90 1.01 1.07 1.00	0.73-1.00 0.76-1.06 0.87-1.18	<0.01	453	06.0	0.74–1.11	0.33	746	1.41	1.16–1.75	<0.01
Childhood motor ability ^d 710 (IQ ^e 757 1 Psychiatric disorder 757 1 any disorder 770 1 no disorder 770 1 no disorder 690 1 not very good 690 1 very good 690 1 very good 765 (normal weight	0.90 1.01 7.01 1.00	0.76–1.06 0.87–1.18	<0.05	428	0.74	0.60-0.92	<0.01	704	1.49	1.20 - 1.84	<0.01
IQ ^e 757 1 Psychiatric disorder 770 1 any disorder 770 1 no disorder 770 1 no disorder 690 1 not very good 690 1 very good 690 1 not very good 765 (overweight/obese 765 (1.01 1.07 1.00	0.87 - 1.18	0.21	435	0.92	0.73-1.17	0.51	710	1.30	1.04 - 1.61	0.02
Psychiatric disorder any disorder no disorder <i>Contemporaneous measures</i> Parent health not very good very good Body mass index overweight/obese 765 (1.07		0.89	458	0.92	0.74 - 1.11	0.37	757	1.16	0.97 - 1.39	0.11
any disorder 770 1 no disorder 770 1 <i>Contemporaneous measures</i> Parent health 690 1 not very good 690 1 very good 765 (overweight/obese 765 (1.07										
no disorder <i>Contemporaneous measures</i> Parent health not very good very good Body mass index overweight/obese 765 (1.00	0.79-1.45	0.67	461	0.88	0.60 - 1.29	0.51	770	1.07	0.72 - 1.53	0.72
Contemporaneous measures Parent health not very good 690 1 very good 690 1 Body mass index 765 (normal weight					1.00				1.00		
Parent health not very good 690 1 very good 1 Body mass index 765 (normal weight 1											
not very good 690 1 very good Body mass index overweight/obese 765 (
very good Body mass index overweight/obese 765 (normal weight	1.54	1.08-2.19	0.02	426	1.59	0.98-2.56	0.06	069	0.58	0.37 - 0.92	0.02
Body mass index overweight/obese 765 (normal weight	1.00				1.00				1.00		
overweight/obese 765 (normal weight											
normal weight	0.98	0.61 - 1.57	0.94	458	1.05	0.57 - 1.95	0.87	765	0.73	0.39 - 1.38	0.33
	1.00				1.00				1.00		
Predicted $VO_2 max^f$ 762 (0.67	0.56-0.81	<0.01	457	0.85	0.69 - 1.03	0.10	762	1.53	1.26 - 1.84	<0.01
General health											
not very good 765 1	1.63	1.20-2.21	<0.01	457	1.37	0.94 - 2.00	0.10	765	0.57	0.40 - 0.81	<0.01
very good	1.00				1.00				1.00		
Television viewing ^g 727	1.20	1.03-1.39	0.02	440	1.13	0.93 - 1.37	0.23	727	0.70	0.57 - 0.85	<0.01
Tobacco smoking											
smoker 766 J	1.11	0.76-1.62	0.59	458	1.47	0.88–2.47	0.14	766	0.87	0.53 - 1.41	0.56
non-smoker	1.00				1.00				1.00		
Alcohol use											
been drunk 764 (0.94	0.69 - 1.30	0.73	458	1.23	0.82-1.83	0.32	764	0.83	0.57 - 1.21	0.34
never been drunk	1.00				1.00				1.00		

J Adolesc Health. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2010 March 1.

Page 13

Richards et al.

PI: Persistent Inactivity PA: Persistent Activity

Key

CI: Confidence Interval

OR: Odds Ratio

All analyses controlled for sex Table notes: Reference groups

^aHigher SES

 $b_{\rm Lower Family Active Recreation Orientation scores$

 $^{c}\mathrm{Fewer}$ Home Activities

 d_{Lower} motor ability scores

^eHigher IQ scores

 $f_{\rm Lower}$ Predicted VO2max scores

 g Greater time spent Television viewing

_
~
_
- 1 -1-1-
tin in the second se
U
$\mathbf{\Sigma}$
-
~
-
<u>+</u>
5
0
¥.
· ·
2
<u>م</u>
5
1
<u> </u>
S
Ô
¥ .
0
+

Richards et al.

