Road User Awareness Training – Secondary School Training Analysis

Executive summary

An evaluation into the delivery of a condensed Road User Awareness Training (RUAT) in the secondary school setting shows that training is effective in altering attitudes and knowledge of participants towards other vulnerable road users.

Focus group participants highlighted that Road User Awareness Training offers valuable context of the Highway Code rules designed to offer more protection to Vulnerable Road Users, with positive feedback that this resembled an extension to a driving lesson rather than a road safety intervention. The provision of the context to the rule is crucial - we see participants scoring highly on their knowledge of the space required to overtake a rider but in focus groups a theme was that prior to the intervention drivers did not understand the "why" of this rule.

Clear improvement on pre- and post-presentation questions is observed and this is effective across both the S5 and S6 age year groups with no meaningful differences observed between year groups.

To maximise the benefits of training, existing instructors should receive CPD sessions to make use of content which resonates with the audience (for example, how this relates to passing their theory test, insurance implications and license retention with context of the Highway Code rules relevant to the experience of Vulnerable Road Users (VRUs).

Rationale

Currently, professional drivers can access a one-day Certificate of Professional Competence (CPC) course on Road User Awareness Training (RUAT).

This course was adapted by Cycling Scotland in 2016 to share learning outcomes with new drivers and provisional licence holders to promote safer road practices. This involved workshops of 1-hour theory content, and optional on-cycle practical elements. The training was promoted directly to provisional licence holders preparing to sit their test, and there was an optional on-bike component in groups of up to 8. In 2017, Cycling Scotland commissioned Prof Guy Walker of Heriot Watt University to evaluate the impact of the training. The results found a statistically significant changes in participants attitudes towards people cycling, and this effect was sustained after a three-month period.

To reach a larger audience, the offer for learners has evolved into a condensed presentation of 50 minutes to suit delivery in a school setting to S5 / S6 pupils.

This is typically delivered to whole class, or whole year groups, during curricular time – effectively with a captive audience. Many S6 pupils will already be preparing to sit a driving test, and a minority may already have a licence. For S5 pupils, many will not have applied for a provisional licence yet and therefore training input is more theoretical. The intended audience will not have established driving behaviours yet, and therefore this will be harder to evaluate. However, as passengers, they may have learned from family and friends.

Cycling Scotland wish to evaluate the effectiveness of this new style of delivery; to understand whether changes made to accommodate larger school audiences still support increased knowledge and changes in attitudes towards vulnerable road users.

Cycling Scotland also wish to assess how participants engage with the content of sessions. The evaluation will inform future decisions about content and format to ensure that provision of Road User Awareness Training to senior secondary school pupils does contribute to effective road safety education, and safer road users.

Cycling Scotland approached Dr Paul Kelly (Physical Activity for Health Research centre, University of Edinburgh) to guide the development of evaluation methods and provide a review of the draft report, and commissioned Josh Wood of South West Scotland Cycle Training to coordinate data collection alongside scheduled school training sessions, and produce a report from these findings.

- Evaluation Primary Aim - to inform Cycling Scotland's Education and Training Team on the effectiveness of this adapted version of RUAT delivered in the secondary school setting.
- Evaluation Secondary Aim - to influence and inform future investment into road user awareness training and promote the benefits of training to future participants.

Key evaluation questions:

- Is classroom-based delivery of RUAT effective?
- Does current content/delivery alter attitudes of participants towards vulnerable road users (VRUs)?
- Does the current content/delivery increase the knowledge of participants towards VRUs?
- Do participants expect to change their decision making as a result?
- Which content resonates most with an audience?
- Was the session engaging / enjoyable?

Methods

Five schools completed a questionnaire immediately pre- and post-course (Appendix A). These questions were split into categories of knowledge and attitudes.

The following questions assessed knowledge of the Highway Code:

- What is meant by the 'hierarchy of road users' in the Highway Code?
- At a junction (such as when turning into a side street), people driving should give way to people walking, whether they are crossing or waiting to cross a road
- People driving may park partially or wholly on the pavement.

Whilst the following assessed attitudes:

- Other road users, such as people walking and people cycling, have the same rights on the roads as people driving.
- If I was driving a car I would give people cycling at least 1.5m space when overtaking.
- Where people are walking or cycling, it may be necessary to drive below the speed limit.
- I think people cycling should be in the far left hand side of the road at all times to allow other traffic to flow freely.
- If the road has painted cycle lanes, I think people cycling should always use them.
- If I was driving a car I think my vehicle could be intimidating for people cycling.

Four focus groups were run at three schools who participated in the training. These semi-structured focus groups (Appendix B) were scheduled to last up to 50 minutes.

The questionnaire is designed to answer the following key questions:

- Does current content/delivery alter attitudes of participants towards vulnerable road users (VRUs)?
- Does the current content/delivery increase the knowledge of participants towards VRUs?
- Is classroom-based delivery of RUAT effective?

The focus groups are designed to answer the remaining aims:

- Do participants expect to change their decision making as a result?
- Which content resonates most with an audience?
- Was the session enjoyable?
- Is classroom-based delivery of RUAT effective?

Results

190 participants took part in the questionnaire split between S5 (n=63) and S6 (n=127). S6 students came from five schools and S5 from two schools.

A note on the tables:

The first two questions are scored as 2 if correct – any other answer is incorrect.

- What is meant by the 'hierarchy of road users' in the Highway Code?
- At a junction (such as when turning into a side street), people driving should give way to people walking, whether they are crossing or waiting to cross a road

The remaining seven questions are scored on a Likert scale with five points as below:

Other road users, such as people walking and people cycling, have the same rights on the roads as people driving.				
Strongly agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Strongly disagree

Four of these questions see “strongly agree” and “agree” scored as correct. All other answers are incorrect. These are coded with an answer <3 being preferable.

