Correlates of Screen-Based Behaviors Among 88,509 Adults: Observations from the 2019 Brazilian National Health Survey

Danilo R Silva (✉ danilorpsilva@gmail.com)

Federal University of Sergipe – UFS

Paul Collings

Bradford Institute for Health Research, Bradford Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust

Raphael H O Araujo

Londrina State University

Luciana L Barboza

University of Brasília (UnB)

Célia L Szwarcwald

Instituto de Comunicação e Informação Científica e Tecnológica em Saúde (ICICT), Fundação Oswaldo Cruz (Fiocruz)

André O Werneck

University of São Paulo (USP)

Research Article

Keywords: sedentary behavior, screen time, television viewing, adults, Brazil.

Posted Date: September 14th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-803277/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

We aimed to investigate correlates of TV viewing and other types of screen-based behaviors in a nationally representative sample of Brazilian adults. In the 2019 Brazilian National Health Survey (including 88,509 adults), TV viewing time and other types of screen behaviors (computer, tablet, and cellphone use) were self-reported and numerous geographical, sociodemographic, behavioral, and health status factors were investigated as potential correlates. Multinomial logistic regression models were used for the main analyses. Living in capital cities, urban areas, being unemployed, high consumption of soft drinks, obesity, and elevated depressive symptoms were each associated with more TV viewing and more time using other types of screens. There were differential associations between TV viewing and the use of other types of screen across age and socioeconomic variables. For instance, younger adults have a more diverse portfolio of screen time than older adults. To conclude, levels of screen-based behaviors vary by geographical, sociodemographic, behavioral, and health status characteristics. Interventions should focus on high-risk population groups and may benefit from targeting specific sedentary behaviors of interest.

Introduction

Sedentary behavior represents a considerable public health challenge [1]. Excessive sedentary time increases the risk of morbidity and mortality [2, 3], especially in individuals who are concurrently physically inactive, which represents a substantial part of the population [4]. National and international organizations have published guidelines and public health policies which recommend reductions in sedentary behavior, and that endorse population-level surveillance systems [5–8]. Regardless, a high prevalence of sedentary behaviors persists in different parts of the world, and relative to research conducted within the physical activity realm, surveys at the population level are limited by lack of coverage [9, 10].

National health surveys have usually assessed sedentary behavior using crude methods. For example, they have captured limited information about sedentary behaviors as part of questionnaires that have otherwise focused on physical activity (e.g. surveys have captured sitting time by IPAQ or GPAQ), or they have focused only on screen time, especially TV viewing. For these reasons, most of the available evidence about the prevalence, temporal trends, and correlates of sedentary behaviors are about total sitting time and TV viewing [9, 11–13]. By definition [14], sedentary behaviors can happen in a range of contexts and domains of life (e.g. reading, writing, using electronic devices), and different behaviors may have a unique profile of correlates and each may be differently associated with health [15].

These concepts are particularly important considering that there is evidence of an emerging “screen transition”, with individuals gradually spending less time watching TV and more time engaged with other screens [16]. Providing an enhanced understanding about the detailed correlates of TV viewing, and simultaneously the detailed correlates of other types of screens, could help to assist the development of

effective interventions that can be used to limit increases, or target reductions, in specific screen-based behaviors.

To date, studies that have investigated sedentary behavior correlates have consistently found that individual characteristics, including sex, age, illness, other lifestyle behaviors (e.g. tobacco smoking, diet), and sociodemographic factors (e.g. education) are associated with the amount of leisure-time sedentary behavior [17–19]. Whilst there is some evidence about the correlates of recreational screen-based behaviors, especially TV viewing that is known to be detrimental to health, few national surveys have evaluated other screen-based behaviors, such as the use of computers, tablets, and cellphones. We aimed to investigate the correlates of TV viewing, and other types of screen-based behaviors, in a national sample of Brazilian adults.

Methods

Design and sample

This study used data from the 2019 Brazilian National Health Survey, a cross-sectional study conducted with a nationally representative sample of adults in Brazil. The sampling process occurred through three stages. First, census tracts were randomly selected; second, households were randomly selected; third, in each household one inhabitant (aged ≥ 15 y old) was randomly selected. From 100,541 selected households, interviews were conducted with a total of 94,114 participants. In this complete-case analysis, participants aged < 18 years and those with missing data for variables of interest were excluded. The final study sample was composed of 88,509 adults (53.2% woman). The Brazilian Council of Ethics in Research approved all procedures according to the Helsinki declaration.