 Table 4

 Multivariate associations between predictor variables and patterns of physical activity participation during adolescence

Variable OR 9% CI 9% CI <th< th=""><th>WariablesOR95% CIpvalueORChildhood measuresChildhood measures$0.35$$0.87$$-$Socioeconomic status $a$$1.01$$0.85-1.21$$0.87$$-$Socioeconomic status $a$$0.78$$0.64-0.95$$0.01$$-$Family Active Rec.$0.78$$0.64-0.95$$0.01$$-$Orient.$b$$0.94$$0.78-1.14$$0.54$$0.80$Home activites^C$0.94$$0.78-1.14$$0.54$$0.80$Childhood moor ability$d$$-$Childhood moor ability dive$-$Childhood$-$Childhood$-$</th><th></th><th></th><th>TIMETE IN T</th><th>IT ACTIVITY VS DF, 1F,</th><th>PI (n = 569)</th></th<>	WariablesOR95% CIpvalueORChildhood measuresChildhood measures 0.35 0.87 $-$ Socioeconomic status a 1.01 $0.85-1.21$ 0.87 $-$ Socioeconomic status a 0.78 $0.64-0.95$ 0.01 $-$ Family Active Rec. 0.78 $0.64-0.95$ 0.01 $-$ Orient. b 0.94 $0.78-1.14$ 0.54 0.80 Home activites ^C 0.94 $0.78-1.14$ 0.54 0.80 Childhood moor ability d $ -$ Childhood moor ability dive $ -$ Childhood $ -$ Childhood $ -$			TIMETE IN T	IT ACTIVITY VS DF, 1F,	PI (n = 569)
Cultifiend meaners 101 0.85-1.21 0.87 - - - 106 0.85-1.12 Seciecenomic stans 4 101 0.85-1.13 0.87-1.21 0.87 - - 1.20 0.94-1 Dimily-Active Res. 0.78 0.64-0.95 0.01 - - - 1.20 0.94-1 Dimily-Active Res. 0.78 0.78-1.14 0.54 0.80 0.65-1.00 0.65 1.24 0.94-1 Dime activities ⁶ 0.94 0.78-1.14 0.54 0.86 0.74-1 0.94-1 Childhood moorability ⁴ - - - - 1.17 0.94-1 Contemportmeon measures 1 0.97-2.18 0.97-2.18 0.97-2.13 0.97-2.13 0.97-2.13 Prent health 0.77 0.77-2.18 0.77-2.13 0.77-1.14 0.45 0.97 0.47-1 Voyan ⁴ 0.77 0.77-1.14 0.47-1.14 0.45 0.47 0.47-1 Contemportmeont 1.00 0.72-2.123 <t< th=""><th>Childhood measures Childhood measures 0.01 0.85-1.21 0.87 $-$ Family Active Rec. 0.78 0.64-0.95 0.01 $-$ Temily Active Rec. 0.78 0.64-0.95 0.01 $-$ Orient.^b 0.78 0.78-1.14 0.54 0.80 Home activities^C 0.94 0.78-1.14 0.54 0.80 Childhood motor ability^d $-$ IQ^e $-$ IQ^e $-$ <</th><th>OR 95% CI</th><th>p-value</th><th>OR</th><th>95% CI</th><th>p-value</th></t<>	Childhood measures Childhood measures 0.01 0.85 -1.21 0.87 $-$ Family Active Rec. 0.78 0.64 - 0.95 0.01 $-$ Temily Active Rec. 0.78 0.64 - 0.95 0.01 $-$ Orient. ^b 0.78 0.78 - 1.14 0.54 0.80 Home activities ^C 0.94 0.78 - 1.14 0.54 0.80 Childhood motor ability ^d $ -$ IQ ^e $ -$ IQ ^e $ -$ <	OR 95% CI	p-value	OR	95% CI	p-value
Socioeconnic stand 101 0.85-1.21 0.87 · · · i 100 0.85-1.21 0.87 · i 100 0.85-1.21 0.87 100 0.85-1.12 0.87 100 0.85-1.12 0.85-1.13 0.85-1.12 0.85-1.13 0.85-	Socioeconomic status a 1.01 0.85-1.21 0.87 - Family Active Rec. 0.78 0.64-0.95 0.01 - Orient. b 0.78 0.54-0.95 0.01 - Home activities ^C 0.94 0.78-1.14 0.54 0.80 Childhood motor ability ^d - - - - - Childhood motor ability ^d - - - - - - - Childhood motor ability ^d - -					
