

1 National Implementation Trial of BeUpstanding™: An Online Initiative for Workers to Sit Less and Move

2 More

3

4 **Authors**

| <b>Name</b>           | <b>Institutional Address(es) and Affiliations</b>  |
|-----------------------|--|
| Genevieve N. Healy    | The University of Queensland, School of Human Movement and Nutrition Sciences, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia   |
| Ana D. Goode          | The University of Queensland, School of Human Movement and Nutrition Sciences, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia   |
| Lisa Ulyate           | The University of Queensland, School of Human Movement and Nutrition Sciences, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia   |
| Alison Abbott         | Work Health Design (retired), Workplace Health and Safety Qld, Office of Industrial Relations  |
| David Dunstan         | 1. Physical Activity Laboratory, Baker Heart and Diabetes Institute. 75 Commercial Road, Melbourne, VIC Australia<br>2. Institute for Physical Activity and Nutrition, Deakin University, Melbourne, VIC Australia |
| Elizabeth G. Eakin    | The University of Queensland, School of Public Health, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia   |
| Nicholas D. Gilson    | The University of Queensland, School of Human Movement and Nutrition Science, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia  |
| Lynn Gunning          | Comcare, GPO Box 9905, Canberra ACT 2601   |
| Jodie Jetann          | The University of Queensland, School of Human Movement and Nutrition Sciences, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia   |
| Anthony D. LaMontagne | Deakin University, Institute for Health Transformation, Determinants of Health Unit, Geelong, VIC, Australia   |

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

|                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| Marj Moodie            | Deakin University, Institute for Health Transformation, Deakin Health Economics, Melbourne, VIC, Australia   |
| Samantha Mulcahy       | The University of Queensland, Health and Wellbeing Centre for Research Innovation, School of Human Movement and Nutrition Science, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia   |
| Neville Owen           | 1. Centre for Urban Transitions, Swinburne University of Technology, Hawthorn, Victoria, Australia<br>2. Physical Activity Laboratory, Baker Heart & Diabetes Institute, 75 Commercial Road, Melbourne 3004, Victoria, Australia |
| Trevor Shilton         | 1. Curtin University, School of Public Health, Kent Street, Bentley, Western Australia<br>2. World Heart Federation  |
| Leanne Sweeny          | Work Health Design, Workplace Health and Safety Qld, Office of Industrial Relations  |
| Leon Straker           | School of Allied Health, Curtin University, Perth, Australia   |
| Elisabeth A.H. Winkler | The University of Queensland, School of Human Movement and Nutrition Sciences, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia   |

5

6 **Corresponding author**

7 Genevieve N. Healy

8 The University of Queensland, School of Human Movement and Nutrition Sciences

9 St Lucia, Brisbane, Queensland, 4072

10 Email: [g.healy@uq.edu.au](mailto:g.healy@uq.edu.au)

11

## 12 **Abstract**

13 **Background:** The online BeUpstanding<sup>TM</sup> program is an eight-week workplace-delivered intervention for  
14 desk-based workers to raise awareness of the benefits of sitting less and moving more and build a  
15 supportive culture for change. A workplace representative (the “champion”) delivers the program, which  
16 includes a workshop where teams collectively choose their sit less/move more strategies. A toolkit  
17 provides the champion with a step-by-step guide and associated resources to support program uptake,  
18 delivery, and evaluation. Here we report on the main findings from the Australian national implementation  
19 trial of BeUpstanding.

20 **Methods:** Recruitment (12/06/2019 to 30/09/2021) was supported by five policy and practice partners,  
21 with desk-based work teams from across Australia targeted. Effectiveness was measured via a single arm,  
22 repeated-measures trial. Data were collected via online surveys, toolkit analytics, and telephone calls with  
23 champions. The RE-AIM framework guided evaluation, with adoption/reach (number and characteristics);  
24 effectiveness (primary: self-reported workplace sitting time); implementation (completion of core  
25 components; costs); and, maintenance intentions reported here. Linear mixed models, correcting for  
26 cluster, were used for effectiveness, with reach, adoption, implementation, and maintenance outcomes  
27 described.

28 **Results:** Of the 1640 website users who signed-up to BeUpstanding during the recruitment period, 233  
29 were eligible, 198 (85%) provided preliminary consent, and 118 (50.6%) champions consented and started  
30 the trial, with 94% (n=111 champions) completing. Trial participation was from across Australia and  
31 across industries, and reached 2,761 staff, with 2,248 participating in the staff survey(s): 65% female, 64%  
32 university educated; 16.9% from non-English speaking background. The program effectively changed  
33 workplace sitting (-38.5 [95%CI -46.0 to -28.7] minutes/8-hour workday) and all outcomes targeted by  
34 BeUpstanding (behaviours and culture), with small-to-moderate statistically-significant effects observed.  
35 All participating teams (n=94) completed at least 5/7 core steps; 72.4% completed all seven. Most  
36 champions spent \$0 (72%) or >\$0-\$5 (10%) per team member; most (67/70 96%) intended to continue or  
37 repeat the program.

38 **Conclusions:** BeUpstanding can be adopted and successfully implemented by a range of workplaces, reach  
39 a diversity of staff, and be effective at creating a supportive culture for teams of desk-based workers to sit  
40 less and move more. Learnings will inform optimisation of the program for longer-term sustainability.

41

42 **Trial registration:** ACTRN12617000682347.

43 The trial was prospectively registered on the 12<sup>th</sup> May, 2017 (ACTRN12617000682347), prior to the soft  
44 launch of the program, with the last update on the 11<sup>th</sup> June, 2019 prior to the commencement of  
45 recruitment to the trial on the 12<sup>th</sup> June, 2019.

46

#### 47 **Keywords**

48 Implementation trial; workplace; sitting; health promotion; activity; health and safety; public health;  
49 occupational; web-based; RE-AIM

50

51

## 52 **Introduction**

53 High levels of sedentary time can be associated with poor health, wellbeing and productivity outcomes and  
54 indicators (1) with detrimental impacts particularly pronounced in those who are also physically  
55 inactive.(2, 3) The desk-based workplace has been identified as a key target setting for intervening on  
56 prolonged sedentary time,(4) with systematic review evidence concluding that interventions addressing  
57 prolonged workplace sedentary time can be both effective and acceptable.(5-9) Recent economic analyses  
58 have also indicated that reductions in sedentary time, to the levels achieved through workplace  
59 interventions, could result in Australian healthcare cost savings of \$39 million per year.(10) Given this  
60 evidence, and the associated identification of workplace sedentary time as an emergent workplace health  
61 and safety issue,(11) there is demand from occupational policy and practice partners for an evidence-based,  
62 low-cost/no-cost, scalable solution to support workers and organisations to reduce prolonged sedentary  
63 time.(12)

64 The online BeUpstanding™ program (13) is based on a strong foundation of research evidence, including  
65 from randomised controlled trials (14) and best-practice approaches to workplace health promotion.(15)  
66 The 8-week program, targeted at desk-based work teams and using a champion-led approach, has a  
67 theoretical basis in social cognitive theory (16) and a social-ecologic model.(17, 18) The program is  
68 designed to raise awareness of the benefits of sitting less and moving more and create a culture of  
69 sustainable change through teams collectively identifying and promoting strategies to support these  
70 behaviours that are suitable for their work team and context.(19)

71 BeUpstanding has been iteratively developed and tested across multiple phases in collaboration with end  
72 users and key policy and practice stakeholders,(12, 20-23) and guided by the RE-AIM (reach,  
73 effectiveness, adoption, implementation, maintenance) framework.(24) Use of this framework is relevant  
74 for informing broader dissemination as it guides design and evaluation of programs in applied  
75 contexts.(25) This study reports on the adoption, reach, effectiveness, selected implementation, and  
76 maintenance intent outcomes from the Australian national implementation trial (Phase 4) of BeUpstanding.  
77 Cost-benefit analyses, and detailed implementation, maintenance, engagement and process analyses, will

78 be reported separately. Importantly, the implementation trial, which started in mid-June 2019, occurred in  
79 the context of major events in Australia and globally, namely the Australian Black Summer bushfires (July  
80 2019 to March 2020) and the COVID-19 pandemic (March 2020--), which caused major disruptions to  
81 ways of working.(26, 27) Findings from this evaluation are intended to inform further optimisation of the  
82 BeUpstanding program prior to Phase 5 (dissemination).

83

## 84 **Methods**

### 85 **Study design**

86 Detailed methods for this implementation trial have been previously reported.(19) In brief, a single-arm  
87 design was used for evaluation of effectiveness, with repeated cross-sectional evaluations at pre-program  
88 (0 weeks), end-of-program ( $\approx 8$  weeks; primary endpoint), and at 9 months post-program ( $\approx 12$  months post  
89 sign-up). Only the pre-program and end-of-program data are reported herein, with data reporting according  
90 to the TIDieR (28) and TREND (29) checklists (Additional Files 1 and 2). The implementation trial was  
91 funded by a National Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC) of Australia Partnership Project  
92 Grant (#1149936), which included cash and/or in-kind support from the five partners (Safe Work Australia,  
93 Comcare, Queensland Office of Industrial Relations, The Victorian Health Promotion Foundation  
94 (VicHealth), and Healthier Workplace Western Australia). These organisations are responsible for  
95 developing, implementing and/or promoting workplace health, safety and wellbeing in Australian  
96 workplaces. Ethical approval was from The University of Queensland Human Research Ethics Committee  
97 (approval #2016001743). Recruitment into the trial ceased on the 30<sup>th</sup> September, 2021, noting the online  
98 program remained available for anyone to access and use. Only data from users who signed-up during the  
99 recruitment period are reported here.

100

### 101 **Participants and recruitment**

102 Promotional efforts, co-ordinated by a detailed marketing and promotional plan developed by the research  
103 team and external marketing and communication experts, were made by the five partners to direct potential

104 users to the BeUpstanding website (13) and the implementation trial. Multiple promotional channels were  
105 used, including social media, web links, email listservers, newsletters, workplace health promotion and  
106 occupational health networks, conferences, and workshops. Recruitment efforts were aimed at champions  
107 and decision makers of desk-based employees from a wide cross-section of industries, especially including  
108 the five sectors identified as priorities by the partners (regional, call centre, small business, blue-collar, and  
109 government).

110  
111 Recruitment into the trial was a multi-step process. The BeUpstanding online program was freely available  
112 online for the entire trial period and beyond, without any requirement to be eligible or participate in the  
113 trial. A user could register (by completing preliminary details of themselves and their organisation) and  
114 fully sign-up to access the toolkit and associated resources by completing a champion profile survey and  
115 providing informed consent. Preliminary eligibility for the trial was ascertained from these two data  
116 sources (initial registration; champion profile survey), with eligibility being: not having previously run the  
117 BeUpstanding program; team size of at least five staff; and, most of the team do predominantly desk-based  
118 work. Those potentially eligible were contacted by telephone (call 1) by the research team to confirm  
119 criteria and ascertain the final eligibility requirements. Namely, that a workplace representative/employee  
120 signing up to the toolkit could perform the duties of a workplace champion and planned to run the program  
121 within the recruitment window. Potential champions were made aware that the main feature of taking part  
122 in the trial (as distinct from using the program independently) was they were committing to the evaluation  
123 steps in the BeUpstanding program and would receive expert health coaching support to deliver the  
124 program via email and phone calls.

