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A  QUESTIONNAIRE
1 Introduction

Bikeability and the Bikeability Brand

1.1 ‘Bikeability’ is the public facing brand of the National Standard for cycle training. Bikeability was launched by the Department for Transport through Cycling England in 2007 as ‘cycling proficiency for the 21st century’. The brand itself is owned by the Department for Transport on behalf of the Crown.

1.2 Bikeability training comprises three levels. Level 1 teaches trainees basic bicycle control skills in an off-road environment; Level 2 is delivered on-road, where trainees gain real cycling experience and the fundamental skills for dealing with traffic on short journeys; and Level 3 equips trainees with skills that enable them to be able to deal with all types of road conditions and more challenging traffic situations.

1.3 The Department for Transport has provided funding contributions for Bikeability child training places since the introduction of the scheme. From 2006/07 to 2011/12, over 750,000 Bikeability training places have been provided using DfT funding. Training is delivered by registered Bikeability schemes (Local Authorities, School Games Organiser Host Schools or independent organisations) using qualified National Standard Instructors and Assistants. The majority of funded training is delivered to Year 6 children (aged 10-11).

1.4 The Bikeability brand (the name ‘Bikeability’ and associated logos) is disseminated to the public by branding cycle training delivered by a Bikeability registered scheme as ‘Bikeability’; through the use of Bikeability branded award materials for trainees who successfully meet the outcomes at each level (badges, certificates and booklets), and through the Bikeability website (www.dft.gov.uk/bikeability). Registered Bikeability schemes are encouraged to use the brand on their own marketing materials.

The Bikeability Brand Survey

1.5 To better understand the appeal, reach and perception of the Bikeability brand amongst the wider public, the Department for Transport commissioned Steer Davies Gleave to conduct a brand research survey with parents of children in England in Years 6 and 7 (the years in which children are likely to receive Bikeability training). The aims of this survey were to:

- Understand how the Bikeability brand is perceived by parents, identifying strengths and weaknesses of the brand and highlighting ways in which the brand could be made more appealing or better positioned;
- Understand access to and uptake of Bikeability training across England, exploring possible reasons for lower or higher uptake;
- Understand the full range of brand ‘touchpoints’ (exploring how children and parents come into contact with Bikeability); and
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- Help support and inform the future development of the Bikeability brand and associated communications with the wider public through the identification of messages and touchpoints that are effective with or preferred by parents.

1.6 The survey was a repeat of research conducted in 2012 and 2011. This year a small number of additional questions were included: these aimed to explore whether parents recognised a distinction between Bikeability and any other cycle training scheme.

This Report

1.7 This report presents a summary and discussion of the results of the brand research undertaken. The remainder of this report is organised as follows:

- Chapter 2 provides an overview of the method used for the survey;
- Chapter 3 presents the findings of the survey, structured according to the key question areas; and
- Chapter 4 presents the conclusions.
2 Method

Survey Methodology

2.1 To ensure that the responses achieved through this survey were comparable with the responses from surveys in previous years, it was important to ensure that the overall approach was consistent. To guarantee consistency the same methodology was used as in 2011 and 2012, with research being undertaken through the use of an online panel survey.

2.2 The online panel survey was co-ordinated and hosted by Research Now, an online survey provider. To be in scope, survey respondents had to be resident in mainland England, and a parent of a child in Year 6 or Year 7 (10-12 years old). An appropriate survey panel was therefore selected by Research Now on the basis of these requirements. Any out of scope respondents were screened out of the survey at the earliest opportunity.

2.3 The survey was ‘soft launched’ on 25th October 2013 to check for any technical issues. After the survey data was checked and no problems were found, the survey was fully launched on 28th October and was live until 20th November. A total of 1,810 responses were achieved.

Survey Structure

2.4 The survey had four key question areas, with respondents progressing through different areas of the survey according to their stated awareness of Bikeability:

- The appeal, importance and awareness of formal cycle training schemes, with ‘formal cycle training’ defined as an organised course, delivered by a qualified instructor.
- The appeal, importance and awareness of Bikeability specifically.
- Communication channels / ‘touchpoints’ for parents - where they would expect to hear about Bikeability.
- The appeal of the current range of Bikeability branded award materials.
- The perceived impact of Bikeability training on a child’s rate of cycling and safety when cycling.

2.5 A copy of the survey is included in Appendix A.

Sample Profile

2.6 Standard demographic quotas for gender and age were applied to the sample and progress against the quotas was monitored whilst the survey was live to ensure the resultant sample profile was representative of the target population of parents.