Screen-based behaviors

Participants self-reported the daily time they usually spent engaged in screen-based behaviors. TV viewing was assessed using the question: *“How many hours a day do you usually spend watching TV?”*. The other types of screen-based behavior were assessed through the question: *“How many hours in your daily free time do you usually use a computer, tablet, or cellphone, to access social media, news, videos, games, etc?”*. For both questions the possible responses were: a) less than 1 h/d; b) more than 1 h/d but less than 2 h/d; c) more than 2 h/d but less than 3 h/d; d) more than 3 h/d but less than 6 h/d; e) more than 6 h/d; and f) do not use. For analysis purposes screen time was reclassified into four categories: None (0 h/d) / Typical (> 0 to < 3 h/d) / Moderate (≥ 3 to < 6 h/d) / High (≥ 6 h/d).

Correlates

A range of correlates across four dimensions was investigated. Possible geographical correlates included the macro regions of the country (North, Northeast, Southeast, South, and Midwest), type of city (capital or non-capital of the State), and characteristics of the surrounding area (urban or rural). Demographic factors included sex (men/women), age group (18-34y, 35-49y, 50-64y, and ≥ 65 y), highest academic attainment (up to high school, high school, and college or more), income (equivalent to ≤ 1 times the

minimum wage, 1–3 times the minimum wage, and > 3 times the minimum wage), and internet access (yes/no). We investigated other lifestyle behaviors as correlates, including self-reported leisure-time physical activity (< 150 min/week versus $\geq$ 150 min/week), consumption of sugary foods (< 5 days/week versus $\geq$ 5 days/week), and soft drinks (< 5 days/week versus $\geq$ 5 days/week). Finally, health status factors, comprising elevated depressive symptoms (defined as a score > 9 in the Patient Health Questionnaire-9 [20]), obesity (defined as a body mass index $\geq$ 30 kg/m²), and self-rated health (good/bad) were also investigated as screen time correlates.

Statistical procedures

We used percentages values and 95% confidence intervals to describe the distribution of each group of correlates according to screen time categories. For the main analyses, multinomial logistic regression models were created. Models included each of the groups of geographical, demographic, other lifestyle behaviors, and health status correlates in turn. Variables were tested at each level and only individual correlates that were statistically significantly associated with screen time (p-value < 0.05) were included in a final model. Estimates were weighted considering the characteristics of the general population as well as the non-response rate [21].

Results

The characteristics of the final sample are presented in Table 1. The weighted prevalence of high ($\geq$ 6.0 h/d) TV viewing and other types of screen-based behavior were 5.8% and 8.6%, respectively. While 8.6% reported no TV viewing, 27.3% reported no use of other types of screen-based behavior. The unadjusted prevalence of TV viewing and other types of screen-based behavior are presented in Supplementary Tables 1 and 2, respectively.

Table 1
Characteristics of the sample (n = 88,509).

	%	95%CI
Geographical factors		
Region		
North	7.9	7.7–8.1
Northeast	26.4	26.1–26.9
Southeast	43.4	42.8–44.1
South	14.7	14.3–15.0
Midwest	7.6	7.4–7.8
Type of city		
Capital	41.6	41.1–42.2
Others	58.4	57.8–58.9
Type of residence		
Urban	86.2	85.9–86.5
Rural	13.8	13.5–14.1
Demographic factors		
Sex		
Men	46.8	46.3–47.4
Women	53.2	52.6–53.7
Age group		
18-34y	32.3	31.4–32.5
35-49y	29.3	28.8–29.8
50-64y	22.6	22.1–23.1
≥ 65y	16.1	15.7–16.5
Highest academic achievement		
Up to high school	49.2	48.7–50.4

Note. Elevated depressive symptoms are defined as a score > 9 in the Patient Health Questionnaire-9. Obesity is defined as a body mass index ≥ 30 kg/m². CI, confidence interval. *Computer, tablet, or cellphone use to access social media, news, videos, games, etc.

	%	95%CI
High school	29.8	29.2–30.4
College or more	21.0	20.5–21.4
Employment status		
Employed	56.2	55.6–56.8
Unemployed	43.8	43.2–44.4
Income		
≤ 1 times minimum wage	51.2	50.6–51.8
1–3 times minimum wage	37.3	36.7–37.9
> 3 times minimum wage	11.5	11.2–11.9
Internet access		
Yes	84.6	84.2–84.9
No	15.4	15.1–15.8
Lifestyle behaviors		
Leisure physical activity		
< 150 min/week	73.5	73.0–74.0
≥ 150 min/week	26.5	26.0–27.0
Sugary foods consumption		
< 5 days/week	85.2	84.7–85.6
≥ 5 days/week	14.8	14.4–15.3
Soft drink consumption		
< 5 days/week	90.8	90.4–91.1
≥ 5 days/week	9.2	8.9–9.6
Health status		
Elevated depressive symptoms		
No	89.2	88.8–89.5

Note. Elevated depressive symptoms are defined as a score > 9 in the Patient Health Questionnaire-9. Obesity is defined as a body mass index ≥ 30 kg/m². CI, confidence interval. *Computer, tablet, or cellphone use to access social media, news, videos, games, etc.