125  
126 All confirmed eligible champion participants were invited to participate in the trial, except where  
127 recruitment quota had been reached for a particular priority sector (see sample size) or a limit was reached  
128 for coaching availability to be allocated to a single organisation. Consent for the trial was in addition to  
129 that provided as part of the website sign-up process. The program was intended to be delivered to all staff

130 in participating teams, with no exclusion criteria at the staff level. Staff provided informed consent as a  
131 step for gaining entry to the staff surveys.

132

### 133 **BeUpstanding program – national implementation trial version**

134 A detailed description of the BeUpstanding program is reported elsewhere.(19) In brief, the program was  
135 designed to be run by the workplace champion across three phases (plan, do, review), each with associated  
136 tasks for the champion to complete. The accompanying toolkit provided information and training for the  
137 champion on the purpose of each phase and associated resources to support implementation, with the seven  
138 core components highlighted (starred) to indicate their importance. The most critical was the staff  
139 information and consultation workshop (or equivalent), where staff were provided information about the  
140 benefits of sitting less/moving more and collectively chose three (or more) team strategies they would use  
141 to sit less/move more as a team. Champions were encouraged to promote these strategies over eight weeks  
142 via the posters and emails provided in the toolkit. This participative approach meant each intervention  
143 program was unique for each team. In line with public, occupational, and clinical guidelines,(30-32)  
144 behavioural targets were for workers to achieve a 50:50 split between sitting and upright activities during  
145 work hours and to alternate sitting/upright posture at least every 30 minutes. Increased incidental  
146 movement throughout the day was also encouraged through the move more messaging. No incentives were  
147 provided as part of the trial. The main distinguishing feature of the implementation trial (as compared with  
148 the program in general) is that the research team both supported (and collected further data on) program  
149 implementation, via email support and telephone calls at five key timepoints: 1) recruitment; 2) obtaining  
150 consent; 3) at program initiation, following the staff consultation; 4) at end of program; and, 5) after  
151 approximately 12 months (maintenance). Project staff providing this support all had a minimal Masters  
152 level qualification and were experienced in motivational interviewing for behaviour change.

153

154 Due to the major shift to hybrid work resulting from COVID-19,(33) the toolkit and resources were audited  
155 and modified, and new resources were developed (e.g., see Additional File 3) during the trial to ensure the  
156 program was suitable for delivery for all desk-workers, no matter where they were working. These new



resources went online in July 2020. Additional measures to capture work-from-home arrangements (staff completed) and the impact of COVID-19 on the workplace (champion completed) were also added (May 2020).

## **Data collection**

Detailed description of the data collection process is provided in the protocol paper.<sup>(19)</sup> Data were primarily collected via the dedicated, stand-alone BeUpstanding website, using surveys and toolkit analytics, with the project management team collecting and confirming implementation data via the telephone check-ins. Each toolkit user was required to complete the registration survey and champion profile survey as part of the sign-up process. Each champion was requested to complete a workplace audit before delivering the program and then a program completion survey after program delivery. Champions were also responsible for sending their bespoke links for the staff surveys (pre-program, post-program) to all staff in their team. For each survey, an anonymous staff identifier was constructed based on responses to three questions (month of birth; first initial of mothers first name; and, last three digits of mobile phone). This identifier, coupled with the cluster identification number, was used to ensure, per combined work team (cluster), each staff member responded only once and to match pre- and post-program responses. There was no blinding.

## **Outcomes and Measures**

The outcomes according to the RE-AIM framework are outlined below.

### ***Adoption***

Adoption was chiefly described in terms of uptake of the toolkit (n and % unlocking the toolkit), trial participation (n and %), the organisational, workplace, team and champion characteristics of those who participated in the trial, and how they had heard of BeUpstanding (in order to adopt it). Organisational characteristics were reported by champions, reconciled across champions from the same organisation, and checked against public records. Workplace characteristics were permitted to diverge between different

184 champions from the same workplace. Champions were classified by project staff according to their role  
185 delivering the program to a team (overseer and primary champion / primary champion / co-champion) or  
186 supporting other aspects of BeUpstanding (overseer only / decision maker / other role). Further detailed  
187 information relevant to understanding adoption were the predictors of non-adoption (comparison of  
188 participants with non-participants), reasons given for not participating or withdrawing, and reasons for  
189 adopting the program, focusing specifically on what the champions said that they aimed to achieve by  
190 running BeUpstanding (open ended).

191

### 192 ***Reach***

193 Reach outcomes included: the number of staff in participating teams (as estimated by the champion, and as  
194 verified through staff surveys), and the characteristics of staff who took part in the evaluation (by  
195 responding to one or both staff surveys).

196

### 197 ***Implementation***

198 Implementation outcomes reported are completion rates (yes/no) of the seven core program steps, and  
199 champion-reported costs they incurred (reported in the program completion survey) or expected to incur  
200 (reported in the planning stage implementation check, shortly after selecting team strategies) through  
201 running BeUpstanding.

202

### 203 ***Effectiveness***

204 Program effectiveness was assessed by the difference between pre-and post-program staff survey responses  
205 regarding 13 indicators of the program's impact on workplace behaviour and workplace culture targeted  
206 directly by the program and 13 measures of productivity and health and wellbeing that were expected  
207 might improve as a result of the program. The primary outcome for effectiveness was workplace sitting,  
208 measured by the Occupational Sitting and Physical Activity Questionnaire (OSPAQ).(34) The post-staff  
209 survey also captured staff perceptions of the program and its impact, and adverse events. When described,  
210 adverse events were classified by two researchers as to whether they constituted adverse events and

211 whether they could reasonably have resulted from the program. Program satisfaction was collected from  
212 staff in post-program surveys and from team champions in program completion surveys.

213

### 214 ***Maintenance intentions***

215 The maintenance intentions of the champions of completing teams were ascertained by coding and  
216 reviewing the responses to an open text question of “What are your plans now in relation to  
217 BeUpstanding?” asked during program completion calls. Their detailed actual maintenance of the program  
218 and longer-term outcomes will be addressed in detail in subsequent papers.

219

### 220 **Sample size (primary effectiveness outcome)**

221 As described elsewhere,<sup>(19)</sup> using assumptions informed by earlier iterations of the program (SD 90,  
222  $r=0.5$ ,  $ICC=0.1$ , post-attrition  $n/workplace = 5$ ), it was determined that 47 to 62 workplaces (235 to 310  
223 staff) were required to provide 80% to 90% power to detect a change in workplace sitting of at least 20  
224 minutes per 8 hours of work (i.e., 4% of the workday) with 5% two-tailed significance. Consequently, the  
225 target sample size was at least 50 workplaces per priority sector to permit subgroup analysis.

226

### 227 **Statistical Analysis**

228 Most of the reach, adoption, implementation and maintenance outcomes are described using descriptive  
229 statistics. Additionally, logistic regression was used to compare the organisational, workplace, team, and  
230 personal characteristics of those who included in the trial (trial adopters) versus non-participants (non-  
231 adopters), as well as those who completed the post-program evaluation of their team versus those who did  
232 not. Effectiveness outcomes (continuous) were compared between pre- and post-program staff surveys  
233 using linear mixed models, correcting for cluster (workplace) as a random intercept, or as random slopes,  
234 where likelihood ratio tests indicated the random slopes model was superior. Unadjusted models were  
235 reported in addition to the main findings, which adjusted for potential confounding due to different staff  
236 and teams providing data at each survey. Specifically, these were characteristics with a  $p<0.2$  association

237 either with teams being part of the post-program evaluation or not (tested by logistic regression models), or  
238 with staff members providing outcome data at only the pre-program survey (n=1481) versus only the post-  
239 program survey (n=397) (tested by mixed logistic regression models, correcting for workplace cluster as a  
240 random intercept). To test the sensitivity of conclusions to missing data handling, confounder-adjusted  
241 models were also reported with missing data imputed, using multiple imputation by chained equations. In  
242 addition to the analytic variables, imputation models contained auxiliary variables (additional variables  
243 predicting outcomes at either pre- or post- program surveys at  $p < 0.2$  in backwards eliminations) to help  
244 improve prediction of missing outcomes. A further sensitivity analysis excluded staff survey responses that  
245 had been collected after the program had already started. Analyses were performed in STATA version 18,  
246 with the final date of data extraction 15 May 2024. Significance was set at  $p < 0.05$  (two-tailed).

247

## 248 **Results**

249 For ease of reporting, RE-AIM outcomes are presented these in the order of Adoption, Reach,  
250 Implementation, Effectiveness, and Maintenance intentions.

251

252

---

**INSERT FIGURE 1 ABOUT HERE**

---

253

## 254 **Adoption**

255 The participant flow diagram (Figure 1) shows that out of the 1640 website users who signed up during the  
256 trial recruitment period, 847 fully registered and unlocked the toolkit, and 233 were determined to be  
257 eligible for the trial, with ineligibility mostly due to not being contactable or not planning to run the  
258 program either at all or in the requisite timeframe. In total, 82 potentially would have been eligible if the  
259 recruitment quota for their sector(s) was considered not already met. Out of the 233 eligible users, the  
260 preliminary consent rate was 85.0% (n=198), which dropped to 50.6% (n=118) after excluding those who  
261 preliminarily seemed eligible and consented but withdrew before starting the program. Completion rates  
262 for the 118 who were included in the trial (who commenced the program) were high (94.1%, n=111). The

263 most common reasons for non-participation prior to preliminary consent were reasons related to not being  
264 able to run the program, or lack of interest in the trial. Reasons for not participating after preliminarily  
265 consenting were primarily due to changing circumstances at either the organisation or champion level.  
266 Withdrawing after having started the program was rare and most often due to it being a difficult time in the  
267 organisation (n=5/7).

268

269 Almost all trial respondents (n=116) indicated what they aimed to achieve by adopting the program, with  
270 results categorised under 22 themes (Additional File 4). The most common aim was to improve either  
271 physical health and/or wellbeing (50.9%), with changing sitting / physical activity levels (37.9%) also  
272 often mentioned. There was some evidence that aims were associated with trial participation (Additional  
273 File 5). Reporting an aim to improve culture (OR=1.95, 95%CI: 1.09, 3.48), connection (OR=1.85,  
274 95%CI: 1.02, 3.35), and/or productivity (OR=2.78, 95%CI: 1.47, 5.24) were associated with significantly  
275 higher odds of participation. Reporting a general aim to improve health was associated with a significantly  
276 lower odds of participation (OR=0.30, 95%CI: 0.09, 0.98).

