

Adults' self-reported barriers and enablers to riding a bike for transport: a systematic review

Lauren Pearson^{a*}, Danielle Berkovic^a, Sandy Reeder^a, Belinda Gabbe^a, and Ben Beck^a

^a *School of Public Health and Preventive Medicine, Monash University, Melbourne, Australia*

^b *Health Data Research UK, Swansea University, Swansea, United Kingdom*

*Lauren Pearson
Sustainable Mobility and Safety Research
School of Public Health & Preventive Medicine
Monash University, Melbourne, Australia
Email: lauren.pearson@monash.edu

Adults' self-reported barriers and enablers to riding a bike for transport: a systematic review

Riding a bike for transport purposes is an effective way to improve population and environmental health. Despite this, participation levels in many countries are low. Identifying the barriers and enablers to riding a bike for transport is essential to developing interventions that encourage bike riding. In this mixed-methods systematic review, we aimed to identify the perceived barriers and enablers to adults riding a bike for transport in Organisation for Economic Development (OECD) countries. A systematic database search was conducted to identify relevant peer-reviewed and grey literature. Fifty-five papers/reports met eligibility criteria. There were 34 barriers and 21 enablers identified. The leading barriers related to riding on the road alongside motor vehicles. Other factors identified included the provision and quality of cycling infrastructure, personal factors such as physical fitness, attitudinal factors such as community perceptions of cyclists, and environmental factors. While this review highlights the complexity of factors that influence the uptake of riding a bike for transport, many of the leading factors could be overcome through the provision of high-quality protected infrastructure for bike riders. Other interventions to address other known barriers and enablers are needed to increase the uptake of bike riding.

Keywords: active transport, cycling, mobility, mixed-methods

Introduction

The health benefits of riding a bike are vast and well established, including improved cardiorespiratory fitness, cognitive function and mental wellbeing (Celis-Morales et al., 2017; Leyland et al., 2019; Nordengen et al., 2019). Beyond this, an increase in trips made by bike has the potential to reduce traffic congestion, environmental pollutants, and offer economic benefits to both individuals and governments (Litman, 2015; Pérez et al., 2017; Rabl & De Nazelle, 2012). A large proportion of trips made by car are a distance that could potentially be made by bike (Beck, 2021; Department of Transport, 2021; Harper, 2021; Vagane, 2007), highlighting the potential for increased participation in bike riding for transport, in addition to for recreational purposes.

Despite the benefits of bike riding, and increased accessibility from e-bikes (Fishman & Cherry, 2016; Fyhri et al., 2017), moving away from car-based transport and towards bike riding has become a considerable cultural, behavioural and political challenge (Agarwal & Gupta, 2021; Kent, 2015; Richards et al., 2011; Wilson & Mitra, 2020). Recognising what facilitates, and what prevents people from choosing to cycle for transport permits informed decisions for cycling infrastructure, promotion campaigns and policy reform for government and advocacy organisations.

There are several studies that report the barriers and enablers of riding a bike for transport in local populations, cited regularly throughout active transport-related literature. However, these study findings are often extrapolated to populations with potentially different circumstances. Further, there are a variety of measures and populations reported, limiting the potential for comparison between studies.

64

65 There is, at present, no peer-reviewed systematic review that synthesises the
66 findings of, and appraises the quality of studies, from multiple contexts of the barriers
67 and enablers to riding a bike for transport. This review is important because it allows for
68 identification of potential issues in measurement of barriers and enablers, areas of
69 needed research, and consistencies and differences between countries.

70

71 The aim of this systematic review was to identify the perceived barriers and
72 enablers to adults' participation in riding a bike for transport. The inclusion of
73 qualitative research in this systematic review attempted to represent some of these lived
74 experiences while still maintaining large-scale quantitative studies to facilitate
75 generalisability and reproducibility.

76 **Methods**

77 Systematic searches of databased of peer-reviewed scientific and grey literature
78 were undertaken to identify the barriers and enablers of riding a bike for transport in
79 Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries (OECD,
80 2020). Both quantitative and qualitative studies were included, and no publication year
81 limits were applied due to the limited published synthesis of data prior to this review.
82 Trips made by bike exclusively for transport purposes were chosen as they have likely
83 differing barriers and enablers than when trips are made for recreation. Transport
84 included any journey made to travel to a destination, such as commuting and to travel to
85 shops. Most OECD member countries are high-income and developed economies
86 (Canser et al., 2016). Because of this, they share similar cycling infrastructure, laws and
87 volumes of traffic (Buehler & Pucher, 2017). Due to these similarities, only OECD

countries were included in this review to allow for meaningful comparisons. The review included papers published up to the 5th February, 2021, when the search was conducted.

Eligibility criteria:

Primary studies published in a peer-reviewed journal or grey literature were eligible for inclusion if they:

- reported on either the perceived barriers or enablers of riding a bike for transport purposes (including initiating participation, or riding more than they currently do),
- recruited an adult population,
- were published in English and;
- were conducted in an OECD country.

Bikes were defined as manual pushbikes and electric bikes. Where trip purpose was not defined in full-text, the paper was excluded. Perceived barriers and enablers included factors that participants reported as either preventing them or encouraging them to ride a bike hypothetically.

To enable findings between homogenous study types to be synthesised, we focussed on studies that stated self-reported barriers and/or enablers to cycling. Studies that aimed to elucidate potential behaviours based on a selection of factors (such as stated preference surveys) or studies that modelled associations between self-reported barriers and frequency of cycling, without reporting the aggregate self-reported barriers and enablers data for the sample, were excluded.

Peer-reviewed Literature

Peer-reviewed published articles were systematically searched in Ovid Medline, Ovid PsycINFO, Embase, Scopus, Transport Research Information Database (TRID) and EBSCO CINAHL using terms generated through thorough consultation with a librarian and text mining. Text mining involved identifying sentinel papers on the research question and using keywords and title words to develop a list of terms to include in the search. These combined various components including active transport or bicycling and barriers, enablers, attitudes and behaviours. The full list of search terms are shown in Supplementary Materials D. The online platform ‘Covidence’ (Covidence, 2020) was used to store articles imported from databases and facilitate organised and blinded screening. Two independent reviewers screened results first by title and abstract, followed by full-text for adherence to inclusion and exclusion criteria. Conflicts between reviewers about which studies to include were discussed by reviewer one and two until consensus was reached, or if this was not possible a third reviewer was consulted.

Following article screening, a hand-search of the reference list of included studies was conducted by a study author to identify further relevant literature.

Grey Literature

Research regarding bike riding is often conducted by government and bicycling advocacy organisations. For this reason, a grey literature search was conducted as this type of research is often not peer-reviewed. The term “barriers and enablers of cycling” was systematically searched in Google, Analysis and Policy Observatory (APO), TRID and the OECD Library. An Advanced Search was performed using Google and limiting the search criteria to each OECD country. Through consultation with a librarian

specialist in grey literature searching, it was decided that the first 50 results produced by Google would be used. Reviewer one conducted these searches and screen-captured the results, before compiling them into a document. Each result in the document was then screened by title and description (where available) by reviewer one and two. Reviewers were blinded to each other's results until completion. The method used in resolving conflicts in the peer-reviewed literature was repeated.

Quality Assessment

The Joanna Briggs Critical Appraisal Tools were used to assess the methodological rigour of peer-reviewed literature (Munn et al., 2014). Tools were specific to study design and included closed questions regarding the methodology, recruitment, analysis and conclusions of the study. Possible answers included 'yes', 'no', 'unclear' or 'not applicable'.

Reviewers one and two conducted quality assessment independently for each peer-reviewed article after full-text screening. When complete, results of quality assessments were compared. Where there were differences of more than 20%, reviewers discussed until consensus or consulted with reviewer three. A mean appraisal score was then calculated for each article based on the proportion of quality appraisal checklist items met by the study. Articles scoring 50% or below on the mean appraisal score were not included in the review to ensure only high-quality literature was synthesised.

Grey literature was appraised using the Authority, Accuracy, Coverage, Objectivity, Date & Significance (AACODS) Checklist (Tyndall, 2010), a critical appraisal tool specific to grey literature. The AACODS Checklist comprises appraisal of literature based on the accuracy, authority, coverage, objectivity, date and significance.

The appraisal process used in the peer-reviewed literature assessment was repeated for the grey literature.

Data Extraction

Data were extracted on study and participant characteristics and study findings (barriers and enablers). An iterative process was employed to categorise barriers and enablers into broader themes. Outcome measures were extracted for quantitative studies, and participation characteristic and quotes extracted from qualitative studies.

Where data were reported as the proportion of the sample that agreed that a particular factor was a barrier or enabler (binary outcome), the population sample size and outcome were extracted for inclusion in a meta-analysis. Due to the variability in outcome measures, meta-analyses of other data types beyond binary outcomes were not possible. To be included in the meta-analysis, study questions, study populations and outcome measures needed to be comparable. Meta-analyses were conducted in RStudio (RStudio Team, 2020) with the ‘meta’ package (Schwarzer & Schwarzer, 2012). Due to the diversity of populations included in the meta-analyses, random effects models were most suited. Where heterogeneity was high, a restricted maximum likelihood indicator was used.