Fundity-trice (ke. 0.78 $0.64-0.95$ 0.01 \cdot \cdot \cdot 1.20 0.94 Home activitie* 0.94 $0.78-1.14$ 0.84 0.86 $0.65-1.00$ 0.65 1.20 0.94 Home activitie* 0.94 $0.78-1.14$ 0.84 0.86 1.20 0.94 Childhool moore ability ^d \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot 0.94 Childhool moore ability ^d \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot 1.17 0.94 Childhool moore ability ^d \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot 1.07 0.94 Childhool moore ability ^d \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot 0.94 Childhool moore ability \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot \cdot 0.94 Childhool moore ability 0.74 0.74 0.87 -0.95 0.94 Childhool moore ability 0.77 0.77 0.87 <	Family Active Rec. 0.78 $0.64-0.95$ 0.01 $-$ Home activities ^C 0.94 $0.78-1.14$ 0.54 0.80 Home activities ^C 0.94 $0.78-1.14$ 0.54 0.80 Childhood motor ability ^d $ -$ Childhood motor ability ^d $ -$ Childhood motor ability ^d $ -$		I	1.06	0.85 - 1.33	0.60
Home activites 094 078-11.14 0.54 0.80 0.65-1.00 0.55 1.24 0.80-1 Childhood moorability ^d : :	Home activities ^c 0.94 0.78-1.14 0.54 0.80 Childhood motor ability ^{dl} - - <td></td> <td>ı</td> <td>1.20</td> <td>0.94–1.53</td> <td>0.15</td>		ı	1.20	0.94–1.53	0.15
Childhood motor abily ^d · · <td>Childhood motor abilitydIQeContemporateous measuresParent health1.460.97-2.180.071.43not very good1.001.00very good1.000.770.62-0.960.020.92VO_2maxf0.770.62-0.960.031.26very good1.001.04-2.160.031.26very good1.001.00not very good1.000.87-1.270.59-Television viewinge1.050.87-1.270.59-Television viewingeTelevision viewinge<td< td=""><td>0.80 0.63–1.00</td><td>0.05</td><td>1.24</td><td>0.98 - 1.57</td><td>0.08</td></td<></td>	Childhood motor abilitydIQ e Contemporateous measuresParent health1.460.97-2.180.071.43not very good1.001.00very good1.000.770.62-0.960.020.92VO_2maxf0.770.62-0.960.031.26very good1.001.04-2.160.031.26very good1.001.00not very good1.000.87-1.270.59-Television viewing e 1.050.87-1.270.59-Television viewing e Television viewing e <td< td=""><td>0.80 0.63–1.00</td><td>0.05</td><td>1.24</td><td>0.98 - 1.57</td><td>0.08</td></td<>	0.80 0.63–1.00	0.05	1.24	0.98 - 1.57	0.08
	Q^{θ} - 143 0.07 0.143 0.07 0.120 0.012 0.011 0.002 0.022			1.17	0.90 - 1.52	0.24
$\begin{tabular}{lllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllllll$	Contemporate 0.07 1.43 Parent health 0.07 1.43 not very good 1.46 0.97 - 2.18 0.07 1.43 very good 1.00 0.07 0.62 - 0.96 0.02 0.92 Vo ₂ max ^f 0.77 0.62 - 0.96 0.02 0.92 Vo ₂ max ^f 0.77 0.62 - 0.96 0.02 0.92 Vo ₂ max ^f 0.77 0.62 - 0.96 0.02 0.92 Vo ₂ max ^f 0.77 0.62 - 0.96 0.02 0.92 Vo ₂ max ^f 0.77 0.62 - 0.96 0.02 0.92 Vo ₂ max ^f 0.77 0.62 0.02 0.92 Vo ₂ max ^f 1.00 0.77 0.62 <			1.03	0.80 - 1.32	0.84