277

278 Table 1 shows the characteristics of teams participating in the trial and their champions. The sample size  
279 target was met in terms of total numbers but not in any of the subgroups, due in part to the COVID-19  
280 pandemic. Teams were recruited from every priority sector: 48 teams (51.1%) from the public sector; 24  
281 teams (25.5%) from small-medium enterprises (11 (11.75%) small business); 33 teams (35.1%) from blue-  
282 collar workplaces; 32 teams (34.0%) with regional staff; and, six teams with call-centre staff (6.4%). Team  
283 size was highly varied and averaged 29.4 (SD=32.1) members. Overall, 13 of the 19 standard industry  
284 classifications in Australia (35) had some representation in the trial. The most common industry of the  
285 organisations of participating teams was Health Care and Social Assistance (n=16, 17.0%) and  
286 Professional / Technical and Scientific Services (n=16, 17.0%). Teams were recruited from every state and  
287 territory of Australia and were predominantly located in Queensland (n=43, 45.7%). Champions' work  
288 locations varied widely in socioeconomic status, with a mean (SD) state percentile of 67.6 (26.7) in terms  
289 of socioeconomic index of advantage and disadvantage. Champions had a mean (SD) age of 42.9 (11.0)

290 years. Many were female (75.9%), in middle (38.8%) or senior (15.5%) management, had a health and  
291 safety role (65.5%), and workplace health promotion training (56.9%). Less than half (36.2%) had prior  
292 experience delivering workplace health promotion programs.

---

294 **INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE**

---

296 Additional File 5 shows the odds of participation (adopting the program) by these characteristics.  
297 Significant predictors included location ( $p < 0.001$ , with highest participation in Queensland, and lowest  
298 participation in WA/NT/TAS), sector ( $p = 0.001$ , with highest participation by public followed by non-profit  
299 then private sector), and COVID-19 impact level ( $p < 0.001$ , with highest participation in high followed by  
300 general followed by no impact). Predictors significantly associated with lower odds of participation were:  
301 having an occupational health and safety role (0.60, 95% CI: 0.39, 0.91); inclusion of call centre staff  
302 (0.38, 95% CI: 0.16, 0.89); small-medium enterprise (0.50, 95% CI: 0.32, 0.79); and, hearing of the program  
303 through an article/publication/newsletter (0.56, 95% CI: 0.32, 0.98). Predictors significantly associated  
304 with higher odds of participation were: hearing of the program through a seminar/presentation/conference  
305 (1.97, 95% CI: 1.07, 3.64) or a colleague (2.29, 95% CI: 1.48, 3.52); and, higher organisational readiness  
306 (1.52, 95% CI: 1.09, 2.12 per unit change efficacy).

307  
308 **Reach outcomes**

309 Based on estimates from participating champions, the program reached 2761 staff in the trial, with 2248  
310 able to be verified via responding to at least the identifier questions in one or both staff surveys. Staff were  
311 on average (mean (SD)) aged 42.9 (11.4) years, worked 38.2 (9.0) hours per week, and exercised for 3.1  
312 (2.2) days per week prior to BeUpstanding, with 27.3% of staff meeting the recommended five or more  
313 days of exercise per week (Table 2). More than half of staff were female (65.0%), in full-time employment  
314 (82.1%), university educated (64.4%), non-managerial employees (68.5%), and in the highest occupational  
315 skill category (50.3%). A very small minority were shift-workers (2.1%), and 16.9% of staff were from a  
316 non-English speaking background.

317

318

---

**INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE**

---

319

320 **Implementation outcomes**

321 The champions had completed all core steps for most of the participating teams (72.4%) and most of the  
322 completing teams (76.4%). The steps with the lowest completion rates were the workplace audit, strategy  
323 selection, and the program completion survey (Table 3). During their planning stage implementation  
324 check-in calls, shortly after selecting their team strategies, 80 champions reported on any costs they had  
325 incurred or expected to incur in order to support or enact their team strategies. In total, 35 cost items were  
326 reported, the most common of which was sit-stand desks or similar (n=14). Other costs included:  
327 accessories to assist with standing at the desk (Bluetooth headsets (n=3); anti-fatigue mats (n=1)), aids for  
328 prompting (reminder/lockout software (n=4); timer (n=1)), enhancements to communal areas (standing  
329 benches/tables (n=3); communal bins (n=1)), equipment (n=2) and subscriptions (n=1) for physical activity  
330 at work; and, miscellaneous other (pedometers (n=1); undescribed equipment (n=2); sporting goods gift  
331 cards (n=1)). In the program completion survey, 72 champions reported what was spent in total to run the  
332 program for their team, with the majority reporting spending \$0 (n=52, 72.2%, Table 4). Sit-stand desks  
333 had been purchased for every team where the amount spent was >\$1000.

334

335

---

**INSERT TABLES 3 AND 4 ABOUT HERE**

---

336

337 **Effectiveness outcomes**

338 *Outcomes targeted by the intervention*

339 Baseline levels of the staff-reported program outcomes and their changes over the program are shown in  
340 Table 5. The main models adjusted for characteristics that might differ between those providing data at  
341 post- and pre-program surveys, based on participation in the post-program evaluation by the team  
342 (Additional File 6) or staff member (Additional File 7). These models (Figure 2) indicated significant

343 improvements in all outcomes directly targeted by the program: the primary outcome (self-reported work  
344 sitting); work standing and moving; the extent to which sitting was accumulated in prolonged bouts; the  
345 alignment between preferred and actual sitting, standing and moving at work; and, all measures of  
346 workplace culture. The magnitude of these effects on average were mostly small-to-moderate, with the  
347 smallest effects seen for moving, moving alignment, and perceived control over sitting. Workplaces varied  
348 significantly in their changes in activity at work and sitting in prolonged bouts, with tests for random  
349 slopes reaching statistical significance (Additional File 8).

350

351

---

**INSERT FIGURE 2 AND TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE**

---

352

353 Conclusions regarding workplace behaviours from the main adjusted models were mostly robust to  
354 modelling choices, except that moving results strengthened slightly and became significant in adjusted  
355 models and then further strengthened with imputation. Results concerning culture were unaffected by  
356 statistical adjustment but were sensitive to missing data handling, whereas results from imputation models  
357 were often weaker and sometimes no longer statistically significant. Excluding the pre-program surveys  
358 that had been collected after the program commenced had no meaningful impact on findings (Additional  
359 File 9).

360

### 361 *Other outcomes*

362 Of the 13 outcomes concerning work productivity and health, significant improvements were seen in self-  
363 rated job performance, job satisfaction, energy, self-rated physical health, and musculoskeletal discomfort  
364 in the upper body, lower back, and lower body, with improvements ranging in magnitude from very small  
365 to small (Figure 2; Table 5). Other changes were consistently all very small, and not statistically  
366 significant. Random slopes tests were not statistically significant for any of these outcomes (Additional  
367 File 8). Findings were similar to those from unadjusted models, except that adjustment brought results for  
368 engagement even closer to the null and the previously significant change in self-rated psychological health  
369 became borderline significant. There were no meaningful changes in outcomes excluding late pre-program



370 surveys (Additional File 9). Many findings, especially for work-related and productivity outcomes, were  
371 highly sensitive to missing data, where multiple imputation results only indicated significant changes (all  
372 improvements) in energy, self-rated physical health, and musculoskeletal discomfort in the upper body and  
373 lower back, all of which were somewhat smaller than they had been in the evaluable case analyses. In  
374 imputed models, effects for lower body discomfort were somewhat attenuated in magnitude and no longer  
375 statistically significant, while effects for estimates of changes in self-rated job performance and job  
376 satisfaction were completely attenuated. Effect sizes became further away from the null for sick days,  
377 stress, and creativity, but remained very small and did not reach statistical significance.

378

### 379 ***Priority sectors***

380 The changes in the primary outcome (work sitting) overall amounted on average to -38.5 (-46.0, -31.0)  
381 min/8 h for the trial in general. Changes were mostly also present within each of the priority sectors: -28.2  
382 (-39.7 to -16.6) min/8-h in small-medium enterprises (based on 24 workplaces and 496 staff); -35.8 (-49.4  
383 to -22.1) min/8-h in blue-collar workplaces (based on 26 workplaces and 772 staff), -41.7 (-52.5 to -31.0)  
384 min/8-h in public-sector workplaces (based on 40 workplaces and 954 staff); and, -45.2 (-60.0 to -30.3)  
385 min/8-h in teams that included regional staff (based on 26 workplaces and 626 staff). Changes in the teams  
386 that included call-centre staff were -46.3 (-126.4 to 33.9) min/8-h and did not reach statistical significance  
387 with the small sample of 3 workplaces and 97 staff.

388

### 389 ***Adverse events and staff perceptions of the program***

390 Most (n=604, 96.0%) of the 629 staff responding to the staff follow-up surveys did not experience any  
391 adverse events. Only 7 staff (1.1%) reported an adverse event that was confirmed by research staff, with  
392 six of these (1.0%) potentially being attributable to the study, and a further 18 staff (2.9%) reported that  
393 they experienced some adverse event that could not be verified as they did not describe it. The six events  
394 that could have arisen from program participation were: new or exacerbation of musculoskeletal pain or  
395 injury (n=4), specifically to the hip from standing propped on a stool, to the back from “overdoing things”,

396 plantar fasciitis, and lower leg and lower back pain; and, adverse work impacts (n=2), specifically feeling  
397 guilty about leaving the desk (n=1) and feeling followed by their supervisor (n=1).

398

399 The majority of staff reported positive impacts on outcomes targeted directly by BeUpstanding (culture,  
400 knowledge, attitudes, awareness), with few reporting negative impacts (Figure 3). Staff provided more  
401 mixed responses in relation to the impact of the program on activity outside work, with very few staff  
402 (n=11, 1.7%) perceiving a negative impact and the rest of the staff being almost equally divided between  
403 perceiving a negligible impact (51.1%) or a positive impact (47.2%).

404

405

---

**INSERT FIGURE 3 ABOUT HERE**

---

406

#### 407 *Program satisfaction*

408 Staff (n=654) reported on their satisfaction with the program. Excluding those who indicated they were not  
409 aware of BeUpstanding or responded not applicable (n=35), most staff (n=477, 77.1%) indicated they  
410 enjoyed BeUpstanding, some were uncertain (n=115, 18.6%), and a minority of staff said they did not  
411 enjoy participating (n=27, 4.4%). Champions also reported on their satisfaction with the program in post-  
412 completion surveys (n=72). When asked whether the program met expectations, most said yes (n=57,  
413 79.2%) or somewhat (n=13, 18.1%) and only two (2.8%) said no. Similarly, most said they would (n=63,  
414 87.5%) or maybe would (n=8, 11.1%) recommend the program and only one said they would not (1.4%).

415

#### 416 **Maintenance intentions**

417 The 8-week BeUpstanding program was completed by 89 of the 94 teams that were part of the trial. Upon  
418 completion, project staff were able to contact 70 of their team champions and ask about their planned next  
419 steps concerning BeUpstanding. Most responses to the open-ended question indicated the champions  
420 intended to continue the program (n=59, 84.3%) or repeat it (n=8, 11.4%), while very few indicated that  
421 the champion intended to stop or pause the program (n=1, 1.4%), including to restart it with different staff  
422 (n=1, 1.4%), and one champion intended to check with management (n=1, 1.4%).