	%	95%CI
Yes	10.8	10.5–11.2
Obesity		
No	78.0	77.4–78.5
Yes	22.0	21.5–22.6
Self-rated health		
Good	66.1	65.6–66.6
Bad	33.9	33.4–34.4
Outcomes		
TV viewing		
None (0 h/d)	8.6	8.3-9.0
Typical (> 0 to < 3 h/d)	69.6	69.0-70.1
Moderate ($\geq$ 3.0 to < 6 h/d)	15.9	15.5–16.4
High($\geq$ 6.0 h/d)	5.8	5.6–6.1
Other screen-based behaviors*		
None (0 h/d)	27.3	26.8–27.7
Typical (> 0 to < 3 h/d)	50.6	50.0-51.1
Moderate ($\geq$ 3.0 to < 6 h/d)	13.6	13.1–14.0
High($\geq$ 6.0 h/d)	8.6	8.3-9.0
Note. Elevated depressive symptoms are defined as a score > 9 in the Patient Health Questionnaire-9. Obesity is defined as a body mass index $\geq$ 30 kg/m ² . CI, confidence interval. *Computer, tablet, or cellphone use to access social media, news, videos, games, etc.		

Results of the adjusted multinomial logistic regression models, which were used to identify the main correlates of both TV viewing and other screen-based behaviors, are shown in Tables 3 and 4, respectively. Table 2 shows that higher odds of moderate and high TV viewing were associated with living in the Southeast macro region (compared to the North), being aged $\geq$ 65y, unemployment, high soft drink consumption, and obesity. In addition, higher odds of high TV viewing was associated with living in the Northeast macro region (compared to North), and having depressive symptoms. Conversely, lower odds of moderate TV viewing was associated with living in the Midwest macro region (compared to North) and having no internet access, and lower odds of both moderate and high TV viewing was associated with living in non-capitals cities and rural areas, being aged 35-49y, and having higher educational attainment. Factors associated with higher likelihood of not watching TV included living in

non-capital cities, being a woman, having the highest level of academic attainment, no internet access, and depressive symptoms. Older age and higher incomes were associated with lower odds of watching no TV.

Table 2
Adjusted regression model quantifying the correlates of TV viewing in Brazilian adults.

TV viewing				
	None (0 h/d) % (95%CI)	Typical (> 0 to < 3 h/d) % (95%CI)	Moderate (≥ 3.0 to < 6 h/d) % (95%CI)	High (≥ 6.0 h/d) % (95%CI)
Geographical factors				
Region				
North	1	Ref	1	1
Northeast	0.90 (0.82–1.00)	Ref	1.05 (0.96–1.14)	1.32 (1.15–1.50)
Southeast	0.86 (0.76–0.98)	Ref	1.17 (1.06–1.29)	1.50 (1.31–1.73)
South	0.74 (0.65–0.85)	Ref	0.99 (0.89–1.11)	0.97 (0.81–1.16)
Midwest	1.05 (0.92–1.20)	Ref	0.87 (0.77–0.97)	0.99 (0.82–1.18)
Type of city				
Capital	1	Ref	1	1
Others	1.22 (1.11–1.34)	Ref	0.82 (0.76–0.88)	0.55 (0.49–0.62)
Type of residence				
Urban	1	Ref	1	1
Rural	0.92 (0.83–1.01)	Ref	0.75 (0.69–0.82)	0.56 (0.48–0.65)
Demographic factors				
Sex				
Men	1	Ref	1	1
Women	1.11 (1.01–1.23)	Ref	1.00 (0.93–1.07)	1.00 (0.89–1.12)

Note. The final model is adjusted for all variables presented. Variable with $p > 0.05$ was removed from the final model. The data are odds ratios and indicate that, for example, compared to participants in urban areas those in rural areas were 44% less likely to be in the high TV viewing than the typical TV viewing group.

TV viewing				
Age group				
18-34y	1	Ref	1	1
35-49y	0.62 (0.55–0.69)	Ref	0.89 (0.80–0.97)	0.76 (0.65–0.89)
50-64y	0.54 (0.48–0.61)	Ref	0.99 (0.91–1.10)	0.90 (0.77–1.05)
≥ 65y	0.68 (0.60–0.78)	Ref	1.34 (1.20–1.50)	1.21 (1.03–1.43)
Highest academic achievement				
Up to high school	1		1	1
High school	0.98 (0.87–1.10)	Ref	1.09 (1.00–1.19)	0.81 (0.71–0.92)
College or more	1.24 (1.08–1.43)	Ref	0.69 (0.62–0.78)	0.44 (0.36–0.53)
Employment status				
Employed	1	Ref	1	1
Unemployed	1.07 (0.97–1.18)	Ref	1.58 (1.46–1.70)	3.02 (2.64–3.45)
Income				
≤ 1 times minimum wage	1	Ref	1	1
1–3 times minimum wage	0.80 (0.71–0.89)	Ref	1.02 (0.95–1.12)	1.00 (0.87–1.14)
> 3 times minimum wage	0.68 (0.57–0.82)	Ref	0.97 (0.85–1.10)	0.98 (0.81–1.19)
Internet access				
Yes	1	Ref	1	1
No	1.35 (1.22–1.48)	Ref	0.91 (0.84–0.99)	1.04 (0.92–1.18)
Lifestyle behaviors				

Note. The final model is adjusted for all variables presented. Variable with $p > 0.05$ was removed from the final model. The data are odds ratios and indicate that, for example, compared to participants in urban areas those in rural areas were 44% less likely to be in the high TV viewing than the typical TV viewing group.

