

This is an Open Access document downloaded from ORCA, Cardiff University's institutional repository: <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/132866/>

This is the author's version of a work that was submitted to / accepted for publication.

Citation for final published version:

Shaw, Caroline, Russell, Marie, Keall, Michael, MacBride-Stewart, Sara, Wild, Kirsty, Reeves, Dory, Bentley, Rebecca and Woodward, Alistair 2020. Beyond the bicycle: seeing the context of the gender gap in cycling. *Journal of Transport and Health* 18, 100871. [10.1016/j.jth.2020.100871](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jth.2020.100871)

Publishers page: <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jth.2020.100871>

Please note:

Changes made as a result of publishing processes such as copy-editing, formatting and page numbers may not be reflected in this version. For the definitive version of this publication, please refer to the published source. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite this paper.

This version is being made available in accordance with publisher policies. See <http://orca.cf.ac.uk/policies.html> for usage policies. Copyright and moral rights for publications made available in ORCA are retained by the copyright holders.



1 **Abstract**

2 **Background:** In most countries women cycle less than men. This is despite the clear environmental
3 and health benefits of active commuting. Feminist critiques suggest this gender gap reflects societal
4 roles and values, yet there has been little empirical research on the differences in men's and
5 women's cycling in the context of total travel.

6 **Methods:** Regression analyses were used to explore the travel mode and distance travelled of
7 49,965 participants in the nationally representative, continuous, cross-sectional New Zealand
8 Household Travel Survey (2002 to 2014). Regular cyclists were people who cycled at least 10 days in
9 the preceding month. We reported results by gender and cyclist status.

10 **Results:** Car was the dominant mode of travel for all groups. While fewer women regularly cycled
11 (2%) compared to men (5%), women travelled less each day (12-17% less distance) and were more
12 likely to use public transport and walk than men. These gender patterns were broadly replicated in
13 people who were regular cyclists. Women made 17-47% more motorised trips of less than 5km than
14 men each day. Overall half of regular cyclists achieved 600 METS or above per week through travel
15 related physical activity, compared to 11-15% of non-regular cyclists. Even after full model
16 adjustment men had more than twice the odds (OR 2.58 (95%CI:2.29 - 2.92)) of cycling compared to
17 women.

18 **Conclusions:** Men are more likely to cycle than women in NZ and cyclists get more physical activity.
19 Nonetheless, analysis across all travel (irrespective of regularity of cycling status) suggests that
20 women use more diverse travel modes and generate lower greenhouse gas emissions than men.
21 Better consideration of the social processes shaping travel is needed to create policy, institutions,
22 programmes and infrastructure that achieve the long term goals of the transport system, such as
23 increasing cycling and reducing greenhouse gas emissions.

24

25

26

27 1. Introduction

28

29 There are a myriad of health, environmental and city liveability reasons to increase cycling for urban
30 transport (Giles-Corti et al., 2016; Stevenson et al., 2016; Watts et al., 2017). Globally, many cities
31 are investing in infrastructure, programmes and policies to increase cycling, with modest levels of
32 success in some cases (Crane et al., 2017; Dill et al., 2014; Goodman et al., 2014; Heinen et al., 2015;
33 Keall et al., 2015). In jurisdictions with a low overall prevalence of cycling, including New Zealand,
34 one of the universal findings is a disproportionately low number of women cycling, with usually only
35 20-30% of cyclists being female (Garrard et al., 2012; Shaw et al., 2016). Low levels of cycling
36 amongst women are not inevitable: in countries with higher levels of cycling, such as the
37 Netherlands, women comprise about half of cyclists (Garrard et al., 2012; Pucher and Buehler, 2008).
38 However in these low prevalence locations, pro-cycling policies, infrastructure and programmes
39 appear to have had limited success to date in increasing the proportion of women cyclists (Aldred et
40 al., 2016; Goodman and Cheshire, 2014; Ogilvie and Goodman, 2012; Pucher et al., 2011).

41

42 One body of research examining these variations in cycling focuses on how gender differences in
43 factors such as risk perception, infrastructure preferences, cultural identities and trip purpose
44 impact on the desire and ability of women to cycle (Aldred et al., 2017; Garrard et al., 2012; Heesch
45 et al., 2012; Ravensbergen et al., 2019; Steinbach et al., 2011; Sullivan and O'Fallon, 2006). For
46 example systematic reviews show that, compared to men, women report greater safety concerns
47 related to cycling and stronger preferences for separated cycle infrastructure (Aldred et al., 2017;
48 Ravensbergen et al., 2019). This approach tends to focus on cycling and cyclists, in particular
49 underrepresented cyclists, and quantitatively or qualitatively examine the factors that impact on
50 cycling (or lack thereof). One criticism of this approach is that it doesn't offer an obvious rationale
51 for why many of these factors do not affect women in high cycling prevalence jurisdictions, not what
52 the reasons underpinning the female/male differences are (Garrard et al., 2012; Ravensbergen et al.,
53 2019).