423

## 424 **Discussion**

425 This study reports the main outcomes, covering the five dimensions of the RE-AIM framework, of the first  
426 national implementation trial of a workplace health promotion initiative specifically supporting teams of  
427 desk-based workers to sit less and move more (BeUpstanding). This trial was the fourth phase in the  
428 research-to-practice translation process from an intervention that had demonstrated effectiveness in the  
429 context of a cluster randomised controlled trial.(14)

430

### 431 *Adoption and Reach*

432 While there was interest in the program more broadly, with over 600 organisations unlocking the toolkit  
433 during the trial period, adoption of the program as part of the research trial was more modest, with  
434 approximately half of eligible workplaces running the program. This needs to be understood in the context  
435 of the BeUpstanding program being available for free online without participation in the trial, and two  
436 significant emergencies in Australia that occurred during the trial’s recruitment period, specifically the  
437 COVID-19 pandemic and the 2019-20 bushfires. Reported reasons for not adopting the program were  
438 mostly regarding it being a difficult time in the organisation (e.g., availability of personnel) or lack of  
439 interest in the research trial. Only rarely did withdrawal occur after initial consent due to an issue with the  
440 program. As might be expected, a higher level of organisational readiness, specifically change efficacy,  
441 was significantly associated with higher odds of adoption into the trial while conversely having an  
442 occupational health and safety role was associated with lower odds of adoption. One interpretation (among  
443 many) is that champions who do not feel their workplace is well placed to run the program may require  
444 additional supports (beyond what was provided in the implementation trial) to adopt the program, while  
445 conversely those in occupational health and safety roles may have felt confident to run the program  
446 independently outside of the trial context without support. Other reasons could include that occupational  
447 health and safety staff had competing priorities especially in the COVID-19 pandemic, and unready  
448 workplaces may have wanted to avoid the oversight of a trial.

449

450 Workplaces and staff took part from every partner-identified priority sector, from every Australian state  
451 and territory (including rural/regional locations), from 13 of 19 ANZIC industries,(35) and with diverse  
452 workplace and worker characteristics. Some groups were easier to reach than others, with limited  
453 participation from shift workers, from those not in fulltime employment, and with lower-skilled  
454 occupations. While this may align with our specific focus on desk-based workers, it is important in future  
455 research to understand how this program and others like it may work in these groups, as well as other  
456 underrepresented or untested key populations, such as people with disabilities. Adoption was significantly  
457 lower for workplaces outside the public sector, of small-medium size, and especially in teams that included  
458 call-centre staff (despite deliberate recruitment efforts). Staff in call centres or contact centres generally  
459 have higher rates of sedentary time than general office workers,(36) but typically also have reduced  
460 autonomy to break up their sedentary time due to their job tasks and job demands.(37) In line with previous  
461 recommendations,(38) it will be important to work with relevant stakeholders to co-design appropriate  
462 approaches for this particular setting.

463

### 464 ***Implementation***

465 Champions were provided automated feedback via the toolkit that was engaging and meaningful and had a  
466 streamlined online user experience that highlighted the core components. As part of the trial, they also  
467 received support from the research team at key stages: all factors that had been added and optimised based  
468 on learnings from the version used by the early adopters.(21) In the previous phase of this research-to-  
469 practice translation (Phase 3), the seven core steps were completed for only 5% of teams, due in part to  
470 retention and in part to progressing through without completing core steps.(20) These modifications appear  
471 to have resulted in a much more complete implementation of the program, with most teams (>72%)  
472 completing all seven core steps, and none completing fewer than five. Most workplaces implemented the  
473 program in a no or low-cost manner, and only a minority spent significant sums of money, usually on sit-  
474 stand workstations.

475

### 476 ***Effectiveness***

477 The program was significantly effective in relation to the primary outcome (workplace sitting), behaviours  
478 and culture (which were the main targets of the program), and also for some indicators of productivity,  
479 health and wellbeing. The average decrease in self-reported work sitting of -38.5 (95%CI -46.0 to -31.0)  
480 minutes per 8-hour workday appeared to have co-occurred mainly with increased standing, and also a  
481 smaller amount of increased moving. Notably the extent of change strongly resembled the average effect  
482 on sedentary behaviour of 38 minutes reduction per workday (95% CI -47.3 to -28.7) achieved by  
483 sedentary behaviour interventions in office workers (across all intervention types combined) as reported by  
484 a recent systematic review and meta-analysis.(39) Given the timing of the trial, and the substantial shift to  
485 hybrid work resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic,(33) these findings also provide some evidence that  
486 BeUpstanding is suitable for work from home and hybrid work contexts. A pre-post design was required  
487 for feasibility reasons, leaving open the possibility of other explanations for changes over time, especially  
488 in light of the pandemic. Notably however, the controlled studies that informed the BeUpstanding program  
489 development had not observed any meaningful degree of changes in control groups.(14, 40, 41) It is not  
490 likely that the pandemic produced the improvements, considering COVID-19 saw an increase in sedentary  
491 time and a reduction in physical activity in desk workers(42), and the average change was -43 minutes per  
492 8-hour workday (-9.0%, 95% CI: -12.0% to -5.9%) in the pre-pandemic evaluation of the program's  
493 early adopters.(20)

494

495 Findings concerning workplace sitting, other workplace behaviours and workplace culture were robust to  
496 issues of potentially selective evaluation, being largely unaltered in sensitivity analyses. Where selective  
497 participation may have been more of an issue was in gauging the impact of the program on productivity  
498 and health, where changes were typically smaller after accounting for missing data, but notably were still  
499 present for energy, self-rated physical health, and upper body and lower back musculoskeletal discomfort.  
500 The benefits seen to at least some of the productivity and health indicators adds to the growing evidence  
501 from field-based studies that interventions aimed at reducing workplace sedentary time, particularly those  
502 where sedentary time is predominantly replaced with standing, are not detrimental to indicators of work  
503 performance.(43) The musculoskeletal findings in particular add to the currently limited evidence base in

504 this area.(17) Although these reductions were small on average, they are potentially important given that  
505 work-related musculoskeletal disorders are the leading work health and safety issue in Australia in terms of  
506 both frequency and costs,(44) and were not necessarily small for all participants. Future detailed evaluation  
507 will explore whether changes are possibly enhanced based on factors such as pre-existing discomfort, and  
508 nuanced aspects of the behaviour changes, such as the reallocation of sitting to standing versus to moving,  
509 the prolonged or interrupted nature of sedentary accumulation, and the specific behavioural strategies that  
510 were adopted.

511

512 A key goal of the implementation trial was to evaluate effectiveness in not just overall but also within key  
513 sectors identified *a priori*.(19) Here, significant improvements in workplace sitting were seen within  
514 almost all sectoral subgroups. The sole exception was that changes in teams with call centre staff were  
515 substantial -46.3 minutes per 8-hour workday (95%CI: -126.4 to 33.9) but inconclusive with wide  
516 confidence intervals as a consequence of only three call centres participating in the evaluation. This finding  
517 adds to a known paucity of evidence, as indicated by a recent scoping review(45) that called for further  
518 evidence on the effectiveness, acceptability and feasibility of health-promoting interventions (including for  
519 addressing sedentary behaviour) conducted in the call-centre setting. Minimal adverse events were  
520 recorded and were of mostly a similar nature (musculoskeletal) as have been reported in similar  
521 programs.(46, 47)

522

### 523 ***Satisfaction and Maintenance intentions***

524 Satisfaction was generally high for both staff and champions and most indicated they would participate  
525 again in BeUpstanding. Although further evidence is needed,(48) shifting culture may be the key for  
526 sustainable change in workplace sedentary behaviour. The BeUpstanding program heavily targeted culture,  
527 and significantly improved many cultural aspects. Following BeUpstanding, most champions intended to  
528 continue on with the program, often also intending adaptation -- an important feature of sustainable  
529 delivery.(49) Many particularly mentioned intentions to expand to either more staff and/or embedding the  
530 program into standard practice, which is consistent with the intent of BeUpstanding. Findings from the 12-

531 month follow-up champions (to be reported elsewhere), will provide further insights into workplace  
532 changes following BeUpstanding.

533

### 534 *Strengths and limitations*

535 Strengths of the study include: the wide-ranging participation from workplaces across Australia and from a  
536 wide variety of industries and all priority sectors identified by the policy and practice partners; the data  
537 collection across the RE-AIM framework, enabling understanding of how the program is working in  
538 practice; and, the data collection on a range of measures, including those relevant to organisations (e.g., job  
539 satisfaction). Limitations include the single-group evaluation design, which was necessary for feasibility  
540 reasons, and the large workforce turnover, reflective of the broader job mobility occurring during this  
541 period.(33) To some extent this was mitigated by combining longitudinal and repeated cross-sectional  
542 designs, and using statistics that account for repeated observations but do not require them. Staff could be  
543 included in the evaluation whether they were part of the team and participating in the evaluation in either  
544 one or both evaluations. Another limitation was the measures used are self-report, or proxy-reported by  
545 champions, and both responses concerning the organisation, the program, and the sending out of staff  
546 surveys all relied on the workplace champions. While necessary for the scalable online program, this does  
547 have significant potential for measurement error and bias. Importantly, staff perspectives were collected as  
548 well as the champion perspectives, and many staff findings were robust to missing data handling. Single-  
549 item or minimal item measures were chosen where possible in order to minimise participant burden in line  
550 with our preliminary work informing the trial.(21) One possibility for better gauging the impact of this  
551 program and others like it on productivity and health is to continue the broad, brief evaluation model but  
552 add optional evaluation tools with more detailed assessments. These may have measurement properties  
553 more suitable to detecting changes.

554

### 555 **Conclusion**

556 Findings from this Australian national implementation trial found that the workplace champion-delivered  
557 BeUpstanding program was effective in supporting teams of desk-based workers to sit less and move more  
558 and in creating a supportive culture for this change. It also demonstrated that the program can be taken up  
559 and implemented by a wide range of users from across Australia and across industries. Learnings from the  
560 trial are being used to inform the next iteration of the program (BeUpstanding 2.0), which in turn will  
561 inform Phase 5 (sustainability) of the research-to-practice process.(12) This optimisation, which will be  
562 described in detail elsewhere, is designed to enhance scalability, inclusivity and the user experience.

563

564

565

566



567 **Declarations**

568 *Ethics approval and consent to participate*

569 The study was conducted according to the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki, and approved by the  
570 Human Research Ethics Committee of The University of Queensland (protocol code #2016001743 on the  
571 9th January 2017). All participants provided informed consent. No individual or personally identifiable  
572 information is reported.

573 *Consent for publication*

574 Not applicable

575 *Availability of data and materials*

576 The datasets generated and analysed during the current study are available from the corresponding author  
577 on reasonable request.

578 *Competing interests*

579 The BeUpstanding program does include consultancy options within the toolkit. All and any proceeds from  
580 consultancy activities return to the research to continue to develop the research program. GNH is on the  
581 Editorial Board of IJBNPA.

582 *Funding*

583 The BeUpstanding program was supported by funding from the Queensland Government “Healthier.  
584 Happier. Workplaces” program, Safe Work Australia, Comcare, and the National Health and Medical  
585 Research Council of Australia through a Partnership Project Grant (#1149936) conducted in partnership  
586 with Comcare, Safe Work Australia, the Queensland Office of Industrial Relations, VicHealth, and  
587 Healthier Workplace WA. GNH was supported by an MRFF-NHMRC Emerging Leadership Investigator  
588 Grant (#1193815). NHMRC had no role in the study in terms of the design, data collection, management,  
589 analysis and/or interpretation. SKM’s salary is supported by the Health and Wellbeing Centre for Research  
590 Innovation (HWCRI), co-funded by The University of Queensland and the Queensland Government  
591 through Health and Wellbeing Queensland.