Synthesis

A segregated approach was used to synthesise quantitative and qualitative data (Lizarondo L, 2020). Quantitative data were extracted into a table and meta-analysis performed where possible. If meta-analyses were not possible, data were extracted into a separate table for inclusion in supplementary material. Qualitative data were extracted into a table, analysed through coding and quotes presented to illustrate higher level

categories of codes. Findings of qualitative and quantitative analyses were reported alongside each other where findings overlapped.

Quantitative data

All quantitative data regarding study characteristics were extracted into a table. Outcome data were extracted into two separate tables exclusively for either barriers or enablers. If data were presented stratified into groups, overall cohort data were extracted.

Qualitative data

Quotes extracted from qualitative studies were analysed with an inductive approach of thematic coding as described by Gibbs (Gibbs, 2007). All quotes were retrieved from included articles that met selection criteria. Quotes were coded with the same label where they were an example of the same phenomenon, idea or explanation. Codes were organised to provide meaning and structure to the data, leading to higher level categories based on their relationships with each other. To describe each of these categories, quotes were used in results. Analysis was conducted by two reviewers for credibility and rigour.

Results

There were 4,602 records screened, of which 60 studies met inclusion criteria (Figure 1). To be included in the meta-analysis, study questions walking and cycling data being aggregated, the study not reporting on barriers and/or enablers, and the study reporting only on actual barriers and enablers that were calculated from self-reports and infrastructure than surrounded the participant, or from self-reports and their frequency of cycling.

209 Through quality assessment, 7 publications and 2 grey literature reports did not meet the
210 requirements. Reasons included lack of information about participants and recruitment,
211 and lack of clarity in the measurement and reporting of outcomes (see Supplementary
212 Materials A).
213




Figure 1. Summary of number of studies included in each screening process

The final 45 final studies were mostly quantitative and cross-sectional in design ($n = 29$), followed by qualitative ($n = 8$), mixed methods ($n = 7$) and one longitudinal survey (see Table 1). Thirty-seven studies were identified from a bibliographic database search, seven from grey literature sources and one from an integrated database (TRID). Online surveys were the most common data collection method ($n = 23$). The majority of studies reported on manual bikes ($n = 43$), and two on electric pedal-assisted bikes (e-bikes). A range of methods were used to assess barriers and enablers and quantify their relative importance, including binary outcomes, Likert scales and other types of proportional data.

Table 1. Included study characteristics and cohort description

First Author	Country Study Conducted In	Sample Size (<i>n</i>)	Population	Study Design
Abasahl et al. (2018)	USA	698	University staff and students	Cross-sectional survey
Agarwal & North (2012)	USA	103	University students	Cross-sectional survey
Akar et al. (2013)	USA	2012	University staff and students	Cross-sectional survey
Chowdhury & Costello (2016)	New Zealand	1178	Representative sample of Auckland's population - cyclists and non-cyclists after the installation of new cycleways	Cross-sectional survey
Community Vibe on behalf of Central Goldfields Shire Council (2017)	Australia	100	Community members of a regional area in Victoria, Australia	Mixed-methods
Crawford et al. (2001)	Scotland	690	Two workplaces within Glasgow - one university and one hospital	Cross-sectional survey
Cred Consulting on behalf of City of Sydney and C40	Australia	89	Women who ride a bike for a substantial part of their transport and live in Sydney, Australia	Mixed-methods*
Curto et al. (2016)	Spain	814	Commuters living and working in Barcelona who are able to ride a bike for 20 minutes	Cross-sectional survey
Daley et al. (2007)	Australia	70	Men and women recruited through phoning a number on a flyer	Qualitative
de Cunha & da Silva (2018)	Portugal	505	Staff and PhD students at the Faculty of Engineering, University of Porto (Portugal)	Cross-sectional survey
de Geus et al. (2008)	Belgium	343	Working Flemish adults who lived within 10km of their workplace	Cross-sectional survey

Delso et al. (2018)	Spain	3786	Sample of 3786 adults who completed the Vitoria-Gasteiz household travel survey	Quantitative
Dill & McNeil (2016)	USA	3116	Sample of 3000 adults who lived in the 50 largest U.S. metropolitan areas	Quantitative
Fernández-Heredia et al. (2014)	Spain	3048	University staff and students	Cross-sectional survey
Galway et al. (2021)	Canada	30	Thirty adult cyclists living in North America	Qualitative
Heart Foundation on behalf of the Cycling Promotion Fund (2011)	Australia	515	Random sample of 1000 Australian adults	Cross-sectional survey
Heart Foundation on behalf of the Cycling Promotion Fund (2013)	Australia	1007	Adult women mostly residing in urban areas in Australia	Cross-sectional survey
Heesch et al. (2012)	Australia	1862	Members of a community bicycle organisation in Queensland	Cross-sectional survey
Heinen et al. (2011)	Netherlands	4299	Employees from several large companies in cities in the Netherlands	Cross-sectional survey
Ingunn Stangeby on behalf of Transportøkonomisk institutt (1997)	Norway	392	Mostly middle-aged people with a high level of education and high household income	Cross-sectional survey
Iwinska et al. (2018)	Poland	561	Random sample for quantitative survey was people at home in Warsaw during a door to door survey. The cyclist survey was of people who indicated they were cyclists in a previous travel survey, living in Warsaw. Qualitative methods were used for cyclists, transportation activists and a scientific expert on transportation systems in Warsaw.	Mixed-methods
Jones et al. (2016)	Netherlands & England	22	E-bike owners living in Randstaf or Groningen in the Netherlands and in Oxford in the UK	Qualitative
Lechaud (2016)	Portugal	305	Convenience sample of 701 people living in Portugal	Cross-sectional survey
Leger et al. (2019)	Canada	37	Older people living in retirement homes, in the community or in active lifestyle communities	Qualitative

Lois et al. (2016)	Spain	21	People who commute for work or study in two cities in Spain (Madrid or Vitoria-Gasteiz)	Qualitative
Manaugh et al. (2016)	Canada	4944**	Staff and students at the McGill University in Montreal	Cross-sectional survey
McManus et al. (2005)	Australia	1657	People who attended a bike to work breakfast event in the CBD of Perth, Western Australia	Cross-sectional survey
Mullan (2013)	Ireland	16	Leisure and sport cyclists living in Ireland who participated in a non-competitive cycling event (Sean Kelly tour)	Qualitative
Munoz et al. (2013)	Spain	224	People walking in the centre of Madrid who were local to the area	Cross-sectional survey
Nikitas (2018)	Greece	640	Sample of adults living in Drama, Greece	Cross-sectional survey
Rérat (2019)	Switzerland	13700	People who participated in the Bike to Work campaign in Switzerland	Mixed-methods
Sahlqvist & Heesch (2012)	Australia	183	Members of a community bicycle organisation in Queensland	Cross-sectional survey
Salvo et al. (2018)	Canada	14	People who have recently relocated to a different neighbourhood	Mixed-methods
Schneider & Hu (2015)	USA	3566	University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee staff and students who lived away from campus	Cross-sectional survey
Scott (2009)	Australia	300	Infrequent/non-cyclists living in New South Wales, Australia	Mixed-methods
Sears et al. (2012)	USA	185	Group of working adults in Vermont who commute by bicycle two or more miles each way on 28 specified days in a 10-month period	Longitudinal survey
Štastná et al. (2018)	Czech Republic	383	Students and staff of the Faculty of AgriSciences, Mendel University in Brno	Cross-sectional survey
Swiers et al. (2017)	England	194	University students living in England	Cross-sectional survey
Ton et al. (2019)	Netherlands	2425	Census data from the Netherlands Mobility Panel. Mostly representative of the Dutch population except for teenagers and low-income individuals	Cross-sectional survey
van Bekkum et al. (2011)	Scotland	831	Staff and PhD students in a cycle-friendly building in a university in Edinburgh	Cross-sectional survey
van Bekkum et al. (2011)	Scotland	15	Cycle commuters and potential cycle commuters from a "cycle-friendly" workplace in a Scottish city (Edinburgh)	Qualitative

Whannell et al. (2011)	Australia	270	First year undergraduate students studying a science, technology and society course focussed on environmental and sustainability issues	Cross-sectional survey
Winters et al. (2011)	Canada	1402	Current and potential cyclists in Vancouver from a random sample of home addresses	Cross-sectional survey
Winters et al. (2015)	Canada	Survey = 191 Interviews = 27	Older adults living in downtown Vancouver, Canada	Mixed-methods
Zander et al. (2013)	Australia	17	Adults living in inner west Sydney between 50 and 75 who were willing to cycle two hours per week or more for a 12-week period	Qualitative

*quantitative outcome data extracted from cross-sectional survey only

**barriers recorded for $n = 295$

Quantitative measures

There were 16 different outcome measures used across 36 quantitative studies of barriers and enablers. Of these, most studies ($n = 17$) reported the proportion of people who noted that the factor was a barrier or enabler to them as a binary outcome of “yes” or “no”. Remaining quantitative studies used Likert scales ($n = 9$) or other types of proportional measures. Likert scales had further variety, ranging from -1 to 1, to 1 to 7 scales, measuring the importance of a barrier or enabler, level of agreement that it was a barrier or enabler, or how much the factor affected their propensity to ride a bike. Studies that used Likert scale measures reported the mean for the cohort. Other types of measures used included the proportion of people who “somewhat agreed” or “strongly agreed” that a particular factor was a barrier or enabler, the proportion of days not commuted by bike due to a particular barrier, the proportion of people who selected a particular factor as being the main barrier to them riding a bike, and the proportion that reported an enabling factor as the most important improvement for them to start using a bike.