54

55 Feminist explanations suggest a slightly different perspective with which to view gender differences
56 in cycling (Connell, 2012; Heise et al., 2019). Law argued that gender is integral to understanding the
57 social relations and structures that influence daily mobility through gendered patterns of activity and
58 differential access to time, money and resources. These forces ultimately produce a range of
59 observable variations in gender-related travel perceptions, experiences and behaviour (Law, 1999).
60 In support of this hypothesis a range of gender differences in overall travel (not just cycling) have

61 been reported in a number of countries, for example women take fewer trips, travel less distances
62 and for a shorter time as well as having different reasons for trips and use of travel modes (Hanson,
63 2010; Kronsell et al., 2016; Lee et al., 2018; Miralles-Guasch et al., 2016; Taylor et al., 2015).

64

65 In light of these different perspectives, in this analysis we sought to understand differences in cycling
66 by gender in New Zealand in the context of wider differences in mobility by gender. Specifically, we
67 aimed to answer the questions:

- 68 • How do the individual and household characteristics of women who currently cycle for transport
69 differ from women who do not cycle? How do these findings differ for men?
- 70 • What are the patterns of travel for female cyclists and non-cyclists? How do these findings differ
71 for men?
- 72 • Do any personal, sociodemographic and household factors explain the difference in cycling
73 between women and men?
- 74 • What are the socio-demographic and household predictors of female cycling? How do these
75 differ for men?

76 **2. Methods**

77

78 **2.1 Study context**

79

80 New Zealand is a car dominated society, with the highest levels of per capita car ownership in the
81 OECD (OECD, 2017). Transport planning has traditionally been car-centric, and this has led to a
82 decline in travel by all modes other than private cars (Imran and Pearce, 2015; Shaw et al., 2016).

83 New Zealand has comparatively high levels of gender equality; at the end of the data period used in
84 this study it ranked 13th in the Global Gender Gap Index. However economic equality remains an
85 area of concern, e.g. in 2014 New Zealand women earned an estimated 61% of the male wage
86 (World Economic Forum, 2014). These comparatively high levels of gender equality in combination
87 with a highly car dominated transport system make New Zealand an interesting setting to examine
88 gender differences in travel patterns.

89

90 **2.2 Study design and population**

91

92 We obtained anonymised data for this secondary analysis of the New Zealand Household Travel
93 Survey (NZHTS) from the Ministry of Transport under their data sharing protocols. The NZHTS is a

94 continuous, nationally representative cross-sectional survey undertaken to provide ongoing
95 surveillance of household travel patterns.

96
97 The NZHTS survey stratifies the country into geographic regions. A random sample of meshblocks
98 from within these geographic units is then selected, roughly proportional to the population in the
99 geographic area. Meshblocks are the smallest geographic unit for which statistical data are collected
100 and processed in New Zealand, each one contains between 60 and 110 people. Within each
101 meshblock all addresses are listed randomly and then every seventh address selected for
102 participation. Each household is sent a letter and visited up to four times to maximise participation.
103 Over a seven to eight-year period all addresses within a specific meshblock are invited to participate.
104 When all addresses in a specific meshblock have been exhausted, another meshblock within the
105 region is selected. The survey doubled in size between 2007/2008 and 2008/2009 from 2200 to 4600
106 households being invited to participate. All eligible household members (household members or
107 visitors present during the survey period) are invited to participate in the survey. Participation in the
108 survey is estimated at 70% by the Ministry of Transport. Further details on the NZHTS sampling and
109 protocols for the 2003-2014 time period is available from the Ministry of Transport (Ministry of
110 Transport, 2018).

111
112 All participants of the NZHTS between 2003 and 2014 who were eligible to be in the survey, had
113 complete responses and were over the age of 18 were included in the population for this analysis.
114 The survey methodology changed substantially in 2015 and again in 2018, so to ensure consistency
115 only the earlier time period (2003-2014) was used in this analysis.

116 117 2.3 Data and variables

118
119 Data were collected through face-to-face interviews with participants. Between 2002-2014 each
120 participant was randomly assigned two contiguous days of the week in which travel information was
121 recorded in a travel diary- an even spread of days of the week was maintained. Subsequent to the
122 travel diary days a follow-up interview occurred to elicit further personal and household information
123 and to ensure the travel diary was complete (using a memory jogger).

124
125 The survey collected information on cycling in two different ways. Firstly, participants were asked
126 about cycling participation in the last year and, if they had cycled in the last month for any reason,
127 frequency (1-4 days, 5-9 days, 10-19 days or 20+ days). Secondly, all trips undertaken during the

128 two-day travel diary had a mode (e.g. car, bus, walking etc) coded, so people who took trips by bike
129 were identified. In this analysis, we defined a regular cyclist as anyone who cycled ten or more days
130 in the preceding month, in order to capture individuals who regularly cycle but happened not to
131 during their two-day travel diary.