2.7 There was a greater response from mothers than from fathers, with 63% of responses from mothers and 37% from fathers.
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**TABLE 2.1 GENDER OF RESPONDENTS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>668</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>1142</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1810</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was an equal split between respondents who had a boy aged 10-12 years (50% of respondents) and respondents who had a girl aged 10-12 years (50%). Respondents who had more than one child aged between 10-12 years were asked to consider the child who was next to have their birthday when responding to the survey.

**TABLE 2.2 GENDER OF RESPONDENT'S CHILD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boy</td>
<td>902</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girl</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1810</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Just over half of respondents had a child who was in Year 7 (56% of respondents), with the remainder of respondents having children who were in Year 6 (44%).

**TABLE 2.3 YEAR GROUP OF RESPONDENT’S CHILD**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 6</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 7</td>
<td>1014</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1810</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A geographic quota was applied to ensure a geographically representative spread of responses amongst the target population. A minimum of 150 responses were required from parents in each English region to ensure that any regional variations in responses could be identified. This minimum response was achieved in all regions except for the North East, where the number of responses fell slightly short of target, with 115 responses. The geographic profile of the resultant sample is shown below in Table 2.4.
### TABLE 2.4 GEOGRAPHIC PROFILE OF RESPONDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of responses</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire / Humberside</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1810</strong></td>
<td><strong>100</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Survey Findings

3.1 This chapter presents the results of the survey. Where comparisons with the previous years’ survey results are possible and relevant, these comparisons have been made.

Formal Cycle Training Schemes

3.2 The first section of the survey investigated respondents’ understanding and recognition of formal cycle training schemes in general, without explicit reference to Bikeability.

The importance of formal cycle training

3.3 Respondents were asked how important or not it is that their child receives formal cycle training. This was defined as cycle training where a qualified instructor teaches a child to cycle through an organised course. Figure 3.1 shows the results.

3.4 In line with the previous surveys’ results, respondents who were aware of Bikeability felt that formal instruction was more important than those who were not aware, with 54% of those aware of Bikeability considering formal cycle training important, in comparison to 79% of those unaware of Bikeability.

3.5 In the 2013 survey 19% of those unaware of Bikeability felt formal cycle training was not at all important. This was a six percentage point increase from the 2011 survey results.

FIGURE 3.1 IMPORTANCE OF A CHILD RECEIVING FORMAL CYCLE TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Fairly important</th>
<th>Not very important</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total 2013</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2012</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total 2011</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of Bikeability 2013</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of Bikeability 2012</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of Bikeability 2011</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware of Bikeability 2013</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware of Bikeability 2012</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware of Bikeability 2011</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qu. 1 Base: All respondents (1810)
3.6 Respondents had the opportunity to add any additional comments regarding the importance of their child receiving formal cycle training. Table 3.1 shows a summary of the most frequent responses (grouped according to the key message in the free text response) amongst those who felt formal cycle training was important.

**TABLE 3.1 WHY RECEIVING FORMAL CYCLE TRAINING IS IMPORTANT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Themes</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The training teaches children about road safety</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important that the training is delivered by a professional</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training teaches children about road awareness</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important that children learn about the Highway Code</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important because roads are dangerous</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important that children receive training because cycling is a life skill</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving training helps to improve a child’s confidence</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training will help deliver health benefits in the longer term</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training helps to promote independence</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training helps children to be sustainable in the longer term</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The training teaches children cycle maintenance</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parents had cycle training at school and found it invaluable</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.7 Additional analysis was undertaken on why professional cycle training was seen as important (i.e. training delivered by a professional, rather than cycle training in a general sense). Table 3.2 breaks down the responses linked to professional training. Over half of respondents (62%) stated that they felt that children learn better when taught by a professional.
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### TABLE 3.2 THE IMPORTANCE OF RECEIVING CYCLE TRAINING FROM A PROFESSIONAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Theme</th>
<th>% of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children learn better with a professional teacher</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children do not listen to parents in the same was as a professional</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental assurance that their child is trained to the correct standard</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads are busy and dangerous</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents unable to train their own child</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.8

A question regarding the importance of formal cycle training including cycling on a public road and not just in a traffic free environment was included in the 2013 survey. This question was aimed at all respondents.

#### 3.9

Respondents were asked how important or not it is that cycle training includes being accompanied by a trained instructor while cycling on a public road, and not just in a traffic free environment. More than half of all respondents (60%) felt that it was ‘very important’ that cycle training includes being accompanied by a trained instructor while cycling on a public road.