Participants

Included studies were conducted in Europe ($n = 21$, 48%), North America ($n = 12$, 27%), Australia ($n = 11$, 23%) and New Zealand ($n = 1$, <1%). Quantitative study sample sizes ranged from $n = 89$ to $n = 13,700$, with a median (quartile 1, quartile 3) of 665 (285, 1937) participants. Studies had varying proportions of women (range: 20-100%, median (quartile 1, quartile 3) = 50% (42%, 58%). Eleven of the 45 included studies focussed on university student and/or staff populations exclusively.

Barriers

There were 34 barriers to cycling for transport identified through quantitative and qualitative methods (Table 2). The most commonly reported and measured barriers in both quantitative and qualitative studies were bad weather, the time taken to a destination being too great, a perceived lack of safety and high density of motor vehicles. Barriers reported in exclusively in qualitative data that were not measured in quantitative studies included a lack of connectivity of bike paths, negative non-rider attitudes toward cyclists, and negative perceptions of e-bikes from people riding pedal bikes. Barriers were categorised into eight themes; safety, trip factors, personal factors, infrastructure, access, environmental factors, end of trip facilities and perceptions. All barriers identified through data that could not be meta-analysed are shown in Supplementary materials B.

286 Table 2. Summary of barriers reported in quantitative and qualitative studies

Barrier	Qualitative studies (n)	Quantitative studies (n)	Total (n)
<i>Safety</i>			
Fear of motorist aggression	4	6	10
Perceived risk of injury	2	10	12
High traffic density	7	10	17
Feelings of safety	3	14	17
Fear of theft or crime	4	6	10
<i>Infrastructure</i>			
Poor quality and condition of dedicated bike lanes	5	6	11
Poor condition of roads	3	6	9
Limited dedicated bike lanes	5	8	13
Darkness	2	8	10
Lack of connectivity of bike paths	3	0	3
<i>Trip factors</i>			
Lack of storage on bike	3	8	11
Long distance	1	11	12
Time to destination too great	4	14	18
Children to transport	4	11	15
<i>Personal factors</i>			
Having to change or shower at destination	6	6	12
Too much effort	2	7	9
Lack of fitness	2	6	8
Not interested	0	6	6
Unable to ride a bike due to injury or disability	1	7	8
Lack of knowledge of bike riding road rules and bike maintenance	4	6	10
Do not own suitable clothing	0	4	4
Lack of comfort	1	3	4
<i>Access</i>			
No bike	0	8	8
Cost of bike too high	2	7	9
Mandatory helmet laws	1	1	2
<i>Environmental factors</i>			
Bad weather	3	22	25
Air-pollution exposure	2	8	10
Too many hills	1	8	9
<i>End of trip facilities</i>			

Lack of showers or lockers	0	13	13
Lack of bike parking	4	12	16
<i>Perceptions</i>			
Negative community perception of cyclists	5	0	5
Negative perception of e-bikes from pedal cyclists	2	0	2

287

288

289 Twenty-six barriers met the inclusion criteria for meta-analyses. The summary

290 estimate and corresponding confidence intervals for each outcome are displayed in

291 Figure 2.

292




Figure 2. Forest plot of meta-analysis summary estimates (square) and confidence intervals (grey error bars) of the proportion of people who reported each barrier to cycling for transport

Table 3. Outcome table of safety, infrastructure and trip factor-related barriers

Author, Year	Safety					Infrastructure					Trip factors					
	Fear of motorist aggression	Perceived risk of injury	High traffic density	Feelings of safety	Fear of theft or crime	Poor quality and condition of dedicated bike lanes	Poor condition of roads	Limited dedicated bike lanes	Darkness	Lack of connectivity of bike paths	Lack of storage on bike	Long distance	Time to destination too great	Children to transport	Other activities before/after work	Need vehicle for work
Abasahl et al. (2018)	X	X	X		X	X	X		X		X		X			
Agarwal & North (2012)			X						X							
Akar et al. (2013)			X						X							
Chowdhury (2016)	X							X	X		X	X	X	X		
Community Vibe (2017)			X	X				X					X			
Crawford et al. (2001)			X				X					X	X	X		
Curto et al. (2016)				X							X			X		
Daley et al. (2007)	X					X	X	X		X						
de Geus et al. (2008)													X			
Delso et al. (2018)			X	X				X				X				
Dill & McNeil (2016)			X	X				X				X				X
Fernández-Heredia (2014)				X	X							X				
Heart Foundation (2011)		X	X				X	X				X	X	X		
Heart Foundation (2013)	X	X	X										X	X		
Heesch et al. (2012)	X		X									X	X			
Iwinska et al. (2018)		X				X		X								
Jones et al. (2016)				X		X								X		
Lechaud (2016)				X		X		X								
Leger et al. (2019)			X													
Lois et al. (2016)	X	X		X	X				X		X		X	X		
Manaugh et al. (2016)				X								X				
Mullan (2013)						X		X		X		X				
Nikitas (2018)				X		X										
Rérat (2019)		X	X		X	X		X	X		X		X	X	X	
Sahlqvist & Heesch (2012)	X		X									X				
Salvo et al. (2018)						X										

Schneider & Hu (2015)				X	X		X					X	X			
Scott (2009)	X	X	X	X	X		X	X		X			X	X		X
Sears et al. (2012)									X						X	
Štastná et al. (2018)		X			X											
Swiers et al. (2017)				X												
van Bekkum et al. (2011)				X			X		X			X	X			
van Bekkum et al. (2011)	X		X			X					X		X			
Whannell et al. (2011)				X					X			X				
Winters et al. (2011)	X	X	X				X		X							
Winters et al. (2015)			X		X			X								
Zander et al. (2013)			X													

250 *Safety*

251 Five barriers were reported across 31 studies that related to safety (see Table 3). These
 252 included perceived risk of injury, traffic density, feeling of safety, fear of motorist
 253 aggression and fear of crime. A fear of motorist aggression was reported by the largest
 254 summary estimate relative to other barriers that were meta-analysed (summary estimate
 255 = 70%; 95% CI: 60%; 80%). This result was supported by Likert scale data, where
 256 participants rated barriers relating to safety as important and qualitative data where
 257 participants commented on not feeling safe on a bike (see Supplementary Materials B).

258 "I mean the big resistance to cycling is...a lot of people just feel...don't feel safe
 259 cycling" (Jones et al., 2016)

260 Feeling unsafe was another barrier relating to safety measured in 16 studies
 261 (Table 3). When asked about feelings of safety, some participants believed this was
 262 regarding their safety on the road in relation to other road-users, or safety on the bike.
 263 Many reported feeling unsafe riding on the road due to the presence of motor vehicle
 264 traffic and the potential for injury.

265 "I don't feel safe at the moment, I know a few people, parents or whatever who
 266 have been hit by or killed by cars in bike accidents... you are not protected like
 267 you are in a car" (Jones et al., 2016)

268 Other participants reported feeling unsafe on a bike due to potential crime.

269 "It is dangerous to cycle in the city, except for certain areas" Male, non-cyclist
 270 (Scott, 2009)

271

272 "I work late and I don't feel safe. In a car you can lock the doors, but on a bike
 273 you just have to ride fast." (Scott, 2009)

274 *Infrastructure*

275 A lack of dedicated bike infrastructure had a higher summary estimate relative to other
276 barriers (summary estimate = 45%; 95% CI: 26%; 64%). This was supported by
277 participant reports across five qualitative studies (M. Daley et al., 2007; Jones et al.,
278 2016; Mullan, 2013; Rérat, 2019; Salvo et al., 2018), and quantitative studies reporting
279 proportional data not included in the meta-analyses (Jennifer Dill & McNeil, 2016;
280 Léchaud, 2016).

281

282 Ten studies reported specifically on the poor condition of existing bike
283 infrastructure as a barrier (Table 3), with a high summary estimate relative to all meta-
284 analyses conducted (summary estimate = 61%; 95% CI: 37%; 85%). This was further
285 expanded in qualitative studies, where participants had varied concerns regarding the
286 condition of infrastructure, including; paths not being wide enough to accommodate
287 bikes (M. Daley et al., 2007), bike lanes being adjacent to parked cars where they were
288 at risk of being hit by a door (Winters et al., 2015), lanes being blocked by parked cars
289 (M. Daley et al., 2007), and poor physical condition of bike infrastructure, including
290 from potholes, gravel and litter (Galway et al., 2021; Jones et al., 2016; Rérat, 2019).
291 While not measured in quantitative studies, a lack of connectivity of existing bike
292 infrastructure was reported across four qualitative studies (M. Daley et al., 2007; Linden
293 et al., 2020; Mullan, 2013; Scott, 2009).

