TRL

An investigation into the social exclusion of young people in relation to transport provision: a literature review

Prepared for TRL Limited

H Harper

TRL Report TRL628

TRL is committed to optimising energy efficiency, reducing
waste and promoting recycling and re-use. In support of these
environmental goals, this report has been printed on recycled
paper, comprising 100% post-consumer waste, manufactured
using a TCF (totally chlorine free) process.

CONTENTS

Executive Summary

Meeting targets for social inclusion has become an increasingly important element in the formulation of transport policy, with efforts increasingly being made to engage certain sectors of groups who experience exclusion, and are disadvantaged, as a result of the gap between their transport needs and the transport options available to them. The 1998 UK Government White Paper on Transport, 'A New Deal for Transport: Better for Everyone', states that the 'transport system of the future should contribute to a 'fairer, more inclusive society' (Enoch, 1999; p.6). In particular, problems of exclusion are particularly acute for certain sectors of society, such as women, the young, the elderly, disabled people and people who live in rural areas (Social Exclusion Unit, 2003a).

This review focuses on the experiences of young people in both rural and urban areas and the extent to which they are socially excluded as a result of transport provision. The review begins by examining the concept and process of social exclusion and the importance of transport policies in tackling social exclusion. The concepts of mobility and accessibility are discussed in detail as a way of understanding the relationship between transport and social exclusion and the difficulties that young people face.

The report outlines the concerns and experiences of young people living in rural and urban areas seeking to examine the interactions between physical geography, transport and quality of life for young people in these differing locations. It examines the travel patterns of young people, identifying different patterns, reflective of the diverse needs of varying age groups and those living in different locations. In particular, it looks at the key role that the car, and image of the car, plays in young people's lives, affecting their travel choices and perceptions of other modes of transport. The review outlines the barriers that young people face in accessing education, social, leisure and employment opportunities. Furthermore, it examines young people's attitudes towards transport, as influenced by the barriers they face. These barriers, financial constraints, paucity and unreliability of services, fears of crime and for personal security, hostile treatment on services, poor cleanliness and comfort and poor provision of information about services, are discussed in detail. Following on from this, attention is paid to the way in which young people attempt to minimise the constraints they face in travel and the strategies through which they do this. The role that educational intervention can play in influencing and changing young people's attitudes towards transport is also examined.

In response to the numerous barriers young people experience in travel, the report outlines a number of solutions recommended in research studies both by researchers and young people, as a way of removing some of the constraints young people face and seeking to improve the quality of life for socially excluded groups. Following on from this, examples of successful case studies and best practice schemes where actions have been taken to improve transport provision for young people are reviewed.

In addition, the report examines the role of young people in consultation, policy development and provision of services. The review looks at existing techniques of consultation with the young, and aims to use the research found to provide guidance on the incorporation of young people in creative and innovative consultation processes. Attention is paid to the way in which young people develop their ideas and perceptions of travel, according to their background and in the context of social identity theory. Finally, a summary of the review is provided, detailing the main findings and outlining recommendations for future research.

1 Introduction

This literature review has been prepared by TRL, to provide an insight into the issues surrounding the social exclusion of young people in relation to transport provision. The purpose of the literature review is to identify and examine the relevant available research and literature concerning the relationship between young people, transport and social exclusion. It aims to discuss young people's transport needs and requirements and the extent to which these requirements are addressed. It draws together previous research on young people and transport and associated literature on the participation of young people in planning and decision making. The report aims to look at how current transport provision impacts upon their lives and proposes recommendations on how to improve and promote public transport, identifying strategies to improve the quality of life of socially excluded groups.

The review begins by discussing the process of social exclusion and the importance of transport policies in enabling social equity. This is followed by a comparative examination of the transport requirements of young people, as well as the difficulties they face, in terms of mobility and accessibility, in everyday travel. In particular, the report distinguishes between the needs and experiences of young people in rural areas and those of young people in urban areas, seeking to examine the interactions between physical geography, transport and quality of life for young people in these differing locations. It provides an overview of young people's attitudes towards transport and the different barriers which they face in accessing education, social, leisure and employment opportunities. Following on from this, potential solutions aimed at reducing the barriers created by transport and suggested both by researchers and young people themselves, are examined, with the aim of seeking to identify strategies to improve the quality of life for socially excluded groups.

In addition, attention is paid to the way in which young people develop their ideas and perceptions of travel, according to their background and in the context of social identity theory. The effect of educational intervention on changing young people's attitudes towards transport is also investigated. The review also focuses on the role of young people in consultation and policy development and provision of services. Young people are commonly marginalised in policy decision making. This review looks at existing techniques of consultation with the young and aims to use the research found to provide guidance on the incorporation of young people in consultation processes and hence to tackle transport-related social exclusion by listening to the perceptions and opinions of those who are affected. The importance of promoting creative and innovative consultation techniques for the young is outlined. Finally, research involving case studies where actions have been taken to improve transport provision for young people is reviewed.

2 Social exclusion, young people and transport

2.1 What is social exclusion?

Social exclusion is defined as:

> *'a process which causes individuals or groups not to participate in the normal activities of the society where they are residents'* (Hine *et al.*, 2000, cited in Holvad, undated).

Tackling social exclusion has become an increasingly important element in the formulation of transport policy, with efforts increasingly being made to engage groups in society who are currently excluded, partially as a result of the gap between their transport needs and the transport provision they have at their disposal. In 1997, the Prime Minister established the Social Exclusion Unit with the aim of helping socially excluded sectors of society. The Unit aims to prevent social exclusion, ensure that basic services deliver for, and are available to, everyone, including transport, and re-integrating people who have 'fallen through the net', including young people (Social Exclusion Unit, 2003b).

Social inclusion can be promoted by ensuring that public transport is accessible to all, hence ensuring mobility for all and promoting social justice. The 1998 UK Government White Paper on Transport, 'A New Deal for Transport: Better for Everyone', states that the 'transport system of the future should contribute to a 'fairer, more inclusive society'' (Enoch, 1999; p.6). Similarly, 'Making the Connections: Final Report on Transport and Social Exclusion' (Social Exclusion Unit, 2003a) states that 'improving public services, creating access to new opportunities and enabling individuals and communities to realise their potential are at the heart of this Government's ambitions. That means making sure everyone in society can get to work, good schools, quality healthcare, affordable healthy food and live in a safe environment' (p.v).

Social exclusion can occur both in scattered and clustered forms; affecting both individuals, specific sectors of society and specific locations. In recent years there has been an increasing recognition that transport problems can both impede social inclusion in that firstly, people might not be able to access transport services because of their social exclusion (for example, age can stop people driving) and secondly, that problems with transport provision and the location of services can exacerbate social exclusion (for example, by preventing them from accessing what they want/need). These problems can be particularly acute for certain sectors of society and certain types of area, such as women, the young, the elderly, disabled people and people in rural areas (Social Exclusion Unit, 2003a).

Everybody has a need for travel. This does not only apply to the economically active or the workers who commute, but to all sectors of society, including young people who may need to journey to school, travel to see friends or participate in leisure activities. Often however, young people find their transport needs are not met. Society is increasingly car-dependent, meaning that those

without cars are increasingly excluded, disadvantaged and isolated socially, physically and spatially/geographically (Transport 2000, 2002). For excluded members of society, the problem is often particularly acute. Such social groups often have the greatest difficulty with mobility and accessibility since they may not have access to a car and are forced to rely on public transport or alternative modes of travel, which may not meet their demands. They often tend to lack personal and social resources which leave them forgotten and marginalised in policy debates (Jones, 2002). Research has found that these sectors of society are likely to be less politically active, therefore their needs often take second place behind the car driver (Banister, 1980). Lack of access to transport deprives the individual of five important needs; individualism, reassurance, flexibility, convenience and immediacy; and society of economic vitality. The car is often seen as the optimum mode of transport to fulfil these needs.

The National Youth Agency (NYA) (2003) describes how young people are particularly susceptible to social exclusion because they often cannot afford public transport yet have little choice since they are not old enough to drive, do not have a regular income and are dependent on family to transport them. In rural areas there is more pressure on young people to drive so that they can have more freedom, feel less isolated and be less dependent on their parents. As a result, 'often young people may feel their rural location gives them little choice – either adopt personal transport or move to a more urban area' (NYA, 2003; p.2). Young people with disabilities are reliant on their parents to an even greater extent and hence their choices are limited further. Young women are particularly disadvantaged due to the perceived risks of travelling alone by public transport, especially at night.

The Scottish Executive Central Research Unit report 'The Role of Transport in Social Exclusion in Urban Scotland' (Hine and Mitchell, 2001) looks at the nature of the relationship, in terms of cause and effect, between social exclusion and transport in Scotland and, in particular, the differential effects of transport 'disadvantage' in different sectors of society. The report highlights that access to transport is a significant concern for some people. It states that access to transport clearly influences the extent to which they can participate in what are seen to be 'the normal activities of citizens' (leisure activities, job-seeking) (p.4) and acts as a constraint on what people can do and where they go. Transport is especially important to those without access to a car. DETR (2000) states that 'previous studies have shown that (transport) is a significant preoccupation for younger people with no car… On the other hand, in rural areas, transport problems are a primary preoccupation for a much wider group of people because access to most facilities is almost impossible in some areas without a car' (p.77).

Across society, there are significant variations in personal travel habits according to mode chosen to travel by, type of journey undertaken, purpose of journey and distance of journey. These variations can be explained partially by mobility and accessibility, but are also influenced by an individual's personal preferences, including their demands for education, employment, leisure and social activities, and their role in society, for example as a young person or wage-earner. This role in society characterises the individual's interests and values and hence dictates their travel needs – in terms of purpose, type and frequency (Hillman *et al.*, 1976; Culliane and Stokes, 1998). Personal characteristics such as age, ability to drive, gender, household composition, location, social class and income, all impact significantly on personal mobility and interact to affect travel patterns. Furthermore, in the case of young people, there is a complex relationship between personal and household/family characteristics (i.e. does the family have a car; can they afford public transport etc.) which interact with each other and influence mobility (Hillman *et al.*, 1976). 'Characteristics of mobility and accessibility together define an individual's capacity to travel in daily life' (p.xiii) (Hillman *et al.*, 1976). The relationship between each individual's travel needs, mobility and their travel behaviour is paramount and is what characterises the social exclusion problems which many young people face in terms of transport (Hillman *et al.*, 1976).

'Travel needs are linked to 'ways of life' (Williams, 1965), lifestyles (Turrentine, 1994) and communities' (Root *et al.*, 1996; p.9). Travel plays a vital role as a means to participate in particular activities (Banister, 1985; p.93). Our ability to decide who we spend time with and what form of entertainment we choose can be liberating if it is not dictated by transport. Lack of transport often forces us to undertake activities which are geographically nearest. 'In this sense travel choices bring an improved quality of life' (Root *et al.*, 1996; p.9). 'Research on rural young people (Root *et al.*, 1996) found that the absence of good transport and facilities led to anti-social behaviour, boredom and frustration through lack of choice' (DTLR, 2000; p.16). Independent travel for people who do not own cars is heavily restricted.

Young people often do not have access to a car and hence are reliant on other modes of transport, particularly public transport in the case of longer trips. Changing lifestyles mean that children are often faced with new opportunities/activities which, if they do not drive or have access to a car may not be viable. If they live in a rural area, they may have to rely on parents if they wish to be transported and this promotes feelings of a lack of mobility, independence and freedom, and even isolation. If they are forced to rely on public transport, matters of safety, frequency, convenience and affordability become important factors (Davis, 2001). Young people tend therefore to be restricted in what they can do and transport imposes several constraints on their activities – these constraints are both chosen (for example, when young people do not feel comfortable travelling a certain way) and forced (when young people are not permitted to travel in certain ways or at certain times or cannot afford to travel) (Davis, 2001).

Young people under the age of 19 account for just over 25% of the population in England and Wales (DfT, 2003a). Of those young people below school-leaving age (15/16) and/or the age at which one can get a driving

licence (17), it is estimated that the mobility of approximately one fifth of the population in England and Wales is dependent on walking, cycling, public transport and the parental car (National Statistics, Census 2001 in DfT, 2003a; p.7). Providing mobility to the large numbers who do not have, or are not able to use, a car is a key social objective (Banister, 1980).

The DETR (2000) report 'Social Exclusion and the Provision and Availability of Public Transport' notes that the clear links between access to and provision of transport and social exclusion are particularly noticeable among young people (as well as the elderly, those on low incomes and families with young children), describing them as 'travel poor' (p.16) in the sense that they lack mobility and do not have adequate access to choice of transport. The report states that:

> *'travel poverty can be a significant problem for those already experiencing social exclusion, with a lack of real travel choice and, therefore, a lack of choice in activities and destinations. It is also, in some cases, one of the causes of social exclusion. Travel poverty is strongly associated with the inability to participate, since it can result in lack of access to both essential and 'non-essential' services and facilities; work…education'* (DETR, 2000, p.17-18).

Access to transport therefore, is of significant importance and those who are constrained in their access might find themselves severely disadvantaged. Transport has several key functions, beyond that of simply providing access, which are crucial in ensuring quality of life for an individual:

1 *Practical/access* function: Transport can provide and permit access to key services and facilities, and hence opportunities, and can similarly deny access to these facilities.

2 *Social* function: Travel can be a way of meeting people, particularly in rural areas.

3 *Social/health* function: The social function can be of health benefit to users.

4 *Symbolic* function: Young people often perceive public transport as a negative social symbol since it cannot meet their needs and also because it operates as a 'controlled space' in which their behaviour is restrained. The provision of buses that are vandalised, infrequent and drive past them at bus stops become symbolic of a society that ignores and marginalises them. Contrastingly, efforts to improve transport services, especially in low self-esteem neighbourhoods, can become symbolic of a feeling that someone 'cares' and can be received with gratitude.

5 *Economic* function.

(DETR, 2000).

