

Physical activity: walking and cycling

Public health guideline

Published: 28 November 2012

[nice.org.uk/guidance/ph41](https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ph41)

Your responsibility

The recommendations in this guideline represent the view of NICE, arrived at after careful consideration of the evidence available. When exercising their judgement, professionals and practitioners are expected to take this guideline fully into account, alongside the individual needs, preferences and values of their patients or the people using their service. It is not mandatory to apply the recommendations, and the guideline does not override the responsibility to make decisions appropriate to the circumstances of the individual, in consultation with them and their families and carers or guardian.

Local commissioners and providers of healthcare have a responsibility to enable the guideline to be applied when individual professionals and people using services wish to use it. They should do so in the context of local and national priorities for funding and developing services, and in light of their duties to have due regard to the need to eliminate unlawful discrimination, to advance equality of opportunity and to reduce health inequalities. Nothing in this guideline should be interpreted in a way that would be inconsistent with complying with those duties.

Commissioners and providers have a responsibility to promote an environmentally sustainable health and care system and should assess and reduce the environmental impact of implementing NICE recommendations wherever possible.

Contents

Overview	6
Who is it for?	6
Introduction: scope and purpose of this guidance	7
What is this guidance about?	7
Who is this guidance for?	7
Why is this guidance being produced?	8
How was this guidance developed?	8
What evidence is the guidance based on?	9
Status of this guidance	9
1 Recommendations	10
Background	10
Benefits of walking and cycling	11
Encouraging people to walk and cycle	11
Whose health will benefit?	11
Policy and planning	12
Local action	15
Schools, workplaces and the NHS	22
2 Public health need and practice	27
Introduction	27
Physical activity levels in England	27
Walking and cycling	28
Air pollution and climate change	29
Wider economic impacts	30
3 Considerations	32
General	32
Evidence	33
Pedometers	35

Wider influences	36
Physical activity	38
Inequalities	39
Barriers and facilitators.....	40
Wider impacts	42
4 Implementation.....	45
5 Recommendations for research	46
6 Updating the recommendations	48
7 Related NICE guidance.....	49
Published	49
Under development	49
8 Glossary	51
Dr Bike.....	51
Handcycles.....	51
Local enterprise partnerships	51
Mode	51
Moderate-intensity physical activity	51
Moderate-to-vigorous physical activity	51
Personalised travel planning	52
Portfolio holder.....	52
Quality-adjusted life year (QALY).....	52
Recommended level of physical activity.....	52
Virtual cycle races.....	52
9 References.....	53
Appendix A Membership of the Programme Development Group (PDG), the NICE project team and external contractors	55
Programme Development Group.....	55
NICE project team	56

External contractors	57
Expert testimony	57
Appendix B Summary of the methods used to develop this guidance	58
Introduction	58
Guidance development.....	58
Key questions	59
Reviewing the evidence	59
Cost effectiveness	61
How the PDG formulated the recommendations.....	62
Appendix C The evidence	64
Introduction	64
Evidence statements	65
Additional evidence	114
Economic modelling	114
Appendix D Gaps in the evidence.....	116
Appendix E Supporting documents.....	118
About this guidance.....	120

This guideline partially replaces PH2.

This guideline is the basis of QS84.

Overview

This guideline covers encouraging people to increase the amount they walk or cycle for travel or recreation purposes.

NICE has also produced guidelines on [providing brief advice on physical activity to adults in primary care](#).

Who is it for?

- Commissioners, managers and practitioners
- Members of the public

Introduction: scope and purpose of this guidance

Recommendations 6 and 7 in this guidance updates and replaces a recommendation in [Four commonly used methods to increase physical activity](#) (NICE public health guidance 2). See [About this guidance](#) for details.

What is this guidance about?

This guidance aims to set out how people can be encouraged to increase the amount they walk or cycle for travel or recreation purposes. This will help meet public health and other goals (for instance, to reduce traffic congestion, air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions). The recommendations cover:

- policy and planning
- local programmes
- schools, workplaces and the NHS.

This guidance does **not** cover:

- Environmental changes to encourage walking or cycling. (NICE's guidance on [physical activity and the environment](#) covers the physical infrastructure and planning needed to make non-motorised transport an easier option.)
- National actions to support walking and cycling, such as fiscal measures and other policy interventions to alter the balance between active and motorised travel in terms of cost and convenience.
- Measures to reduce the risk of unintentional injuries from walking and cycling. (See NICE's guidance on [strategies to prevent unintentional injuries among under-15s](#).)

Who is this guidance for?

The guidance is for commissioners, managers and practitioners involved in physical activity promotion or who work in the environment, parks and leisure or transport planning sectors. They could be working in local authorities, the NHS and other organisations in the public, private, voluntary and community sectors. It is also aimed at:

- employers

- estate managers
- highways authorities
- those involved in land use planning and development control
- private developers
- public transport operators
- those involved in carbon reduction or sustainability planning
- others responsible for workplace travel, carbon reduction or sustainability plans.

In addition, it will be of interest to people who promote walking and cycling in an unpaid capacity, those who want to walk or cycle and other members of the public.

Why is this guidance being produced?

The Department of Health (DH) asked the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE) to produce this guidance.

The guidance should be implemented alongside other relevant guidance and regulations (for more details see sections [4](#) and [7](#) on implementation and related NICE guidance respectively).

How was this guidance developed?

The recommendations are based on the best available evidence. They were developed by the Programme Development Group (PDG).

Members of the PDG are listed in [appendix A](#).

The guidance was developed in line with the NICE public health programme process. See [appendix B](#) for details.

Supporting documents used to prepare this document are listed in [appendix E](#).

What evidence is the guidance based on?

The evidence that the PDG considered included: reviews of the evidence, economic modelling and the testimony of expert witnesses. Further detail on the evidence is given in the considerations section ([section 3](#)) and appendices [B](#) and [C](#).

In some cases the evidence was insufficient and the PDG has made recommendations for future research.

More details on the evidence on which this guidance is based and NICE's processes for developing public health guidance are on the [NICE website](#).

Status of this guidance

The guidance complements but does not replace, NICE guidance on physical activity and the environment. It supersedes recommendation 6 in NICE guidance on four commonly used methods to increase physical activity (for further details, see [section 7](#)).

1 Recommendations

The evidence statements underpinning the recommendations are listed in [appendix C](#).

The Programme Development Group (PDG) considers that the recommended approaches are highly cost effective.

For the research recommendations and gaps in research, see [section 5](#) and [appendix D](#) respectively.

The evidence reviews, supporting evidence statements and economic modelling report are available at the [NICE website](#).

Background

This guidance considers walking and cycling as forms of transport, for example, to get to work, school or the shops. It also considers them as recreational activities, for example, as a means of exploring parks or the countryside.

Walking and cycling are distinct activities which are likely to appeal to different segments of the population. A range of factors may be important in helping or restricting people from taking part. These will vary according to whether someone is walking or cycling for transport purposes, for recreation or to improve their health. Wherever the term 'walking and cycling' is used in this guidance, these variations should be kept in mind.

In the context of this guidance, walking and cycling includes the use of adapted cycles (such as trikes, tandems and [handcycles](#)), wheelchairs and similar mobility aids.

The action needed to increase levels of walking and cycling will vary according to people's local and personal circumstances. For instance, it will differ according to whether someone lives or works in an urban or rural area, the local traffic conditions and their perceptions of safety.

'Local' may refer to an area defined by geography or for administrative purposes. It may comprise an area larger than that covered by a single local authority such as Greater London, Manchester or Merseyside. It may also refer to a housing estate, a small town or a village.

Benefits of walking and cycling

Increasing how much someone walks or cycles may increase their overall level of physical activity, leading to associated health benefits. These include:

- Reducing the risk of coronary heart disease, stroke, cancer, obesity and type 2 diabetes.
- Keeping the musculoskeletal system healthy.
- Promoting mental wellbeing.

An increase in walking or cycling can also help:

- Reduce car travel, leading to reductions in air pollution, carbon dioxide emissions and congestion.
- Reduce road danger and noise.
- Increase the number of people of all ages who are out on the streets, making public spaces seem more welcoming and providing opportunities for social interaction.
- Provide an opportunity for everyone, including people with an impairment, to participate in and enjoy the outdoor environment.

Encouraging people to walk and cycle

Encouraging and enabling people to walk or cycle requires action on many fronts – and by many different sectors. A range of issues have to be addressed, including environmental, social, financial and personal factors.

In addition to the recommendations made in this (and related) NICE guidance, other measures are needed to tackle the wider influences on walking or cycling. This includes measures to reduce road dangers and to reallocate road space to create a more supportive environment (see the [scope](#) for further detail). Action in these areas is particularly important in tackling inequalities in health, including with regard to people with impairments.

Whose health will benefit?

Unless otherwise stated, the recommendations will benefit everyone.

Policy and planning

Recommendation 1 High-level support from the health sector

Who should take action?

- Directors of public health.
- Public health portfolio holders in local authorities.
- Clinical commissioning groups.

What action should they take?

- Ensure a senior member of the public health team is responsible for promoting walking and cycling. They should support coordinated, cross-sector working, for example, by ensuring programmes offered by different sectors complement rather than duplicate each other (see recommendation 2). The senior member should also ensure NICE's recommendations on physical activity and the environment are implemented.
- Ensure the joint strategic needs assessment, the joint health and wellbeing strategy and other local needs assessments and strategies take into account opportunities to increase walking and cycling. They should also consider how impediments to walking and cycling can be addressed.
- Ensure walking and cycling are considered, alongside other interventions, when working to achieve specific health outcomes in relation to the local population (such as a reduction in the risk of cardiovascular disease, cancer, obesity and diabetes, or the promotion of mental wellbeing^[1]). These include outcomes identified through the joint strategic needs assessment process.
- Ensure walking and cycling are included in chronic disease pathways.
- Ensure all relevant sectors contribute resources and funding to encourage and support people to walk and cycle.
- Where appropriate, ensure walking and cycling are treated as separate activities which may require different approaches.
- Ensure walking and cycling projects are rigorously evaluated. This includes evaluating their impact on health inequalities.

For more on the role of the NHS in promoting walking and cycling, see recommendations 9 and 10.

Recommendation 2 Ensuring all relevant policies and plans consider walking and cycling

Who should take action?

- Local authorities, in particular, portfolio holders, lead members and directors responsible for:
 - adult and older people's services
 - children and young people's services
 - community safety
 - countryside management
 - disability
 - education
 - environment
 - health and wellbeing (including mental health)
 - land use, planning and development control
 - parks and leisure
 - planning (including district planning)
 - regeneration and economic development
 - social services
 - transport.
- National parks authorities.
- Integrated transport authorities.
- Local enterprise partnerships.
- Chief constables, police authorities and elected police commissioners.

- Agencies with an interest in walking and cycling.
- Agencies with an interest in health and wellbeing or that work with population groups such as older people or people with disabilities.

What action should they take?

- Ensure local, high-level strategic policies and plans support and encourage both walking and cycling. This includes a commitment to invest sufficient resources to ensure more walking and cycling – and a recognition that this will benefit individuals and the wider community. Relevant policies and plans include those on:
 - air quality
 - community safety
 - disability
 - education
 - environment (including sustainability and carbon reduction)
 - health and wellbeing
 - housing
 - land use, planning and development control
 - physical activity
 - regeneration and economic development
 - transport.
- Ensure the walking and cycling aspects of these plans are developed in conjunction with relevant voluntary and community organisations.
- Ensure strategies to promote walking and cycling address factors which influence activity at various levels – from policy down to the individual. This includes ensuring NICE's recommendations on [physical activity and the environment](#) are implemented.
- Assess the impact of relevant policies and decisions on people's ability to walk and cycle. Where necessary, amend them to ensure support for walking and cycling.

- Ensure plans relevant to walking and cycling are implemented and evaluated^[2].

Local action

Recommendation 3 Developing programmes

Who should take action?

- Local authority directors and portfolio holders for:
 - countryside management
 - environment (including sustainability)
 - leisure services
 - parks
 - public health
 - regeneration and economic development
 - transport.
- Police traffic officers and neighbourhood policing teams.

What action should they take?

- Develop coordinated, cross-sector programmes to promote walking and cycling for recreation as well as for transport purposes, based on a long-term vision of what is achievable and current best practice. Ensure the needs of all sections of the population are addressed. Incorporate public health goals to increase the prevalence of people cycling and walking, as well as the distance covered by those who already walk and cycle regularly.
- Aim to shift attention away from focusing on individual risk factors and isolated, small-scale interventions and ensure programmes comprise an integrated package of measures, implemented by all relevant sectors and stakeholders. Where appropriate, they should link to existing national and local walking and cycling initiatives, and incorporate actions in specific settings, such as workplace or schools (see recommendations 8 and 9).
- Ensure walking and cycling programmes form a core part of local transport investment planning, on a continuing basis. In line with the Department for Transport's [Manual for streets](#) and the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation's [Manual for streets 2 – wider](#)

application of the principles, pedestrians and cyclists should be considered before other user groups in the design process – this helps ensure that they are not provided for as an afterthought.

- Draw on data, including the transport and physical activity elements of the joint strategic needs assessment, to ensure programmes are based on an understanding of:
 - the local population and the journeys people take using all modes of transport (the aim is to assess the potential for a 'modal change' towards walking and cycling)
 - the opportunities available to increase people's level of walking and cycling, given the right circumstances
 - the behaviour and preferences of existing walkers and cyclists
 - the needs of people with impairments
 - general factors influencing people's behaviour such as their attitudes, existing habits, what motivates them and their barriers to change, taking into account NICE's recommendations on behaviour change.
- Ensure programmes address the behavioural and environmental factors that encourage or discourage people from walking and cycling. These include measures to reduce road danger or the perception of danger. (Environmental factors can be tackled by implementing NICE's recommendations on physical activity and the environment.)
- Ensure local expertise is available so that programmes are based on a realistic understanding of the scale of changes needed to encourage the population to change its behaviour.
- Ensure programmes take account of recommendations on developing local and regional programmes (recommendations 13–18) in NICE's guidance on preventing cardiovascular disease, in particular those relating to the need for long-term action.
- Ensure programmes take account of the geography of the surrounding area (for instance, connections with neighbouring local authority areas), as well as local factors such as major road and rail routes, rivers and hills.
- Ensure programmes include communications strategies to publicise the available facilities (such as walking or cycle routes) and to motivate people to use them. Include information that people with impairments will require, such as where dropped kerbs are located, the location and design of barriers at access points to cycle paths, and where public transport links and disabled toilets can be found.

- Ensure programmes, including specific elements within them, are evaluated. Assess how much walking and cycling people are doing. Also assess the number of trips undertaken, using different modes of transport, by different groups within the local population. Where appropriate, control groups should be used. (See, for example, the National Obesity Observatory [evaluation tool](#).)
- Use an appropriate tool to establish the cost effectiveness of initiatives. For instance, use the World Health Organization's [Health economic assessment tool \(HEAT\) for cycling and walking](#).
- Consider providing specific support for people at a 'transition point' in their lives, for instance, when they are changing job, house or school. At these times people may be open to trying a new [mode](#) of transport or new types of recreation. Note: some people may be considering motorised transport, instead of walking or cycling – and support may be needed to help them maintain their active travel habits.

Recommendation 4 Personalised travel planning

Who should take action?

- Transport planners.
- Directors of public health.

What action should they take?

Help those interested in changing their travel behaviour to make small, daily changes by commissioning [personalised travel planning](#) programmes. These should be based on current best practice^[3]. Staff running these programmes should:

- Identify those willing to make changes, for example, people at transitional points in their life (such as when moving house, job or school).
- Provide people with information and help, such as tickets, maps, timetables and, if required, more support to make different travel choices. This includes people with impairments who may rely on wheelchairs or adapted cycles.
- Consider implementing NICE's recommendations on [physical activity and the environment](#) to create a supportive environment to encourage and sustain walking or cycling.

Recommendation 5 Cycling programmes

Who should take action?

- Adult and child disability services.
- Clinical commissioning groups.
- Local authority transport leads, transport planners and other transport department staff.
- Local education services.
- Organisations with an interest in cycling.
- Public health practitioners.
- Public transport operators.

What action should they take?

- Address infrastructure and planning issues that may discourage people from wanting to cycle. Take into account NICE's recommendations on [physical activity and the environment](#) and on [road design](#). For example, ensure local facilities and services are easily accessible by bicycle and make changes to existing roads, where necessary, to reduce traffic speeds.
- Implement town-wide programmes to promote cycling for both transport and recreational purposes. These should be linked to existing national and local initiatives. (Note: 'town-wide' in this case could include cities or suburban areas.) Programmes could include:
 - provision of information, including maps and route signing
 - fun rides, recreational and sponsored group rides and school sports promotions
 - use of leisure routes on and off roads
 - use of off-road mountain bikes, BMX courses, circuits and parks
 - car-free events or days, [virtual cycle races](#) and links with cycle sports events
 - cycle hire schemes
 - intensive sessions in particular settings or aimed at particular groups, such as: 'Bike to work' weeks and workplace challenges; activities aimed at children and families (such as

'Bike it', 'Bike club' and other school programmes); and activities for people with impairments who may use specially adapted cycles

– activities and campaigns to emphasise the benefits of cycling (including the health benefits, the reliability and ease of access to local facilities and services).

- Ensure programmes are based on an accepted theoretical framework for behaviour change and take into account NICE's recommendations on [behaviour change](#). They should also be based on an understanding of the needs of existing and potential cyclists, including those with impairments (see recommendation 3).
- Ensure cycle parking and residential storage issues are addressed.
- Ensure travel by cycle and public transport is integrated to support longer journeys. This includes providing secure cycle parking at public transport sites as well as support to transport adapted cycles and tandems for people with disabilities.
- Ensure training is available for those who are interested in cycling, either as a form of transport or as a recreational activity. An example of a cycle training programme is the Department for Transport's [Bikeability](#).
- Ensure all training is sensitive to cultural issues, for instance, by providing women-only groups with female trainers, where appropriate. Also ensure it includes an understanding of the needs of people with impairments
- Consider providing free cycle safety checks (such as [Dr Bike](#) sessions) and cycle maintenance training.
- Use local media to publicise activities and to clarify the links between different elements of the programme (for instance, the programme may include the provision of maps, local cycling classes and local challenges and events). In addition, use local media to raise awareness of any new or improved infrastructure. Also provide success stories from different elements of the programme to create momentum.

Recommendation 6 Walking: community-wide programmes

Who should take action?

- Adult and child disability services.
- Clinical commissioning groups.

- Local transport leads, transport planners and other transport department staff.
- Local authority leisure services.
- Organisations with an interest in walking.
- Public health practitioners.

What action should they take?

- Address infrastructure issues that may discourage people from walking, for example, motor traffic volume and speed, lack of convenient road crossings, poorly maintained footways or lack of dropped kerbs, where needed. Take into account NICE's recommendations on [physical activity and the environment](#) and on [road design](#).
- Develop walking programmes for adults who are not active enough, based on an accepted theoretical framework for behaviour change and taking into account NICE's recommendations on [behaviour change](#). Ensure groups that are likely to be the least active are encouraged to participate, by addressing issues that may act as a barrier.
- Ensure walking programmes for all adults link to existing national and local walking initiatives.
- Ensure all programmes address safety, cultural and disability issues.
- Ensure all programmes offer a variety of routes, paces and distances at different times of the day (including evenings and on different days of the week or at the weekend). Local people with different preferences, time constraints and physical abilities should all be able to participate. Programmes could include:
 - community-wide events, such as mass participation walking groups, community challenges and 'walkathons'
 - walks led by suitably trained walk leaders (paid or voluntary) and aimed at people who are currently inactive.
- Ensure walking routes are integrated with accessible public transport links to support longer journeys. Signage should give details of the distance and/or walking time, in both directions, between public transport facilities and key destinations.
- Provide information tailored for individuals who want to go walking without joining a group or club. Offer continued support in line with recommendation 7.

- Develop and implement a publicity strategy to let the local community know about the walking routes and events and how accessible they are.
- Provide support to help people who have started walking as a leisure activity to also consider walking as a means of transport.

This recommendation (together with recommendation 7), updates and replaces recommendation 6 in [Four commonly used methods to increase physical activity](#) (NICE public health guidance 2).

Recommendation 7 Walking: individual support, including the use of pedometers

Who should take action?

- Adult and child disability services.
- Clinical commissioning groups.
- Directors of public health and public health specialists with responsibility for physical activity.
- Local authority leisure services.
- Organisations with an interest in walking.

What action should they take?

- Ensure individual support is available for anyone who is walking on their own, walking informally with others in a group, or participating in local walking programmes. This includes helping to assess their activity levels and to set goals which build on this. The aim should be to increase the distance walked gradually, rather than providing them with a set target to aim for.
- Ensure additional, one-to-one support is offered at regular intervals to help people develop a long-term walking habit. This could be provided face-to-face, via the telephone or by using print-based materials, email, the Internet or text messaging. The support could include:
 - individual, targeted information
 - goal-setting (which may or may not include the use of pedometers), monitoring and feedback.
- Provide general information including:
 - maps, signs and other details about walking routes

- how to visit places of interest on foot (such as shops, educational or recreational facilities)
- details on surface quality and accessibility.
- Only use pedometers as part of a package which includes support to set realistic goals (whereby the number of steps taken is gradually increased), monitoring and feedback.