294 "You are going along the road and all of a sudden there's a pedestrian crossing or
295 something like that, and the cycle lanes just ends, and then you have to work your
296 way back out into traffic." (Mullan, 2013)

297 *Trip factors*

298 A lack of storage on a bike had the highest summary estimate compared to other trip
 299 factors reported (summary estimate = 42%; 95% CI: 33%; 50%). Findings varied
 300 greatly across meta-analysis results, Likert scale and qualitative data for other barriers
 301 relating to trip factors. Of the five studies that used Likert scales to measure agreement
 302 or importance of distance as a barrier, participants in three studies (Crawford et al.,
 303 2001; Delso et al., 2018; Fernández-Heredia et al., 2014) reported that this was
 304 important or stopped them from cycling, while two studies (Manaugh et al., 2017;
 305 Jennifer E. van Bakkum et al., 2011) reported that it was not important or disagreed.

306
 307 Results varied between studies reporting having children or other people to
 308 transport as a barrier (Table 3). Of the two studies that used Likert scales, one reported
 309 having people to transport as an important barrier (Crawford et al., 2001), while another
 310 found it not discouraging (Jennifer E. van Bakkum et al., 2011). Participants in some
 311 qualitative studies felt infrastructure was not available for them to safely transport their
 312 children by bike.

313 "I would not ride a bike with a small kid in a trailer or child seat on the main
 314 roads...It is too dangerous in my mind, even though I always ride on main roads
 315 when I am alone" (Rérat, 2019)

316

Table 4. Outcome table of personal, access, environmental, end of trip facility and perception-related barriers

	Personal								Access			Environmental			End of trip facilities		Perceptions	
Author, Year	Having to change or shower at destination	Too much effort	Lack of fitness	Not interested	Unable to ride a bike due to injury or disability	Lack of knowledge of bike riding road rules and bike maintenance	Do not own suitable clothing	Lack of comfort	No bike	Cost of bike too high	Mandatory helmet laws	Bad weather	Air-pollution exposure	Too many hills	Lack of showers or lockers	Lack of bike parking	Negative community perception of cyclists	Negative perception of e-bikes from pedal cyclists
Abasahl et al. (2018)			X			X			X			X	X		X			
Agarwal & North (2012)												X						
Akar et al. (2013)												X						
Chowdhury & Costello (2016)					X	X			X			X		X				
Community Vibe (2017)												X						
Crawford et al. (2001)	X		X							X		X	X	X	X			
Curto et al. (2016)									X			X			X		X	
Daley et al. (2007)			X			X											X	
de Geus et al. (2008)				X														
Delso et al. (2018)			X			X	X				X			X				
Dill & McNeil (2016)									X			X						
Fernández-Heredia et al. (2014)			X					X				X		X		X		
Heart Foundation (2011)			X		X	X	X		X			X		X	X	X		
Heart Foundation (2013)												X	X		X			
Heesch et al. (2012)			X			X				X			X	X	X	X		
Iwinska et al. (2018)	X									X		X			X		X	
Jones et al. (2016)																X		X
Lechaud (2016)								X				X		X				
Leger et al. (2019)					X													X
Lois et al. (2016)	X											X		X		X	X	
Manaugh et al. (2016)		X						X		X				X		X		
Mullan (2013)	X																X	

Nikitas (2018)		X			X				X									
Rérat (2019)	X	X	X				X	X				X	X			X		
Sahlqvist & Heesch (2012)																X		
Schneider & Hu (2015)					X	X			X			X			X	X		
Scott (2009)	X	X		X	X	X	X			X	X	X	X		X	X	X	
Sears et al. (2012)	X	X										X						
Štastná et al. (2018)	X	X										X			X			
Swiers et al. (2017)	X									X		X			X			
van Bekkum et al. (2011)		X			X					X		X	X	X	X	X		
van Bekkum et al. (2011)	X	X																
Whannell et al. (2011)									X			X						
Winters et al. (2011)												X						
Winters et al. (2015)						X												
Zander et al. (2013)						X												

319

320 *Personal Factors*

321 Ten personal barriers were reported across 25 studies (Table 4). Having to
322 change or shower at a destination had the largest summary estimate relative to other
323 personal factors meta-analyses (summary estimate = 51%; 95% CI: 28%; 74%). This
324 was supported by findings from four qualitative studies (David Lois et al., 2016;
325 Mullan, 2013; Scott, 2009; J. E. van Bekkum et al., 2011), however accounted for only
326 0.7% of days not biked for this reason in a longitudinal study of barriers to cycle-
327 commuting (Sears et al., 2012).

328 "I would have to be in my gear - my cycle pants - and you know, I would have to
329 have [a shower], my hair would be stuck to my head. In my line of work, it's all
330 about being professional...how you appear, like. If I got caught in the rain it would
331 take from my confidence and take from my work" (Mullan, 2013)

332 Owning clothes that are suitable to ride a bike in was reported by five cross-
333 sectional studies, with differing findings (Table 4). Proportions of participants who
334 either slightly or strongly agreed that this was a barrier ranged from 19-24% (Léchaud,
335 2016; Rérat, 2019). Between 5 and 7.6% of participants in two quantitative cross-
336 sectional studies reported not owning suitable clothes as their main barrier to cycling
337 (Heart Foundation, 2013; Scott, 2009). However, on a Likert scale, a survey of women
338 at a university in Edinburgh reported this as not a discouraging factor (Jennifer E. van
339 Bekkum et al., 2011).

340 *Access*

341 Access-related barriers were reported in 15 studies. The summary estimate for not
342 owning a bike being a barrier was lower relative to other meta-analyses (Figure 2). The
343 cost of a bike was reported in eight studies (Table 4), where of three using Likert scales,

two reported cost as not being a discouraging factor (Manaugh et al., 2017; Jennifer E. van Bakkum et al., 2011) while one reported this as an important barrier (Crawford et al., 2001).

"My biggest barrier is the cost of a bike" (Swiers et al., 2017)

Environmental factors

Environmental barriers were reported in 30 studies. Bad weather was identified as a barrier in 22 papers (Table 4), with the largest summary estimate for environmental barriers (summary estimate = 48%; 95% CI: 34%; 63%). Consistent with these findings, participants in studies using Likert scales commonly reported bad weather as an important barrier (Crawford et al., 2001; Fernández-Heredia et al., 2014; Jennifer E. van Bakkum et al., 2011; Winters et al., 2011). Some participants in qualitative studies reported that bad weather could put them at risk of injury.

"It's not getting wet, but the fact that [in the rain] I can't see well, and especially at night, I think car drivers will have trouble seeing me and braking and reacting" (David Lois et al., 2016)

End of Trip Facilities

A lack good quality bike parking, had a lower summary estimate relative to other meta-analyses (summary estimate = 31%; 95% CI: 15%; 48%). Across four qualitative studies, and two Likert scale studies (Fernández-Heredia et al., 2014; Manaugh et al., 2017) participants reported this as a barrier (Jones et al., 2016; D. Lois et al., 2016; Rérat, 2019; Scott, 2009). One study that reported Likert scales and sampled only women reported this as not a discouraging factor for riding a bike (Jennifer E. van Bakkum et al., 2011).

369

370 *Attitudes*

371 All attitudinal barriers were identified through qualitative data only. Participants
372 reported the negative community perceptions of cyclists in five studies (Table 4).
373 Reasons behind these perceptions differed, including the perception of status when
374 riding a bike, and the perception of cyclists on roads. Some participants reported that
375 when they cycled on the road, they felt that they were treated as a “second-class citizen”
376 (M. Daley et al., 2007). Others reported that if someone were riding a bike, this may
377 lead them to thinking the person does not have a car. They reported having a car as
378 being a mark of socioeconomic status.

379 "There is that attitude that you only cycle because you can't afford a car" (Male,
380 cyclist) (Mullan, 2013)

381 Negative perceptions of e-bikes from pedal cyclists were reported in two qualitative
382 studies (Jones et al., 2016; S. J. Leger et al., 2019). Participants reported riding an e-
383 bike as being perceived as “cheating” by people who ride unpowered pedal bikes.

384 "I guess the initial reaction is that it's cheating, partly because I'm part of the
385 cycling group/culture and [they] think it's cheating" (Jones et al., 2016)

386 *Enablers*

387 There were 22 enablers to cycling for transport identified (Table 5). Enablers were
388 categorised as either relating to infrastructure, resources and end of trip facilities,
389 personal improvement and enjoyment, motivations and practicality. Riding a bike being
390 a fun enjoyable activity was reported by the highest number of studies ($n = 17$),
391 followed by riding a bike being an environmental choice ($n = 15$) and an efficient mode
392 of transport ($n = 17$). All recorded qualitative and quantitative data that were not able to

393 be included in meta-analyses are shown in Supplementary Materials or available on
394 request.