Despite the major barriers facing young people in terms of transport, young people's perceptions on travel are commonly ignored and marginalised (Davis, 2001). Everyday, children undertake decision making about transport, influenced by their personal experiences, experiences of others and peer group influence. However, travel patterns of young people are often neglected in travel surveys, despite the fact that policy decisions can influence their opportunities to engage in various activities (Hillman *et al.*, 1976). Davis (2001) stresses that planners should attend to young peoples' views and needs in order to gain a fresh perspective on decisions which they are affected by. This issue is discussed later in the review.

2.2 Understanding social exclusion

Hine *et al.,* (2000) observe that there are three key levels of information that are required in attempting to understand the affect of transport on social exclusion:

● 'Identification of the types of activity from which a person is excluded (school; work; leisure; social).

● Which factors are responsible (cost; safety; frequency; reliability).

● The extent to which transport is implicated'.

(Hine *et al.*, 2000 cited in Holvad undated).

In looking at social exclusion, it is also important to consider how the individual might perceive themselves as being excluded. With young people, exclusion is predominantly due to constraint rather than choice (Holvad, undated).

Individuals can be excluded from activities in several ways:

● *Spatial/geographical exclusion*: Access to facilities is difficult due to geographical location and a lack of transport services in some locations, e.g. rural and urban fringe locations.

● *Financial/economic exclusion:* Monetary constraints restrict use of transport and prevent access to facilities.

● *Temporal exclusion:* Poor provision of services prevents access to facilities at certain times – particularly during early mornings, late evenings and weekends when services are less frequent.

● *Fear-based exclusion:* Psychological issues, including worry and fear of safety and crime, affect how public transport is used.

● *Personal/physical exclusion:* Physical and mental barriers restrict use of transport services and mobility, e.g. age, illness and disability.

(Church and Frost and Church *et al.*, 1999 in Hine and Mitchell, 2001; DETR, 2000; Cross in Enoch, 1999).

In identifying what such factors prevent people from using public transport, each factor and form of exclusion should be tackled specifically through targeted measures and solutions. For example, establishing services in isolated rural and suburban areas could alleviate spatial exclusion; improved late night, early morning and weekend services might improve temporal exclusion; the provision of specialist, innovative services such as dial-a-ride and infrastructural changes for disabled changes can prevent personal exclusion; and introducing concessionary fares, travelcards and inter-availability of tickets can reduce financial exclusion (Cross, cited in Enoch, 1999).

2.3 Accessibility and mobility

In understanding the link between social exclusion and transport, Holvad (undated) emphasises the importance of the concepts of mobility (ease of travelling) and accessibility (ease of reaching). Mobility is defined as the 'ability of an individual to move about' (Banister, 1985; p.89) or 'ease of movement' (Culliane and Stokes, 1998; p.9), as influenced by various factors from personal characteristics, such as disability and financial resources, to the availability of public transport services or other modes of transport. Accessibility is defined as the 'ability of people to get to or be reached by the opportunities which are perceived relevant to them' (Banister, 1985; p.90) or 'the degree to which something is 'get-at-able'' (Culliane and Stokes, 1998; p.61). Culliane and Stokes (1998) state that 'as mobility has increased for a great proportion of the population, this has led planners to ignore those without access to a car and to build centralised facilities which mean that people have to travel longer distances. Accessibility for those reliant on public transport has consequently declined dramatically' (p.62).

There has been an increasing focus on accessibility rather than mobility in research and policy, with transport increasingly being seen as a means to an end rather than an end itself. People travel because there are benefits at the destination which outweigh the travel costs. Accessibility is multi-faceted and depends upon a number of factors: the individual's needs and desires to access facilities; whether or not people have access to transport services in order that they may access facilities; whether or not people feel able to depend upon the transport, for example in terms of safety and reliability; whether or not people know about the transport; whether or not people are physically or financially able to access transport; and whether or not facilities and services are located within a reasonable distance (Social Exclusion Unit, 2003a). Such factors combine to determine whether or not people can access the services they need and hence the extent to which they experience social exclusion. Improving accessibility, through transport, is seen as having a key role to play in improving equity (Halden et al., 2002). Accessibility is a particular issue in rural areas. Increased prosperity and car ownership in rural areas have not solved mobility and accessibility for all rural residents but instead, exacerbated the situation for certain sectors of the community. In particular, those without access to a car, and are then hence dependent upon others for their mobility, have particular difficulty in gaining access to facilities. Depending on public transport is not always feasible and hence many desires for movement are obstructed by this. 'Buchan (1992) defines accessibility as being one of the quality-of-life objectives for transport' (Culliane and Stokes, 1998; p.62).

Young people face five key barriers to accessing services:

1 The availability and physical accessibility of transport: For some people there is no public transport, or it doesn't go to the right places or at the right times, or it does not go often enough or reliably enough… People living in rural areas without access to a car can face particularly acute problems…

2 Cost of transport: Some people find the costs of personal or public transport are very high or unaffordable… Cost of transport is a major obstacle to mobility.

3 Services and activities located in inaccessible places…

4 Safety and security: Some people are unwilling to use public transport or walk to key services because of fear of crime or antisocial behaviour…

5 Travel horizons. Some people are unwilling to travel long journey times or distances, or may not know about or trust transport services…'.

(Social Exclusion Unit, 2003a; p.3).

It is anticipated that these barriers will be assessed, and solutions developed, during the course of this research.

There are huge spatial and social inequalities in mobility and accessibility and hence in the opportunities available. Social exclusion, as created by travel difficulties, relates to mobility and accessibility and is both a social and a spatial issue (Blowers, 1978). Socially, mobility and accessibility are a significant problem for those who cannot drive or do not possess a car, perhaps due to age, income or disability. Spatially, mobility and accessibility are particularly problematic for those in rural areas (Blowers, 1978). In order to consider accessibility, we need to consider the spatial and social characteristics of the population and the distribution of facilities as well as the transport links available to them (Banister, 1985). Accessibility can be improved by making changes to the transport system and ensuring changes in the location of activities (Blowers, 1978). Mobility and accessibility are inter-linked and many sectors of society, including young people, suffer from a lack of both. Individual circumstances are very important in determining an individual's levels of mobility and accessibility. Furthermore, mobility shifts throughout a person's life and in particular, Culliane and Stokes (1998) state it is worse during childhood.

Holvad outlines four combinations of mobility and accessibility and the roles they can play in both inclusion and exclusion:

- *High mobility and high accessibility:* this is unlikely to lead to social exclusion but instead forms clustered social inclusion.

- *High mobility but low accessibility:* an individual might not be socially excluded, even though the community in which they live is. This is a form of scattered social inclusion (e.g. high income people in rural areas).

- *Low mobility but high accessibility:* an individual might be socially excluded but their community is not. This creates scattered social exclusion and is a likely scenario for young people living in a high income urban area.

- *Low mobility and low accessibility:* both the individual and the community are socially excluded and transport is likely to be exacerbating this problem. This creates clustered social exclusion and is a likely scenario for those young people living in rural areas.

(Holvad, undated).

'The problem we face, then, is of inequalities in mobility and accessibility experienced by particular groups in specific locations. It is compounded by inequalities relating to political differences…'' (Blowers, 1978; p.48).

3 Policy context

The 1978 Transport Act recognised the importance of the 'distributional effects as to who benefits and who loses from transport decisions' (Banister, 1980; p.1). Following on from this, in recent years, there have been increasing efforts to identify the accessibility needs of society and examine the impacts, including social exclusion, of poor accessibility. There has been an increasing recognition of the need to improve the accessibility and mobility of all of society and to provide an equitable, inclusive transport system which meets society's transport needs and demands. The UK Government White Paper 'A New Deal for Public Transport: Better for Everyone' (1998) recognises the importance of catering for different needs and states that Local Transport Plans in England will 'include measures to reduce social exclusion and address the needs of different groups in society' (p.99) and that 'in both rural and urban areas, the plans will take account of the transport and accessibility needs of local communities and business…' (p.100). DETR (1999 cited in DfT, 2003a) notes that although young people are major users of public transport, it is generally recognised that public transport is not responding to the needs of these people. The report states that 'public transport is not perceived by many young people as a friendly environment where they are welcome and their custom valued' (DETR, 1999 cited in DfT, 2003a; p.7) and that attempting to tackle such constraints are vital to ensuring social inclusion.

In rural areas particularly, Halden *et al.* (2002) note that the need to reduce social exclusion has been given increased political priority with key aims stressing the need to:

- Identify the accessibility needs of those living in rural areas.
- Assess the impacts, (including social exclusion), of poor accessibility in rural locations.
- Pinpoint practical techniques for measuring accessibility in rural areas.
- Reveal the transport policy interventions that have sought to improve rural accessibility.

(Halden *et al.*, 2002).

Furthermore, the Transport White Paper addresses the importance of ensuring that those who are particularly impacted and disadvantaged by transport should be given a political voice. In this context, it states that 'local authorities will need actively to involve young people' (p.100) i.e. in policy decisions which affect them. Following on from this, the DfT report 'Involving children and young people: Action Plan 2003-2004' observes that in order to provide access to transport, and goods and services from this, it is crucial to surmise what people need and think. In particular, it focuses on understanding and catering for young peoples' needs. The Action Plan aims particularly to 'understand the diverse transport needs and requirements of young people from urban and rural environments' (DfT, 2003a; p.7) and to provide recommendations on potential ways of involving younger people in developing policies and providing services. It states three clear goals:

- To 'deliver better services to children and young people,… [provide] children and young people with a transport system that works for them… [and make] transport provision more responsive to children and young people, their parents and communities'.
- To promote social inclusion by ensuring that 'all children and young people, including the hardest to reach and those facing disadvantage and inequality, get excellent service and to involve them in the development of services'.
- To 'give children and young people participation opportunities which contributes to the development of personal and social skills and active citizenship'.

(DfT, 2003a; p.8).

Furthermore, the report pays particular attention to the need to cater for different needs, such as young ethnic groups, young disabled people or young people with mobility difficulties.

4 Transport concerns in rural and urban areas

The needs, demands, experiences and perceptions of the people living in these different types of area, vary widely. 28.5% of people in England live in districts and unitary authorities classified as rural (2001 census) and 71.5% in urban areas (The Countryside Agency, 2003 p.7). Table 1 shows a breakdown of these percentages by age, highlighting that roughly equal proportions of young people live in both rural and urban areas.

Table 1 Population estimates in 2001, by age breakdown (%)

	Rural %	Urban %
Under 15	18.2%	19.1%
15-24	10.4%	12.9%
25-44	26.9%	30.3%
45-64	26.3%	22.7%
65+	18.1%	15.0%
All	28.5%	71.5%

Source: The Countryside Agency (2003; p.8).

The Countryside Agency report 'The State of the Countryside' (2003) researched whether there are differences in public attitudes and opinions between rural and urban areas which may affect responses to social, economic and environmental change. The research looked at people's approach to problems and patterns of personal worries, relative to their area of residence. The results showed that 90% of all people in England felt that the area in which they live (urban/rural) does significantly affect their approach to issues – 47% said it affected their approach a great deal. The traditional 'one size fits all' solution in policy making is perhaps then not the best approach. Instead, there is a need to effectively target response towards particular needs, with 'clear policies relating to a group of people for a particular purpose' (Halden *et* al., 2002; p.13).

Despite this, both rural and urban residents do share common concerns, even though some of these causes for concern might be greater in particular locations. People in rural and urban locations are also generally influenced by the same factors – media, family, and friends (The Countryside Agency, 2003). When asked if they thought whether or not the public transport provision in their area was good, the residents' responses were varied. The results are shown in Table 2.

Table 2 Perception of transport facilities by age group (% response)

	Age range							
	16-29		30-39		40-49		All	
Facility type	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
Transport								
Good	50%	72%	46%	68%	31%	66%	42%	68%
Poor	5%	8%	5%	9%	4%	7%	4%	6%

Source: The Countryside Agency (2003, p.21).

The results show that lack of adequate transport is a major concern for people in the rural areas with only four out of ten people in rural areas feeling that their transport is good, compared to nearly 7 out of ten in urban areas. Work by DETR (2000) in the report 'Social Exclusion and the Provision and Availability of Public Transport' also indicates that in rural areas, 'transport often appears to be one of the primary preoccupations of the residents, since they are aware that adequate transport is the only way that they can connect with work, services, education, shops etc.' (p.45). Similarly, Todovoric and Wellington (2000) show that people living in suburban and rural areas are particularly dissatisfied with public transport and leisure facilities with only 36% of rural residents describing public transport as good, as compared to 91% of urban residents.

4.1 Transport in rural areas

A lack of rural services, longer journey distances and remoteness combined, mean that people in rural areas might have difficulty in accessing basic services, particularly the elderly and young. The average number of journeys or purpose of the journeys varies little between urban and rural areas, however, rural residents tend to travel further to get to work, shopping, visit friends etc. and their total travel mileage per year is approximately 25% higher than that of urban residents (The Countryside Agency, 2003). In particular, dependence on the car is high. In rural areas, 74% of all journeys are made as a car driver or passenger or another form of private transport, whilst only 4% are made as a passenger on a bus or train (The Countryside Agency, 2003). 42% of primary school children in rural areas are driven to school (The Countryside Agency, 2003). People in rural areas without car transport are forced to rely on public transport and hence lose the freedom of 'regularity and spontaneity' (The Countryside Agency, 2003; p.64). This is particularly of issue when considering that 20% of rural settlements in

England are estimated to have a bus service below 'subsistence' levels, that is less than 4 return journeys a day and no weekend or evening service (DETR, 1998). Where public transport is provided, the supply is often inflexible and hence cannot meet the diverse needs of people with differing transport requirements and demands.

As a result of poor public transport provision, 'people living in rural areas [are forced] to adapt to their environment by adopting [either] a lifestyle involving limited mobility or by making their own arrangements for transport' (Coe and Fairfield, 1980 cited in Halden et al., 2002). To this extent, 'car ownership [or access] is critical in explaining the large range in accessibility levels experienced by rural dwellers' (Halden et al., 2002; p.7). The lack of public transport is particularly significant for the accessibility and mobility of those social groups without cars and acts as a barrier to their inclusion. For young people growing up in rural areas, there is often an overriding sense of isolation from social networks, opportunities, facilities, services and friends and for many individuals, the lack of access to transport means that the majority of their whole life is conducted within the boundaries of their village or even house (Mullins et al., 2001).