**FIGURE 3.2 IMPORTANCE OF CYCLE TRAINING TAKING PLACE ON A PUBLIC ROAD WITH A TRAINED INSTRUCTOR**

![Bar Chart](chart.png)

*Qu. 1A: All respondents (1810)*
The benefits of formal cycle training for children

3.10 Respondents were asked to identify the main benefits for their child of receiving formal cycle training. Respondents were asked to identify up to three benefits of cycle training, ranking their first choice through to their third choice.

3.11 ‘Safer when cycling’ and ‘Improved road awareness’ were the most common first choice benefits of formal cycle training identified by respondents, with 58% and 40% respectively identifying these benefits first. These benefits were also the most common second choice benefits. Figure 3.3 shows all of the results.

FIGURE 3.3 MAIN BENEFITS OF RECEIVING FORMAL CYCLE TRAINING

Qu. 2 Base: All respondents (1810)

Unprompted awareness of formal cycle training schemes

3.12 Respondents were asked to name any formal cycle training schemes for children they were aware of. This was a free text response and the most frequent responses are listed in Table 3.3.

TABLE 3.3 UNPROMPTED AWARENESS OF FORMAL CYCLE TRAINING SCHEMES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scheme Name</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cycling proficiency</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeability</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.13 The proportion of respondents identifying Bikeability as a formal cycle training scheme, without prompting, has increased year on year since the 2011 survey; an increase of 17 percentage points between 2011 and 2013.
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3.14 There was a decrease in the number of respondents naming cycling proficiency as a formal cycle training scheme they were aware of. This decreased from 52% of respondents in 2012 to 37% of respondents in 2013, although this is still a 10 percentage point increase from the 2011 survey.

Uptake of formal cycle training

3.15 Respondents were asked whether their child had received cycle training, had been offered cycle training, or currently had cycle training booked (were due to receive cycle training in the near future). Figure 3.4 shows the responses by region.

3.16 London was the region with the lowest percentage of parents reporting their children having been offered or receiving training, with only 28% of children having received, or being booked to receive formal cycle training. The East of England was the region with the highest proportion of children who had received cycle training (48%).

FIGURE 3.4 UPTAKE OF CYCLE TRAINING BY REGION

Qu. 5 Base: All respondents (1810)

3.17 Figure 3.5 presents a comparison with the responses received in 2011 and 2012. As shown, the proportion of children reported as having received formal cycle training has decreased slightly from the 2012 survey by three percentage points.

3.18 The proportion of respondents who stated they would be unlikely to let their child take part if they were offered cycle training dropped from 5% of respondents in 2012 to 3% of respondents in 2013.
FIGURE 3.5 UPTAKE OF CYCLE TRAINING – COMPARISON WITH 2011 AND 2012 RESULTS

Qu. 5 Base: All respondents (1810)

Bikeability

Awareness of Bikeability

Respondents were asked about their awareness of the Bikeability cycle training scheme. Two fifths of all respondents (40%) in the 2013 survey were aware of the Bikeability training scheme when shown the Bikeability scheme logo, compared to 28% in 2011.
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FIGURE 3.6 HAVE YOU HEARD OF THE BIKEABILITY TRAINING SCHEME?

Qu. 4 Base: All respondents (1810)

Overall awareness of the Bikeability cycle training scheme differs from region to region. The regions with the highest percentage of people aware of Bikeability are the South West and West Midlands (both 48%). The region with the lowest awareness of Bikeability is London, where almost three quarters (71%) of respondents were unaware of Bikeability.

FIGURE 3.7 THOSE AWARE OF BIKEABILITY BY REGION

Qu. 4 Base: All respondents (1810)
Those respondents aware of Bikeability were asked further questions about the scheme and what Bikeability training involves. Respondents were asked if they were aware that:

- Bikeability is different to cycling proficiency
- Bikeability is delivered by professional instructors
- Bikeability includes training on public roads

Over half of respondents (60%) were not aware that Bikeability is different to cycling proficiency, however, perhaps surprisingly, respondents seemed aware of what Bikeability training involves at the practical level; 84% of respondents stated that they were aware that Bikeability is delivered by professional instructors, and 77% were aware that training takes place on public roads.

**FIGURE 3.8 AWARENESS OF WHAT BIKEABILITY CYCLE TRAINING INVOLVES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No (%)</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bikeability is different to cycling proficiency</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeability is delivered by professional instructors</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bikeability includes training on public roads</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Qu. 4A Base: All respondents aware of Bikeability (727)*

**Uptake of other formal cycle training schemes**

Respondents who stated that their child had been offered cycle training, were booked to receive cycle training, or had already received cycle training were asked if they could identify which cycle training scheme their child had taken part in or would be taking part in. Respondents were shown the logos for Bikeability, CTC and Go-Ride training. Both CTC and Go-Ride offer cycle training in some English regions. It is unlikely that many children will have received CTC or Go-Ride training (or training branded as such) - this question was designed to test how well respondents identified with the Bikeability logo and name when faced with alternatives (how memorable Bikeability is).