TV viewing				
Soft drink consumption				
< 5 days/week	1	Ref	1	1
≥ 5 days/week	1.03 (0.87–1.22)	Ref	1.31 (1.16–1.48)	1.55 (1.31–1.85)
Health status				
Elevated depressive symptoms				
No	1	Ref	1	1
Yes	1.81 (1.59–2.07)	Ref	1.00 (0.90–1.11)	1.67 (1.45–1.93)
Obesity				
No	1	Ref	1	1
Yes	0.96 (0.85–1.09)	Ref	1.24 (1.14–1.32)	1.46 (1.31–1.64)
Note. The final model is adjusted for all variables presented. Variable with $p > 0.05$ was removed from the final model. The data are odds ratios and indicate that, for example, compared to participants in urban areas those in rural areas were 44% less likely to be in the high TV viewing than the typical TV viewing group.				

Table 3

Adjusted regression model quantifying the correlates of screen time (except TV viewing) in Brazilian adults.

Computer, tablet, or cellphone use to access social media, news, videos, games, etc.				
	None (0 h/d) % (95%CI)	Typical (> 0 to < 3 h/d) % (95%CI)	Moderate (≥ 3.0 to < 6 h/d) % (95%CI)	High (≥ 6.0 h/d) % (95%CI)
Geographical factors				
Region				
North	1	Ref	1	1
Northeast	0.88 (0.81–0.96)	Ref	0.99 (0.89–1.10)	1.14 (1.00–1.30)
Southeast	0.56 (0.51–0.62)	Ref	0.92 (0.82–1.04)	0.91 (0.79–1.05)
South	0.58 (0.52–0.65)	Ref	0.79 (0.69–0.89)	0.78 (0.66–0.92)
Midwest	0.55 (0.49–0.63)	Ref	0.94 (0.83–1.07)	0.90 (0.76–1.06)
Type of city				
Capital	1	Ref	1	1
Others	1.25 (1.16–1.35)	Ref	0.87 (0.80–0.95)	0.69 (0.62–0.76)
Type of residence				
Urban	1	Ref	1	1
Rural	1.94 (1.79–2.09)	Ref	0.76 (0.67–0.86)	0.54 (0.45–0.63)
Demographic factors				
Sex				
Men	1	Ref	1	1

Note. The final model is adjusted for all variables presented. Variable with $p > 0.05$ was removed from the final model. The data are odds ratios and indicate that, for example, compared to participants without elevated depressive symptoms those with elevated depressive symptoms were 55% less likely to be in the high screen time than the typical screen time group.

Computer, tablet, or cellphone use to access social media, news, videos, games, etc.				
Women	0.71 (0.66–0.77)	Ref	1.01 (0.93–1.10)	0.93 (0.84–1.03)
Age group				
18-34y	1	Ref	1	1
35-49y	2.03 (1.84–2.24)	Ref	0.41 (0.37–0.45)	0.27 (0.24–0.30)
50-64y	4.54 (4.10–5.03)	Ref	0.25 (0.23–0.29)	0.14 (0.12–0.16)
≥ 65y	12.61 (11.20–14.19)	Ref	0.21 (0.18–0.26)	0.11 (0.08–0.14)
Highest academic achievement				
Up to high school	1	Ref	1	1
High school	0.44 (0.40–0.47)	Ref	1.37 (1.24–1.51)	1.20 (1.06–1.35)
College or more	0.22 (0.19–0.25)	Ref	1.26 (1.12–1.43)	1.01 (0.87–1.16)
Employment status				
Employed	1	Ref	1	1
Unemployed	1.55 (1.43–1.67)	Ref	1.18 (1.08–1.32)	1.74 (1.56–1.95)
Income				
≤ 1 times minimum wage	1	Ref	1	1
1–3 times minimum wage	0.64 (0.59–0.69)	Ref	1.19 (1.07–1.31)	1.14 (1.01–1.28)
> 3 times minimum wage	0.48 (0.42–0.56)	Ref	1.10 (0.96–1.28)	1.09 (0.90–1.31)
Internet access				
Yes	1	Ref	1	1
No	5.90 (5.45–6.40)	Ref	0.60 (0.50–0.71)	0.54 (0.43–0.66)
Note. The final model is adjusted for all variables presented. Variable with $p > 0.05$ was removed from the final model. The data are odds ratios and indicate that, for example, compared to participants without elevated depressive symptoms those with elevated depressive symptoms were 55% less likely to be in the high screen time than the typical screen time group.				