395

396

Table 5. Summary of content analysis in quantitative and qualitative studies and reported enablers

Enablers	Qualitative studies (n)	Quantitative studies (n)	Total (n)
<i>Infrastructure</i>			
Protected bike lanes	2	5	7
Any bike lanes	2	6	8
Lighting	0	3	3
Signage to show bike routes	0	2	2
Quiet roads	3	1	4
<i>Resources and end of trip facilities</i>			
Secure bike storage or parking	1	7	8
Change rooms & showers available	0	4	4
Taking bike on public transport	0	1	1
No helmet requirements	0	1	1
Bike route-specific maps	1	1	2
<i>Personal improvement and enjoyment</i>			
Fun and enjoyable activity	8	9	17
Improves health and fitness	4	12	16
Stress relief	3	5	8
Ability to explore	2	4	5
Improves personal image	0	5	5
<i>Motivations</i>			
Environmental benefits	4	14	18
Seeing other people riding bikes	4	4	8
Role model	4	0	4
<i>Practicalities</i>			
Economical transport	3	10	13
Flexible	2	7	9
Efficient	7	10	17

399

400

401 Eight meta-analyses were possible where two or more studies reported

402 unweighted proportional data on the same outcome (Figure 3).




Figure 3. Forest plot of meta-analysis summary estimates (square) and confidence intervals (error bar) of the proportion of people who reported each enabler to cycling for transport

Infrastructure

The provision of protected bike lanes (bike lanes physically separated from traffic) had the highest summary estimate relative to other meta-analyses of enablers (summary estimate = 84%; 95% CI: 80%; 87%). This was further rated as important in two Likert scale studies (Crawford et al., 2001; Winters et al., 2011). Adequate lighting, signage specific to people riding bikes, or having a mostly flat route were also rated as important enablers (Crawford et al., 2001; Heart Foundation, 2013; Stangeby, 1997; The Heart Foundation, 2011; Winters et al., 2011).

Resources and end of trip facilities

Having access to changing rooms and showers was measured as an enabler in three quantitative studies that were not included in meta-analyses (Crawford et al., 2001;

418 Heart Foundation, 2013; Whannell et al., 2012), where in one survey of women, 4.9%
419 reported this as the main reason that would enable them to ride a bike (Heart
420 Foundation, 2013).

421 *Personal improvement and enjoyment*

422 Factors related to personal improvement and enjoyment from bike riding were widely
423 reported in qualitative data. A high summary estimate was reported for riding a bike
424 being a fun and enjoyable activity (summary estimate = 55%; 95% CI: 25%; 86%),
425 further supported by participants across eight studies (Table 6) that commented on the
426 enjoyment of riding a bike.

427 "I always feel happy [when e-biking]. I liked it so much better than sitting in a car."
428 (Jones et al., 2016)

429 Some studies reported bike riding as a stress release, or to help a person's mental
430 health, as an enabling factor. In a survey conducted in the centre of Madrid (Muñoz et
431 al., 2013) participants reported a mean of 7.04 on a scale of 1 (strongly disagree) to 10
432 (strongly agree), for stress release being an enabling factor for bike riding. Participants
433 recalled bike riding as "*my little bit of time alone*" (M. Daley et al., 2007).

434 *Motivations*

435 Bike riding as a more sustainable and environmentally friendly option to travel was
436 reported as less of an enabling factor compared to summary estimates of other enablers
437 (summary estimate = 58%; 95% CI: 31%; 85%). However, this was rated as an
438 important enabling factor across all studies that measured this with a Likert scale
439 (Crawford et al., 2001; De Geus et al., 2008; Fernández-Heredia et al., 2014; Heinen et
440 al., 2011; Muñoz et al., 2013), and one study of women who ride a bike as their primary
441 mode of transport (Cred Consulting, 2020). Participants in four qualitative studies

(Galway et al., 2021; Samantha J Leger et al., 2019; D. Lois et al., 2016; J. E. van Bakkum et al., 2011) reported riding a bike because it is "*better for the planet*" (Galway et al., 2021).

An enabling factor reported in four qualitative studies (R  rat, 2019; Salvo et al., 2018; Scott, 2009; J. E. van Bakkum et al., 2011), and not measured in quantitative studies, was being a role model by riding a bike for transport. Participants in several studies commented on riding a bike in hope that their children would do the same in the future.

"I'd like my son to see that cycling was a viable choice of transport. He's too ready to jump into the car at every opportunity." (J. E. van Bakkum et al., 2011)

Potentially related to this enabling factor was the improvement of personal image from riding a bike. This was recorded in five quantitative studies (De Geus et al., 2008; Heinen et al., 2011; Mu  oz et al., 2013; Ton et al., 2019), with conflicting findings on the degree of importance.

Practicality

Riding a bike being a more economically viable transport option had a high summary estimate relative to other meta-analyses of enablers (summary estimate = 60%; 95% CI: 45%; 74%). Participants in four Likert scale studies rated this as an important enabling factor (Crawford et al., 2001; Fern  ndez-Heredia et al., 2014; Heinen et al., 2011; Mu  oz et al., 2013), while participants in three qualitative studies (D. Lois et al., 2016; Scott, 2009; J. E. van Bakkum et al., 2011) reported that bike riding was a one-time cost rather than ongoing costs, such as with a motor vehicle or public transport.

Discussion

This systematic review and meta-analysis identified a range of barriers and enablers to cycling for transport from 45 studies. Meta-analyses facilitated comparison between barriers and enablers, and the inclusion of qualitative data highlighted potentially under-researched factors and provided a consumer perspective. In total, 34 barriers and 21 enablers were identified. Meta-analyses were possible for 34 of the identified barriers and enablers. Barriers reported by the largest proportions of participants in meta-analyses were related to safety and infrastructure. Furthermore, the enablers reported by the highest proportion of participants were also regarding provision of infrastructure. Barriers identified through qualitative data included a negative perception of bike riders, a negative perception of e-bikes, and a lack of connectivity between existing infrastructure. Qualitative methods identified enablers that were not measured in other quantitative studies, including bike riding permitting exploration of local areas, and riding a bike to act as a role model for children.

Barriers and enablers relating to safety and infrastructure were rated as most important, and reported by the largest number of people in this review. It is likely that barriers regarding a perceived lack of safety relate to the reported lack of infrastructure that supports safe and low-stress bike riding (Branion-Calles et al., 2019). A perceived risk of injury, fear of harassment or aggression from motor vehicle drivers, and fear of riding a bike on the road with cars, were widely reported as barriers to riding a bike. A lack of high-quality infrastructure minimising interactions between bikes and motor vehicles, such as protected bike lanes, were also commonly reported. There is potential for these barriers, which are largely safety and infrastructure-related, to be overcome by interventions that minimise interactions between bike riders and motor vehicle traffic.

The provision of high-quality protected infrastructure remains the gold-standard for increasing participation in bike riding (Hull & O’Holleran, 2014; Stewart et al., 2015). However, there is difficulty in providing protected infrastructure across entire cities and regions. Further interventions to minimise potentially unsafe interactions between bike riders and motor vehicles could enable connections between protected infrastructure. This may include areas of lower motor vehicle speeds (such as 30km/h urban speed limits) or traffic calming infrastructure (Yang et al., 2010). Despite the need for protected infrastructure, on-road bike lanes remain a prominent form of bike infrastructure in urban design (Beck, 2021). As supported by our findings where “any bike lane” had a lower summary estimate than specifically protected bike lanes, this type of infrastructure does little to enhance participation in bike riding (Akar & Clifton, 2009; Michelle Daley & Rissel, 2011; J. Dill, 2009; Kristiann C Heesch et al., 2012; Twaddle et al., 2010), and places a person at a substantially higher risk of injury compared to riding a bike in a protected bike lane (Haileyesus et al., 2007; Lusk et al., 2011; Mehan et al., 2009).

A lack of storage on a bike was widely reported as a barrier to riding a bike for transport. This included storage to carry children and objects required for work. This suggests there is a greater need for availability of bikes with enhanced storage capacity, and for environments supportive of such bikes. One way to account for this need could be an increase in the accessibility of ‘cargo bikes’. Cargo bikes have substantial carrying capacity permitting the movement of children and belongings, however there are issues in uptake due to current infrastructure often being too narrow to comfortably ride and manoeuvre in (Liu et al., 2020). Many urban environments are designed with the premise of being used solely by upright two-wheeled bikes (Napper, 2020). Newly

established infrastructure dedicated to bikes may benefit from input from cargo-bike riders to ensure lanes are designed to enhance the capacity for bikes with storage capabilities to ride on them.

When designing inclusive infrastructure, it is also important to incorporate the needs of people riding bikes with children (Aldred et al., 2017; Clayton & Musselwhite, 2013). It was evident through qualitative data that some adults would ride a bike for transport if they were able to with their children. However, they reported not feeling safe to do so with existing infrastructure. Other research indicates that parents often avoid riding a bike for travel as sections of their bike network are perceived as unsafe for children, such as sections with on-road lanes (McLaren, 2016). While the barriers to children riding a bike to commute to school have been thoroughly researched, there is limited data on the barriers to adults riding alongside children for other trips. As many trips with children are often within local areas (Yeung et al., 2008), there is potential for modal shifts to bike riding if the needs of this group are understood and met.