132

133 Gender was self-assigned either male or female (between 2002-2014 no other gender option was
134 permitted). Information was collected during the interviews or derived on other relevant variables,
135 including; age (grouped into 18-29, 30-44, 45-59, 60-74, 75+); personal income (collected in bins);
136 NZDep (an area based deprivation measure); self-assigned total ethnicity (Māori, Pacific, Asian, NZ
137 European, other - 4% of people self-identify with more than one ethnicity); employment status (full
138 time, part time, looking for work, student, homemaker, beneficiary, retire and other); whether the
139 person has multiple jobs; car driving license (yes/no); lifetime driving experience (self-reported
140 kilometres driven – nil, less than 20000km, over 20000 km); household size (grouped into 1-2
141 people, 3-5 people and 6+); rurality; household car access (nil, 1 car, 2 or more cars); and working
142 bikes in household (nil, 1 bike, 2 or more bikes).

143

144 Information was collected on the purpose (i.e. going to work, home, social visits etc), destination,
145 mode, and duration of each trip taken during the travel diary. Trip distance was estimated by the
146 Ministry of Transport by calculating the fastest route between the map coordinates of the origin and
147 destination addresses provided by the respondents (via any intermediate address if relevant).

148

149 Transport related physical activity metabolic equivalents (METS) were calculated by multiplying the
150 daily time spent in minutes for walking and cycling by 3.5 and 4.0 respectively, consistent with
151 published values for walking for transport and cycling to and from work and analysis of the average
152 speed of travel for those modes in the NZHTS (Ainsworth et al., 2011; Mizdrak et al., 2018). (One
153 MET is considered equivalent to the resting metabolic rate, and MET values express intensity levels
154 as multiples of the resting metabolic rate). A weekly MET value was then calculated and a binary
155 variable of under or over 600METs/week was created; this is the approximate MET equivalent to the
156 World Health Organization recommendations for minimum weekly physical activity for good health
157 (Kyu et al., 2016; World Health Organization, 2010).

158

159 2.4 Analysis

160

161 We produced basic tabulations of person, household and travel characteristics of female cyclists and
162 non-cyclists and male cyclists and non-cyclists. As interpreting travel patterns for each mode is quite
163 complex we created a number of policy-relevant summary indicators. For example the proportion of
164 trips under 5km taken by car (i.e. in theory able to be cycled), and proportion of people who
165 achieved over 600METs from walking and cycling for transport. Analysis took into account how many
166 days of the travel diary were completed (about 16% of the participants in the analysis only filled in
167 one day of the two-day diary). We undertook logistic regression to identify sociodemographic and
168 household associations between gender and cycling. Covariates that might plausibly act as
169 confounders between the exposure (gender) and outcome (cycling) were examined. We then looked
170 at the independent associations of sociodemographic and household factors separately by gender,
171 hypothesising that given the different gender roles in society these associations might be different
172 for women and men.

173

174 All analyses were undertaken using Stata 15.1. The data were weighted with survey weights
175 calculated and provided by the Ministry of Transport to weight the sample to represent the entire
176 New Zealand population. The confidence intervals and statistical tests will be slightly conservative
177 (overstating the variance) because the software used did not account for post-stratification used in
178 the travel survey estimates.(Ministry of Transport, 2017)

179

180 **3. Results**

181

182 Figure 1 shows the dataset for analysis and final participants. Overall two percent of women and five
183 percent of men over the age of 18 were classified as regular cyclists using the definition of having
184 cycled 10 more days in the preceding month. Over 94% of survey participants individuals took one or
185 more trips by any mode during the two day travel diary period.

186

187 **Figure 1 Participants of household travel survey 2003-2014 for analysis**

188 Unweighted numbers reported in this figure (remainder of results use survey weights).

189

190 Table 1 shows the personal and household characteristics of the participants by cyclist status and
191 gender (information about cycling during each survey year and frequency over the preceding year
192 can be found in the supplementary information). Regular cyclists were more likely to be in the 30-44
193 age group and less likely to be in older age groups. Men overall were more likely to hold a drivers
194 licence than women, but male regular cyclists were less likely (90.2%) to hold a drivers licence than

195 male non-regular cyclists (94.2%). For women this was reversed; women regular cyclists were more
196 likely to hold a drivers licence (92%) than non-regular cyclists (86%).

197

198 **Table 1 Personal and household characteristics by cyclist status and gender**

199 Regular cyclist: cycled 10 or more days in the last month. *Individuals can identify with more than one category so no p
200 values possible and only row percent.

201

202 Table 2 looks at the travel characteristics of regular cyclists and non-regular cyclists by gender. Men
203 took overall fewer trips compared to women (e.g. non-regular cyclists mean daily trips 4.63
204 95%CI:4.57 - 4.70 for male cf. 4.90 95%CI:4.84-4.95 female) but travelled further (e.g. non-regular
205 men cyclists 46 km/day 95%CI:45 – 47 cf. women 38 km/day 95%CI:37-39).

