



Family formation and everyday travel in Britain since c.1850

Colin G. Pooley, Tim Jones, Heather Jones, Ben Spencer & Kiron Chatterjee

To cite this article: Colin G. Pooley, Tim Jones, Heather Jones, Ben Spencer & Kiron Chatterjee (2018) Family formation and everyday travel in Britain since c.1850, *The History of the Family*, 23:2, 290-306, DOI: [10.1080/1081602X.2017.1417146](https://doi.org/10.1080/1081602X.2017.1417146)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1081602X.2017.1417146>



© 2018 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 08 Jan 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)






Article views: 416



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Family formation and everyday travel in Britain since c.1850

Colin G. Pooley^a , Tim Jones^b , Heather Jones^c, Ben Spencer^b  and Kiron Chatterjee^c 

^aLancaster Environment Centre and Centre for Mobilities Research (CeMoRe), Lancaster University, Lancaster, UK; ^bSchool of the Built Environment, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, UK; ^cCentre for Transport and Society, University of the West of England, Bristol, UK

ABSTRACT

This paper focuses on the extent to which everyday travel behaviour in Britain changes in relation to family responsibilities, and examines how this has altered over the past century and a half. It is argued that prior to the mid-twentieth century changes in the family such as increased child-care responsibilities barely influenced the modes of transport used for everyday travel, but that increasingly in the later twentieth century people adjusted their travel behaviour during the family formation phases of the life cycle. In particular, parents of young children have become more car-dependent and less likely to walk or cycle. Data are drawn from two separate projects, one that collected travel life histories from the past half-century as context for research on cycling in later life, and one that uses personal diaries to reveal everyday mobility strategies of people in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It is argued that the observed changes are due not only to increased access to a wide range of different transport forms, especially the motor car, but also to changes in societal perceptions of risk and norms of travel behaviour. In conclusion, it is suggested that more awareness of past travel behaviours could aid the development and implementation of more sustainable transport policies in the UK.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 6 September 2017
Accepted 11 December 2017

KEYWORDS

Family formation; family responsibilities; transport; mobility; policy

1. Introduction

Historical and contemporary studies of life-course transitions usually focus on key events such as adolescence, leaving home, parenting and retirement, on the fluidity of such processes, and on the impacts that such transitions had on individuals and families (Bailey, 2009; Hareven, 1978; Hopkins & Pain, 2007; Hunt, 2017; Jarvis, Pain, & Pooley, 2011). However, a change in family circumstances could also impact on many other aspects of everyday life, one of which is the way in which people travelled from place to place as they went about their lives (Jones, Chatterjee, & Gray, 2014, 2015; Scheiner, 2014). This has been recognized in a small number of contemporary studies, but has rarely been considered in a long historical perspective (Pooley, Turnbull, & Adams, 2005a). This paper specifically focuses on one aspect

CONTACT Colin G. Pooley  c.pooley@lancaster.ac.uk

© 2018 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

of such changes: the alteration of travel behaviour in relation to family formation and child-care responsibilities in Britain from the mid-nineteenth century to the present, assessing the extent of continuity and change over time. Qualitative data are used to demonstrate the ways in which changing family responsibilities influenced the everyday travel decisions of men and women, and to assess how such relationships have shifted as new modes of mobility have become available. It is argued that as transport options have diversified for most people the influences of family responsibilities on everyday mobility have increased, leading to greater transport-related social exclusion for some, and to a decline in the use of the most environmentally sustainable transport modes. We also suggest that there may be lessons from the past for future transport policy.

The concept of the 'new mobility paradigm' (Sheller & Urry, 2006; Urry, 2007) has focused attention on the centrality of movement to all aspects of social, cultural and economic life, and it has been argued elsewhere that this was as true in the past as in the present (Pooley, 2017a). The ability to move quickly and easily is important at all stages of family formation, but we argue that the ways in which people travel have changed in relation not only to shifts in transport technology and the transport modes most commonly available, but also to changes in perceptions of what forms of transport are appropriate and to shifts in perceptions of both busyness and risk. In part, the ways in which transport choices at different stages of family formation have changed over time simply reflect the modes of transport that were available to most people. Until the middle decades of the nineteenth century transport options for most people were limited. Many journeys were undertaken on foot, with longer trips by coach or horse when this could be afforded, or on canal packets or coastal shipping. From the 1840s options widened substantially both for short everyday trips within urban areas and for longer journeys. The expanding rail network allowed more rapid inter-urban travel, while first horse-drawn omnibuses and trams followed by those powered by steam, electricity and in the twentieth century petroleum, provided improved urban public transport. Personal travel was also speeded up by the increased use of the bicycle for everyday trips, especially from the 1920s, and by the private car, though this did not become a common form of everyday transport until the second half of the twentieth century (Dyos & Aldcroft, 1969; Freeman & Aldcroft, 1991; Gunn, 2013). However, although new forms of travel were available for many people more traditional modes, especially walking, persisted.

Changes in everyday travel in relation to family formation also interact with many other variables to produce particular travel outcomes. These include gender (with transport opportunities for men and women persistently unequal), age, income, class, location, journey purpose, weather, personal health and disability all potentially significant factors. It is not possible to explore fully all such factors in this paper, especially with the selective use of qualitative data that does not allow the comparison of large and representative population samples, but it is possible to provide selective insights into the interactions between family responsibilities, everyday travel and a range of other personal and external factors.

2. Sources of evidence

Most quantitative data on travel mode do not provide good information concerning the ways in which mobility changed in relation to family circumstances. Prior to the mid-twentieth century such data are almost entirely lacking and although the British National Travel Survey (NTS) has provided some information on travel in different age categories since

1965, these cannot be used to infer any association with family formation and responsibilities as the age at which household formation and parenthood has taken place has changed significantly over the past 50 years (Department for Transport (DfT), 2015; Schoen & Canudas-Romo, 2005). To provide insights into long-term changes in travel behaviour, and their relationship to family circumstances, it is necessary to use qualitative data. While these do not allow generalisations to be made (as may be the case from larger sample surveys) they do provide valuable insights into the ways in which people made decisions about everyday travel and how these may have varied in relation to family responsibilities. Two main sources are used in this paper. For the more recent past a series of travel life histories was collected from respondents aged 50 years and over at the time of interviews in 2014 and 2015. These were designed to provide contextual data for a project on cycling in later life in four British cities (Oxford, Bristol, Reading and Cardiff),¹ but also reveal valuable additional information on changes in most forms of travel behaviour at different stages of family formation. In this paper we draw mainly on a set of 37 interviews conducted in Bristol and the immediate surrounding area, and (more briefly) on 72 interviews from Oxford. Both cities have levels of cycling above the norm for England and Wales, Oxford most markedly so,² and thus any constraints on sustainable travel (and especially cycling) over the life course are likely to be more marked elsewhere. All personal names used are pseudonyms. For the nineteenth and early twentieth century we draw on a small selection of diaries studied as part of a project on life writing and everyday mobility in the past.³ These are drawn from a range of archival sources and have been used elsewhere to study aspects of spatial mobility (Pooley, 2017b, 2017c; Pooley & Pooley, 2015).

