Non-wage benefits, corporate ownership and firm performance in post-communist economies: evidence from Ukraine

Manuscript Submission to Children's Geographies:

Does the walkability of neighbourhoods affect children's independent mobility, independent of parental, socio-cultural and individual factors?

Karen Villanueva[1*] (Email: karen.villanueva@uwa.edu.au; Telephone: +61 8 6488 8760)
Billie Giles-Corti[2] (Email: b.giles-corti@unimelb.edu.au; Telephone: +61 3 8344 9332)
Max Bulsara[3] (Email: max.bulsara@nd.edu.au; Telephone: +61 8 9433 0297)
Georgina Trapp[1] (Email: georgina.trapp@uwa.edu.au; Telephone: +61 8 6488 1310)
Anna Timperio[4] (Email: anna.timperio@deakin.uwa.edu.au ; Telephone: +61 3 9244 6017)
Gavin McCormack[5] (Email: gmccorma@ucalgary.ca; Telephone: 403 220-8193)
Kimberly Van Niel[6] (Email: kimberly.vanniel@uwa.edu.au; Telephone: +61 3 6488 2707)

[1]Centre for the Built Environment and Health, School of Population Health, The University of Western Australia, Perth, Western Australia, Australia.
[2]McCaughey Centre VicHealth Centre for the Promotion of Mental Health and Community Wellbeing, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.
[3]Institute of Health and Rehabilitation, University of Notre Dame University, Fremantle, Western Australia, Australia.
[4]Centre for Physical Activity and Nutrition Research, Deakin University, Melbourne, Victoria, Australia.
[5] Population Health Intervention Research Centre, University of Calgary, Alberta, Canada.
[6]School of Earth and Environment, The University of Western Australia, Perth, Western Australia, Australia.
[*]Corresponding author

[1]Postal address:
Centre for the Built Environment and Health (M707)
School of Population Health
The University of Western Australia
35 Stirling Highway
CRAWLEY WA 6009 Australia

[2]Postal address:
McCaughey Centre VicHealth Centre for the Promotion of Mental Health and Community Wellbeing
School of Population Health
University of Melbourne
Level 5, 207 Bouverie Street
MELBOURNE, VIC 3000 Australia

[3]Postal address:
Institute of Health and Rehabilitation Research
University of Notre Dame
19 Mouat Street
P.O Box 1225
FREMANTLE WA 6959 Australia

[4]Postal address:
Centre for Physical Activity and Nutrition Research
Deakin University
221 Burwood Highway
BURWOOD VIC 3125 Australia

[5]Postal address:
Population Health Intervention Research Centre,
University of Calgary
3330 Hospital Drive, N.W.
Calgary, AB T2N 4Z6
CANADA

[6]Postal address:
School of Earth and Environment (M004)
The University of Western Australia
35 Stirling Highway
CRAWLEY WA 6009 Australia

Author responsible for correspondence*:

Karen Villanueva

Word count: 9575 words (bibliography, in-text references, tables, figures, captions, main text, acknowledgements).

Does the walkability of neighbourhoods affect children's independent mobility, independent of socio-cultural and individual factors?

Abstract (100 words)

The association between neighbourhood walkability and children's independent mobility using an ecological approach is relatively unexplored. In 2007, 1480 10-12 year-old children (and 1314 parents) attending low and high walkable schools across Perth, Western Australia, completed surveys. Objective built environment, social-cultural and individual-level factors were explored. High neighbourhood walkability predicted girls' independent mobility. However, girls and boys were more likely to be independently mobile if they and their parents were confident that they could travel independently. Providing safe, walkable neighbourhoods – particularly for girls - combined with strategies to improve children's skills to safely navigate their neighbourhood may increase independent mobility.

Key words: children**,** independent mobility, walkability, built environment, Australia

Introduction

Regular participation in physical activity during childhood reduces the risk of developing disease risk factors in adulthood (Boreham and Riddoch, 2001), enhances mental and emotional well-being (Parfitt and Eston, 2005, Biddle et al., 2004) and may prevent overweight and obesity (Flynn et al., 2006). Active transportation (i.e., walking or cycling for transport) has the potential to contribute to higher overall physical activity levels in children (Alexander et al., 2005, Saksvig et al., 2007, Landsberg et al., 2008, Cooper et al., 2006, Sirard et al., 2005), however children's active transport (AT) levels have declined rapidly in the last twenty years (McMillan, 2007, Harten and Olds, 2004, McDonald, 2007, Salmon et al., 2005).

Declines in active transportation have been coupled with declining levels of independent mobility (herein abbreviated as 'IM') among children, that is, active transportation to destinations undertaken without adult supervision (Pooley et al., 2005, Holt et al., 2009). Studies have shown that children in past generations experienced more freedom to move and explore their neighbourhood compared to current generations (Hillman et al., 1990, Pooley et al., 2005). These trends are mirrored by dramatic increases in motorised vehicle use (Mackett, 2002, Ham et al., 2008) and increases in parents chauffeuring children to destinations (Ker and Tranter, 1997, Tudor-Locke, 2001, McKee et al., 2007, Martin et al., 2009). In addition to reducing physical activity (Wen et al., 2009, Page et al., 2010), reduced IM may limit self-esteem (Sissons Joshi et al., 1999), hamper spatial skills (e.g., distance estimation, direction, spatial referencing skills) and provide less opportunity for children to learn about their environment (Rissotto and Tonucci, 2002). Thus, reduced IM may not only affect children's physical activity levels, but also their development and mental and social wellbeing.

In Australia, declining levels of children's IM at a time of alarming childhood obesity levels is a public health concern however, limited evidence exists to guide public health policy and

interventions aimed at encouraging children's IM (Fyhri et al., 2011, Whitzman and Pike, 2007). The factors that influence children's IM and the reasons for its decline are not well understood. To date only a limited number of international studies have comprehensively explored the range of factors influencing children's IM (Johansson, 2006, Hillman et al., 1990, Jago et al., 2009, Page et al., 2009), and few have taken an ecological approach that considers the independent contributions of individual-level, social environmental and physical environmental factors simultaneously (Johansson, 2006, Fyhri and Hjorthol, 2009). Moreover, few have explored IM in an Australian context (Whitzman and Pike, 2007, Malone, 2007)

Evidence to date suggests that individual-level correlates positively associated with IM include being older, and living closer to school (Hillman et al., 1990, Jones et al., 2000, Prezza et al., 2001, O'Brien et al., 2000, Johansson, 2006, Fyhri and Hjorthol, 2009). Moreover, others have suggested that boys are more likely to be independently mobile than girls (Johansson, 2006, Page et al., 2009), typically resulting in studies exploring any differences among sex (Brown et al., 2008). Social-cultural factors include support from peers, parental and child fear of 'stranger danger' and crime (Prezza et al., 2001, Jago et al., 2009), and parent's attitude towards IM (Johansson, 2006). To date, however, the built environment has received less attention.

The built environment has been consistently shown to be associated with children's AT, and therefore it is likely that the built environment is also an important correlate of children's IM. 'Walkable' environments combine a number of built environment attributes that encourage ease of pedestrian access and neighbourhood AT. For example, better connected street networks have generally been shown to positively influence 9-11 year old children's AT behaviour (Braza et al., 2004, Boarnet et al., 2005, Falb et al., 2007, Kerr et al., 2006, Bejleri et al., 2009) by reducing distances to destinations and providing multiple route options (Chin et al., 2008). Lower levels of traffic exposure have also been shown to influence children's AT (Timperio et al., 2004, Carlin et

al., 1997, von Kries et al., 1998). Although supportive built environments are important for facilitating mobility, *perceptions* about the built environment may also impact children's autonomy (Prezza et al., 2001). For example, parental concerns about traffic safety (e.g., volume, speed, presence of obstructions on the road) are also important factors influencing children's mobility (Weir et al., 2006, Collins and Kearns, 2001, Kerr et al., 2006).