4.2 Transport in urban areas

DETR (2000) notes that 'attitudes to public transport among urban young people vary and may affect the way it is used, particularly where it is seen as a symbol of authority (Cetur 1993, Brown, 1994)' (p.16). Even where public transport provision is deemed to be adequate, DETR notes that in urban areas, 'it could do little more than to begin to offset the disadvantages of those who cannot for whatever reason run a car. Accessing all normal facilities would still be likely to involve a disproportionate expenditure, both of time and money, without super organisation. People's schedules are, in any case, often built around public transport timetables, and reliability is thus a key issue' (DETR, 2000; p.45).

5 Young peoples attitudes

In order to understand the travel behaviour of young people, it is crucial to understand their underlying perceptions of, and attitudes towards transport, many of which dictate the way in which they use transport. Young people's opinions of transport are often formed early on in their lives, usually as a result of their own experiences of transport. In this context, it is important that children's early experiences of transport are not negative. Similarly, 'research in South Yorkshire has indicated that travel habits developed at a young age can influence subsequent behaviour (Goodwin et al., 1983 cited in DTLR, 1999; p.3). Often, young people's attitudes are also formed as a result of their parents' influence. McWhannell and Braunoltz (2002) note that 'if their parents use public transport, it is more likely that young people will find this an acceptable mode of transport' (p.4). In contrast, it has been suggested that those who have not been regular public transport users as young people [perhaps as a result of parental influence]

are less likely to be passengers in their adult life (Atkins, 1996)' (DTLR, 1999; p.3). McWhannell and Braunoltz (2002) suggest that in terms of car use, young people rely heavily on their parents to drive them to places and as a result, young people absorb an image of the car as convenient and comfortable and generally tend to view it more positively than public transport. The family car is often the main mode of transport relied on to transport children places, so younger children often have little familiarity with public transport. This does change with age as older teenagers tend to travel more independently once they get older and their parents transport them less. However by this stage, the 'relative attractions' of the car are already established and many young people aspire to own a car and have the convenience, as their parents do. The importance of influencing young people and their attitudes early on in their childhood therefore, is shown to be pivotal.

5.1 Young peoples travel patterns

Looking at social exclusion through lack of provision of transport, raises questions about the relationship between travel values, choices and behaviour. There is a need to look at the ways in which choices are constrained and options understood, by different social groups. For young people, this requires an examination of the options that young people do have, the ones which they choose, how they perceive their choices and lives; the constraints that they do experience and how they cope with these constraints (Root *et al.*, 1996). As discussed at the beginning of this report, travel behaviour, needs and experiences differ significantly with age, personal differences (access to different modes of travel) lifestyle circumstances, and spatial considerations (different settlement types – rural, urban; peri-urban and area differences in facility location and public transport provision) (Lucas *et al.*, 2001; Hillman *et al.*, 1976). This is also true for young people. Young people are a diverse group and those of different ages and living in different locations hold different perceptions, have different experiences and problems, and also travel by different methods and for different purposes (Gloucestershire Labour Market Information Unit, 2002). In particular, perceptions of public transport shift as young people get older.

There are different perceptions and patterns of use of public transport between younger and older children (DTLR, 1999). Approximately a quarter of young people's journeys are made on foot or by bicycle. Although this provides freedom, neither is a popular choice and tend to be used only for short distances and hence often in urban areas given that this is not appropriate for the longer distances involved in rural areas (Storey and Brannen, 2000). 'The incidence of walking rises as town size and density increase' and hence is more of a feature of urban lifestyles (Hillman *et al.*, 1976; p.18). Cycling is generally one of the least popular methods of getting from A to B. Those who do cycle tend to be aged 12-14 and doing it as part of fun with friends rather than using it as a form of transport. The unpopularity of cycling is attributed to the need for a bike, equipment such as helmets, locks and lights, fear of theft and an 'uncool' image (McWhannell

and Braunoltz, 2002). Children under ten are heavy car users since they rely on adults to transport them around. Children younger than 12 years old, entering the transitional stage between primary and secondary school, tend to travel on public transport accompanied by family members. Research by Davis (2001) showed that those aged 9-11 thought, broadly, that they did not have enough choice or independence and perceived there being many constraints, both environmental and in the form of parental restrictions, on their freedom.

DTLR (1999) observed that after the age of 12, young people tend to be allowed out on their own more and tend to travel more independently, perhaps with friends. They also tend to start using public transport more at the weekend and in the evenings, particularly in order to access social and leisure activities. Indeed, the use of buses for travel other than to school increases at the age of 13 as young people begin to travel independently with friends at this age (DETR, 2000). Research by Gloucestershire Labour Market Information Unit (2002) shows that in those aged 13, 14, and 15+, travelling by bus is the most popular form of public transport when travelling other than to school or college, with 'more than half of young people aged 13 or 14 years using the bus at least once a week and this increases to two thirds for those 15 years and older' (p.16). DTLR (1999) notes that the extent to which young people use public transport, especially for leisure trips, varies with age and whether the family has regular use of a car' (DTLR, 1999, p.12)' Young people tend to use buses more often than adults although the roles of public transport and car travel do vary according to the levels of car ownership among the young person's households or friends and the public transport services offered (Hilman *et al.*, 1976). Often public transport is used as an activity in itself and buses and bus shelters, for example, are seen as cheap, dry places to meet and socialise. Following on from this, McWhannell and Braunoltz (2002) note that younger teenagers (aged 12-14) tend to view public transport as more 'fun' and 'exciting'. They enjoy the independence afforded by public transport and see journeys as part of the fun of a trip and a social experience, where they can chat to friends and have a degree of independence, rather than as merely a way of getting from one place to another. Jones *et al.* (2000) remarks that those aged 13-14 tend to have greater expectations of autonomy and independence. Research by Davis (2001) showed however, that those aged 13-14 tended to have more of an acceptance of the restrictions imposed upon them, for example through traffic danger and parental restrictions, often viewing such restrictions as inevitable.

In contrast, those a little older (aged 15-17) take independence much more for granted and as a result public transport seems less attractive and is merely seen as a necessity. (McWhannell and Braunoltz, 2002) For teenagers and young adults, public transport is the main form of independent transport and is important for freedom. This is also the age at which young people might be travelling to further education or work and when leisure travel becomes more important (DETR, 2000).'Teenagers are at an age where independence is increasingly important

to their development into maturity and adulthood' (Hillman *et al.*, 1976; p.21) and hence they look for activities outside the home. They rely on public transport which makes them vulnerable to variations in services, especially at weekends and in the evenings. Rather than simply wanting to be able to travel independently, people of this age want to be able to stay out late and look for the fastest, most convenient routes, often regardless of cost. Freedom comes to mean something different. They have already established their independence in other ways. (McWhannell and Braunoltz, 2002) For those beyond the age of 17, in the transitional stage of being able to drive, the key aim is to learn to drive and own a car, hence public transport becomes increasingly less attractive as an option, with its only real attraction predominantly being cost (McWhannell and Braunoltz, 2002).

Research by DETR (2000) examining young people's perceptions of transport showed that different ages of young people also have particular transport problems, reflective of their differing demands:

For those young people aged 5-16, key problems included:

● Problems with adult perceptions of young people: buses driving past bus stops when bus not full; feelings of not being wanted on buses; feelings that older people are prioritised on buses.

● Problems with school buses: too few school buses; transport constraints on choice of school.

● Problems with public transport services: morning buses too full; bus routes too slow and long; unreliability and paucity of buses; not enough buses to leisure facilities; in particular, those with parents without cars have major problems getting to places on Sundays since bus services are so poor then.

● Problems with cost: transport too expensive and many young people often not aware of saver tickets;

● Problems with condition: old, dirty buses.

For those aged over 16, problems included:

● Problems with cost: at this age, the majority of concessionary fares are no longer available; no cheap returns available before 9am.

● Problems with public transport services: limited range of off-peak service. Buses crowded at peak times; post-16 school choice limited by transport routes and time taken.

● Problems with adult perceptions of young people: antagonism between young people, drivers and other passengers.

DETR observed that 'on the whole [this group of young people] were waiting for the day when they could acquire a car so that they would no longer be dependent on public transport' (2000; p.54).

So, whilst many young people do gain freedom from transport, many others suffer problems with it not tending to their needs.

Young people in rural areas have particular problems with transport in getting to education, work and carrying out social activities. Also, as facilities tend to be located further away in rural areas, transport is a key concern of young people. Seeing friends is a problem for young people without their own transport. There are few bus services after 6pm so they have to rely on parents for transport, although this can be a problem getting lifts home late at night (Storey and Brannen, 2000). As a result, for young people in rural areas particularly, the transition to adulthood is 'made [even] more complex by their dependency on their families to meet their daily travel needs' (National Youth Agency, 2003; p.4). A survey by Hillman *et al.* (1976) showed that in a comparison of teenagers' travel patterns in five different areas, the least social trips were reported by those living in the village. Furthermore, leisure and shopping trips were longer and more varied in the larger scale urban areas, reflecting the greater opportunities and also use of public transport here. In the village there were both short and long travel journeys – short for those within the village and longer ones for journeys to towns several miles away. Further research (McWhannell and Braunoltz, 2002) has shown that unlike those living in urban areas, young people who live in rural locations are more likely to use the car over the bus for everyday business. Similarly, research by Jones *et al.* (2000), car travel and use of the school bus service was far greater in the medium and low-density areas, partially due to distance and higher journey times outside of urban areas. Compared to those in rural areas, young people living in urban areas are also more likely to travel regularly by bus for leisure purposes, partially as a result of service availability. Trains are often used more for longer journeys (DTLR, 1999; p.1).

Restrictions on independent travel and mobility occur due to varying accessibility, road safety and car ownership. Thus children in a city suburb have the most independence due to low traffic levels and high levels of car ownership. In contrast, in inner London, traffic levels are high and hence movement is restricted due to the high density of roads and heavy traffic. As a result, independent travel decreases for facilities less likely to be near to home, since these are more likely to involve crossing roads or using buses. In the villages, the children are very restricted in terms of bus use. (Hillman *et al.* 1976).

5.2 The role of the car

As already discussed, access to a car is a key influence on accessibility. Those who travel by car have a wider 'catchment area' of opportunities whereas those without are more isolated and are limited to a smaller area which they can interact in and with. Lifestyles are predominantly focused on the ability to travel by car and those without are restricted from many activities, clearly highlighting the link between an individual's lifestyle and their means of transport (Simpson, 2002). An individual's means of transport affects patterns of social contact, personal contact, and access to shopping, employment and education. Lack of access to car therefore can create social exclusion, particularly in rural areas where public transport might not be available as an alternative.

For young people, access to a car is pivotal in affecting their ability to access services and facilities, leisure and

social opportunities and education and work opportunities. The majority of young people aspiring to own a car are prevalent among this sector of society. The 'car culture' and positive image of the car are seen as a lifeline to freedom and as a key to a desirable lifestyle (Mehta, undated). Young people want to own a car and do not want to be excluded from this image. The car is often seen as a symbol of wealth and social grouping, particularly in deprived areas. In a survey by the Transport Statistics User Group (1999) 61% of teenagers said the car was more essential than a TV, hi-fi or computer (cited in Mehta, undated). The car can help young people get on the ladder for employment, freedom and so forth. Young people are influenced particularly by their parents, many of whom use cars. As a result, from an early age, many young people experience the convenience and dependence of car travel and this image becomes instilled within them (Simpson, 2002). A study of year five and six school children in Liverpool by Lucas *et al.* (2001) showed that the car is seen as something to aspire to, symbolising freedom, status and adulthood. When asked how they would like to travel when they grew up, the car was the most popular choice for factors of convenience, comfort, speed, safety and warmth. In particular, 'the children thought that cars were particularly necessary for getting to work, taking days out of Liverpool and for 'showing off'' (p.13). 'This aspiration has significant implications for future transport policy because, as one of the children pointed out:

> '*what's the use of taking a bus when you have already got a car? Only if someone else was using the car or the bus was free (of charge) then you might think of using it*' (p.13).

Young people younger than 17 often depend on lifts for the majority of journeys. Research by Storey and Brannen (2000) shows that 'lifts are the most frequent method of travel, accounting for over two-thirds of non-school journeys'. The majority of lifts are from parents so the lifts depend on the number of cars and drivers in a household, as well as the amount of time the parent has. Those with lone parents or living in households with just one car and driver can be particularly disadvantaged. In negotiating lifts, young people are clearly highly dependent on their parents and this reduces their autonomy. Furthermore, 'activities requiring lifts become visible to parents and potentially subject them to parents' supervision. With services such as health centres and banks centralised in only the largest villages and towns, young people reliant on lifts may have to involve parents in matters which they would prefer to keep private'. (Storey and Brannen, 2000).

For many young people therefore, learning to drive and getting a car is seen as vital to freedom, increasing control over their own lives reducing dependency on parents for lifts:

> '*Until you get to 17 and you can get a car and a decent paid job, you can't get anywhere and you can't see your mates*' (cited in Storey and Brannen, 2000).

A DTLR study showed that 'irrespective of the age or gender of the participants or their geographical location,

almost all children and young people expressed a great deal of enthusiasm for the private car and almost all expected to be car owners and anticipated pleasure from driving' (DTLR, 1999; p.11). 'Young people's strong enthusiasm for future car ownership is universal' (DTLR, 1999; p.2). For those living in rural areas, many see that 'their rural situation gives them a stark choice – either get their own transport or move away to town' (Storey and Brannen, 2000). Car ownership is a particularly high priority in rural areas, seen more as a necessity than a luxury, and generally, young people in rural areas learn to drive before those in urban areas (Storey and Brannen, 2000). In this context, the car is viewed as a necessity, although also as a luxury in terms of cost (McWhannell and Braunoltz, 2002).