A range of measures were used in studies included in this review to identify barriers or enablers, or quantify the importance of these barriers and enablers. Because of this, many study findings were unable to be robustly compared or synthesised, limiting discussion of differences in barriers and enablers between countries, samples and study types. Measures included in meta-analyses used binary outcomes which were useful for showing the size of the effect of a particular barrier or enabler. However, this does not consider the relative strength that a barrier or enabler may have in influencing an individual's bike riding behaviours. Other studies used Likert scales, permitting the participant to choose if a factor was very much, or less so of a barrier or enabler to their

riding a bike. This approach highlights potentially influential factors, allowing for a more focused approach. A downside of using Likert scales in this context is that studies exploring barriers and enablers to bike riding often have a large list of factors for inclusion. Where each factor requires a Likert scale answer, this can contribute to respondent fatigue, threatening data validity (Cox III, 1980; Dolnicar et al., 2011). To allow for comparisons between, and synthesis of, study findings in future, an approach that utilises the benefits of both binary and Likert scale measures is necessary. A two-step logic where participants first select all factors that are a barrier or enabler to them riding a bike, followed by a Likert scale question displaying only those factors chosen by the participant could be beneficial. This approach would identify both the proportion of people affected by particular barriers and enablers, and how much they do so.

It was evident through qualitative findings that there were varying interpretations of questions regarding feelings of safety while riding a bike. Some people perceived questions around feelings of safety to mean feeling unsafe riding a bike, while others perceived this as not feeling a sense of personal safety in, for example, a particular area. The separation of safety due to traffic and road safety compared to safety due to crime, theft or other environmental factors in future research is imperative for the validity and reliability of data (Forman et al., 2008). Pikora et al. (2002) previously outlined potential questions and keywords to specify and reliably measure safety in bike riding research, however this could benefit from updated review (Pikora et al., 2002).

Some enablers reported in this review were identified exclusively through qualitative data. These included riding a bike for transport as a role model for children,

in a hope that they will see it as a viable choice of transport. This enabling factor is also present in qualitative research of the enablers of physical activity (Caperchione et al., 2012; Stronach et al., 2016). As it is well established that parents participating in physical activity will have a positive influence on children's perception and participation in physical activity (Cheung & Chow, 2010; Welk et al., 2003), and there is evidence that this may be an enabling factor for adults, further quantitative measurement and exploration may be beneficial. An understanding of enabling factors such as this have the potential to inform meaningful promotional campaigns and values-based messaging around bike riding.

Reviews in bike riding and active transport research are often limited to published research, excluding potentially relevant grey literature conducted as part of government or bicycle organisation research. This review included a systematic grey literature search to incorporate this, while maintaining rigour by using study-specific quality assessment tools. While consideration was taken to carefully interpret data from grey literature sources, as they were not peer-reviewed, these sources may be subject to selection and publication bias.

A further limitation extends from the synthesis of data across a diversity of populations and locations. Locations had varying geographical areas, trip distances and infrastructure. Populations varied, including groups of university students, and studies of solely women. These variations and the substantial heterogeneity between samples prevented robust comparisons being made between study designs, countries and populations. Despite these variations and their likely influence on results, certain summary estimates had smaller confidence intervals relative to others. This

demonstrates the consistency of reporting these barriers and enablers across diverse geographical areas and population groups. In addition, not all barriers and enablers were able to be meta-analysed due to the heterogeneity of outcome measures used.

This review only included studies conducted in OECD countries and published in the English language. Findings are likely not reflective of the barriers and enablers present for people in lower to middle income economies (Bank, 2019), who encounter vastly different road and infrastructure conditions (Forjuoh, 2003). Further review is required to understand the unique barriers and enablers faced by these areas.

There are other methods used to capture barriers and enablers to cycling than what has been included in this review. Stated preference surveys have been used and reviewed previously, however the majority report on focused categories of barriers and/or enablers, such as infrastructure types (Aldred et al., 2017) or bike parking (Heinen & Buehler, 2019). This review focused on self-reported barriers and enablers from survey and qualitative data, which enabled the capture of the diversity and breadth of barriers and enablers people experience for riding a bike, as well as comparisons in frequency and distribution between categories.

Conclusion

Understanding the barriers and enablers to cycling for transport is integral to designing environments supportive of current and potential bike riders, for promotional campaigns to encourage participation in bike riding and to influence the development of supportive policy. This systematic review identified a diverse range of barriers and enablers using quantitative and qualitative data, highlighting the importance of safety and infrastructure, and potential flaws in survey reliability. Further research should include

615 measures to show the strength of particular barriers and enablers. It is recommended
616 that future research of barriers to bike riding clearly specifies the meaning of “safety”.

References

- Abasahl, F., Kelarestaghi, K. B., & Ermagun, A. (2018). Gender gap generators for bicycle mode choice in Baltimore college campuses [Empirical Study; Mathematical Model; Quantitative Study]. *Travel Behaviour and Society*, 11, 78-85. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tbs.2018.01.002>
- Agarwal, A., & Gupta, V. (2021). Economic impact of cycling across various nations [Article]. *International Journal of Economics and Business Research*, 21(2), 156-179. <https://doi.org/10.1504/IJEER.2021.113145>
- Agarwal, A., & North, A. (2012). Encouraging Bicycling among university students: Lessons from Queen's university, Kingston, Ontario [Article]. *Canadian journal of urban research*, 21(1), 151-168. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84874454836&partnerID=40&md5=4111f4fcbbaf02f1b63a1bcc60b53013>
- Akar, G., & Clifton, K. J. (2009). Influence of individual perceptions and bicycle infrastructure on decision to bike. *Transportation Research Record* (pp. 165-172).
- Akar, G., Fischer, N., & Namgung, M. (2013). Bicycling Choice and Gender Case Study: The Ohio State University [Article]. *International Journal of Sustainable Transportation*, 7(5), 347-365. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15568318.2012.673694>
- Aldred, R., Elliott, B., Woodcock, J., & Goodman, A. (2017). Cycling provision separated from motor traffic: a systematic review exploring whether stated preferences vary by gender and age. *Transport Reviews*, 37(1), 29-55.
- Bank, T. W. (2019). *Low & middle income* <https://data.worldbank.org/country/XO>
- Beck, B., Winters, M., Thompson, J., Stevenson, M., & Pettit, C. . (2021). Spatial variation in bicycling: a retrospective review of travel survey data from Greater Melbourne, Australia. . *SocArXiv Papers*. osf.io/preprints/socarxiv/78qgf
- Branion-Calles, M., Nelson, T., Fuller, D., Gauvin, L., & Winters, M. (2019). Associations between individual characteristics, availability of bicycle infrastructure, and city-wide safety perceptions of bicycling: A cross-sectional survey of bicyclists in 6 Canadian and US cities. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 123, 229-239.
- Buehler, R., & Pucher, J. (2017). Trends in walking and cycling safety: recent evidence from high-income countries, with a focus on the United States and Germany. *American Journal of Public Health*, 107(2), 281-287.
- Canser, B., Haydar, S., & Söyük, S. (2016). The similarities and differences analysis of OECD countries in terms of health system indicators. *Acıbadem Üniversitesi Sağlık Bilimleri Dergisi*(3), 154-164.
- Caperchione, C. M., Vandelanotte, C., Kolt, G. S., Duncan, M., Ellison, M., George, E., & Mummery, W. K. (2012). What a man wants: understanding the challenges and motivations to physical activity participation and healthy eating in middle-aged Australian men. *American journal of men's health*, 6(6), 453-461.
- Celis-Morales, C. A., Lyall, D. M., Welsh, P., Anderson, J., Steell, L., Guo, Y., Maldonado, R., Mackay, D. F., Pell, J. P., & Sattar, N. (2017). Association between active commuting and incident cardiovascular disease, cancer, and

