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## Summary

Background: Physical activity helps prevent excessive weight gain in youth. Few studies have examined regional variations in common activities, walking and bicycling.

Objective: The primary aim was to examine participation in previous 7-day walking/bicycling for active transport and for fun/exercise by region, gender and age groups.
Methods: Children $(n=2693)$ from 130 diverse, geographically distributed US communities reported participation in previous 7-day walking/bicycling. Mixed model ANOVAs were used to compare walking/bicycling by region, gender and age groups using Healthy Communities Study data.

Results: Walking/bicycling for fun/exercise was higher in the Midwest, South and West compared with the Northeast, with the same regional patterns for boys, girls and 9-11-year olds. Walking/bicycling to non-school destinations was higher in the Midwest compared with the South and Northeast, with the same pattern for girls and 9-11-year olds. Walking/bicycling to school was higher Midwest, Northeast and West compared with the South, with similar patterns for girls and 12-15-year olds.

Conclusions: Walking/bicycling for fun/exercise and to non-school destinations had higher prevalence than active transport to school. The Northeast reported lower walking/bicycling for fun/exercise; the South and Northeast reported lower walking/bicycling to non-school destinations. Program/policy initiatives should consider contextual demographic influences, as well as purpose/destination of walking/bicycling.
What is known:

- Children and adolescents are less active than recommended.
- In the USA, regional disparities exist in obesity and physical activity.
- Walking and bicycling for recreation and for active transport have potential for positive public health impact.
What this study adds:
- There is regional variation in the prevalence of walking and bicycling to school and other destinations and for fun or exercise.
- Walking and bicycling to school settings was less prevalent than walking and bicycling to other settings and for fun or exercise.
- Based on regional gender and age patterns, there appears to be more complexity in factors influencing active transport than recreational walking or bicycling.
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## Introduction

Public health concern about child obesity arises from its high prevalence (16.9\%) (1) and association with adult obesity and chronic disease (2). Physical activity has been consistently associated with preventing excessive weight gain in youth (3), and children and adolescents who engage in regular physical activity experience numerous physical and mental health benefits (4). Yet youth are consistently less physically active and more sedentary than currently recommended $(5,6)$ and become increasingly less active as they mature (7). The resulting complex public health challenge has serious implications for health in childhood, adolescence and adulthood. Furthermore, there is evidence for regional disparities in obesity $(8,9)$ and physical activity among youth $(10,11)$, as well as adults (11) in the USA, but few recent studies have examined regional differences. This information would enable regions, states and localities to develop more informed, targeted interventions, policies and environmental change, thereby potentially increasing their public health impact (8-11).

Promoting physical activity through walking and active transport is a US national priority, as reflected in the Surgeon General's Call to Action to Promote Walking and Walkable Communities (12), Healthy People 2020/Physical Activity Guidelines (13) and Objectives (i.e. Objectives 13-2 and 14.2) (14), National Physical Activity Plan (15) and Safe Routes to School Partnership (16). Walking or bicycling for active transport to non-school destinations and for fun and exercise are among the most commonly reported forms of physical activity among boys and girls $(17,18)$ and thus is a highly accessible form of physical activity with large potential for public health impact. Walking or bicycling to school is less prevalent but has many potential benefits (19). Little is known about regional variations in bicycling and walking for fun or exercise, to school, or to non-school destinations.

The Healthy Communities Study (HCS), which systematically examined the impact of federal, state and local 'natural experiments' to address obesity through policy and environmental change (20), provided a unique opportunity to examine prevalence of specific types of physical activity in a nationally distributed sample of US youth. Specifically, the HCS data afford an opportunity to examine regional variations in walking and bicycling. Accordingly, the primary purpose of this study was to examine regional variations in previous 7-day participation in walking or bicycling to school and other destinations and walking or bicycling for fun or exercise overall and among boys and girls
and youth ages 9-11 and 12-15 years old in geographically distributed community settings in the USA.

## Methods

## Study data

The data for this cross-sectional and descriptive study were obtained from the HCS. Detailed methods have been previously reported (20-23) and are summarized here.