5.3 The exclusion of young people from facilities and services

A lack of transport hinders young people's ability to access key services and opportunities, including social facilities, education and employment.

5.3.1 Difficulties in accessing social facilities

Transport can be a major obstacle in accessing social activities for young people: '33% of young people think that better public transport would improve their social lives. This rises to 39% of young people aged 16-24 years old' (CfIT, 2001 in SEU, 2003; p.13). Leisure and social time is important to young people in affording a level of social interaction (Gloucestershire Labour Market Information Unit, 2002). In particular, 'Storey and Brannan (2000)… found that for young people living in rural areas, school and college play a significant part in their social lives, so that when school finishes, so does the ready-made venue for social interaction' (Gloucestershire Labour Market Information Unit, 2002; p.16-17). Out-of-school learning groups e.g. study clubs and sports clubs can be important in pupil's attainment, attitude to school and attendance (DfES, 2001 cited in Social Exclusion Unit, 2003a). Access to out-of-school learning is particularly a problem for low-income groups, either due to the cost of public transport or the parent's inability to collect the children by car (Social Exclusion Unit, 2003a). Often young people don't have the money to participate in activities if they need money for travel too (Gloucestershire Labour Market Information Unit, 2002).

Travelling in a parent's/friend's car is the most popular mode by which to travel to leisure activities, particularly for young people in rural areas. Young people in urban areas are more likely to use the bus in order to access leisure facilities, as compared to those living in rural areas (DTLR, 1999 cited in Gloucestershire Labour Market Information Unit, 2002). 'Young people in rural areas are at a disadvantage compared to young people from urban areas, with the lack of public transport reported as the main barrier facing young people in terms of accessing leisure activities' (Gloucestershire Labour Market Information Unit, 2002; p.vi). Those in rural areas who want to travel to leisure activities are often dependent on lifts. As soon as

they can drive however, they become much more mobile 'and in Storey and Brannen's (2000) study, they found that young people with jobs and cars described social lives that were as good as anyone in a more urban setting' (Gloucestershire Labour Market Information Unit, 2002; p.17). This again shows the key role of the car in enabling freedom and young people's participation in social interaction, particularly in rural areas.

McWhannell and Braunoltz (2002) observes that patterns of use of transport for leisure activities vary according to age of the young person, generally reflecting the types of leisure activities in which the different age groups participate. For younger children, leisure activities tend to constitute organised activities with friends, the main form of transport to which is parental lifts. In contrast, social activities for younger teenagers tend to either revolve around visiting friends or going into town, particularly at weekends. Such activities are constrained by availability and cost of public transport – in terms of what they do, when they do it and how they do. In particular, Sunday is a day on which young people might particularly visit their friends, but it is at this time that public transport services are particularly scarce. For older teenagers, social activities focus around going out at night with the main choices for return travel being to either take the bus/train home in the early evening or to get picked up by car or taxi later on. Often alcohol consumption is important in their decision. The report by McWhannell and Braunoltz (2002) showed that few young people use late night services because they have the perception the last train/bus would be too early for when they want and that they would have to wait ages for the next service if they missed one due to infrequent services. There was some concern for safety with girls in particular, worrying about waiting at bus stops at night and hence preferring the reassurance of a taxi or organised lift. Many felt that there should be late night services introduced, for example at times such as 1.30am or 2.30am for those leaving pubs or clubs. However, most felt that they would still use taxis since these provide a more convenient, safer door-to-door service.

5.3.2 Difficulties in accessing education
School journeys account for a quarter of all children's travel (DTLR, 1999 cited in Gloucestershire Labour Market Information Unit, 2002). 20% of these journeys are made by bus or coach (Association of Transport Coordinating Officers *et al.*, 1997 in DTLR, 1999). Research by Gloucestershire Labour Market Information Unit (2002) shows that the majority of young people travel to learning by bus or by walking. However, for the majority of young people, the preferred mode of travel was by car. The McWhannell and Braunoltz (2002) observed that even those who could take the bus often choose to walk, despite it taking longer, so that they could travel with friends and also due to complaints of the conditions of school buses. A survey by DTLR (1999) shows that for those aged 10-12, one quarter travel to school by bus. For those aged 15+, this proportion rises to almost 40%. In contrast, walking to school or college decreases with age, reflecting the increasing distances that young people have to travel to school/college.

Research by Devon County Council (1999) has shown that transport constraints act as a barrier to travelling to education and training opportunities (cited in DETR, 2000). Particular barriers faced by young people travelling to learning are the cost of transport, poor availability of transport and the location of education facilities with secondary schools specifically often being further away, particularly in rural areas (Gloucestershire Labour Market Information Unit, 2002). For those over 16, sixth form and education colleges tend to be located in main towns, which involves longer distances to travel. As a result, a study by Storey and Brannen (2000) observed that 40% of those aged 15-16 say that transport is a factor in making decisions about post-16 education. Similarly, a study by Gloucestershire Labour Market Information Unit (2002) showed that 19% of those aged 16 to 19 in Gloucestershire saw transport as a barrier to learning. A key barrier to those aged 16+ is cost of transport. Most children are entitled to concessionary fares or travel relatively short distances to school. Pupils aged 16 and under are entitled to free transport to school if it is more than three miles from home to school (two miles for those aged under 8 years old) (Social Exclusion Unit, 2003a). However, young people entering further education or training usually do not receive discounts and often travel longer distances. DETR (2000) states that 'nearly half of 16-18-year-old students say they find their transport costs hard to meet' (Callender, 1999 in SEU, 2003; p.13).

5.3.3 Difficulties in accessing employment
One quarter of all young people aged 11-16 in selected schools in England and Wales have a term-time job, the main jobs of which are delivering newspapers and babysitting (Gloucestershire Labour Market Information Unit, 2002). It is also likely that many young people engage in vacation employment outside of the school term. There is however, little research on how young people in education travel to work. When travelling to work, destination and time of day are crucial factors (McWhannell and Braunoltz, 2002). Those in urban areas tend to use public transport to get to work or college, while those in rural areas mainly travel by car. In urban areas, use of more public transport arises because there is more choice of transport services. Those in rural areas feel they have no choice but to take the car since local services either don't run from where they live, it takes too long or won't get them to work on time. For many, public transport is not perceived as an option. However, McWhannell and Braunoltz note that 'if given the choice to take public transport over using their cars, most say they would be happy to use public transport services if it was guaranteed to get them to work or college in time' (2002, p.18).

5.4 Young peoples attitudes concerning barriers to transport
Young people face several barriers to the use of public transport. They include financial constraints, poor paucity and reliability of public transport services, fears of crime and for safety, hostile treatment by staff and other transport users, poor cleanliness and comfort and a lack of publicised information about services. Here we will discuss them in detail.

5.4.1 Financial constraints

High costs and affordability of services are seen as a deterrent to young people using public transport more regularly. A survey by Lucas *et al.* (2001) observed that it was felt that the majority of help was targeted at capital (creating new services) rather than revenue expenditure (e.g. subsidised fares) and so this did not help disadvantaged groups. A survey by DTLR (1999) showed that the cost of public transport and the age at which concessionary fares were no longer available was a major criticism of public transport by young people. 'The cost of transport was identified along with the perceived poor attitude of staff as the two main reasons why young people felt unwanted and poorly served by public transport, especially the buses' (DTLR, 1999; p.5). Research by McWhannell and Braunoltz (2002) shows that those in their early teens travelling for leisure reasons tend to pay for buses with their own money. For taxis and trains however, their parents normally give them money, perhaps due to the greater cost of these modes. Those travelling to school tend to be given their fares by their parents. Older teenagers tend to pay all their travel themselves. Those who feel dependent on public transport, for any purpose, tend to be those who criticise the prices most. Younger teenagers are particularly aware of the cost and as a result, are wary of taking journeys where they need to take more than one bus because that costs more – the complexities of travel therefore are an important factor because of cost, as well as time and convenience. The cost of public transport can be particularly high if you have to change and correspondingly, it was noted that it would be useful to have tickets that cover whole journeys, across services and companies and modes, in an effort to combat this. Lucas *et al.* (2001) also noted that if activities were not provided locally, the extra cost of transport to travel to activities put them out of the price range of many young people, particularly those coming from low income groups. In terms of spending habits, transport is often low on the priority list of what young people wish to spend their money on. Many people do not have access to ready money apart from pocket money in some circumstances.

With regards to concessionary fares, the DTLR (1999) state there that 'there is no consistent age limit to qualify for a child's fare. Across local authorities, there are a variety of passes available for young people in education and training. How young people access these passes varies considerably. In some places, they have to pay a charge for their pass, whilst others are free; and some passes are well published and easily available, whilst others are poorly publicised and difficult to obtain' (DTLR, 1999, p.15 cited in Gloucestershire Labour Market Information Unit, 2002). Concessionary schemes are currently discretionary and depend upon the area and distance covered, the amount of concession granted and the period for which it is available. There are disparities between operators and authorities with regards to what is provided. Age limits for concessionary fares were of particular concern for young people, as was localised inequalities in fares (Gloucestershire Labour Market Information Unit, 2002). In Carlisle for example, young people up to the age of 16

pay a third of the adult fare (Young TransNet, 2003c) whereas in other locations many young people have to pay the full fare from the age of 14. Of those surveyed, 76% of young people wanted the age limit for the child's fare increased. Many wanted the age limit to be raised until they left full time education and/or until they were 18 or 19 years old (DTLR, 1999). Research by Storey and Brannen (2000) shows that most young people felt that it was unfair that they had to pay the full fare on public transport whilst still in full-time education and particularly because they were aware that elderly people receive concessions. Many questioned the inconsistency in that they should be treated as 'adult' paying passengers when on buses yet are not allowed to be treated as adult when buying alcohol, voting, learning to drive or in terms of pay. DETR (2000) recommends that the criteria for eligibility for concessionary tickets should be extended to cover more people, for example the young. Historically, older people tend to benefit more than younger people from schemes. However, young people do need to travel and may not be able to afford it, particularly over the age of 16. Despite this, concessions are not always available to them.

There are various problems with fares, including with operators who do not tend to view young people as a target audience because they are not seen as being a particularly profitable market. Young teenagers who go to school (12-16) are allowed half fare on buses and train and travel mainly at peak times. As a result, they are seen by operators to be taking up valuable space at peak periods when it is busy and when premium fares are charged for adults (McWhannell and Braunoltz, 2002).

Many young people also criticise the fact that they are charged adult fares despite being eligible for child fare. Often many were asked to prove their age, even when they were young enough to qualify for the fare, and they resented being asked. There was even mention of bus drivers 'conning' young people on fares by not giving change, on the assumption that they could get away with it with young people. It was felt that cheaper fares might encourage young people to use public transport more (DTLR, 1999). Rail fares were seen as particularly expensive, especially due to the loss of the 50% concession at age 16 (DfT, 2003a). Work by Lucas *et al.* (2001) uncovered complaints that the Young Person's railcard did not cover buses and also that it's cost of £20 upfront was too much for some young people. Many young people were shown to often lie about their age on buses so as to receive cheaper fares. Many even said that their parents will not take them out on public transport if they have to pay full fare for them. The overall result of high costs of fares for young people was to make young people feel that services are provided for adults and not them.

Cost of public transport is a particular issue in rural areas since often young people have no choice but to use the mode of travel. A study of young people in small towns and villages in North Warwickshire showed that one third were restricted by the cost of public transport. (DTLR, 1999). In particular, few young people use taxis in rural areas since they are costly as they are often not based locally – they are particularly expensive in evenings/night-time when young peoples' demand is likely to be greater (Storey and Brannen, 2000).

5.4.2 Paucity and unreliability

Reliability of services is a key factor in determining young people's opinions of them. Buses in particular are seen as unreliable and as not adhering to their timetables (McWhannell and Braunoltz, 2002). Research with young people and children in Merseyside (Crime Concern, 1995 cited in DTLR, 1999) showed similarities between adult attitudes and the young people. Bus travel was perceived as being 'really slow' and to have 'long winding routes'. Reliability of services was seen as important for older children and young people. They made complaints about unreliable, patchy services 'and how experiences of delays or cancellations negatively influenced their views of public transport' (DTLR, 1999; p.2).

A lack of services was also a key issue seen to affect options for young people, particularly at evenings and weekends. A survey of young people in small towns and villages in North Warwickshire showed that two thirds of the young people surveyed were restricted in using facilities by the paucity of services, especially the lack of evening buses (DTLR, 1999). In a survey by DTLR (1999), many young people criticised the irregularity of public transport services:

> 'buses are irregular and they don't run on Saturdays and Sundays when we really need them because we are isolated in the country'(boy in North Somerset school) (DTLR, 1999; p.9).

> 'there's just not enough buses at weekends and in the evenings… that's when young people really need transport to get to places' (young man at central Edinburgh youth project) (DTLR, 1999; p.9).

Comments in DfT (2003a) made by young people involved in transport schemes reinforce these ideas:

> 'My bus service runs from a major town but it stops at 5 o'clock' (DfT, 2003a; p.6).

A lack or infrequency of services means that often activities of young people, in terms of what they do and when, are dictated by the availability of services. Times and frequency of services therefore has a clear influence on lifestyle. When services are scarce, there are also fears of getting 'stranded' if one misses the only service of the day. (Storey and Brannen, 2000).

5.4.3 Fears of crime and for safety

Research by DTLR (1999) shows that many young people had some personal security fears about using public transport, predominantly concerning the threat of other passengers, particularly at night. The lack of staff, presence of drunks, 'weirdos' and tramps and other people's anti-social behaviour were some issues of concern. McWhannell and Braunoltz (2002) note that young people travelling alone often feel self-conscious and are more aware of other passengers. They commented that girls tend to be more wary than boys, especially at night. It was felt that perhaps forbidding drunken people to travel on public transport or providing bus conductors at night could alleviate these issues to some extent. Public transport is generally seen as a

more hostile, unsafe environment than the car (Lucas et al., 2001). A survey of young people in small towns and villages in North Warwickshire showed that nearly 50% of young women and one fifth of men felt restricted due to crime/personal safety fears, for example when walking home from a bus stop at night (DTLR, 1999).