As with all oral history evidence the interview data used here are not without their limitations (Perks, 1992; Ritchie, 2014). Respondents for the travel life histories were recruited by advertising widely in a range of local media and organisations, but we could interview only those prepared to come forward. Although split fairly evenly between males and females, and representing a range of social groups, there is no way of knowing how typical their travel behaviour was. It is possible that motivation to participate in a survey is linked to particular views on travel and transport, and that because the principal focus of the project was cycling in older age the sample was biased towards cyclists. However, respondents were carefully selected to include a representative range of social classes,⁴ and to include non-cyclists as well as cyclists. As with most surveys, it is likely that those who were both money- and time-poor were least likely to respond, thus excluding families with the fewest transport options. However, the travel histories of respondents did broadly reflect the shifts in travel modes used over the past half-century, as summarised in Table 1 and reflected in National Travel Survey and similar statistics (Department for Transport (DfT), 2015).

Table 1. Percentage of trips by main travel mode in England, 1965–2016

Year	Walk	Cycle	Public transport	Car/van
1965	(12.1)*	7.6	40.3	40.1
1975/76	34.8	3.2	13.2	45.8
1985/86	34.2	2.4	10.1	50.5
1995/97	26.7	1.8	9.1	61.3
2005	23.6	1.4	9.8	63.9
2016	25.5	1.6	10.2	62.0

*Excluding all trips under 1 mile (1.6 km); Source: National Travel Surveys 1965–2016.

All oral life histories obviously depend both on the skill of the interviewer and on the memory of the respondent. A semi-structured interview schedule was used, with a collaboratively completed life history calendar and then a set of topics to cover. Within the topics (e.g. past residential history) we invited participants to talk freely about their everyday travel behaviour in relation to other aspects of their life. This approach meant that respondents could create a linear narrative, thus aiding recall. Prior to the interview respondents had been asked to construct a life history grid that could be used as an aide memoir during the interview, and some had sought additional information on past travel patterns from close relatives. It is, however, possible that respondents still rationalised and reconstructed past behaviours in the light of present circumstances and views. This is almost impossible to detect and such life history data must be taken at face value. Finally, all research with human respondents raises ethical considerations. This research was subject to rigorous ethical scrutiny and approval at the relevant universities, and all respondents were made fully aware of the purpose of the study and of their ability to withdraw at any point in the process.

Diaries and other forms of life writing also pose problems of interpretation (Fothergill, 1974; Lejeune, 2009). Those who wrote diaries were by definition literate and had some leisure time. They are thus a sub-set of any total population and few genuinely working-class diaries exist. Diary survival is sporadic and random and it is not possible to judge how representative those that survived are of a theoretical diary population. Diaries are more likely to be written by women, especially young women with leisure time, while men were more likely to write autobiographies later in life. While diaries have the advantage of being written fairly spontaneously and soon after the events recorded, life histories and autobiographies were written with reflection and often contained a narrative of justifying past actions. They are less likely to contain details of mundane events such as everyday travel and are not used in this paper. Even diaries have their limitations as a record of everyday events such as travel. It is most likely that a diarist recorded things that were considered unusual and significant, rather than those aspects of daily life that were mundane and repetitive. Thus travel to work or to school may be scantily recorded, only appearing in the written record when something unusual occurred. This can give a distorted view of such activities as the unusual is privileged over the mundane. Most diaries were kept (or survive) for only a relatively short period of time and thus can rarely be used to show directly changes in travel at different stages of family formation for the same individual.⁵ Instead different individuals and families have to be compared for similar time periods. Details of the diaries used in this paper are provided in Table 2 and more information regarding the individuals involved is provided in the course of the analysis. Although all the diaries used in this research are held in a public archive with no restrictions on use, diary use does also raise ethical questions. On occasion there are entries that have been partially erased but which can still be read: the researcher must make a decision about whether such material can be used. Finally, it must be stressed that all such qualitative sources, both diaries and narrative life histories, can only be used to provide examples of processes and experiences. They cannot be used to generalise about larger populations and it is not the intention of this paper to do so.⁶

3. Mobility, travel mode and the life course since c.1960

The travel life histories collected as part of a project on cycling in later life revealed four main ways in which changing family responsibilities significantly influenced decisions about

Table 2. The diaries

Name of diarist	Date of birth	Dates of diary	Location during diary	Occupation during diary	Location of diary
John Leeson	1803	1846–1865	London	House proprietor	Bishopsgate Institute archive (GDP/8)
Mary Leesmith	1870	1894–1896	Yorkshire and Hertfordshire	Artist and portrait painter	Bishopsgate Institute archive (GDP/95)
Verena Pennyfather	1885	1907–1939	Hampshire, London and Surrey	Domestic duties	Bishopsgate Institute archive (GDP/51)
Annie Rudolph (Rudoff)	1905	1923 (plus later summary)	London	Art school and assists in father's second-hand clothing shop + domestic duties	Bishopsgate Institute archive (GDP/31)
Irene Fern Smith	1902	1941	Wolverhampton	Domestic duties	Bishopsgate Institute archive (GDP/18)

everyday travel. These can be summarised as the impact of children and family responsibilities on increased car use; the perceived need for the principal care giver (usually the mother) to use the only family car to transport children leading to the other partner (usually male) increasing their use of other modes of transport, including cycling; the influence of a young family in encouraging outdoor activities and more active travel for reasons of health and sociability; and reductions in the use of those transport modes (especially cycling) perceived to be more risky because of family responsibilities and the potential impact of serious injury on the family. Thus while the majority of shifts in travel behaviour linked to family life and associated responsibilities were towards less sustainable transport (increased car use), in some cases the opposite was true as both necessity and choice could produce more active travel (cycling and walking). These themes can be illustrated with examples taken from interviews conducted in Bristol, using a combination of direct quotes from respondents and from the summaries produced by the lead interviewer in Bristol (H. Jones).