Parent health Parent health 037-2.36 0.16 0.60 0.35-1. not very good 1.46 0.97-2.18 0.07 1.43 0.87-2.36 0.16 0.60 0.35-1. very good 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 very good 0.77 0.62-0.96 0.02 0.92 0.74-1.14 0.45 1.40 1.13-1 General health 1.50 1.04-2.16 0.03 1.26 0.82-1.93 0.29 0.72 0.47-1 not very good 1.00 1.50 0.87-1.27 0.59 1.26 0.74-1.14 0.45 0.47 not very good 1.00 1.00 1.35 0.74-1.45 0.47 0.47 very good 1.00 1.03 0.59 0.74 1.00 1.13-1 not very good 1.05 0.87-1.27 0.59 0.74-2.45 0.33 2 1.00 Tobecto smoking 1 1 1 1 1 1	Parent health Parent health $0.97-2.18$ 0.07 1.43 not very good 1.00 $0.97-2.18$ 0.07 1.43 very good 1.00 0.07 0.02 0.92 VO ₂ max ^f 0.77 $0.62-0.96$ 0.02 0.92 VO ₂ max ^f 0.77 $0.62-0.96$ 0.02 0.92 General health 0.77 $0.62-0.96$ 0.02 0.92 General health 0.77 $0.62-0.96$ 0.02 0.92 Nety good 1.50 0.77 $0.62-0.96$ 0.03 1.26 VO ₂ max ^f 1.00 1.00 $0.67-1.27$ 0.59 -1.00 Very good 1.05 $0.87-1.27$ 0.59 -1.35 Tobacco smoking $ -$ Tobacco smoking $ -$ Tobacco smoking $ -$ None-smoker $ -$ <					
not very good 1.46 0.97-2.18 0.07 1.43 0.87-2.36 0.16 0.60 0.35-1 very good 1.00 1.00 0.72 0.52-0.96 0.02 0.37 1.00 1.13-1 V0 ₂ max ⁶ 0.77 0.52-0.96 0.02 0.92 0.74-1.14 0.45 1.40 1.13-1 General health 1.50 1.54 0.63 1.26 0.82-1.93 0.29 0.47-1 not very good 1.50 1.64 0.63 1.13-1 1.13-1 1.13-1 not very good 1.50 0.74-1.14 0.45 0.47-1 1.13-1 not very good 1.00 0.72 0.59 1.26 0.82-1.93 0.72 0.47-1 very good 1.00 0.87-1.27 0.59 1.26 0.74-2.45 0.72 0.73 1.20 Tokeos moking - - - - 1.00 1.13 1.14 Tokeos moking - - - - -	not very good 1.46 $0.97-2.18$ 0.07 1.43 very good 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 VO ₂ max ^f 0.77 $0.62-0.96$ 0.02 0.92 General health 0.77 $0.62-0.96$ 0.02 0.92 General health 1.50 $1.04-2.16$ 0.03 1.26 not very good 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 very good 1.00 $0.87-1.27$ 0.59 1.00 Television viewing ⁸ 1.05 $0.87-1.27$ 0.59 $-$ Tobacco smoking $ -$ non-smoker $ -$ smoker $ -$ on-smoker $ -$ smoker $ -$ on-smoker $ -$ on-smoker $-$					
very good 1.00 1.00 1.00 V0 ₂ mas ⁶ 0.77 0.62-0.96 0.02 0.92 0.74-1.14 0.45 1.40 1.13-1. General health 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 General health 1	very good 1.00 1.00 $VO_2 ma $ 0.77 $0.62-0.96$ 0.02 0.92 General health 1.60 $0.62-0.96$ 0.02 0.92 General health 1.50 $1.04-2.16$ 0.03 1.26 not very good 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 Very good 1.00 $0.87-1.27$ 0.59 $-$ Television viewing $^{\mathcal{S}}$ 1.05 $0.87-1.27$ 0.59 $-$ Tobacco smoking $ 1.00$ smoker $ 1.35$ on-smoker $ 1.35$ in on-smoker $ 1.35$ on-smoker $ 1.00$ $\frac{e_1}{e_1}$ $ 1.00$ e_2 $ 1.00$ e_2 $ -$ <	1.43 0.87–2.36	0.16	0.60	0.35 - 1.02	0.06