Bikeability training was the most identified scheme, with 51% of respondents stating that their children had been offered, booked or received Bikeability.
3.25 Just over a third of respondents did not know the name of the cycle training scheme being offered to their child (37%). This has decreased slightly from the 2011 survey (43%).

**FIGURE 3.9 WHICH OF THESE SCHEMES HAS YOUR CHILD BEEN OFFERED, BOOKED, OR RECEIVED?**

![Bar chart showing regional variation in brand recognition.](chart)

**Qu. 6 Base: All respondents whose child has been offered, booked, or received cycle training (979)**

3.26 Figure 3.9 shows regional variation in the brand recognition. Bikeability is the most known formal cycle training scheme in all regions of the country. The region with the highest percentage of children having been offered, booked, or received Bikeability training was the West Midlands (64%).

3.27 Similarly to the results of the 2012 survey, CTC training (delivered by the organisation, the CTC) was a particularly common response among London residents when compared to the other regions. Just over one tenth (11%) of London respondents stated that their child had been offered, booked, or received cycle training delivered by the CTC. London was again the region with the lowest recognition of the Bikeability brand, with only 32% of respondents stating that their children had been offered, booked, or received Bikeability training.

3.28 There was a high proportion of respondents who did not know the name of the formal cycle training scheme offered to their children; this was common across all regions. The region with the highest percentage of respondents who did not know the name of the cycle training scheme was Yorkshire and Humberside, where 44% of all respondents were not aware of the scheme's name.
FIGURE 3.10 WHICH OF THESE SCHEMES HAS YOUR CHILD BEEN OFFERED, BOOKED OR RECEIVED, BY REGION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Bikeability</th>
<th>CTC Training</th>
<th>Go-Ride Training</th>
<th>Some other training</th>
<th>Do not know name of training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire / Humber</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Bikeability</th>
<th>CTC Training</th>
<th>Go-Ride Training</th>
<th>Some other training</th>
<th>Do not know name of training</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East of England</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire / Humber</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Qu. 6 Base: All respondents whose child has been offered, booked, or received cycle training (979)**

3.29 They key cycle training schemes mentioned within ‘some other scheme’ were:

- Cycling proficiency 33%
- School training 30%

**Communication channels**

3.30 Respondents who were not already aware of the Bikeability training scheme were asked where they would expect to hear about a scheme like Bikeability. The majority of respondents who were not already aware of Bikeability stated that they expected to hear about Bikeability through their child’s school (85%).

3.31 Of the 14 respondents who expected to hear about Bikeability through leaflets and posters from elsewhere, all expected to see such leaflets or posters in community centres or council buildings.

3.32 The main locations mentioned by respondents who expected to hear about Bikeability online suggested social media websites such as Facebook, and through internet search engines such as Google.
FIGURE 3.11 COMMUNICATION CHANNELS – THOSE UNAWARE OF BIKEABILITY

Qu. 7B Base: All respondents not already aware of Bikeability (1063)

Those aware of Bikeability were asked where they had heard about the scheme. The most common source in the 2011, 2012 and 2013 surveys was through their child’s school. Although the child’s school is still the most common source of awareness of Bikeability, the proportion of respondents stating this dropped from 69% in 2012 to 55% in 2013.
FIGURE 3.12 COMMUNICATION CHANNELS - THOSE ALREADY AWARE OF BIKEABILITY

Qu. 8 Base: All respondents aware of Bikeability (907)

Bikeability - Those not Offered / Booked

**Likelihood of participation**

3.34 Respondents were asked how likely they would be to give permission for their child to take part in Bikeability if it was offered to them in the next few weeks or months. The response from fathers and mothers was very similar.

3.35 Those aware of Bikeability were slightly more likely to give permission for their child to take part in the training (58%) than those who were unaware of Bikeability (54%).
Summary of Responses

FIGURE 3.13 LIKELIHOOD OF PARENTS TO GIVE PERMISSION FOR BIKEABILITY TRAINING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Don't know</th>
<th>Very unlikely</th>
<th>Fairly unlikely</th>
<th>Neither likely nor unlikely</th>
<th>Fairly likely</th>
<th>Very likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fathers</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mothers</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of Bikeability</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unaware of Bikeability</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qu. 10 Base: All respondents whose child has not been offered, booked, or received Bikeability training (1291)

Over half of respondents (54%) in the 2013 survey stated that they would be very likely to give permission for their child to take part in Bikeability training. Although the proportion of respondents very likely to give permission has increased since the 2011 survey, there was a small (two percentage points) decrease in the proportion of respondents from the 2012 survey, where 56% of respondent stated that they would be very likely to give permission for their child to take part in Bikeability training.
FIGURE 3.14 LIKELIHOOD OF PARENTS TO GIVE PERMISSION FOR CHILDREN TO TAKE PART IN BIKEABILITY TRAINING – COMPARISON WITH 2011 AND 2012 RESULTS

Qu. 10 Base: All respondents whose child has not been offered, booked, or received Bikeability training (1291)

Reasons for not giving permission for children to participate

3.37 Respondents who were unlikely to give permission for their child to take part in Bikeability training were asked what the main reasons for this were.