This recommendation (together with recommendation 6), updates and replaces recommendation 6 in [Four commonly used methods to increase physical activity](#) (NICE public health guidance 2).

Schools, workplaces and the NHS

Recommendation 8 Schools

Whose health will benefit?

- Pupils, siblings, their parents and carers.
- School staff.
- Visitors to schools.

Who should take action?

- Head teachers and school governors.
- Local authority PHSE coordinators, school travel advisers and transport planners.
- Police traffic officers and neighbourhood policing teams.
- Road danger reduction and/or road safety officers.

What action should they take?

- Foster a culture that supports physically active travel for journeys to school (for all staff, parents and students) and during the school day. For example, promote the health benefits of cycling^[4] and walking and provide sufficient, secure cycle parking. Also ensure it is easy to get into the school grounds by foot or by bike. In addition, schools should provide suitable cycle and road safety training for all pupils^[5].
- Develop and implement school travel plans that encourage children to walk or cycle all or part of the way to school^[4], including children with limited mobility. Integrate these plans with those

produced by other local schools and other travel plans available for the local community^[6].
Involve pupils in the development and implementation of plans.

- Map safe routes to school and to local play and leisure facilities, taking into account the views of pupils, parents and carers. Also consult with the local community^[4], including people with expertise in accessibility issues (such as those with mobility difficulties or community groups that work with them).
- Develop programmes to ensure the local environment around schools and the nearby catchment area provide opportunities for all children to cycle or walk. This should include addressing motor vehicle speed, parking and dangerous driving practices.
- Introduce regular 'walking buses' and other activities, such as 'Walk once a week' projects, which support and encourage walking and cycling to school^[4].
- Set performance targets for school travel plans which are audited annually and which form part of delivery plans. Remedial action should be taken when agreed targets are not reached^[5].
- Ensure all children can take part in 'Bikeability' training (see the [Department for Transport website](#) for details). Ensure cycle training is age-appropriate and timed to allow cycling to school to become a habit. In addition, ensure it is appropriate for those with limited mobility who may need additional support.
- Schools should develop parents' and carers' awareness of the wider benefits of walking and cycling and other physically active modes of travel. For example, they should explain how it can improve children and young people's movement skills, social wellbeing, self-confidence and independence. They should also explain how it can help children to explore and become more familiar (and at ease) with their local environment while, at the same time, being physically active^[4].
- Head teachers should identify a walking or cycling champion (or champions) with sufficient senior support to coordinate activities. The champion/s should liaise with the local authority and other potential partners to address any environmental or organisational barriers to walking and cycling to school.

Recommendation 9 Workplaces

Whose health will benefit?

Staff and others who use workplaces.

Who should take action?

- Employers, including the NHS and local authorities.
- Directors and senior staff including managers, health and safety staff, estates managers and human resources professionals.
- Active travel champions.

What action should they take?

- Develop strategies in consultation with staff (and other relevant stakeholders, for example, students in universities and colleges) to promote walking and cycling in and around the workplace^[7]. Ensure activities are developed in line with wider local activities (see recommendations 2, 3 and 4) and are linked to existing national and local initiatives.
- Liaise with local authority transport departments, neighbouring businesses and other partners to improve walking and cycling access to workplace sites. (Also see NICE's recommendations on [physical activity and the environment](#) and promoting [physical activity in the workplace](#).)
- Identify an 'active travel champion' (or champions) within the workplace, at a sufficiently senior level. They should coordinate activities such as led and informal walking groups, workplace 'challenges' and promotional competitions (for example, using pedometers), bicycle user groups and walking interest groups. The active travel champion/s should also develop (or promote) schemes that give staff access to a pool of bicycles for short-distance business travel, or access to discounted cycle purchases (such as cycle to work schemes).
- Ensure workplace walking and cycling programmes are developed using an evidence-based theoretical model of behaviour change (see NICE guidance on [behaviour change](#)).
- Provide information tailored for the specific workplace on walking and cycling routes and circuits. This should include details on the distances involved, maps, routes and safety information.

See NICE guidance on [promoting physical activity in the workplace](#) for further recommendations.

Recommendation 10 NHS

Who should take action?

- Clinical commissioning groups.

- National commissioning board.
- Primary and secondary healthcare professionals.

What action should they take?

- Incorporate information on walking and cycling into all physical activity advice given by health professionals. (See also NICE's recommendations on [four commonly used methods to increase physical activity](#).)
- Ensure walking and cycling are among the options provided by the [Let's get moving](#) physical activity care pathway.
- Ensure people who express an interest in walking or cycling as a way of being more physically active are given information about appropriate national and local initiatives. Also provide individual support and follow-up (see recommendation 7).
- Direct people with limited mobility to specialist centres where adapted equipment, assessment and training are available for walking and cycling.
- Ensure walking and cycling programmes link to existing national and local initiatives.

For more on the role of the NHS in promoting walking and cycling, see also recommendations 1 and 9.

^[1] Descriptions of the links between physical activity and health outcomes can be found in the Chief Medical Officers' report on physical activity [Start active, stay active](#).

^[2] Further advice on evaluation can be found in the [National Obesity Observatory guide to evaluation](#).

^[3] For additional information see [Making personal travel planning work: practitioners' guide](#).

^[4] Adapted from recommendation 12 in [Promoting physical activity for children and young people](#) (NICE public health guidance 17).

^[5] This is part of recommendation 12 in [Promoting physical activity for children and young people](#) (NICE public health guidance 17).

^[6] Adapted from recommendations 5 and 12 in Promoting physical activity for children and young people (NICE public health guidance 17).

^[7] This is adapted from recommendation 1 in Promoting physical activity in the workplace (NICE public health guidance 13).

2 Public health need and practice

Introduction

Physical activity is essential for good health. It can help reduce the risk of coronary heart disease, stroke, cancer, obesity and type 2 diabetes (Chief Medical Officers of England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland 2011). It also helps keep the musculoskeletal system healthy and promotes mental wellbeing.

As well as a direct benefit from physical activity, walking and cycling offer pleasure, independence and exposure to outdoor environments. These benefits may be particularly significant for people with disabilities whose participation in other activities may be more restricted.

New national physical activity guidelines were issued in 2011 (Chief Medical Officers of England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland 2011) for: the under-5s, those aged 5–18, adults aged from 19–64 and for those aged 65 plus. Key points include the need to:

- be physically active at all ages
- be flexible (combining moderate and vigorous-intensity activity can be effective)
- participate in daily activity
- minimise sedentary behaviour
- consider strength and balance activities for adults and older adults.

Depending on factors such as speed and the terrain, walking and cycling can both be moderate or vigorous activities. Moderate intensity activities will make the participant breathe faster, experience an increase in heart rate and feel warmer. They may sweat on hot or humid days. The amount of activity needed to reach this varies from one person to another.

Physical activity levels in England

Based on self-reporting, 61% of men (71% of women) in England aged 16 and over did not meet the national recommended physical activity levels^[6] (Craig et al. 2009).

The proportion of men who are physically active enough decreases markedly as they get older (from 53% at age 16–24 to 16% at 65-plus). The level of activity among women was considerably

lower once they reach 65-plus, from a lower base. (Around 12% of women over 65 met the recommended levels compared to 28–36% of younger women.) (Craig et al. 2009).

Black African and Asian adults and black Caribbean women were less likely to achieve the recommendations than the general population (Sproston and Mindell 2006).

Sixty three per cent of girls (72% of boys) aged between 2 and 15 report being physically active for 60 minutes or more on 7 days a week (girls' activity declines after the age of 10) (Craig and Shelton 2008).

However, objective data suggest the above self-reporting data is an overestimate. Based on accelerometry, only 6% of men and 4% of women achieved at least 30 minutes of moderate or vigorous activity on at least 5 days (Craig et al. 2009). Only 2.5% (5.1% of boys and 0.4% of girls) actually did more than 60 minutes of moderate-to-vigorous physical activity daily (Riddoch et al. 2007).

There is a lack of information on the levels of physical activity among people with disabilities, although they are likely to be low for those with limited mobility.

The Chief Medical Officers' 2011 report notes: 'there is a clear causal relationship between the amount of physical activity people do and all-cause mortality. While increasing the activity levels of all adults who are not meeting the recommendations is important, targeting those adults who are significantly inactive (that is, engaging in less than 30 minutes of activity per week) will produce the greatest reduction in chronic disease' (Chief Medical Officers of England, Scotland, Wales, and Northern Ireland 2011).

Walking and cycling

Walking is reported to be the most common – and cycling the fourth most common – recreational and sporting activity undertaken by adults in Britain (Fox and Rickards 2004). Walking (for any purpose) accounted for between 37% and 45% of the time that women of all ages spent doing moderate or vigorous-intensity physical activity. It also accounted for between 26% and 42% of the time devoted to such activities by men of all ages (Belanger et al. 2011). As a result, it is the most likely way all adults can achieve the recommended levels of physical activity.

Bicycles are used for around 2% of journeys in Britain – compared to about 26% in the Netherlands, 19% in Denmark and 5% in France (Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management

2009). Yet of all trips made in Great Britain in 2009, 20% covered less than 1 mile and more than half (56%) of car journeys covered less than 5 miles (Department for Transport 2010a).

In England on average, 10% of adults cycle at least once a week (this figure varies from over 50% to less than 5% according to the area) (Department for Transport and Sport England 2012). On average, 11% of adults cycle for at least half an hour, at least once a month (again, this figure varies from 4% to 35% according to the area (Department for Transport and Sport England 2012). Today, on an average day in London, it is estimated that around 4.3 million trips are 'potentially cyclable' (Transport for London 2010).

The majority (85.8%) of adults claim they can ride a bicycle (around 92.9% of men and 79% of women) (Department for Culture Media and Sport 2011). However, the average time spent travelling on foot or by bicycle in Britain has decreased from 12.9 minutes per day in 1995/97 to 11 minutes per day in 2007 (Department for Transport 2010a). More starkly, the average distance walked, per person per year, has fallen from 255 miles in 1975/76 to 201 miles in 2006. Bicycle mileage for the same years fell from 51 to 39 miles per person per year (Department for Transport 2007).

Air pollution and climate change

Motorised transport in urban areas of England is associated with poor air quality, congestion, collisions and physical inactivity – each costing society around £10 billion a year (Department for Transport 2009a). The cost of greenhouse gas emissions and the annoyance associated with noise are smaller, but still significant. In the case of greenhouse gases, costs are expected to rise sharply in future years (Department for Transport 2009a).

Exposure to air pollution is a significant cause of mortality in England. The House of Commons environmental audit report on air quality noted that: 'poor air quality reduces the life-expectancy of everyone in the UK by an average of 7 to 8 months and up to 50,000 people a year may die prematurely because of it' (House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee 2010).

Air pollution is caused by a range of factors and people's exposure depends on the level of emissions, dispersion and other factors. Particulate matter, especially small particles less than 10 or 2.5 microns (PM₁₀ or PM_{2.5}) in diameter, has a significant impact on health. Other significant pollutants include nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and ozone.

Industrial sources produce a larger percentage of PM₁₀ and NO_x than road transport (46% and 30% respectively for NO_x and 36% and 18% for PM₁₀). However, road transport is responsible for up to

70% of air pollution in urban areas where most human exposure to air pollution occurs (House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee 2010).

Greenhouse gas emissions from domestic transport in Great Britain stayed at the same level between 1990 and 2009 (around 120 MtCO₂e^[9]). Over this period, an improvement in the fuel economy of new cars was offset by increases in mileage. At the same time, the overall emission of greenhouse gases from all sources in this country has decreased. As a result, as a percentage, the proportion from transport has increased from 16% to 22%. Ninety per cent of these emissions are from road transport (58% from cars and around 30% from heavy goods vehicles and light vans) (Department for Transport 2010a).

The transportation of goods and general travel in urban areas accounts for around 20% of the distance travelled by motor vehicle, but the contribution to air pollution and climate change is greater, because of driving conditions and frequent cold starts (Favez et al. 2009).

Climate change, driven by human emissions of gases such as carbon dioxide, will lead to higher temperatures, more frequent extreme weather events, changes in rainfall and weather patterns, food and waterborne diseases and changes in distribution of vector-borne diseases. This will all have a significant impact on health in England (and globally). Changes associated with migration, following events such as flood or famine and higher levels of stress from extreme events are also likely to have a negative effect (World Health Organization 2009).

Reducing transport-related carbon emissions, by supporting a shift to walking and cycling, will help to address these adverse effects. It will also help ensure people are more physically active, so improving their health (Vardoulakis and Heaviside 2012).

Wider economic impacts

The wider economic impact of supporting walking and cycling are difficult to identify with certainty.

Excess delays from traffic congestion in English urban areas are estimated to cost the economy around £10.9 billion a year (based on 2009 prices and values) (Department for Transport 2009a).

A Living Streets report highlights that improvements to the walking environment can increase the economic value of, and economic activity within, an area. This can be reflected by the sale price of residential properties and the rental price of retail premises (Sinnott et al. 2011). The report points out that local retailers may overestimate the proportion of shoppers arriving by car (41% compared with the actual proportion of 22%, in a study in Bristol).

Transport for London's 'Town centre study' (Transport for London 2011) found that people walking to a town centre spent an average of £93 per week there, compared with £56 for car drivers or passengers. Bus users spent £70 per week.

^[8] These figures refer to the pre-2011 guidelines for physical activity (that is: adults should be active for at least 30 minutes at least five times a week at moderate intensity or greater).

^[9] Million tonnes of carbon dioxide equivalent. Various gases (such as methane) have a different impact on the warming of the atmosphere. Converting to MtCO₂e enables a direct comparison of the impact of different gases or mixtures on the atmosphere.

3 Considerations

The Programme Development Group (PDG) took account of a number of factors and issues when developing the recommendations.

General

- 3.1 The PDG noted that encouraging people to walk or cycle for recreation purposes is different from encouraging them to walk or cycle as a mode of transport.
- 3.2 The PDG considered walking and cycling as two separate activities.
- 3.3 Most people should be able to fit these activities into their daily lives and both are relatively cheap or may save money.
- 3.4 The PDG is aware of the volume of work and guidance available that is relevant to walking and cycling. It is also aware of the range of examples of good practice, both in this country and abroad. This guidance is intended to support, rather than replace that information.
- 3.5 People with disabilities are less likely to be physically active and more likely to face barriers to being active than those without impairments. Many of this group can walk or cycle. However, they may require additional support, for example, involving specially adapted equipment or changes to the physical environment.
- 3.6 The PDG noted that local authority structures and roles vary across the country and that this will affect who has responsibility for specific actions. As a result, the recommendations tend to refer to general areas of responsibility, rather than to specific job titles. Similarly, as different administrative areas may produce plans on similar issues under a different title, the recommendations refer to generic plans.
- 3.7 Achieving change is likely to be a long-term task and will involve participation by many professionals. This includes those working in local authorities and the NHS, as well as those working in communities (such as voluntary and faith

sector organisations). The actions needed include those recommended in this and related NICE guidance.

- 3.8 The PDG noted that in the 'Cycle cities and towns' where cycling and walking had increased, the level of spending to encourage walking and cycling for transport purposes had been in the region of £5–10 per head per year. This had been maintained for a prolonged period. The PDG noted that this level of funding could be achieved by changing investment priorities within existing budgets rather than requiring additional funds.

Evidence

- 3.9 Evidence related to walking and cycling comes from a number of different professional sectors, in particular, transport and health. Each sector has its own approach to research and evaluation which can lead to difficulties in identifying and interpreting the evidence.
- 3.10 Health sector evidence tends to involve controlling for as many factors as possible to help identify and explain any causal links between a given activity and health. While this provides greater certainty about cause and effect, it has tended to limit investigation to topics which lend themselves to this strict approach. Examples include promotional work with individuals to encourage them to walk or cycle, or within a limited setting, such as a school. Transport and other professional sectors are more likely to address population-level factors – and are more likely to have a range of outcomes or intentions in mind. For instance, both public health and transport professionals might have an interest in the benefits of cycling. However, the former might want to know how it impacts on levels of physical activity (and hence health), particularly among those who were previously inactive. Transport professionals, meanwhile, might want to know which particular journey would be cycled (and hence, the impact on motor traffic and congestion levels). They would tend to have less interest in who has changed their mode of transport. As a result, while both groups might have a legitimate interest in activities to increase cycling levels, the outcomes of evaluations might be different.
- 3.11 The PDG noted that different professionals have different reasons for wanting to encourage people to walk and cycle. For instance, transport professionals may aim to reduce the volume of motorised traffic (by identifying and

influencing people who are most likely to move from motorised transport to cycling). From a public health point of view, the goal might be to encourage people who are currently inactive to take up walking or cycling in order to increase the amount of physical activity they do. While the 2 goals are very closely related (and can be complementary) they may focus on different groups and involve different approaches and outcomes.

- 3.12 The evidence identified was predominantly from an urban perspective, so rural issues are under-represented in the recommendations.
- 3.13 It is difficult to apply the findings of non-UK cycling studies to England because of the cultural and legal differences – and the fact that levels of cycling are considerably higher in many other countries. Equally, the value of findings from older literature may be of limited relevance because of the social and environmental changes that have since taken place.
- 3.14 There is evidence that interventions tailored to people's needs and aimed at either the most sedentary groups – or at those who are most motivated to change – can encourage people to walk more. Evidence showed that interventions could work if aimed at individuals, households or groups.
- 3.15 Evidence showed that community-wide promotional activities, combined with an improved infrastructure, had the potential to increase cycling rates by modest amounts. Studies of marketing activities aimed at individuals reported a consistent, positive effect on cycling behaviour. However, the PDG noted that more robust study designs were needed to generate more detailed evidence of the best way to achieve this improvement. (For instance, detail is needed on whether the increases are sustained over time or are limited to certain subgroups such as young men.)
- 3.16 Practical experience indicates that two particular factors play a key role in increasing walking and cycling rates: having a 'champion' who is committed to promoting walking or cycling, and effective local authority support.
- 3.17 Four interventions, including two multi-component interventions (Cycling Demonstration Towns and Sustainable Travel Towns) were included in the economic modelling. Using cost per quality-adjusted life years (QALY) gained, the interventions were highly cost effective, even when the effect disappeared

after year 1. The PDG noted that the key factors influencing the outcome of the economic model were: threshold cost, level of effects, decay in effects and costs related to initial effects. Members also noted the importance of offering the most appropriate interventions for different local settings and needs.

- 3.18 Data from a UK randomised control trial (RCT) were used to model the cost-effectiveness of led walks. The PDG raised concerns because the RCT showed no difference in effect between led walks and the provision of advice only. The results were not used for the recommendations. Using evidence from an evaluation of 'Get walking, keep walking', a large UK study, produced a cost per QALY of around £2700.
- 3.19 In addition to a cost-utility analysis, cost-benefit ratios were also calculated for environmental and traffic outcomes. These considered a range of benefits associated with increased walking or cycling and a consequent change in motor vehicle miles driven. The methodology was based on that used by the Department for Transport. However, health benefits (which account for most of the benefits calculated using the Department for Transport methodology) were not included, as these had been calculated in the cost-utility analysis.
- 3.20 The PDG recognised the importance of considering children. However the modelling did not consider under-18s due to a lack of direct evidence on children's behaviour in many of the studies.

Pedometers

- 3.21 Pedometers are cheap, effective and 'user-friendly'. The PDG noted that they may play an important role in helping people to walk more, provided they are used within a programme involving monitoring, support and goal setting. However, the PDG also noted that the use of set targets (such as 10,000 steps a day) was unlikely to be helpful if it did not take into account someone's current level of activity. In addition, some people may be put off if pedometers are used as part of a competition.
- 3.22 The PDG discussed the role of other technologies that might replicate pedometers, including mobile phone apps. While these may have a role to play in getting people to walk more, there is a lack of robust evidence to indicate whether or not they are effective.

