Exploring activity levels in physical education lessons in the UK: A cross-sectional examination of activity types and fitness levels

SUPPLEMENTARY FILE 7: Fitness model estimates

Table: Summary of fitness model estimates, CIs and p-values

Model 1 estimate	аВ	95% CI
(Intercept)	-2.37***	-3.18 to -1.56
Female ^b	-0.48***	-0.56 to -0.39
eFSM ^c	-0.22***	-0.29 to -0.15
Female*eFSM	-0.01	-0.11 to 0.09

^a Fully-adjusted model including age, term of test, and school effects; fitness scores are orderNorm transformed

Model 3 estima	ite ^a B	95% CI
(Intercept)	-1.95***	-3.03 to -0.88
School Type ^b	-0.02	-0.30 to 0.26

^a Fully-adjusted model including FSM, age, term of test, and school effects; fitness scores are orderNorm transformed

Model 2 estimate a	ß	95% CI
(Intercept)	-2.34***	-3.16 to -1.52
Tertile-Low ^b	-0.40**	0.16 to 0.63
School Type (ST) ^c	-0.11	-0.48 to 0.26
Tertile-Medium*ST	0.27	-0.31 to 0.84
Tertile-Low*ST	-0.03	-0.55 to -0.49

^a Fully-adjusted model including sex, FSM, age, term of test, and school effects; fitness scores are orderNorm transformed

Notes

Fitness Model 1 (Pupil Sex*Pupil FSM status - main effects and interaction) to determine how fitness varied i) between boys and girls, ii) with FSM status and iii) to determine the interaction effect of sex with FSM status on fitness.

Fitness Model 2 (School postcode Index of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) Tertile*School Type - main effects and interaction) to explore how fitness varied between school location (based on the IMD tertile), and the interaction of school type (co-educational or single sex).

Fitness Model 3 (School Type [Girls only]) was developed to see if, for girls-only, fitness varied between school type.

^bReference category: male

^c Reference category: not eligible for FSM *** p<.001; ** p<.0125; * p<.05

 $^{^{\}rm b}$ Reference category: Co-educational *** p<.001; ** p<.0125; * p<.05

^b Reference category: High

^c Reference category: Co-educational

^{- ***} p<.001; ** p<.0125; * p <.05