## Sampling and procedures

The HCS used a hybrid sampling strategy to select 130 communities across the USA; some were selected via a stratified national probability-based sample, and some because they had implemented promising programs and policies targeting child obesity (21). The resulting sample was not representative nationally but, rather, was composed of communities that were widely distributed around the USA. In each selected community, up to 81 children and adolescents along with their parents/caregivers were recruited in grades K-8 from two public elementary and two public middle schools ( $n=5138$ youth) $(20,21)$.
Physical activity data were collected between October 2013 and August 2015 in all regions simultaneously by trained field data collectors $(20,23)$. Specific dates for data collection are not available; however, simultaneous data collection reduced the risk of confounding because of seasonal effects on physical activity. Child physical activity measures were completed on tablet computers in the home by children ages 9 to 15, with parental assistance for children ages 9 to 11, as needed (23). The study was approved by the Battelle Memorial Institute IRB, and parents provided written informed consent for their child's participation (22).

## Participants

The 2693 participants in this study, described in Table 1, included HCS youth who were 9-15 years of age. Two thousand one hundred ninety six of the 5138 HCS participants were less than 9 years of age and were excluded because physical activity information was surrogate-reported vs. self-reported. An additional 249 participants did not respond to key questions (note that some participants were missing multiple items); missing data include ethnicity $=77$, family income $=205$, walk to non-school destinations $=29$, walk for fun or exercise $=38$ and walk to school $=35$.
Table 1 Demographics of total sample $(n=2693)$


Table 1 (Continued)

|  | Total sample |  | Midwest (IA, IL, IN, KS, MI, MO, MN, ND, NE, OH, SD, WI) |  | Northeast (CT, MA, ME, NH, NJ, NY, PA, RI, VT) |  | South (AR, DE, DC, AL, FL, GA, KY, LA, MD, MS, NC, OK, TN, TX, SC, VA, WV) |  | West (AK, CO, AZ, CA, HI, ID, MT, NM, NV, OR, UT, WA, WY) |  | Regional diff. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Hispanic | 1140 | 42.3 | 157 | 29.8 | 156 | 40.3 | 471 | 42.7 | 356 | 52.7 |  |
| Other | 1011 | 37.5 | 202 | 38.3 | 181 | 46.8 | 323 | 29.3 | 305 | 45.1 |  |
| Percent of community with poverty status | 567 | 21.1 | 115 | 21.8 | 82 | 21.3 | 250 | 22.7 | 120 | 17.4 | $<.0001^{6}$ |

## Measures

As previously reported (23), the 7-day Physical Activity Behavior Recall instrument was used to collect self-reported physical activity. This study focused on any participation (yes/no) for three mutually exclusive behaviours: walking or bicycling for fun or exercise; walking or bicycling for active transport to or from a store, park, playground or friend's house and walking or bicycling to or from school over the prior 7 days.

## Data analysis

We examined overall regional differences in childlevel and community-level demographics using chi-squared tests. For each behaviour in the primary analysis, we made overall (i.e. not region-based) gender and age group comparisons for participation of walking or bicycling for fun or exercise, walking or bicycling to non-school destinations and walking or bicycling to/from school using logistic regression (Proc Glimmax). We examined regional differences in overall participation of walking or bicycling for fun or exercise, walking or bicycling to non-school destinations and walking or bicycling to/from school for the total sample, by gender and by age group (9-11-year olds and 12-15-year olds) using a mixed model ANOVA for each behaviour that included a random effect to account for variation between communities, while adjusting for family income, race, ethnicity, urbanicity and community poverty for all analyses and sex and age group as appropriate to each specific analysis (i.e. did not adjust for sex in gender comparison or age group in age group comparisons).