592 *Authors contributions*

593 GNH, ADG, AA, DWD, EGE, NDG, LG, ADL, MM, NO, TS, LS: conception, funding, recruitment,  
594 interpretation.

595 LS: recruitment

596 ADG; SKM, JJ, LU: recruitment; data collection; project management; partner engagement

597 EAHW: data management and data analysis

598 GNH and EAHW wrote the paper with input from all authors.

599 ***Acknowledgements***

600 We acknowledge and thank the partner investigators and their associated support staff, academic  
601 investigators, project staff, and external consultants for their contribution to the BeUpstanding program of  
602 research. We also acknowledge and thank all the participants who have taken part in the program,  
603 particularly our workplace champions.

604

**Table 1:** Characteristics of champions, teams and workplaces/organisations participating in the trial

| Characteristic  | Category / (units or range)         | All trial participants |               | Champions leading teams only |               |
|---|-------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------|------------------------------|---------------|
|   |                                     | n                      | M(SD) or n(%) | M(SD) or n(%)                | M(SD) or n(%) |
| <b><i>Champion characteristics</i></b>                                  |                                     |                        |               |                              |               |
| Location (State)  | New South Wales                     | 118                    | 20 (16.9%)    | 94                           | 17 (18.1%)    |
|   | Australian Capital Territory        |                        | 5 (4.2%)      |                              | 5 (5.3%)      |
|   | Victoria                            |                        | 20 (16.9%)    |                              | 14 (14.9%)    |
|   | Queensland                          |                        | 56 (47.5%)    |                              | 43 (45.7%)    |
|   | South Australia                     |                        | 8 (6.8%)      |                              | 7 (7.4%)      |
|   | Western Australia                   |                        | 7 (5.9%)      |                              | 6 (6.4%)      |
|   | Tasmania                            |                        | 1 (0.8%)      |                              | 1 (1.1%)      |
|   | Northern Territory                  |                        | 1 (0.8%)      |                              | 1 (1.1%)      |
| Postcode SES <sup>a</sup>   | Australian Percentile (1-100)       | 118                    | 68.2 (27.5)   | 94                           | 69.9 (27.0)   |
|   | State Percentile (1-100)            | 118                    | 67.6 (26.7)   | 94                           | 69.3 (26.3)   |
| Age   | (years)                             | 116                    | 42.9 (11.0)   | 94                           | 43.4 (11.1)   |
| Female  | Yes                                 | 116                    | 88 (75.9%)    | 94                           | 73 (77.7%)    |
| Job classification  | Employee                            | 116                    | 53 (45.7%)    | 94                           | 40 (42.6%)    |
|   | Middle management                   | 116                    | 45 (38.8%)    | 94                           | 38 (40.4%)    |
|   | Upper management                    | 116                    | 18 (15.5%)    | 94                           | 16 (17.0%)    |
| Occupational Health and Safety Role (Yes)                               |                                     | 116                    | 76 (65.5%)    | 94                           | 60 (63.8%)    |
| Prior Workplace Health Promotion Training (Yes)                         |                                     | 116                    | 66 (56.9%)    | 94                           | 55 (58.5%)    |
| Prior Workplace Health Promotion Experience (Yes)                       |                                     | 116                    | 42 (36.2%)    | 94                           | 32 (34.0%)    |
| Referred to BeUpstanding by ... (multiples apply)                       | Article / Publication / Newsletter  | 116                    | 16 (13.8%)    | 94                           | 13 (13.8%)    |
|   | Internet / Website                  | 116                    | 28 (24.1%)    | 94                           | 20 (21.3%)    |
|   | Seminar / Presentation / Conference | 116                    | 15 (12.9%)    | 94                           | 14 (14.9%)    |
|   | Social Media / TV / Radio           | 116                    | 4 (3.4%)      | 94                           | 3 (3.2%)      |
|   | Colleague                           | 116                    | 38 (32.8%)    | 94                           | 31 (33.0%)    |
|   | Other word of mouth                 | 116                    | 13 (11.2%)    | 94                           | 12 (12.8%)    |
|   | General Workplace                   | 116                    | 1 (0.9%)      | 94                           | 1 (1.1%)      |
|   | Health & Safety Organisation        | 116                    | 2 (1.7%)      | 94                           | 2 (2.1%)      |
|   | Email                               | 116                    | 1 (0.9%)      | 94                           | 1 (1.1%)      |
|   | Other source                        | 116                    | 5 (4.3%)      | 94                           | 4 (4.3%)      |
|   | <b><i>Team characteristics</i></b>  |                        |               |                              |               |
| Team Size <sup>b</sup>  |                                     | 94                     | 29.4 (32.1)   | 94                           | 29.4 (32.1)   |
| Team Size Category  | 1-10                                | 94                     | 30 (31.9%)    | 94                           | 30 (31.9%)    |
|   | 11-20                               | 94                     | 27 (28.7%)    | 94                           | 27 (28.7%)    |
|   | >20                                 | 94                     | 37 (39.4%)    | 94                           | 37 (39.4%)    |
| Current participation in other workplace health promotion program (Yes) |                                     | 116                    | 31 (26.7%)    | 94                           | 23 (24.5%)    |
| Interest in Health <sup>c</sup>   | (1-5)                               | 116                    | 3.4 (0.7)     | 94                           | 3.4 (0.7)     |
| Motivation to Sit Less <sup>c</sup>                                     | (1-5)                               | 116                    | 3.1 (0.7)     | 94                           | 3.2 (0.7)     |
| Stress <sup>c</sup>   | (1-5)                               | 116                    | 3.3 (0.6)     | 94                           | 3.2 (0.5)     |
| Regional/remote staff included (Yes) <sup>d</sup>                       |                                     | 116                    | 41 (35.3%)    | 94                           | 32 (34.0%)    |
| Call-centre staff included (Yes) <sup>e</sup>                           |                                     | 118                    | 6 (5.1%)      | 94                           | 6 (6.4%)      |
| Main Location (State) <sup>f</sup>                                      | New South Wales                     | 103                    | 20 (19.4%)    | 94                           | 17 (18.1%)    |
|   | Australian Capital Territory        |                        | 5 (4.9%)      |                              | 5 (5.3%)      |
|   | Victoria                            |                        | 17 (16.5%)    |                              | 14 (14.9%)    |
|   | Queensland                          |                        | 46 (44.7%)    |                              | 43 (45.7%)    |

|  |  |     |            |    |            |
|--|--|-----|------------|----|------------|
|  | South Australia                                  |     | 7 (6.8%)   |    | 7 (7.4%)   |
|  | Western Australia                                |     | 6 (5.8%)   |    | 6 (6.4%)   |
|  | Tasmania   |     | 1 (1.0%)   |    | 1 (1.1%)   |
|  | Northern Territory                               |     | 1 (1.0%)   |    | 1 (1.1%)   |
| <b>Workplace or organisation</b>           |  |     |            |    |            |
| Organisation Size                          | Small (<20)                                      | 118 | 11 (9.3%)  | 94 | 11 (11.7%) |
|  | Medium (20-199)                                  |     | 17 (14.4%) |    | 13 (13.8%) |
|  | Large (200-1999)                                 |     | 34 (28.8%) |    | 24 (25.5%) |
|  | Very large (2000+)                               |     | 56 (47.5%) |    | 46 (48.9%) |
| Small-medium enterprise Sector             | Yes  | 118 | 28 (23.7%) | 94 | 24 (25.5%) |
|  | Public   | 118 | 62 (52.5%) | 94 | 48 (51.1%) |
|  | Non-profit                                       |     | 19 (16.1%) |    | 14 (14.9%) |
| Blue-collar workplace <sup>g</sup>         | Private  |     | 37 (31.4%) |    | 32 (34.0%) |
|  | Yes  | 118 | 40 (33.9%) | 94 | 33 (35.1%) |
| COVID-19 impact <sup>h</sup>               | None   | 118 | 6 (5.1%)   | 94 | 6 (6.4%)   |
|  | General  |     | 66 (55.9%) |    | 53 (56.4%) |
|  | High   |     | 46 (39.0%) |    | 35 (37.2%) |
| Organisational readiness <sup>i</sup>      |  |     | 3.8 (0.6)  |    | 3.8 (0.6)  |
|  | Context (1-5)                                    | 99  | 3.8 (0.6)  | 94 | 3.8 (0.6)  |
|  | Change effort (0-1)                              | 100 | 0.4 (0.4)  | 94 | 0.4 (0.4)  |
|  | Change efficacy (1-5)                            | 116 | 4.1 (0.5)  | 94 | 4.1 (0.5)  |
| Main industry of organisation <sup>j</sup> | Administrative and Support Services              | 118 | 6 (5.1%)   | 94 | 6 (6.4%)   |
|  | Agriculture / Forestry and Fishing               |     | 4 (3.4%)   |    | 2 (2.1%)   |
|  | Construction                                     |     | 6 (5.1%)   |    | 6 (6.4%)   |
|  | Education and Training                           |     | 6 (5.1%)   |    | 6 (6.4%)   |
|  | Electricity / Gas / Water and Waste Services     |     | 8 (6.8%)   |    | 7 (7.4%)   |
|  | Financial and Insurance Services                 |     | 4 (3.4%)   |    | 3 (3.2%)   |
|  | Health Care and Social Assistance                |     | 29 (24.6%) |    | 20 (21.3%) |
|  | Manufacturing                                    |     | 9 (7.6%)   |    | 8 (8.5%)   |
|  | Other Services                                   |     | 8 (6.8%)   |    | 8 (8.5%)   |
|  | Professional / Scientific and Technical Services |     | 22 (18.6%) |    | 16 (17.0%) |
|  | Public Administration and Safety                 |     | 7 (5.9%)   |    | 6 (6.4%)   |
|  | Retail Trade                                     |     | 2 (1.7%)   |    | 2 (2.1%)   |
|  | Transport / Postal and Warehousing               |     | 7 (5.9%)   |    | 4 (4.3%)   |

606 Characteristics of organisations, workplaces, and teams were collected from as many of the champions as possible and linked to each team  
 607 mostly by using data from the team's primary champion, or if unavailable, from another co-champion for the team, an overseer with  
 608 knowledge of all the teams, or any other suitable respondent from that workplace.

609 <sup>a</sup> SES = Socioeconomic Status (postal area level Index of Relative Economic Advantage and Disadvantage in national and state  
 610 percentiles).(50)

611 <sup>b</sup> estimated by champions, and periodically updated by project staff during implementation checks as champions evolved their concept of who  
 612 their team would be

613 <sup>c</sup> champion perception when signing up of team's current level (1=worst response to 5=best response)

614 <sup>d</sup> some or all of the team were in regional or remote work locations as reported by champions or ascertained from staff or champion workplace  
 615 postcodes

616 <sup>e</sup> some or all of the team were call-centre staff according to the champion

617 <sup>f</sup> the primary state in which the team is located, calculated from champion and staff-reported workplace postcodes

618 <sup>g</sup> classified from the reported industry, or by champion report of a blue-collar workplace where the industry was mixed

619 <sup>h</sup> Those participating prior to COVID-19 were treated as no impact. General impact (e.g., working from home) was assigned where there was  
 620 no evidence of a high impact (decided subjectively). Severe impacts (e.g., job losses, shutdown of core business) reported by the champion, an  
 621 impact strong enough to prevent participation, being located in Victoria where extended lockdowns occurred, or being part of sectors hard hit  
 622 delivering healthcare or COVID-19 response schemes all qualified as high impact.