Wider influences

- 3.23 A wide range of factors influence whether or not people walk or cycle. Many were outside the scope of this guidance. In particular, the PDG noted that environmental factors such as the quality, accessibility and availability of walking and cycling networks are likely to be important. Other issues, such as the relative costs and convenience, are also likely to be significant. As a result, it recommended that this guidance should be implemented in conjunction with other related NICE recommendations, in particular, on the changes needed to the physical environment.
- 3.24 The scope for this guidance included an adapted logic model (Sallis et al. 2006) which sets out local factors and interventions which can impact on walking and cycling rates. It demonstrates the conceptual link between local interventions targeting the physical or social environment (or individuals) and intermediate outcomes in relation to walking and cycling. These outcomes, in turn, link to impacts on health, the environment and other areas (such as the economy). The model also highlights how local policy, resources and other factors influence the effectiveness of local interventions to improve rates of walking and cycling. For example, a decision to use cycling as a form of transport can be influenced by the level and speed of motor traffic, attitudes to safety, the ability to plan and execute a route, and the ability to carry baggage. (Please note: although national factors such as legislation and fuel duty also have an important impact, these are not included here as they fall outside the scope of the guidance.)
- 3.25 A number of legal issues differentiate England from parts of continental Europe, where levels of cycling are significantly higher. In parts of continental Europe, 'strict liability' means that pedestrians or cyclists injured in a collision involving a motor vehicle do not have to prove fault in seeking compensation. In addition, drivers have a civil responsibility to have insurance that will pay vulnerable victims independently of fault, while not changing criminal responsibility (see 'Expert paper 2'). Such legal requirements may act as an incentive for drivers to behave in a way that protects the most vulnerable road users.
- 3.26 The PDG noted that relatively few people in England cycle on a regular basis for transport purposes. This is not the case in other parts of Europe. For example, in Denmark and the Netherlands, it is considered the norm to use a bicycle for many journeys. Age is not necessarily a barrier. In the Netherlands, 26% of all

journeys – and 19% of all the journeys made by people over 75 – are by bike (Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management 2009). The PDG considered these examples as possible aspirational goals for England.

3.27 The PDG noted that moving towards the higher levels of cycle use seen in some Northern European countries is a process that will involve change over a prolonged period. It also noted that some of these changes are beyond the scope of this guidance. However, it felt that substantial public health benefits (such as increased levels of physical activity and reduced emissions of air pollutants) could be achieved as a result of such a process.

3.28 The PDG noted a range of issues which, if tackled in isolation, are unlikely to lead to a significant increase in walking or cycling. It also noted that tackling such issues could, nevertheless, provide a necessary foundation for interventions which will have a significant impact. For example, a key factor preventing people from walking and cycling is the danger as well as the perceived danger (including personal security fears) facing them on or near roads, paths or trails. The PDG discussed a range of measures that may help overcome this problem. These included:

- Awareness-raising of the comparatively low risks posed on the roads and contextualising these in terms of other risks (such as the potential risks caused by having a sedentary lifestyle).
- Awareness-raising among motorists and cyclists of the needs of pedestrians (for instance, the need to avoid causing a hazard by pavement parking).
- Awareness-raising among motorists of the needs of cyclists (for instance, by making motorists aware that they should give way, where appropriate, and should give cyclists a wide berth when overtaking them).
- Appropriate enforcement of road traffic law.
- The potential role of engineering measures such as chicanes or raised junctions and 20 mph limits in helping to restrict motor traffic speed.
- The needs of children and older people (see NICE guidance on [strategies to prevent unintentional injuries among under-15s](#) and on [road design](#))

- The needs of people with mobility difficulties or other impairments which may increase their vulnerability on the road.

- 3.29 Action to increase walking and cycling rates may reduce motor traffic volume and the PDG was concerned that the resulting benefits (of reduced congestion and reduced air pollution) should not be lost. For example, less traffic could lead to increases in vehicle speed, or may encourage some people to drive for journeys previously undertaken using other modes of transport. Members noted that action to ensure this does not happen could include a reallocation of road space or a reallocation of time at junctions to favour walkers or cyclists, or restricted motor vehicle access.
- 3.30 Local roads may act as a barrier to walking and cycling for children. Although it is not a panacea (addressing road conditions is vital), achieving 'Bikeability' level 3 would mean they could deal with all types of road conditions and more challenging traffic situations. This may be important, at least, for older children. The PDG noted that cycling off-road, where there is no exposure to motor vehicles may be appropriate for those who find road cycling too challenging.

Physical activity

- 3.31 Most people can walk, including groups such as older people and those with some functional difficulties. While the majority of adults (85.8%) in the UK say they can ride a bicycle (Department of Culture, Media and Sport 2011), cycling as a means of transport is a minority activity. It accounts for a small percentage of all journeys – and for a small part of overall physical activity in this country. Nevertheless, 43% of adults own a bicycle and 14% use it at least monthly (Department for Transport 2009b). Cycling remains popular among children and young people, with 41% of those aged 5–16 years cycling at least weekly (Department for Transport: unpublished data 2012).
- 3.32 In London, an estimated 4.3 million trips a day (around two thirds taken by car, the remainder mainly by bus) could be cycled. For this survey, trips were assessed according to a set of criteria designed to reflect trips currently made by bicycle (Transport for London, 2010).

Inequalities

- 3.33 Overall physical activity levels vary across the population (see section 2). This is also the case with specific activities, particularly cycling.
- 3.34 Most adult cyclists in most areas of England are male. The highest number of cyclists are among people who are middle-aged. Black and minority ethnic groups cycle the least. Cycling participation is roughly equal across income quintiles but the biggest growth has come among the more wealthy.
- 3.35 The variation in levels of walking among groups in terms of gender, race or socioeconomic status is probably the smallest for any type of physical activity.
- 3.36 People in households without a car walk, on average, 284 miles per year, compared to 176 miles per year walked by people in households with a car (Department for Transport 2010b). People who are most physically active do not necessarily walk or use a bicycle as a mode of transport. For some, the fact they have access to a car may have a positive influence on their physical activity levels.
- 3.37 The distance walked in Great Britain varies per person per year. In the quintile with the lowest household income, the distance walked is 223 miles, then it is 202, 182 and 177 miles respectively for people in the next 3 quintiles. In the quintile with the highest household income, people walk an average 201 miles per year. For cycling, the distance increases across the spectrum. Miles cycled per person per year is 32 in the lowest 2 quintiles, then 39, 49 and 77 miles respectively (Department for Transport 2010b).
- 3.38 One way of encouraging people to walk or cycle, as a form of transport, might be to apply greater levels of restraint on car usage in urban areas. This could be achieved, for instance, by introducing restricted parking and higher parking charges. However, there is a need to consider how this would impact on car owners living in areas where the environment is not conducive to walking or cycling, or where there is little real alternative to driving.
- 3.39 The guidance recommends an integrated package of measures which address a range of barriers to walking and cycling. It should be noted that reducing car use may have a beneficial influence on the environment by reducing traffic volume

and air pollution and this may have a positive impact on the health of the whole population.

- 3.40 The PDG discussed the impacts that the recommendations may have on health inequalities. It acknowledged that those who are better off may have more opportunity to respond to the choices on offer. It also acknowledged that some transport interventions may deliberately target those most likely to change their mode of transport, rather than those who are least active. In addition, it noted that people with disabilities have specific needs. Taking these issues into account, the PDG emphasised that the recommendations should be accompanied by action to address factors such as a hostile and degraded environment, restricted access points, poor surfaces and the availability of disabled toilets. The Group also noted that some people with, for example, sensory or cognitive impairments, may need specially adapted equipment or information.
- 3.41 Interventions which reduce motor traffic will reduce air pollution and road danger (assuming the benefits of a reduction in motorised traffic are 'locked in' and not accompanied by, for instance, an increase in traffic speeds). Planners may be reluctant to apply traffic reduction measures in one locality for fear of 'gridlock' on other, neighbouring roads. However, in most cases, the overall level of motorised traffic will be reduced. This is likely to have a positive impact on health inequalities because people from deprived groups, who are exposed to the greatest risks from air pollution and traffic injuries, are most likely to benefit. The very old and the very young, as well as those with pre-existing respiratory or circulatory problems, will also benefit from a reduction in overall exposure to air pollutants.

Barriers and facilitators

- 3.42 When making transport choices, habit is important for most people, most of the time. Choosing to use a different mode of transport from usual is also likely to require more planning and thought. For instance, making a decision to start cycling might mean obtaining appropriate clothing, preparing the bike, route planning and allowing time for a trip of an unknown duration. The PDG noted that these factors are unlikely to remain as significant barriers once walking or cycling becomes the norm. For instance, both will usually involve reliable and more predictable journey times. Many journeys may be quicker, as well as being

more healthy. There are also wider community benefits from reduced congestion and pollution.

- 3.43 The PDG noted that changing travel mode might require stopping old habits, such as using the car for short trips. Or it might involve an even more fundamental lifestyle choice, such as deciding to give up having a car altogether.
- 3.44 The PDG felt it was important that, where possible, health professionals (and others) set a positive example through their own behaviour in relation to walking and cycling.
- 3.45 The PDG noted that the times when someone has to reconsider their transport choices (such as when changing job or school, retiring or moving house) may offer important opportunities to influence their behaviour.
- 3.46 Despite walking and cycling being different activities, sometimes they are grouped together. The PDG felt this was often unhelpful, as barriers and facilitators to walking and cycling vary – and, in turn, they differ according to whether the activity is chosen for transport or recreational purposes. They can also be specific to the purpose and location of the trip – and to the person undertaking it. Successful interventions to increase cycling and walking need to take into account this wide range of factors.
- 3.47 Walking and cycling, like any form of transport, involve exposure to a certain level of risk. This includes the risk of injury from falls or from collisions and exposure to air pollution. These risks are not unique to transport involving physical activity. However, evidence shows that the health benefits of being more physically active outweigh these disbenefits.
- 3.48 The whole population benefits from less exposure to polluted air and congested streets when there is a general shift away from motorised vehicles.
- 3.49 Risk of injury or collision is a key consideration when walking and cycling in places where there are other people. As well as the actual level of risk, perception of risk is important. The PDG noted that cyclists and pedestrians are more vulnerable in the event of a collision than those in a motor vehicle. At the same time, they are much less likely to cause injury in the event of a collision, due to their lower mass and lower speed of travel.

- 3.50 There is evidence to support the hypothesis (usually called 'safety in numbers') that areas where there are higher numbers of cyclists have better safety records than others. One of the reasons for this may be increased driver awareness of the likelihood of encountering a cyclist – and the fact that they modify their driving as a result.
- 3.51 The PDG concurred that transport planning could be a way to reduce road dangers for all users. These dangers relate to motorised traffic volumes and speeds. They are also caused by a lack of driver awareness of the risks of poor driving and the need to fully consider pedestrians and cyclists, including those with restricted mobility.
- 3.52 Attitudes to walking and cycling are generally positive or neutral, with walking generally regarded more favourably. However, a combination of factors discourages people from taking up either if it is a question of choice, rather than necessity. These include:
- Concerns about the physical environment, in particular, with regard to perceptions of and actual safety. Motor traffic is a major deterrent for many cyclists (potential and current) and pedestrians in rural areas – and for children in all areas. Fear of violence or robbery is another deterrent. Many potential walkers restrict their journeys on foot because of their perception that empty streets, particularly at night, are dangerous.
 - Complex household routines (especially for those with young children). For many people it is a combination of circumstances that prevent them from walking or cycling for everyday travel. These include: the logistics of organising and travelling with children, pressures of time and other commitments, and parental concerns about safety.
 - The perception that walking and cycling are not things to do as a matter of routine.

Wider impacts

- 3.53 Traffic volume and speed act as barriers to walking and cycling (for recreation, as well as for transport purposes). The PDG noted that the level of motor traffic creates congestion which, in turn, imposes costs on the economy, through loss of productive time. Motor vehicles are also major contributors to air and noise pollution, as well as to carbon dioxide emissions.

- 3.54 Increasing the amount people walk or cycle, particularly in urban areas, results in a change in exposure to air pollution. Moving journeys from motorised transport to walking or cycling may alter individual exposure to air pollution, while reducing the total emissions of pollutants. Modelling by De Hartog et al. (2010) suggests that an individual's risk from increased exposure to air pollutants is modest in comparison with the benefits of them being more physically active. In addition, the overall decrease in air pollutant emissions benefits the health of the whole population. The PDG noted that a range of other potential benefits might accrue from a shift to physically active travel. These include reductions in road danger, noise, congestion and emissions of carbon dioxide. Walking and cycling can also benefit local communities by encouraging more people of all ages to be out on the streets, so making streets appear less threatening.
- 3.55 Personal exposure to air pollution is influenced by route choice. Routes which avoid busy roads may have much lower levels of air pollutants. This can be a much more significant influence on personal exposure than the mode of transport used.
- 3.56 Cost-utility calculations were based on the increased longevity associated with walking and cycling. They incorporate the effects of deaths from collisions. In addition, the economic modelling included an assessment of the cost-benefit ratios associated with environmental pollution and congestion. In most cases, interventions to promote walking and cycling led to greater benefits than costs, when considering their impact on congestion, infrastructure, collisions, local air quality, noise, greenhouse gases and indirect taxation. Costs associated with collisions were included, based on the expected reduction in car kilometres. Changes in levels of injury, based on changes in walking and cycling behaviour, are difficult to predict, partly because the relationship is not linear (see 3.50). Large increases in cycling and walking, especially if accompanied by interventions to increase safety, could reduce the absolute number of related accidents. As a result, the model did not include an additional modelled effect on injuries. Only for Cycling Demonstration Town interventions were the costs greater than the benefits. However, the modelling did not include the substantial benefits (likely to be in excess of 80% of the total) to be gained from reducing the range of health conditions associated with not being physically active enough. (These were calculated separately.)

- 3.57 The PDG agreed that both walking and cycling provide a wide range of health, social, environmental and economic benefits. Members also agreed that there is significant scope to increase the levels of walking and cycling in England – and that this would result in gains across society.

4 Implementation

NICE guidance can help:

- Commissioners and providers of NHS services to meet the quality requirements of the DH's [Operating framework for 2012/13](#). It can also help them to deliver against domain one of the NHS outcomes framework (preventing people from dying prematurely).
- Local health and wellbeing boards to deliver on their requirements within [Healthy lives, healthy people](#) (2010).
- Local authorities, NHS services and local organisations, determine how to improve health outcomes and reduce health inequalities during the joint strategic needs assessment process.

NICE guidance can also help commissioners and providers of services to meet the following indicators within the Department of Health's [Public health outcomes framework for England](#):

- Improve the wider determinants of health by utilising green space for exercise/health reasons.
- Improve health by reducing excess weight among children (aged 4–5 and 10–11 years) and adults and increasing the proportion of physically active adults.
- Protect health by reducing air pollution.
- Prevent deaths from all cardiovascular diseases (including heart disease and stroke).

NICE has developed tools to help organisations put this guidance into practice. For details, see our website.

5 Recommendations for research

The Programme Development Group (PDG) recommends that the following research questions should be addressed. It notes that 'effectiveness' in this context relates not only to the size of the effect, but also to cost effectiveness and duration of effect. It also takes into account any harmful/negative side effects.

All the research should aim to identify differences in effectiveness among groups, based on characteristics such as socioeconomic status, age, gender and ethnicity.

- 5.1 How could existing guidance on evaluating complex, population-wide interventions be most usefully adapted and applied to approaches that aim to increase rates of walking and cycling? Issues to consider include: population-level health outcomes such as pollution emissions and exposure, the impact of an intervention on risk and danger and other, wider outcomes of interest such as the impact on the local economy. Approaches should be developed to take account of the backgrounds and needs of the different professional groups involved in helping to influence walking and cycling for transport or recreation. This includes professionals working in public health, transport, environment, economic development and regeneration.
- 5.2 What key factors influence the effectiveness of population-level or whole-area approaches to encouraging walking or cycling? How do these factors interact? (Specifically, how do infrastructure changes, promotion of these changes, promotion of walking and cycling generally, the provision of individual support and approaches in specific settings interact?) How does effectiveness vary between different geographical areas?
- 5.3 How do individual and local factors influence the effectiveness of specific approaches to encouraging walking or cycling? (This includes people's level and perception of risk, the degree of connectivity for cycling trips, and the local 'visibility' of cycling or walking as a mode of transport.) How do these factors interact with personal factors (such as willingness to try walking or cycling) and how do these personal factors influence effectiveness? In particular, do local factors influence the effectiveness of cycle training and personalised travel planning?

- 5.4 What key factors ensure people continue to walk or cycle in the long term (over a year)? How do individual interventions (such as follow-up or goal-setting) interact with environmental factors (such as distance, perception of danger or provision of facilities) in encouraging people to continue to walk or cycle?
- 5.5 What key factors influence differences in walking and cycling behaviour among different groups – and what are the implications for interventions aiming to achieve population-level change and reduce inequalities? This should take into account transport-related variables such as level of car ownership.

More detail on the gaps in the evidence identified during development of this guidance is provided in [appendix D](#).

6 Updating the recommendations

This guidance will be reviewed 3 years after publication to determine whether all or part of it should be updated. Information on the progress of any update will be posted at the NICE website.

7 Related NICE guidance

Published

[Preventing type 2 diabetes – risk identification and interventions for individuals at high risk.](#) NICE public health guidance 38 (2012)

[Preventing type 2 diabetes: population and community interventions.](#) NICE public health guidance 35 (2011)

[Preventing unintentional road injuries among under-15s: road design.](#) NICE public health guidance 31 (2010)

[Strategies to prevent unintentional injuries among under-15s.](#) NICE public health guidance 29 (2010)

[Prevention of cardiovascular disease.](#) NICE public health guidance 25 (2010)

[Promoting physical activity for children and young people.](#) NICE public health guidance 17 (2009)

[Mental wellbeing and older people.](#) NICE public health guidance 16 (2008)

[Promoting physical activity in the workplace.](#) NICE public health guidance 13 (2008)

[Community engagement.](#) NICE public health guidance 9 (2008)

[Physical activity and the environment.](#) NICE public health guidance 8 (2008)

[Behaviour change.](#) NICE public health guidance 6 (2007)

[Four commonly used methods to increase physical activity.](#) NICE public health guidance 2 (2006)

Under development

Obesity: working with local communities (publication expected November 2012)

Physical activity advice in primary care (publication expected May 2013)

Physical activity: walking and cycling (PH41)

Overweight and obese children and young people: lifestyle weight management services
(publication expected October 2013)

Overweight and obese adults: lifestyle weight management services (publication expected January
2014)

8 Glossary

Dr Bike

Generally, Dr Bike sessions are basic safety and maintenance checks provided free to the cyclist. They cover topics such as brakes, steering, mechanical integrity and the overall condition of the bicycle. Minor adjustments are carried out free of charge. Sessions may also include security marking, visibility and cycling tips. They may be provided by local authorities, cycling groups or employers.

Handcycles

Handcycles are two or three-wheeled bikes powered by the arms rather than the legs. They come in a variety of styles which make them suitable for many people with disabilities.

Local enterprise partnerships

Local enterprise partnerships are led by local authorities and businesses. They provide the vision, knowledge and strategic leadership needed to drive sustainable private sector growth and job creation in their area.

Mode

Transport mode refers to the form of transport used (such as by car, lorry, bicycle, public transport or on foot).

Moderate-intensity physical activity

Moderate-intensity physical activity requires a degree of effort and noticeably increases the heart rate. Examples include brisk walking, cycling and gardening.

Moderate-to-vigorous physical activity

Moderate-to-vigorous physical activity requires a large amount of effort, causes rapid breathing and a substantial increase in heart rate. Examples include running and climbing briskly up a hill.

Personalised travel planning

Personalised travel planning aims to encourage people to change their travel habits by providing them with detailed information on possible alternatives. People running these schemes provide individuals (usually across a specified geographical area) with information on, and encouragement to use, alternatives to a car for the trips they make.

Portfolio holder

A portfolio holder is a local authority member with a specific responsibility delegated by the leader of the local authority.

Quality-adjusted life year (QALY)

A quality-adjusted life year (QALY) is a measure used in health economics to assess the cost effectiveness of an intervention. It is defined as a measure of the state of health of a person or group in which the benefits, in terms of length of life, are adjusted to reflect the quality of life. One QALY is equal to 1 year of life in perfect health.

Recommended level of physical activity

The Chief Medical Officers for England, Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland (2011) [report](#) sets out target levels of physical activity for different groups. For adults, the recommendation is that 'over a week, activity should add up to at least 150 minutes (2½ hours) of moderate-intensity activity, in bouts of 10 minutes or more (one way to approach this is to do 30 minutes on at least 5 days a week)'.

For children, the recommendation is that 'all children and young people should engage in moderate-to vigorous-intensity physical activity for at least 60 minutes and up to several hours every day'.

Virtual cycle races

These are competitions where participants log the number of miles they have cycled on their own or as part of a team. The aim is to cycle a predetermined number of miles over a certain time. A target could be, for example, to cycle the number of miles it would take to travel from Lands End to John O'Groats.