While associations between built environment factors and AT have been established in several studies, few studies have examined built environment correlates of IM. Thus, using an ecological framework, this study explored the impact of objectively-measured neighbourhood walkability on IM, independent of parental perceptions of the neighbourhood, social-cultural factors and child-specific individual-level factors. It is hypothesised that a walkable environment increases the likelihood of boys' and girls' IM.

Methods

This study formed part of the TRavel Environment and Kids (TREK) project, a cross-sectional study conducted in metropolitan Perth, Western Australia. Its aim was to examine the impact of the built environment on Year 5 to 7 (i.e., 10-12 year-old) government primary school children's AT to and from school. Perth is an isolated, coastal city with high urban sprawl, and a relatively high standard of living in a Mediterranean climate. With a population of approximately 1.7 million (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2010), Perth is one of the smaller Australian capital cities (Giles-Corti et al., 2005). The University of Western Australia's Human Ethics Committee provided ethics approval (RA/4/1/1394). The study design is described fully elsewhere (Wood et al., 2010) but is described briefly here. Data were collected in two stages: 1) school-specific walkability assessment (Giles-Corti et al., 2011); and 2) a cross-sectional survey of Year 5-7 children and their parents (Wood et al., 2010).

Participant selection and recruitment

Using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) software, a school-specific walkability index (SWI) was developed and applied to all public primary schools in metropolitan Perth (n=238). The SWI is described fully elsewhere (Giles-Corti et al., 2011). Briefly, it summed two measures: 1) *street connectivity* assessed by pedsheds (i.e., walkable service area based on pedestrian network up to 2km in any direction from the school, divided by the actual area within 2km Euclidean (as crow flies) distance of the school (Chin et al., 2008); and 2) *road volume exposure*, a measure of road function detailing exposure to number of vehicles/day based on Main Roads Department of Western Australia's Functional Road Hierarchy, within 2km of each school using the road and pedestrian networks. Using the functional road function hierarchy, a ratio of kilometres of the higher volume roads (i.e., roads that carry large volumes of traffic; >6000 vehicles/day) to kilometres of the lower volume roads (i.e., roads that carry low volumes of traffic; <3000 vehicles/day) within 2km of the school was calculated. Schools ranked as the most (high street connectivity, low traffic exposure) and the least (low street connectivity, high traffic exposure) walkable schools from within three area-level socioeconomic status (SES) strata (i.e., low, medium, high), were selected and invited to participate in a cross-sectional survey (n=36 schools). For each participating school (n=25; 69.4% response rate), one class from each Year 5, Year 6 and Year 7 group was randomly selected until a minimum of 30 children were invited from each year group (n=2617). This age group was chosen because 'middle childhood' marks the time when parents grant their children more independence to explore their local neighbourhood (Jago et al., 2009, Hillman et al., 1990). Moreover, children above the age of 10 years have the cognitive (attention focus, interpreting traffic signs) and perceptual (locating sounds, judging speed, peripheral vision) abilities to negotiate complex traffic situations (Cross et al., 2000) and are considered more 'streetwise' (i.e., capable of handling the environment) (Prezza et al., 2001). Overall, 1480 children (56.5% response rate) and 1314 parents (89.6% response rate of parents of participating children) provided written consent and participated.

School-specific walkability was used as a proxy for the walkability of the child's neighbourhood for children who resided within 2km of their school (n=1254, 84.7% of sample). Children who did not reside within the zone were excluded from analyses (n=226, 15.3%).

Survey data collection

Questionnaire data were collected between July–December 2007. Children completed questionnaires during a 75-minute classroom session, and parents completed a questionnaire at home. Test-retest reliability of relevant items was assessed one week apart in four schools not included in the main study (n=160 10-12 year old children, n=101 parents) prior to the main survey. Items with acceptable reliability (i.e., kappa or intraclass correlation (ICC)>0.60) were included in the final survey instruments, and items <0.60 were modified to enhance their reliability. Modified items were re-tested for reliability (Wood et al., 2010).

Outcome variable (Independent mobility)

An IM index was computed using questions from both the student and the parent questionnaire. Children indicated whether or not they participated in or visited 15 activities or destinations (excluding trips to school) in their neighbourhood in the last week and parents indicated whether or not their child was generally allowed to participate or visit each of these without an adult (Figure 1). A score based on the number of activities or destinations in which they participated and were allowed to do/visit without an adult was computed in accordance with Figure 1. Potential scores could range from 0 (i.e., no independent active travel to any activity or destination) to 15.

Insert Figure 1 here

142 ***Independent variables***

143 Participants were administered 37 potentially relevant variables, of which 21 were included in six
144 subscales. The components of each subscale are described in Table 1. Using SPSS v17, principal
145 components analysis with varimax or oblimin rotation (depending on how correlated the items
146 were) was performed on three groups of variables (total 21 items, 7 of which were reverse coded so
147 that a higher score represented positive IM) to reduce the number of items into related factors. The
148 resulting scree plots, Eigen values and factor loadings were examined. Factors were determined
149 based on Eigen values >1, factor loadings >0.40 and on a single factor. Perceived environmental
150 factors, social-cultural factors, and individual factors are described in more detail below. Reliability
151 results for each factor (i.e., Kappa and ICC values) are also reported.

152 **Insert Table 1 here**

153 *Perceived environmental factors*

154 Parental perceptions of the environment were assessed with seven items. Parents were asked
155 "Which of the following best describes the location of your home?" (i.e., on a highway or on a busy
156 road (not on a highway) rather than a minor road (50 km/hr speed limit), in a cul-de-sac or within a
157 school zone (40km speed limit in school hours)). Responses were dichotomised into the variable
158 'Home on a busy road' (Yes/No, Kappa 0.697). Parents were asked "Is your backyard large enough
159 and suitable for children to run around" (Yes/No, Kappa 0.759) and "How fearful are you that if
160 your child walked or rode a bike in your neighbourhood without an adult s/he or she may cross the
161 road unsafely" (Not very fearful/fearful, Kappa 0.472). Parents were also asked four items relating
162 to neighbourhood friendliness (scale ICC 0.544, Cronbach's α=0.75) and two items relating to
163 safety of neighbourhood road crossings (scale ICC 0.540, Cronbach's α=076). Response options
164 were provided on a five-point likert scale and summed for each of the two subscales (Table 1).

Children indicated how much they agreed or disagreed (i.e., likert scale 1= strongly disagree to 5=strongly agree, don't know) with six items: 1) 'I am worried about strangers in my neighbourhood' (ICC 0.685); 2) 'It is safe for me to play at the park closest to my house without an adult present' (ICC 0.704); 3) 'The park closest to my house has fun or interesting things for me to do'(ICC 0.0.560); 4) 'My neighbourhood is a nice place to walk around' (ICC 0.576); 5) 'My neighbourhood is friendly' (ICC 0.651); and 6) 'You often see people out on walks in my neighbourhood' (ICC 0.0.648). Principal components analysis results suggested that the items loaded on one factor, however upon creation of the scale, the Cronbach's alpha value was low (i.e., below 0.7) indicating that the variables may not be measuring the same construct, and were therefore used as individual variables. Children were also asked two items related to confidence in travelling to the local shops independently (scale ICC 0.742, Cronbach's α=0.86) and two items relating to the amount of time taken to travel to the local shops (scale ICC 0.520, Cronbach's α=0.76). Response options were provided on a five-point likert scale and summed for each of the two subscales (Table 1).

Social-cultural and Individual factors

Two subscales were created from eleven social-cultural parent questionnaire items detailed in Table 1: 'Not fearful of child's personal safety in neighbourhood' (8 items, scale ICC 0.832, Cronbach's α=0.92); and 'Fearful of child engaging in antisocial behaviour' (3 items, scale ICC 0.739, Cronbach's α=0.94). Parents were also asked about the 'Number of children living in the house' (one to six, ICC 0.940). Three single items measured children's individual perceptions: 1) 'Child has many friends in the neighbourhood' (Yes/No, Kappa=0.758); 2) 'Child has lots of children their own age to hang out with in their area' (Yes/No, Kappa=0.727); and 3) 'Child has access to a bike at home to ride' (Yes/No, Kappa=0.734).