- mortality: prospective cohort study. *bmj*, 357, j1456.
<https://www.bmj.com/content/357/bmj.j1456>
- Central Goldfields Shire Council. (2017). *Central Goldfields Shire Walking and Cycling Strategy* (
<https://www.centralgoldfields.vic.gov.au/files/sharedassets/public/community-services/recreation/cgswalkingcyclingstrategy20apr17.pdf>).
- Cheung, P. P., & Chow, B. C. (2010). Parental mediatory role in children's physical activity participation. *Health Education*.
- Chowdhury, S., & Costello, S. B. (2016). An examination of cyclists' and non-cyclists' mode choice under a new cycle network [Conference Paper]. *Road and Transport Research*, 25(4), 50-61.
<https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85019659368&partnerID=40&md5=571a88b852b02bc105e08c082b624f3c>
- Cred Consulting & City of Sydney (2020). *On the go: how women travel around our city: a case study on active transport across Sydney through a gender lens* (https://www.cityofsydney.nsw.gov.au/_data/assets/pdf_file/0016/321154/On-the-Go-How-women-get-around-our-city.pdf)
- Clayton, W., & Musselwhite, C. (2013). Exploring changes to cycle infrastructure to improve the experience of cycling for families [Article]. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 33, 54-61. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2013.09.003>
- Covidence. (2020). *Better systematic review management* <https://www.covidence.org/>
- Cox III, E. P. (1980). The optimal number of response alternatives for a scale: A review. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 17(4), 407-422.
- Crawford, F., Mutrie, N., & Hanlon, P. (2001). Employee attitudes towards active commuting. *International Journal of Health Promotion and Education*, 39(1), 14-20.
- Curto, A., De Nazelle, A., Donaire-Gonzalez, D., Cole-Hunter, T., Garcia-Aymerich, J., Martínez, D., Anaya, E., Rodríguez, D., Jerrett, M., & Nieuwenhuijsen, M. J. (2016). Private and public modes of bicycle commuting: A perspective on attitude and perception [Article]. *European Journal of Public Health*, 26(4), 717-723. <https://doi.org/10.1093/eurpub/ckv235>
- Daley, M., & Rissel, C. (2011). Perspectives and images of cycling as a barrier or facilitator of cycling. *Transport Policy*, 18(1), 211-216.
- Daley, M., Rissel, C., & Lloyd, B. (2007). All dressed up and nowhere to go? A qualitative research study of the barriers and enablers to cycling in inner Sydney [Article]. *Road & Transport Research*, 16(4), 42-52.
- De Geus, B., De Bourdeaudhuij, I., Jannes, C., & Meeusen, R. (2008). Psychosocial and environmental factors associated with cycling for transport among a working population [Article]. *Health Education Research*, 23(4), 697-708.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/her/cym055>
- Delso, J., Martín, B., & Ortega, E. (2018). Potentially replaceable car trips: Assessment of potential modal change towards active transport modes in Vitoria-Gasteiz [Article]. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 10(10), Article 3510.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su10103510>
- Department of Transport, U. (2021). *National Travel Survey: 2020*
<https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/national-travel-survey-2020/national-travel-survey-2020#trends-in-car-trips>
- Dill, J. (2009). Bicycling for transportation and health: the role of infrastructure. *Journal of Public Health Policy*, 30 Suppl 1, S95-110.
<https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1057/jphp.2008.56>

- Dill, J., & McNeil, N. (2016). Revisiting the four types of cyclists: findings from a national survey. *Transportation Research Record*, 2587(1), 90-99.
- Dolnicar, S., Grün, B., & Leisch, F. (2011). Quick, simple and reliable: Forced binary survey questions. *International journal of market research*, 53(2), 231-252.
- Fernández-Heredia, T., Monzón, A., & Jara-Díaz, S. (2014). Understanding cyclists' perceptions, keys for a successful bicycle promotion [Article]. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 63, 1-11.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2014.02.013>
- Fishman, E., & Cherry, C. (2016). E-bikes in the mainstream: reviewing a decade of research. *Transport Reviews*, 36(1), 72-91.
- Fishman, E., Washington, S., & Haworth, N. (2012). Barriers and facilitators to public bicycle scheme use: A qualitative approach. *Transportation research part F: traffic psychology and behaviour*, 15(6), 686-698.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2012.08.002>
- Forjuoh, S. N. (2003). Traffic-related injury prevention interventions for low-income countries. *Injury control and safety promotion*, 10(1-2), 109-118.
- Forman, H., Kerr, J., Norman, G. J., Saelens, B. E., Durant, N. H., Harris, S. K., & Sallis, J. F. (2008). Reliability and validity of destination-specific barriers to walking and cycling for youth. *Preventive Medicine*, 46(4), 311-316.
- Fyhri, A., Heinen, E., Fearnley, N., & Sundfør, H. B. (2017). A push to cycling—exploring the e-bike's role in overcoming barriers to bicycle use with a survey and an intervention study [Article]. *International Journal of Sustainable Transportation*, 11(9), 681-695.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15568318.2017.1302526>
- Galway, L. P., Deck, E., Carastathis, J., & Sanderson, R. (2021). Exploring social-ecological influences on commuter cycling in a midsize northern city: A qualitative study in Thunder Bay, Canada [Article]. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 92, Article 102995. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2021.102995>
- Gibbs, G. R. (2007). Thematic coding and categorizing. *Analyzing qualitative data*, 703, 38-56.
- Haileyesus, T., Anest, J. L., & Dellinger, A. M. (2007). Cyclists injured while sharing the road with motor vehicles. *Injury prevention*, 13(3), 202-206.
<https://doi.org/10.1136/ip.2006.014019>
- Harper, C., Fan, Z. (2021). *Environmental Impacts of Short Car Trip Replacement with Micromobility Modes*
(https://ppms.cit.cmu.edu/media/project_files/Final_Report_-_310.pdf)
- Heart Foundation. (2013). *Women and Cycling Survey* (<http://www.cycle-helmets.com/women-cycling-survey-2013.pdf>)
- Heesch, K. C., Sahlqvist, S., & Garrard, J. (2012). Gender differences in recreational and transport cycling: a cross-sectional mixed-methods comparison of cycling patterns, motivators, and constraints [Comparative Study Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't]. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition & Physical Activity*, 9, 106. <https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1479-5868-9-106>
- Heesch, K. C., Sahlqvist, S., & Garrard, J. (2012). Gender differences in recreational and transport cycling: a cross-sectional mixed-methods comparison of cycling patterns, motivators, and constraints. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 9(1), 106.
- Heinen, E., & Buehler, R. (2019). Bicycle parking: a systematic review of scientific literature on parking behaviour, parking preferences, and their influence on

- cycling and travel behaviour [Article]. *Transport Reviews*, 39(5), 630-656.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2019.1590477>
- Heinen, E., Maat, K., & Van Wee, B. (2011). The role of attitudes toward characteristics of bicycle commuting on the choice to cycle to work over various distances [Article]. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 16(2), 102-109. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2010.08.010>
- Hull, A., & O'Holleran, C. (2014). Bicycle infrastructure: can good design encourage cycling? *Urban, Planning and Transport Research*, 2(1), 369-406.
- Iwińska, K., Blicharska, M., Pierotti, L., Tainio, M., & de Nazelle, A. (2018). Cycling in Warsaw, Poland – Perceived enablers and barriers according to cyclists and non-cyclists [Article]. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 113, 291-301. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2018.04.014>
- Jones, T., Harms, L., & Heinen, E. (2016). Motives, perceptions and experiences of electric bicycle owners and implications for health, wellbeing and mobility [Article]. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 53, 41-49.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2016.04.006>
- Kent, J. L. (2015). Still feeling the car—The role of comfort in sustaining private car use. *Mobilities*, 10(5), 726-747.
- Léchaud, C. d. F. (2016). *The role of innovation on Bicycle Commuting in Portugal*].
- Leger, S. J., Dean, J. L., Edge, S., & Casello, J. M. (2019). “If I had a regular bicycle, I wouldn't be out riding anymore”: Perspectives on the potential of e-bikes to support active living and independent mobility among older adults in Waterloo, Canada [Article]. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 123, 240-254. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2018.10.009>
- Leger, S. J., Dean, J. L., Edge, S., & Casello, J. M. (2019). “If I had a regular bicycle, I wouldn't be out riding anymore”: Perspectives on the potential of e-bikes to support active living and independent mobility among older adults in Waterloo, Canada. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 123, 240-254.
- Leyland, L. A., Spencer, B., Beale, N., Jones, T., & van Reekum, C. M. (2019). The effect of cycling on cognitive function and well-being in older adults. *PloS one*, 14 (2) (no pagination)(e0211779).
<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0211779>
- Linden, H., Fitch, A., Emerson, A., Hoeper, S., & Granner, M. L. (2020). Maybe next time: Perspectives on commuting from bike to work week non-participants [Article]. *Health Behavior and Policy Review*, 7(2), 110-119.
<https://doi.org/10.14485/HBPR.7.2.4>
- Litman, T. (2015). *Evaluating active transport benefits and costs*. Victoria Transport Policy Institute.
- Liu, G., Nello-Deakin, S., te Brömmelstroet, M., & Yamamoto, Y. (2020). What makes a good cargo bike route? Perspectives from users and planners. *American Journal of Economics and Sociology*, 79(3), 941-965.
- Lizarondo L, S. C., Carrier J, Godfrey C, Rieger K, Salmond S, Apostolo J, Kirkpatrick P, Loveday H. (2020). *JBIManual for Evidence Synthesis*. Joanna Briggs Institute.
<https://wiki.jbi.global/display/MANUAL/Chapter+8%3A+Mixed+methods+systematic+reviews>
- Lois, D., Lopez-Saez, M., & Rondinella, G. (2016). Qualitative analysis on cycle commuting in two cities with different cycling environments and policies [Empirical Study; Interview]. *Universitas Psychologica*, 15(2), 15-34.
<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.upsy15-2.qacc>