623 <sup>i</sup> Higher scores are beneficial(51)

624 <sup>j</sup> main industry of the organisation according to the 19 standard ANZIC categories(35)

625

626 **Table 2:** Characteristics of participating staff (n=2228)

| Characteristic                        | (Unit or range) / category         | n    | Mean (SD) or n(%) <sup>a</sup> |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------|--------------------------------|
| Age                                   | (years)                            | 2004 | 42.9 (11.4)                    |
| Work hours                            | (hours per week)                   | 2043 | 38.2 (9.0)                     |
| Pre-program exercise <sup>b</sup>     | (days per week)                    | 1768 | 3.1 (2.2)                      |
| Meeting recommendations <sup>b</sup>  | No <5 days per week                | 1768 | 1286 (72.7%)                   |
|                                       | Yes, ≥5 days per week              |      | 482 (27.3%)                    |
| Post-program exercise <sup>b</sup>    | (days per week)                    | 709  | 3.5 (2.1)                      |
| Meeting recommendations <sup>b</sup>  | No, <5 days per week               | 709  | 469 (66.1%)                    |
|                                       | Yes, ≥5 days per week              |      | 240 (33.9%)                    |
| Body Mass Index (BMI) <sup>c</sup>    | <25 kg/m <sup>2</sup>              | 1705 | 771 (45.2%)                    |
|                                       | 25-<30 kg/m <sup>2</sup>           |      | 561 (32.9%)                    |
|                                       | ≥30 kg/m <sup>2</sup>              |      | 373 (21.9%)                    |
| Female                                | No                                 | 2131 | 745 (35.0%)                    |
|                                       | Yes                                |      | 1386 (65.0%)                   |
| Non-English speaking background       | No                                 | 2015 | 1674 (83.1%)                   |
|                                       | Yes                                |      | 341 (16.9%)                    |
| Full-time employment                  | No                                 | 2043 | 365 (17.9%)                    |
|                                       | Yes                                |      | 1678 (82.1%)                   |
| Education                             | High school or less                | 2024 | 191 (9.4%)                     |
|                                       | TAFE/Trade certificate/<br>Diploma |      | 530 (26.2%)                    |
|                                       | University or other tertiary       |      | 1303 (64.4%)                   |
| Job classification                    | Employee                           | 2043 | 1399 (68.5%)                   |
|                                       | Middle management                  |      | 167 (8.2%)                     |
|                                       | Upper management                   |      | 477 (23.3%)                    |
| Job category skill level <sup>d</sup> | 1 (most skill / training)          | 2043 | 1028 (50.3%)                   |
|                                       | 2                                  |      | 266 (13.0%)                    |
|                                       | 3                                  |      | 505 (24.7%)                    |
|                                       | 4                                  |      | 56 (2.7%)                      |
|                                       | 5 (least skill / training)         |      | 188 (9.2%)                     |
| Shift worker                          | No                                 | 2043 | 2001 (97.9%)                   |
|                                       | Yes                                |      | 42 (2.1%)                      |

627 <sup>a</sup> Mean SD corrected for clustering using linearized variance (STATA survey commands)

628 <sup>b</sup> number of days per week exercised for at least 30 minutes (0-7)(52) and meeting national guidelines (≥5 v <5 days)

629 <sup>c</sup> Excludes invalid responses (truncated to plausible range of 15 to 50)(53)

630 <sup>d</sup> Australian Standard Classification of Occupations (ASCO: 1 most to 5 least skilled)(54)

631

632

633 **Table 3:** Completion of core steps for all participating teams (n=94) and completing teams (n=89) by one or more  
 634 champion(s) for that team

| Core program steps  | All teams<br>n (%) | Completing teams<br>n (%) |
|---|--------------------|---------------------------|
| - Pre-program staff survey                                    | 94 (100.0%)        | 89 (100.0%)               |
| - Workplace audit <sup>a</sup>                                | 71 (75.5%)         | 71 (79.8%)                |
| - Staff information and consultation session (e.g., workshop) | 94 (100.0%)        | 89 (100.0%)               |
| - Strategy selection  | 73 (77.7%)         | 78 (87.6%)                |
| - Program promotion via posters and/or emails                 | 94 (100.0%)        | 89 (100.0%)               |
| - Post-program staff survey                                   | 94 (100.0%)        | 89 (100.0%)               |
| - Program completion survey                                   | 80 (85.1%)         | 79 (88.8%)                |
| Number of core steps completed (out of 7)                     |                    |                           |
| 7   | 68 (72.3%)         | 68 (76.4%)                |
| 6   | 17 (18.1%)         | 16 (18.0%)                |
| 5   | 9 (9.5%)           | 5 (5.6%)                  |
| <5  | 0 (0.0%)           | 0 (0.0%)                  |

635 <sup>a</sup> The workplace audit mostly asked about the workplace in general and was considered completed if it was  
 636 completed by any champion for the workplace

637

638

639 **Table 4:** Post-program costs reported by the champion (n=72 champions)

| Total costs reported |            | Costs per team member |            |
|----------------------|------------|-----------------------|------------|
| Cost                 | n (%)      | Cost                  | n (%)      |
| \$0                  | 52 (72.2%) | \$0                   | 52 (72.2%) |
| <\$100               | 7 (9.7%)   | >\$0-\$5              | 7 (9.7%)   |
| \$100-\$499          | 1 (1.4%)   | >\$5- \$25            | 4 (5.6%)   |
| \$500-\$999          | 1 (1.4%)   | >\$25-\$50            | 2 (2.8%)   |
| \$1000-\$1499        | 4 (5.6%)   | >\$50-\$100           | 2 (2.8%)   |
| \$1500-\$1999        | 1 (1.4%)   | \$133                 | 1 (1.4%)   |
| \$2000-\$2499        | 3 (4.2%)   | \$250                 | 1 (1.4%)   |
| \$7000               | 1 (1.4%)   | \$318                 | 1 (1.4%)   |
| \$10,500             | 1 (1.4%)   | \$1500                | 1 (1.4%)   |

640

**Table 5:** Changes in staff-reported main outcomes pre to post BeUpstanding program (k=82 workplaces) <sup>a</sup>

| Outcome   | Pre-program  |      | Unadjusted           |        | Adjusted <sup>b</sup> |                      | Adjusted <sup>b</sup> & multiply imputed <sup>c</sup> |      |                      |        |
|---|--------------|------|----------------------|--------|-----------------------|----------------------|---|------|----------------------|--------|
|   | M (SD)       | n    | Change (95% CI)      | p      | n                     | Change (95% CI)      | p   | n    | Change (95% CI)      | p      |
| <i>Outcomes targeted by the intervention</i>    |              |      |                      |        |                       |                      |   |      |                      |        |
| Activity as % of workday <sup>g</sup>           |              |      |                      |        |                       |                      |   |      |                      |        |
| Sitting <sup>d,e</sup>                          | 78.3 (17.9)  | 2131 | -7.6 (-9.1, -6.1)    | <0.001 | 2043                  | -8.1 (-9.7, -6.5)    | <0.001  | 2248 | -7.7 (-9.6, -5.8)    | <0.001 |
| Standing <sup>d,f</sup>                         | 10.7 (11.1)  | 2131 | 5.0 (3.3, 6.7)       | <0.001 | 2043                  | 5.9 (3.8, 7.9)       | <0.001  | 2248 | 6.3 (4.3, 8.3)       | <0.001 |
| Moving <sup>d,f</sup>                           | 11.0 (10.5)  | 2131 | 0.8 (-0.2, 1.8)      | 0.109  | 2043                  | 1.3 (0.1, 2.4)       | 0.032   | 2248 | 3.1 (2.1, 4.1)       | <0.001 |
| % of sitting in prolonged bouts <sup>d,h</sup>  | 65.8 (24.5)  | 2130 | -9.1 (-11.0, -7.1)   | <0.001 | 2042                  | -9.3 (-11.2, -7.3)   | <0.001  | 2248 | -9.0 (-11.2, -6.7)   | <0.001 |
| Activity preference alignment <sup>i</sup>      |              |      |                      |        |                       |                      |   |      |                      |        |
| Sitting   | 153.1 (84.0) | 2091 | -34.3 (-40.7, -27.8) | <0.001 | 2043                  | -33.7 (-40.2, -27.1) | <0.001  | 2248 | -30.7 (-37.6, -23.9) | <0.001 |
| Standing  | 90.3 (62.6)  | 2091 | -17.6 (-22.5, -12.6) | <0.001 | 2043                  | -17.3 (-22.2, -12.3) | <0.001  | 2248 | -14.8 (-21.8, -7.8)  | <0.001 |
| Moving  | 70.8 (60.6)  | 2091 | -10.7 (-15.4, -6.0)  | <0.001 | 2043                  | -10.3 (-15.1, -5.6)  | <0.001  | 2248 | -6.9 (-12.7, -1.0)   | 0.023  |
| Perceptions of culture (0-4) <sup>j</sup>       |              |      |                      |        |                       |                      |   |      |                      |        |
| Overall culture score                           | 2.6 (0.8)    | 2092 | 0.37 (0.31, 0.43)    | <0.001 | 2043                  | 0.37 (0.30, 0.43)    | <0.001  | 2248 | 0.34 (0.28, 0.40)    | <0.001 |
| Perceived control over sitting <sup>e</sup>     | 2.6 (1.1)    | 2092 | 0.23 (0.16, 0.30)    | <0.001 | 2043                  | 0.23 (0.15, 0.30)    | <0.001  | 2248 | 0.06 (-0.02, 0.13)   | 0.136  |
| Organisation supports choices <sup>e</sup>      | 2.7 (1.0)    | 2092 | 0.36 (0.30, 0.43)    | <0.001 | 2043                  | 0.36 (0.30, 0.43)    | <0.001  | 2248 | 0.15 (0.09, 0.21)    | <0.001 |
| Organisation supports moving                    | 2.9 (0.9)    | 2092 | 0.28 (0.21, 0.35)    | <0.001 | 2043                  | 0.27 (0.20, 0.34)    | <0.001  | 2248 | 0.05 (-0.02, 0.13)   | 0.159  |
| Role modelling                                  | 2.1 (1.0)    | 2092 | 0.47 (0.38, 0.55)    | <0.001 | 2043                  | 0.46 (0.38, 0.55)    | <0.001  | 2248 | 0.33 (0.25, 0.42)    | <0.001 |
| Supportive culture                              | 2.5 (1.0)    | 2092 | 0.47 (0.39, 0.55)    | <0.001 | 2043                  | 0.47 (0.38, 0.55)    | <0.001  | 2248 | 0.28 (0.20, 0.36)    | <0.001 |
| <i>Other outcomes</i>                           |              |      |                      |        |                       |                      |   |      |                      |        |
| Feeling part of a team (0-4) <sup>k</sup>       | 2.6 (1.0)    | 2043 | 0.02 (-0.06, 0.10)   | 0.633  | 2043                  | 0.01 (-0.07, 0.09)   | 0.869   | 2248 | -0.05 (-0.13, 0.04)  | 0.296  |
| Feeling engaged (0-4) <sup>k</sup>              | 2.5 (0.9)    | 2043 | 0.05 (-0.02, 0.12)   | 0.173  | 2043                  | 0.03 (-0.04, 0.11)   | 0.368   | 2248 | -0.04 (-0.13, 0.05)  | 0.383  |
| <i>Productivity and Health</i>                  |              |      |                      |        |                       |                      |   |      |                      |        |
| Self-rated job performance (1-7) <sup>e,l</sup> | 5.5 (1.0)    | 2043 | 0.09 (0.01, 0.18)    | 0.027  | 2043                  | 0.09 (0.01, 0.16)    | 0.019   | 2248 | -0.07 (-0.16, 0.03)  | 0.148  |
| Job satisfaction (1-7) <sup>e,m</sup>           | 5.1 (1.2)    | 2043 | 0.00 (0.00, 0.00)    | 0.923  | 2043                  | 0.09 (0.00, 0.17)    | 0.047   | 2248 | -0.01 (-0.10, 0.07)  | 0.733  |
| Sick Days past 28 days (0-28) <sup>f,n</sup>    | 0.6 (1.9)    | 2043 | 0.03 (-0.06, 0.12)   | 0.573  | 2043                  | 0.00 (0.00, 0.00)    | 0.923   | 2248 | -0.14 (-0.51, 0.23)  | 0.441  |
| Stress (0-4) <sup>o</sup>                       | 1.7 (1.1)    | 2043 | 0.13 (0.08, 0.18)    | <0.001 | 2043                  | 0.03 (-0.06, 0.12)   | 0.507   | 2248 | 0.06 (-0.02, 0.14)   | 0.169  |
| Energy score (0-4) <sup>o</sup>                 | 2.1 (0.7)    | 2043 | 0.02 (-0.05, 0.10)   | 0.558  | 2043                  | 0.12 (0.07, 0.18)    | <0.001  | 2248 | 0.10 (0.06, 0.14)    | <0.001 |
| Creativity (0-4) <sup>o</sup>                   | 1.6 (1.0)    | 2043 | 0.02 (-0.06, 0.10)   | 0.633  | 2043                  | 0.01 (-0.07, 0.08)   | 0.864   | 2248 | 0.05 (-0.01, 0.12)   | 0.093  |
| Self-rated health (0-100) <sup>p</sup>          |              |      |                      |        |                       |                      |   |      |                      |        |