3.38 The proportion of respondents stating that their child does not want cycle training decreased from 20% of respondents in 2012 to 11% in 2013. The proportion of respondents stating that their children do not know how to ride a bike has also decreased from 13% in 2012 to only 4% in 2013.

3.39 Less than one tenth (9%) of respondents stated that they are unlikely to give permission for their child to take part in Bikeability training as cycling is too dangerous. This was an increase from the proportion of respondents stating this in the 2012 survey (5%). The number of respondents who do not want their child to ride a bike has increased by two percentage points from the 2011 survey.
**FIGURE 3.15 MAIN REASONS FOR NOT GIVING PERMISSION FOR BIKEABILITY TRAINING**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My child does not need cycle training</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child does not want cycle training</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child does not have a bike available</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child does not know how to ride a bike</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child has special educational needs</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical reason</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycle training doesn’t make any difference</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child has received other training</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child will be taught to cycle by family / friend</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am concerned about cost</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child is not confident cycling on the road</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling is too dangerous</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not want my child to ride a bike</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qu.11 Base: All respondents unlikely to give / not sure of giving permission for their child to take part in Bikeability (139)

Verbatim responses given as ‘other’ reasons for being unlikely to give permission for a child to take part are detailed below.

- “Cannot get cycle to school on days offered.”
- “The scheme is often done in school. We do not live close to my child’s school and her bike does not fit in my car, so it is very difficult for her to take part.”
- “[My child has a] physical disability.”
- “My child is disabled.”
- “[My child already] cycles regularly.”
- “My child can already ride.”
Summary of Responses

- “She did training at cubs.”
- “[My child is] too busy with other activities.”
- “She is studying for her SATS at the moment.”
- “[It is my] child’s decision.”
- “[My child] has no interest.”
- “Personal time constraints.”

Bikeability - Those Participating in the Scheme

**Bikeability award materials**

3.41 Respondents whose child had received Bikeability training were asked if their child was awarded any of the core Bikeability award materials (Bikeability branded badges, certificates and booklets).

3.42 This questions was aimed at respondents whose child had taken part in the Bikeability training scheme, and did not distinguish between those children who passed the course, and those who did not meet the required outcomes for the level undertaken.

3.43 Certificates were the frequently received award, with 91% of respondents whose children took part in Bikeability stating that their child received a certificate. Just over three quarters (76%) of respondents whose children took part in Bikeability received the Bikeability badge, and 69% received the Bikeability booklet.

**FIGURE 3.16 BIKEABILITY AWARD MATERIALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Award Material</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badge awarded</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate awarded</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booklet awarded</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Qu. 7 Base: All respondents whose child has received Bikeability training (412)

3.44 Respondents whose child had received Bikeability training were asked to rate the appeal of the Bikeability award materials. Overall there was a very positive response to the appeal of the award materials. 54% of respondents thought that the badge had excellent appeal.
Summary of Responses

3.45 Only a very small number of respondents (1%) felt that both the badges and certificates were of poor appeal.

3.46 In contrast to the 2012 survey, the award materials were slightly more popular with parents of girls than with parents of boys, with a higher percentage of respondents with boys than respondents with girls regarding the appeal of the badges, certificates and booklets as excellent.

FIGURE 3.17 APPEAL OF THE BIKEABILITY AWARD MATERIALS BY GENDER OF CHILD

Respondents were asked if there were any other awards they would like to see offered to their child. There was a high proportion of respondents who stated there were no other award materials they would like to see offered to their child (58%). Of those respondents that would like to see other award materials offered to their child, the most popular award suggested was high visibility / reflective items (34%). Other suggestions included bicycle stickers (7%) and protective equipment such as helmets (3%).

Attitudes towards Bikeability

3.47 Respondents were asked whether they agreed or disagreed with a list of statements regarding Bikeability. This question was asked to those who were aware of Bikeability, and to respondents whose child had been offered, booked or received Bikeability training.