Computer, tablet, or cellphone use to access social media, news, videos, games, etc.				
Lifestyle behaviors				
Leisure physical activity				
< 150 min/week	1	Ref	1	1
≥ 150 min/week	1.54 (1.42–1.67)	Ref	0.88 (0.80–0.96)	0.84 (0.76–0.94)
Sugary foods consumption				
< 5 days/week	1	Ref	1	1
≥ 5 days/week	0.98 (0.89–1.09)	Ref	1.19 (1.06–1.35)	1.44 (1.28–1.63)
Soft drink consumption				
< 5 days/week	1	Ref	1	1
≥ 5 days/week	1.12 (0.97–1.29)	Ref	1.40 (1.22–1.60)	2.06 (1.79–2.37)
Health status				
Elevated depressive symptoms				
No	1	Ref	1	1
Yes	1.13 (1.01–1.26)	Ref	1.34 (1.10–1.63)	1.55 (1.34–1.80)
Obesity				
No	1	Ref	1	1
Yes	0.90 (0.83–0.97)	Ref	1.19 (1.08–1.32)	1.16 (1.04–1.30)
Self-rated health				
Good	1	Ref	1	1
Bad	1.25 (1.16–1.34)	Ref	0.88 (0.80–0.97)	1.09 (0.97–1.24)
Note. The final model is adjusted for all variables presented. Variable with $p > 0.05$ was removed from the final model. The data are odds ratios and indicate that, for example, compared to participants without elevated depressive symptoms those with elevated depressive symptoms were 55% less likely to be in the high screen time than the typical screen time group.				

Table 3 shows that higher likelihood of moderate and high use of other screen types was associated with intermediate educational attainment (compared to the lowest educational status), unemployment, incomes 1–3 times higher than the minimum wage, high consumption of sugary foods, high intake of soft drinks, depressive symptoms, and obesity. In addition, a higher likelihood of moderate use of other screens was associated with the highest level of academic attainment, whereas participants with good self-rated health displayed lower odds of moderate use. In contrast, lower odds of moderate and high use of other types of screen-based behaviors was associated with living in the South macro region (compared to the North), non-capital cities, and rural areas, older age, having no internet access, and physical activity. Except for regional differences, the same factors were associated with higher likelihood of not using other screen types, and the association was strongest for adults aged ≥ 65 y. Other factors associated with higher likelihood of not using other screen types were unemployment, depressive symptoms, and bad self-rated health. Factors associated with lower odds of not using other screen types included living in all macro regions compared to North, being a woman, having higher academic attainment, higher income, and obesity.

Discussion

This investigation shows that TV viewing and other screen types share certain correlates among Brazilian adults. We further highlight that there are unique screen-type specific correlates. For instance, higher educational attainment was associated with lower odds of moderate and high TV viewing, and yet with higher odds of moderate and high use of all other screens. Differences in associations were most striking for the ≥ 65 y age group, who compared to the youngest adults were more likely to watch moderate and high volumes of TV, and who were also much more likely not to use any other type of screen.

Regarding TV viewing, our results concur with existing evidence, which has shown that higher TV viewing is correlated with lower educational status, poorer dietary habits, and negative health outcomes [22–24]. The geographical distribution of TV viewing has seldom been studied. We observed that Brazilian adults living in the Northeast and Southeast macro regions were more likely to spend excess time watching TV. In addition, we found that adults living in non-capital cities and rural areas were less likely to watch higher volumes of TV and were also less likely to engage in higher usage of other types of screen-based behavior; in general, they were more likely not to use any screens at all. These results may be related to limited internet availability in rural locations, indeed we found that having no internet access was markedly associated with higher odds of not using other types of screen-based behavior. This pattern of results may also be explained by greater availability and accessibility of public parks and green spaces, lower violence and fewer issues of perceived safety in smaller non-capital cities and rural landscapes [25]. We uniquely identified that unemployment was associated with higher likelihood of moderate and high TV viewing. A u-shaped association was apparent for other types of screen-based behavior, such that unemployment was associated both with higher likelihood of moderate and high use of other types of screen-based behavior, and also with higher odds of not using any other types of screen-based behavior at all. This may be explained by unemployed younger adults using diverse types of screen device throughout the day, and older retirees not using other types of screen. Taken together, the results

highlight priority groups that may benefit most from interventions that are designed to reduce screen time.