The main focus of the study was on cycling and thus many respondents narrated the ways in which their engagement with cycling varied over time and interacted with other transport modes, especially the car. Sheena (age 53 when interviewed in Bristol) was typical of many female respondents. In the 1990s she had started a family but continued working and felt that these commitments 'locked her in to commuting by car because of a need to maximise her time at home with children'. Similar sentiments were expressed by Patricia (age 71 when interviewed in Bristol). She had cycled when younger but stated that as she gained a family: 'it was just being in a phase of life.... I don't think I even gave any thought to riding a bike ... we fostered a child and then I was pregnant....' Most everyday travel was by car, though with some use of public transport and walking for short local journeys. Ramona (age 72 when interviewed in Bristol) told a similar story of her engagement with cycling and of the pressures of family commitments. As with many respondents she had cycled when younger but stopped when she had children and other pressures of family life. She described her cycling as: 'stop-start thing with family coming in the middle and then divorce ... bit patchy really'. Although family pressures impacted more strongly on women

than on men, some male respondents did also vary their travel behaviour because of the constraints of family. For instance, Simon (age 72 when interviewed in Bristol) commented that although he enjoyed cycling and continued to use the bike for some journeys the car became more common when he had a family: 'We had young children at the time so it was more car use but I would have used the bike if it was practical for, you know, anything, shopping whatever.' What these interviews demonstrate is that even for people who had previously engaged in active travel such as cycling, and who enjoyed this form of transport, the pressures of family life and child care meant that at this point of their life course car use became dominant and normal.

When considering cycling in particular as a travel mode, perceptions of risk were an important secondary consideration for many respondents. Together with the time pressures outlined above this could form a powerful motivation for more travel by car or public transport and less cycling. Parents felt the additional responsibility towards their family and were thus less prepared to undertake what they perceived as a potentially risky activity than they were when single or childless. This sentiment was expressed clearly by several men including Charles (age 51 when interviewed in Bristol). He realised that cycling could be a convenient way to travel to work but ruled it out on the grounds of safety: 'Since I've worked for XX, which is a logistics firm, now I see loads of bulletins about incidents as part of my job, the number of cyclists getting hurt or near misses is just so high I just think I have a family to look after.' Lance (age 63 when interviewed in Bristol) expressed very similar sentiments: 'I had a young family and the number of people I'd heard about getting killed, it just didn't feel safe.... It felt more dangerous cycling around Yate even though all the people I'd heard about had been killed in London it felt like drivers were more aware of you there ... there was a different mentality.' Although he previously had been a keen cyclist he sold three of his four bikes and gave up cycling on a regular basis. Although many of the risks associated with cycling are more perceived than real (De Hartog, Boogaard, Nijland, & Hoek, 2010; Rojas-Rueda, de Nazelle, Tainio, & Nieuwenhuijsen, 2011), the assumption that cyclists are particularly vulnerable road users led many respondents (especially men) to reduce or cease their cycling activities when they became parents.

While increased family responsibilities mostly led to increased use of cars (and to a lesser degree public transport), some factors operated in the opposite direction, particularly for men. Gareth (age 60 when interviewed in Bristol) started cycling to work because they had only one car and his wife needed it to transport their children to school and other activities. He had cycled when younger but not for the three years prior to moving to Bristol, and it was the combination of family responsibilities and limited transport options that encouraged him to return to cycling. Stanford (age 67 when interviewed in Bristol) also cycled to work because it was deemed more important for his wife to have access to the sole family car so that she could more efficiently care for the needs of their three children, and cycling was the more convenient alternative. Family attitudes and preferences could also influence the travel behaviour of parents in ways that were positive towards active travel, and which could counteract concerns about risk when cycling. Diane (age 62 when interviewed in Bristol) started cycling as an adult so that she could accompany her children on cycle rides when on family holidays. She then bought her own bike and family rides on a Sunday afternoon became a normal activity, though she rarely used her bike for anything other than off-road leisure travel. Wilfred (age 64 when interviewed in Bristol) was also persuaded to get a bike by his wife and children as a way of encouraging him to be more active, primarily for health

reasons when he was in his 50s. He had cycled previously but had stopped on several occasions due to both work and family commitments and, in one instance, because of a lack of cycle storage when they lived in a flat. Although, as with Diane, Wilfred's later cycling was mostly for leisure, it was his family who encouraged him to try more active travel because they were concerned about his health as he moved into late middle age.

The travel life narratives outlined above all show a similar pattern of relatively active travel, including at least some walking and cycling, when young; reduced active travel in the family formation stage of the life cycle; and, in some cases at least, a return to more active travel for mainly health reasons in later life (Jones et al., 2016). Such changes have been made possible by the increased choice of travel modes available over the past half-century, with most families in Britain gaining some access to a car, and then finding this an essential accessory to what has become defined as an efficient family life. How people travel has been structured through a range of factors, but changing family responsibilities have played an important role over the past half-century. However, in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries the situation was rather different.

4. Mobility, transport and the life course c.1840–1940

In 1951 only 14 per cent of British households had access to a private motor vehicle (car or van), rising to 31 per cent in 1961 and 52 per cent in 1971 (Department for Transport (DfT), 2016, Table NTS0205). While this increase in car ownership enabled more families to make choices about how they travelled, and to vary their travel modes in relation to their life course stages, in the century before 1951 this was much less possible. In this section we examine the transport choices available to households in the century after 1840, and assess the extent to which travel modes changed in relation to family and childcare responsibilities. As outlined earlier there are no systematic data sources that provide such information but illustrative material may be gained from personal diaries.