$VO_2 ma $ 0.71 $0.62 - 0.96$ 0.02 $0.74 - 1.14$ 0.45 1.40 $1.13 - 1.13$ General health 1.50 $1.04 - 2.16$ 0.03 1.26 $0.82 - 1.93$ 0.29 0.72 $0.47 - 1.13$ General health 1.50 1.00 1.26 $0.03 - 1.93$ 0.29 0.72 $0.47 - 1.13$ not very good 1.00 1.00 $0.87 - 1.27$ 0.59 0.2 0.72 $0.47 - 1.13$ rot very good 1.00 $0.87 - 1.27$ 0.59 0.72 0.72 $0.47 - 1.20$ Tobacco smoking 1.05 $0.74 - 2.45$ 0.33 0.29 0.72 $0.41 - 1.00$ Tobacco smoking 0.7 0.72 $0.74 - 2.45$ 0.33 0.29 $0.61 - 1.100$ Robacco smoking 0.7 $0.74 - 2.45$ 0.33 0.7 0.73 $0.71 - 2.100$ Robacco smoking 0.7 $0.74 - 2.45$ 0.33 0.7 0.73 0.7 $0.71 - 2.100$	$VO_2 max^{f}$ 0.77 $0.62-0.96$ 0.02 0.92 General health 0.70 $0.62-0.96$ 0.02 0.92 General health 1.50 $1.04-2.16$ 0.03 1.26 not very good 1.00 1.00 $0.07-1.27$ 0.59 $-$ Television viewing ^R 1.05 $0.87-1.27$ 0.59 $ 1.00$ Television viewing ^R 1.05 $0.87-1.27$ 0.59 $ -$ Tobacco smoking $ 1.35$ Non-smoker $ 1.35$ non-smoker $ 1.35$ A: Persistent Inactivity $ 1.00$ A: Persistent Activity $ 1.00$	1.00		1.00		
General health Constrained 1.50 1.04-2.16 0.03 1.26 0.82-1.93 0.29 0.72 0.47-1. not very good 1.00 <td>General health 1.50 $1.04-2.16$ 0.03 1.26 not very good 1.00 1.00 1.00 very good 1.00 $0.87-1.27$ 0.59 $-$ Television viewing^g 1.05 $0.87-1.27$ 0.59 $-$ Tobacco smoking 1.35 smoker 1.35 non-smoker 1.35 in the state of the state of</td> <td>0.92 0.74–1.14</td> <td>0.45</td> <td>1.40</td> <td>1.13-1.75</td> <td><0.01</td>	General health 1.50 $1.04-2.16$ 0.03 1.26 not very good 1.00 1.00 1.00 very good 1.00 $0.87-1.27$ 0.59 $-$ Television viewing ^g 1.05 $0.87-1.27$ 0.59 $-$ Tobacco smoking $ 1.35$ smoker $ 1.35$ non-smoker $ 1.35$ in the state of	0.92 0.74–1.14	0.45	1.40	1.13-1.75	<0.01
not very good 1.50 1.04-2.16 0.03 1.26 0.82-1.93 0.29 0.72 0.47-1. very good 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 Television viewing ⁸ 1.05 0.87-1.27 0.59 \cdot \cdot 1.00 1.00 Television viewing ⁸ 1.05 0.87-1.27 0.59 \cdot \cdot 1.00 Tobacco smoking \cdot	not very good 1.50 1.04–2.16 0.03 1.26 very good 1.00 1.00 1.00 1.00 Television viewing $^{\mathcal{B}}$ 1.05 0.87–1.27 0.59 - Tobacco smoking 1.05 0.87–1.27 0.59 - Tobacco smoking - - 1.35 smoker - - - 1.35 non-smoker - - - 1.35 non-smoker - - - 1.00 \underline{ev} - - - 1.00 \underline{ev} - - - 1.00 \overline{ev} - - - 1.00					
very good 1.00 1.00 1.00 Television viewing ⁸ 1.05 0.87-1.27 0.59 - - 0.78 0.61-1 Tobacco smoking 1.05 0.87-1.27 0.59 - - 0.78 0.61-1 Tobacco smoking - - 1.35 0.74-2.45 0.33 - - smoket - - - 1.00 - - - 0.61-1 non-smoket - - 1.35 0.74-2.45 0.33 - - - non-smoket - - 1.00 - - - - - - - non-smoket - - 1.00 - <	very good 1.00 1.00 Felevision viewing ^R 1.05 0.87–1.27 0.59 - Tobacco smoking - 0.59 - - Sinoker - - - 1.35 non-smoker - - 1.35 non-smoker - - 1.35 non-smoker - - 1.35 non-smoker - - 1.35 event - - - event - - 1.00	1.26 0.82-1.93	0.29	0.72	0.47 - 1.11	0.13