206

207 We found regular cyclists, irrespective of gender, took more trips and travelled for a longer time but
208 about the same distance as non-regular cyclists. For example, female regular cyclists took a mean
209 5.66 (95%CI:5.38 - 5.94) trips daily by all modes and travelled 39km (95%CI: 35-44) compared to non-
210 regular cyclists who took 4.90 (95%CI:4.84 - 4.95) trips for 38km (95%CI:37 - 39).

211

212 Regular cyclists (male and female) walked more than non-regular cyclists (trips, time and distance in
213 these modes are all greater for regular cyclists). The number of PT trips was low for both men and
214 women. Male regular cyclists and non-regular cyclists took the same number of PT trips (0.08
215 trips/day) however women non-regular cyclists took more PT trips than regular cyclists (0.10
216 95%CI:0.09-0.11 cf. 0.06 95%CI:0.03-0.08). Further information on public transport use in the
217 previous month and year by cyclist status and gender is available in the supplementary information.
218 Finally, the majority of trips taken, time spent travelling and distance travelled by both genders
219 irrespective of cyclist status, was in a private motor vehicle. Proportionately fewer of the total km
220 travelled by regular cyclists was in private motor vehicle (e.g. 33 out of 39km/day (85%) for women
221 regular cyclists compared to 36 out of 38 km/day (95%) for non-regular cyclists)

222

223 **Table 2 Daily travel characteristics by cyclist status and gender**

224 These mean figures include people who did not travel during the two day travel diary.

225

226 Figures 2 and 3 show the six most common trip purposes by cyclist status (relevant table in the
227 supplementary information). Overall these showed similar levels of trips with the purpose of
228 accompanying people, shopping and social visits irrespective of cyclist status. Regular cyclists were
229 more likely to take trips with the purpose of recreation (0.68 95%CI: 0.56-0.80) than non-regular

230 cyclists (0.26 95%CI 0.25-0.27). In general men took fewer trips accompanying other people and
231 fewer shopping trips, irrespective of cyclist status.

232

233 **Figure 2 Daily trips by trip purpose taken by women by cyclist status (six most common purposes)**

234 Mean number of trips and 95% confidence intervals

235

236 **Figure 3 Daily trips by trip purpose taken by men by cyclist status (six most common purposes)**

237 Mean number of trips and 95% confidence intervals

238

239 Figures 4 and 5 show some summary indicators of travel by gender (relevant table in the
240 supplementary information). Figure 4 shows that among non-regular cyclists 11% of women and
241 15% of men achieved 600 METs/week from transport related walking and cycling. For regular cyclists
242 this increased to around half. Figure 5 shows mean trips taken per person, and, irrespective of
243 gender, regular cyclists took over double the number of trips by walking, cycling or PT compared to
244 non-regular cyclists. However women took more 'replaceable' trips of 5km or less in a private
245 vehicle (mean of 2.4/day irrespective of cyclists status) than men. Men took less of these replaceable
246 trips overall, and male regular cyclists took 21% less than non-regular cyclists.

247

248 **Figure 4 Percentage of people taking any trips by sustainable modes and achieving 600METs
249 transport related physical activity per week, by gender and cyclist status.**

250 All differences between regular cyclists and non-regular cyclists significant at <0.0001. Any cycling and walking trips
251 indicator = any trip taken by any of those modes within the travel diary period. Over 600 METs/week indicator = achieved
252 over 600 METs/week from cycling and walking trips.

253

254 **Figure 5 Mean daily potentially replaceable trips and trips by sustainable modes, by gender and
255 cyclist status.**

256 PT: public transport. Means and 95% confidence intervals presented.

257

258 Table 3 shows the results of regression analysis looking at the association between gender and
259 cycling. Men had an odds ratio of 2.51 (95%CI: 2.24 - 2.81) of being a regular cyclist compared to
260 women. This association was unchanged even after progressive adjustment for the
261 sociodemographic, household and transport access factors that were theorised to potentially act as
262 confounders in the association.

263

264 **Table 3 Modelling of association between gender and cyclist status**

265 * All models adjusted for survey year. Reference group: women.

266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275
276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284

285
286
287
288
289
290
291
292
293
294
295
296
297
298
299

Table 4 shows the regression results examining the socio-demographic and household determinants of cycling compared to not cycling by gender. After adjusting for the other household and socio-demographic factors in the table most other ethnic groups were less likely to cycle than NZ European, although some of the confidence intervals include one (even with 12 years data there were few non NZ European female cyclists). There were no clear associations by income for women. Women who had larger household sizes and children in the households were much less likely to cycle than women who don't. For example women with any children in the household under 18 were 60% less likely to be regular cyclists compared to those without children (OR 0.43 95%CI: 0.31 - 0.58). There was a linear association between cycling and household car access; the more cars in the household the less likely cycling was. Most findings were similar for men; although while Pacific and Asian men were less likely to cycle than NZ European (e.g. Pacific men OR 0.42 (95% CI: 0.25 - 0.72)), Māori men had about the same chance of being regular cyclists after adjusting for other covariates (OR 0.97 (95%CI: 0.75 - 1.25)).