Bivariate and multivariate analyses

SPSS v17 and Stata/IC 11.0 for Windows were used. Only children who resided within 2km of the school with an IM score (n=1061) were eligible for analyses. Bivariate comparisons between individual, social-cultural, perceived environmental and objective variables (e.g., SWI), and IM were examined using Pearson's chi-square and Independent t-tests (Table 3). Variables with *p* values>0.1 were excluded from further multivariate analyses. Backward stepwise entry of correlates into the logistic regression model were manually undertaken to estimate the odds of some versus no IM in the last week (Tables 4 and 5). Classes of independent factors were sequentially entered into the models - objective environment (model 1), perceived environment (model 2), social-cultural factors (model 3) and individual factors (model 4). All models were adjusted for highest level of maternal education, the child's school year and whether or not the child was sick in the week prior to survey data collection, and robust standard errors for parameter estimates were obtained using the 'cluster by (school)' command (in Stata) allowing for intra-school correlation so observations are independent across schools. Due to documented sex variation in IM (Mackett et al., 2007, O'Brien et al., 2000), analyses were stratified by sex. Mediation analyses were undertaken among girls only using the Baron and Kenny approach (Baron and Kenny, 1986) and tested for significance using the Sobel test (Preacher and Hayes, 2004). Moreover, the proportion of the effect mediated was calculated (MacKinnon et al., 2007).

Results

Sample description

There were no significant demographic differences between boys and girls (Table 2). Approximately equal proportion of boys and girls attended low, medium and high SES schools. A higher proportion of boys (26.5%) than girls (19.7%) indicated that they were sick in the week preceding the data collection ($p<0.05$).

215 ***Independent mobility***

216 Children's IM scores as computed using the index (Figure 1), ranged from 0-10 (mean 1.57, SD
217 1.48), 0 indicating no IM. Due to the small number of children who were independently mobile,
218 scores were dichotomised into: 1) children with *no* IM; and 2) children with *some* IM (i.e., yes).
219 Overall, 71.8% of children had some form of IM (i.e., they were permitted to travel to *at least one*
220 activity/destination without an adult). During the school week surveyed, more boys had some IM
221 compared with girls (75.1% vs. 68.8% respectively, $p<0.01$; Table 2).

222

223 **Insert Table 2 here**

224 ***Associations with independent mobility***

225 Table 3 shows the bivariate associations between IM and 26 objective environmental, social-
226 cultural and individual independent variables. Eligible items or scales ($p\leq0.1$) were included in
227 further multivariate analyses shown in Tables 4 and 5 (i.e., objective environmental items: boys=2,
228 girls=2; perceived environmental items: boys=11, girls=7; social-cultural items: boys=5, girls=5;
229 individual items: boys=4, girls=5).

230 **Insert Table 3 here**

231

232 Tables 4 and 5 show variables associated with boys' and girls' IM, respectively, in the multivariable
233 models. After full adjustment, girls, but not boys' IM was positively associated with attending a
234 school located in a walkable environment (girls OR 1.96, $p=0.002$; boys OR 0.98, $p=0.950$).
235 Among girls and boys, both the child's and their parents' confidence in the child's ability to walk to
236 the closest shop without adult supervision, the child's perception that it was safe to play at the park
237 closest to their house and that there were lots of children their own age to hang out with locally
238 increased the odds of being independently mobile. Higher odds of IM were also found among boys
239 whose parents perceived neighbourhood roads to be safe. Girls who perceived that they often see

people out on walks in their neighbourhood or who had a bike at home to ride if they wanted to had higher odds of IM compared to those who did not in the final model.

Insert Table 4 here

Insert Table 5 here

Notably, however, after adjustment for social-cultural factors (model 3), associations between IM and parental perceptions of living on a busy road (OR 0.65, p=0.152) attenuated and became non-significant among girls. Mediation analysis (Baron and Kenny, 1986, Cerin and MacKinnon, 2008) showed that the association between parental perceptions of living on a busy road and IM (OR=0.54, p=0.026) was partially mediated by parents' confidence in their child's ability to walk to the closest shop without an adult (i.e., self-efficacy) (OR=0.62, p=0.100; Figure 2). In other words, *without* adjustment for parent confidence in their child's ability to travel independently, girls were 46% less likely (i.e., OR 0.54) to be IM if they lived on a busy road, but *with* adjustment (for parent confidence), girls were now 38% less likely to be independently mobile (i.e., OR 0.62). Parents who reported that their home was located on a busy road, were half as likely to be confident in their child's ability to travel without adult supervision. Overall mediation of the model was significant (Sobel test p=0.034). The proportion mediated was 0.352.

Insert Figure 2 here

Discussion

Although ecological frameworks exploring children's AT behaviour have begun to appear in the literature (Panter et al., 2008, McMillan, 2005, Timperio et al., 2004), to date few studies have investigated multiple levels of factors influencing IM (Fyhri and Hjorthol, 2009, Page et al., 2010).

This study found that few children were independently mobile but boys had more IM than girls. However, a walkable neighbourhood characterised by well-connected, low traffic streets increased girls' IM, but not boys. While in boys, positive parental perceptions about safe neighbourhood road crossings enhanced their IM. Child and parent confidence in the child's ability to travel independently was associated with IM in both boys and girls.

In this study, 71.8% of children had some form of IM (i.e., they were permitted to travel to *at least one* activity/destination without an adult), however the majority of these children travelled to only a few destinations independently. The proportion of children with IM in this study is higher than that reported in studies conducted elsewhere. For example, in the UK just over one half of children aged 8-11 years were allowed outside without an adult (Mackett et al., 2007), while in New Zealand, 44.3% of children aged 6-11 years travelled independently (Mitchell et al., 2007) and in Sweden, 30% of children aged 8-11 years travelled independently to leisure activities (Johansson, 2006). Although the number of destinations travelled to independently was not included in the IM measure in other studies, differences in IM rates between studies may be attributed to differences in age groups, data collection methods, and wording of questions, making direct comparisons between countries difficult. For example, the UK study (Mackett et al., 2007) included only two schools and used travel diaries to measure whether children travelled independently to each destination. The Swedish study (Johansson, 2006) also used travel diaries whereas the New Zealand study (Mitchell et al., 2007) was qualitative and explored independent journeys to *school* only.

There were few differences in correlates of IM by sex. Consistent with previous AT studies, (Zhu and Lee, 2008, Boarnet et al., 2005, Kerr et al., 2006), neighbourhood walkability measured by street connectivity and exposure to traffic was associated with children's IM, but in girls only. However, parental concern about the safety of neighbourhood road crossings was associated with