Young people can themselves be the cause of anti-social behaviour and crime. Anti-social behaviour involving young people is a major cause of concern on public transport, for example through young people intimidating others, graffiti, rowdiness (especially a problem on school services), criminal damage, vandalism, fighting, assaults and general unacceptable behaviour (DTLR, 1999). However, despite this, it is important to remember also that 'children and young people can be victims of crime and anti-social behaviour on public transport and not only the perpetrators of crime, nuisance and vandalism' (DTLR, 1999; p.9).

There are some concerns for road safety. A report by Lucas et al. (2001) showed that many children who cycled around their area did not feel safe on bicycles, due to car traffic.

5.4.4 Hostile treatment

Treatment by both staff and other users was cited as a significant problem for young people on public transport. Research by DTLR (1999) showed that many young people felt a level of animosity towards bus drivers whom they felt were impatient, hostile and treated young people poorly. A common specific complaint was that buses did not stop for young people, especially if they were in a group. Many felt that transport staff and other service users on a whole have a preconceived attitude that all young people are the same, assuming they are going to cause trouble and seeing them as nothing but a nuisance. Storey and Brannen (2000) note that many feel pushed out by other passengers stating that they were often glared at for taking up space. It was felt that there was an element of voluntary segregation which took place, with older people sitting at the front and younger people congregating near the back of buses. This however, does not work when buses are overcrowded. Young people in urban areas were generally more negative about the perceptions of staff than those in rural areas (DTLR, 1999). In terms of being listened to at a more broad level, a study by Jones et al. (2000) notes that young people feel that adults do generally not respond to young people's needs for changes in local environments.

5.4.5 Cleanliness and comfort

Cleanliness and comfort of public transport was a key criticism raised by young people, similarly to adult passengers (DTLR, 1999). Criticisms were made as to the age and condition of vehicles. In particular, many young people felt that, as a group, it was often them that had to make do with the old, dirty, vandalised buses that were used as school buses:

> 'Why is it that we get the dirty, clapped out, graffiti-covered buses?' (DfT, 2003a; p.6).

Since school runs tend to be non-profit making, operators tend to use older buses which have already 'paid their way' for economic reasons. McWhannell and Braunoltz (2002) however, note severe implications of this: by using dirty, old buses the school children see the buses at their worst and this is likely an image that stays in their minds of public transport. Given the extent to which people travel to school by bus (as noted previously), this image is reinforced on a daily basis. This image is likely to enforce the young people's negative attitudes and 'puts them off' public transport. McWhannell and Braunoltz (2002) comment that if there was an area, therefore, that might help change young people's attitudes, it could be in trips to school.

School buses overall, are not viewed favourably by young people. Instead, they are perceived as being noisy, overcrowded and an environment in which anti-social behaviour is rife, which puts off both other travellers and young people (McWhannell and Braunoltz, 2002). Perceptions of the school bus varied between those in urban and rural areas. In urban areas views were more negative. Many children in urban areas have to travel to school on regular route buses with the commuters – this suits neither party. Often such buses are crowded and it was felt that there were not enough buses for the school children in urban areas. Those with provided school buses were generally happier about it. American style school buses were mentioned frequently as a potential solution in that they would provide a bus solely for school pupils that did not have to be shared with the public. In urban areas, the American style school bus was seen as being a particularly good idea in terms of reliability and the fact that it could provide a near door-to-door service. If the bus was only being used for school runs then it would turn up on time, unlike some regular route buses. The Department for Transport (2003b) has conducted research looking at the evaluation of pilot American-style, yellow bus schemes implemented in the UK. The research indicates that initial reactions, from parents, schools and students, towards the yellow bus schemes were favourable. In particular, several key attributes of the American style buses were observed by both parents and young people:

- Provision of a pick up close to home and drop off close to school, providing an almost door-to-door service. For young people, this was seen as advantageous in terms of convenience whereas for the parents the predominant appeal was personal and road safety.
- The use of the buses solely by young people was seen as beneficial to students in terms of reducing antagonism between young people and other bus users. For parents, this was also seen as beneficial for personal security.
- Allocation of a specific driver to a specific bus would breed familiarity and promote personal safety and potentially improve behaviour on the buses.
- The prohibition of standing and guarantee of a seat was seen as a key attribute. However, the allocation of a specific seat was not welcomed by all students.
- Provision of CCTV was seen as beneficial by operators, schools and students in order to improve behaviour on the buses and reduce bullying.

The research showed that overall, the implementation of a 'yellow bus package' of measures can promote modal shift away from cars, improve perceptions of school transport and improve behaviour on buses. There is a risk however, that the buses may not only shift people from car use but that they may also result in a reduction in the number of young people choosing walking and cycling as a mode to travel to school. Some criticisms of the colour were also recorded, particularly by secondary school students and predominantly as a result of issues of image and embarrassment.

Provision of the school buses has the potential to transfer young people from existing local bus services, to the yellow bus. In some locations, this might be particularly useful in allowing an increase in capacity on local bus services for other users, often resulting in an improved transport experience for other public transport users. Overall, the study showed that the yellow buses were seen as safer than other buses, both by parents and young people, particularly where they replaced double-decker buses on which bullying and vandalism might be a particular problem. Seat belts were viewed as important but were found generally not to be used in practice. In terms of affordability, opinions varied. In several locations cost was seen by drivers, parents and young people as a deterrent to the use of the yellow buses, particularly where they were often seen to be more expensive than local buses.

Overall, the research indicated that the success of yellow bus schemes 'is dependent upon the locality introduced, the objectives of vehicles/services, the careful routing of services and the relationship with the school' (DFT, 2003b; p.7). It is also suggested that when providing yellow school bus schemes, different elements are provided for primary school and secondary schools, in recognition of their differing needs.

5.4.6 Lack of information

Poor publicity, for example with regards to bus timetables and services, especially for young people in non-using households, means that many young people are uninformed as to when local services run. Even frequent young users reported problems with finding out when and where services ran (Storey and Brannen, 2000). However, research by the McWhannell and Braunoltz, (2002) showed that many young people felt that often it is not worth knowing timetable times because the services never turn up on time anyway. Lack of information is likely to be a greater problem in rural areas. In urban areas, people tend to assume that if there is not a bus at the time when there should be, then one will come in the next few minutes. In contrast, in rural areas people rely on bus timetables to be accurate because the buses tend to be less frequent and they might have travelled further to get to the bus stop (McWhannell and Braunoltz, 2002). Transport can, in some cases, provide freedom and access and numerous opportunities to young people. However, this is only the case if young people are familiar with what is provided. Many young people are often unaware of what is available and this limits their opportunities (DETR, 2000).

5.4.7 Summary of young peoples attitudes towards barriers to travel

Overall, concerns raised in relation to public transport and discussed by young people appear similar to the concerns of adults with key criticism concerning availability, frequency, reliability and comfort. In contrast to adults, however, young people expressed much greater concerns about the cost of travel, the attitudes of transport staff, and the availability of evening, late night and weekend services (DTLR, 1999). Other restrictions include parental restrictions and image (Davis, 2001).

Although many of the attitudes to public transport were negative, there were some positive views expressed. Buses were seen as a good form of transport in the sense that they carry lots of people and are more environmentally friendly than cars (Lucas *et al.*, 2001). Buses were also sometimes viewed as positive in terms of cost, convenience (no need to find a parking space) and also in allowing freedom and independence for young people (McWhannell and Braunoltz, 2002). McWhannell and Braunoltz (2002) suggest that such positive attributes could be used in marketing campaigns to target young people and possibly their parents. Although there was general dissatisfaction with regularity of services in some areas, regular bus users did mention some improvements such as additional Sunday and evening services. Many non-users were unaware of this however, highlighting the issue of poor publicised information (Storey and Brannen, 2000).

5.5 Perceptions and management of risk

A study by Jones *et al.* (2000) looks at the views and experiences of young people in the English Midlands with regards to travel, access and independent mobility in three different areas of high, medium and low population density. The study examines the way in which young people perceive and manage risk in relation to transport, travel and the local environment/location. It looked at variations across the three locations and the differences between young people's views about their local areas and how they managed risk in their respective localities. In particular, it seeks to explore the ways in which young people respond to parental fears concerning safety. The results show that the young people's perceptions of levels of safety, access, traffic danger and noise varied significantly between the three locations.

The perceptions of risk by the young people varied throughout the three locations. In the urban, high-density area, young people were less likely to travel unaccompanied, even in their local areas and hence had less independent mobility and played less out-of-school sports. In each location and related to unaccompanied travel after dark, boys had more freedom than girls. In the high density area in Birmingham, even the young people's local areas were seen as noisy, dirty and dangerous due to busy traffic and travelling beyond the local area was seen as dangerous. In contrast, in the medium and low-density locations, young people were more demanding of independent access. Unsurprisingly, suburban and rural areas were seen as safer, quieter and friendlier although they were also described as

'boring', more remote and further from their friends. Walking was the preferred mode of travel although this was normally accompanied - predominantly by peers. In urban areas, safety was the main reason given for accompanied walking. Girls in particular were less likely to travel alone, especially after dark. Low levels of cycle use in the inner-city area were linked to the perceived danger of pollution, traffic and theft. This was not perceived as a major issue in medium and low density areas and hence here, cycling was more common.

Parents tend to be deemed responsible for assessing and managing transport risk of young people. However, young people do access their local and wider environment for school and leisure and social activities and hence they do manage the risk. In the survey, management and minimisation of risk was found to occur on two levels: both through parental attempts to minimise risk, for example through the setting of curfews, and also through self-imposed attempts of young people themselves to maximise safety whilst minimising loss of independence. It is important for young people to be able to negotiate the external environment, yet many are constrained in their local areas.

The young people recognised the need to be cautious when outside their home. Part of their way of solving this and minimising any risk in this situation was to gather in large mixed groups. Groups were seen as a key resource in minimising danger, rather than a 'parentally approved system for keeping safe' (p.321). In different locations, the group role took on different meanings: in inner-city Birmingham, it was seen as a way of providing protection from physical assault whereas in lower-density areas groups were more casual and socially focused. Some tensions were noticeable between parents' efforts to ensure the children's safety through accompanied travel and setting designated routes and times and the young people's wish to have independent mobility and undertake activities outside their homes. To try and deal with their parents' fears for safety yet maintain their independence, young people, and especially girls, were shown to also develop strategies involving the use of evasion, collusion, creating trust and lying.

Many of the young people had ideas to make the environment safer but felt that they were not listened to by adults or policymakers. In all locations, the young people had ideas to make their local environments safer and more accessible although there were significant differences between urban and less urban areas. Different priorities for change were raised in the different locations, reflecting the different types of environment found there and reflecting the young peoples' differing perceptions of danger from travel, traffic and strangers. In Birmingham, traffic danger was a major concern and many young people called for cycle paths, pedestrian areas and controls over traffic for example. In the Northampton and Kettering district, there was less concern about traffic and the lack of transport was a much greater issue, as was the high cost of bus and train fares. The majority of their recommendations focused on allowing youngsters to be safe whilst being more active.

5.6 The role of educational intervention in changing attitudes

The research project 'Catching Them Young' (Pilling and Murray, 1998) examined the extent to which a short term intensive educational intervention process could lead to a change in young people's attitudes. Intervention focused on young people aged between 12 and 23, living in Greater Manchester. The report looked at the transport experiences of young people, how such experiences effect the way the choices of travel mode made by young people and what can be instigated to help change young people's attitudes to travel. It looks at how young people make decisions about the ways in which they travel and the way they prioritise different factors when undertaking different types of journey, as related to Ajzen and Fishbein's Theory of Planned Behaviour (Ajzen, 1988 cited in Pilling and Murray, 1998).

For the survey, Pilling and Murray (1998) developed educational and awareness-raising materials and measured the effect of this intervention on attitudinal change, interviewing both those who had undertaken the intervention, as well as the youth workers who had facilitated it. Intervention included visual arts and focus discussion groups. Focus groups of young people in informal settings such as youth clubs were seen as the most appropriate forum for the educational intervention because it was believed that many young people form their attitudes in interaction with their peers. Stewart and Shamdasani note that 'it is the characteristics of group members relative to one another and not merely individual characteristics that determine group behaviour and performance' (cited in Pilling and Murray, 1998, p.4). The groups talked about their travel experiences, where they went, why, how often and by what mode and indicated their perceptions of these different modes.

The results of the research showed that a number of factors affect young people's decisions about different modes of travel. Certain groups of young people, depending on gender and age, were shown to be more susceptible to intervention in terms of it influencing their attitudes. Older people were shown to be more resistant to change, especially once they are established car drivers/users. Young males were also shown to be particularly susceptible to attitudinal change, although conversely they may also be susceptible to reversing some of their opinions quickly as well. Other findings showed that after intervention, attitudes to buses did not change. For many young people there is an inability to change many attitudes towards buses. Despite some positive feelings about using buses, in terms of convenience, cheapness and ability for friends to travel together, young people's experiences of using buses are mainly negative. As a result, intervention clearly has limits as people's everyday experiences do not allow them to view a mode in a more positive light: 'for many young people it was just too implausible to find a means of creating a positive message about buses' (Pilling and Murray, 1998; p.29). However, the research showed that modes of cycling, trains and walking were viewed more positively following intervention. Where views are more flexible, it appeared that

attitude change becomes more possible. Attitudes towards trains, trams and cycling appear more susceptible to change for two reasons: firstly, they are used less and young people's experiences are not so fixed with them and secondly, their everyday experiences of these modes do not contradict efforts to promote their use. Following intervention, young people were shown to also afford different priority to factors determining their travel decisions. Cost was rated more highly after intervention and image became less significant.

Overall, the results of the project suggest that it is possible to alter young people's attitudes through short-term educational intervention. However, the young people themselves were not sure if actually, the intervention had helped alter their attitudes. Several thought that they would probably forget what they had learnt within a week. The research showed that 'attitudinal change is most effective if it involves the development of a series of user-friendly educational resources, an intensive process, close collaboration with providers, (for example, youth service, schools/colleges, employment providers), and consultation with young people, the end users' (p.iv).