Table 4 Socio-demographic and household determinants of cycling compared to not cycling by gender

*Adjusted for all other variables in table and survey year. **Bold results:** 95%CI exclude the null.

4. Discussion

4.1 Key findings

The majority of travel (trips taken, time spent and distance travelled) was by private vehicle for all groups, however, despite this, we found distinct and complex patterns in travel by gender and cyclist status in NZ adults. Women took more trips, but travelled 12-17% fewer kilometres per day, and were more likely to walk and use PT than men. Thus women overall had a more diverse and lower greenhouse gas emission travel profile than men. Women undertook more potentially replaceable trips per day (car trips less than 5km) than men (female regular cyclists and non-regular cyclists both took more replaceable trips than men). For both men and women regular cyclists were much more likely to achieve 600METs per week from transport-related cycling and walking than non-regular cyclists. Even after full model adjustment for household and sociodemographic factors men were still over twice as likely to cycle as women.

300 4.2 Strengths and Weaknesses

301

302 A strength of this study is the data, which comes from a nationally representative cross sectional
303 survey of household travel in New Zealand with 12 years of standardised data collection.

304

305 This research was interested in utility/transport cycling rather than recreational cycling since the
306 former is more likely to substitute for travel by car, with consequent social and environmental
307 benefits. We initially explored three different definitions of a regular cyclist; one or more cycling trip
308 in the two day travel diary, cycling for any reason 10 or more days in the last month (implying this is
309 a regular activity) or any cycling for any reason in the last month. The three definitions resulted in
310 an overall prevalence of regular cyclists amongst women of 1.7%, 2.2% and 9.1% and men 3.9%,
311 5.3%, and 17.2% respectively. We also examined a definition of cycling 5 or more days in the last
312 month but there was some evidence that this may have lowered the specificity of the exposure
313 measure by recruiting in more recreational only cyclists (see Table 6 in supplementary material). We
314 chose the definition of cycling 10 or more days in the last month for this analysis. We felt this
315 approach achieved a compromise between only using people who took a cycling trip in the two day
316 travel diary (resulting in a selected group may not have represented the overall travel patterns of all
317 cyclists) or using those who cycled less than 10 days a month (which may have inflated our exposure
318 measure to include people who took infrequent recreational cycling trips). Our exposure group may
319 include some people who exclusively cycle for recreational reasons, however these are likely to be
320 relatively few – only 1% of individuals who cycled during the travel diary period (i.e. people who we
321 know the purpose of every trip including cycle trips) did so exclusively for recreational reasons. We
322 also acknowledge that the boundary between these activities is not always straight forward (Handy
323 et al., 2014), and the focus on utility transport has limitations (Aldred, 2015). We conducted
324 sensitivity analyses using these different definitions (data not presented). Defining a cyclists as
325 someone who has done any cycling in the last month showed, unsurprisingly, that the cyclist group
326 was identical to the non-cyclist group of the relevant gender (i.e. if a person only cycles once a
327 month then the remainder of their trips will look the identical to the remainder of the same
328 gendered population). Using the definition of a cyclist only being someone who took a cycling trip
329 during the travel diary period resulted in findings largely similar to what we have presented but
330 slightly more exaggerated in terms of the difference (i.e. even fewer kilometres travelled by car).
331 Better elucidation of cycling patterns and reasons in national surveys would be helpful to construct
332 analyses such as this.

333

334 As with all analyses using routinely collected data we were limited to the variables collected, which
335 in some cases were not optimal (e.g. limited socioeconomic variables, family type was determined
336 by 'interviewer observation' rather than directly asked). The cross-sectional nature of the survey also
337 means that it is difficult to pinpoint cause and effect. For example, the association between
338 increased car access and reduced cycling may mean either being without a car results in more
339 cycling or being less likely to cycle leads to greater likelihood of buying a car.

340

341 4.3 Policy and practice implications

342

343 This paper provides further evidence for gender differences in cycling being a social process which is
344 just one illustration of a variety of gendered travel patterns and behaviours (Law, 1999). One of the
345 most striking findings in this paper is that overall differences in travel between genders are largely
346 maintained even when men and women are regular cyclists. That is, the 'travel profiles' of both men
347 and women regular cyclists look more like their gender compatriots than each other (i.e. women
348 regular cyclists take more trips but travel the same distance as women non-regular cyclists; the same
349 applies to men). These similarities are only revealed because we framed the analysis around overall
350 travel patterns by gender, rather than just looking at differences amongst men and women who
351 cycle.