290 boys' IM, but not girls. Other studies also suggest that real and perceived traffic issues, such as
291 traffic volume, speed, lack of safe crossings, and presence of visual obstructions on the roads (e.g.,
292 parked cars on the road) are important correlates of children's mobility and affect whether parents
293 allow their child to walk or cycle (Mitchell et al., 2007, Jago et al., 2009, Gielen et al., 2004,
294 Timperio et al., 2004, McMillan, 2007).
295
296 Conversely, well-connected street networks facilitates AT behaviour (Braza et al., 2004, Boarnet et
297 al., 2005, Kerr et al., 2006, Falb et al., 2007, Bejleri et al., 2009, Mota et al., 2007, Giles-Corti et al.,
298 2011). Connected streets increase proximity to local destinations, providing shorter and usually
299 more direct routes to destinations. This enables children to easily navigate their neighbourhood,
300 which may encourage parents to allow their children to travel independently. However, street
301 connectivity appeared to be important for encouraging girls' IM only. It may be that provided the
302 streets are safe in terms of traffic, boys and their parents are less concerned about whether the
303 streets are highly connected. Rather, stronger more proximal factors appeared to influence boy's
304 mobility (e.g., confidence in ability to travel independently).
305
306 Several factors may contribute to the sex differences observed. Consistent with previous studies
307 (Page et al., 2009, O'Brien et al., 2000, Mackett et al., 2007), more boys than girls were
308 independently mobile. Moreover, boys generally have a larger territorial range (van Vliet, 1983,
309 Matthews, 1987, Webley, 1981) travel independently more frequently (Mackett et al., 2007), and
310 are allowed to do more local activities and errands (Mackett et al., 2007). Thus parent perceptions
311 about safe neighbourhood road crossings for example, may be important because boys are more
312 exposed to their neighbourhood environment. Nevertheless, because boys have more experience in
313 being IM, it appears that parents may feel they are more capable than girls in negotiating traffic
314 conditions, and being spatially aware of their surroundings. Thus, they have more confidence in
315 their son's abilities to traverse their neighbourhood. Subsequently these views may also affect

316 parental decisions to grant boys more independence. On the other hand, parental control over girls
317 IM may be more rigid, most likely due to safety concerns.
318
319 Indeed, McMillan (2005) has proposed a conceptual framework that identifies parental decision-
320 making as a mediator of the relationship between the built environment and travel behaviour in
321 children (McMillan, 2005). Parents determine whether or not their child travels independently. In
322 the current study, the parent's (and child's) confidence in the child's ability to walk or cycle without
323 adult supervision emerged as a strong factor influencing increased independent movement in both
324 girls *and* boys. For example, this confidence appeared to partially mediate the relationship between
325 parent perceptions of living on a busy road and their daughter's IM. Notably, parents of girls who
326 lived on busy streets were half as likely to be confident in their daughter's ability to travel
327 independently, possibly due to perceived dangers associated with high traffic exposure. It may be
328 that girls are less experienced negotiating local traffic compared with boys, in part due to having
329 less opportunity to be independently mobile. This finding suggests that the built environment may
330 influence parents' *perceptions* about the neighbourhood environment which in turn affects whether
331 or not they were confident enough to allow their children independence.
332
333 There were some similarities among boys and girls. It is noteworthy that there was no association
334 between IM and parental fear of their child's safety (i.e., stranger danger, bullying, personal injury).
335 Studies have found that parental concerns about strangers (e.g., abductions, kidnappings, murders)
336 and crime can restrict their child's travel behaviour (Pooley et al., 2005, Mitchell et al., 2007) and
337 independent physical activity (Jago et al., 2009), although there are mixed age-dependent findings
338 (Jago et al., 2009) and others have also found no sex differences (Johansson, 2003). Notably, most
339 parents - irrespective of whether or not they allowed their child independence - reported being
340 concerned about strangers and their children's safety (90.1%). Thus, this factor did not discriminate
341 between children who were or were not independently mobile. Children themselves may also fear

342 for their safety (Mitchell et al., 2007). This is reflected in our current findings showing that boys'
343 and girls' IM was related to whether they perceived the park closest to their house to be safe and
344 their perceptions of children their own age present in their neighbourhood. For children travelling to
345 parks and other destinations, children have expressed concerns about strangers, and the presence of
346 older children and gangs (Nayak, 2003, Jago et al., 2009). Children's perceptions of people walking
347 and cycling and interactions with neighbours and friends is associated with increases in children's
348 outdoor activity in previous studies (Timperio et al., 2004, Carver et al., 2008, Page et al., 2010,
349 Evenson et al., 2007). The presence of young children and adults could increase actual and
350 perceived surveillance which may contribute to a sense of safety (Valentine, 1997), sense of
351 community, feelings of trust and mutual support (Franklin 2002).

352

353 Conversely, children with more IM (e.g., boys), have more exposure to the local environment as
354 they are granted more freedom to move. Therefore, it is plausible that because independently
355 mobile children are more exposed to their neighbourhood surroundings, they are able to enjoy the
356 benefits of IM. Indeed, previous research suggests that IM can enhance children's self-esteem,
357 develop their cognitive skills (e.g., problem-solving, dealing with risk, initiative), provide
358 opportunities to cope with responsibility, develop social skills through interacting with others, and
359 develop spatial and way-finding skills to manipulate traffic situations (Rissotto and Tonucci, 2002,
360 Prezza and Pacilli, 2007, Joshi et al., 1999). The presence of children in the neighbourhood may
361 also facilitate social capital, a sense of community, and the development of local friendships
362 (Tranter and Whitelegg, 1994), suggesting wider community benefits. However, as this is a cross-
363 sectional study, causal associations cannot be determined.

364

365 The study findings have important implications for policy and practice. Designing safe, 'walkable'
366 neighbourhoods appears to be an important pre-condition for children to be independently mobile.

Streets surrounding destinations should be both highly connected to minimise distances between home and local destinations, yet carry lower levels of traffic. This may involve creating avenues or boulevards that separate children, pedestrians and cyclists *away* from cars. This would not only create a safer neighbourhood environment for children, but would also increase parent and child's confidence in children being independently mobile. Although not implemented in Perth, US Programs such as 'Safe routes to school' (Boarnet et al., 2005) have had some success in altering the built environment to provide a safer travel environment for children. However, greater attention should be given to creating safe routes to all local destinations frequented by children (such as shops, sporting facilities and parks), not just to schools (Giles-Corti et al., 2009). These results suggest that *appealing* yet safe routes and places for children are essential in shaping parental and child feelings of safety and confidence.

Despite attempts to address some of the built environment barriers, parents may still be reluctant to allow their children to travel independently. Given that Perth is a highly car-dependent city, with a high proportion of parents ((~60% in 1997 (Carlin et al., 1997); ~71% in 2008 (Martin et al., 2009)) 'chauffeuring' their children to school and other destinations, there is considerable scope to change social norms, and encourage parents to allow their children to walk or cycle. It may be that parents drive their children to protect them from adverse traffic conditions yet this creates a major source of traffic safety problems for children who do walk or cycle (Tranter and Pawson, 2001). There appears to be a need to not only create safer environments, but also to educate parents, children, schools, and the community of the multiple benefits of IM. For example, as outlined earlier, promoting IM offers the potential to increase community PA levels and provides extensive benefits, not only for the child, but for their parents, and the wider community (Prezza et al., 2001). In fact, Jago and colleagues (2009) suggested that interventions and campaigns to promote IM and approaches to manage parental concerns are required. In WA, there are currently no programs that target IM *per se*. Designing interventions to promote children's IM is complex, and may involve

numerous strategies and the cooperation of multiple players. For example, a focus on skill development could be integrated in future campaigns, thereby increasing the child's competence and confidence (and their parents) to be independently mobile. Bicycle education classes, neighbourhood watch programs, walking school bus programs and school travel plans are all examples of programs that may contribute to building confidence in a child's ability to spatially navigate their area safely through skill-building and awareness through doing. Currently, bicycle education classes are not part of the curriculum in WA primary schools (Trapp et al., 2011). There may be potential to improve children's cycling ability through programs that combine theoretical knowledge (e.g., road rules, wearing helmets, bicycle maintenance), with practical skills classes (e.g., concentration and attention to surroundings, judging speed, decision making and confidence) (Briem et al., 2004). Although the walking school bus program is not targeted specifically at IM, it provides children with skills to increase confidence in their ability to walk or cycle by identifying safe practices and negotiating traffic situations. Moreover, to facilitate a sense of neighbourhood safety and surveillance, there is potential benefit of promoting AT in different populations and age groups; efforts should be made to create child-friendly streets and places by encouraging parents, children and neighbours to be *active* in their neighbourhood, thereby providing environments conducive for independent travel. This study highlights the need to involve managing parental and child concerns by creating safe routes and destinations through improvements to connectivity, walking and cycling infrastructure, protection from traffic, as well as child and parent education.