## Results

## Demographics

Based on HCS regional classification (19), around $41 \%$ of participants resided in the South, $25 \%$ in the West, $20 \%$ in the Midwest and $14 \%$ in the Northeast. Slightly more than half of the youth in the sample were female, and around $56 \%$ were 9-11-year olds; there were no overall regional variations in sex or age group distributions. Slightly more than half of the families reported an income of less than $\$ 35000$ with significant overall regional variation (Table 1). The Northeast and South compared with the West appeared to have more family income levels less than \$35K. Similarly, the West compared with the other regions appeared to have a lower percentage of population with poverty status in community.
Around 58\% reported race as white, 20\% reported race as African American, 4\% reported race as multiple and $5 \%$ as other; race is unknown for about $13 \%$,
with significant overall regional variations in race (Table 1). The West compared with all other regions appeared to have a lower percentage of African American participants. About $54 \%$ of the sample reported ethnicity as non-Hispanic, with significant overall regional variation. The Midwest reported fewer and the West reported more participants classified as Hispanic. There was also significant overall regional variation in urbanicity (Table 1). Communities in the South compared with other regions appeared to be more rural and less urban.

Previous 7-day participation in walking or bicycling for fun or exercise overall and by region, gender and age group
Nearly $60 \%$ of all participants reported participation in walking or bicycling for fun or exercise during the previous 7 days (Table 2). There were no significant differences between boys and girls ( $p=.07$ ), but significantly more 9-11-year olds compared with 12-15-year olds reported previous 7 -day participation $(p=.002)$. Participation was significantly higher in the Midwest, South and West compared with the Northeast (Table 2). The percentage of respondents reporting participation ranged from about $48 \%$ in the Northeast, $58 \%$ in the South, to about $63 \%$ and $64 \%$ in the Midwest and West.
For boys, previous 7 -day participation in walking or bicycling for fun or exercise was significantly higher in the Midwest, South and West (range about 56 to 65\%) compared with the Northeast (about 47\%). For girls, previous 7 -day participation in walking or bicycling for fun or exercise was significantly higher in the Midwest, South and West (range about 60 to 67\%) compared with the Northeast (about 50\%) (Table 2).

For 9-11-year-old respondents, participation in walking or bicycling for fun or exercise was significantly higher in the Midwest, South and West (about 61-69\%) compared with the Northeast (51\%). For 12-15-year-old respondents, participation in walking or bicycling for fun or exercise was significantly higher in the West (64\%) compared with the Midwest, Northeast and South (about 45-55\%). It was also higher in the Midwest and South (about 55\% each) compared with the Northeast (45\%).

Previous 7-day participation in walking or bicycling to non-school destinations overall and by region, gender and age group
Half of all respondents reported participation in walking or bicycling to non-school destinations over the
Table 2 Regional comparisons of walking or bicycling for fun or exercise in the past 7 days

|  | Total Sample |  |  |  | Midwest |  | Northeast |  |  | South |  |  | West |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $n$ | Freq. Yes | Percent | $n$ | Freq. Yes | Percent | $n$ | Freq. Yes | Percent | $n$ | Freq. Yes | Percent | $n$ | Freq. Yes | Percent | $p$ |
| Total* | 2693 | 1595 | 59.2 | 527 | 333 | $63.2^{\text {a }}$ | 387 | 187 | 48.3 | 1103 | 641 | $58.1^{\text {a }}$ | 676 | 434 | $64.2{ }^{\text {a }}$ | <. 01 |
| Boys ${ }^{\dagger}$ | 1310 | 753 | 57.5 | 249 | 146 | $58.6{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 188 | 88 | 46.8 | 534 | 299 | $56.0{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 339 | 220 | $64.9{ }^{\text {a }}$ | <. 05 |
| Girls ${ }^{\dagger}$ | 1383 | 842 | 60.9 | 278 | 187 | $67.3^{\text {a }}$ | 199 | 99 | 49.8 | 569 | 342 | $60.1^{\text {a }}$ | 337 | 214 | $63.5{ }^{\text {a }}$ | <. 05 |
| 9-11 years $^{\ddagger}$ | 1502 | 928 | 61.8 | 292 | 202 | $69.2^{\text {a }}$ | 210 | 108 | 51.4 | 628 | 381 | $60.7^{\text {a }}$ | 372 | 237 | $63.7{ }^{\text {a }}$ | <. 05 |
| 12-15 years ${ }^{\ddagger}$ | 1191 | 667 | 56.0 | 235 | 131 | $55.7^{\text {a }}$ | 177 | 79 | 44.6 | 475 | 260 | $54.7^{\text {a }}$ | 304 | 197 | 64.8 | $<.05$ |

