Scilight

Work and Health

https://www.sciltp.com/journals/wah

Commentary

The Occupational Activity Paradox: When Work Harms Rather Than Heals

James Latimer

Occupational Health and Wellbeing Department, Bishop Auckland Hospital, Cockton Hill Road, Bishop Auckland DL14 6AD, UK; james.latimer1@nhs.net

How To Cite: Latimer, J. The Occupational Activity Paradox: When Work Harms Rather Than Heals. *Work and Health* **2026**, *2*(2), 11. https://doi.org/10.53941/wah.2026.100011

Received: 11 June 2026
Accepted: 22 June 2026
Published: 30 June 2026

Abstract: Physical activity is widely promoted as a cornerstone of cardiovascular health, yet a growing body of evidence challenges the assumption that all physical activity confers equivalent benefit. The "occupational activity paradox" describes the phenomenon whereby high levels of physical activity performed during employment are not associated with the cardiovascular and survival advantages observed with leisure-time physical activity and may, in certain populations, actively increase risk. This commentary looks at current epidemiological and mechanistic evidence with a particular focus on male manual workers. Drawing on meta-analytic data from nearly 200,000 participants, we examine how sustained cardiovascular strain, insufficient recovery, failure to improve cardiorespiratory fitness, and adverse psychosocial working conditions collectively explain why occupational activity diverges from leisure-time activity in its health effects. We further explore the sex-specific nature of the paradox, the disproportionate burden borne by blue-collar occupational groups, and the implications for current physical activity guidelines and surveillance systems that do not distinguish between activity domains.

Keywords: occupational physical activity; physical activity paradox; cardiovascular health; manual workers; leisure-time physical activity; cardiorespiratory fitness; occupational health inequalities; job strain; workplace intervention

Exercise has been globally cited as the most powerful tool for preventing the development of disease. Beneath this consensus there is however a paradox that challenges the fundamental understanding of how physical activity can influence health. It has been progressively recognised that physical activity performed during employment will not provide the same cardiovascular and survival benefits as leisure-time activity. This has been particularly seen in men employed in high-demand manual labour jobs where occupational physical activity has been associated with an increased risk of cardiovascular events and premature death [1,2]. Colloquially this becomes known as the "occupational activity paradox" and has significant implications for how we understand, measure and promote physical activity among those engaged in employment [3].

Understanding the paradox requires a recognition of the fundamental differences between work and leisure physical activity. Occupational activity produces sustained heart rate and blood pressure elevation throughout the workday without restitutive rest whilst leisure activity involves intermittent cardiovascular demand elevation followed by recovery periods allowing beneficial physiological adaptations. This forms the basis of the "mismatch hypothesis"—that occupational activity fails to produce beneficial cardiorespiratory adaptations because intensity is inadequate and recovery insufficient [3]. This results in chronic cardiovascular strain which leads to persistently elevated heart rate and blood pressure, systemic inflammation and (most crucially) a failure to improve cardiorespiratory fitness—one of the most powerful predictors of cardiovascular health [4,5]. This sustained demand promotes hypertension, left ventricular hypertrophy and accelerated atherosclerosis rather than beneficial health adaptations.

A comprehensive meta-analysis by Coenen et al. [1] explored the epidemiology behind this—pooled data from approximately 193,696 participants revealed that men with high occupational physical activity had 18% increased all-cause mortality risk (with hazard ratio of 1.18 and 95% confidence interval 1.05–1.34) compared to men with lower occupational activity even after accounting for leisure-time activity and confounding factors. Interesting in the same literature women with high occupational activity showed no harmful association and a trend toward lower mortality. This sex-specific pattern—harm in men but not women—has emerged consistently across studies, though it remains incompletely understood [6].

Stamatakis and colleagues analysed seven British population cohorts including 11,168 employed adults and followed them for 12.9 years [7]. Their study examined mortality outcomes associated with sedentary versus non-sitting occupations (standing/walking jobs) and the results revealed sex differences mirroring broader paradox literature with women in standing/walking occupations noted to have a 32% lower all-cause mortality and 40% lower cancer mortality compared to sedentary occupations. Men in standing/walking occupations showed no significant mortality associations—neither beneficial nor harmful. These findings suggest that for women, non-sedentary occupations may actually confer some benefits, while men derive no apparent mortality advantage from occupational activity.

The psychosocial and socioeconomic dimensions are even more complex as adverse psychosocial working conditions including those with high job demands and low job control are substantially more prevalent in physically demanding occupations and may amplify harmful effects on cardiovascular health [7]. High physical demands and low job control is often termed "job strain" and has been consistently associated with increased cardiovascular disease and mortality risk. A large occupational screening study of 72,855 workers compounded this observation and had found that blue-collar workers had 80% higher odds of clustering multiple cardiovascular risk factors compared to high-skilled white-collar workers. Low-skilled blue-collar workers had highest clustering, with more than twice the odds [5].