Limitations

This study has several limitations. Although based on a large sample, the generalizability of the results is limited to children aged 10-12 years attending public primary schools in high and low walkable neighbourhoods. Moreover, the school-specific walkability index used was a composite of street connectivity and road traffic volume exposure only. Other aspects of the built environment,

418 such as destination or land use mix may be important. Zhu et al. (2008), for example, incorporated a
419 measure of pedestrian facilities, residential density, land-use mix and street connectivity into their
420 neighbourhood walkability index for children. Moreover, the walkability of the school
421 neighbourhood was used as a proxy for neighbourhood walkability. This may have introduced
422 measurement error, particularly for those living on the edge of the school-neighbourhood. A
423 walkability measure specific to the child's home would be a more accurate measure, especially for
424 children travelling to destinations other than school. Furthermore, other broader factors may
425 influence IM (e.g., ethnicity, hours of daylight, weather conditions, and parental restrictions),
426 however these were not explored here. It is important to note that the level of IM for children was
427 low although it was higher in comparison to other studies. Moreover, this was a cross-sectional
428 study, therefore causality cannot be assumed.
429
430 **Conclusion**
431
432 As children age and are given more independence, neighbourhood design may impact on whether
433 children are able, or allowed to walk or cycle. A walkable and child-friendly neighbourhood is
434 necessary, albeit insufficient for supporting IM. Although the built environment plays an important
435 role in shaping parents' and child perceptions and confidence in whether or not they feel safe, to
436 foster IM, a multilevel integrated approach (involving children, parents, schools, the community,
437 and organisations involved in safety and designing neighbourhoods) to interventions should be
438 adopted. Providing safe, walkable neighbourhoods – particularly for girls - combined with strategies
439 to increase children's skills to safely navigate their neighbourhood may be required to increase both
440 girls' *and* boys' independent mobility by helping manage parental safety concerns and increasing
441 parental and child confidence in children's independent travel abilities.
442
443

Acknowledgements

The National Health and Medical Research Council (#403933) funded this project. Walking WA is the industry partner on this project and the input of members of this Committee is gratefully acknowledged, particularly Alice Haning (Department of Transport) who has supported the project from its inception. Spatial data based on information provided by and with the permission of the Western Australian Land Information Authority was used and access to the data provided by the Department of Planning. KV was supported by scholarships provided by an Australian Postgraduate Award (APA) and Ad Hoc Scholarships; GT was supported by an APA and the NHMRC Capacity Building Grant (#458668); BGC is supported by a NHMRC Principal Research Fellow Award (#1004900); AT by a VicHealth Public Health Research Fellowship (2004 0536); and GM by a Canadian Institutes of Health Research Bisby Postdoctoral Fellowship.

References

Alexander, L. M., Inchley, J., Todd, J., Currie, D., Cooper, A. R. & Currie, C. 2005. *The Broader Impact of Walking to School among Adolescents: Seven Day Accelerometry Based Study* BMJ: British Medical Journal, 331, 1061-1062.

Australian Bureau of Statistics. 2010. *National Regional Profile: Perth (Statistical Division)* [Online]. Perth, Western Australia. Available: http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@nrp.nsf/Latestproducts/505Population/People12006-2010?opendocument&tabname=Summary&prodno=505&issue=2006-2010 [Accessed 23 November 2011].

Baron, R. & Kenny, D. 1986. *The Moderator-Mediator Variable Distinction in Social Psychological Research: Conceptual, Strategic, and Statistical Considerations*. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 51, 1173-1182.

Bejleri, I., Steiner, R. L., Provost, R. E., Fischman, A. & Arafat, A. A. 2009. *Understanding and Mapping Elements of Urban Form That Affect Children's Ability to Walk and Bicycle to School; Case Study of Two Tampa Bay, Florida, Counties* Journal of the Transportation Research Board, 148-158.

Biddle, S. J. H., Gorely, T. & Stensel, D. J. 2004. *Health-enhancing physical activity and sedentary behaviour in children and adolescents*. Journal of Sports Sciences, 22, 679-701.

Boarnet, M., Andersen, C., Day, K., McMillan, T. & Alfonzo, M. 2005. *Evaluation of the California Safe Routes to School Legislation; Urban Form Changes and Children's Active Transportation to School*. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 28, 134-140.

Boreham, C. & Riddoch, C. 2001. *The physical activity, fitness and health of children*. Journal of Sports Sciences, 19, 915-929.

Braza, M., Shoemaker, W. & Seeley, A. 2004. *Neighborhood Design and Rates of Walking and Biking to Elementary School in 34 California Communities*. American Journal of Health Promotion, 128-136.

Briem, V., Radeborg, K., Salo, I. & Bengtsson, H. 2004. *Developmental Aspects of Children's Behavior and Safety While Cycling*. Journal of Pediatric Psychology, 29, 369-377.

Brown, B., Mackett, R., Gong, Y., Kitazawa, K. & Paskins, J. 2008. *Gender differences in children's pathways to independent mobility*. Children's Geographies, 6, 385-401.

Carlin, J., Stevenson, M., Roberts, I., Bennett, C., Gelman, A. & Nolan, T. 1997. *Walking to school and traffic exposure in Australian children*. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 21, 286-292.

Carver, A., Timperio, A. & Crawford, D. 2008. *Playing it safe: The influence of neighbourhood safety on children's physical activity - A review*. Health & Place, 14, 217-227.

Cerin, E. & MacKinnon, D. 2008. *A commentary on current practice in mediating variable analyses in behavioural nutrition and physical activity*. Public Health Nutrition, 12, 1182-1188.

Chin, G., Van Niel, K., Giles-Corti, B. & Knuiman, M. 2008. *Accessibility and connectivity in physical activity studies: The impact of missing pedestrian data*. Preventive Medicine, 49, 41-45.

Collins, D. & Kearns, R. 2001. *The safe journeys of an enterprising school: negotiating landscapes of opportunity and risk*. Health & Place, 7, 293-306.

Cooper, A. R., Wedderkopp, N., Wang, H., Andersen, L. B., Froberg, K. & Page, A. S. 2006. *Active Travel to School and Cardiovascular Fitness in Danish Children and Adolescents* Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise, 38, 1724-1731.

Cross, D., Stevenson, M., Hall, M., Burns, S., Laughlin, D., Officer, J. & Howat, P. 2000. *Child Pedestrian Injury Prevention Project: Student Results* Prev Med, 30, 179-187.

Evenson, K., Scott, M., Cohen, D. & Voorhees, C. 2007. *Girls' Perception of Neighborhood Factors on Physical Activity, Sedentary Behavior, and BMI*. Obesity, 15, 430-445.

Falb, M., Kanny, D., Powell, K. & Giarrusso, A. 2007. *Estimating the Proportion of Children Who Can Walk to School*. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 33, 269-275.

Flynn, M. A. T., McNeil, D. A., Maloff, B., Mutasingwa, D., Wu, M., Ford, C. & Tough, S. C. 2006. *Reducing obesity and related chronic disease risk in children and youth: a synthesis of evidence with 'best practice' recommendations*. The International Association for the Study of Obesity. Obesity Reviews, 7, 7-66.

Fyhri, A. & Hjorthol, R. 2009. *Children's independent mobility to school, friends and leisure activities*. Journal of Transport Geography, 17, 377-384.

Fyhri, A., Hjorthol, R., Mackett, R. L., Fotel, T. N. & KyttÃ, M. 2011. *Children's active travel and independent mobility in four countries: Development, social contributing trends and measures*. Transport Policy, 18, 703-710.

Gielen, A., DeFrancesco, S., Bishai, D., Mahoney, P., Ho, S. & Guyer, B. 2004. *Child Pedestrians: the Role of Parental Beliefs and Practices in Promoting Safe Walking in Urban Neighborhoods*. Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine, 81, 545-555.