[^0]previous 7 days (Table 3). Boys and girls did not differ significantly ( $p=.37$ ), but more 12-15-year olds compared with 9-11-year olds youth reported participation in walking or bicycling to non-school destinations ( $p=.02$ ). For all respondents, previous 7 -day walking or bicycling for active transport to non-school destinations was significantly higher in the Midwest (about 58\%) compared with the South and Northeast (around 46\% each) (Table 3).

For boys, significantly more participants in the West (55\%) compared with the Northeast (45\%) and South ( $47 \%$ ) reported participation in walking or bicycling for active transport to non-school destinations, whereas for girls, it was significantly higher in the Midwest (about 60\%) compared with other regions (around 45 to 49\%) (Table 3). For 9-11-year-old respondents, the participation in walking or bicycling to non-school destinations was significantly higher in the Midwest (about 59\%) compared with the South and the Northeast (42 and 44\%). For 12-15-year-old respondents, there were no significant regional differences in walking/bicycling for transportation (49 to 57\%) (Table 3).

## Previous 7-day participation in walking or bicycling to school overall and by region, gender and age group

Slightly over one-quarter of all respondents reported participation in walking or bicycling to school over the previous 7 days. There were no significant differences by gender or age group ( $p=.40$ and .65 respectively) (Table 3). For the total sample, fewer respondents in the South ( $18 \%$ ) reported active transport to school compared with other regions (range 26-36\%).

The same regional pattern held for girls (about 17\% in the South compared with 28 to $34 \%$ in other regions) and for $12-15$-year olds (about 17\% in the south compared with 27 to $38 \%$ in other regions). Boys in the South and West differed (about 20 and $37 \%$ respectively), and fewer 9-11-year olds in the South compared with Midwest (30\%) and West (33\%) reported walking or bicycling to school (Table 3).

## Discussion

Contribution of this study
The importance of physical activity among youth, especially walking and active transport, is recognized as a public health priority in the USA (12-16) and globally (24). A more complete understanding of geographic variations in common physical activity behaviours, walking or bicycling for fun or exercise
and for active transport to non-school and school destinations, would enable the development of more targeted physical activity programs and policies. Towards these ends, the unique contributions of this study are the (i) description of walking or bicycling among 9-15-year olds for multiple purposes in a diverse and geographically distributed sample of US communities and (ii) examination of regional variations overall and by gender and age groups.

## Nationally distributed sample

Walking or bicycling for fun or exercise and for active transport to non-school destinations was fairly common in this nationally distributed US sample. These results are comparable with previous reports $(17,18)$. These population levels of participation in walking or bicycling for fun or exercise leave room for improvement, especially given accessibility of these activities to broad segments of the population and the potential for public health impact.
Active transport to school was less common in the nationally distributed sample (around 25\%). This is consistent with Yang and colleagues (25), but somewhat higher than other reports $(11,26)$ and much lower than reports from other countries $(27,28)$. Clearly, this level of participation affords room for improvement, and current efforts are underway to increase active transport to school $(15,16)$. There is also potential for increased physical activity via comprehensive planning to integrate walking with bus or light rail transport (29). The national US view is informative; however, an examination of regional variations and considering variations by gender and age group presents a more nuanced picture and may be useful for more targeted regional, state and local strategies to promote physical activity in youth.