Although more limited transport options formed one important difference from the later twentieth century, there were also other differences that could have had a substantial impact on how and when people travelled. First, gender roles were even more strongly delineated than they were in (for instance) the 1970s, with almost all child-care and home-making responsibilities falling on women. Female participation in the workforce was substantially lower, though this varied markedly across the country, with many women ceasing full-time work on marriage but often engaging in some informal part-time employment (Davidoff & Hall, 2002; Gordon & Nair, 2003; Vicinus, 1977). Many wives and mothers were thus, in theory, available to provide full-time child care without having to fit domestic duties around full-time paid employment. Second, many middle-class (and some skilled working-class) households employed a domestic servant, and often a nurse for very young children (Delap, 2011; Higgs, 1983; Pooley, 2009). Thus there were additional females available to share child-care and household duties with a mother. Even in those households unable to afford paid help, extra female support for domestic duties could often be provided through reciprocal relationships with nearby relatives and neighbours, or through the labour of an elder daughter who would be kept at home to help care for her siblings (Dyhouse, 1981). In these ways domestic duties could be shared, arguably reducing the constraints that child care and homemaking placed on a married woman and her mobility potential. Third, although there were undoubtedly many risks associated with travelling more than a century ago, past

societies tended to be less risk averse than they became in the late twentieth century. Therefore most children would take themselves to and from school, often travelling with siblings and friends, and children would regularly be sent on errands or to the shops for everyday purchases. Most such locations were near home and within a community where families were known to each other, and both children and parents felt comfortable travelling independently in the neighbourhood (Pooley, Turnbull, & Adams, 2005b). This greater autonomy for children's travel meant that parents also had more freedom to go about their own business, and were not so tied to ferrying children to and from school, to the houses of friends or to and from after-school activities as many parents became in the late twentieth century (Furedi, 2001; Pain, 2006). To what extent are such themes apparent in personal diaries?

It is relatively rare to find a diary that covers a life-course transition from being a single adult, through marriage and parenthood. Most diaries were written by younger single people, with diary writing ceasing after marriage through a combination of lack of time and changed emotional needs as people entered what was in theory a more stable life-course stage. However, the diary of John Leeson is one exception.⁷ It starts in July 1846 when Leeson was 43 years old, still single and living with his widowed mother, and continues for almost 20 years until just before his death, during which time he married and had two children. Leeson came from a relatively wealthy family (though there were times when he and his family appeared to be short of accessible money); he lived in a fashionable part of central London, and managed a portfolio of properties that were rented out to tenants. Following the death of his mother, Leeson married his housekeeper (Charlotte Rudd) in August 1850. She was a widow some 15 years younger than Leeson and had been employed with him only four months before they married. Their first child (a daughter) was born in December 1851, with a son born some two years later in January 1854. Diary entries were made regularly (though not always daily and sometimes several days were written up together). What is most notable about the travel patterns of John and Charlotte Leeson is how little they changed over the course of the diary despite significant shifts in their family structure. Everyday travel was mostly undertaken on foot, by omnibus or in a cab, with longer journeys mainly by train but sometimes by boat or in a carriage. It is unlikely that all such journeys were recorded in the diary, but there is sufficient evidence to demonstrate that all these modes were used by John Leeson when single, by him and his wife prior to having children, and continued to be used by Charlotte and the children and by the whole family until the end of the diary. Selected examples illustrate these points.

When he was single John Leeson travelled widely across London, mostly on foot or by cab. For longer journeys he travelled by train, as in this example when he was away from London for two months in Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire: 'Left London and I went by Railway from Euston Square to Derby and Ambergate, Matlock, to Buxton, got there at 5.'⁸ Some seven years later, when he was married with two small children, he and his family (including a nurse for his two-year-old son) took a similar summer trip to the Midlands. His diary entry shows that travel was undertaken in much the same way as before, with an itinerary that visited a number of stately homes, together with calling on old friends:

Left London with Mrs. Leeson, Lotty, John and Nurse went by Railway to Rowsley and then by coach to Buxton – stayed there 3 weeks – to Matlock for 2 weeks – to Ilkeston for 2 weeks – to Nottingham for 2 weeks and then came home. Went to Manchester, Chatsworth, Haddon Hall, Derby Dale Abbey, Basford &c.⁹

Throughout the diary, the Leeson family travelled in much the same way regardless of whether they were alone or with children, and Mrs Leeson travelled by a variety of means when alone with children (though often with a nurse when the children were small), as well as when her husband was present. Walking was mostly for leisure or for very local trips as in this instance on Good Friday 1854: 'In afternoon Charlotte, I, Lotty and Johnny walked in St James' Park – the park full of Holidays folk and children – tag rag and bob tail – all very happy.'¹⁰ His family sometimes accompanied John Leeson when he travelled, mainly on business in London, effectively combining work and pleasure as in this journey by cab which took place a day after the previous example: 'Charlotte, Lotty and I rode in a cab for the rents – called on Mrs .Brown Camden Town who was not at home.'¹¹ Travel by train was also common, especially as the children got older, as in this example from 1863 when Mrs Leeson took her two children to visit friends in south London, some 12 miles (19 km) distant: 'Mrs .L and children went to Mr .Tunks, Long Ditton, for the day, by railway, they enjoyed it very much.'¹² Throughout the diary the Leeson family took advantage of the range of travel options available in and around London in the mid-nineteenth century, and a growing family did not seem to alter how they travelled.

This pattern of movement changed little over the following half-century, as evidenced by the everyday travel of Mary Leeson in the late nineteenth century.¹³ Mary (age 24) was single and had been living with her mother in Yorkshire before moving (with her mother) to London, primarily to attend art school and to be closer to her future husband and his family. This journey in 1895 is typical of her movement across London, a city that was still relatively unfamiliar to her:

Hs & I went to town at 9.12, lovely morning – changed at Willesden, Addison & Gloucester Rd for Bayswater. Went to Whitley's to see if they let out costumes – recommended us to Covent Garden shops. Got a map & then armed with that we went by bus to Bond St, walked down there looked at some photos, had lunch at Lyons. Then went up and down Endell St, found no shops we wanted, then went down Bow St., went into 2 shops there ... then to Holborn rest. for something to eat. Wired mother we couldn't get home till 9. Back to Burnetts where we got all we wanted in scraps (some lovely remnants) and then home after a long day.¹⁴

Mary Leeson had no family responsibilities at this time, but her utilisation of multiple forms of urban transport was little different from that of John Leeson and his family some 50 years earlier.