9 References

Belanger M, Townsend N, Foster C (2011) Age-related differences in physical activity profiles of English adults. *Preventive Medicine* 52: 247–9

Chief Medical Officers of England, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland (2011) [Start active, stay active: a report on physical activity from the four home countries' Chief Medical Officers](#) [online]

Craig R, Shelton N (2008) Health survey for England 2007. Healthy lifestyles: knowledge, attitudes and behaviour. Leeds: The Information Centre for Health and Social Care

Craig R, Mindell J, Hirani V (2009) Health survey for England 2008. London: The Information Centre for Health and Social Care

Department for Culture, Media and Sport (2011) Taking part 2011/12 quarter 2. London: Department for Culture, Media and Sport

Department for Transport (2007) National travel survey 2006. London: Department for Transport

Department for Transport (2009a) The wider costs of transport in English urban areas in 2009. London: Department for Transport

Department for Transport (2009b) National travel survey 2008. London: Department for Transport

Department for Transport (2010a) Transport trends 2009. London: Department for Transport

Department for Transport (2010b) National travel survey 2009. London: Department for Transport

Department for Transport, Sport England (2012) Local area walking and cycling statistics: England 2010/11. London: Department for Transport

Department of Health (2004) At least five a week. London: Department of Health

Favez J, Weilenmann M, Stilli J (2009) Cold start extra emissions as a function of engine stop time: evolution over the last 10 years. *Atmospheric Environment* 43: 996–1007

Fox K, Rickards L (2004) Sport and leisure: results from the sport and leisure module of the 2002 general household survey. London: The Stationery Office

House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee (2010) Air quality: fifth report of session 2009–10. London: The Stationery Office

Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management (2009) Cycling in the Netherlands. The Netherlands: Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water Management

Riddoch CJ, Mattocks C, Deere K et al. (2007) Objective measurement of levels and patterns of physical activity. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 92: 963–9

Sinnett D, Williams K, Chatterjee K et al. (2011) Making the case for investment in the walking environment: a review of the evidence. London: Living Streets

Sproston K, Mindell J (Editors) (2006) Health survey for England 2004. The health of ethnic minorities. London: The Information Centre for Health and Social Care.

Transport for London (2010) Analysis of cycling potential. London: Transport for London

Transport for London (2011) Town centre study 2011. London: Transport for London

Vardoulakis S, Heaviside C (Editors) (2012) Health effects of climate change in the UK 2012. Current evidence, recommendations and research gaps. Chilton: Health Protection Agency

World Health Organization (2009) Climate change is affecting our health: Something should be done now. Geneva: World Health Organization

Appendix A Membership of the Programme Development Group (PDG), the NICE project team and external contractors

Programme Development Group

PDG membership is multidisciplinary. The Group comprises public health practitioners, clinicians, local authority officers, teachers, social care professionals, representatives of the public, academics and technical experts as follows.

Ralph Bagge

Community Member

Nick Cavill

Director, Cavill Associates

Adrian Davis

Public Health and Transport Consultant, NHS Bristol

Charlie Foster

Programme Leader, University of Oxford

Mark Frost

Senior Transport Planner, London Borough of Hounslow

Melvyn Hillsdon

Associate Professor of Exercise and Health Behaviour, University of Exeter

Philip Insall

Director, Health, Sustrans

Tim Jones

Research Fellow, Land Use and Transportation Planning, Oxford Brookes University

Patrick Lingwood

Walking and Cycling Officer, Bedford Borough Council

Susie Morrow

Community Member

Nanette Mutrie

Chair of Physical Activity for Health, University of Edinburgh; formerly Professor of Exercise and Sport Psychology, University of Strathclyde

Jennifer Roberts

Professor of Economics, University of Sheffield

Harry Rutter

(Chair) Senior Clinical Research Fellow, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine; formerly Director, National Obesity Observatory

NICE project team

Mike Kelly

CPHE Director

Jane Huntley

Associate Director

Hugo Crombie

Lead Analyst

Charlotte Haynes

Analyst

James Jagroo

Analyst

Kim Jeong

Technical Adviser, Health Economics

Victoria Axe

Project Manager

Sue Jelley

Senior Editor

Alison Lake

Editor

External contractors

Evidence reviews

Review 1 was carried out by the School of Health and Related Research (ScHARR), University of Sheffield. The principal authors were: Lindsay Blank, Roy Jones, Helen Buckley Woods and Nick Payne.

Review 2 was carried out by ScHARR, University of Sheffield. The principal authors were: Maxine Johnson, Lindsay Blank, Roy Jones, Helen Buckley Woods and Nick Payne.

Cost effectiveness

The review of economic evaluations was carried out by ScHARR, University of Sheffield. The principal authors were Laurence Blake and Alan Brennan.

The economic modelling was carried out by ScHARR, University of Sheffield. The principal authors were Laurence Blake and Alan Brennan.

Expert testimony

Expert paper 1 by Phillipa Hunt, Living Streets

Expert paper 2 by Colin Pooley, Lancaster University

Expert paper 3 by Chris Peck, CTC, the national cyclists' organisation

Expert paper 4 by Ed Plowden, Bristol City Council

Expert paper 5 by David Ogilvie and Jenna Panter, MRC Epidemiology Unit

Expert paper 6 by John Pucher, Rutgers University

Appendix B Summary of the methods used to develop this guidance

Introduction

The reviews, primary research, expert testimony and economic modelling report include full details of the methods used to select the evidence (including search strategies), assess its quality and summarise it.

The minutes of the Programme Development Group (PDG) meetings provide further detail about the Group's interpretation of the evidence and development of the recommendations.

All supporting documents are listed in [appendix E](#) and are available at the [NICE website](#).

Guidance development

The stages involved in developing public health programme guidance are outlined below.

1. Draft scope released for consultation
2. Stakeholder meeting about the draft scope
3. Stakeholder comments used to revise the scope
4. Final scope and responses to comments published on website
5. Evidence reviews and economic modelling undertaken and submitted to PDG
6. PDG produces draft recommendations
7. Draft guidance (and evidence) released for consultation
8. PDG amends recommendations
9. Final guidance published on website
10. Responses to comments published on website

Key questions

The key questions were established as part of the scope. They formed the starting point for the reviews of evidence and were used by the PDG to help develop the recommendations. The overarching questions were:

Which local interventions are effective and cost effective at promoting and increasing cycling and walking for recreational and travel purposes?

Which local interventions are effective and cost effective at changing population-level norms and behaviour in relation to cycling and walking for recreational and travel purposes?

What factors help or hinder the planning and delivery of walking and cycling-related interventions for recreation or travel purposes?

What factors help or prevent people from walking and cycling for recreation or travel?

What health and other outcomes may be achieved by increasing cycling and walking for travel and recreation?

These questions were made more specific for each review (see reviews for further details).

Reviewing the evidence

Effectiveness reviews

One review of effectiveness was conducted (review 1).

Identifying the evidence

A number of databases were searched in August 2011 for papers relating to walking and cycling published since 1990. See the review for details of the databases searched.

In addition, specific websites were examined and papers from stakeholders and members of the PDG were considered.

Selection criteria

Studies were included in the effectiveness review if they considered the impact of local interventions to raise awareness of, encourage or increase uptake of, walking and cycling for recreational and travel purposes.

Studies were excluded if they covered:

- national policy, fiscal or legislative changes
- local interventions which solely aimed to change the physical environment.

Other reviews

A review of barriers and facilitators (review 2) was conducted.

Identifying the evidence

A number of databases were searched in August 2011 for papers relating to walking and cycling published since 1990. See the review for details of the databases searched.

In addition, specific websites were examined and papers from stakeholders and members of the PDG were considered.

Selection criteria

Studies were included if they focused on interventions identified in the scope and addressed barriers and facilitators to walking and cycling.

Studies were excluded if they focused on:

- National policy, fiscal and legislative changes.
- Local interventions which solely aimed to change the physical environment (such as traffic-calming measures, provision of cycle parking facilities or construction of cycle routes).

Quality appraisal

Included papers were assessed for methodological rigour and quality using the NICE methodology checklist, as set out in the NICE technical manual 'Methods for the development of NICE public

health guidance' (see [appendix E](#)). Each study was graded (++, +, -) to reflect the risk of potential bias arising from its design and execution.

Study quality

++ All or most of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled. Where they have not been fulfilled, the conclusions are very unlikely to alter.

+ Some of the checklist criteria have been fulfilled. Those criteria that have not been fulfilled or not adequately described are unlikely to alter the conclusions.

- Few or no checklist criteria have been fulfilled. The conclusions of the study are likely or very likely to alter.

The evidence was also assessed for its applicability to the areas (populations, settings, interventions) covered by the scope of the guidance. Each evidence statement concludes with a statement of applicability (directly applicable, partially applicable, not applicable).

Summarising the evidence and making evidence statements

The review data was summarised in evidence tables (see full reviews).

The findings from the reviews were synthesised and used as the basis for a number of evidence statements relating to each key question. The evidence statements were prepared by the external contractors/public health collaborating centres (see [appendix A](#)). The statements reflect their judgement of the strength (quality, quantity and consistency) of evidence and its applicability to the populations and settings in the scope.

Cost effectiveness

There was a review of economic evaluations and an economic modelling exercise.

Review of economic evaluations

Studies were identified by searching the NHS Economic Evaluation Database (NHSEED). An additional search was undertaken using an economics study filter.

The search focused on health economic studies that dealt with:

- interventions to increase walking and/or cycling and reported relevant health-related outcomes
- cost-benefit analysis results studies which considered wider outcomes, including travel, congestion and pollution.

Simplified search strategies were also used to search another economic specific database EconLit.

Economic modelling

An economic model was constructed to incorporate data from the reviews of effectiveness and cost effectiveness. The results are reported in: 'Walking and cycling: local measures to promote walking and cycling as forms of travel or recreation: health economic and modelling report'.

How the PDG formulated the recommendations

At its meetings in November 2011 and January, February and March 2012, the Programme Development Group (PDG) considered the evidence, expert reports and cost effectiveness to determine:

- whether there was sufficient evidence (in terms of strength and applicability) to form a judgement
- where relevant, whether (on balance) the evidence demonstrates that the intervention or programme/activity can be effective or is inconclusive
- where relevant, the typical size of effect (where there is one)
- whether the evidence is applicable to the target groups and context covered by the guidance.

The PDG developed draft recommendations through informal consensus, based on the following criteria:

- Strength (type, quality, quantity and consistency) of the evidence.
- The applicability of the evidence to the populations/settings referred to in the scope.
- Effect size and potential impact on the target population's health.
- Impact on inequalities in health between different groups of the population.
- Equality and diversity legislation.

- Ethical issues and social value judgements.
- Cost effectiveness (for the NHS and other public sector organisations).
- Balance of harms and benefits.
- Ease of implementation and any anticipated changes in practice.

The PDG noted that effectiveness can vary according to the context. For instance, geographical factors such as population density in rural or urban areas influence the likelihood of walking or cycling being a viable option for utility travel.

Where evidence was lacking, the PDG also considered whether a recommendation should only be implemented as part of a research programme.

Where possible, recommendations were linked to an evidence statement(s) (see [appendix C](#) for details). Where a recommendation was inferred from the evidence, this was indicated by the reference 'IDE' (inference derived from the evidence).

Appendix C The evidence

Introduction

This appendix lists the evidence statements and links them to the relevant recommendations. (See [appendix B](#) for the key to quality assessments.) Note: the evidence statements in review 1 (see [appendix A](#)) were amended by NICE and endorsed by the Programme Development Group (PDG). This appendix includes the amended evidence statements from review 1.

Appendix C also lists six expert reports and their links to the recommendations and sets out a brief summary of findings from the economic analysis.

The evidence statements are short summaries of evidence, in a review, report or paper (provided by an expert in the topic area). Each statement has a short code indicating which document the evidence has come from. The letter(s) in the code refer to the type of document the statement is from, and the numbers refer to the document number, and the number of the evidence statement in the document.

Evidence statement number R1.ES1 indicates that the linked statement is numbered 1 in the document 'Evidence statements on the effectiveness of local interventions to promote cycling and walking for recreational and travel purposes'. **Evidence statement numbered R2.ES1** indicates that the linked statement is numbered 1 in the document 'Synthesis of evidence relating to barriers and facilitators to implementing interventions that promote cycling and walking, and to carrying out cycling and walking for recreational and travel purposes'. **Evidence statement EM.ES1** indicates that the linked statement is numbered 1 in 'Interventions to promote cycling and walking for recreational and travel purposes: Health economic and modelling report'

The reviews, expert reports and economic analysis are available online. Where a recommendation is not directly taken from the evidence statements, but is inferred from the evidence, this is indicated by IDE (inference derived from the evidence).

Where the PDG has considered other evidence, it is linked to the appropriate recommendation below. It is also listed in the additional evidence section of this appendix.

Recommendation 1: IDE; Additional evidence expert papers 2, 4, 6

Recommendation 2: IDE; Additional evidence expert papers 2, 4, 6

Recommendation 3: Evidence statements R1.ES5, R1.ES6, R1.ES7; Additional evidence expert papers 2, 4, 6

Recommendation 4: Evidence statements R1.ES4, EM.ES4

Recommendation 5: Evidence statements R1.ES3, R1.ES5, R1.ES6, R1.ES7, R1.ES9, R1.ES12, R1.ES19, R2.ES9, R2.ES15, R2.ES18, EM.ES3, EM.ES5; Additional evidence expert papers 2, 3, 4, 5, 6

Recommendation 6: Evidence statements R1.ES1, R1.ES2, R1.ES7, R1.ES13, R1.ES18, R1.ES21, R1.ES22, R2.ES1, R2.ES2, R2.ES3, R2.ES5, R2.ES6, R2.ES10, R2.ES12, R2.ES13, EM.ES1, EM.ES3; Additional evidence expert papers 1, 5

Recommendation 7: Evidence statements R1.ES13, R1.ES14, R1.ES18, R1.ES21, R1.ES22, R2.ES3, R2.ES13, EM.ES2; Additional evidence expert paper 5

Recommendation 8: Evidence statements R1.ES8, R1.ES9, R1.ES10a, R1.ES10b, R1.ES10c, R2.ES15, R2.ES16, EM.ES1; Additional evidence expert paper 1

Recommendation 9: Evidence statements R1.ES11, R1.ES15, R1.ES16, R1.ES17, R1.ES23, R2.ES2, R2.ES4, R2.ES7, R2.ES9, R2.ES18; Additional evidence expert papers 1, 3

Recommendation 10: Evidence statements R1.ES20, R2.ES2, R2.ES4

Evidence statements

Please note that the wording of some evidence statements has been altered slightly from those in the evidence review(s) to make them more consistent with each other and NICE's standard house style.

Evidence statement R1.ES1: Population-level change in mass-media interventions to increase walking

There was inconsistent evidence from two studies^{1,2} (both [+]) on the effectiveness of mass-media interventions (which included paid advertisements [TV, radio, cable, newspapers], billboards/posters, public relations, educational activities and community participation), delivered in the community in increasing population levels of walking for leisure or travel in adults up to 1 year post intervention. One before-and-after (BA)¹ study showed no effect on walking (the reporting of data

in this study was poor) and one cross-sectional (CS)² study showed a small, but positive effect on walking.

One (+) BA study¹ (UK n=3476, 12 months) – 40-second TV advert supported by a telephone helpline – showed no change in the number of days spent walking for at least 30 minutes: mean of 4.26 days in 1995 and 4.13 days in 1996, no significance statistics given.

One (+) CS study² (USA n=297, 5 months) – billboard, newspaper, radio, and poster advertisements – showed that those exposed to the campaign were more likely to walk for at least 10 minutes on more days of the week than the control group (5.2 days versus 4.52 days $t[7]=2.34, p=0.02$).

Population-level evidence on mass-media interventions to increase walking is partially applicable to the UK as one study was conducted in the UK. The differing environment in the USA must be considered in reference to the studies conducted there. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ Wimbush (1998)

² Wray (2005)

Evidence statement R1.ES2: Multi-component community-based interventions to promote walking

There was inconsistent evidence from six studies concerning the effectiveness of multi-component interventions on increasing population levels of walking for leisure or travel in the long term. Four non-randomised control studies (nRCT)^{1,2,3,4} papers (three [+] and one [++]) showed positive effects on walking and two nRCT^{5,6} papers (one [++] and one [+]) indicated that the interventions were not effective in increasing walking.

One (+) nRCT¹ (Australia n=two wards, 2 years) – park modifications, media campaign, walking maps – showed that those in the intervention ward were more likely than those in the control ward to have walked in the 2 weeks prior to follow up (89.3% versus 81.0% respectively; $X^2=11.51, p=0.001$), and within-ward analysis indicated that walking increased from baseline in the intervention ward ($X^2[1]=5.85, p=0.016$), but not in the control ward ($X^2[1]=0.07, p=0.794$). There was no difference in the number reaching adequate levels of physical activity (health department recommendations).

One (++) nRCT⁵ (USA n=1233, 12 months) – individually tailored newsletters, interpersonal activities that stressed social support, community-wide events such as walk-a-thons – showed that rates of 7-day walking for any purpose or for exercise declined slightly in the intervention communities compared with the comparison sites (-1.4 min, p=0.91; and -5.6, p=0.37 respectively).

One (+) nRCT⁶ (USA n=1531, 12 months) as above found that the change in walking was higher in intervention (11.7 minutes) than comparison (6.5 minutes), although not statistically significant. Percentage of respondents who met the recommendation for walking was the same across the intervention and comparison areas: 22.2% and 21.6%, p=0.811.

One (+) nRCT² (USA n=1472, 8 weeks) – paid advertising, public relations events to generate media coverage, public health educational activities at work sites, churches and local organisations – found a 23% increase in walking observations in the intervention community versus a 6% decrease in the comparison community (OR 1.31, 95% CI 1.14–1.50; p<0.0001).

One (++) nRCT³ (USA n=1472, 12 months) – paid advertisements (TV, radio, cable, newspapers), public relations and community participation – found that the least active group in the intervention population were more likely than control population to have increased daily walking (OR=1.72, 95%CI 1.01–2.95).

One (+) nRCT⁴ (USA n=4 communities, 8 weeks) – four interventions: Welch Walks (WW): paid media, media relations, community activities; Broome County (BC) walks (BC): WW components + website; Wheeling walks and West Virginia (WV) walks: BC components + 12-week participatory planning, policy and environmental changes – found that 32% of insufficiently active persons in Wheeling Walks reported meeting the criteria for regular walking immediately post campaign compared to an 18% increase in the comparator community (OR=2.12, 95%CI 1.41–2.24). An increase in reaching regular walking was observed for the most sedentary group in WV walks (p<0.05). The intervention community in Welch walks demonstrated a twofold (OR=2.0 95%CI 1.01–3.97) gain in weekly walking by at least 30 minutes versus the comparison community. Forty one per cent of the BC walks intervention community increased walking by 30 minutes per week compared to 30% in the control (OR=1.56 95%CI 1.07–2.28).

The population-level evidence on multi-component interventions to increase walking is only partially applicable to the UK as studies were conducted in the US and Australia. The differing environment in the USA must be considered in reference to the studies conducted there. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ New South Wales Health Department (2002)

² Reger (2002)

³ Reger-Nash (2005)

⁴ Reger-Nash (2006)

⁵ Brownson (2004)

⁶ Brownson (2005)

Evidence statement R1.ES3: Population-level change in mass-media interventions to increase walking and cycling – Australia 'Walk to work day'

Moderate evidence from one BA study reported in two papers^{1,2} (both [+]) suggests that the mass-media campaign 'Australia walk to work day' (a collaborative annual event in which members of the public are encouraged to walk [or cycle] to work) may be effective in increasing population levels of walking and cycling for travel in adults up to 1 year post intervention. This intervention resulted in positive effects on both walking and cycling.

One(+)¹ study (n=1100, at least 1 year) found that overall, total weekly minutes of moderate physical activity increased by 20 minutes per week (t[1087]=4.76, p<0.005 with, an decrease in the proportion who were inactive -4.0% p<0.005). Significant population increase in total walk time (+16minutes per week t[780]=2.04, p<0.05) in participants who were employed, and in minutes spent walking increased by 21 minutes per week in 'passive commuters' (t[535] = 2.42, p< 0.05).

One (+)² study (n=1100, 2 months) found a significant population-level increase in health enhancing active commuting (3.9%, p=0.01).

The evidence on mass-media interventions to increase walking and cycling is only partially applicable to the UK as studies were conducted in Australia. The differing environment in Australia must be considered in reference to these studies. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ Merom (2005)

² Merom (2008)

Evidence statement R1.ES4: Population-level change in TravelSmart as an intervention to increase walking and cycling

Weak evidence from a series of evaluation reports (ER)^{1,2} (both [+]) suggests that TravelSmart is effective in increasing population levels of walking and cycling for travel in adults (who volunteered to participate) at least over 1 year. TravelSmart uses 'Individualised travel marketing' (ITM) which aims to highlight travel choices 'people may not know they have' by providing locally relevant information and support to households. The evidence is moderate as the reports only present percentage change data and limited methodologies. The intervention targets individuals, but data is reported at population level.

One (+) evaluation report¹ (Australia n=5 regions, various) found household projects routinely showed decreases in car use of 4–15% and rise in use of walking, cycling and public transport.

One (+) evaluation report² (UK n=19 regions, various) found cycling for travel increased by between 14% and 69%, travel by walking increased between 9% and 29%, travel by car decreased at each site by between 10 and 14%, overall sustainable travel trips increased at each site (between 9% and 29%).

The evidence on this intervention to increase walking and cycling is fully applicable to the UK as most of the data reported is from UK sites. However, the differing environment in Australia must be considered in reference to the data collected there. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of data from individual sites.