## Regional patterns

Unique findings of this study are that Northeast youth overall report lower participation in bicycling for fun or exercise compared with other regions, youth in both the Northeast and South reported lower walking or bicycling for active transport to non-school destinations and youth in the South reported lower participation for walking or bicycling to/from school compared with other regions. These results are partially consistent with regional variations reported by Yang and colleagues (11) and by Singh and colleagues (10).
It is important to note that there were regional variations in demographics including income and poverty, race and ethnicity and urbanicity. Study communities in the West appeared to be higher in family income and lower in community poverty status, whereas
Table 3 Regional comparisons of walking or bicycling to non-school and school destinations in the past 7 days

|  | Total sample |  |  |  | Midwest |  | Northeast |  |  | South |  |  | West |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $n$ | Freq. Yes | Percent yes | $n$ | Freq. Yes | Percent Yes | $n$ | Freq. Yes | Percent Yes | $n$ | Freq. Yes | Percent Yes | $n$ | Freq. Yes | Percent Yes | $p$ |
| Non-school destinations |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total* | 2693 | 1343 | 49.9 | 527 | 307 | $58.3{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 387 | 179 | $46.3{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 1103 | 508 | $46.1^{\text {b }}$ | 676 | 349 | $51.6^{\text {a }}$ | <. 05 |
| Boys ${ }^{\dagger}$ | 1310 | 665 | 50.8 | 249 | 140 | $56.2^{\text {a }}$ | 188 | 85 | $45.2{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 534 | 253 | $47.4{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 339 | 187 | $55.2^{\text {a }}$ | <. 05 |
| Girls ${ }^{\dagger}$ | 1383 | 678 | 49.0 | 278 | 167 | 60.1 | 199 | 94 | $47.2^{\text {a }}$ | 569 | 255 | $44.8{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 337 | 162 | $48.1^{\text {a }}$ | <. 01 |
| 9-11 years ${ }^{\ddagger}$ | 1502 | 720 | 47.9 | 292 | 173 | $59.3{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 210 | 89 | $42.4{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 628 | 276 | $44.0{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 372 | 182 | $48.9^{\text {a,b }}$ | <. 01 |
| 12-15 years ${ }^{\ddagger}$ | 1191 | 623 | 52.3 | 235 | 134 | $57.0^{\text {a }}$ | 177 | 90 | $50.9^{\text {a }}$ | 475 | 232 | $48.8{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 304 | 167 | $54.9{ }^{\text {a }}$ | NS |
| School destination |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total ${ }^{*}$ | 2693 | 712 | 26.4 | 527 | 149 | $28.3^{\text {a }}$ | 387 | 121 | $31.3^{\text {a }}$ | 1103 | 202 | 18.3 | 676 | 240 | $35.5^{\text {a }}$ | <. 05 |
| $B y^{+}{ }^{+}$ | 1310 | 356 | 27.2 | 249 | 70 | $28^{\text {a }}$ | 188 | 56 | $29.8{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 534 | 106 | 19.9 | 339 | 124 | $36.6{ }^{\text {a }}$ | <. 01 |
| Girls ${ }^{\dagger}$ | 1383 | 356 | 25.7 | 278 | 79 | $28.4{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 199 | 65 | $32.7{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 569 | 96 | 16.9 | 337 | 116 | $34.4{ }^{\text {a }}$ | <. 01 |
| 9-11 years ${ }^{\ddagger}$ | 1502 | 392 | 26.1 | 292 | 88 | $30.1{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 210 | 58 | $27.6^{\text {a }}$ | 628 | 122 | 19.4 | 372 | 124 | $33.3{ }^{\text {a }}$ | <. 05 |
| 12-15 years ${ }^{\ddagger}$ | 1191 | 320 | 26.9 | 235 | 61 | $26.0^{\text {a }}$ | 177 | 63 | $35.6{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 475 | 80 | 16.8 | 304 | 116 | $38.2^{\text {a }}$ | <. 01 |

[^1]study communities in the South appeared to be lower in family income and higher in community poverty status. The South appeared to be more rural and less urban compared with the other regions. These factors could account for some variation in regional patterns. However, regional disparities remained in our study after adjusting for family income, race, ethnicity, urbanicity and community poverty for all analyses. It is possible that the statistical adjustments did not fully address regional differences. For example, active transport to school and non-school destinations in the South may be lower because the South is more rural (e.g. no sidewalks and greater distances between home and other locations) (11). Understanding the patterns in the Northeast, which was higher on active transport to school but lower on prevalence of walking and bicycling for fun or exercise and active transport to other destinations, is more challenging based on sociodemographic characteristics, as no clear pattern emerges. There are also no clear, descriptive sociodemographic patterns that clarify the overall greater prevalence of walking or bicycling in the Midwest and West. Future research should explore region-specific explanatory factors.