6 Solutions recommended by researchers and young people

Throughout the reviewed literature, there were several 'solutions' suggested as a way in which to reduce the barriers faced by young people from transport. Solutions were recommended both by researchers and by young people themselves as a result of surveys carried out.

6.1 Solutions recommended by researchers

The NYA (2003) describes several of the main issues faced by young people, offering solutions that might be introduced to address and alleviate such difficulties. The Agency notes that there is an issue of young people paying adult fares given that there are varying transport company policies on the age at which a person must pay adult fare. It highlights the need for service providers to ensure the access of services by all members of society through adequate transport provision and also the importance of looking at the location of key services and how people access them in planning decisions. In response to this, it was suggested that mobile youth provision, for example in the form of mobile youth centres, to reach youths in outlying areas, might reduce isolation and improve their access to key services.

Cross in Enoch (1999) suggests the introduction of solutions specifically targeted at the main forms of exclusion:

- *Spatial exclusion:* solutions include establishing services in isolated rural and suburban areas under the Rural Bus Grant and Rural Bus Challenge.

- *Temporal exclusion:* solutions include the introduction of improved Sunday, early morning and late night services.

- *Personal exclusion:* solutions include the provision of specialist, innovative services such as dial-a-ride, special car schemes and infrastructural changes for disabled peoples.

- *Fiscal exclusion:* solutions include ensuring the provision of concessionary fares, low fares for young people, travelcards, inter-availability of tickets and restrictions on fare increases.

Regarding targeting financial issues, the Social Exclusion Unit (2003a) 'Making the Connections: Final Report on Transport and Social Exclusion' suggests learner support funds to help students overcome individual financial barriers to participating in learning, in which students receive money from their college/school according to their family income and their needs (e.g. transport). Currently, local authorities cannot force operators to provide discounts to groups other than the elderly and disabled people. In some parts of the country, concessions are available on a voluntary basis arranged by operators and the authority, hence there are local disparities in their introduction. Applying a general standard for their introduction and who they cover might aid young people. Hine and Mitchell (2001) also note the importance of targeted subsidies through the provision of concessionary fares and budget passes for all school children.

Blowers (1978) suggests four key methods through which to improve mobility:

- Concessionary fares, policies and subsidies, including bus passes and contract vehicles for school children, directed towards specific groups and individuals so as to improve mobility – subsidies for individuals.

- Innovation and adaptations to existing conventional bus services such as commuter buses; 'drop-me-off' services where the route is determined by the passengers' destinations; 'nightrider' late evening buses.

- Better use of unconventional services such as post buses; community buses; dial-a-ride; car sharing; and taxi and car hire schemes.

- Providing minimum standards of mobility service levels.

Focusing particularly on school travel, DfT (2003a) promotes school travel plans as a way to reduce car journeys to school and improve road safety. These are often combined with mode specific plans such as cycling travel plans, which seek to promote cycling to school. In some schools, young people have played key roles in helping design and implement the plans. DfT (2003a) also recommends innovative yellow bus schemes which have pick-ups near the home, a seat for every child and seatbelts. This scheme is believed to reduce car journeys to school, reduce pollution, reduce congestion and reduce accidents. Similarly, McWhannell and Braunoltz (2002) promote the idea of the introduction of the American style school bus. The American style bus would be used wholly for school children, therefore separating schoolchildren and commuters and potentially reducing trouble. The buses could provide a 'door-to-door' service, picking children up at their doorstep and returning them there.

McWhannell and Braunoltz (2002) highlight the importance of conducting further research into influences affecting young people's travel behaviour. As touched upon already in this review, young people tend to follow their parents' behaviour patterns and are influenced by their attitudes and opinions. Research looking at the parents of young people could be valuable, especially those in urban areas who mostly have access to all the main modes of transport. Furthermore, if young people are to be encouraged to travel on public transport, there is a need to improve the image of public transport in young people's minds, for example by providing reliable services and maintaining them better. Image is crucial. Young people use services that are seen as 'popular' and both reliability and recommendation, by parents or by peers, can make a service popular.

6.2 Solutions suggested by young people

In a study by McWhannell and Braunoltz (2002) young people were asked to come up with suggestions for improving transport provision for young people in Scotland. Some common ones were:

- Improve the reliability of services through time-tabling of buses and the provision of real-time information for buses.

- Provide music on buses, for example by tuning into the local radio station. Since some people would undoubtedly be against this and would not want to listen to music, it was suggested that music could just be provided on the upper deck. Music (and videos) could also be provided on trains, in a similar fashion to the way in which one smoking carriage is provided.

- Bring back bus conductors to supervise behaviour, not just collect tickets.

- Increase frequency of services on Sundays and late at night.

- Lower cost tickets.

- Introduce ID cards that can be used on more than one bus provider.

- Improve capacity of services at peak times, for example by replacing single decker buses with double deckers.

- Introduce American style school buses.

- Improve the upkeep of buses and in particular, improve cleanliness.

- Introduce fast track buses on popular routes.

- Install trams and Underground services in city centres.

- Modernise all buses and trains.

A survey by DTLR (1999) asked young people what would encourage them to use public transport. The results were as follows:

- One third of respondents said that cheaper fares and concessionary travel would act as an incentive. Lower fares were more likely to be suggested by older young people than children.

- One fifth suggested that more friendly or polite staff could make a difference.

- Fifteen percent of those surveyed stated that improved safety and security when travelling would encourage them. In particular, they made specific suggestions such as increased installation of CCTV; more control over people travelling on the buses; no drinking or drugs permitted; forbid bullies and drunks to travel on buses; 'have a section on the bus just for children'; improved lighting at bus stops; rid of graffiti; increased comfort in travelling with comfortable seats, air conditioning, cleanliness, 'no smells'; windows easier to open, wider aisles, better waiting rooms and better seats.

Similarly, the Young TransNet website (2003a), a young student-based resource, asked users to choose three key options that they thought would improve public transport. The top three choices, based on a percentage of how many students chose that option, were:

- A bus stop closer to home 38%.
- Buses running more often 30%.
- Cheaper fares 43%.

Several young people suggested the improvement of the availability and provision of information on transport services. A survey by Storey and Brannen (cited in NYA, 2003) showed that young people recommended a national bus enquiry system based on the national rail enquiries model and also bus timetables being delivered to households in rural areas.

In a report by Lucas *et al.* (2001), for improvements to transport the children suggested ideas to reduce traffic congestion and encourage the use of public transport and environmentally friendly modes such as cycling. They wanted to see more trams, cycle and bus lanes, zebra crossings, car-sharing and cheaper taxis and buses. Similarly, in Davis (2001), young people suggested potential changes that could be made to their local areas to make it easier get around, including cyclist and pedestrian facilities. Often such suggestions were made with specific locations in mind.

Young people also highlighted the need for adults to listen to their opinions and allow them to play a role in discussion:

> 'If you want to know more, you need a dialogue, not just a questionnaire' (youth worker) (Pilling and Murray, 1998; p.26).

> 'Listen to young people. We don't need sympathy, we need support' (Paul, 18, Yorkshire) (Mullins *et al.*, 2001; p.5).

7 Case studies of schemes to aid young people

Identifying good practice methods is an invaluable method through which we can share practical knowledge and experience, critically reflect and highlight effective methods that have been introduced in order to aid young people with regards to transport. Providing examples of successful case studies allows us to learn from the strategies of others and re-use knowledge to raise performance as a whole. The case studies below reflect examples of successful schemes implemented by local authorities, transport operators and youth services in order to aid young people use transport.

7.1 'Life in the Bus Lane': Devon County Council

The 'Life in the Bus Lane', run by Devon County Council, First Red Bus, North Devon College and Bideford and Ilfracombe Colleges, won a Government grant to improve transport in the North Devon area. The project promotes reduced car-dependency through the provision of financial support to students and improved rural bus services. The project provides bus travel discounts and access to retail discounts for young people who join a bus travel club by buying a 'Smartcard'. In 1999, a student had to pay £200 per year for travel to and from college (one round trip). If they wanted to travel outside these times, they had to pay to use public services, if there were any. Following the introduction of the Smartcard in September 2000, student travel has been reduced to £100 per year and travel permitted at any time. The card also provides half-price travel all day at weekends and during holidays (Devon County Council, undated).

The ability to use the card for discounted costs for travel outside of school times is important in providing greater freedom for people to engage in social and leisure activities beyond the school boundaries. In particular, providing cheaper fares at weekends and during holiday periods, times when young people are likely to desire to travel more during their free time, enables young people to conduct social lives without the need to rely on parental forms of transport during these times.

7.2 'Wheels to Work': Herefordshire and Shropshire Community Councils

Young people often suffer a lack of suitable transport options, yet still have the need to reach a range of destinations. Transport alternatives have been provided by charitable organisations established by Herefordshire and Shropshire Community Councils to provide young people living in remote rural areas with transport opportunities, giving them access to further education and training. The charities aim to develop rural communities and 'Wheels to Work' operates in south Shropshire and north Herefordshire. The scheme covers loans of motorcycles, subsidised driving lessons and financing for car repairs and insurance.

16-25 year olds in rural areas are offered the use of a scooter or motorcycle, together with lessons in riding and maintenance. After their training/education, participants are given 6 months to save up and buy a motorbike/car to use afterwards. Subsidised driving lessons are also provided for non-drivers who have access to a car. Financing for car repairs is aimed at less well-off car drivers to help pay for repairs or insurance.

Shropshire Community Council describes the scheme as a success, stating that that 'Wheels to Work has served around 100 carefully targeted disadvantaged young

people' and has 'helped many of them to "get on the first rung of the ladder"' (Enoch, 1999; p.7).

The 'Wheels to Work' scheme helps young people in rural areas to overcome transport barriers to access education, training and employment opportunities by providing them with transport opportunities. A key element of the scheme is its financial support since cost of transport is, as we have seen, a major barrier to transport for young people.

7.3 'Kids for a Penny': Trent Buses

As part of a Bus Quality Partnership initiative, Trent Buses developed 'Kids for a Penny', a scheme in which children could travel on buses for just a penny, throughout the weekend and off-peak during the week. The scheme has not affected company profits, as adults travelling more often have offset the loss in revenue from children (SEU, 2003).

The 'Kids for a Penny' scheme is important in allowing young people to travel with greater freedom outside of school time, due to cheaper fares. In particular, providing cheaper fares at weekends enables young people to conduct social lives without the need to rely on parental forms of transport during these times and without the need to worry about cost. Having such low fares is also likely to promote parents to travel with their children, as a family. Often parents do not travel or engage in activities with their children that require travel by public transport because they find it too expensive to pay for their travel.

7.4 'Youth on the Move': Merseytravel

Since 1996, Merseytravel (Merseyside PTE) has run a programme of initiatives under the 'Youth on the Move' scheme, aiming to promote young people's use of public transport and to prevent the misuse of public transport. The initiatives aim to engage with children and young people so as to improve their behaviour when using public transport and to ensure that young people, 'as a market of the future', are encouraged to retain their use of public transport. The project is described very much as a 'learning experience' to 'explore and identify what works' (DTLR, 1999; p.2). Consultations have shown that the project has had a beneficial impact on the young people participating (DTLR, 1999).

Unlike many of the other schemes detailed thus far, 'Youth on the Move' highlights the importance of education in improving young people's behaviour on transport and encouraging them to use public transport. It is a particularly useful case study because it emphasises the way in which working with and listening to young people, about their needs, perceptions and behaviour is crucial.

7.5 'Train taxis': Holland

There is a system of 'train taxis' in Holland which aims to provide for people who live in rural areas where there is no other form of public transport. The taxi services collect people from the train station and takes take them to rural areas within a 5 mile radius. Fares are relatively low. (Young TransNet, 2003c).

Train taxis are a particularly useful strategy for rural areas where public transport is virtually absent. Their ability to provide a door-to-door service is important in perhaps minimising risk to personal security and of crime, two key concerns of young people and indeed, their parents.

7.6 'American-Style Yellow Bus Schemes'

As discussed earlier in the review, a number of local education authorities, including West Sussex, Staffordshire and Cheshire, have established American style school bus pilot schemes. Local authorities, local education authorities and Public Transport Executives have also launched an initiative from 'First' in which a package of measures involving an American school bus has been introduced so as to improve quality and image of school transport and encourage modal shift from car use to bus use. Research by the Department for Transport (2003b) has shown that the yellow bus pilot schemes have been broadly successful in terms of modal shift, reactions to the buses and advantages perceived by parents, schools and young people.

However, DfT (2003b) does note that there are several barriers to the expansion of yellow bus schemes, particularly in terms of impact upon the viability of local bus networks, driver availability, costs of expansion and driver training, concerns for congestion and safety at school entrances, lack of co-ordinated school times and costs of operating yellow buses in comparison with daily rates of existing school transport vehicles.

7.7 Dorset Action for Rural Transport (DART): Dorset County Council

Dorset County Council recognises that social exclusion through inadequate means of transport is a significant problem in rural areas and has introduced policies to tackle this, including DART (Dorset Action for Rural Transport). DART focuses particularly on the transport needs of those aged 16-25 who have problems accessing facilities due to lack of transport and also particularly due to the removal of County Council support for transport provision for those over 16 years of age. The scheme also encourages active involvement of young people in consultations about local transport plans. (Thirlwall, 1999).

Specific measures include:

- Lift-sharing schemes and organised taxi sharing.
- Community transport to improve access to youth clubs and leisure facilities.
- Short term subsidy of transport costs.
- Subsidised driving lessons.
- Moped and cycle lease schemes (Thirlwall, 1999).

The Blackmore Vale Scooter scheme provides young people with a moped for 6 months and provides support to pay for tax, insurance, training and clothing. The DART scheme provides support and guidance and grants for those on the scheme and helps them plan for the future (Gloucestershire Labour Market Information Unit, 2002).