Family responsibilities and associated changes occur not only through decisions that are made positively (for instance to get married and to have children), but also may be thrust upon someone by external events beyond their control. This was the case for Annie Rudolph who lived in London in the 1920s.¹⁵ At the age of 17 her life was changed by the unexpected death of her mother and, as the eldest daughter at home, she was expected to take responsibility for running the household and caring for her younger siblings. Previously she had combined studying at college with helping her father in his shop in the East End of London, and was expected to continue with these duties in addition to her new responsibilities. A diary entry shortly after her mother's death summarises the enforced change to her circumstances and the burden of her new responsibilities:

The last two weeks have been Hell nothing else. The work I've had to do. I never was at home always out – I went to business, dad's place, about 9.30 in the morning – I made dinner there – did the correspondence and the books – and about 6 o'clock I went either to the art school or else out – I only stopped indoors Friday evening that's all – But in a few weeks how different I am – here I am settled down to housework! responsibility!!! and cooking!!! If anyone had told me

this a little while ago I'd have laughed – clean the floor ME!! Be in a house all day – cook – wash up – I'd have laughed to think that I'd do such things – that I even could do them.¹⁶

These responsibilities created added difficulties for Annie's travel. The family shop was some 11 miles (18 km) from her home and she had to rush to and fro mainly by tram. Apart from further expansion of the underground railway and tram network, the modes of travel available to most people in London had changed little since the late nineteenth century. Like most families the Rudolphs did not have a motor car, and there is no mention of her (or any member of her family) cycling. Travel was mostly by bus, tram, train or on foot, often combining two or more modes, and Annie's dilemma was only resolved when her younger sister took on more domestic responsibilities. Two examples are typical of Annie's everyday travel in London in the 1920s after her mother's death and, in the second example, when she was clearly thinking about the future and her own possible family: 'I was up West a few days ago, with a girl friend. We had been looking round the shops – and been to a restaurant for supper – We were just going for a little stroll before getting the bus home;'¹⁷ 'Awfully embarrassing today – I was sitting in the tram car – on the way home – opposite me was a young woman with such a dear baby in her arms – I could have bitten a lump out of it – the kid was cooing and gurgling and I just smiled over it'¹⁸

Change in travel behaviour was slow even in the twentieth century, with (as stated above) most households still not having access to a car in mid-century. Even when a car was in theory available in the early years of the twentieth century it could not easily be used for all journeys. The diary of Verena Black-Hawkins (later Pennyfather), born 1885, spans the period 1907 to 1939 and covers her life as a young woman living at home in Hampshire and London, her marriage and responsibilities as a mother of two children.¹⁹ Both before and after her marriage in April 1908 travel around London was mostly by a combination of walking and public transport. The entry for January 1908 is typical: 'Walked with Sommy [fiancé] to Knightsbridge, tubed to no23 and then walked to the stores with Cecil, and bused home.'²⁰ Again, this is very similar to the London travel patterns of John Leeson half a century earlier. Initially the Pennyfathers did not have a car, but several of their acquaintances did and in August 1908 Verena's husband bought a motor which both he and Verena drove. The car was used almost entirely for pleasure outings and, like most motors in the early twentieth century, was not always reliable: 'Mangle [nickname for the car] broke down before starting, Tub [husband] bicycled to the station.'²¹ This was one of the few occasions when a bicycle was mentioned and was clearly used as a last resort. Travel in and around London continued to be mostly on foot and by public transport, and even outside London the car was often used only for short journeys with longer trips by train. Moreover, by 1913 when the Pennyfathers had two small children it was not large enough to accommodate the whole family. It was not uncommon for Verena and the children to travel by train and her husband (often with a friend or relative) to drive to the destination later: 'Finished packing, lunched at the Vicarage and then came back to the flat. Tub [husband] there. Left Paddington by the 3.45. Luggage very late coming out. ... [next day] Tub and Teddy arrived in the mangle in time for lunch, and afterwards we drove to the station and went to Wargrave.'²²

External events could also prevent car use, and lead to continued reliance on public transport, as in the case of Irene Fern Smith who kept a diary for a short period in 1941.²³ Irene was 39 years old at the time, married with one daughter and living in Wolverhampton in the English Midlands. Although her husband did have a motor car, it had been taken off the road due to wartime petrol restrictions, and most of Irene's travel with her daughter was

either on foot or by bus. Arguably this would have been much the same even if the car had been available as her husband would almost certainly have had sole use of it, and it is unlikely that Irene could drive as even by 1975 only 29 per cent of women in England had a full driving licence (Department for Transport (DfT), 2016). Two short diary entries are typical and show the high demand for bus travel that was being generated at the time: 'Roland has holiday today but decides to go to the office for an hour or two. We all set forth together and have great difficulty getting on a 'bus. In the end we did manage it,'²⁴ 'In afternoon to "Kingfisher Pool", a delightful place about 5 miles away.... We had to wait 2 h for the 'bus home so it rather made a bad finish to a good day. We got home at 11 pm.'²⁵ In essence, the family travel of Irene in the 1940s was little different from that of John Leeson and his family (though of course she had access to motor buses), and there is no evidence that such travel would have varied much in response to changing family responsibilities.

5. Conclusions

These data provide only a selective view of travel in the past, and it cannot be suggested that evidence from a small number of diaries and oral testimonies represents all experiences. As such, this paper provides a starting point for potential further research. However, we argue that the data available do demonstrate clearly the differences in everyday travel and in attitudes to different transport modes that occurred over the past century and a half for those people studied. Whereas in the past additional family responsibilities did not significantly alter how people travelled, in the last 50 years family formation and parenthood appear to have become more significant. This has been made possible by the greater range of transport options available to most people, especially the availability of private motorised transport, but we argue this is not necessarily the key driver of change. Because something is available it is not necessarily used in all circumstances, and we argue that there are factors which go beyond the simple availability of convenient motorised transport that help to explain the differences in travel behaviour that have been outlined above. Just as important are changes in perceptions of normality, time pressures and risks, which all seem to have altered over time. In the nineteenth and early twentieth century it was normal for most people to travel on foot or by public transport. Only the very rich could afford private transport (be it horse-drawn in the nineteenth century or motorised in the early twentieth century), and thus walking or using the bus or train seemed the natural and taken-for-granted means of travel for men and women of almost all social classes. In contrast, by the late twentieth century the dominance of the automobile had normalised private motorised transport, with other means of travelling increasingly marginalised and deemed to be unusual or even abnormal (Pooley et al., 2013). Although all the nineteenth-century modes of travel (bus, train, tram, cycle, walking) were available, and in some cases greatly improved in the late twentieth century, they had increasingly been perceived to be unattractive and less normal modes of transport, to be used by those unable to access a car due to poverty, age or infirmity, or by those with unusually distinctive views about how they should travel.