352

353 Commonly cited explanations for gender differences in (all) travel, including cycling, include women
354 working closer to the family home, having more household responsibilities or having less access to
355 the family vehicle (Hanson, 2010). However, international studies suggest that these explanations
356 are not always supported by evidence (Hanson, 2010; Kavanagh and Bentley, 2008; Kronsell et al.,
357 2016; Miralles-Guasch et al., 2016). For example, one Spanish study showed that even for the same
358 trip purpose women and men will use different modes (Miralles-Guasch et al., 2016). In this study
359 we also found differences in mode for trips for the same purpose by gender. For example shopping
360 trips undertaken by men in NZ are much more likely to be done using a car than those by women
361 (unpublished results). A US study by Taylor et al explored possible reasons for why women
362 undertake more household serving trips than men (i.e. travel other than commuting). These
363 included time-use related reasons (i.e. the perception that women have more time because they are
364 more likely to have part-time paid work), microeconomic (i.e. women earn less than men) and
365 gender socialisation (i.e. implicit gender beliefs about who should do specific tasks in the
366 household). Gender socialisation that fitted best with these findings, as even in households where
367 women were better educated, worked more and earned more than their male partners, they still

368 undertook about 50% more household serving trips (Taylor et al., 2015). We need to use the
369 available NZHTS data to further examine differences by gender in overall travel.

370

371 What do these findings mean for policy to increase women's cycling? The combination of an existing
372 propensity towards low greenhouse gas emission travel modes, evidence from countries with high
373 overall cycling levels that women take half (or more) of the trips by bike *and* the number of trips
374 women take in NZ that are potentially amendable to mode swapping suggests there is significant
375 potential for supporting increased cycling among women, who already have more flexible and lower
376 carbon travel. The travel patterns and reasons for travel that we observed in this study suggest
377 specific changes in cycling infrastructure to women to undertake relatively short trips to their
378 required destinations (home/shops) and to travel safely in the company of others. These would likely
379 require whole street/suburb changes rather than a network approach of the provision of cycle lanes
380 on busy streets leading into the central city. These are changes that require a much greater
381 emphasis on what is local to where people live, to facilitate activities that can be regarded as
382 mundane. These types of policies work to enable mode change within established variations in travel
383 by gender; and implicitly normalise these gender variations in travel. An additional approach would
384 be policies that aim to disrupt the processes that structure social relations and institutions that
385 ultimately result in the observable gender differences in travel (Law, 1999).

386

387 While most of the discussion is centred on women, it is just as relevant to consider how gender
388 processes play out in men's travel. Despite men cycling more than women, men travel further each
389 day and take the majority of trips by car, meaning their travel profile is more greenhouse gas
390 emission intensive. Even men who regularly cycle still travel further by private vehicle than female
391 non-regular cyclists. In addition, there are other stark examples of gender inequities in transport
392 outcomes e.g. New Zealand men are much more likely to be hospitalised or killed as a result of road
393 traffic injury than women (Hosking et al., 2013). Men's travel is perceived as less complex than
394 women's due to less unpaid work-related travel, hence, in theory, it should be more amenable to
395 mode change. Policies need to focus on how to get more men, for example, using public transport
396 for their routine commuting.

397

398 Finally, we need policies to challenge the social processes that underpin the gender differences in
399 travel. Like other gender related social processes, gendered perceptions of travel start early in life
400 (Baslington, 2008). Gender equity policies that aim to break down traditional roles and
401 responsibilities of men and women may be useful to help ameliorate some of the current gender

402 differences in travel. However these need to be done in tandem with environmental transport
403 policies as international literature suggests that as women moved into the labour force women's
404 travel became more like men's, rather than vice versa, meaning car travel increased(Susilo et al.,
405 2018).

406

407 5. Conclusion

408

409 Cycling provides just one example of wider differences in travel patterns by gender in NZ. To achieve
410 a low greenhouse gas emission land transport system, of which cycling is an important part, more
411 attention needs to be paid in transport research, policy, institutional structures, planning and
412 programmes to understanding and modifying the social processes impacting on travel.

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420 **References**

421

422

423 Ainsworth, B.E., Haskell, W.L., Herrmann, S.D., Meckes, N., Bassett, D.R., Jr., Tudor-Locke, C., Greer,
424 J.L., Vezina, J., Whitt-Glover, M.C., Leon, A.S., 2011. 2011 Compendium of Physical Activities: a
425 second update of codes and MET values. *Med Sci Sports Exerc* 43, 1575-1581.

426 Aldred, R., 2015. A Matter of Utility? Rationalising Cycling, *Cycling Rationalities*. *Mobilities* 10, 686-
427 705.

428 Aldred, R., Elliott, B., Woodcock, J., Goodman, A., 2017. Cycling provision separated from motor
429 traffic: a systematic review exploring whether stated preferences vary by gender and age. *Transport*
430 *Reviews* 37, 29-55.