The main novelty of this study was that we were able to contrast the correlates of TV viewing (which is an important sedentary behavior in its own right and an often used, albeit inadequate, proxy for total sedentary time) with that of other screen types that are increasingly prevalent worldwide [26]. We observed different associations for TV viewing and other screen types across age and socioeconomic variables. For instance, higher educational attainment was associated with lower odds of moderate and high TV viewing, but with higher odds of moderate and high use of all other screens. In addition, the oldest group of adults was more likely to watch moderate and high volumes of TV, but, compared to the youngest age group, older adults of all other ages were less likely to engage in moderate or high usage of other screens, and were more likely to report not using any other screens at all. This pattern of results may reflect social, cultural, and economic differences in the accessibility and usability of different types of screen-based device. The results corroborate previous studies and provide additional support for the concept of an emerging “screen transition”, which has previously been shown to be influenced by socioeconomic factors and technological shifts in low- and middle-income countries [16, 24, 27, 28].

It is conceivable that sedentary behaviors may be associated with higher adiposity and adverse health not because of sedentary time per se, but because of coexisting (possibly mediating) obesogenic diet, inactivity, and sleep behaviors [29, 30]. Accordingly, we found that a higher intake of soft drinks was associated with higher TV viewing and higher use of other types of screen-based behavior. Higher consumption of sugary foods was further associated with higher use of other types of screens. The coexistence of TV viewing with poor dietary habits is well established and our findings add to emerging evidence-base for other types of screen-based behavior [31, 32]. We also found being more physically active was associated with lower odds of moderate and high use of other screen types, and with higher odds of not using any other screen types at all. Regarding health status, obesity and elevated depressive symptoms were associated with higher volumes of TV viewing and also with higher use of other types of screen-based behavior. There was a difference in the shape of associations, however, with some evidence that the associations for depressive symptoms were curvilinear (depressive symptoms were also associated with higher likelihood of not watching TV and not using other screen types). Unfortunately, because this is a cross-sectional study, it is impossible to assign any direction of association to our results. This is particularly problematic for obesity and depressive symptoms, which may exhibit bidirectional associations with sedentary behaviors [33, 34]. Obesity and depressive symptoms may be both a cause and a consequence of higher TV time and higher use of other screens.

As far as we are aware, this is the first study to explore correlates of different types of screen-based behaviors in a representative sample of Brazilian adults. It is advantageous that we investigated TV viewing and other screens, as well as myriad potential correlates that spanned diverse dimensions. By doing so we have provided an enhanced understanding about the distributions of screen use throughout the Brazilian adult population. This information can be used to assist the development of targeted and more effective interventions to reduce screen-based behaviors in high-risk population groups. A limitation

of the current study includes the joint analysis of multiple types of screen-based behavior (computer, tablet, and cellphones) which precluded a more refined analysis of specific screen-based behaviors. It is also a weakness that all data were self-reported, meaning they are subject to inaccurate and biased responses. Due to the cross-sectional study design, we cannot infer direction let alone causality of any of the reported associations.

To conclude, in a nationally representative sample of Brazilian adults, we found that living in capital cities, urban areas, being unemployed, poor dietary behaviors, obesity, and elevated depressive symptoms were consistently associated with higher screen time, regardless of type. There were differential associations between TV viewing and use of other types of screen-based behavior across age and socioeconomic variables. Younger adults have a more diverse portfolio of screen time than older adults.

Abbreviations

TV = television

IPAQ = International Physical Activity Questionnaire

GPAQ = Global Physical Activity Questionnaire

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The Brazilian Council of Ethics in Research approved all procedures according to the Helsinki declaration and the participants assigned an informed consent form prior to the study beginning.

Consent for publication

The study do not present individual details/images/videos of the participants.

Availability of data and material

Data is available under open access through the link:

<https://www.ibge.gov.br/estatisticas/sociais/saude/9160-pesquisa-nacional-de-saude?=&t=microdados>

Competing interests

Authors declare no competing interests.

Funding

This specific study did not receive funding. The Brazilian Ministry of Health funds the Brazilian Health Survey.

Authors' contributions

DRS, RHOA, LLB, AOW, and CLS: study design and conception. DRS, PC and AOW: dataset organization and data analysis. DRS: first draft. All authors made substantial contributions on the main manuscript text and approved the final version.

Acknowledgements

PC is funded by a BHF Immediate Postdoctoral Basic Science Research Fellowship (FS/17/37/32937). RHOA is supported by the Coordination for the Improvement of Higher Education Personnel (CAPES) with a PhD scholarship (CAPES process: 88887.605034/2021-00). CLS is funded by the National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (Process number 310318/2020-3). AOW is supported by the São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) with a PhD scholarship (FAPESP process: 2019/24124-7). This paper presents independent research. The views expressed in this publication are those of the authors and not necessarily those of the acknowledged institutions.