Television viewing ⁸ 1.05 0.87-1.27 0.59 - - 0.78 0.61-1. Tobacco smoking 0.59 . 0.73 0.53 . . Tobacco smoking . . . 1.35 0.74-2.45 0.33 . . . smoker . . . 1.35 0.74-2.45 0.33 . . . non-smoker . . 1.00 . <t< td=""><td>Television viewing⁸ 1.05 0.87-1.27 0.59 - Tobacco smoking - - - 1.35 smoker - - - 1.35 smoker - - - 1.35 non-smoker - - - 1.35 inon-smoker - - - 1.00 <u>ev</u> - - - 1.00 A: Persistent Inactivity - - - 1.00</td><td>1.00</td><td></td><td>1.00</td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Television viewing ⁸ 1.05 0.87-1.27 0.59 - Tobacco smoking - - - 1.35 smoker - - - 1.35 smoker - - - 1.35 non-smoker - - - 1.35 inon-smoker - - - 1.00 <u>ev</u> - - - 1.00 A: Persistent Inactivity - - - 1.00	1.00		1.00		
Tobacco smokingEndecto smokingsmoker <t< td=""><td>Tobacco smoking - - 1.35 smoker - - 1.35 non-smoker - - 1.00 ev - - - - ev - - - - ev - - - - ev - - - - - ev - - - - - - ev - - - - - - - ev - - - - - - - - - ev - - - - - - - - - - - - ev -<</td><td></td><td>I</td><td>0.78</td><td>0.61 - 1.00</td><td>0.05</td></t<>	Tobacco smoking - - 1.35 smoker - - 1.35 non-smoker - - 1.00 ev - - - - ev - - - - ev - - - - ev - - - - - ev - - - - - - ev - - - - - - - ev - - - - - - - - - ev - - - - - - - - - - - - ev -<		I	0.78	0.61 - 1.00	0.05
snoker - - 1.35 0.74–2.45 0.33 -	smoker 1.35 non-smoker 1.00 in Persistent Inactivity A: Persistent Activity					
non-smoker - - 1.00 - - - <u>ex</u> <u>ex</u> <u>ex</u> <u>ex</u> Persistent Inactivity A: Persistent Activity P: Declining Participation 	non-smoker 1.00 <u>ev</u> I: Persistent Inactivity A: Persistent Activity	1.35 0.74–2.45	0.33	,	ı	ı
ey I: Persistent Inactivity A: Persistent Activity P: Declining Participation 2: Increasing Participation	<u>ey</u> I: Persistent Inactivity A: Persistent Activity	1.00		·	ı	
1: Persistent Inactivity A: Persistent Activity DP: Declining Participation P: Increasing Participation	1: Persistent Inactivity A: Persistent Activity					
A: Persistent Activity DP: Declining Participation P: Increasing Participation	A: Persistent Activity					
DP: Declining Participation P: Increasing Participation						
P: Increasing Participation	DP: Declining Participation					
	P. Increasing Participation					
J: Confidence Interval	J: Confidence Interval					

J Adolesc Health. Author manuscript; available in PMC 2010 March 1.

All analyses controlled for sex

NIH-PA Author Manuscript

Table notes: Reference groups

^aHigher SES

b Lower Family Active Recreation Orientation scores

^cFewer Home Activities

 d_{Lower} motor ability scores

 e Higher IQ scores

 $f_{\rm Lower}$ Predicted VO2max scores

 g Greater time spent Television viewing