Seasonality may be an important influence on physical activity including active transport. Even though simultaneous data collection in all regions reduced the risk of confounding because of seasonality, it is possible that seasonal effects played a role (11).

Walking or bicycling for fun or exercise showed consistent geographic patterns by gender and for younger youth; however, the geographic pattern for older youth was more varied. This variability is consistent with previously reported developmental differences in physical activity (30). There were variations for geographic patterns in walking or bicycling for transportation to school and non-school destinations by gender and age groups, indicating more complexity. For example, it is possible that gender-based variations in prevalence of walking or bicycling for active transport to non-school destinations within a region could reflect gender-specific social influences and/or gender-based differences in reactions to the built environment. Furthermore, physical and social environments may be linked, making it important to consider and address multilevel elements of both program and policy initiatives, as well as built environment, sociodemographic and social environment factors.

Our results suggest that it is important for regional, state and local change initiatives to consider demographic characteristics (gender), the specific purpose of the activity (active transport vs. recreation), specific destination (school vs. non-school) for active transport as well as both the social and
physical environments in which these behaviours take place. Walking or bicycling for fun or exercise, walking or bicycling to non-school destinations and walking or bicycling to school are separate physical activity behaviours, each contextually bound with differing salient features depending on gender and age. These results provide practical region-specific information that practitioners can apply, in conjunction with the recommendations in the Surgeon General's Call to Action to Promote Walking and Walkable Communities (12), National Physical Activity Plan (15) and Safe Routes to School Partnership (16), to promote population physical activity among youth and achieve the goals and objectives of Healthy People 2020 and the Physical Activity Guidelines ( 13,14 ).

## Limitations and strengths

Limitations of this study include the use of selfreported physical activity behaviour, cross-sectional design and limited information on time of data collection. Strengths include a sample of diverse and geographically distributed communities in the USA and the ability to examine specific physical activity behaviours by region. To our knowledge, this study is one of the first to examine regional variations in walking and bicycling for multiple purposes and to consider regional variations by gender and age groups.

## Conclusions

Walking or bicycling for fun or exercise and to non-school destinations was reasonably prevalent in this sample, whereas fewer respondents reported active transport to school in the previous 7 days. Regional examination revealed that walking or bicycling for fun or exercise were lower in the Northeast, walking or bicycling for active transport to non-school destinations was lower in the South and Northeast and walking or bicycling to school was lower in the South. Variability in regional patterns by gender and age group was greater for active transport than for walking or bicycling for fun or exercise, suggesting more complexity in factors influencing active transport. Regional patterns by gender were consistent for recreational activity, whereas age-related patterns reflected aged-related developmental declines in physical activity. There was more variability in regional pattern by gender and age group for active transport.
Programs and policies designed to create opportunities and promote walking or bicycling in youth should consider the purpose (recreational or active transport) and for active transport, the destination (school or non-school) of the activity, as well as demographic,
social and contextual/environmental factors that vary regionally. These results provide practical information that can be applied, in conjunction with current efforts of national and government partnerships, to promote physical activity in the US population of youth.
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[^0]:    Values across a row that do not share a superscript letter are significantly different.
    *Analyses adjusted for sex, age group, family income, race, ethnicity, urbanicity and community poverty,
    Analyses adjusted for age group, family income, race, ethnicity, urbanicity and community poverty.
    ${ }^{\text {Analy }}$ Anses adjusted for sex, family income, race and ethnicity, urbanicity and community poverty.

[^1]:    *Analyses adjusted for sex, age group, family income, race, ethnicity, urbanicity and community poverty.
    ${ }^{\dagger}$ Analyses adjusted for age group, family income, race, ethnicity, urbanicity and community poverty.