¹ TravelSmart (2006)

² TravelSmart (2011)

Evidence statement R1.ES5: Population-level change in cycle demonstration towns as interventions to increase cycling

There is moderate evidence indicating that cycling demonstration towns (CDT) (multi-component interventions to increase cycling in six towns) are effective in increasing population levels of cycling for active travel in the general population up to 10 years post intervention. One (-) ER¹, one (+) BA² and one (+) interrupted time series (ITS) study³ showed positive effects on cycling in cycle demonstration towns, although the significance of the effects is not reported. See also R1.ES7 and R1.ES6.

One (+) ITS³ (UK n= six towns, 4 years) found automatic counter data indicated an average increase in cycles counted of 27%. Proportion of pupils cycling to school at least once a week increased from 12% pre-survey to 26% post-survey.

One (-) ER¹ (UK n=6 towns, 10 years) found data from automatic cycle counts indicated a 12% increase overall in usage of cycle routes and up to 60% at specific sites (this report also uses data from other interventions).

One (+) BA² (UK n=1500, 4 years) found the proportion of adult cycling for at least 30 minutes once or more per month increased from 11.8% in 2006 to 15.1% in 2008, an increase of 3.3%-points or 28%.

The evidence on cycle demonstration town is directly applicable as it was conducted in the UK.

¹ Cope (2011)

² Sloman (2009)

³ Cope (2009)

Evidence statement R1.ES6: Population-level change in multi-component interventions to increase cycling

Weak evidence from one (+) nRCT¹ study suggests that multi-component interventions are not effective in increasing population levels of cycling in the general population up to 2 years post intervention, but may result in increased use of bicycle paths and increase in cycling among new/beginner cyclists. See also R1.ES5.

One (+) nRCT¹ (n=909, 2 years) – multi-component community-based intervention including: organised bike rides and events, cycling skills courses, distribution of cycling maps of the area, local press coverage – found significantly greater use of the bicycle paths in the intervention area (28.3%) at follow-up compared with the comparison area (16.2%) $p < 0.001$. No self-reported increase in residents who said they cycled in the last year, however, significantly more 'novice'/beginner riders had cycled in the last year in the intervention area (11.5% versus 1.4% in the comparison area; $p = 0.013$).

The population-level evidence on multi-component interventions to increase cycling is only partially applicable to the UK as the study was conducted in Australia. The differing environment in

Australia must be considered in all studies conducted there. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ Rissel (2010)

Evidence statement R1.ES7: Population-level change in multi-component interventions to increase walking and cycling in adults

Weak evidence from four (two [+], two [-]) of five^{1,2,3,4,5} studies indicates that multi-component interventions delivered in the community are effective in increasing population levels of walking and cycling for travel and/or leisure up to 9 years post-intervention. Evidence from the three BA^{1,2,3}, and one ITS⁴, showed mostly positive effects of community interventions to encourage cycling and walking for travel and/or leisure. One (+) nRCT⁵ indicated that multi-component interventions may reduce a natural decline in walking in women and that among those with a low educational level, cycling may show a small increase. See also R1.ES5 and R1.ES6.

One (+) BA¹ (Belgium n=438, 1 year) – physical activity promoted in the entire city of Ghent. Central theme of '10,000 steps/day', with secondary taglines of 'every step counts') and 'every revolution (of bicycle pedals) counts', pedometers given – found that 47.5% increased average step counts by 896 steps/day or more at 1-year follow-up (no statistical analysis; cycling was 'converted' to step counts).

One (-) BA² (USA n=not reported, 12 months) – multi-component intervention to increase safe physical activity opportunities and encourage walking and biking for short trips – found the number of people seen using active transportation increased from 1028 in 2005 to 1853 in 2006 (63% increase). Walking to school more than doubled at three of four schools engaged for at least 2 years (no other analysis).

One (+) BA³ (UK n=at least 12,000, 4 years) – three 'Sustainable travel towns' which implemented intensive town-wide Smarter Choice Programmes to encourage use of non-car options; bus use, cycling and walking, and less single occupancy cars – found that cycle trips per head grew substantially in all three towns by 26–30%. Comparison towns cycle trips decreased. Walking trips per head grew substantially by 10–13% compared to a national decline in similar towns.

One (-) ITS⁴ (USA n=not reported, 1 year) – Project U-Turn, active transportation (biking, walking, and transit use) through an integrated approach to active living, ran for 5 years, targeting 36,000. City-wide count of people using active transport, showed an increase of 63% over 1 year, limited

study details provided. Also had a major schools component and reported an increase in walking over time, no statistics given.

One (+) nRCT⁵ (Netherlands n=3114, 5 years) – community-based project with 790 lifestyle interventions, 361 were physical activity focused, example: printed guides of walking and cycling routes – found that there was a smaller decline in walking in women in the intervention compared to control region (-0.3 hours/week versus -2.3 hours/week; $p \leq 0.05$); and among those with a low education level there was a significant difference in change in cycling and walking in the intervention versus control region (0.2 hours/week versus -0.3 hours week respectively for cycling and 0.0 hours/week versus -2.2 hours week for walking; both $p \leq 0.05$).

The population-level evidence on multi-component interventions to increase walking and cycling in adults is only partially applicable to the UK as one studies was conducted in the UK. The differing environment in the USA and Europe must be considered in reference to the studies conducted there. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ De Cocker (2009)

² Hendricks (2009)

³ Sloman (2010)

⁴ TenBrink (2009)

⁵ Wendel-Vos (2009)

Evidence statement R1.ES8: Population-level change in multi-component interventions to increase walking and cycling in children

Inconsistent evidence from three studies^{1,2,3} on the effectiveness of school-based multi-component interventions to increase levels of walking and cycling for children. Evidence from two (+) BA studies^{1,2} showed positive effects on school population-level walking in children however evidence from one (++) cluster randomised control study (RCT)³ showed no effect on cycling and walking for school travel.

One (+) BA¹ (UK n=179, 41 months) – school travel plan group developed a walking bus scheme, incentive scheme 'going for gold' included children cycling or scooting to school, also cycle training,

pedestrian training, park and walk scheme, curriculum work, school assemblies and newsletters – found walking to school increased from 30% to 58.8%, cycling to school increased from 0– 4%.

One (++) cluster RCT³ (UK n=21 schools, 12 months) – multi-component school travel plans were developed by a school travel coordinator – found the proportion of children walking or cycling to school was not affected by the intervention.

One (+) BA² (UK n=11 schools, up to approximately 18 months) – 'Safe routes to school'– identified and created safe routes to school, invites community-wide involvement, full-time educator employed to develop curriculum and volunteer team leader in each school – found an increase in number of school trips made by walking (64%) and biking (114%).

The population-level evidence on multi-component interventions to increase walking and cycling in children is applicable to the UK as all studies were conducted in the UK. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ Cairns (2006a)

² Staunton (2003)

³ Rowland (2003)

Evidence statement R1.ES9: School-based change in interventions to increase cycling in children

Weak evidence from one (+) BA study¹ suggests that school-based multi-component interventions may be effective in increasing school population levels of cycling in children. Evidence showed positive effects on walking at the school population level.

The study¹ (UK n=52 schools, 1 year) – 'Bike it': school travel plans, cycling champions in schools to demonstrate to parents and pupils that cycling is a popular choice. Percentage of school pupils cycling to school every day increased from 3% to 10%. Number of pupils cycling at least once a week increased from 10% to 27%. Number of pupils who never cycled decreased from 80% to 55%.

The evidence on multi-component interventions to increase cycling in children is applicable in the UK as the study was carried out in the UK.

¹ Sustrans (2008)

Evidence statement R1.ES10a: Walking school bus interventions to increase walking

Moderate evidence from three (+) BA studies^{1,2,3} and one (+) nRCT⁴ suggests that walking school bus interventions may be effective in increasing levels of walking at the school population level for children up to 30 months post-intervention.

One (+) BA¹ (UK n=309, 14 months) – walking school buses supported by environmental interventions such as street lighting on walking routes – found that participants walking increased from 60% to 68.3%, 25% of that was due to walking buses.

One (+) nRCT² (USA n=3 primary schools, follow up 6 months after baseline) – Walking School Bus (WSB). The school implemented three routes staffed by parent volunteers, and were compared to two nearby schools without a WSB – found that the number of children who walked to school increased from baseline to follow up by 25% (from 19–26%). Comparison schools showed a decrease in the proportion of children walking to school over the same period (no data given).

One (+) BA³ (UK n=64, 18–30 months) – walking buses at five schools. Information sent home to parents to encourage participation – found that there was an overall average increase of 513 metres walked per day. For children that had previously walked to school the WSB resulted in an average increase of only 19 metres/day, for those that previously travelled to school by a mixture of car and walking: average increase of 309 metres/day and for those that previously regularly travelled by car to get to school: average increase of 1549 metres/day (no statistical analyses reported). Participation in the walking buses declined over time.

One (+) nRCT⁴ (USA n=643, 12 months) – WSB run by a part-time coordinator and parent volunteers. The intervention included three routes which ranged from 0.3 to 1.5 miles and took 15–40 minutes. The WSB operated once or twice a week – found that higher proportions of students walked to the intervention (25% +/- 2%) versus the control schools (7% +/- 1%: p<0.001). Significant increase in walking to school in intervention school from 20% (+/-2%) at baseline.

The evidence on school-based walking sessions to increase walking is partially applicable to the UK as two studies were conducted in the UK. The differing environment in the USA must be considered in reference to the studies conducted there. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ Bickerstaff (2000)

² Johnston (2006)

³ Mackett (2005)

⁴ Mendoza (2009)

Evidence statement R1.ES10b: School-based interventions using pedometers to increase walking

Moderate evidence from one (+) cluster RCT¹ and one (+) ITS² suggests that school-based walking interventions which incorporate pedometers may be effective in increasing levels of walking at the school population level for children up to 12 weeks post intervention.

One (+) ITS² (USA n=169, 6 weeks) – pedometers and a 'Fit bits' programme to implement physical activity breaks in the classroom – mean steps increased from 19,149 (95%CI 18,224–20,073) week 1 to 21,248 (95%CI 19,730–22,765) week 6 (p<0.001) found that overall, walking peaked at week 3; and younger students had a stronger response to the intervention.

One (+) cluster RCT¹ (New Zealand n=85, 12 weeks) – physical activity self-monitoring and educative programme – the pedometer (PED) group set daily step targets, and the minutes (MIN) group set daily time based activity goals – found that both intervention groups had significant increase in steps between baseline and week 12 (p<0.001), no significant differences between time points for the control group (p=0.23).

The evidence on school-based walking sessions to increase walking is only partially applicable to the UK as studies were undertaken in the USA and New Zealand. The differing environments in these countries must be considered in reference to the studies conducted there. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ Schofield (2005)

² Cirignano (2010)

Evidence statement R1.ES10c: School-based walking session interventions to increase walking

Inconsistent evidence from five studies (reported in six papers^{1,2,3,4,5,6}) on the effectiveness of school-based walking session interventions in increasing levels of walking at the school population level for children up to 48 months post intervention. Evidence from one (+) nRCT¹ and two (+) BA studies (reported in three papers^{2,3,4}) showed positive effects on school population walking.

However one (+) nRCT⁵ showed no effect on walking and one (+) cluster RCT⁶ had conflicting evidence concerning the intervention effect on walking for school travel.

One (+) BA² (UK n=585, 48 months) – 'Walk on Tuesday and Thursday' (WOTT) encouraged walking to school, included incentives – found that walking to school increased from 53.3% to 58.7% (percentages only reported). Also reported in a second (+) BA³.

One (+) nRCT¹ (UK n=60, 10 weeks) – school-based active travel project. Active travel was integrated into the curriculum, and participants used interactive travel planning resources at home – found that mean distance travelled to school by walking increased significantly more in the intervention (389%) than the control (17%: $t[38]=-4.679$, $p<0.001$, 95% CI -315 to -795 m).

One (+) nRCT⁵ (UK n=13 schools, 4 weeks) – interventions linked to national walk to school week – found no difference between intervention and control schools in walking before or after the intervention.

One (+) cluster RCT⁶ (Australia n=24 schools, 2 months) – health promoting schools policy: classroom activities, pedometer-based walking activities (some schools) development of school travel access guides, parent newsletters, and improving environments with local councils – found that, based on student survey data while both intervention and control groups increased walking by about 4% from baseline, there was no statistically significant difference in mean percentages of change in mode of transport to or from school from baseline to follow-up between the intervention and control groups (no data given). But parent survey data (n=807) indicated a significant increase in walking trips by students in the intervention compared to control schools (28.8% versus 19%, $p=0.05$).

One (+) BA⁴ (Australia n=234, 4 weeks) – classroom activities supported by a weekly newsletter to encourage walking to school – found the percentage of walking trips increased by 3.4% and car trips decreased by 3.4%.

The evidence on school-based walking sessions to increase walking is partially applicable to the UK as three studies were conducted in the UK. The differing environments in Australia must be considered in reference to the studies conducted there. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ McKee (2007)

² Cairns (2006b)

³ Cairns (2006c)

⁴ Zaccari (2003)

⁵ Tapestry (2003)

⁶ Wen (2008)

Evidence statement R1.ES11: Population-level change in workplace-based interventions to increase independent walking and cycling

Weak evidence from one (+) BA study¹ and one (+) ITS² indicates that multi-component interventions delivered in the workplace are effective in increasing population levels of walking and cycling

One (+) ITS¹ (UK n=1850 to 2829 in each of four staff surveys, 9 years) – university transport plan: limiting the number of available parking spaces and permits, improving, installing secure cycle storage, subsidised cycle purchase scheme, car share scheme, free bus travel, and discounted season tickets – found that respondents who usually walked to work increased from 19 to 30% (Z=4.24, p<0.001) and regular cyclists increased from 7.0% to 11.8% (not significant).

One (+) BA² (UK n=2240, 3 years) – Well@Work programmes which consisted of a diverse set of initiatives and actions aimed at promoting and supporting healthy lifestyles – found an increase of 9% in the proportion of employees participating in active travel (walking or cycling), significant increase in employees cycling (4%) or walking (8%) to work.

The population-level evidence on multi-component interventions to increase walking and cycling in adults is applicable to the UK as both studies were conducted in the UK. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ Bull (2008)

² Brockman (2011)

Evidence statement R1.ES12: Individual-level change from participation event to increase cycling

Weak evidence from one study suggests that a mass participation intervention may be effective in increasing individual-level cycling for leisure in adults. Evidence from one (+) BA study¹ showed a positive effect on cycling 1 month after the intervention.

One (+) BA¹ (Australia n=918, 2 months) – mass cycling event – found that participants with low pre-event self-reported cycling ability reported an average of four sessions of cycling in the month before the event and an average of 6.8 sessions in the month after the event ($t=5.25$, $p<0.001$).

The evidence on mass participation event intervention to increase cycling is only partially applicable to the UK as the study was conducted in Australia. The differing environment in Australia must be considered in reference to the studies conducted there. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ Bowles (2006)

Evidence statement R1.ES13: Individual-level change in community delivered targeted health information interventions to increase walking

Moderate evidence from six studies^{1,2,3,4,5,6} suggests that individual, targeted provision of health information (including printed media, telephone support and text messages) delivered in the community are effective in increasing individual levels of walking for leisure or travel in adults up to 1 year post intervention. Five (++) RCTs^{1,2,3,4,5} showed positive effects on walking. One further (++) RCT⁶ also showed positive effects on walking, but was designed to test intervention fidelity.

One (++) RCT¹ (USA n=117, 3 months) – ten weekly emails containing links to a webpage with an interactive information tailoring tool to promote physical activity – found that walking increased at a faster rate in the intervention group than the control group ($\beta=15.04$ [SE=8.38], $p=.035$ [one-tailed]). Intervention group increased walking by 69 minutes/week versus 32 minutes/week in control.

One (++) RCT² (Australia n=399, 10 weeks) – print only (participants were mailed self-help brochures weekly for 3 weeks) or print plus telephone (participants received the same print programme plus three weekly telephone support calls – found that both intervention groups significantly increased time reported walking for exercise per week (from 130 to 147 minutes: $t[1,277] = -3.50$, $p<0.001$; and from 132 to 150 minutes, $t[1,106] = -2.44$, $p=0.016$).

One (++) RCT³ (USA n=197, 6 months) – counselling weekly telephone calls to assess physical activity levels and problem solve how to fit adequate walking activity into their week – found that women in the intervention group reported more time walked each day than the control women (F [1,191]=4.10, p<0.05).

One (++) RCT⁴ (USA n=253, 12 months) – telephone calls with or without counselling, or a control video – found that women in the intervention group showed a linear increase in walking from baseline to 6 months (latent growth analysis to assess the relationship between time and intervention group membership).

One (++) RCT⁵ (UK n=149, 4 weeks) – two theory-based interventions consisting of forming 'implementation intentions' along with text message reminders to achieve walking-related plans or goals – found a differential change across groups in brisk walking or fast walking (F [2,130]= 3.12, p=0.048). Two intervention groups which differed in having a plan reminder or goal reminder had a 45% and 42% increase of at least 2 days a week meeting physical activity daily guidelines respectively, with a 22% increase in the control group.

One (++) RCT⁶ (USA n=50, 12 months) – two interventions consisting of forming 'implementation intentions' along with text message reminders to achieve walking-related plans or goals using social cognitive theory (SCT) – found the greatest increase in walking in interventions that adhered more closely to SCT. High fidelity intervention increased walking by 34.23 minutes a week (+/-81.91) compared to a low fidelity increase of 7.91 minutes a week (+/-47.93, F=3.207 p=0.08).

The evidence on community delivered health information interventions is only partially applicable to the UK as most studies were conducted in Australia or the USA with only one UK study included. The differing environment in Australia and the USA must be considered in reference to the studies conducted there. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

Note: pedometers are a technology which offers an opportunity to present individualised information about walking and so are closely linked to the studies above. Use of pedometers is related to goal setting and monitoring rather than to delivery of information about health benefits or methods to overcome barriers. Studies may use pedometers as one of a number of factors to support increases in walking, in common with other approaches, or may use pedometers solely as a means of measuring change. Pedometer studies are considered below.

¹ Dunton (2008)

² Humpel (2004)

³ Nies (2003)

⁴ Nies (2006)

⁵ Prestwich (2010)

⁶ Rovniak (2005)

Evidence statement R1.ES14: Individual-level change in community-based pedometer interventions to increase walking

Moderate evidence from 12 studies suggests that pedometer-based interventions delivered in the community are effective in adults (or women only) to increase individual levels of walking for leisure or travel, up to 6 months post intervention. Evidence from five (++) RCTs^{1,2,3,4,12} and 2 BA studies^{5,6} (one [+] and one[-]) showed positive effects on walking for leisure and/or travel in adults. This is supported by data from a (-) CS study⁷. However, one (++) RCT⁸ found that short-term improvements in walking 4 weeks post intervention had decreased by 12 months follow-up. Evidence from one (++) RCT⁹ and one (+) BA study¹⁰ showed substantial positive effects on walking for leisure and/or travel in women. An additional (++) RCT¹¹ found that a pedometer-based intervention increased walking in environments with low aesthetics, but not in those with aesthetically pleasing environments.

One (++) RCT⁸ (UK n=61, 52 weeks) – walking programme with goals set in minutes, or steps or using a pedometer – found that the pedometer group increased walking at 4 weeks ($p<0.001$), but decreased between 4 weeks and 12 months. No change in minutes or control groups.

One (++) RCT¹ (UK n=130, 4 weeks) – motivational component had three stages: participants were shown 10 statements about what would make it easier for them to walk more, asked to complete a scale to show how confident they would be about walking in each situation, and discussed with facilitator and walking plan developed; pedometers were worn – found a significant difference in number of minutes spent walking to week 2 between the control group ($M=138.7, SD=93.3$) and the intervention group ($M=22.5, SD=100.3$), from a mean of 19.8 minutes to 32.2 minutes per day (increase of over 60%). Also a significant increase in the number of minutes spent walking per week for intervention group from week 1 to week 4 (mean 287.3, $SD=129.4$ $t[46]=8.12, p<0.001$).

One (+) BA¹⁰ (USA n=36, 6 weeks) – women who were designated as insufficiently active were given brochures and pedometers and were sent emails. Participants received a pedometer, 6 weeks of step log sheets, self-addressed envelopes, and three commercial brochures describing strategies based on transtheoretical model (TTM) for increasing physical activity and the risks and benefits of physical activity – found that participants significantly increased their total walking minutes from baseline (median 55) to post intervention (median 245: Z=4.03, p=0.001) including walking while at work (Z=2.79, p=0.005, d=0.63), for transport (Z=2.86, p=0.004, d=0.60) and during leisure time (Z=3.54, p=0.001, d=0.81).

One (++) RCT² (Japan n=68, 12 weeks) – feedback based on accelerometer daily physical activity, number of daily steps and time spent performing daily moderate physical activity (MPA) which was provided to each participant every 2 weeks. Participants were recommended to accumulate 9000 steps and 30 minutes of MPA per day – found a significant group interaction for steps (f=10.53, p<0.01). The intervention group increased their steps by 16% (7811 +/-3268 to 9046 +/-2620 steps). There was no significant change in the control group.