431 Aldred, R., Woodcock, J., Goodman, A., 2016. Does More Cycling Mean More Diversity in Cycling?
432 *Transport Reviews* 36, 28-44.

433 Baslington, H., 2008. Travel Socialization: A Social Theory of Travel Mode Behavior. *International*
434 *Journal of Sustainable Transportation* 2, 91-114.

435 Connell, R., 2012. Gender, health and theory: conceptualizing the issue, in local and world
436 perspective. *Soc Sci Med* 74, 1675-1683.

437 Crane, M., Rissel, C., Standen, C., Ellison, A., Ellison, R., Wen, L.M., Greaves, S., 2017. Longitudinal
438 evaluation of travel and health outcomes in relation to new bicycle infrastructure, Sydney, Australia.
439 *J Transp Health* 6, 386-395.

440 Dill, J., McNeil, N., Broach, J., Ma, L., 2014. Bicycle boulevards and changes in physical activity and
441 active transportation: Findings from a natural experiment. *Preventive Medicine* 69, S74-S78.

442 Garrard, J., Handy, S., Dill, J., 2012. Women and cycling in: Pucher, J., Buehler, R. (Eds.), *City Cycling*.
443 The MIT Press., Cambridge, MA.

444 Giles-Corti, B., Vernez-Moudon, A., Reis, R., Turrell, G., Dannenberg, A.L., Badland, H., Foster, S.,
445 Lowe, M., Sallis, J.F., Stevenson, M., Owen, N., 2016. City planning and population health: a global
446 challenge. *Lancet* 388, 2912-2924.

447 Goodman, A., Cheshire, J., 2014. Inequalities in the London bicycle sharing system revisited: impacts
448 of extending the scheme to poorer areas but then doubling prices. *Journal of Transport Geography*
449 41, 272-279.

450 Goodman, A., Sahlqvist, S., Ogilvie, D., iConnect, C., 2014. New walking and cycling routes and
451 increased physical activity: one- and 2-year findings from the UK iConnect Study. *Am J Public Health*
452 104, e38-46.

453 Handy, S., van Wee, B., Kroesen, M., 2014. Promoting Cycling for Transport: Research Needs and
454 Challenges. *Transport Reviews* 34, 4-24.

455 Hanson, S., 2010. Gender and mobility: new approaches for informing sustainability. *Gender, Place &*
456 *Culture* 17, 5-23.

457 Heesch, K.C., Sahlqvist, S., Garrard, J., 2012. Gender differences in recreational and transport cycling:
458 a cross-sectional mixed-methods comparison of cycling patterns, motivators, and constraints. *Int J*
459 *Behav Nutr Phy* 9, 106.

460 Heinen, E., Panter, J., Mackett, R., Ogilvie, D., 2015. Changes in mode of travel to work: a natural
461 experimental study of new transport infrastructure. *Int J Behav Nutr Phys Act* 12, 81.

462 Heise, L., Greene, M.E., Opper, N., Stavropoulou, M., Harper, C., Nascimento, M., Zewdie, D., Gender
463 Equality, N., Health Steering, C., 2019. Gender inequality and restrictive gender norms: framing the
464 challenges to health. *Lancet* 393, 2440-2454.

465 Hosking, J., Ameratunga, S., Exeter, D., Stewart, J., Bell, A., 2013. Ethnic, socioeconomic and
466 geographical inequalities in road traffic injury rates in the Auckland region. *Aust N Z J Public Health*
467 37, 162-167.

468 Imran, M., Pearce, J., 2015. Discursive Barriers to Sustainable Transport in New Zealand Cities. *Urban*
469 *Policy and Research* 33, 392-415.

470 Kavanagh, A.M., Bentley, R., 2008. Walking: A gender issue? *Aust J Soc Issues* 43, 45-64.

471 Keall, M., Chapman, R., Howden-Chapman, P., Witten, K., Abrahamse, W., Woodward, A., 2015.

472 Increasing active travel: results of a quasi-experimental study of an intervention to encourage

473 walking and cycling. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 69, 1184-1190.

474 Kronsell, A., Smidfelt Rosqvist, L., Winslott Hiselius, L., 2016. Achieving climate objectives in

475 transport policy by including women and challenging gender norms: The Swedish case. *International*

476 *Journal of Sustainable Transportation* 10, 703-711.

477 Kyu, H.H., Bachman, V.F., Alexander, L.T., Mumford, J.E., Afshin, A., Estep, K., Veerman, J.L.,

478 Delwiche, K., Iannarone, M.L., Moyer, M.L., Cercy, K., Vos, T., Murray, C.J., Forouzanfar, M.H., 2016.

479 Physical activity and risk of breast cancer, colon cancer, diabetes, ischemic heart disease, and

480 ischemic stroke events: systematic review and dose-response meta-analysis for the Global Burden of

481 Disease Study 2013. *BMJ* 354, i3857.

482 Law, R., 1999. Beyond 'women and transport': towards new geographies of gender and daily

483 mobility. *Prog Hum Geog* 23, 567-588.