|   |           |      |                      |        |      |                      |        |      |                      |       |
|---|-----------|------|----------------------|--------|------|----------------------|--------|------|----------------------|-------|
| Psychological                                   | 2.2 (1.0) | 2043 | 0.07 (0.00, 0.14)    | 0.038  | 2043 | 0.07 (0.00, 0.14)    | 0.054  | 2248 | 0.04 (-0.03, 0.11)   | 0.222 |
| Physical  | 2.0 (1.0) | 2043 | 0.12 (0.05, 0.18)    | <0.001 | 2043 | 0.12 (0.05, 0.18)    | <0.001 | 2248 | 0.07 (0.00, 0.14)    | 0.044 |
| Musculoskeletal discomfort (0-100) <sup>q</sup> |           |      |                      |        |      |                      |        |      |                      |       |
| Upper body                                      | 4.7 (3.0) | 2043 | -0.55 (-0.78, -0.33) | <0.001 | 2043 | -0.54 (-0.76, -0.31) | <0.001 | 2248 | -0.35 (-0.58, -0.13) | 0.003 |
| Lower back                                      | 3.9 (3.1) | 2043 | -0.60 (-0.84, -0.37) | <0.001 | 2043 | -0.58 (-0.82, -0.34) | <0.001 | 2248 | -0.37 (-0.68, -0.06) | 0.020 |
| Lower body                                      | 3.8 (3.1) | 2043 | -0.37 (-0.60, -0.13) | 0.002  | 2043 | -0.36 (-0.59, -0.12) | 0.003  | 2248 | -0.12 (-0.37, 0.13)  | 0.323 |

<sup>a</sup> Estimated from linear mixed models, with random intercepts for workplace, and staff (nested within workplace). Reports M and SD with linearized variance to correct for workplace clustering, and contrasts of marginal means. Expressions used for transformed outcomes.

<sup>b</sup> Adjusts for variables that may be imbalanced across pre- and post-program respondents: p<0.2 predictors of team participation in post-program surveys (Additional File 6); p<0.2 predictors of staff participation in post-program only versus pre-program only surveys (Additional File 7) using only one variable for concepts measured in multiple ways (organisational readiness, location, and postcode SES). Models adjusted for: small-medium enterprise (yes/no); regional staff (yes/no); inclusion of call-centre staff (yes/no); Champion Occupational Health & Safety role (yes/no); COVID-19 impact level (none/general/high); public sector (yes/no); organisational readiness (context score); Champion age (years); full-time employment (yes/no); Job category skill (1-5); team health interest level (0-4); Postcode SES.

<sup>c</sup> Missing data multiply imputed by chained equations (STATA) with m=20 imputations.

<sup>d</sup> Model also includes random slopes for workplace, as likelihood ratio test supported random slopes over random intercept models at p<0.05 (Additional File 8)

<sup>e</sup> Inverse log transformed as  $\ln(1 + \text{maximum value} - \text{variable})$ .

<sup>f</sup> log transformed as  $\ln(\text{variable})$  for positive or  $\ln(\text{variable} + 0.001)$  for non-negative variables

<sup>g</sup> Occupational Sitting and Physical Activity Questionnaire.(34)

<sup>h</sup> percentage of their sitting that staff estimate is accrued by sitting for 30+ minutes continuously: 0-100;(55)

<sup>i</sup> absolute difference between desired and self-reported percentage (0= perfect alignment; 100=complete misalignment)(22)

<sup>j</sup> 0-4;(19) higher=better.

<sup>k</sup> single item (0-4; higher=better)

<sup>l</sup> single item;(56) 1-7; higher=better;

<sup>m</sup> single item;(57) 1-7; higher=better;


<sup>n</sup> sick days in last four weeks (0-28 days; lower=better);(58)

<sup>o</sup> 0-4 with higher=better; note: energy is mean of 3 items

<sup>p</sup> self-rated physical and psychological health (0=poor; 4=excellent); higher=better.(59, 60)


<sup>q</sup> musculoskeletal discomfort experienced over the last week (0=no discomfort; 10=severe discomfort);(61, 62)

1 **Figure 1: Participant flow diagram**




2

3 **Figure 2:** Change in staff-reported outcomes from pre to post BeUpstanding intervention



4

5 **Figure 3:** Staff perceptions of the impact of the BeUpstanding program (n=654)



6

## 7 References

1. Saunders TJ, McIsaac T, Douillette K, Gaulton N, Hunter S, Rhodes RE, et al. Sedentary behaviour and health in adults: an overview of systematic reviews. *Appl Physiol Nutr Metab*. 2020;45(10 (Suppl. 2)):S197-S217.
2. Ekelund U, Tarp J, Steene-Johannessen J, Hansen BH, Jefferis B, Fagerland MW, et al. Dose-response associations between accelerometry measured physical activity and sedentary time and all cause mortality: systematic review and harmonised meta-analysis. *BMJ*. 2019;366:l4570.
3. Dempsey PC, Biddle SJH, Buman MP, Chastin S, Ekelund U, Friedenreich CM, et al. New global guidelines on sedentary behaviour and health for adults: broadening the behavioural targets. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act*. 2020;17(1):151.
4. Healy GN, Lawler SP, Thorp A, Neuhaus M, Robson EL, Owen N, et al. Reducing prolonged sitting in the workplace (An evidence review: full report). Available at: [http://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/Publications/Economic-participation/Creating\\_Healthy\\_Workplaces.aspx](http://www.vichealth.vic.gov.au/Publications/Economic-participation/Creating_Healthy_Workplaces.aspx). Melbourne, Australia: Victorian Health Promotion Foundation; 2012.
5. Chu AH, Ng SH, Tan CS, Win AM, Koh D, Muller-Riemenschneider F. A systematic review and meta-analysis of workplace intervention strategies to reduce sedentary time in white-collar workers. *Obes Rev*. 2016.
6. MacEwen BT, MacDonald DJ, Burr JF. A systematic review of standing and treadmill desks in the workplace. *Prev Med*. 2015;70:50-8.
7. Neuhaus M, Eakin EG, Straker L, Owen N, Dunstan DW, Reid N, et al. Reducing occupational sedentary time: a systematic review and meta-analysis of evidence on activity-permissive workstations. *Obes Rev*. 2014;15(10):822-38.
8. Tew GA, Posso MC, Arundel CE, McDaid CM. Systematic review: height-adjustable workstations to reduce sedentary behaviour in office-based workers. *Occup Med (Lond)*. 2015;65(5):357-66.

- 32 9. Shrestha N, Kukkonen-Harjula KT, Verbeek JH, Ijaz S, Hermans V, Bhaumik S. Workplace  
33 interventions for reducing sitting at work. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2016;3:CD010912.
- 34 10. Nguyen P, Ananthapavan J, Tan EJ, Crosland P, Bowe SJ, Gao L, et al. Modelling the potential  
35 health and economic benefits of reducing population sitting time in Australia. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys*  
36 *Act.* 2022;19(1):28.
- 37 11. Straker L, Coenen P, Dunstan D, Gilson N, Healy GN. *Sedentary Work – Evidence on an Emergent*  
38 *Work Health and Safety Issue – Final Report.* Canberra: Safe Work Australia; 2016.
- 39 12. Healy GN, Goode A, Schultz D, Lee D, Leahy B, Dunstan DW, et al. The BeUpstanding Program:  
40 Scaling up the Stand Up Australia Workplace Intervention for Translation into Practice. *AIMS*  
41 *Public Health.* 2016;3(2):341-7.
- 42 13. The University of Queensland. BeUpstanding [Available from: [www.beupstanding.com.au](http://www.beupstanding.com.au)].
- 43 14. Healy GN, Eakin EG, Owen N, Lamontagne AD, Moodie M, Winkler EA, et al. A Cluster  
44 Randomized Controlled Trial to Reduce Office Workers' Sitting Time: Effect on Activity Outcomes.  
45 *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2016;48(9):1787-97.
- 46 15. LaMontagne AD, Noblet AJ, Landsbergis PA. Intervention development and implementation:  
47 Understanding and addressing barriers to organisational-level interventions. In: Biron C, Karanika-  
48 Murray M, Cooper CL, editors. *Improving organisational interventions for stress and well-being:*  
49 *Routledge;* 2012.
- 50 16. Bandura A. Health promotion by social cognitive means. *Health Educ Behav.* 2004;31(2):143-64.
- 51 17. McLeroy KR, Bibeau D, Steckler A, Glanz K. An ecological perspective on health promotion  
52 programs. *Health Educ Q.* 1988;15(4):351-77.
- 53 18. Owen N, Sugiyama T, Eakin EE, Gardiner PA, Tremblay MS, Sallis JF. Adults' sedentary behavior  
54 determinants and interventions. *Am J Prev Med.* 2011;41(2):189-96.
- 55 19. Healy GN, Goode AD, Abbott A, Burzic J, Clark BK, Dunstan DW, et al. Supporting Workers to Sit  
56 Less and Move More Through the Web-Based BeUpstanding Program: Protocol for a Single-Arm,  
57 Repeated Measures Implementation Study. *JMIR Res Protoc.* 2020;9(5):e15756.