3.48 Almost all respondents (92%) agreed that Bikeability ‘makes a real difference in terms of children’s road safety’, and 85% agreed that ‘it teaches all the skills children need to cycle in modern road conditions’.

Qu. 7 Base: All respondents whose child has received Bikeability training, and were awarded a badge, certificate or booklet (badge awarded 314, certificate awarded 375, booklet awarded 286)
Three quarters of respondents (76%) disagreed with the statement that Bikeability is impractical, and 73% of respondents disagreed that it is a hassle or inconvenient to get children to take part in Bikeability training.

**FIGURE 3.18 ATTITUDES TOWARDS BIKEABILITY**

Qu. 9 Base: All respondents aware of Bikeability or respondents whose child has been offered, booked or received Bikeability training (747), excluding ‘don’t know’ responses

Comparing the 2013 survey results with the 2011 and 2012 surveys, the proportion of respondents who stated that Bikeability gives children enough confidence to use the roads on their own increased from 80% in both 2011 and 2012, to 84% in 2013. This is in contrast to the increase in the proportion of respondents who felt that Bikeability makes children over confident about using the roads, increasing from 30% of respondents in 2012 to 35% of respondents in 2013.

The proportion of respondents who think Bikeability makes a real difference in terms of children’s road safety remained high with 92% of respondents agreeing with this statement; the same proportion of respondents as in the 2012 survey.
FIGURE 3.19  ATTITUDES TOWARDS BIKEABILITY – COMPARISON WITH 2011 AND 2012 RESULTS

Qu. 9 Base: All respondents aware of Bikeability or respondents whose child has been offered, booked or received Bikeability training (691)
### Summary of Responses

**Improvement to road safety**

3.53 There was an increase in the proportion of respondents who thought that Bikeability improved their child’s safety on the road ‘a lot’; an increase of three percentage points from the 2012 survey. There was, however, a slight increase in the proportion of respondents who thought that Bikeability neither improved nor worsened their child’s safety on the road - this increased from 9% of respondents in 2012 to 12% of respondents in 2013.

3.54 No respondents thought that their child’s safety on the road had been worsened by taking part in the Bikeability training scheme.

**FIGURE 3.20 SAFETY ON THE ROAD FOLLOWING BIKEABILITY TRAINING**

Qu. 13 Base: All respondents whose child had received Bikeability training (412)

3.55 Respondents whose child had received Bikeability training were asked if their child cycles more since receiving their training. 15% of respondents said that their child cycles to school more often since receiving their Bikeability training, an increase of two percentage points from the 2012 survey.

3.56 The proportion of respondents stating that their child does not cycle more since receiving Bikeability training increased from 38% in 2012 to 44% in the 2013 survey.
Summary of Responses

FIGURE 3.21 CYCLING LEVELS FOLLOWING BIKEABILITY TRAINING

Qu. 13A Base: All respondents whose child had received Bikeability training (412)
4 Conclusions

The Appeal of Bikeability

4.1 Parents consider formal cycle training schemes to be important because they recognise and value the safety element of training first and foremost; they want their children to be safe when using the roads. Respondents stated that the main benefits of their child receiving formal cycle training were that their child would have improved road awareness and would be safer when cycling. Benefits such as the opportunity to improve fitness, riding skills and confidence were often recognised as secondary benefits, but those benefits explicitly linked to safety were considered the most important aspect of formal cycle training.

Recommendation: continue to ensure that any communications with parents (through website or other channels) are aligned with the messages which they respond to most (safety), whilst communicating the other, complementary messages about confidence, independence, health and fitness etc. Individual schemes may require some advice on the best ways of communicating with parents.

Awareness and Attitudes Towards Bikeability

4.2 Both unprompted and prompted awareness of Bikeability has increased since the time of the last research. When asked to name a formal cycle training scheme, 24% of respondents identified Bikeability, and two fifths (40%) of respondents stated that they were aware of Bikeability when they were prompted by the Bikeability logo.

4.3 Cycling proficiency was identified by 38% of respondents as a formal cycle training scheme - this ‘awareness’ of cycling proficiency is still higher than that for Bikeability, but it is steadily decreasing.

4.4 Overall, respondents seemed to be reasonably well informed about what Bikeability involves. Whilst over half of respondents stated that they were not aware that Bikeability was different to cycling proficiency, the majority of respondents - when prompted - stated that they were aware that Bikeability is delivered by professional instructors, and involved training on public roads. One possible reading of these seemingly contradictory results is that respondents recognise the characteristics of Bikeability but have not taken particular notice of the brand. Otherwise, they have recalled cycling proficiency as more comprehensive than it was.