References

1. Owen N, Healy GN, Dempsey PC, Salmon J, Timperio A, Clark BK, Goode AD, Koorts H, Ridgers ND, Hadgraft NT *et al*: **Sedentary Behavior and Public Health: Integrating the Evidence and Identifying Potential Solutions**. *Annu Rev Public Health* 2020, **41**:265-287.
2. Patterson R, McNamara E, Tainio M, de Sá TH, Smith AD, Sharp SJ, Edwards P, Woodcock J, Brage S, Wijndaele K: **Sedentary behaviour and risk of all-cause, cardiovascular and cancer mortality, and incident type 2 diabetes: a systematic review and dose response meta-analysis**. *Eur J Epidemiol* 2018, **33**(9):811-829.
3. Saunders TJ, Mclsaac T, Douillette K, Gaulton N, Hunter S, Rhodes RE, Prince SA, Carson V, Chaput JP, Chastin S *et al*: **Sedentary behaviour and health in adults: an overview of systematic reviews**. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* 2020, **45**(10 (Suppl. 2)):S197-s217.
4. Ekelund U, Tarp J, Fagerland MW, Johannessen JS, Hansen BH, Jefferis BJ, Whincup PH, Diaz KM, Hooker S, Howard VJ *et al*: **Joint associations of accelero-meter measured physical activity and sedentary time with all-cause mortality: a harmonised meta-analysis in more than 44 000 middle-aged and older individuals**. *Br J Sports Med* 2020, **54**(24):1499-1506.
5. Bull FC, Al-Ansari SS, Biddle S, Borodulin K, Buman MP, Cardon G, Carty C, Chaput J-P, Chastin S, Chou R *et al*: **World Health Organization 2020 guidelines on physical activity and sedentary behaviour**. *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2020, **54**(24):1451.
6. Dempsey PC, Biddle SJH, Buman MP, Chastin S, Ekelund U, Friedenreich CM, Katzmarzyk PT, Leitzmann MF, Stamatakis E, van der Ploeg HP *et al*: **New global guidelines on sedentary behaviour and health for adults: broadening the behavioural targets**. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 2020, **17**(1):151.

7. Ross R, Chaput JP, Giangregorio LM, Janssen I, Saunders TJ, Kho ME, Poitras VJ, Tomasone JR, El-Kotob R, McLaughlin EC *et al*: **Canadian 24-Hour Movement Guidelines for Adults aged 18-64 years and Adults aged 65 years or older: an integration of physical activity, sedentary behaviour, and sleep.** *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab* 2020, **45**(10 (Suppl. 2)):S57-s102.
8. Katzmarzyk PT, Powell KE, Jakicic JM, Troiano RP, Piercy K, Tennant B: **Sedentary Behavior and Health: Update from the 2018 Physical Activity Guidelines Advisory Committee.** *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 2019, **51**(6):1227-1241.
9. McLaughlin M, Atkin AJ, Starr L, Hall A, Wolfenden L, Sutherland R, Wiggers J, Ramirez A, Hallal P, Pratt M *et al*: **Worldwide surveillance of self-reported sitting time: a scoping review.** *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 2020, **17**(1):111.
10. Prince SA, Butler GP, Roberts KC, Lapointe P, MacKenzie AM, Colley RC, Foley M, Saunders TJ, Thompson W: **Developing content for national population health surveys: an example using a newly developed sedentary behaviour module.** *Arch Public Health* 2019, **77**:53.
11. Troiano RP, Stamatakis E, Bull FC: **How can global physical activity surveillance adapt to evolving physical activity guidelines? Needs, challenges and future directions.** *British Journal of Sports Medicine* 2020, **54**(24):1468.
12. Prince SA, Melvin A, Roberts KC, Butler GP, Thompson W: **Sedentary behaviour surveillance in Canada: trends, challenges and lessons learned.** *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity* 2020, **17**(1):34.
13. Prince SA, LeBlanc AG, Colley RC, Saunders TJ: **Measurement of sedentary behaviour in population health surveys: a review and recommendations.** *PeerJ* 2017, **5**:e4130.
14. Tremblay MS, Aubert S, Barnes JD, Saunders TJ, Carson V, Latimer-Cheung AE, Chastin SFM, Altenburg TM, Chinapaw MJM: **Sedentary Behavior Research Network (SBRN) - Terminology Consensus Project process and outcome.** *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2017, **14**(1):75.
15. Hallgren M, Dunstan DW, Owen N: **Passive Versus Mentally Active Sedentary Behaviors and Depression.** *Exerc Sport Sci Rev* 2020, **48**(1):20-27.
16. Mielke GI, Hallal PC, Malta DC, Lee IM: **Time trends of physical activity and television viewing time in Brazil: 2006-2012.** *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 2014, **11**:101.
17. O'Donoghue G, Perchoux C, Mensah K, Lakerveld J, van der Ploeg H, Bernaards C, Chastin SF, Simon C, O'Gorman D, Nazare JA: **A systematic review of correlates of sedentary behaviour in adults aged 18-65 years: a socio-ecological approach.** *BMC Public Health* 2016, **16**:163.
18. Nicolson G, Hayes C, Darker C: **Examining total and domain-specific sedentary behaviour using the socio-ecological model - a cross-sectional study of Irish adults.** *BMC Public Health* 2019, **19**(1):1155.
19. Bakker EA, Hopman MTE, Lee D-c, Verbeek ALM, Thijssen DHJ, Eijssvogels TMH: **Correlates of Total and domain-specific Sedentary behavior: a cross-sectional study in Dutch adults.** *BMC Public Health* 2020, **20**(1):220.
20. Santos IS, Tavares BF, Munhoz TN, Almeida LSPd, Silva NTBd, Tams BD, Patella AM, Matijasevich A: **Sensibilidade e especificidade do Patient Health Questionnaire-9 (PHQ-9) entre adultos da população**