Certain occupational groups are disproportionately affected by this paradox—namely construction workers, cleaners and manufacturing workers who all face elevated occupational activity exposure and psychosocial risk factors amplifying cardiovascular risk [8]. These groups experience the highest cardiovascular disease and premature mortality rates in British society despite their recorded physical activity levels (when measured conventionally) appearing to meet or exceed national recommendations.

The paradox fundamentally challenges the assumption that all physical activity is equally beneficial. Indeed, some experts argue that guidelines and surveillance should distinguish occupational from leisure-time activity, with separate recommendations emphasizing leisure-time moderate-to-vigorous activity for cardiovascular health [2,4]. Workers in manual occupations may assume their demanding jobs provide sufficient activity, leading them to forgo leisure exercise despite not receiving equivalent cardiovascular benefits and because high occupational activity concentrates in lower socioeconomic groups, treating all activity as equivalent risks widening health inequalities.

Manual workers face a double disadvantage in that their exposure to occupational activity doesn't confer cardiovascular benefits and may be harmful whilst they simultaneously have less time and financial resources for health-promoting leisure activity. Future consideration of public health strategies should include targeted workplace interventions, improved leisure activity access for manual workers and broader efforts addressing social determinants creating risk factor clustering in manual occupations.

Given that occupational activity doesn't reliably improve cardiorespiratory fitness, promoting leisure-time moderate-to-vigorous activity among manual workers will represent a critical intervention strategy. However, this requires not only workplace exercise programmes and behavioural counselling but also recognizing and addressing common barriers: fatigue after work shifts, time constraints, financial limitations, and limited facility access. The challenge is difficult given these barriers and the answer likely requires creative solutions including on-site facilities, subsidized memberships and perhaps most importantly work redesign reducing harmful cardiovascular load.

Advancing public health requires a significant rethinking of how we as clinicians and professionals measure and promote physical activity in the working-age populations. Guidelines must distinguish between occupational and leisure activity and surveillance systems must separately assess occupational and leisure activity for accurate health-promoting activity estimates. Workplace interventions must move beyond generic wellness programmes to address specific manual worker challenges, including work redesign reducing harmful cardiovascular load, leisure-time activity promotion, and addressing broader socioeconomic and psychosocial factors amplifying cardiovascular risk.

Going forward clinicians and individuals creating policy need to recognize that high physical workload does not equate to health protection and that the widely held assumption that "all physical activity is good for health" is unsupported by evidence regarding occupational activity. Targeted prevention strategies, rigorous intervention research and equity-focused approaches addressing social determinants are urgently needed to protect vulnerable

manual worker populations and reduce persistent UK health inequalities whilst also reflecting the complex reality of how people live and work.

Funding

This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Use of AI and AI-Assisted Technologies

No AI tools were utilized for this paper.

References

1. Coenen, P.; Huysmans, M.A.; Holtermann, A.; et al. Do highly physically active workers die early? A systematic review with meta-analysis of data from 193,696 participants. *Br. J. Sports Med.* **2018**, *52*, 1320–1326.
2. Krause, N.; Brand, R.J.; Arah, O.A.; et al. Occupational physical activity and 20-year incidence of acute myocardial infarction: Results from the Kuopio Ischemic Heart Disease Risk Factor Study. *Scand. J. Work Environ. Health* **2015**, *41*, 124–139.
3. Holtermann, A.; Krause, N.; van der Beek, A.J.; et al. The physical activity health paradox: Six reasons why occupational physical activity (OPA) does not confer the cardiovascular health benefits that leisure time physical activity does. *Br. J. Sports Med.* **2018**, *52*, 149–150.
4. Siegrist, J.; Starke, D.; Chandola, T.; et al. The measurement of effort-reward imbalance at work: European comparisons. *Soc. Sci. Med.* **2004**, *58*, 1483–1499.
5. Gupta, N.; Heiden, M.; Aadahl, M.; et al. What is the effect on obesity indicators from replacing prolonged sedentary time with brief sedentary bouts, standing and different types of physical activity during working days? A cross-sectional accelerometer-based study among blue-collar workers. *BMJ Open* **2016**, *6*, e010053.
6. Cillekens, B.; Lang, M.; van Mechelen, W.; et al. How does occupational physical activity influence health? An umbrella review of 23 health outcomes across 158 observational studies. *Br. J. Sports Med.* **2020**, *54*, 1474–1481.
7. Stamatakis, E.; Chau, J.Y.; Pedisic, Z.; et al. Are sitting occupations associated with increased all-cause, cancer, and cardiovascular disease mortality risk? A pooled analysis of seven British population cohorts. *PLoS ONE*. **2013**, *8*, e73753.
8. Stocks, S.J.; McNamee, R.; Carder, M.; et al. The incidence of medically reported work-related ill health in the UK construction industry. *Occup. Environ. Med*. **2010**, *67*, 574–576.