4.5 As in previous years, awareness of Bikeability is lowest in the London region.

4.6 Respondents had very positive perceptions of Bikeability and its impacts:
   - 92% of respondents agreed that Bikeability ‘makes a real difference in terms of children’s road safety’
   - 91% agreed that Bikeability ‘gives children a realistic experience of using the roads’
Summary of Responses

1. 85% agreed that Bikeability ‘teaches all the skills children need to cycle in modern road conditions’

Brand Touchpoints

4.7 Most respondents who were aware of Bikeability had heard about it through their child’s school (e.g. letter or through teachers). Only 7% of respondents were aware of Bikeability because another of their children had taken part, and 8% were aware because another parent had told them about it. This suggests that Bikeability is not yet ‘secure’ in the public consciousness (e.g. the brand cannot rely on word of mouth) and continued efforts to promote Bikeability are required.

Recommendation: it is likely that overall awareness of Bikeability will not continue to increase at the same rate as in the previous few years if there is no action to promote the scheme, either centrally or through individual providers. It is recommended that opportunities to promote Bikeability are identified and explored in the year ahead.

4.8 Respondents whose children had received Bikeability training and the associated award(s) rated the appeal of the Bikeability branded award materials (badge, certificate and booklet) as good overall. The Bikeability badges had the highest level of appeal, followed by certificates then booklets.

Recommendations: the Bikeability award materials were revised in 2013 and are now available to registered Bikeability schemes. It is recommended that special attention is paid to the feedback received from trainees and parents on this subject so that early action is taken if the new awards are less well received than the previous awards.

It is recommended that the use of Bikeability award materials by registered Bikeability schemes is monitored to ensure that all trainees receive the official awards.

Impacts of Bikeability

4.9 Respondents whose child had received Bikeability training stated that the training had had a positive impact on their child’s road safety, with 42% stating that Bikeability had improved their child’s safety on the road ‘a lot’, and 45% stating that Bikeability had improved their child’s safety on the road ‘a little’.

4.10 Bikeability was also said to have had a positive impact on levels of cycling amongst children who had participated in the training, with over half of respondents stating that their child cycled more often as a result of Bikeability training; 15% of respondents stating that their child cycled to school more often since taking part in Bikeability and 41% stated that their child cycled after school or at weekends more often since attending Bikeability. There were 44% of respondents who stated that their child did not cycle more (to school or for leisure) since attending Bikeability.

Recommendation: encouraging trainees to progress with cycling after they have taken part in Bikeability is important. Ways of encouraging and facilitating progression are currently being investigated.
APPENDIX

A

QUESTIONNAIRE
If you have more than one child aged 10-12 (in school years 6 or 7), please think about your child in this age group who is next to have their birthday, when answering the questions below.

**SINGLE CODE**

Qa. Thinking about the child you will be answering questions about, are they a boy or a girl, and what school year are they in?
1. Boy - Year 6
2. Girl – Year 6
3. Boy - Year 7
4. Girl – Year 7

---

**SINGLE CODE**

Q1. How important or not is it that your child receives formal cycle training? By formal cycling training, we mean where a qualified instructor teaches your child to cycle through an organised course.
1. Very important
2. Fairly important
3. Not very important
4. Not at all important
5. Don’t know

Please let us know why?
(include comments box for additional text)

**SINGLE CODE**

Q1a. How important or not is it that cycle training includes being accompanied by a trained instructor while cycling on a public road, and not just in a traffic free environment?
1. Very important
2. Fairly important
3. Not very important
4. Not at all important
5. Don’t know

**MULTI CODE – TYPE IN 1 to 4 - RANDOMISE ORDER OF CODES**

Q2. What do you think are, or would be, the main benefits for your child as a result of receiving cycle training? Please can you rank your top three choices by putting at ‘1’ in your first choice benefit, ‘2’ in your second choice benefit and ‘3’ in your third choice benefit.

1. Improved road awareness
2. Improved riding skills
3. Improved confidence
4. Improved health / fitness
5. Safer when cycling
6. Encouraged to cycle more
7. Other (WRITE IN BELOW)
8. Don’t know

**OPEN RESPONSE**

Q3. What formal cycle training schemes for children can you name?
(Open text box and “I can’t name any” tick box)

**SINGLE CODE – SHOW LOGO WITH QUESTION**

Q4. Have you heard about the Bikeability cycle training scheme?
1. Yes
2. No

**SINGLE CODE – ASK IF AWARE OF BIKEABILITY**

Q4a. Are you aware that:
1. Bikeability is different to cycling proficiency
2. Bikeability is delivered by professional instructors
3. Bikeability includes training on public roads