There are, of course, exceptions to this trend which demonstrate that automobile dominance, including during the family formation phases of the life course, is not inevitable. For instance, British cities such as Cambridge and Oxford maintained a much higher incidence of cycling than most other parts of the country during the second half of the twentieth century, and travelling by bike is also much more likely to persist across all life stages (Aldred,

2010, 2013). In these places cycling has become normalised, as it has in some parts of continental Europe, especially in Denmark and The Netherlands (Pucher & Buehler, 2008; Pucher & Dijkstra, 2003). However, in most parts of Britain cycling rates have remained low (mostly below 2 per cent (National Travel Survey 2016, Tables NTS0301 and NTS9903)), and although recent investments in infrastructure have generated some increase in cycling in London, this is mainly confined to inner London and to a relatively narrow demographic (Transport for London (TfL), 2016, 2017). Data from travel life histories collected in Oxford also reveal that cycling with children was (and remains) much more usual than in Bristol (which also has cycling rates that are higher than those in most of the UK), with most respondents expressing few qualms about cycling. For instance Desiree (age 72 when interviewed in Oxford) moved to Oxford in 1973 and bought a bike with a child seat on the back because it seemed 'the obvious thing to do'. At that time she had no concerns about cycling in the city with a small child on the back, and her daughter learned to ride independently at a young age. Sean (age 51 when interviewed in Oxford) was himself a keen cyclist and when his children were small he at times carried all three on his bike. Later all the children had bikes and cycled in Oxford, though his wife did not.

However, some parents interviewed in Oxford did express concerns about the wisdom of cycling as a parent with young children, even though they had cycled quite happily when single. Peggi (age 54 when interviewed in Oxford) had cycled as a student in Cambridge, 'a natural cycling place, very easy, very flat', and initially continued in Oxford. However, she stopped when pregnant. Although she later tried to cycle with a child seat because cycling was the most convenient way to get her son to nursery and for her to get to work, she stopped because she was nervous about her son's safety, especially after the bike had fallen over with him on it. After that, cycling was mainly for leisure as she was put off by what she called the 'faff factor' of dealing with lights, reflective jacket and helmet, together with the 'sarcastic remarks from colleagues about the fact I insisted on wearing a helmet'. Even in apparently cycle-friendly Oxford, Peggi found that cycling was only partially normalised. The example of Lynette (age 71 when interviewed in Oxford) also emphasised the exceptionalism of cycling in cities such as Oxford and Cambridge, and the effects of pregnancy and childcare responsibilities on female cycling. She cycled in Oxford in the early 1960s and perceived no real dangers, 'just like walking around, didn't require a special decision as to whether you cycled or not', but stopped when pregnant and then after moving away from Oxford did not restart cycling until she returned later in life. In particular she noted that while in Newcastle (North East England) she did not cycle due to 'the logistics of transporting young children and being in a place where no one else cycled'. Despite such perceptions of increased risk, it can be argued that late nineteenth century and early twentieth century streets were in fact more dangerous than roads today. They carried large volumes of traffic, with horse-drawn vehicles, trams, bicycles, cars and pedestrians all competing for limited road space. Urban space was less regulated than today, vehicles less robust and accidents were common (Cooter & Luckin, 1977; Luckin & Sheen, 2009). Travelling was at least as risky as today but this did not prevent people from doing so with or without young children.

In addition to perceptions that travel by any means other than a car has become more dangerous, there is also a common perception that lives are busier today than they were in the past, and that for these reasons using the car to speed travel becomes essential. These feelings are implicit in many of the responses outlined above, and reflect the view that the twentieth century saw an increased acceleration of the pace of life through processes of

time–space compression (Harvey, 1989; Kivisto, 2012; Rosa, 2013). In fact, in many respects, life today is not only much safer but also easier than it was in the past. As the extract from Annie Rudolph's diary shows, in the past domestic duties for many women were onerous, with large families and no modern labour-saving devices. Even in households with servants most mothers were heavily involved with domestic duties. Working hours for most people were long, holidays were few and opportunities for relaxation limited. Nineteenth-century families were at least as busy and time-pressured as those today, although the burdens may have been distributed differently (Flanders, 2004; Horrell & Humphries, 1995; Joyce, 1980). It is thus argued that the reasons which present-day respondents give for altering their travel behaviour in response to increased family responsibilities in ways that were uncommon in the past owe more to perceptions of normality, risk and busyness promoted within society and through the media, than to any real changes in circumstances over time. The range and influence of all forms of media and communication have expanded greatly in recent decades with almost all-pervasive influences (Lundby, 2009, 2014). This does not mean that such beliefs are not real – they are firmly held by many people – but it does give clues to how more sustainable (and varied) everyday travel might be achieved in Britain.

It is recognized by most people and authorities that reducing car use and increasing active travel (cycling and walking) and use of public transport is good for both the environment and human health (Banister, 2005; Hull, 2008; Pooley et al., 2013). As has been demonstrated above, it is also the case that people are likely to use less sustainable transport modes more often as they gain family responsibilities: something that did not occur in the past. In order to promote more sustainable travel that is attractive to all, it is thus necessary to remove those barriers to active travel that people perceive as important when they have children, and to re-create some of the conditions that existed in the past when everyday travel changed little after people became parents. In other words, it is necessary to make more sustainable forms of transport (walking, cycling, public transport) more attractive to everyone (including those with family responsibilities), even though the option of using private motor transport may be available. It is argued that such aims may be achieved most easily through the imposition of much stricter controls on car use, especially in urban areas, together with the provision of improved public transport and pedestrian and cycle infrastructure. In this way, non-motorised transport becomes more attractive as roads are perceived to be safer, travel by car becomes slower, and choice is effectively restricted through controls on car use in urban areas. Over time, such measures could help to normalise non-car travel, and make car use something that is exceptional rather than normal in urban areas. This is not an easy transition to achieve in Britain, and lessons from parts of continental Europe where cycling in particular is a much more dominant and normalized part of the transport system have so far had limited impact in the UK (Pucher & Buehler, 2008; Pucher & Dijkstra, 2003). But recognition that things were different in the past may make it easier to persuade politicians, planners and the public that it is possible to travel differently, and that increased family responsibilities do not have to alter how everyday mobility is achieved.