geral. *Cadernos de Saúde Pública* 2013, **29**:1533-1543.

21. Stopa SR, Szwarcwald CL, Oliveira MMd, Gouvea EdCDP, Vieira MLFP, Freitas MPSd, Sardinha LMV, Macário EM: **Pesquisa Nacional de Saúde 2019: histórico, métodos e perspectivas.** *Epidemiologia e Serviços de Saúde* 2020, **29**.
22. Werneck AO, Cyrino ES, Collings PJ, Ronque ERV, Szwarcwald CL, Sardinha LB, Silva DR: **TV Viewing in 60,202 Adults From the National Brazilian Health Survey: Prevalence, Correlates, and Associations With Chronic Diseases.** *J Phys Act Health* 2018, **15**(7):510-515.
23. Scully M, Dixon H, Wakefield M: **Association between commercial television exposure and fast-food consumption among adults.** *Public Health Nutr* 2009, **12**(1):105-110.
24. Iven Mielke G, Ricardo L, Wendt A, Christofaro D, Owen N: **Descriptive epidemiology of high TV-viewing time in Brazilian adults.** *Revista Brasileira de Atividade Física & Saúde* 2018, **23**:1-6.
25. Prince SA, Reed JL, McFetridge C, Tremblay MS, Reid RD: **Correlates of sedentary behaviour in adults: a systematic review.** *Obes Rev* 2017, **18**(8):915-935.
26. Vizcaino M, Buman M, DesRoches T, Wharton C: **From TVs to tablets: the relation between device-specific screen time and health-related behaviors and characteristics.** *BMC Public Health* 2020, **20**(1):1295.
27. Mielke GI, da Silva IC, Owen N, Hallal PC: **Brazilian adults' sedentary behaviors by life domain: population-based study.** *PLoS One* 2014, **9**(3):e91614.
28. Mielke GI, Brown WJ, Ekelund U, Brage S, Goncalves H, Wehrmeister FC, Menezes AM, Hallal PC: **Socioeconomic position and sedentary behavior in Brazilian adolescents: A life-course approach.** *Prev Med* 2017, **107**:29-35.
29. Werneck AO, Oyeyemi AL, Collings PJ, Cyrino ES, Ronque ERV, Szwarcwald CL, Sardinha LB, Silva DRP: **Physical activity can attenuate, but not eliminate, the negative relationships of high TV viewing with some chronic diseases: findings from a cohort of 60 202 Brazilian adults.** *J Public Health (Oxf)* 2021, **43**(1):e7-e15.
30. Werneck AO, Oyeyemi AL, Szwarcwald CL, Stubbs B, Silva DR: **Potential influence of physical, psychological and lifestyle factors on the association between television viewing and depressive symptoms: A cross-sectional study.** *Gen Hosp Psychiatry* 2019, **60**:37-43.
31. Werneck AO, Silva DR, Malta DC, Gomes CS, Souza-Júnior PR, Azevedo LO, Barros MB, Szwarcwald CL: **Associations of sedentary behaviours and incidence of unhealthy diet during the COVID-19 quarantine in Brazil.** *Public Health Nutr* 2021, **24**(3):422-426.
32. Sisson SB, Shay CM, Broyles ST, Leyva M: **Television-viewing time and dietary quality among U.S. children and adults.** *Am J Prev Med* 2012, **43**(2):196-200.
33. Barone Gibbs B, Aaby D, Siddique J, Reis JP, Sternfeld B, Whitaker K, Pettee Gabriel K: **Bidirectional 10-year associations of accelerometer-measured sedentary behavior and activity categories with weight among middle-aged adults.** *Int J Obes (Lond)* 2020, **44**(3):559-567.
34. Vancampfort D, Firth J, Schuch FB, Rosenbaum S, Mugisha J, Hallgren M, Probst M, Ward PB, Gaughran F, De Hert M *et al*: **Sedentary behavior and physical activity levels in people with**

schizophrenia, bipolar disorder and major depressive disorder: a global systematic review and meta-analysis. *World Psychiatry* 2017, **16**(3):308-315.

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [supplementaryfile.docx](#)