484 Lee, J., Vojnovic, I., Grady, S.C., 2018. The 'transportation disadvantaged': Urban form, gender and

485 automobile versus non-automobile travel in the Detroit region. *Urban Studies* 55, 2470-2498.

486 Ministry of Transport, 2017. NZ Household Travel Survey 2003-2014 Ministry of Transport

487 Wellington.

488 Ministry of Transport, 2018. (2003-2014) Detailed Travel Survey Information.

489 Miralles-Guasch, C., Melo, M.M., Marquet, O., 2016. A gender analysis of everyday mobility in urban

490 and rural territories: from challenges to sustainability. *Gender, Place & Culture* 23, 398-417.

491 Mizdrak, A., Blakely, T., Cleghorn, C., Cobiac, L., 2018. Technical report for BODE³ active transport

492 and physical activity model. , Burden of Disease Epidemiology, Equity and Cost-Effectiveness

493 Programme technical report University of Otago Wellington Wellington

494 OECD, 2017. OECD Environmental Performance Reviews: New Zealand 2017. OECD Publishing Paris.

495 Ogilvie, F., Goodman, A., 2012. Inequalities in usage of a public bicycle sharing scheme: socio-

496 demographic predictors of uptake and usage of the London (UK) cycle hire scheme. *Prev Med* 55, 40-

497 45.

498 Pucher, J., Buehler, R., 2008. Making Cycling Irresistible: Lessons from The Netherlands, Denmark

499 and Germany. *Transport Reviews* 28, 495-528.

500 Pucher, J., Buehler, R., Seinen, M., 2011. Bicycling renaissance in North America? An update and re-

501 appraisal of cycling trends and policies. *Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice* 45, 451-

502 475.

503 Ravensbergen, L., Buliung, R., Laliberte, N., 2019. Toward feminist geographies of cycling. *Geogr*

504 *Compass* 13.

505 Shaw, C., Russell, M., van Sparrentak, K., Merrett, A., Clegg, H., 2016. Benchmarking cycling and

506 walking in six New Zealand cities: Pilot study 2015. New Zealand Centre for Sustainable Cities,

507 Wellington.

508 Steinbach, R., Green, J., Datta, J., Edwards, P., 2011. Cycling and the city: A case study of how

509 gendered, ethnic and class identities can shape healthy transport choices. *Social Science & Medicine*

510 72, 1123-1130.

511 Stevenson, M., Thompson, J., de Sá, T.H., Ewing, R., Mohan, D., McClure, R., Roberts, I., Tiwari, G.,

512 Giles-Corti, B., Sun, X., Wallace, M., Woodcock, J., 2016. Land use, transport, and population health:

513 estimating the health benefits of compact cities. *The Lancet*.

514 Sullivan, C., O'Fallon, C., 2006. Increasing cycling and walking: an analysis of readiness to change.,

515 Land Transport New Zealand Research Report Land Transport New Zealand Wellington

516 Susilo, Y.O., Liu, C., Börjesson, M., 2018. The changes of activity-travel participation across gender,

517 life-cycle, and generations in Sweden over 30 years. *Transportation*.

518 Taylor, B.D., Ralph, K., Smart, M., 2015. What Explains the Gender Gap in Schlepping? Testing

519 Various Explanations for Gender Differences in Household-Serving Travel*. *Social Science Quarterly*

520 96, 1493-1510.

521 Watts, N., Adger, W.N., Ayeb-Karlsson, S., Bai, Y., Byass, P., Campbell-Lendrum, D., Colbourn, T., Cox,
522 P., Davies, M., Depledge, M., Depoux, A., Dominguez-Salas, P., Drummond, P., Ekins, P., Flahault, A.,
523 Grace, D., Graham, H., Haines, A., Hamilton, I., Johnson, A., Kelman, I., Kovats, S., Liang, L., Lott, M.,
524 Lowe, R., Luo, Y., Mace, G., Maslin, M., Morrissey, K., Murray, K., Neville, T., Nilsson, M., Oreszczyn,
525 T., Parthemore, C., Pencheon, D., Robinson, E., Schutte, S., Shumake-Guillemot, J., Vineis, P.,
526 Wilkinson, P., Wheeler, N., Xu, B., Yang, J., Yin, Y., Yu, C., Gong, P., Montgomery, H., Costello, A.,
527 2017. The Lancet Countdown: tracking progress on health and climate change. *Lancet* 389, 1151-
528 1164.

529 World Economic Forum, 2014. The Global Gender Gap Report 2014. World Economic Forum, Geneva

530 World Health Organization, 2010. Global recommendations on physical activity for health World
531 Health Organization, Geneva.

532

533