- Lois, D., López-Sáez, M., & Rondinella, G. (2016). Qualitative analysis on cycle commuting in two cities with different cycling environments and policies [Article]. *Universitas Psychologica*, 15(2), 175-194. <https://doi.org/10.11144/Javeriana.upsyl5-2.qacc>
- Lusk, A. C., Furth, P. G., Morency, P., Miranda-Moreno, L. F., Willett, W. C., & Dennerlein, J. T. (2011). Risk of injury for bicycling on cycle tracks versus in the street. *Injury prevention*, 17(2), 131-135. <https://doi.org/10.1136/ip.2010.028696>
- Manaugh, K., Boisjoly, G., & El-Geneidy, A. (2017). Overcoming barriers to cycling: understanding frequency of cycling in a University setting and the factors preventing commuters from cycling on a regular basis. *Transportation*, 44(4), 871-884. <https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s11116-016-9682-x>
- McLaren, A. T. (2016). Families and transportation: Moving towards multimodality and altermobility? *Journal of Transport Geography*, 51, 218-225.
- Mehan, T. J., Gardner, R., Smith, G. A., & McKenzie, L. B. (2009). Bicycle-related injuries among children and adolescents in the United States [Article]. *Clinical Pediatrics*, 48(2), 166-173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0009922808324952>
- Mullan, E. (2013). Exercise, weather, safety, and public attitudes: A qualitative exploration of leisure cyclists' views on cycling for transport [Article]. *SAGE Open*, 3(3), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244013497030>
- Munn, Z., Moola, S., Riitano, D., & Lisy, K. (2014). The development of a critical appraisal tool for use in systematic reviews addressing questions of prevalence. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, 3(3), 123.
- Muñoz, B., Monzon, A., & Lois, D. (2013). Cycling habits and other psychological variables affecting commuting by bicycle in Madrid, Spain. *Transportation Research Record* (pp. 1-9). National Research Council.
- Napper, R. (2020). What is a parked bicycle? Vehicle fleet characteristics in Australia [Article]. *Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, 7, Article 100204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2020.100204>
- Nikitas, A. (2018). Understanding bike-sharing acceptability and expected usage patterns in the context of a small city novel to the concept: A story of 'Greek Drama' [Empirical Study; Nonclinical Case Study; Quantitative Study]. *Transportation research part F: traffic psychology and behaviour*, 56, 306-321. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2018.04.022>
- Nordengen, S., Andersen, L. B., Solbraa, A. K., & Riiser, A. (2019). Cycling is associated with a lower incidence of cardiovascular diseases and death: Part 1—systematic review of cohort studies with meta-analysis. *British Journal of Sports Medicine*, 53(14), 870-878.
- Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD). (2020). *Member countries* <https://www.oecd.org/about/members-and-partners/>
- Pérez, K., Olabarria, M., Rojas-Rueda, D., Santamariña-Rubio, E., Borrell, C., & Nieuwenhuijsen, M. (2017). The health and economic benefits of active transport policies in Barcelona. *Journal of Transport & Health*, 4, 316-324.
- Pikora, T. J., Bull, F. C., Jamrozik, K., Knuiman, M., Giles-Corti, B., & Donovan, R. J. (2002). Developing a reliable audit instrument to measure the physical environment for physical activity. *American journal of preventive medicine*, 23(3), 187-194.
- Rabl, A., & De Nazelle, A. (2012). Benefits of shift from car to active transport. *Transport Policy*, 19(1), 121-131.

- Rérat, P. (2019). Cycling to work: Meanings and experiences of a sustainable practice [Article]. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 123, 91-104. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tra.2018.10.017>
- Richards, R., Murdoch, L., Reeder, A. I., & Amun, Q.-t. (2011). Political activity for physical activity: health advocacy for active transport. *International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity*, 8(1), 1-7.
- RStudio Team. (2020). *RStudio: Integrated Development for R*. RStudio, PBC. <http://www.rstudio.com/>
- Sahlqvist, S. L., & Heesch, K. C. (2012). Characteristics of utility cyclists in Queensland, Australia: an examination of the associations between individual, social, and environmental factors and utility cycling [Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't]. *Journal of Physical Activity & Health*, 9(6), 818-828.
- Salvo, G., Lashewicz, B. M., Doyle-Baker, P. K., & McCormack, G. R. (2018). A mixed methods study on the barriers and facilitators of physical activity associated with residential relocation. *Journal of Environmental and Public Health*, 2018 (no pagination)(1094812). <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2018/1094812>
- Schneider, R. J., & Hu, L. (2015). Improving university transportation sustainability: Reducing barriers to campus bus and bicycle commuting [Article]. *International Journal of Sustainability Policy and Practice*, 11(1), 24-34. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84922780056&partnerID=40&md5=da8f72cb5997536f05e546a1e616aa8b>
- Schwarzer, G., & Schwarzer, M. G. (2012). Package ‘meta’. *The R foundation for statistical computing*, 9.
- Scott, C. (2009). *Research into barriers to cycling in NSW: Final report*
- Sears, J., Flynn, B. S., Aultman-Hall, L., & Dana, G. S. (2012). To bike or not to bike: Seasonal factors for bicycle commuting. *Transportation Research Record*, 2314(1), 105-111.
- Stangeby, I. (1997). *Attitudes towards walking and cycling instead of using a car*.
- Šťastná, M., Vaishar, A., Zapletalová, J., & Ševelová, M. (2018). Cycling: A benefit for health or just a means of transport? Case study Brno (Czech Republic) and its surroundings [Article]. *Transportation research part F: traffic psychology and behaviour*, 55, 219-233. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2018.02.006>
- Stewart, G., Anokye, N. K., & Pokhrel, S. (2015). What interventions increase commuter cycling? A systematic review. *BMJ Open*, 5(8), e007945.
- Stronach, M., Maxwell, H., & Taylor, T. (2016). ‘Sistas’ and Aunties: sport, physical activity, and Indigenous Australian women. *Annals of Leisure Research*, 19(1), 7-26.
- Swiers, R., Pritchard, C., & Gee, I. (2017). A cross sectional survey of attitudes, behaviours, barriers and motivators to cycling in university students [Empirical Study; Quantitative Study]. *Journal of Transport & Health*, 6, 379-385. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jth.2017.07.005>
- The Heart Foundation. (2011). *Riding a bike for transport* (<https://www.heartfoundation.org.au/images/uploads/publications/Cycling-Survey-2011-Riding-a-Bike-for-Transport.pdf>)
- Ton, D., Zomer, L. B., Schneider, F., Hoogendoorn-Lanser, S., Duives, D., Cats, O., & Hoogendoorn, S. (2019). Latent classes of daily mobility patterns: the relationship with attitudes towards modes [Article]. *Transportation*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-019-09975-9>

- Twaddle, H., Hall, F., & Bracic, B. (2010). Latent bicycle commuting demand and effects of gender on commuter cycling and accident rates. *Transportation Research Record* (pp. 28-36).
- Tyndall, J. (2010). *AACODS Checklist*. Flinders University
https://dspace.flinders.edu.au/xmlui/bitstream/handle/2328/3326/AACODS_Checklist.pdf?sequence=4
- Vagane, L. (2007). Short car trips in Norway: is there a potential for modal shift? (Ed.),[^](Eds.). Proceedings of the European Transport Conference 2007, Lieden, The Netherlands.
- van Bekkum, J. E., Williams, J. M., & Morris, P. G. (2011). Cycle commuting and perceptions of barriers: Stages of change, gender and occupation [Empirical Study; Quantitative Study]. *Health Education*, 111(6), 476-497.
<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/09654281111180472>
- van Bekkum, J. E., Williams, J. M., & Morris, P. G. (2011). Employees' perceptions of cycle commuting: A qualitative study [Article]. *Health Education*, 111(3), 198-215. <https://doi.org/10.1108/09654281111123484>
- Welk, G. J., Wood, K., & Morss, G. (2003). Parental influences on physical activity in children: An exploration of potential mechanisms. *Pediatric Exercise Science*, 15(1), 19-33.
- Whannell, P., Whannell, R., & White, R. (2012). Tertiary student attitudes to bicycle commuting in a regional Australian university [Article]. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 13(1), 34-45.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/14676371211190290>
- Wilson, A., & Mitra, R. (2020). Implementing cycling infrastructure in a politicized space: Lessons from Toronto, Canada. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 86, 102760.
- Winters, M., Davidson, G., Kao, D., & Teschke, K. (2011). Motivators and deterrents of bicycling: Comparing influences on decisions to ride [Article]. *Transportation*, 38(1), 153-168. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-010-9284-y>
- Winters, M., Sims-Gould, J., Franke, T., & McKay, H. (2015). "I grew up on a bike": Cycling and older adults [Article]. *Journal of Transport and Health*, 2(1), 58-67. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jth.2014.06.001>
- Yang, L., Sahlqvist, S., McMinn, A., Griffin, S. J., & Ogilvie, D. (2010). Interventions to promote cycling: systematic review. *bmj*, 341.
- Yeung, J., Wearing, S., & Hills, A. P. (2008). Child transport practices and perceived barriers in active commuting to school. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice*, 42(6), 895-900.
- Zander, A., Passmore, E., Mason, C., & Rissel, C. (2013). Joy, exercise, enjoyment, getting out: a qualitative study of older people's experience of cycling in Sydney, Australia [Research Support, Non-U.S. Gov't]. *Journal Of Environmental & Public Health*, 2013, 547453.
<https://doi.org/https://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2013/547453>