Notes

1. See cycle Boom project website: <http://www.cycleboom.org/>
2. Travel-to-work data from the 2011 census show that in England and Wales 1.8 per cent of journeys were undertaken by bike with the figure rising to 2.0 per cent in all urban areas. In

Bristol 5.0 per cent of journeys to work were by bike and in Oxford 10.4 per cent (Census of England and Wales 2011. Available at: <https://www.nomisweb.co.uk/>).

3. In total some 50 diaries have been consulted so far. This paper uses illustrative extracts from a small selection of these diaries.
4. Checked against the Index of Multiple Deprivation values of the areas in which respondents lived.
5. Though the diary of John Leeson used below does allow this.
6. Diaries used in this paper have all been collected as part of the 'Great Diary Project' (<http://www.thegreatdiaryproject.co.uk/>), and are held in the archives of the Bishopsgate Institute in London, UK (<http://www.bishopsgate.org.uk/>). Diaries from London residents are over-represented in the collection and it is likely that travel opportunities and behaviours in London were somewhat different from those in smaller settlements elsewhere in Britain.
7. Diary of John Leeson 1846–1865, Bishopsgate Institute Archive, London (GDP/8).
8. Diary of John Leeson, 2 August 1849.
9. Diary of John Leeson, 5 August to 8 October 1856.
10. Diary of John Leeson, 15 April 1854.
11. Diary of John Leeson, 16 April 1854.
12. Diary of John Leeson, 11 July 1863.
13. Diary of Mary Leesmith, 1894–1896, Bishopsgate Institute Archive, London (GDP/95).
14. Diary of Mary Leesmith, 18 January 1895.
15. Diary of Annie Rudolph 1923, Bishopsgate Institute Archive, London (GDP/31).
16. Diary of Annie Rudolph, 22 May 1923.
17. Diary of Annie Rudolph, 28 October 1923.
18. Diary of Annie Rudolph, 24 July 1923.
19. Diary of Verena Vera Pennyfather (née Black-Hawkins) 1907–1939, Bishopsgate Institute Archive, London, (GDP/51).
20. Diary of Verena Vera Pennyfather (née Black-Hawkins) 10 January 1908.
21. Diary of Verena Vera Pennyfather, 9 June 1913.
22. Diary of Verena Vera Pennyfather, 1–3 May 1913.
23. Diary of Irene Fern Smith, 1941, Bishopsgate Institute Archive, London (GDP/18).
24. Diary of Irene Fern Smith, 12 April 1941.
25. Diary of Irene Fern Smith, 21 June 1941.

Acknowledgements

Thanks are offered to all respondents in the cycle BOOM project, to archivists in the Bishopsgate Institute Archive in London, and to all the other team members on the cycle BOOM project.

Disclosure statement

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Funding

Research for the cycle BOOM project was funded by the British Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC), grant number EP/K037242/1.

ORCID

Colin G. Pooley  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6155-2541>

Tim Jones  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-5187-5654>

Ben Spencer  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4806-8509>

Kiron Chatterjee  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-6432-9230>

Archival sources

- Diary of John Leeson 1846–1865, Bishopsgate Institute Archive, London (GDP/8).
 Diary of Irene Fern Smith 1941, Bishopsgate Institute Archive, London (GDP/18).
 Diary of Annie Rudolph 1923, Bishopsgate Institute Archive, London (GDP/31).
 Diary of Verena Vera Pennyfather (née Black-Hawkins) 1907–1939, Bishopsgate Institute Archive, London (GDP/51).
 Diary of Mary Leesmith 1894–1896, Bishopsgate Institute Archive, London (GDP/95).

References

- Aldred, R. (2010). 'On the outside': Constructing cycling citizenship. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 11, 35–52. doi:10.1080/14649360903414593
- Aldred, R. (2013). Incompetent or too competent? Negotiating everyday cycling identities in a motor dominated society. *Mobilities*, 8, 252–271. doi:10.1080/17450101.2012.696342
- Bailey, A. J. (2009). Population geography: Lifecourse matters. *Progress in Human Geography*, 33, 407–418. doi:10.1177/0309132508096355
- Banister, D. (2005). *Unsustainable transport: City transport in the new century*. London: Routledge.
- Cooter, R., & Luckin, B. (Eds.). (1977). *Accidents in History: Injuries, fatalities and social relations*. Amsterdam: Editions Rodopi B.V.
- Davidoff, L., & Hall, C. (2002). *Family fortunes: Men and women of the English middle class, 1780–1850*. London: Routledge.
- De Hartog, J. J., Boogaard, H., Nijland, H., & Hoek, G. (2010). Do the health benefits of cycling outweigh the risks? *Environmental health perspectives*, 118, 1109–1116. doi:10.1289/ehp.0901747
- Delap, L. (2011). *Knowing their place: Domestic service in twentieth-century Britain*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Department for Transport (DfT). (2015). *National travel survey: Change in travel since 1965*. London: DfT. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/national-travel-survey-2014>
- Department for Transport (DfT). (2016). *National travel survey 2015*. London: National Statistics. Retrieved from <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistics/national-travel-survey-2015>
- Dyhouse, C. (1981). *Girls growing up in late Victorian and Edwardian England*. London: Routledge.
- Dyos, H. J., & Aldcroft, D. (1969). *British transport: An economic survey from the seventeenth century to the twentieth*. Leicester: Leicester University Press.
- Flanders, J. (2004). *The Victorian house: Domestic life from childbirth to deathbed*. London: HarperCollins.
- Fothergill, R. (1974). *Private chronicles: A study of English diaries*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Freeman, M. J., & Aldcroft, D. (1991). *Transport in Victorian Britain*. Manchester, NH: Manchester University Press.
- Furedi, F. (2001). *Paranoid parenting*. London: Allen Lane.
- Gordon, E., & Nair, G. (2003). *Public lives: Women, family, and society in Victorian Britain*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Gunn, S. (2013). People and the car: The expansion of automobility in urban Britain, c. 1955–70. *Social History*, 38, 220–237. doi:10.1080/03071022.2013.790139
- Hareven, T. (Ed.). (1978). *Transitions: The family and the life course in historical perspective*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Harvey, D. (1989). *The condition of modernity: An enquiry into the origins of cultural change* (pp. 284–307). Oxford: Blackwell.
- Higgs, E. (1983). Domestic servants and households in Victorian England. *Social History*, 8, 201–210. doi:10.1080/03071028308567561
- Hull, A. (2008). Policy integration: What will it take to achieve more sustainable transport solutions in cities? *Transport Policy*, 15, 94–103. doi:10.1016/j.tranpol.2007.10.004
- Hopkins, P., & Pain, R. (2007). Geographies of age: Thinking relationally. *Area*, 39, 287–294. doi:10.1111/j.1475-4762.2007.00750.x