Giles-Corti, B., Broomhall, M. H., Knuiman, M., Collins, C., Douglas, K., Ng, K., Lange, A. & Donovan, R. J. 2005. *Increasing walking: How important is distance to, attractiveness, and size of public open space?* American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 28, 169-176.

Giles-Corti, B., Kelty, S. F., Zubrick, S. R. & Villanueva, K. P. 2009. *Encouraging Walking for Transport and Physical Activity in Children and Adolescents How Important is the Built Environment?* Sports Medicine, 39, 995-1009.

Giles-Corti, B., Wood, G., Pikora, T., Learnihan, V., Bulsara, M., Van Niel, K., Timperio, A., McCormack, G. & Villanueva, K. 2011. *School site and the potential to walk to school: The impact of street connectivity and traffic exposure in school neighborhoods* Health & Place, 17, 545-550.

Ham, S. A., Martin, S. & Kohl, H. W. I. 2008. *Changes in the Percentage of Students Who Walk or Bike to School - United States, 1969 and 2001*. Journal of Physical Activity and Health, 5, 205-215.

Harten, N. & Olds, T. 2004. *Patterns of active transport in 11-12 year old Australian children*. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 28, 167-172.

Hillman, M., Adams, J. & Whitelegg, J. 1990. *One false move...A Study of Children's Independent Mobility,* London, Great Britain, Policy Studies Institute.

Holt, N. L., Cunningham, C.-T., Sehn, Z. L., Spence, J. C., Newton, A. S. & Ball, G. D. C. 2009. *Neighborhood physical opportunities for inner-city children and youth*. Health & Place, 15, 1022-1028.

559 Jago, R., Thompson, J., Page, A., Brockman, R., Cartwright, K. & Fox, K. 2009. *License to be active: parental*
560 *concerns and 10-11-year-old children's ability to be independently physically active*. Journal of
561 Public Health**,** 1-6.
562
563 Johansson, M. 2003. *Social Dangers as Constraints for Pro-Environmental Travel Modes - the Perception of*
564 *Parents in England and Sweden*. Medio Ambiente y Comportamiento Humano*,* 4**,** 49-69.
565
566 Johansson, M. 2006. *Environment and parental factors as determinants of mode for children's leisure travel*.
567 Journal of Environmental Psychology*,* 26**,** 156-169.
568
569 Jones, L., Davis, A. & Eyers, T. 2000. *Young people, transport and risk: comparing access and independent*
570 *mobility in urban, suburban and rural environments*. Health Education Journal*,* 59**,** 315-328.
571
572 Joshi, M., MacClean, M. & Carter, W. 1999. *Children's journey to school: Spatial skills, knowledge and*
573 *perceptions of the environment*. British Journal of Developmental Psychology*,* 17**,** 125-139.
574
575 Ker, I. & Tranter, P. 1997. *A Wish Called Wander: Reclaiming Automobility from the Motor Car*. World
576 Transport Policy & Practice*,* 3**,** 11-14.
577
578 Kerr, J., Rosenberg, D., Sallis, J., Saelens, B., Frank, L. & Conway, T. 2006. *Active Commuting to School:*
579 *Associations with Environment and Parental Concerns*. Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise**,**
580 787-794.
581
582 Landsberg, B., Plachta-Danielzik, S., Much, D., Johannsen, M., Lange, D. & MÃller, M. J. 2008. *Associations*
583 *between active commuting to school, fat mass and lifestyle factors in adolescents: the Kiel Obesity*
584 *Prevention Study (KOPS)*. European Journal of Clinical Nutrition*,* 62**,** 739-747.
585
586 Mackett, R., Brown, B., Gong, Y., Kitazawa, K. & Paskins, J. 2007. *Children's Independent Movement in the*
587 *Local Environment*. Built Environment*,* 33**,** 454-468.
588
589 Mackett, R. L. 2002. *Increasing car dependency of children: should we be worried?* Municipal Engineer 151**,**
590 29-38.
591
592 MacKinnon, D., Fairchild, A. & Fritz, M. 2007. *Mediation Analysis*. Annual Reviews Psychology*,* 58**,** 593-614.
593
594 Malone, K. 2007. *The bubble-wrap generation: children growing up in walled gardens*. Environmental
595 Education Research*,* 13**,** 513-527.
596
597 Martin, K., Rosenberg, M., Miller, M., French, S., McCormack, G., Bull, F., Giles-Corti, B. & Pratt, S. 2009.
598 *Child and Adolescent Physical Activity and Nutrition Survey 2008: Key Findings*. Perth, Western
599 Australia: Western Australian Government.
600
601 Matthews, M. 1987. *Gender, Home Range, and Environmental Cognition*. Transactions of the Institute of
602 British Geographers*,* 12**,** 43-56.
603
604 McDonald, N. C. 2007. *Active Transportation to School; Trends Among U.S. Schoolchildren, 1969-2001*.
605 American Journal of Preventive Medicine*,* 32**,** 509-516.
606
607 McKee, R., Mutrie, N., Crawford, F. & Green, B. 2007. *Promoting walking to school: results of a quasi-*
608 *experimental trial*. Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*,* 61**,** 818-823.
609
610 McMillan, T. 2005. *Urban Form and a Child's Trip to School: The Current Literature and a Framework for*
611 *Future Research* Journal of Planning Literature 19**,** 440-456.

McMillan, T. E. 2007. *The relative influence of urban form on a child's travel mode to school*. Transportation Research Part A: Policy and Practice, 41, 69-79.

Mitchell, H., Kearns, R. & Collins, D. 2007. *Nuances of neighbourhood: Children's perceptions of the space between home and school in Aucklands, New Zealand*. Geoforum, 38, 614-627.

Mota, J., Gomes, H., Almeida, M., Ribeiro, J., Carvalho, J. & Santos, M. 2007. *Active versus passive transportation to school - differences in screen time, socio-economic position and perceived environmental characteristics in adolescent girls*. Annals of Human Biology, 34, 273-282.

Nayak, A. 2003. *'Through children's eyes': childhood, place and the fear of crime*. Geoforum, 34, 303-315.

O'Brien, M., Jones, D., Sloan, D. & Rustin, M. 2000. *Children's Independent Spatial Mobility in the Urban Public Realm*. Childhood, 7, 257-277.

Page, A. S., Cooper, A. R., Griew, P., Davis, L. & Hillsdon, M. 2009. *Independent mobility in relation to weekday and weekend physical activity in children aged 10-11 years: The PEACH Project*. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 6, 2-11.

Page, A. S., Cooper, A. R., Griew, P. & Jago, R. 2010. *Independent mobility, perceptions of the built environment and children's participation in play, active travel and structured exercise and sport: the PEACH Project*. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 7, 17-27.

Panter, J., Jones, A. & van Sluijs, E. 2008. *Environmental determinants of active travel in youth: A review and framework for future research*. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 5, 34-48.

Parfitt, G. & Eston, R. 2005. *The relationship between children's habitual activity level and psychological well-being*. Acta Paediatrica, 94, 1791-1797.

Pooley, C. G., Turnbull, J. & Adams, M. 2005. *The journey to school in Britain since the 1940s: continuity and change*. Area, 37, 43-53.

Preacher, K. & Hayes, A. 2004. *SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models*. Behavior Research Methods, Instruments & Computers, 36, 717-731.

Prezza, M. & Pacilli, M. 2007. *Current Fear of Crime, Sense of Community, and Loneliness in Italian Adolescents: The Role of Autonomous Mobility and Play During Childhood*. Journal of Community Psychology, 35, 151-170.

Prezza, M., Pilloni, S., Morabito, C., Sersante, C., Alparone, F. R. & Giuliani, M. V. 2001. *The Influence of Psychosocial and Environmental Factors on Children's Independent Mobility and Relationship to Peer Frequentation*. Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 11, 435-450.