Again, this scheme is important in highlighting that young people can, and should, be consulted with regards to local transport issues. It focuses very much on the local area in terms of identifying local 'gaps' in provision and providing community based schemes through which to fill these.

7.8 Connexions

Connexions is the Government's guidance service for young people aged 13-19. Connexions brings together the services and support which young people need. All young people aged 16-19 are entitled to have a Connexions card, a smartcard which entitles them to a range of discounts, including local transport and aimed at promoting learning (Connexions, 2003).

Unlike many of the local schemes detailed so far, the Connexions scheme provides an example of an encompassing scheme aiming to help all young people. The provision of the discount card for those aged 16-19 is particularly relevant in that, as we have seen, it is at this age that many young people find themselves no longer eligible for concessionary fares, despite often needing them due to higher costs of transport to learning.

7.9 Concessionary fares: Derbyshire

In Derbyshire, young people aged up to 14 travelling on Stagecoach (the main school service provider) pay two thirds of the adult fare (half fare on services subsidised by the County Council). At the age of 14, young people are given a travel pass from their school which entitles them to half fare until they are 18 provided they are in full time education. This pass can be used on buses *and* trains and outside Derbyshire in neighbouring counties on certain routes. Young people can travel to Manchester, Sheffield, and Leeds and locally for half fare by train or bus. (Young TransNet, 2003c).

The more 'unique' element of the Derbyshire Stagecoach scheme is that it provides cheaper fares across modes of transport instead of focusing on one mode such as the bus. Furthermore, it enables travel outside Derbyshire. This is important given that, as we have seen, young people criticised the fact that cost of public transport can be particularly high if you have to change and noted that it would be useful to have tickets that cover whole journeys, across services and companies and modes. It is also valuable in providing financial help to those aged 14 plus, an age at which independent travel becomes more desirable and at which increasing numbers of young people begin to travel more.

8 Engaging young people in decision-making processes

The United Nations Convention on the Rights of a Child (1990) is an international agreement setting out 54 articles identifying principles and standards for the treatment of children (child being defined as every human being under 18 years of age) (Adams and Ingham, 1998). Article 12 of the Convention states that:

> *'The child has the right to express an opinion, and to have that opinion taken into account, in any matter or procedure affecting the child, in accordance with his or her maturity'* (Article 12, United Nations Convention on the Rights of a Child, 1990 cited in Children and Young People's Unit, 2003).

Davis (2001) observes that young people are commonly excluded from key, contemporary discussions, such as those concerning transport, the environment and planning. Planning decisions affect everyone, including young people. However, young people are often not consulted accordingly and their needs rarely addressed in decisions (Adams and Ingham, 1998). In 'Involving Children and Young People: Action Plan 2003-2004', DfT (2003a) notes that young people's views and perceptions on travel are predominantly overlooked and marginalised. This is despite the fact that young people are a key target audience for 'current and future patronage' (p.7) and that everyday, young people undertake decision making and problem solving about transport, influenced by their own personal experiences, peer influences and the experiences of others (Davis, 2001). Young people are often constrained in what they can do, both through chosen constraints, (young people do not feel comfortable doing something), and forced constraints, (they are not allowed to) (Davis, 2001). Davis (2001) remarks that values are traditionally adult-centred and lead to the creation of barriers which undermine young people's independence, mobility and quality of life. The prevailing discourse is one in which young people are 'seen as objects to be fitted in to the adult constructed world' (Davis, 2001; p.191). Many young people feel they have little control over their lives (Adams and Ingham, 1998).

Although young people are currently often an 'unheard voice in planning decisions', there has been an increasing recognition of the need to involve and converse with the communities and users that are affected by decisions - including young people (Adams and Ingham, 1998). Jones *et al.* say that there is a need to see young people as a 'rich resource' in policy making and decision making, rather than as nuisances. Wade *et al.* (2003) note the need to increase the level of consultation with socially excluded groups such as young people. They describe the need to involve young people in planning and consultation processes so as to ensure their views are listened to by policy makers and to respond to their needs. They suggest methods, for example youth work projects and school initiatives, through which to do this. Adams and Ingham (1998) explore the theory and practice of child participation and highlight the need to understand the relationships between people and place; the social and the physical environment, and how this relationship can impact upon quality of life. In particular, they emphasise the need to consider children's rights and expectations in planning and to encourage them to play an active, rather than passive, role in shaping decisions and processes that affect their lives.

DfT (2003a) aims to increase their understanding of the differing transport needs and requirements of young people in urban and rural locations and to involve young people within the decision making and development process. The engagement of young people within policy making is crucial given that young people's perceptions, experiences, values and needs of their environment differ to those of adults (Adams and Ingham, 1998). DfT states that 'we all need access to transport and to the goods and services it delivers… [and] if we are going to succeed in meeting our aim of transport that works for everyone we need to start from understanding what people think and what they want…' (DfT, 2003a; p.4). Like adults, young people have 'first-hand physical, social and emotional experience' which should be taken into account in decision making and used to understand how transport impacts upon the lives of *everyone* in society (Adams and Ingham, 1998; p.5). Even young people themselves are not a homogenous group and have different individual concerns and perspectives defined, for example, by age (child versus teenager) and location (urban versus rural) (Adams and Ingham, 1998).

These sentiments are echoed by many youth organisations designed to promote the active involvement of young people in decision making. The National Children's Bureau (NCB) works within the UN Convention of the Rights of a Child and promotes the active participation of children and young people in all matters that affect them. The NYA and Local Government Association report 'Hear by Right' (Wade *et al.*, 2001) also aims to promote young people's voice and influence in society. It states 'there is a real opportunity for transport companies and services for young people, to work together to reduce the social exclusion' (p.3). It calls attention to the fact that young people are active members of the community well before they become adults and are affected by their environment, and hence corresponding decisions concerning their environment, as much as adults (Wade *et al.*, 2001). Similarly, Connexions (undated) stresses the importance of active involvement of young people in ensuring that those people who have stake in a service are listened to. In this context, Hart (1992) describes participation as 'the process of sharing decisions which affect one's life and the life of the community in which one lives' (Hart 1992 in Adams and Ingham, 1998, p.29).

Play-Train (1995), an independent training and development agency for play work, identifies several key needs:

- 'The child's right to be consulted and to have their views taken into account.
- The need to understand the child's wants and needs.
- The need to make provision more responsive to users.
- The need for children to participate in a wider society.
- The need for democracy'.

(cited in Adams and Ingham, 1998; p.27-28)

8.1 Working with young people

Often, outsiders find going into schools and working with young people difficult, due to limited experience in this field. They often have unrealistic expectations of young people's knowledge and enthusiasm and use language that young people cannot understand. In terms of resources available for young people, it is useful for young people to learn to use secondary sources of information and to learn how to access information. Working with young people and using a wide variety of resources, such as maps, photographs, leaflets, studies, records and online information, as well as a wide variety of techniques, such as focus groups, discussions, interviewing and creative and artistic design, enables young people to be introduced to different resources and creative consultation processes. For professionals working with young people, there is a need for a clear focus on what information needs to be collected, ensuring that the information provides the necessary detail, making sure the method of investigation is appropriate and ensuring that it does help young people to explore the issues, avoiding doing all of the work for the children. This will promote active learning and encourage young people to consider the issues themselves, without over-prompting.

There are several major benefits of promoting the involvement of young people: these arise in the form of both benefits for the decisions-makers and also benefits for the young people engaged in discussion.

Benefits for decision-makers:

- We can learn more about young peoples' changing needs, demands and attitudes (Connexions; Wade *et al.*, 2001).
- We can identify key barriers that young people face in accessing services and opportunities (Connexions; Wade *et al.*, 2001).
- We can distinguish what young people perceive as 'quality' in terms of service provision (Wade *et al.*, 2001).
- We can find out which services young people use, if such services are attractive to them and, if not, why not (Connexions; Wade *et al.*, 2001).
- We can identify the main success factors in attracting young people (Wade *et al.*, 2001).

Benefits for young people:

- Consultation allows 'service users' to become 'service shapers' who are 'actively involved in the planning, delivery, monitoring and evaluation of the service' (Connexions, undated; p.4).
- Participation in consultation matters allows the development of personal and social skills and active citizenship of young people (Connexions; DfT, 2003a).
- Discussion can encourage young people to 'understand the links between their personal lives and the wider issues of change' (Adams and Ingham; 1998; p.9).

However, Adams and Ingham (1998), outline several barriers to young people's participation:

- Young people are often seen as a problem rather than a source of ideas.

- Whilst there is recognition that children should ideally be consulted in theory, this is often not followed through into practice.
- There is an entrenched idea that there are too many obstacles to participation.
- Often, participation is not seen to be appropriate or beneficial.

Not only should consultation be recognised as important, but also participation, with emphasis placed on feedback and allowing young people recognition for their ideas (Adams and Ingham, 1998). There is significant scope for young people to participate in both the consultation process and the design process of planning (Adams and Ingham, 1998). Local Agenda 21 urges government to promote the participation of young people at all levels, local, regional and national (Adams and Ingham, 1998). Article 12 is a UK-based group, run by young people under the age of 18. The group's work concentrates on Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of a Child which expresses the right of young people to be taken seriously and to express their opinions (Young TransNet, 2003).

> *'They need to give more of a voice to young people and for them to be listened to' (Andy, 17, East Sussex)* (Mullins *et al.*, 2001, p.50).

9 Social identity theory

Social Identity Theory was developed in 1979, by Henri Tajfel and John Murray, to explain what happens to an individual's self perception once they become a member of a group (Australian National University, 2001). It emphasises the importance of membership of a group on an individual's behaviour (Tajfel, 1981) and highlights the importance of how an individual behaves in their social context, as well as just individual psychology, emphasising the relationship between societal and individual processes (Brown and Lunt, 2003). Young people regularly make travel choices based both on individual choices and choices formed under peer, societal or group influence.

Individuals belonging to a group interact both individually and collectively (Tajfel, 1981), therefore there are two elements of an individual's self image: 'personal identity' and 'social identity'. 'Social identity' refers to the way in which an individual is influenced by, and interacts with, their social environment and how their identity is formed as a result of membership of a group (Australian National University, 2001). 'Personal identity' describes the way in which a person thinks of themselves as a unique individual (Australian National University, 2001). An individual is both an individual and a group member, and both aspects of this 'personal identity' and 'social identity', create their self-concept (Australian National University, 2001).

Social Identity Theory helps to explain why the social exclusion of young people, due to lack of access to non-car modes of transport, is an important issue. Transport can contribute to the formation of a young person's identity, or lack of identity as many young people have to rely on parents for lifts. As a result, young people may be excluded from social settings and peer group activities. For young people, travel is not merely a way of getting from A to B, but the travel in itself is part of the experience and fun. Young people interact whilst travelling and often find the social experience of travelling as enjoyable as the activity to which they are travelling. Young people who do not have access to such transport may find themselves excluded from their peers and group situations as a result. If young people have ready access to transport, they find themselves able to travel independently, improve their mobility and make their own decisions. This is a key element in a young person's transition from a child to a young adult and is vital to their independence, and therefore their identity.

Social Identity Theory has three key components: social categorisation, social identification and social comparison (Tajfel, 1981):

1. Social categorisation
We categorise people, and ourselves, in order to understand the social environment, 'defin[ing] appropriate behaviour by reference to the norms of groups we belong to' (Australian National University, 2001). The 'group' acts as 'a system of orientation which helps to create and define the individual's place in society' (Tajfel, 1981; p.255).

2. Social identification
An individual identifies themselves with the group(s) that they perceive themselves as belonging to. The individual's self-image is formed by their membership of social group/groups, together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership (Tajfel, 1981). Group membership influences our perceptions and a person forms values and judgements as a result of being in the group. Different groups form different value systems and judgements. In the context of young people and transport, the differing social contexts of rural and urban play a role on the travel choices and values and perceptions towards transport formed by young people in these locations.

3. Social comparison
Individuals evaluate their opinions by comparing them to those of others. Individuals are categorised into groups on the basis of sharing common characteristics and a 'common fate' (Tajfel, 1981; p.258). It is this comparative aspect which links social categorisation with social identification (Australian National University, 2001). Social categorisation acts 'as a system of orientation which creates and defines the individual's own place in society' (Tajfel, 1981; p.258).

Combined, the three elements create a process in which we categorise people into groups in order to understand the social environment, identify with groups that we believe we belong to and compare ourselves with other similar groups and individuals. In order to understand why young people behave in certain ways or choose certain things we can use Social Identity Theory. Young people are very

good at creating a 'social identity', as opposed to a 'personal identity' and this social identity, formed through groups relate to age, location and gender for example, and impacts upon how they behave towards, perceive and value transport. Transport for children involves choices – individual choices and choices formed under peer influence. It is vitally important to understand what influences young people in the opinions they form and the travel choices they make. How young people perceive themselves can have an impact on their beliefs and consultation with young people should be seen in this context. Young people perceive transport in different ways to adults and hence this needs to be explored further. There is a need to examine the extent to which young people are excluded from their peer groups as a result of transport.

10 Conclusion

Young people are major users of public transport and therefore are a key potential future market. However, 'young people are often not perceived as a priority group for using public transport' (National Youth Agency, 2000 in Gloucestershire Labour Market Information Unit, 2002, p.11) and hence, as a result, it often does not tend to their needs. Young people have important travel needs. Transport operates both as a necessity in young peoples' lives and also as a choice which can open up their lives and provide them with freedom and independence. Overall, the review has shown that young people in both rural and urban areas, experience difficulties accessing education, employment, leisure and social facilities, and hence social exclusion, as a result of transport. In terms of public transport, the main obstacles faced by young people arise as a result of financial constraints, the paucity and unreliability of services, fears for safety and of crime, hostile treatment by other users and transport staff, poor cleanliness and comfort of services and the poor provision of information regarding services. Whilst walking and cycling are options, these are often unpopular due to image, distance of journeys, time needed for journeys and also fears for safety. As a result of such factors, young people experience limited mobility and accessibility which, in turn, dictates their lifestyle in terms of what they can do and when they can do it. This acts as a barrier to opportunities and limits the quality of their life.