One (++) RCT³ (Australia n=314, 3 months) – self-help booklet based on social cognitive theory constructs, plus six weekly diaries printed on reply-paid postcards (WP group), plus a pedometer (WPP group). Three incremental stages, starting with short walks (<15 minutes) 3 days a week, typically by incidental walking, gradually increasing the duration of walks to 3 to 4 days, then (continuously) walking briskly for 30 minutes – found that the mean change in total sessions of all-purpose walking/week increased within all groups from baseline, but increased the most within WPP. The control group had a mean increase of 1.2 sessions/week (95% CI: 0.6-1.8, t=3.97, p<0.001); WP: 1.3 sessions/week (0.5–2.0, t=3.32, p<0.001); WPP: 2.3 sessions/week (1.6–3.1, t=6.30, p<0.001). Leisure time walking sessions/week for the previous 3 months also increased within all groups, with both WP (2.0 sessions/week 1.6–2.4, t=9.49, p<0.001) and WPP (2.1 sessions/week 1.7–2.6, t=9.63, p<0.001) showing a significantly larger increase than the control group (0.9 sessions/week 0.6–1.2, t=5.82, p<0.001). There was a similar pattern for leisure time walking minutes/week for the previous 3 months, but only the WPP group (66 minutes/week 50–82, t=8.05, p<0.001) showed a significant increase compared to the control group (34 minutes/week 21–48, t=5.03, p<0.001). The WPP group was also more likely than controls to meet physical activity recommendations. Unclear if the provision of pedometers provides benefit over and above standardised structure walking programme.

One (++) RCT¹¹ (Australia n=369, 3 months) – participants received a single mail-out of a self-help walking programme (WP) or the same programme plus a pedometer (WPP) – found that only the WPP group were significantly more likely than controls to increase total walking time (Exp [b] = 2.53, p<0.01) and to undertake regular walking (OR=5.85, 95% CI 2.60–12.2) where environment

aesthetics (level of greenery and interesting scenery) were perceived to be low; while in aesthetically pleasing environments, the differences in walking measures between intervention and control groups were non-significant.

One (+) BA⁵ (Japan n=56, 4 months) – subjects were given a pedometer and instructed to walk at least 7,500 steps each day. They were also given additional monthly advice on healthy diet and lifestyle provided in a newsletter – found the mean steps per day increased significantly from 9389 to 11846 (p<0.01).

One (++) RCT⁹ (USA n=24, 24 weeks) – given pedometer and initially, all (post-menopausal) women were prescribed a distance of 1.4 km/day above their baseline. Distance was then increased by 0.5 km/day until the desired walking distance was met – found that the intervention group increased their daily walking by 4300 steps (2.9 ± 0.2 km/day); significantly different from baseline and from the control group (both p<0.05).

One (++) RCT⁴ (Australia n=26, 12 weeks) – participants (overweight middle-aged women) in the pedometer group were told to record their pedometer steps on a daily basis for 12 weeks; those in the control group were asked to wear a sealed pedometer for 12 weeks with weekly recording. The pedometer group was also encouraged to reach a daily step goal of 10,000 steps/day – found that the pedometer group daily average number of steps at weeks 6 (8321 ± 884 steps/day) and 12 (9703 ± 921 steps/day) were significantly higher than the baseline daily average (of 6242 ± 541 steps/day: p=0.046 and p=0.035) respectively.

One (-) BA⁶ (USA n=12, 2 weeks) – participants over 65 years of age; site-specific walking route maps, health counselling session with individualised goal-setting and pedometers – average daily pedometer steps increased between baseline (M=3020, SD=1858) and week 1 (M=4314, SD=2627; t[11]= -2.99, p=0.012) and week 2 (M=4246, SD=2331; t[11]=3.42, p=0.006) found that all participants met their daily step goals in week 1 while 50% met their step goals in week 2.

One (-) CS⁷ (Canada n=41, 6 months) – lending pedometers to patrons of five public libraries. The pedometers were loaned for maximum of 9 weeks. Education packages were handed out with the pedometer including: information on pedometer use, physical activity/walking recommendations, maps of local trails, and a walking challenge questionnaire – found that 39.5% indicated they walked more since borrowing the pedometer and 60.5% reported walking about the same.

One (++) RCT¹² (n=79 12 weeks) – the sessions were based on the Transtheoretical Model of exercise behaviour change. Strategies used included enhancing motivation, overcoming barriers and developing appropriate walking plans. Followed a 12-week pedometer-based walking program

– found a significant increase in steps/day for the intervention group between baseline (M=6802, SD=3212) and week 12 (M=9977, SD=4669, $t(38)=-6.06$, $p<0.001$, $d=0.79$, CI 2,115–4236). No significant difference was observed in the control group ($t(39)= -0.50$, $p=0.618$, CI -463–770).

The evidence on community pedometer interventions to increase walking is only partially applicable to the UK. Three studies were conducted in the UK, with the majority in the USA, Australian, Canada, and Japan. The differing environments must be considered in reference to the studies, particularly for those conducted in Japan. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ Darker (2010)

² Koizumi (2009)

³ Merom (2007)

⁴ Pal (2009)

⁵ Miyazaki (2011)

⁶ Rosenberg (2009)

⁷ Ryder (2009)

⁸ Baker (2011)

⁹ Moreau (2001)

¹⁰ Dinger (2005)

¹¹ Merom (2009)

¹² Baker (2008b)

Evidence statement R1.ES15: Individual-level change in workplace pedometer interventions to increase walking

Moderate evidence from 11 studies suggests that pedometer-based interventions delivered in the workplace may be effective in increasing individual levels of walking for leisure or travel, up to 12 months post intervention. Evidence from three (++) RCTs^{2,3,4}, one (+) nRCT⁵, two (+) BA^{6,7} and two (+) ITS studies^{8,9} showed positive effects on walking for leisure and/or travel in the short term (up to 12 weeks). However, one (+) ITS study¹⁰ which used a competition format, saw the initial increase in walking decline over 12 weeks. One (+) nRCT¹¹ found significant increases in walking 12 months after the intervention, while another (++) RCT¹ found that initial increase in walking declined by 52 weeks follow-up.

A (++) RCT¹ (UK n=50, 52 weeks) – walking programme with goals set in steps using an open pedometer for feedback – found that both groups significantly increased step counts from baseline to week 4. Significantly greater number of participants in the intervention (77%) compared with the control (54%) achieved their week 4 goals ($X^2 = 4.752$, $p = 0.03$). There was no significant change in step counts from week 4–16 and a significant decrease from week 16–52.

A (+) ITS¹⁰ (USA n=640 (in 64 teams of 10), 12 weeks) – competition-based employer sponsored physical activity programme using pedometers. Employees formed groups of 10 to undertake the challenge of attaining 10,000 steps per participant per day – found that total weekly steps for all teams combined increased between weeks 1 and 8 ($p < 0.0001$), but declined from weeks 9–12. Increase in total weekly step count between week 1 and 12 not significant. Significant difference in team steps, with post-hoc comparisons indicating significant differences from baseline step counts during weeks 6–8 ($F = 71.15$, $p < 0.001$) but not at the end of the programme.

A (+) nRCT¹¹ (Australia n=205, 12 months) – staff defined as inactive received a 3-month self-help walking programme and pedometer plus four maintenance newsletters over 9 months to assist them to maintain their new activity levels. Control received pedometer and programme but no maintenance – found that both intervention groups significantly increased minutes walking ($p = 0.01$). Change in moderate or vigorous physical activity (MVPA) minutes was significantly higher in the standard plus maintenance group compared with the standard group (118 minutes versus 69 minutes, $P = 0.029$). No significant differences between groups were observed for total physical activity (161 minutes versus 117 minutes, $P = 0.187$).

A (+) ITS⁹ (Canada n=106, 12 weeks) – adoption phase: participants met in workplace-based groups with a facilitator for 30–60 minutes each week during a lunch break. Set individual steps per day goals and self-monitored their progress using a pedometer to record daily accumulated steps

taken. Then adherence measured for 8 weeks – found that steps per day increased (from 7,029 +/- 3,100 [SD] at baseline to a plateau of 10,480 +/- 3,224 steps/day by 3.96 +/- 3.28 weeks of the intervention). Some decreases in activity relative to baseline steps per day, (ranging from -2.4% to -20.6% [12.0% ± 7.6%]).

A (+) nRCT⁵ (Australia n=56, 6 weeks) – the intervention group received a pedometer and step logs. Set a daily step goal based on the previous week's step counts. They received weekly email reminders to wear the pedometer and return that week's log. They also received three commercial brochures. The control group received the intervention but without commercial brochures, intervention emails contained transtheoretical model (TTM)-based strategies – found that daily steps increased significantly (from 6419 ± 2386 during week 1 to 7984 ± 2742 during week 6: p<0.001) for both groups combined. Increases did not differ between groups.

A (+) ITS⁸ (USA n=206, 10 weeks) – each day participants put on pedometers upon arriving at work, prior to getting out of their cars. To increase motivation, participants were encouraged to develop teams, and each team chose a team leader. Weekly motivational emails were sent to participants – found a significant increase in the number of steps per week for weeks 2, 3, 4, 6 and 8 compared to baseline (p=0.001).

A (++) RCT² (UK n=64, 10 weeks) – walking routes which employed prescribed walks around campus with participants asked to complete at least 15 minutes continuous brisk walking every day and 'Walking in task' which encouraged the accumulation of step counts through the working day – found a decrease in steps for the control group (-767 steps/day) and increases in intervention groups for walking routes (+926 steps/day) and walking in tasks (+997 steps/day). (Control versus walking routes p<0.008, control versus walking in tasks p<0.005).

A (++) RCT³ (UK, Australia and Spain n=64, 70 and 80 respectively, 10 weeks) – participants in the first intervention group were directed to increase their step count through brisk, sustained, route-based walking during work breaks. The second intervention group was asked to engage in incidental walking and accumulate step counts during working tasks, both groups were instructed to use pedometers to motivate and regulate walking – found that average step count data decreased in the control group (-391 steps/day t=1.76; p <0.08) and significant increases in both the routes (968 steps/day; t=3.9; p<0.001) and the incidental group (699 steps/day; t=2.5; p<0.014).

A (+) BA⁶ (USA n=290, 12 weeks) – participants wore a pedometer at least 5 days per week for 12 weeks and completed questionnaires assessing demographic information. After baseline (week 1) they were given suggested number of steps to meet recommendations, instructions for goal-setting

and other behaviour-change strategies to gradually increase number of daily steps – found that the average number of steps increased from week 1 to week 6 ($p < 0.001$) and week 12 ($p = 0.002$).

A (++) RCT⁴ (Canada $n = 63$, 1 week) – intervention group pedometer was worn for 1 week for all waking hours to encourage walking. Control (non-pedometer) participants were informed they could wear a pedometer the following week – found that, compared to the no pedometer group, the pedometer group reported more walking ($F = 5.22$, $p = 0.03$).

A (+) BA⁷ (USA $n = 188$, 10 weeks) – participants were provided with pedometers and given personalised daily and weekly step goals over the 10 week intervention. Local strategies available to the participants included walking groups, marked walking circuits and posted walking maps – found a mean increase of 1503 steps (38% increase over baseline). Mean weekly step counts values for all intervention weeks were significantly higher than baseline ($p < 0.01$).

The evidence on workplace pedometer interventions to increase walking is partially applicable to the UK. Three studies were conducted in the UK but most studies were conducted abroad: in USA, Australia, Canada or Spain which may limit the applicability in some cases. The differing environments must be considered in reference to the studies. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ Baker (2008a)

² Gilson (2007)

³ Gilson (2009)

⁴ Spence (2009)

⁵ Dinger (2007)

⁶ Jackson (2008)

⁷ Warren (2010)

⁸ Faghri (2008)

⁹ Chan (2004)

¹⁰ Behrens (2007)

¹¹ Borg (2010)

Evidence statement R1.ES16: Individual-level change in workplace delivered targeted health information interventions to increase walking

Weak evidence from two studies suggests that individual, targeted provision of health information delivered in the workplace (including flyers, email, telephone calls, website postings, and information booths) may be effective in increasing individual levels of walking for leisure or travel in adults up to 24 weeks post intervention. One (+) RCT study¹ showed a positive effect on walking and one (+) BA study² showed a small (borderline significance) positive effect on walking.

A (+) RCT¹ (USA n=135, 24 weeks) – phone calls once a week versus every 3 weeks, and structured versus non-structured feedback – survival curves indicated that there was a significant effect on walking for treated (the combined four treatment conditions) versus the control condition (LD=17.661 p<0.001) and for frequency of prompting (those prompted once a week against every 3 weeks) (LD=17.719, p<0.0001).

A (+) BA² (USA, n=not reported, 2 weeks) – promotional material distributed via flyers, email, website postings, and at bi-weekly information booths – borderline statistically significant increases in walking counts on a route ('Path to health') from baseline midway through the campaign (p=0.069) and following the campaign: (p=0.075 – p values only reported).

The evidence on workplace health information interventions is only partially applicable to the UK as the studies were conducted in the USA. The differing environment in the USA must be considered in reference to the studies conducted there. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ Lombard (1995)

² Napolitano (2006)

Evidence statement R1.ES17: Individual-level change in workplace delivered targeted health information interventions to increase walking and cycling

Moderate evidence from one (++) RCT study¹ suggests that individual, targeted provision of health information (including a booklet of interactive materials, social marketing and individualised

marketing strategies) in the workplace may be effective in increasing individual levels of walking, but not cycling, for travel in adults for up to 6 months post intervention. See also R1.ES4.

A (++) RCT¹ (UK n=295, 6 months) – interactive materials based on the transtheoretical model of behaviour change: choosing routes, maintaining personal safety, shower and safe cycle storage information, and useful contacts – found a significant increase in time per week spent walking to work (mean 125 minutes/week intervention versus 61 minutes/week control), but no difference in average weekly minutes of cycling between cyclists in the intervention group (n=9) and control group (n=9).

The evidence on health information intervention to increase walking and cycling is applicable to the UK as the study was conducted in the UK. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ Mutrie (2002)

Evidence statement R1.ES18: Individual-level change in multi-component interventions to increase walking

Weak evidence from two (++) BA studies^{1,2} suggests that multi-component interventions have a positive effective on increasing individual levels of walking for leisure or travel up to three months post intervention.

A (+) BA¹ (USA n=124, 8 weeks) – multi physical activity and dietary program, pedometers – found post intervention that 46.2% (n=43) met the 10,000 steps/day criteria for high activity (no further statistics). This increased from 11.8% at baseline. Average steps increased from 5969stpes/day to 9757 steps/day

A (+) BA² (USA n=53, 3 months) – sponsored walking groups, improving walking routes, providing information about walking options, and advocating for pedestrian safety – found self reported walking activity increased from 65 to 109 minutes per day: 44.1% increase (95%CI= 28.0-60.2, p=0.001). The proportion that reported being at least moderately active for at least 150 minutes per week increased from 62% to 81% (19.2 % increase 95% CI= 2.2, 36.3 P=018);

The individual level evidence on multi-component interventions to increase walking is only partially applicable to the UK as studies were conducted in the USA. The differing environment in the USA must be considered in reference to the studies conducted there. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ Clarke (2007)

² Krieger (2009)

Evidence statement R1.ES19: Individual-level change from cycle training interventions to increase cycling

Weak evidence from one BA (+) study¹ suggests that cycle training interventions may be effective in increasing individual levels of cycling for active travel amongst those not cycling at baseline, up to 2 months post intervention.

A (+) BA¹ (Aus n=81, 2 months) – practical skills development and supervised on road or cycle path training. Free courses for beginner and intermediate level cyclists were conducted. Promoted through flyers, posters, media releases, articles and TV and newspaper adverts – found non cyclists at baseline reported significant increase ($p < 0.001$) in minutes cycling.

The individual level evidence on multi-component interventions to increase cycling is only partially applicable to the UK as the study was conducted in Australia. The differing environment in Australia must be considered in all studies conducted there. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹Telfer (2006)

Evidence statement R1.ES20: Individual-level change in healthcare delivered multi-component interventions to increase both walking and cycling in adults

Moderate evidence from 1 (++) RCT study¹ concerning the effect of multi-component interventions on increasing individual levels of both walking and cycling for travel and/or leisure up to 18 months post intervention indicated a positive effect on cycling but no effect on walking.

A (++) RCT¹ (Sweden n=120, 18 months) – physician meetings, physical activity prescriptions, group counselling, and bicycle provision; control and intervention groups received pedometers – found the intervention group was more likely to achieve recommended level of cycling than controls (38.7% versus. 8.9%, OR=7.8, 95%CI 4.0-15.0, $p < 0.001$) but there was no difference in compliance with the walking recommendation (45.7 versus. 39.3%, OR 1.2, 95%CI 0.7-2.0, $p = 0.5$). Commuting by car and public transport were reduced by 34% ($P < 0.01$) and 37% ($P < 0.001$), respectively in the whole sample, with no differences between groups.

The individual level evidence on multi-component interventions to increase walking and cycling in adults is only partially applicable to the UK as the study was conducted in the Sweden. The differing environment in Sweden must be considered in reference to this study. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ Hemmingsson

Evidence statement R1ES21: Individual-level change in community-based led walking group interventions to increase walking

Inconsistent evidence from 5 studies^{1,2,3,4,5} on the effects of a community-based led walking group interventions on walking. 1 (++) RCT⁵, 1 (++) clustered RCT², 1 (++) nRCT¹ and 1 BA (+) study³ showed positive effects on walking from community-based walking group interventions; but evidence from a further (++) RCT⁴ showed no difference between groups at 12 months.

A (++) nRCT¹ (UK n=7883, 12 weeks) – 'Get walking, keep walking': Bespoke, led walks and sessions and walking packs aimed at encouraging (predominantly) inactive people, those from deprived communities, black and minority backgrounds, women and younger adults to walk – found 67% of participants increased the amount of exercise they did each week. Walking from 'place to place' increased by 1.1 day/week and walking for leisure by 1 day/week.

A (++) cluster RCT² (USA n=501, 6 months) – leader-led walking group activity or an information-only control group – found significant increase observed in walking activity: $p < 0.05$.

A (+) BA³ (Australia n=169, 6 months) – walk leaders received a prescriptive progressive weekly exercise program guided by social cognitive theory, that contained written information on the appropriate length for the walking program; stretching exercises; and ball skills, such as side twist leader ball, participants aged 65-74 – found baseline mean walking time for recreation was one hour (SD =1.65), increasing to 2.69 hours (SD =2.02) per week by the end of the program.

A (++) RCT⁴ (UK n=260, 12 months) – accompanied walks were provided at several different times in the day and evening, during the week and at weekends, and were led by lay volunteers – found at 12 months, although both walking and control groups increased activity (by 35.7% and 22.6% respectively; 95% CI 0.003% to 25.9%) $p=0.05$, there was no significant difference between them.

A (++) RCT⁵ (USA n=114, 20 weeks) – efficacy based Exercise classes were conducted by trained exercise specialists and employed brisk walking as the aerobic component – found at the end of the 20 week program, subjects in the intervention group walked more miles per week than the control

group: $p < 0.05$. Intervention group subjects also walked more often ($p < 0.01$) and accumulated more minutes ($p < 0.01$) than control

The evidence on community based walking group sessions to increase walking is only partially applicable to the UK as only two studies were conducted in the UK. The differing environment in the USA and Australia must be considered in reference to the studies conducted there. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ CLES (2011)

² Fisher (2004)

³ Jancey (2008)

⁴ Lamb (2002)

⁵ McAuley (1994)

Evidence statement R1.ES22: Individual-level change in interventions to increase independent community-based walking

Weak evidence from 2 (+) BA studies^{1,2} and 1 (++) RCT³ suggests that interventions to increase independent community based walking may be effective in increasing individual walking for leisure, exercise or travel up to 13 weeks post intervention in adults or the whole community.

A (+) BA¹ (Canada $n=39$, 8 weeks) – 'mall walking programme', participants provided with pedometers. Participants self-selected the pace, time, and frequency of walking. Encouraged to attend as often as possible between 8am and 10am Monday to Friday – found average daily mall walk steps increased from 5055 (SD 1374) to 5969 (SD 1543): $p=0.002$, and average daily mall walk time increased from 42.9 (SD 10.6) min to 50.4 (SD 13.5) min: $p=0.002$.

A (+) RCT³ (Aus $n=88$, 13 weeks) – participants: postnatal women; information, goal setting consultations, activity and self-monitoring daily planner, tailored SMS, nominated social support person – found frequency of walking for exercise (days/week) increased over time in the intervention compared to control group (time \times group interaction effect $F(2,85)=5.38$, $p=0.023$, medium effect size partial $\eta^2=0.06$); while change in duration of walking did not show a significant time \times group interaction effect ($p=0.081$; effect size partial $\eta^2=0.05$), there was a significant group

effect with increases in walking duration in the intervention compared to control ($p=0.005$; medium to large effect size partial $\eta^2=0.09$).