- 58 20. Healy GN, Winkler EAH, Goode AD. A RE-AIM evaluation in early adopters to iteratively improve  
59 the online BeUpstanding program supporting workers to sit less and move more. *BMC Public*  
60 *Health*. 2021;21(1):1916.
- 61 21. Goode AD, Frith M, Hyne SA, Burzic J, Healy GN. Applying a User Centred Design Approach to  
62 Optimise a Workplace Initiative for Wide-Scale Implementation. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*.  
63 2022;19(13).
- 64 22. Healy GN, Eakin EG, Winkler EA, Hadgraft N, Dunstan DW, Gilson ND, et al. Assessing the  
65 Feasibility and Pre-Post Impact Evaluation of the Beta (Test) Version of the BeUpstanding  
66 Champion Toolkit in Reducing Workplace Sitting: Pilot Study. *JMIR Form Res*. 2018;2(2):e17.
- 67 23. Goode AD, Hadgraft NT, Neuhaus M, Healy GN. Perceptions of an online 'train-the-champion'  
68 approach to increase workplace movement. *Health Promot Int*. 2019;34(6):1179-90.
- 69 24. Glasgow RE, Harden SM, Gaglio B, Rabin B, Smith ML, Porter GC, et al. RE-AIM Planning and  
70 Evaluation Framework: Adapting to New Science and Practice With a 20-Year Review. *Front Public*  
71 *Health*. 2019;7:64.
- 72 25. Glasgow RE, Battaglia C, McCreight M, Ayele RA, Rabin BA. Making Implementation Science  
73 More Rapid: Use of the RE-AIM Framework for Mid-Course Adaptations Across Five Health  
74 Services Research Projects in the Veterans Health Administration. *Front Public Health*. 2020;8:194.
- 75 26. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Australian bushfires 2019–20: Exploring the short-term  
76 health impacts. . Canberra; 2020. Contract No.: Cat. no. PHE 276.
- 77 27. Stobart A, Duckett S. Australia's Response to COVID-19. *Health Econ Policy Law*. 2022;17(1):95-  
78 106.
- 79 28. Hoffmann TC, Glasziou PP, Boutron I, Milne R, Perera R, Moher D, et al. Better reporting of  
80 interventions: template for intervention description and replication (TIDieR) checklist and guide.  
81 *Bmj*. 2014;348:g1687.
- 82 29. Des Jarlais DC, Lyles C, Crepaz N. Improving the reporting quality of nonrandomized evaluations of  
83 behavioral and public health interventions: the TREND statement. *Am J Public Health*.  
84 2004;94(3):361-6.

- 85 30. Buckley JP, Hedge A, Yates T, Copeland RJ, Loosemore M, Hamer M, et al. The sedentary office:  
86 an expert statement on the growing case for change towards better health and productivity. *Br J*  
87 *Sports Med.* 2015;49(21):1357-62.
- 88 31. Human Factors and Ergonomics Society of Australia (HFESA) Inc. Sedentary Behaviour: HFESA  
89 Position on Prolonged Unbroken Sitting Time 2015 [Available from:  
90 <https://www.ergonomics.org.au/documents/item/184>. Accessed: 2017-11-06. (Archived by  
91 WebCite® at <http://www.webcitation.org/6ulUGJfFW>).
- 92 32. Colberg SR, Sigal RJ, Yardley JE, Riddell MC, Dunstan DW, Dempsey PC, et al. Physical  
93 Activity/Exercise and Diabetes: A Position Statement of the American Diabetes Association.  
94 *Diabetes Care.* 2016;39(11):2065-79.
- 95 33. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare. Changing patterns of work. 2023 7th September.
- 96 34. Chau JY, Van Der Ploeg HP, Dunn S, Kurko J, Bauman AE. Validity of the occupational sitting and  
97 physical activity questionnaire. *Med Sci Sports Exerc.* 2012;44(1):118-25.
- 98 35. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Australian and New Zealand Standard Industrial Classification  
99 (ANZSIC) Canberra: ABS; 2006 [Available from:  
100 <https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/classifications/australian-and-new-zealand-standard-industrial->  
101 [classification-anzsic/latest-release](https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/classifications/australian-and-new-zealand-standard-industrial-classification-anzsic/latest-release).
- 102 36. Thorp AA, Healy GN, Winkler E, Clark BK, Gardiner PA, Owen N, et al. Prolonged sedentary time  
103 and physical activity in workplace and non-work contexts: a cross-sectional study of office, customer  
104 service and call centre employees. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act.* 2012;9:128.
- 105 37. Morris A, Murphy R, Shepherd S, Graves L. Multi-Stakeholder Perspectives of Factors That  
106 Influence Contact Centre Call Agents' Workplace Physical Activity and Sedentary Behaviour. *Int J*  
107 *Environ Res Public Health.* 2018;15(7).
- 108 38. Morris AS, Murphy RC, Shepherd SO, Healy GN, Edwardson CL, Graves LEF. A multi-component  
109 intervention to sit less and move more in a contact centre setting: a feasibility study. *BMC Public*  
110 *Health.* 2019;19(1):292.



- 111 39. Wang C, Lu EY, Sun W, Chang JR, Tsang HWH. Effectiveness of interventions on sedentary  
112 behaviors in office workers: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Public Health*. 2024;230:45-51.
- 113 40. Healy GN, Eakin EG, Lamontagne AD, Owen N, Winkler EA, Wiesner G, et al. Reducing sitting  
114 time in office workers: short-term efficacy of a multicomponent intervention. *Prev Med*.  
115 2013;57(1):43-8.
- 116 41. Neuhaus M, Healy GN, Dunstan DW, Owen N, Eakin EG. Workplace sitting and height-adjustable  
117 workstations: a randomized controlled trial. *Am J Prev Med*. 2014;46(1):30-40.
- 118 42. Wilms P, Schroder J, Reer R, Scheit L. The Impact of "Home Office" Work on Physical Activity and  
119 Sedentary Behavior during the COVID-19 Pandemic: A Systematic Review. *Int J Environ Res*  
120 *Public Health*. 2022;19(19).
- 121 43. Sui W, Smith ST, Fagan MJ, Rollo S, Prapavessis H. The effects of sedentary behaviour  
122 interventions on work-related productivity and performance outcomes in real and simulated office  
123 work: A systematic review. *Appl Ergon*. 2019;75:27-73.
- 124 44. Oakman J, Clune S, Stuckey R. Work-related musculoskeletal disorders in Australia. Canberra;  
125 2019.
- 126 45. Bell Z, Porcellato L, Holland P, Morris A, Smith C, Haines C, et al. A systematic scoping review of  
127 health-promoting interventions for contact centre employees examined through a behaviour change  
128 wheel lens. *PLoS One*. 2024;19(3):e0298150.
- 129 46. Edwardson CL, Biddle SJH, Clarke-Cornwell A, Clemes S, Davies MJ, Dunstan DW, et al. A three  
130 arm cluster randomised controlled trial to test the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of the SMART  
131 Work & Life intervention for reducing daily sitting time in office workers: study protocol. *BMC*  
132 *Public Health*. 2018;18(1):1120.
- 133 47. Shrestha N, Kukkonen-Harjula KT, Verbeek JH, Ijaz S, Hermans V, Pedisic Z. Workplace  
134 interventions for reducing sitting at work. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2018;12(12):CD010912.
- 135 48. Taylor WC, Suminski RR, Das BM, Paxton RJ, Craig DW. Organizational Culture and Implications  
136 for Workplace Interventions to Reduce Sitting Time Among Office-Based Workers: A Systematic  
137 Review. *Front Public Health*. 2018;6:263.

- 138 49. Schell SF, Luke DA, Schooley MW, Elliott MB, Herbers SH, Mueller NB, et al. Public health  
139 program capacity for sustainability: a new framework. *Implementation Science*. 2013;8(1):15.
- 140 50. Australian Bureau of Statistics. Socio-Economic Indexes for Areas (SEIFA) Australia: ABS; 2021  
141 [Available from: [https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/people-and-communities/socio-economic-  
143 indexes-areas-seifa-australia/latest-release#cite-window1](https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/people/people-and-communities/socio-economic-<br/>142 indexes-areas-seifa-australia/latest-release#cite-window1)].
- 143 51. Hannon PA, Helfrich CD, Chan KG, Allen CL, Hammerback K, Kohn MJ, et al. Development and  
144 Pilot Test of the Workplace Readiness Questionnaire, a Theory-Based Instrument to Measure Small  
145 Workplaces' Readiness to Implement Wellness Programs. *Am J Health Promot*. 2017;31(1):67-75.
- 146 52. Milton K, Bull FC, Bauman A. Reliability and validity testing of a single-item physical activity  
147 measure. *Br J Sports Med*. 2011;45(3):203-8.
- 148 53. Miller Y. Recommendations for the truncation of body mass index in population data. . Liverpool,  
149 NSW; 2003. Report No.: CPAH03-0005.
- 150 54. Australian Bureau of Statistics. ANZSCO - Australian and New Zealand Standard Classification of  
151 Occupations.: ABS; 2022 [Available from: [https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/classifications/anzsco-  
153 australian-and-new-zealand-standard-classification-occupations/latest-release](https://www.abs.gov.au/statistics/classifications/anzsco-<br/>152 australian-and-new-zealand-standard-classification-occupations/latest-release)].
- 153 55. Clark BK, Stephens SK, Goode AD, Healy GN, Winkler EAH. Alternatives for Measuring Sitting  
154 Accumulation in Workplace Surveys. *J Occup Environ Med*. 2021;63(12):e853-e60.
- 155 56. Bond FW, Bunce D. Job control mediates change in a work reorganization intervention for stress  
156 reduction. *Journal of occupational health psychology*. 2001;6(4):290-302.
- 157 57. Dolbier CL, Webster JA, McCalister KT, Mallon MW, Steinhardt MA. Reliability and validity of a  
158 single-item measure of job satisfaction. *Am J Health Promot*. 2005;19(3):194-8.
- 159 58. Kessler RC, Barber C, Beck A, Berglund P, Cleary PD, McKenas D, et al. The World Health  
160 Organization Health and Work Performance Questionnaire (HPQ). *J Occup Environ Med*.  
161 2003;45(2):156-74.
- 162 59. Jurges H, Avendano M, Mackenbach JP. Are different measures of self-rated health comparable? An  
163 assessment in five European countries. *Eur J Epidemiol*. 2008;23(12):773-81.

- 164 60. Ahmad F, Jhajj AK, Stewart DE, Burghardt M, Bierman AS. Single item measures of self-rated  
165 mental health: a scoping review. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2014;14:398.
- 166 61. Dickinson CE, Campion K, Foster AF, Newman SJ, O'Rourke AM, Thomas PG. Questionnaire  
167 development: an examination of the Nordic Musculoskeletal questionnaire. *Applied ergonomics*.  
168 1992;23(3):197-201.
- 169 62. Brakenridge CL, Chong YY, Winkler EAH, Hadgraft NT, Fjeldsoe BS, Johnston V, et al. Evaluating  
170 Short-Term Musculoskeletal Pain Changes in Desk-Based Workers Receiving a Workplace Sitting-  
171 Reduction Intervention. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2018;15(9).

172

173