- Horrell, S., & Humphries, J. (1995). Women's labour force participation and the transition to the male-breadwinner family, 1790–1865. *The Economic History Review*, 48, 89–117.
- Hunt, S. (2017). *The life course: A sociological introduction*. 2nd ed. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Jarvis, H., Pain, R., & Pooley, C. (2011). Multiple scales of time-space and life course (Guest Editorial). *Environment and Planning A*, 43, 519–524. doi:10.1068/a44101
- Jones, H., Chatterjee, K., & Gray, S. (2014). A biographical approach to studying individual change and continuity in walking and cycling over the life course. *Journal of transport & health*, 1, 182–189. doi:10.1016/j.jth.2014.07.004
- Jones, H., Chatterjee, K., & Gray, S. (2015). Understanding change and continuity in walking and cycling over the life course: A first look at gender and cohort differences. In J. Scheiner & C. Holz-Rau (Eds.), *Räumliche Mobilität und Lebenslauf. Studien zur Mobilitäts- und Verkehrsforschung* (pp. 115–132). Wiesbaden: Springer VS.
- Jones, T., Chatterjee, K., Spinney, J., Street, E., Van Reekum, C., Spencer, B., ... Beale, N. (2016). *cycle BOOM. Design for lifelong health and wellbeing. Summary of key findings and recommendations*. Oxford: Oxford Brookes University, UK. Retrieved from <http://cycleboom.org/summary-report/>
- Joyce, P. (1980). *Work, society and politics: The culture of the factory in later Victorian England*. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Kivisto, P. (2012). Time-space compression. *The Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Globalization*. Retrieved from <http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/9780470670590.wbeog557>
- Lejeune, P. (2009). *On diary*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Luckin, B., & Sheen, D. (2009). Defining early modern automobility: The road traffic accident crisis in Manchester, 1939–45. *Cultural and Social History*, 6, 211–230. doi:10.2752/147800409X411065
- Lundby, K. (Ed.). (2009). *Mediatization: Concept, changes, consequences*. New York, NY: Peter Lang.
- Lundby, K. (Ed.). (2014). *Mediatization of communication*. (Vol. 21). Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Pain, R. (2006). Paranoid parenting? Rematerializing risk and fear for children. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 7, 221–243. doi:10.1080/14649360600600585
- Perks, R. (1992). *Oral history: Talking about the past*. London: Historical Association.
- Pooley, C. (2017a). *Mobility, Migration and Transport: Historical Perspectives*. London: Palgrave Pivot.
- Pooley, C. (2017b). Cities, spaces and movement: Everyday experiences of urban travel in England c1840–1940. *Urban History*, 44, 91–109. doi:10.1017/S0963926816000031
- Pooley, C. (2017). Travelling through the city: Using life writing to explore individual experiences of urban travel c1840–1940. *Mobilities*, 12, 598–609. doi:10.1080/17450101.2017.1331019
- Pooley, C., with Jones, T., Tight, M., Horton, D., Scheldeman, G., Mullen, C., ... Strano, E. (2013). *Promoting walking and cycling: New perspectives on sustainable travel*. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Pooley, C., & Pooley, M. (2015). Mrs Harvey came home from Norwich... her pocket picked at the station and all her money stolen': Using life writing to recover the experience of travel in the past. *Journal of Migration History*, 1, 54–74. doi:10.1163/23,519,924-00101004
- Pooley, C., Turnbull, J., & Adams, M. (2005a). '... everywhere she went I had to tag along beside her': Family, life course, and everyday mobility in England since the 1940s. *The History of the Family*, 10(2), 119–136. doi:10.1016/j.hisfam.2004.11.001
- Pooley, C., Turnbull, J., & Adams, M. (2005b). *A mobile century? Changes in everyday mobility in Britain in the twentieth century*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Pooley, S. (2009). Domestic servants and their urban employers: A case study of Lancaster, 1880–1914. *The Economic History Review*, 62, 405–429. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0289.2008.00459.x
- Pucher, J., & Buehler, R. (2008). Making cycling irresistible: Lessons from the Netherlands, Denmark and Germany. *Transport reviews*, 28, 495–528. doi:10.1080/01441640701806612
- Pucher, J., & Dijkstra, L. (2003). Promoting safe walking and cycling to improve public health: Lessons from the Netherlands and Germany. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93, 1509–1516. doi:10.2105/AJPH.93.9.1509
- Ritchie, D. (2014). *Doing oral history*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rojas-Rueda, D., de Nazelle, A., Tainio, M., & Nieuwenhuijsen, M. J. (2011). The health risks and benefits of cycling in urban environments compared with car use: Health impact assessment study. *British Medical Journal*, 343(d4521), 1–8. doi:10.1136/bmj.d4521
- Rosa, H. (2013). *Social acceleration: A new theory of modernity*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

- Scheiner, J. (2014). Gendered key events in the life course: Effects on changes in travel mode choice over time. *Journal of Transport Geography*, 37, 47–60. doi:10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2014.04.007
- Schoen, R., & Canudas-Romo, V. (2005). Timing effects on first marriage: Twentieth-century experience in England and Wales and the USA. *Population Studies*, 59, 135–146. doi:10.1080/00324720500099124
- Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006). The new mobilities paradigm. *Environment and planning A*, 38, 207–226. doi:10.1068/a37268
- Transport for London (TfL). (2016). *Attitudes towards cycling*. London: TfL. Retrieved from <https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/cycling-and-walking>
- Transport for London (TfL). (2017). *Strategic cycling analysis: Identifying future cycling demand in London*. London: TfL. Retrieved from <https://tfl.gov.uk/corporate/publications-and-reports/cycling>
- Urry, J. (2007). *Mobilities*. Cambridge: Polity.
- Vicinus, M. (1977). *A widening sphere. Changing roles of victorian women*. London: Methuen.