A (+) BA² (USA $n=16$, 12 weeks) – walking intervention facilitated by community health workers. Weekly sessions encouraged participants to accumulate at least 30 min of moderate intensity walking on most/all days of the week – found that exposure to the programme resulted in significant increase in walking: 915.8 metabolic equivalent min/week, $p=0.002$.

The evidence on interventions to increase independent community based walking may not be applicable to the UK as studies were conducted in the USA and Canada. The differing environment in the USA must be considered in reference to the studies conducted there. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ Culos-Reed (2008)

² Mier (2011)

³ Fjeldsoe (2010)

Evidence statement R1.ES23: Individual-level change in workplace-based interventions to increase independent walking

Inconsistent evidence from 2 (++) RCT studies^{1,2} concerning workplace walking session interventions (conducted in universities) effectiveness in increasing individual levels of walking for staff and/or student participants up to 12 months post intervention. Evidence from 1 RCT¹ showed positive effects on walking while one RCT² showed no effect on walking.

A (++) RCT¹ (USA $n=32$, 32 weeks) – sedentary adults; walking prescription: 3 brisk walking conditions: 30 continuous minutes, 3 10-minute bouts, or 30 minutes made up of any combination of bouts each at least 5 minutes long; 1 hour information and modelling session followed by weekly meetings with an activity counsellor for 15 weeks. Behavioural methods used to promote adherence: goal setting and mastery, self-management techniques, weekly personal feedback, problem solving, behavioural contracting participants paid \$50, refunded on successful completion – found self-reported walking for all intervention groups significantly increased throughout the program: $F(6, 186)= 26.16$; $p<0.001$.

A (++) RCT² (USA $n=26$, 6 weeks) – two 8-week walking for fitness classes – found that neither group increased walking time or number of steps significantly over time.

The evidence on workplace (university) based walking sessions to increase walking is only partially applicable to the UK as the studies were conducted in the USA. The differing environments must be considered in reference to the studies conducted in the US. Individual local contexts as well as the setting will also impact on the applicability of individual studies.

¹ Coleman (1999)

² Eastep (2004)

Evidence statement R2.ES1: Providers' and researchers' views of barriers and facilitators to planning and delivering interventions to increase walking

Moderate evidence from four studies suggests that facilitators to planning and delivering interventions included organisational support and sufficient planning time. It may be beneficial to include volunteer leaders at the planning stage.

Having previous experience in marketing and a conceptual framework facilitated recruitment efforts. Personal satisfaction, social interaction and a positive rapport with group members were motivational effects of leading walking groups.

Barriers to planning and delivery included lack of inter-organisational collaboration. This was facilitated by introducing staff in different organisations to each other and being clear about shared goals. Employing an individual to co-ordinate between organisations was a facilitator to implementation.

De-motivators to being involved in organising and monitoring groups included researchers' perceived workload, efforts required for effective recruitment, lack of support from and feelings of responsibility for group members.

A (+) UK evaluation¹ suggested that sufficient planning time is required for successful implementation of a family-based intervention. Involvement of proposed walking leads at the planning stage was suggested as a way of increasing their engagement with the programme.

A US (+) pilot evaluation² reported that walking group policy makers supported the walking group by promoting the intervention and assisting with recruitment. Administrative support was also supplied, and events were organised.

A (+) study³ that included interviews from the UK reported that the process of recruiting members to a walking group was draining on time and resources for the organisers, and some volunteers lacked skills in recruitment. Having experience in marketing and a conceptual framework around recruitment was a facilitator to recruiting new members. However, word of mouth was regarded as the most effective recruitment strategy.

A pilot evaluation² reported that running the walking group provided a sense of personal satisfaction for organisers as well as an opportunity for personal development and health promotion. Interaction with club members was a motivator for organisers.

Collaboration with other organisations was an issue in two studies^{1,2}, due to a focus on their own organisation and lack of communication. In one study² this meant that walking routes were not shared and events were less well attended. Club directors could also feel isolated. In the other study¹, collaboration between a walking association and a family support group was improved through members getting to know each other and being clear that goals were to be shared, and that interventions would run alongside each other rather than new initiatives replacing existing ones. Coordination by one designated officer also facilitated implementation.

One study² reported that group organisers expressed views about their burden of responsibility for the wellbeing and safety of members, especially if leadership was not shared. Recruitment and maintenance of membership numbers were regarded as a burden, and strategies were developed by the club to limit drop-out. Having to walk at a slow pace with other members was a de-motivator.

One UK (+) interview study⁴ found that carrying out routine physiological measurements in a pedometer study was regarded as a burden for researchers.

Findings from these studies have partial applicability to other walking groups. The organisation of walking interventions will differ across countries, regions and groups. Groups may have different goals, and recruit specific populations. There is no reason to believe that the barriers and facilitators described are not applicable to other similar interventions.

¹ Milton et al. (2011)

² Nguyen et al. (2005)

³ Matthews et al. (undated)

⁴ Shaw et al. (2011)

Evidence statement R2.ES2 Participants' views about motivators and barriers to participating in interventions to increase walking

Moderate evidence from five studies suggests that participating in a walking intervention motivated people to walk through the presence of role models, organised routes, and the support of being part of a group.

Families were motivated by the opportunity for children to participate in an activity that was free of charge. For others, the opportunity to improve health and enjoy fresh air and nature were motivational.

Barriers to motivation include conflicts between walking activities and work / school schedules, and cultural lack of acceptance in regard to work-based activity.

One US (+) pilot evaluation¹ reported that having access to a role model and to organised walk routes were motivators to attendance. For women, having the support and security of a group was a motivator (one [++] focus groups, US)². For families, the opportunity for children to participate in activities with the family, free of charge, and outside of nursery hours were incentives (one [+] evaluation, UK)³. For adults, a sense of routine and structure was valued for those who were not in employment (one [+] focus groups, UK)⁴.

Participants in one (+) UK focus groups study⁴ were motivated by the opportunity to improve their health and be out in the fresh air and natural environment.

However, barriers to participation included conflicting schedules with school attendance³ or workplace responsibilities (one [+] interviews, UK)⁵. In a workplace setting, they also reported that increasing walking time required acceptance from colleagues, and this varied depending on the status of the employee within the organisation.

Applicability: The findings from these studies are applicable to other walking groups. The acceptability of walking interventions will depend upon specific walking group characteristics, settings and aims. There is no reason to believe that the barriers and facilitators reported are not applicable to interventions implemented in the UK.

¹Nguyen et al. (2005)

²Burroughs et al. (2006)

³Milton et al. (2011)

⁴Hynds and Allibone (2009)

⁵Gilson et al. (2008)

Evidence statement R2.ES3 Participants' views about maintaining participation in interventions to increase walking

Moderate evidence from ten studies provided evidence regarding factors associated with maintenance of participation.

Social interaction and social support were major factors in maintaining participation. Maintenance was also related to the extent to which activities could be integrated into daily life.

Monitoring activity, providing people remembered to self-monitor, could increase motivation, though it could also introduce unwanted competition between members.

Other motivators included variation in walking routes, and incentives such as gifts.

Barriers to maintenance included the difficulty of integrating walking and attendance at clubs into daily routines. Boredom, dissatisfaction with elements of the club, and incongruent aims were reported factors associated with discontinued membership.

The social factor associated with walking in groups was supported by six studies^{1,2,3,4,5,6}. The social factor was particularly strong for women and older adults. One (+) UK focus group study⁵ reported a strong bond and sense of loyalty to the group that facilitated attendance. For men, the social factor was not so important with males tending to prefer walking alone (one [++] focus groups, US)⁷.

Support was also important; in one intervention⁷, feedback from providers was welcome, though e-mail was the preferred mode.

A US (+) RCT² highlighted the importance of family and friends in supporting the maintenance of walking behaviours. Walking also had a positive effect on interactions with family members.

A UK (+) interview study⁸ reported that walking to deliver messages at work instead of e-mailing created a greater sense of community.

An important aspect of walking was the ability to integrate interventions into daily life. The ability to turn up without booking was a positive factor for some, and a sense of routine and structure was valued for those who were not in employment (one [+] focus groups, UK)⁵.

However, one study¹ reported that women in particular found difficulty integrating extra walking into daily routines. Life changes, coinciding schedules and other commitments were also a barrier^{2,4,5,9}. Wearing female-oriented clothing such as high heels was a barrier to walking while at work^{2,8,9}. For African-American women, it was difficult to focus on self-based activities⁴.

Monitoring activities was reported as a motivator. Two studies^{1,10} reported that pedometer use and the process of self-monitoring increased walking behaviours. One⁵ reported that step counting gave a sense of achievement.

However, a US observation and interviews (+) study⁶ found that in older adults (mainly female), pedometer use and fitness objectives conflicted with the moral economy (shared values regarding social interaction) of the walking group, which was based on sociability rather than competition. In addition, people often forget to complete logs, or to use their pedometer¹⁰.

Other incentives included rewards and gifts⁷.

One study⁹ reported that the atmosphere of the club, mismatch between aims of the club and aims of the participant, as well as the pace required to walk could be barriers to participation in walking interventions. Another¹ also added that boredom could dissuade attendance, and for African-American women, one study reported lack of objectives as potential barriers⁴.

Applicability: The findings from these studies are applicable to other walking groups. The motivation to maintain walking behaviour within an intervention will depend upon individual circumstances and requirements as well as the characteristics and aims of the club. There is no reason to believe that the barriers and facilitators reported are not applicable in the UK.

¹Shaw et al. (2011)

²Nies and Motyka (2006)

³Milton et al. (2011)

⁴Dunn (2008)

⁵ Hynds and Allibone (2009)

⁶ Copleton (2009)

⁷ Burroughs et al. (2006)

⁸ Gilson et al. (2008)

⁹ Nguyen et al. (2005)

¹⁰ Zoellner et al. (2009)

Evidence statement R2.ES4: Participants' views of the benefits of participating in a walking intervention

Moderate evidence from eight studies highlighted the reported benefits of walking as part of a walking intervention.

Perceived benefits to walking were reported to facilitate motivation and hence walking behaviour (one [+] focus groups, US)¹. Such benefits could be emphasised when encouraging participation in interventions.

Reported benefits included physical and psychological benefits, adding variety to the day and getting out of the house or office. Walking could provide a sense of peace and solitude, and was also fun, providing an opportunity to be out in fresh air and see the sights.

Reported physical benefits were feeling healthy¹, (one [++] focus groups, US)², and fit (one [+] pilot evaluation, US)³, (one [+] RCT, US)⁴, increased energy⁴, (one [+] interview studies, UK)⁵, lower blood pressure⁴, weight loss^{1,4} and improved body shape¹.

Psychological benefits included enhanced mood^{4,5}, stress reduction^{1,2,4}, mental and emotional satisfaction⁴, feeling rejuvenated⁴, and having meditative or spiritual feelings¹. Feeling tired at the end of a walk was associated with a sense of achievement (one [+] focus groups, UK)⁶.

In a workplace intervention, walking was reported to add variety to the day and improved output at work⁵. For a group of previously sedentary adults, walking became fun, and was a chance to get out of the house³. Walking for one group of mid-age women allowed them time to think, time out of the office, time with the family and fresh air⁴.

Benefits reported from two (+) pedometer-based interventions included seeing the sights (interviews, UK)⁷, and socialising with members of the group (observation and interviews, US)⁸.

Applicability: The findings from these studies are applicable to other walking groups. Benefits of walking may differ by setting, though there is no reason to believe that the benefits reported are not applicable in those settings within the UK.

¹Dunn (2008)

²Burroughs et al. (2006)

³Nguyen (2005)

⁴Nies and Motyka (2006)

⁵Gilson et al. (2008)

⁶Hynds and Allibone (2009)

⁷Shaw (2011)

⁸Copleton (2009)

Evidence statement R2.ES5: Walking intervention participant's views of perceived barriers to walking

Moderate evidence from seven studies highlighted perceived barriers to walking for participants of walking interventions. These included physical and psychological limitations, environmental barriers, and poor weather conditions.

Physical barriers to continuing with the walking programme included health problems such as arthritis (one [+] focus groups, US)¹, and physical limitations such as illness and injuries (one [+] RCT,US)². Tiredness and depression also prevented some women from continuing attendance¹.

Poor weather conditions or hot weather were reported disincentives to walking^{1,2} (one [+] interviews,UK³; one [+] pilot evaluation, US⁴;one [+] focus groups, US⁵;one [+] focus groups, UK⁶). One study reported costs of participation as a barrier⁴.

Lack of access to the walking route, and obstacles such as poorly maintained stiles along the walking route were also reported barriers⁶.

Applicability: The findings from these studies are applicable to other walking groups. The barriers to participation in walking interventions might depend upon individual circumstances, such as age and physical fitness as well as seasonal weather conditions. Weather conditions may be better, or more extreme, in the US, Canada and Australia than in the UK, though there is no reason to believe that the barriers reported are not applicable in the UK.

¹ Dunn (2008)

² Nies and Motyka (2006)

³ Shaw (2011)

⁴ Nguyen et al. (2005)

⁵ Burroughs et al. (2006)

⁶ Hynds and Allibone (2009)

Evidence statement R2.ES6: Suggested strategies to overcoming barriers to maintaining walking in a walking intervention

Moderate evidence from two studies highlighted reported strategies to overcome perceived barriers to participating in walking interventions. These included making time, and integrating walking into daily life as well as thinking positively.

A (+) US RCT¹ reported strategies including scheduling time to walk, problem-solving and using motivators such as positive thinking and focusing on the long-term benefits. Goals were more achievable if walking was made a priority and was fitted into daily life as much as possible. Similarly, a (+) US study² (focus groups) reported that for African-American women, weaving walking into family life was a strategy that allowed themselves and the family to participate.

Applicability: The findings from these studies are applicable to other walking groups. The ability to implement strategies to overcome barriers to participation in walking interventions will depend upon individual circumstances.

¹ Nies and Motyka (2006)

² Dunn (2008)

Evidence statement R2. ES7: Providers' views about effective intervention components that motivate walking and cycling

Moderate evidence from one study suggests that workplace efforts to encourage walking and cycling are most successful where they attend to cultural attitude, access, security and available facilities. Incentives and provision of equipment are also motivating.

The (+) study (survey and interviews, UK)¹ provides evidence that, across 20 workplace initiatives, walking and cycling are increased where good onsite and offsite access is available, along with provision of showers, drying and changing facilities. Organised walks at lunchtime and cycling groups were an incentive.

Organisational attitude was important, with some workplaces marketing the benefits of walking to staff. Motivators such as complementary products or financial incentives were used.

For cycling, the ability to borrow equipment or receive discounts on cycling equipment was important, as was having secure parking for cycles.

Applicability: Findings from this study were taken from a range of workplace initiatives within the UK and so are applicable in UK workplace settings.

¹ Cairns et al. (2010)

Evidence statement R2.ES9: Participants' views about taking part in interventions to increase cycling

Moderate evidence from one exploratory study and one evaluation showed that facilitators to a led cycling intervention were a feeling of safety and acceptance that was obtained from cycling in a group.

Provision of acceptable equipment and the need not to wear a helmet was a facilitator for boys.

In a workplace-based cycling intervention, facilitators included the provision of storage and changing facilities and raised awareness about benefits.

The (++) exploratory study (focus groups, UK)¹ elicited community members' views about use of a cycle trail and a proposed intervention that included led cycling groups.

The main facilitator to using the trail for led cycle groups was the protection of riding together in a group. For young women, the image of cycling as 'uncool' was an issue, but this barrier would be lessened if they were cycling with friends.

Image was also an issue for boys, whose participation would be facilitated by the provision of the 'right' bike, and not having to wear a cycling helmet.

The (+) UK evaluation study² (found that the main influences on increase in cycling following an intervention were the provision of workplace cycling facilities, a house or job move that made cycling more attractive, and heightened awareness of the importance of physical activity for health. Welcomed and best used measures were secure cycle parking, showering and changing facilities, and cycle purchase loans.

Applicability: The findings from these UK-based studies are applicable to other potential cycling interventions. The motivation to participate in cycling interventions might depend upon individual circumstances, as well as local geography and usage of the proposed site. Some areas of the UK may be more or less attractive as cycling venues than the one described here. Workplaces will also differ in provision of facilities, and interventions may be affected by factors outside the control of organisers, such as weather conditions.

¹ Cavill and Watkins (2007)

² Cleary et al. (2000)

Evidence statement R2.ES10: Young people's views about walking for travel or leisure (not related to an intervention)

Moderate evidence from one interview study and one survey study suggests that walking for leisure was facilitated by walking as a social event or as part of a challenge.

Barriers to walking for travel or leisure for young people are mainly related to lack of time. In addition, having a lot to carry and wearing shoes that were not comfortable were disincentives. Young people report busy lives as a barrier to walking for transport. For men, walking was not sufficiently vigorous to be considered 'exercise'.

The (++) UK interview study¹ reported that young people, and especially young men, did not regard walking as vigorous enough to provide exercise. Walking for transport required too much time out of a busy day. Walking for leisure was only acceptable if it included some form of teamwork or challenge. For those that did walk for transport, listening to music was a facilitator as it drowned out noise from traffic and construction sites.

The (+) US survey study² reported that undergraduates found that lack of time, having a lot to carry, and wearing shoes that were uncomfortable were the most highly rated barriers.

Applicability: The findings from these studies are applicable to young people in the UK and US. Evidence reflects aspects of daily life that alter with changes through the life course. Participants in this study are constricted by timescales associated with the working day that might not apply to some other populations. There are also specific gender differences in perceptions of walking for fitness.

¹ Darker et al. (2007)

² Dunton et al. (2006)

Evidence statement R2.ES12: Older people's views about walking for travel or leisure (not related to an intervention)

Moderate evidence from six studies suggests that the main facilitator to walking for travel or leisure in older adults was social interaction.

Barriers to walking for travel or leisure for older adults are related to limited mobility and fears for safety. These factors were mediated by the external environment, with fears of falling or of swift traffic being commonly voiced.

Walking indoors was a relatively safe and comfortable alternative if designed appropriately. Walking indoors also incorporated a social aspect to walking.

Older adults reported factors that impacted on safety as the main barriers. When walking outside, narrow pavements and obstacles such as parked cars on pavements, and construction sites were barriers to access (one [-] interviews, UK)¹. Traffic was also an issue, with cycle tracks and bus lanes creating hazards. Suggested improvements were wider pavements and better provision for cyclists.

In addition, two focus group studies from Canada (one [++]² and one [+]³) reported that fear of falling was a barrier to older adults, particularly in icy weather. Uneven pavements and car parks that are not designed for pedestrians were hazards. Older adults often require more time to cross roads, and it was reported that fast roads and poor visibility at crossroads were barriers to outdoor walking.

Suggestions for improving the walking experience for this group were access to toilets and seating, as well as adequate access to local amenities and pedestrianised shopping areas. Making sure that pavements were smooth and clear of snow and ice was also a factor².

A (+) UK survey⁴ reported that obstructions to mobility included crossings without dropped kerbs, narrow footpaths, and a dropped curb with a steep angle. The authors report that 19% of people aged >80 years could not reach key places if they need to pass through a gap of 1000 mm.

Two studies assessed indoor walking for older adults. A (++) observations and interviews study from the UK⁵ reported on mall walking that not only contributed to improved physical activity, but also provided a social network and a meaningful work replacement following retirement. Routines were adapted and events were organised in a relatively safe environment compared to outdoors.

For older adults in assisted living facilities, a (++) focus group study from the US⁶ reported similar facilitators in corridor walking, such as relative safety of being indoors, and the social incentive of meeting people in the corridors. Handrails were valued, as well as appropriate flooring, seating in corridors and adequate toilet arrangements. Public rooms needed to be thoughtfully placed to allow residents optimum access.

Reported barriers to this activity⁶ were the lack of varied things to see compared with outside. Facilities with outdoor walking areas provided an opportunity to overcome this barrier providing the walking surfaces were adequate.

Applicability: The findings from these studies are applicable to older adults in the UK and North America. The evidence reflected safety concerns that alter with changes through the life course such as ageing. Participants in this study were constricted by limited mobility that might not apply to some other populations. Social interaction is important for this population to prevent social exclusion.

¹ Newton et al. (undated)

² Lockett (2005)

³ Ripat et al. (2010)

⁴ Mackett et al. (2001)

⁵ Duncan et al. (1995)

⁶ Lu et al. (2011)

Evidence statement R2.ES13: Views of people from deprived areas about walking for travel or leisure (not related to an intervention)

Moderate evidence from two studies suggests that the main barriers to walking for travel or leisure in people from deprived areas were safety, lack of time and lack of motivation.

Women were constricted by perceived dangers from the external environment, family commitments, lack of motivation and lack of walking companions.

There was evidence that participants were either out of the habit of walking, or that walking was enforced due to a lack of options.

For men, walking was not sufficiently vigorous to be considered 'exercise'.

Two studies assessed the views of populations from deprived groups. One (+) UK interview study¹ reported that males did not associate walking with exercise as it is not strenuous enough. Women more often preferred to walk with someone else rather than alone, so walking with a friend, or children was an incentive. Walking with a dog was a motivator for men or women.