Rissotto, A. & Tonucci, F. 2002. *Freedom of Movement and Environmental Knowledge in Elementary School Children*. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 22, 65-77.

Saksvig, B. I., Catellier, D. J., Pfeiffer, K., Schmitz, K. H., Conway, T., Going, S., Ward, D., Strikmiller, P. & Treuth, M. S. 2007. *Travel by Walking Before and After School and Physical Activity Among Adolescent Girls*. Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 161, 153-158.

Salmon, J., Timperio, A., Cleland, V. & Venn, A. 2005. *Trends in children's physical activity and weight status in high and low socio-economic status areas of Melbourne, Victoria, 1985-2001*. Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 29, 337-342.

Sirard, J., Riner, W., McIver, K. & Pate, R. 2005. *Physical activity and active commuting to elementary school*. Medicine & Science in Sports & Exercise, 37, 2062-2069.

Sissons Joshi, M., MacClean, M. & Carter, W. 1999. *Children's journey to school: Spatial skills, knowledge and perceptions of the environment*. British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 17, 125-139.

Timperio, A., Crawford, D., Telford, A. & Salmon, J. 2004. *Perceptions about the local neighbourhood and walking and cycling among children*. Preventive Medicine, 38, 39-47.

Tranter, P. & Pawson, E. 2001. *Children's Access to Local Environments: a case-study of Christchurch, New Zealand*. Local Environment, 6, 27-48.

Tranter, P. & Whitelegg, J. 1994. *Children's travel behaviours in Canberra: car-dependent lifestyles in a low-density city*. Journal of Transport Geography, 2, 265-273.

Trapp, G., Giles-Corti, B., Christian, H., Bulsara, M., Timperio, A., McCormack, G. & Villanueva, K. 2011. *On your bike! A cross-sectional study of the individual, social and environmental correlates of cycling to school*. International Journal of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Activity, 8, 123-133.

Tudor-Locke 2001. *Active Commuting to School; An Overlooked Source of Children's Physical Activity?* Sports Medicine, 31, 309-313.

Valentine, G. 1997. *A Safe Place to Grow Up? Parenting, Perceptions of Children's Safety and the Rural Idyll*. Journal of Rural Studies, 13, 137-148.

van Vliet, W. 1983. *Exploring the Fourth Environment: An Examination of the Home Range of City and Suburban Teenagers*. Environment and Behavior, 15, 567-588.

von Kries, R., Kohne, C., Bohm, O. & von Voss, H. 1998. *Road injuries in school age children: relation to environmental factors amenable to interventions*. Injury Prevention, 4, 103-105.

Webley, P. 1981. *Sex differences in home range and cognitive maps in eight-year old children*. Journal of Environmental Psychology, 1, 293-302.

Weir, L., Etelson, D. & Brand, D. 2006. *Parents' perceptions of neighborhood safety and children's physical activity*. Preventive Medicine, 43, 212-217.

Wen, L. M., Kite, J., Merom, D. & Rissel, C. 2009. *Time spent playing outdoors after school and its relationship with independent mobility: a cross-sectional survey of children aged 10-12 years in Sydney, Australia*. International Journal for Behavioural Nutrition and Physical Activity, 6, 15-23.

Whitzman, C. & Pike, L. 2007. *From Battery-Reared to Free Range Children: Institutional Barriers and Enablers to Children's Indepndent Mobility in Victoria, Australia*.

Wood, G., Giles-Corti, B., Pikora, T., Bulsara, M., McCormack, G. & Timperio, A. 2010. *The TRavel, Environment and Kids Project: Preliminary findings report*. Perth: Centre for the Built Environment and Health, School of Population Health, The University of Western Australia.

Zhu, X. & Lee, C. 2008. *Walkability and Safety Around Elementary Schools; Economic and Ethic Disparities*. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 34, 282-290.

716

717

Table 1: Results from factor analyses of independent variables

Factor subscale	Questionnaire items included in factor subscales	Cronbach's alpha
Perceived environment factors		
Child is confident that they can actively travel to the local shops without an adult[§]	'I am sure that I could walk to the shop closest to my home without an adult present'; 'I am sure that I could ride a bike to the shop closest to my home without an adult present'	0.86
Child perceives that it takes too long to actively travel to the closest shop[§]	'It takes too much time to walk to the shop closest to my home'; 'It takes too much time to ride a bike to the shop closest to my home'	0.76
Parent perceives that their neighbourhood is friendly[§]	'I often see adults walking in our neighbourhood; 'I often see children walking in our neighbourhood'; 'Our neighbourhood is friendly'; 'Our neighbourhood is a nice place to walk around'	0.75
Parent perceives that their neighbourhood road crossings are safe[§]	'There are no safe crossings for my child to use if he/she walked or cycled to the local shop'; 'There are no safe crossings for my child to use if he/she walked or cycled to the closest park'	0.76
Social-cultural factors		
Parent is not fearful of child's personal safety in neighbourhood[#]	How fearful are you that if your child walked or rode a bike in your neighbourhood without an adult he or she may; 'be approached by a stranger'; 'be taken by a stranger'; 'be hurt by a stranger'; 'be bullied by children the same age'; 'be bullied by older children or teenagers'; 'be injured in an incident when walking'; 'be injured in an incident when riding a bike'; 'be bitten by a dog'	0.92
Parent is fearful of their child engaging in antisocial behaviour[#]	How fearful are you that if your child walked or rode a bike in your neighbourhood without an adult he or she may: 'get involved in shoplifting'; 'get involved in graffiti or vandalism'; 'engage in smoking'	0.94

[§]Likert scale: strongly disagree to strongly agree; [#]Likert scale: not at all fearful to extremely fearful.

Table 2: Sample characteristics

Sample Characteristic (%)	Boys (n=506)	Girls (n=555)	All (n=1061)
Child's age			
10	33.6	31.9	32.7
11	35.8	38.4	37.1
12	30.6	29.7	30.2
SES of school			
Low	24.3	29.0	26.8
Medium	35.2	31.4	33.2
High	40.5	39.6	40.1
School neighbourhood walkability			
Low	54.0	51.2	52.5
High	46.0	48.8	47.5
Sick in the last week?*			
No	73.5	80.3	77.1
Yes	26.5	19.7	22.9
Maternal education			
Less than TEE	25.5	29.7	27.7
TEE/trade/diploma	57.2	53.7	55.4
Bachelor degree or higher	17.3	16.6	16.9
Independent Mobility*			
No	24.9	31.2	28.2
Some	75.1	68.8	71.8

*$p<0.05$; SES: socioeconomic status

Table 3: Distribution and bivariate associations of independent mobility with individual, socio-cultural and environmental variables stratified by sex

Variables	Boys			Girls		
	Independent mobility (No, Yes)			Independent mobility (No, Yes)		
	% No (n=126)	% Yes (n=380)	*p*-value	% No (n=173)	% Yes (n=382)	*p*-value
Objective environmental factors						
School SES - Low	29.4	22.6	0.310*	37.6	25.1	0.009*
- Medium	32.5	36.1		29.5	32.2	
- High	38.1	41.3		32.9	42.7	
School neighbourhood walkability - High	44.0	46.6	0.677*	39.3	53.1	0.002*
Perceived parent environmental factors						
Home is on a busy road[#]	17.1	9.9	0.033*	15.8	9.1	0.025*
Size of backyard is large enough for children to run around	88.9	82.9	0.225	86.1	85.1	0.598
Fearful that child will cross road unsafely	52.8	43.4	0.066*	44.7	38.7	0.188
[1]Parent perceives that their neighbourhood is friendly			0.005*			0.000*
[2]Parent perceives that their neighbourhood road crossings are safe			0.000*			0.000*
Perceived child environmental factors						
[3]Child is confident that they can actively travel to the local shops without an adult			0.000*			0.000*
[4]Child perceives that it takes too long to actively travel to the closest shop			0.000*			0.000*
I am worried about strangers in my neighbourhood						
- No	42.1	55.3	0.001*	34.1	39.5	0.256
- Neither	15.9	20.5		22.0	23.8	
- Yes	42.1	24.2		43.9	36.6	
It is safe for me to play at the park closest to my house without an adult						
- No	32.5	14.5	0.000*	39.3	22.0	0.000*
- Neither	18.3	13.4		27.2	18.1	
- Yes	49.2	72.1		33.5	59.9	
The park closest to my house has fun or interesting things for me to do						
- No	34.9	30.8	0.035*	28.9	24.9	0.224
- Neither	21.4	13.7		20.8	17.0	
- Yes	43.7	55.5		50.3	58.1	