The review has shown that the transport needs and demands of young people vary between urban and rural areas and also between young people of different ages. Such variations highlight the need to consider the transport problem and difficulties faced by young people in a social and spatial context and hence, as a result, to focus on the needs of and problems faced by, different individuals and groups. To enable and introduce effective, targeted social policy initiatives, it is important to recognise that young people's needs vary significantly, according to age and location. In order for solutions to be successful, they must be specific, focused and respond exactly to the needs of the specific individuals and locations at which they are aimed. An examination of case-studies and strategies aimed at reducing the transport difficulties faced by young

people in this review has highlighted the success of some specific schemes and shown that there is a definite need to consider the introduction of measures to reduce the social exclusion of young people through transport.

There is scope for much future research into both issues concerning young people and the difficulties they face as a result of transport. Much of the literature concentrates on young people's transport needs in terms of journeys to school with little mention given to other journey types and purposes such as leisure and social activities. This is an area which could be greatly expanded upon. Further research on the engagement of young people in transport-related decision-making would also be beneficial. As touched upon already in this review, McWhannell and Braunoltz (2002) highlight the importance of conducting further research into influences affecting young people's travel behaviour. Much of the current research focuses on the barriers faced by young people and the consequence of this, paying little attention to how young people form their opinions and perceptions of transport and the influences affecting their travel habits. Young people are often influenced by parental or peer attitudes and behaviour patterns. Research among parents of young people, especially those in urban areas who mostly have access to all the main modes of transport, could be valuable.

DTLR (1999) have suggested that further research observing more localised, space-dependent problems would be valuable, looking therefore not merely at social exclusion, but also 'social-spatial' exclusion. DTLR (1999) have found that many studies focus on aggregate data, hence paying little attention to individual and space-specific context. Throughout this study we intend to focus on this individual and socio-spatial context of exclusion, looking particularly at the differences experienced by those in rural and those in urban areas. Greater promotion of the implementation of successful case-studies to aid young people with regards to transport, could play a key role providing key best practice guidance from which other policy makers could learn and be inspired. In particular, DfT (2003b) identifies the need for further research looking into the long term costs and benefits of operating yellow buses, as well as research monitoring the potential of packages of measures to achieve modal change in urban/rural and primary/secondary areas.

In particular, this review has emphasised the role that consultation of young people can play in decision-making processes concerned with transport. The importance of engaging young people in discussion is paramount, both as a way for researchers and policy-makers to be made aware of young people's perceptions and opinions and understand better the difficulties they face, and also as a way for young people to actively influence decisions which affect their lives. Much of the literature examined within this review provided detail of surveys conducted with young people. These surveys highlighted the key role that the discursive element played in helping researchers gain information (Jones *et al*., 2000). Much of the literature highlighted the value of combining survey and focus-group approaches as an informal and relaxed manner of getting information (Jones *et al*., 2000).

This study aims to ask young people what they want and how things can be improved so as to reduce the number of difficulties they face through transport. Furthermore, it aims to identify and explore the influences that affect young people, such as parents, peers, location and social background, as a way of understanding the context behind young people's attitudes towards, and their choice concerning, transport. The study seeks to understand what influences young people in the opinions they form and the travel choices they make, in the context of social identity theory. Young people perceive transport in different ways to adults and hence this needs to be explored further. This study focuses on young people's travel to leisure facilities and employment, often neglected issues, rather than school journeys which have already been examined in great detail in previous research. It aims to provide analysis of the types of consultation used to talk to young people used in the research. This analysis will enable the identification of the most appropriate ways in which to engage in discussion with young people and those methods to which they most efficiently respond. This will help in future promotion of the involvement of young people in consultation and decision-making processes.

The findings of the remainder of the study can be found in TRL Report TRL661, 'An Investigation into the Social Exclusion of Young People in Relation to Transport Provision' (2004).

11 References

Adams E and Ingham S (1998). *Changing places: Children's participation in environmental planning.* London: The Children's Society.

Australian National University (2001). *Social identity.* Retrieved: August 2003, from http://www.anu.edu/ psychology/social/socident.htm

Banister D (1980). *Transport mobility and deprivation in inter-urban areas.* Saxon House.

Banister D (1985). *Rural transport and planning: a bibliography with abstracts.* London: Mansell Publishing Limited.

Brown S D and Lunt P (2000). *Henry Tajfel and the social identity tradition: rediscovering territory.* Retrieved: August 2003, from http://www.devpsy.lboro.ac.uk/ psygroup/sb/Tajfel.htm

Cabinet Office (2002). *Why social exclusion is a priority.* Retrieved: May 2002, from http://www.cabinet-office.gov.uk/seu/publications/reports/html/pse/pse_html/ sumamry.htm

Cassidy (2003). *Lecture 2: Social Identity: Contemporary Perspectives* (lecture notes). Retrieved: August 2003, from http://www.strath.ac.uk/Departments/Psychology/ ugcourses/l20hs.pdf

Children and Young People's Unit (2003). *Summary of the United Nations convention on the rights of a child.* Retrieved: August 2003, from http://www.cypu.gov.uk/ corporate/childrights/index.cfm

Connexions (2003). Retrieved: November 2003, from http://www.connexions-cd.org.uk/ about_connexionscard.asp

Connexions (undated). *The active involvement of young people in the Connexions Service: a practitioners guide 2.* Retrieved: September 2003, from http:// www.connexions.gov.uk/publications/uploads/op/1651/ Practitionersguide.pdf

Cresswell R (ed.). *Rural transport and country planning.* Glasgow: Leonard Hill.

Culliane S and Stokes G (1998). *Rural transport policy.* Pergamon Press.

Davis A (2001). Getting around: Listening to children's views. *Municipal Engineer*, 145, Issue 2, June 2001, pp. 191-194.

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (1998). *A new deal for transport: better for everyone.* Retrieved: September 2003, from http:// www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups_dft_transstrat/documents/ pdf/dft_transstrat_pedf_021588.pdf

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions (2000). *Social exclusion and the provision and availability of public transport.* Report by TRaC at the University of North London for DETR, July 2000. London: The Stationery Office.

Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions (1999). *Young people and crime on public transport.* London: The Stationery Office. Retrieved: April 2002, from http://www.mobility-unit.dtlr.gov.uk/ypc/1.htm

Department for Transport (2003a). *Involving children and young people: Action plan 2003-2004.* London: The Stationery Office.

Department for Transport (2003b). *Evaluation of first yellow school bus schemes – Summary.* Retrieved: 2003, from http://www.dft.gov.uk/stellent/groups/dft_localtrans/ documents/page/dft_localtrans_025636.hcsp

Devon County Council (undated). *Foreword.* Retrieved: October 2003, from http://www.devon.gov.uk/buslane/ newsletter/year1_travel/foreword.html

Enoch M (1999). Can transport policies help to re-integrate the socially excluded. *Local Transport Today*, 14 January 1999, pp.6-7

Faulks R W (1981). *Urban and rural transport.* Shepperton: Ian Allen Ltd.

Gaffron P, Hine J P and Mitchell F (2001). *The role of transport in social exclusion in urban Scotland: Literature review.* Scottish Executive Central Research Unit, Transport Research Series. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.

Gloucestershire Labour Market Information Unit (2002). *Experiences of young people to travelling to learning, work and leisure: a review of the literature.* Retrieved: September 2003, from http://www.southwestsurvey.com/Downloads/Experiences.pdf

Halden D, Farrington J and Copus A (2002). *Rural accessibility.* Scottish Executive Central Research Unit, Transport Research Series. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.

Hillman M, Henderson I and Whalley A (1976). Transport realties and planning policy: Studies of friction and freedom in daily travel. *Political and Economic Planning*, vol. XLII no. 567.

Hine J and Mitchell F (2001). *The role of transport in social exclusion in urban Scotland.* Scottish Executive Central Research Unit, Transport Research Series. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.

Holvad T (2002). *Social inclusion and road user charges/ workplace parking levies.* Paper presented at Aston University Conference 'Transport and social inclusion: the role of the local authority'.

Jones L, Davis A and Eyers T (2000). Young people, transport and risk: comparing access and independent mobility in urban, suburban and rural environments. *Health Education Journal,* 59, pp. 315-328.

Local Transport Today (2002). Socially excluded 'get raw deal in the transport stakes'. *Local Transport Today*, 23 May 2002.

Lucas K, Grosvenor T and Simpson R (2001). *Transport, the environment and social exclusion.* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation, York Publishing Services Ltd.

McWhannell F and Braunholtz S (2002). *Young people and transport.* Scottish Executive Social Research, Transport Research Series, Transport Research Planning Group. Edinburgh: The Stationery Office.

Martin A, Moreland V, Harper H and Huggins P (2004). *An investigation into the social exclusion of young people in relation to transport provision.* TRL Report TRL616. Crowthorne: TRL Limted.

Mehta J (2002). *Social inclusion and access to car travel.* Paper presented at Aston University Conference 'Transport and social inclusion: the role of the local authority'.

Mullins A, McCluskey J and Taylor-Browne J (2000). *Challenging the rural idyll: children and families speak out about life in rural England in the 21st Century.* A report by National Children's Charities on behalf of The Countryside Agency.

National Youth Agency (2003). *NYA response to transport and social exclusion.* Retrieved: September 2003, from http://www.nya.org.uk/Templates/internal.asp?NodeID=89212

Pilling A and Murray S (1998). *Catching them young: community-based project to increase transport awareness and influence travel behaviour amongst young people.* Greater Manchester Transport Resource Unit, Greater Manchester Centre for Voluntary Organisation, Manchester.

Psybox (2003). Social identity theories. *Psychology Dictionary*. Retrieved; August 2003, from http://www.psybox.com/web_dictionary/Socialidentity.htm

Root A, Boardman B and Fielding W J (1996). *SMART: The costs of rural travel.* Final Report, SMART (Sustainable Mobility and Accessibility in Rural Transport) Project, Energy and Environment Programme, Environmental Change Unit, University of Oxford.

Simpson B (2002). *Definitions and the relevance of transport policy.* Paper presented at Aston University Conference 'Transport and social inclusion: the role of the local authority', 1st May 2002.

Social Exclusion Unit (2002). *Transport and social exclusion: Overview.* Retrieved: May 2002, from http://www.socialexclusionunit.gov.uk/transport/transport.htm

 Social Exclusion Unit (2003a). *Making the connections: Final report on transport and social exclusion.* Office of the Deputy Prime Minister. February 2003. London: The Stationery Office. Retrieved: August 2003, from http://www.socialexclusionunit.gov.uk/publications/reports/pdfs/SEU-Transport_Main.pdf

Social Exclusion Unit (2003b). *What is the SEU?* Retrieved: 2003, from http://wwwsocialexclusionunit.gov.uk/what_is_SEU.htm

Storey P and Brannen (2000). *Young people and transport in rural areas.* York: Joseph Rowntree Foundation.

Tajfel H (1981). *Human groups and social categories: studies in social psychology.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

The Countryside Agency (2003). *The state of the countryside 2003.* May 2003.

Thirlwall B (1999). *Mobility for young people is the target of Dorset's DART partnership.* Retrieved: August 2002, from http://www.atoc.org.uk/news/news994/thirlwal.htm

Todorovic J and Wellington S (2000). *Living in urban England: attitudes and aspirations.* London: The Stationery Office.

Transport 2000 (2002). *Transport and social exclusion.* Retrieved: May 2002, from http://www.transport2000.org.uk/campaigns/SocialInclusion.htm

University of Exeter (2002). *Deindividuation.* Retrieved: August 2003, from http://www.ex.ac.uk~tpostmes/deindividuation.html

University of Strathclyde (2003). *Social Cognition Lecture 11 (*lecture notes). Retrieved: August 2003, from http://www.strath.ac.uk/Departments/Psychology/ugcourses/LECT11oh.odf

Wade H, Lawton A and Stevenson M (2003). *Hear by right: setting standards for the active involvement of young people in democracy.* National Youth Agency and Local Government Association. Retrieved: October 2003, from http://www.hearbyright.info/pdf/hear_by_right.pdf

Young TransNet (2003a). *Public transport to school.* Retrieved: September 2003, from http://www.youngtransnet.org.uk/analysis/chooseroute.asp?page=10&year=13&dir=t

Young TransNet (2003b). *Young people in action.* Retrieved: September 2003, from http://www.youngtransnet.org.uk/main/links/yp.htm

Young TransNet (2003c). *Our research.* Retrieved: September 2003, from http://www.youngtransnet.org.uk/icc/research.htm.

Abstract

TRL Limited has conducted some self-funded research with the aim of exploring the issues surrounding social exclusion, with a particular emphasis upon young people. As social exclusion becomes more prominent on the political agenda, it is hypothesised that the needs of young people remain excluded from transport policy and provision. As lifestyles have changed and children increasingly want to experience new and exciting activities there are many issues that face youngsters who do not drive or own their own car: lack of independence, rationed time spent with peers, personal security, affordability and provision of public transport.

   This literature review focuses on the experiences of young people in both rural and urban areas and the extent to which they are socially excluded as a result of transport provision. The review begins by examining the concept and process of social exclusion and the importance of transport policies in tackling social exclusion. The concepts of mobility and accessibility are discussed in detail as a way of understanding the relationship between transport and social exclusion and the difficulties young people face.

Related publications

TRL616   *An investigation into the social exclusion of young people in relation to transport provision* by A Martin, V Moreland, H Harper and P Huggins. 2004 (price £40, code JX)

RR203   *Concessionary fares and children's travel patterns: An analysis based on the 1978/79 NTS* by D M O'Reilly. 1989 (price £20, code B)

CT151   Transport and social inclusion (2000-2004) *Current Topics in Transport: selected abstracts from TRL Library's database* (price £25)

Prices current at January 2005

For further details of these and all other TRL publications, telephone Publication Sales on 01344 770783, email: publications@trl.co.uk, or visit TRL on the Internet at www.trl.co.uk.