**SINGLE CODE**

Q5. Which one of the following statements, if any, best applies to your child?
1. Received cycle training
2. Booked, but not yet received cycle training
3. Been offered cycle training – and likely to take part
4. Been offered cycle training – but unlikely to take part
5. Not offered, booked or received training
6. None of these
Q6. Which of these cycle training schemes has your child been offered, booked, or received?
1 Bikeability (with logo)
2 CTC Training (with logo)
3 Go-Ride (with logo)
4 Some other scheme (WRITE IN BELOW)
5 Do not know the name of the training  EXCLUSIVE

Q7 You have said that your child received Bikeability training; were they given one or more of the following Bikeability award materials? If so, please rate the appeal of these to your child

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AWARD MATERIAL</th>
<th>AWARD PROVIDED</th>
<th>EXCELLENT</th>
<th>GOOD</th>
<th>AVERAGE</th>
<th>POOR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Badge</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Certificate</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Booklet</td>
<td>Y/N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Q7A. Are there any other awards materials you would like to see offered to your child?
OPEN RESPONSE

Q8. Where did you hear about Bikeability?
1 Leaflets / Posters at school
2 Leaflets / Posters elsewhere – Where? (WRITE IN BELOW)
3 From school (eg. letter brought home / heard from teacher / child told me)
4 Another of my children has already taken part in Bikeability
5 Another parent told me about it
6 Saw it on the Internet – Where? (WRITE IN BELOW)
7 Heard about it from Cubs / Brownies etc
8 Saw it in the local press
9 Elsewhere (WRITE IN BELOW)
ASK ALL AWARE OF BIKEABILITY (Q4=1 OR Q6=1)
SINGLE CODE PER STATEMENT – RANDOMISE ORDER OF CODES

Q9. Do you agree or disagree with these statements about the Bikeability scheme?
Agree / Neither / Disagree / Not sure
   a. It teaches all the skills children need to cycle in modern road conditions
   b. It gives children enough confidence to use the roads on their own
   c. It gives children a realistic experience of using the roads
   d. It makes a real difference in terms of children’s road safety
   e. It encourages children to cycle more, or cycle more often
   f. It makes children more confident about using the roads
   g. It is a hassle / inconvenient to get children to take part
   h. It is impractical (e.g. requires children to have too much gear - bike / helmet / pads etc)

ASK IF NOT OFFERED / RECEIVED / BOOKED BIKEABILITY (NOT Q6=1) SINGLE CODE

Q10. If Bikeability training were offered to your child in the next few weeks or months how likely would you be to give your permission for them to take part in training?
   1. Very likely
   2. Fairly likely
   3. Neither likely nor unlikely
   4. Fairly unlikely
   5. Very unlikely
   6. Don’t know

ASK IF UNLIKELY TO GIVE PERMISSION (Q10=4,5)
OR IF OFFERED BIKEABILITY BUT NOT LIKELY TO TAKE IT UP (Q5=4 AND Q6=1)
MULTI CODE – MAXIMUM FIVE CODES - RANDOMISE ORDER OF CODES

Q11. What are the main reasons why you would be unlikely to give your permission for your child to take part in Bikeability?
   1. My child does not need cycle training
   2. My child does not want cycle training
   3. My child does not have a bike available
   4. My child does not know how to ride a bike
   5. My child has special educational needs
   6. Medical reason
   7. Cycle training doesn’t make any difference
   8. My child has received other training
   9. My child will be taught to cycle by a family member or friend
   10. I am concerned about cost
   11. My child is not confident cycling on the road
   12. Cycling is too dangerous
   13. I do not want my child to ride a bike
   14. Other (WRITE IN BELOW)

ASK IF RECEIVED BIKEABILITY TRAINING (Q5=1 AND Q6=1)
SINGLE CODE

Q12. Thinking specifically about your child, when did they receive Bikeability training?
   1. In the last month
   2. In the last three months
   3. In the last six months
   4. In the last year
   5. Longer than a year ago
   6. Don’t know
Q.13. How has the Bikeability training your child received improved their safety on the road?
1. Improved their safety on the road a lot
2. Improved their safety on the road a little
3. Neither improved nor worsened their safety on the road
4. Worsened their safety on the road a little
5. Worsened their safety on the road a lot

Q13a. Since attending Bikeability training, does your child cycle more often?
1. Yes; cycles to school more often
2. Yes; cycles after school/at weekends more often
3. No

Information given for the next two questions (school and postcode) will be used solely to determine the level of availability for the Bikeability scheme in your area – please remember all information you give is treated in strictest confidence.

Q14. What is the name of your child’s primary school, or the primary school they went to last year (for those children now in secondary school)?

Q15. What is your home postcode?
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