Though health benefits such as weight management and reducing aggression or boredom were recognised by those that did maintain walking activities, there was a habit of not walking that needed to be broken. Lack of motivation, other commitments, lack of time and bad weather were all barriers to continuing walking¹.

A (+) UK interview study² examined the experiences of women without access to a car and reported feelings of social exclusion due to having to walk in neglected areas and often with very young children, who were tired. Women often had to walk long distances to shops, and feared for their children's safety at busy roads.

Applicability: The findings from these studies are applicable to people living in deprived areas in the UK. The evidence reflected safety concerns associated with perceived environmental dangers. Participants in this study were constricted by reduced options that might not apply to some other populations. Social interaction is important for this population to increase the feeling of safety, particularly for women. There were also specific gender differences in perceptions of walking for fitness.

¹ Ipsos/MORI (unpublished report)

² Bostock (2001)

Evidence statement R2.ES15: Views about barriers and facilitators to active travel to school (walking and/or cycling for transport)

Moderate evidence from nine studies suggested that the main facilitators to active travel included the social aspect of walking and spending time with friends, or having quality time with parents.

Barriers for schoolchildren contemplating active travel to and from school were parental and children's lack of time and dangers from traffic and from intimidation or attack by other people. The missed opportunity by schools to develop children's existing awareness, and displaying conflicting messages was also a barrier. Peer pressure was an important factor for this age group in terms of choices.

Other reported barriers included distance, carrying heavy bags, and poor weather conditions. Parental habits and commitments as well as fears for their children's safety were also influential on decisions about walking.

Barriers to cycling for children included a lack of cycle lanes and a lack of facilities to store bicycles.

The perceived image of cycling, and a dislike of wearing cycling helmets was also reported to be a barrier.

Walking or cycling

Three studies (one [++] focus groups, UK¹; one [++] focus groups, US²; and one [+] survey and interviews, UK³) identified recognition in parents and children that walking or cycling would be beneficial to health and could increase a child's confidence and sense of independence around roads. In addition, two studies¹, (one [+] focus groups, UK)⁴ reported that walking with a parent

provided valuable time together. Spending time with friends was an important social aspect for older children¹.

However, barriers to walking or cycling included lack of time^{1,2,3,4}; parents often needed to accompany children to different schools and arrive at their place of work in time. Children and parents would need to get out of bed much earlier in the morning in order to fit in walking. Laziness was reported as a reason for not using active travel¹.

Peer pressure and the trend toward car ownership was a factor, particularly for cycling, which for some groups was socially unacceptable. Schools may also miss opportunities to develop children's knowledge about sustainable transport choices³.

A US (+) survey⁵ and an Australian (+) survey⁶ found that among children that did not walk to school, distance was the most commonly reported barrier, followed by traffic danger. Parents restricted their children to playing close to home on their bicycles (one [+] focus groups, UK)⁷.

Children having to carry heavy bags of books and equipment was a barrier to both walking and cycling^{1,3,4}, as were bad weather, dark mornings^{1,2,4} and hilly terrain⁴.

For older children who travel without an adult, there were fears for personal safety^{1,2}, of accidents and abductions², of strangers and bullies^{4,7} and of busy traffic^{1,2,4,7}. Environmental factors such as poor lighting, secluded areas or woodland on the journey exacerbated these fears^{1,2,4,7}.

A (+) survey from Australia⁸ showed that parental perceptions were a factor in decisions to walk. These included parents own physical activity habits, parental working schedules, and parental concerns about safety. Having to attend out-of-school activities was also a factor.

Cycling

Cycling was associated with particular barriers, such as lack of cycle lanes, and general support for cycling at school such as provision to store bicycles and helmets^{1,4}. Fear of having a bicycle stolen was a disincentive^{1,7}.

The image that cycling conveyed was an issue for some. For teenage girls, cycling was perceived as childish⁴. For children that did cycle, the 'coolest' bike was required⁴, and cycling helmets were regarded as 'uncool'¹ (one [+] action research, Australia⁹), lacking in style and fit, with consequences such as negative comments from others⁹. In addition, cycling impacted on personal appearance; for example, cycling helmets dishevelled one's hair¹.

Applicability: The findings from these studies are partially applicable as the findings are specific to schoolchildren. While some barriers and facilitators to active travel are applicable to any population, schoolchildren and their parents face particular issues pertaining to safety and practicalities for children. Some barriers differ by age group and gender.

¹ Kirby (2008)

² Ahlport et al. (2008)

³ Halden Consultancy (2003)

⁴ Granville et al. (2002)

⁵ Beck et al. (2008)

⁶ Yeung et al. (2008)

⁷ Davis and Jones (1996) and Davis (2001)

⁸ Ziviani et al. (2004)

⁹ Stevenson and Lennie (1992)

Evidence statement R2.ES16: Suggestions for strategies to encourage active travel to school (walking and/or cycling for transport)

Moderate evidence from five studies provided suggestions for strategies that might encourage safe active travel in schoolchildren.

Suggested strategies included environmental improvements to increase safety, changing attitudes to car use, school-based campaigns to assist in cycling skills and awareness, and personal-level encouragement by provision of storage facilities and better design of cycling helmets.

Suggested strategies that may overcome some of the reported barriers included employing crossing patrols near to schools (one [++] focus groups, US¹), escort schemes, traffic calming schemes, and pedestrian training (one [+] focus groups, UK²).

A (+) survey from the UK³ reported that modifying attitudes to car-centredness would be a useful policy; more so than promoting general environmental awareness.

To reduce cycling accidents, improved cycle paths and compulsory helmet wearing was suggested in one (+) study (action research, Australia)⁴.

Other suggestions included schools organising walking and cycling groups, providing training in cycling proficiency, and support such as storage for wet clothes and bicycles (one [++] focus groups, UK⁵)^{2,4}.

Improved design of cycling helmets might impact on their use and on cycling behaviour by children⁴.

Applicability: The findings from these studies are partially applicable as the findings are specific to schoolchildren. While some suggestions to encourage active travel are applicable to any population, schoolchildren and their parents face particular issues pertaining to safety and practicalities for this age group.

¹ Ahlport et al. (2008)

² Granville et al. (2002)

³ Black et al. (2001)

⁴ Stevenson and Lennie (1992)

⁵ Kirby (2008)

Evidence statement R2.ES18: Adult views about cycling for transport

Moderate evidence from five studies was available regarding barriers and facilitators to adult cycling for transport.

Benefits of cycling for transport were reported motivators, such as the ability to travel relatively quickly through traffic, the feeling of autonomy and freedom, and benefits for health and the environment. Cycling rather than driving could be encouraged by workplace initiatives.

Barriers to cycling were reported such as obstacles in the road, pollution and poor weather. Carrying bags and changes of clothing required after getting wet were also reported disincentives.

Cycling for transport requires negotiating space on the road; major barriers were traffic volume, inconsiderate driving and lack of adequate cycling tracks.

Some cycling behaviours were perceived as inappropriate by some other road users, giving cyclists a poor image and limited relationship with drivers.

Cycling was perceived as male, white and middle class. There was evidence that resistance to this image from female cyclists includes adopting and disseminating ideas for a feminine cycling image.

Reported benefits from commuting by bicycle included swiftness of travel through busy traffic, not having to rely on public transport, and improved fitness (for men) or body shape (for women). An additional factor was reassurance that the environment is being protected (one [+] interviews, UK¹).

Parents were reported to drive less to work when cycling was encouraged by their workplace (one [+] survey, Australia²).

However, cyclists in the city report a number of obstacles that can interrupt the journey, such as poor road surfaces, manhole covers, glass, rough gutters, hilly terrain, parked cars and buses. In addition, pollution and bad weather can be a disincentive (one [++] interviews, UK³; one [+] survey and interviews, UK⁴). A (+) survey from Australia⁵ reported that women cyclists preferred off-road paths compared to roads with no facilities, and off-road paths compared to on-road lanes.

Commuting by cycle often involved carrying extra clothes to work and extra time at work to get changed from cycling outfits to work attire, including re-styling hair after wearing a helmet¹. Lack of available facilities was a barrier to cycling, as were saddle-soreness and tiredness⁴.

Cycling on the road also requires negotiation with other road users. Cyclists reported fears of traffic and of accidents¹ which meant having to be constantly alert for other traffic in order not to collide, and feeling vulnerable when crossing traffic to turn right³.

Cyclists reported feeling segregated and invisible on the road³. In areas where cycling is traditionally less prominent, there was a 'strangeness' about cycling, which was internalised by cyclists. There was also a perception that cycling is a male (predominantly white) activity, and some women felt the need to construct their own cycling identity, which could mean resisting the 'blokey' image and embracing femininity (for example, wearing heels while cycling; using blogs to reinforce identity)¹.

Applicability: The findings from these studies are applicable to cyclists who commute in the UK and Australia. Differences in experiences between cycling populations (gender, ethnicity e.t.c.) and between settings in their promotion and support of cycling need to be taken into account.

¹ Steinbach et al. (2011)

² Wen et al. (2010)

³ McKenna and Whatling (2007)

⁴ Gaterslaben et al. (2007)

⁵ Garrard et al. (2008)

Evidence statement R2.ES19: Views about cycling identities

Moderate evidence from one (+) UK focus groups and interviews study¹ that obtained car driver views of adult cycling identities.

Cycling for transport requires negotiating space on the road. Some cycling behaviours were perceived as inappropriate by some other road users, giving cyclists a poor image and limited relationship with drivers.

Car drivers reported being fearful of collisions, since cars and cycles travel at different speeds, and gave cyclists a wide berth. Some cyclists were reported as behaving poorly on the roads, for example passing through red lights, and this contributed for some, to cyclists having a negative image. Drivers that cycled were more likely to have empathy with cyclists on the road. Cycling proficiency testing, road taxes and compulsory helmet wearing were suggestions for improving the status of cyclists on the road.

Applicability: Findings from this study are applicable to car drivers in the UK. How cyclists are perceived by other road users and the impact that this may have for cyclists needs to be taken into account.

¹ Granville et al. (2001)

Evidence statement EM.ES1: Led walking including 'walking school bus'

Moderate evidence from four studies suggests that led walking interventions (seven different interventions analysed in four studies) could be cost effective.

A Spanish study¹: 6-month programme to promote walking-based exercise via a supervised exercise programme with three 50-minute sessions per week. Incremental cost per QALY range of €94– 871 per QALY.

A US study²: community-based social support strategies, including organised walking groups, home visits and phone calls, and newsletters, maps and handouts. Incremental cost per QALY of \$27,373 and \$39,690 for the two different led walking interventions versus do nothing.

A UK study³: organised community walking groups. The two organised walking group interventions showed a cost per QALY of £301 and £475.

Another UK study⁴: walking bus intervention designed to encourage schoolchildren to walk to school. Incremental cost per QALY estimated to be approx. £4007 per QALY gained.

The evidence is partially applicable to the UK, with two of the studies UK-based, and the other international studies concerning interventions that could be of UK relevance.

¹ Gusi (2008)

² Roux (2008)

³ Pringle (2010)

⁴ Fordham (2008)

Evidence statement EM.ES2: Pedometers

Moderate evidence from one Australian study¹ suggests pedometer interventions could be cost effective: pedometer interventions, which used a meta-analysis of eight randomised control trials. Pedometer interventions maintained a net saving even when the intervention effect was modelled to decay completely by the end of the first year. That is, the modelled lifetime cost savings to the health service outweighed the pedometer costs as well as providing health benefits.

The evidence is partially applicable to the UK as similar pedometer interventions are of relevance.

¹ Cobiac (2009)

Evidence statement EM.ES3: Media campaigns

Moderate evidence from one UK study¹ suggests media campaigns could be cost-effective: media campaigns circulating maps of walking and cycling routes. The cost-per-QALY of £86 for provision of a healthy living map with walking and cycling routes, and £288 for the promotion of walking and cycling through printed media.

The evidence is applicable to the UK.

¹ Pringle (2010)

Evidence statement EM.ES4: Community health information (TravelSmart)

Moderate evidence from one Australian study¹ suggests TravelSmart interventions could be cost-effective: TravelSmart intervention with individualised information to households on travel choices measuring change in the number of walking and cycling trips made per week. The TravelSmart programme resulted in a cost of \$18,000 per disability-adjusted life year (DALY) assuming 50% decay per annum. The TravelSmart programme had net savings with annual decay rates of 0% and 25%, but costs rose to \$41,000 per DALY at 75%, and \$63,000 per DALY at 100% decay.

The evidence is partially applicable to the UK as the TravelSmart style intervention is relevant in the UK.

¹ Cobiac (2009)

Evidence statement EM.ES5: Multi-component (Cycling Demonstration Towns)

Moderate evidence from one UK study¹ suggests that the Cycling Demonstration Towns projects have a good benefit/cost rate.

The study: infrastructure measures such as the building of cycle paths, combined with a programme of education and marketing aimed at the general population. Benefits converted to monetary values and compared with the initial investment and running costs to produce a benefit-cost ratio. A range of 2.6–3.5 was given, reflecting the different approaches available for estimating accident and absenteeism benefits. Under all but the most pessimistic of scenarios considered, the benefit-cost ratio remained above one.

The evidence on cycle demonstration town is directly applicable as it was conducted in the UK.

¹Cope (2010)

Additional evidence

- Expert paper 1 'Paving the way for everyday walking: 'Living Streets' interventions and public health'
- Expert paper 2 'Making walking and cycling normal: key findings from the understanding walking and cycling research project':
- Expert paper 3 'Programmes to promote cycling – evidence for NICE from CTC':
- Expert paper 4 'Evidence to NICE PDG walking and cycling: experience from Bristol City Council and cycling city (2008–2011)': Ed Plowden, Bristol City Council
- Expert paper 5 'Submission to the NICE programme development group on walking and cycling'
- Expert paper 6 'Effectiveness of interventions to increase cycling'

Economic modelling

Overall, all the interventions modelled were found to be highly cost effective, with each estimated to cost below £10,000 per quality-adjusted life years (QALYs) gained.

The economic model was constructed to incorporate, where possible, data from the reviews of effectiveness and cost effectiveness. In addition, it built on the relationship between:

- physical activity and relative risk of mortality
- levels of walking and cycling and overall physical activity
- levels of walking and cycling and motorised travel (especially driving distance, but also driving time and number of trips).

Four interventions were modelled:

- Two multi-component interventions (Cycling Demonstration Towns and Sustainable Travel Towns).

- Personalised travel advice (TravelSmart).
- Use of pedometers.
- Community-based led walks.

Health outcomes were expressed using QALYs gained and incremental net benefit (INB).

Wider impacts (environmental and traffic-related outcomes) were based on a limited selection of environmental outcomes and the value of a statistical life, expressed in terms of environmental benefit-cost ratios. The ratios were calculated based on the framework used by the Department for Transport.

It should be noted, that in the Department for Transport framework, most of the calculated benefits derived from health outcomes related to increased physical activity (up to 83%). However, health outcomes were excluded when calculating the environmental benefit-cost ratio, as they had been considered separately in a cost-utility analysis. Thus the results should be interpreted with caution.

A series of 'what if' analyses was undertaken to determine if the level of cost is justified for interventions producing a particular level of effect. In addition, the trade-off between narrow interventions with large effects per person were compared with wider interventions leading to smaller effects per person.

A number of assumptions were made which could underestimate or overestimate the cost effectiveness of the interventions. The results of the modeling were non-linear. The key factors influencing outcome were: threshold cost, level of effects, decay in effects and costs related to initial effects.

The specific scenarios considered and the full results can be found in 'Interventions to promote cycling and walking for recreational and travel purposes: Health economic and modelling report'.

Appendix D Gaps in the evidence

The Programme Development Group (PDG) identified a number of gaps in the evidence related to the programmes under examination based on an assessment of the evidence. These gaps are set out below.

1. There is a lack of UK evidence on whether or not interventions to increase walking or cycling for transport or leisure result in a decrease or increase in participation in other types of physical activity. Evidence is needed for a range of groups within different community settings.
2. There is a lack of evidence on whether people who cycle or walk for recreational purposes, eventually adopt it as a form of transport.
3. There is a lack of evidence on the long-term health, social and environmental impact of short-term interventions to increase walking or cycling. Specifically, there is a lack of evidence on the impact of interventions to encourage walking, cycling or both, for a range of groups within different community settings.
4. There is a lack of evidence on whether it is effective and cost effective to support physically active travel as a segment of a longer journey. Specifically, it is not clear whether such support increases walking or cycling levels and, if it does, how this impacts on the environment.
5. There is a lack of UK evidence on whether differences in urban and rural settings and environments impact on the implementation and effectiveness of interventions to increase walking or cycling. Evidence is needed for a range of groups within different community settings.
6. There is a lack of evidence on the barriers to, and facilitators for, inter-sector and inter-agency collaboration to promote walking and cycling. Evidence is also needed on the interventions that could overcome any identified barriers. Barriers may include the working cultures of different professionals.
7. There is a lack of UK evidence on how effective and cost effective it is to address walking and cycling together or separately. Specifically, there is a lack of evidence on how combining interventions impacts on their effectiveness – and whether multiple interventions have a positive, synergistic effect. Evidence is needed for a range of groups within different community settings.

8. There is a lack of evidence on how people can be helped to make walking or cycling an habitual activity. Evidence is needed for a range of groups within different community settings.
9. There is a lack of UK evidence on the extent to which the provision of a free bus service impacts on walking levels. Evidence is needed for a range of groups within different community settings.
10. There is a lack of UK evidence on the impact that an individual's perception of distance has on their view of how viable cycling or walking is as a mode of transport. There is also a lack of evidence on what interventions can effectively change someone's perception of distance as a barrier to walking and cycling. Evidence is needed for a range of groups within different community settings.
11. There is a lack of UK evidence on the social constructs which act as barriers to, and facilitators for, the uptake of walking or cycling as a mode of transport. Evidence is needed for a range of groups within different communities.

The Group made 5 recommendations for research into areas that it believes will be a priority for developing future guidance. These are listed in [section 5](#).

Appendix E Supporting documents

Supporting documents include the following (see [supporting evidence](#)).

These include the following.

- Evidence reviews:
 - Review 1: 'Systematic review and narrative synthesis of the effectiveness of local interventions to promote cycling and walking for recreational and travel purposes', and 'Evidence statements on the effectiveness of local interventions to promote cycling and walking for recreational and travel purposes'
 - Review 2: 'Synthesis of evidence relating to barriers and facilitators to implementing interventions that promote cycling and walking, and to carrying out cycling and walking for recreational and travel purposes'.
- Economic modeling: 'Interventions to promote cycling and walking for recreational and travel purposes: Health economic and modelling report'.
- Expert papers:
 - Expert paper 1 'Paving the way for everyday walking: Living Streets interventions and public health'
 - Expert paper 2 'Making walking and cycling normal: key findings from the understanding walking and cycling research project'
 - Expert paper 3 'Programmes to promote cycling – evidence for NICE from CTC'
 - Expert paper 4 'Evidence to NICE PDG walking and cycling: experience from Bristol City Council and cycling city (2008–2011)'
 - Expert paper 5 'Submission to the NICE programme development group on walking and cycling'
 - Expert paper 6 'Effectiveness of interventions to increase cycling'.
- A [pathway](#) for professionals whose remit includes public health and for interested members of the public. This is on the NICE website.

For information on how NICE public health guidance is developed, see:

- 'Methods for development of NICE public health guidance (second edition, 2009)'
- 'The NICE public health guidance development process: An overview for stakeholders including public health practitioners, policy makers and the public (second edition, 2009)'

About this guidance

NICE public health guidance makes recommendations on the promotion of good health and the prevention of ill health.

This guidance was developed using the NICE [public health programme](#) guidance process.

It updates recommendation 6 in NICE public health guidance 2 (published 2006).

The recommendations from this guidance have been incorporated into a [NICE Pathway](#). Tools to help you put the guidance into practice and information about the evidence it is based on are also [available](#).

Your responsibility

This guidance represents the views of the Institute and was arrived at after careful consideration of the evidence available. Those working in the NHS, local authorities, the wider public, voluntary and community sectors and the private sector should take it into account when carrying out their professional, managerial or voluntary duties.

Implementation of this guidance is the responsibility of local commissioners and/or providers. Commissioners and providers are reminded that it is their responsibility to implement the guidance, in their local context, in light of their duties to avoid unlawful discrimination and to have regard to promoting equality of opportunity. Nothing in this guidance should be interpreted in a way which would be inconsistent with compliance with those duties.

Copyright

© National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence 2012. All rights reserved. NICE copyright material can be downloaded for private research and study, and may be reproduced for educational and not-for-profit purposes. No reproduction by or for commercial organisations, or for commercial purposes, is allowed without the written permission of NICE.

Contact NICE

National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence
Level 1A, City Tower, Piccadilly Plaza, Manchester M1 4BT

www.nice.org.uk

nice@nice.org.uk

0845 033 7780

Accreditation