My neighbourhood is friendly						
- No	9.5	8.4	0.021*	6.40	4.70	0.123
- Neither	31.7	20.3		27.7	20.9	
- Yes	58.7	71.3		65.9	74.3	
You often see people out on walks in my neighbourhood						
- No	11.9	8.9	0.009*	11.0	4.70	0.002*
- Neither	21.4	11.6		15.0	9.20	
- Yes	66.1	79.5		74.0	86.1	
Socio-cultural factors *(Parent perceptions)*						
Confidence in child's ability to walk to the closest shop with other children but without an adult	68.5	89.1	0.000*	64.9	87.0	0.000*
Confidence in child's ability to bike to the closest shop with other children but without an adult	64.5	84.1	0.000*	56.7	79.6	0.000*
[5]Parent is not fearful of child's personal safety in neighbourhood			0.002*			0.000*
[6]Parent is fearful of their child engaging in antisocial behaviour			0.728			0.378
I often see media coverage about stranger danger to independently mobile children						
Disagree	14.4	17.6	0.000*	8.30	13.1	0.000*
N/A	8.0	22.6		9.50	21.4	
Agree	77.6	59.8		82.1	65.5	
Individual factors						
Number of children living in house			0.601			0.933
Child has many friends in neighbourhood	64.3	80.5	0.000*	62.2	77.7	0.000*
Child has lots of children their own age to hang out with in area	44.4	68.2	0.000*	44.5	67.5	0.000*
Student age	37.3	32.4	0.101*			
10	39.7	34.5		41.9	27.5	0.002*
11	23.0	33.2		36.4	39.3	
12				22.0	23.2	
Student was sick in the week prior to data collection	24.6	27.1	0.581*	20.9	19.1	0.618*
Maternal education						
Less than TEE	25.6	25.4	0.792*	28.7	30.2	0.935*
TEE	55.2	57.9		54.4	53.4	
University/Diploma	19.2	16.7		17.0	16.4	
Child has access to a bike at home to ride	89.7	92.5	0.168	85.0	95.5	0.000*

*Factor was included in further multivariate analyses outlined in Tables 4 and 5; [1-6]Subscales.The factors forming the factor subscales are described in Table 1 in more detail; [#]Parent perceived that home is located on a busy road (yes, no): Yes= On a highway, busy road; No= minor road, cul-de-sac, school-zone; SES: socioeconomic status.

Table 4: Boys - Effects of adjusting for environmental, social-cultural, and individual associations between independent mobility in multilevel logistic regression models

		Model 1 (Objective environment)			Model 2 (Model 1 + perceptions of environment)			Model 3 (Model 2 + social-cultural factors)			Model 4 (Model 3 + individual factors)		
		OR	***p***	**95%CI**	**OR**	***p***	**95%CI**	**OR**	***p***	**95%CI**	**OR**	***p***	**95%CI**
Walkability of school neighbourhood	High	1.10	0.706	0.68,1.77	1.01	0.981	0.60,1.69	0.94	0.840	0.55,1.62	0.98	0.950	0.57,1.69
	Low	1.00			1.00			1.00			1.00		
Parent perceives that their neighbourhood road crossings are safe[#]					1.44	0.000	1.23,1.69	1.37	0.000	1.17,1.62	1.37	0.000	1.18,1.59
Child is confident that they can walk to closest shop without an adult[#]					1.53	0.000	1.28,1.84	1.45	0.000	1.20,1.76	1.42	0.000	1.17,1.73
Child perceives that it is safe to play at the park closest to their house	Yes				2.36	0.003	1.34,4.17	2.38	0.003	1.33,4.24	2.19	0.016	1.16,4.16
	N/A				1.67	0.189	0.77,3.62	1.73	0.173	0.78,3.82	1.58	0.255	0.72,3.50
	No				1.00			1.00			1.00		
Parent is confident in child's ability to walk to the closest shop without an adult	Yes							2.67	0.001	1.52,4.69	2.93	0.000	1.67,5.14
	No							1.00			1.00		
Child perceives lots of children their own age to hang out with in neighbourhood	Yes										2.48	0.000	1.59,3.87
	No										1.00		

[#]Subscale; N/A= Not applicable; Adjusted for socio-economic status (low, medium, high), age (10,11, 12 years) , maternal education (less than TEE/TEE, trade or diploma/Bachelor degree or higher), sex (male/female), whether or not child was sick last week (yes/no), school clustering (n=25).

Table 5: Girls – Effects of adjusting for environmental, social-cultural, and individual associations between independent mobility in multilevel logistic regression models

		Model 1 (Objective environment)			Model 2 (Model 1 + perceptions of environment)			Model 3 (Model 2 + social-cultural factors)			Model 4 (Model 3 + individual factors)		
		OR	***p***	**95%CI**	**OR**	***p***	**95%CI**	**OR**	***p***	**95%CI**	**OR**	***p***	**95%CI**
Walkability of school neighbourhood	High	2.06	0.003	1.27,3.32	2.10	0.000	1.40,3.15	2.06	0.000	1.39,3.06	1.96	0.002	1.29,2.98
	Low	1.00			1.00			1.00			1.00		
Parent perceives that home is on a busy road	Yes				0.51	0.044	0.26,0.98	0.57	0.080	0.30,1.07	0.65	0.152	0.37,1.17
	No												
Child is confident that they can actively travel to closest shop without an adult[#]					1.56	0.000	1.24,1.95	1.48	0.000	1.20,1.81	1.44	0.001	1.17,1.77
Child perceives that it is safe to play at the park closest to their house	Yes				2.14	0.012	1.18,3.89	2.16	0.011	1.19,3.94	1.98	0.026	1.08,3.63
	N/A				1.04	0.919	0.51,2.10	1.07	0.849	0.51,2.24	1.09	0.815	0.51,2.33
	No				1.00			1.00			1.00		
Child perceives that they often see people out on walks in their neighbourhood	Yes				2.14	0.025	1.10,4.16	2.20	0.017	1.15,4.20	1.94	0.046	1.01,3.72
	N/A				1.28	0.628	0.47,3.49	1.38	0.515	0.52,3.62	1.28	0.621	0.48,3.41
	No				1.00			1.00			1.00		
Parent is confident in child's ability to walk to the closest shop without an adult	Yes							2.67	0.000	1.88,3.79	3.02	0.000	1.97,4.63
	No							1.00			1.00		
Child perceives lots of children their own age to hang out with in neighbourhood	Yes										1.72	0.003	1.20,2.47
	No										1.00		
Child has a bike at home to ride if they wanted to	Yes										2.96	0.044	1.03,8.50
	No										1.00		

[#]Subscale; N/A=Not applicable; Adjusted for socio-economic status (low, medium, high), age (10,11, 12 years) , maternal education (less than TEE/TEE, trade or diploma/Bachelor degree or higher), sex (male/female), whether or not child was sick last week (yes/no), school clustering (n=25).

Figure titles

Figure 1: Development of the TREK independent mobility index

Figure 2. Mediating influence of parent's confidence in daughter's ability to travel independently on the relationship between home location on a busy road and girls' independent mobility (Overall mediation p=0.034)