- Other road users, such as people walking and people cycling, have the same rights on the roads as people driving.
- If I was driving a car I would give people cycling at least 1.5m space when overtaking.
- Where people are walking or cycling, it may be necessary to drive below the speed limit. If I was driving a car I think my vehicle could be intimidating for people cycling.
- If I was driving a car I think my vehicle could be intimidating for people cycling.

3 of the questions are scored so that “strongly disagree” and “disagree” are scored as correct. These are coded with an answer >3 being preferable.

- I think people cycling should be in the far left hand side of the road at all times to allow other traffic to flow freely.
- If the road has painted cycle lanes, I think people cycling should always use them.
- People driving may park partially or wholly on the pavement.

For ease of interpretation scores have been coded as correct or incorrect as a percentage for before and after training which enables us to explore the percentage change pre / post training.

Question	Mean score before training	Mean score after Training	% correct before	% correct after	% point change
What is meant by the 'hierarchy of road users' in the Highway Code?	1.99	1.99	98.74	98.63	**-0.11**

At a junction (such as when turning into a side street), people driving should give way to people walking, whether they are crossing or waiting to cross a road	1.57	1.92	68.71	94.22	**25.51**
Other road users, such as people walking and people cycling, have the same rights on the roads as people driving	2.42	1.6	61.08	88.89	**27.81**
If I was driving a car I would give people cycling at least 1.5m space when overtaking.	1.62	1.23	91.98	96.83	**4.85**
Where people are walking or cycling, it may be necessary to drive below the speed limit.	1.79	1.51	84.95	92.47	**7.52**
I think people cycling should be in the far left hand side of the road at all times to allow other traffic to flow freely	2.31	3.33	14.44	53.76	**39.32**
If the road has painted cycle lanes, I think people cycling should always use them	1.79	3.21	7.03	48.63	**41.6**
People driving may park partially or wholly on the pavement	3.47	3.85	54.14	68.33	**14.19**
If I was driving a car I think my vehicle could be intimidating for people cycling	2.45	1.83	60.87	82.32	**21.45**

Figure 1 – table of results on RUAT questionnaire for all participants

Participants baseline knowledge on the following questions was already high or quite high:

- What is meant by the 'hierarchy of road users' in the Highway Code? (98.74%)
- At a junction (such as when turning into a side street), people driving should give way to people walking, whether they are crossing or waiting to cross a road (68.71%)
- If I was driving a car I would give people cycling at least 1.5m space when overtaking. (91.98%)
- Where people are walking or cycling, it may be necessary to drive below the speed limit. (84.95%)

This is especially true for questions relating to the hierarchy of road users, particularly compared to previous driver surveys on this question[1]. This could be indicative of a new generation of driver learning the Highway Code for the first time post 2022 with no prior bias / learning.

[1] In a sample survey of driver's knowledge and awareness of Highway Code rules relating to vulnerable road users commissioned by Cycling Scotland in 2023, 81% of experienced drivers correctly identified that all motor vehicles were less vulnerable than other road users.

There is a clear and large increase in knowledge of junction priorities post training increasing by 25.51% to 94.22%. The other knowledge question on pavement parking also sees an increase in correct scores of 14.19% to 68.33%. This smaller increase may be the result of two things: 1) a bias of what participants see happening in their day-to-day life where pavement parking is often not enforced, or more likely is influenced by the session where the Tutor was not able to cover this topic due to time constrains (this is covered in more detail later).

All other topic areas linking to attitudes when driving saw large increases in number of correct answers from baseline. The lowest pre-course knowledge was seen regarding attitudes towards use of cycle lanes but this did see a 41.6% increase post training.

	S5					S6				
Question	**Before training**	**After Training**	**% correct before**	**% correct after**	**% point change**	**Before training**	**After Training**	**% correct before**	**% correct after**	**% point change**
What is meant by the 'hierarchy of road users' in the Highway Code?	1.98	2	97.96	100	**2.04**	2	1.98	99.09	97.89	**-1.2**
At a junction (such as when turning into a side street), people driving should give way to people walking, whether they are crossing or waiting to cross a road	1.59	1.91	69.49	91.38	**21.89**	1.55	1.93	67.77	95.65	**27.88**
Other road users, such as people walking and people cycling, have the same rights on the roads as people driving	2.54	1.76	59.02	82.29	**23.27**	2.29	1.44	62.9	92.13	**29.23**
If I was driving a car I would give people cycling at least 1.5m space when overtaking.	1.71	1.13	85.48	98.39	**12.91**	1.54	1.32	95.2	96.06	**0.86**

Where people are walking or cycling, it may be necessary to drive below the speed limit.	1.85	1.5	79.03	91.94	**12.91**	1.73	1.52	87.9	92.74	**4.84**
I think people cycling should be in the far left hand side of the road at all times to allow other traffic to flow freely	2.37	3.56	17.74	62.3	**44.56**	2.26	3.11	12.8	49.6	**36.8**
If the road has painted cycle lanes, I think people cycling should always use them	1.85	3.24	11.29	48.39	**37.1**	1.73	3.17	4.88	49.59	**44.71**
People driving may park partially or wholly on the pavement	3.47	4.23	51.61	85.25	**33.64**	3.48	3.48	55.46	60.5	**5.04**
If I was driving a car I think my vehicle could be intimidating for people cycling	2.52	1.81	54.84	79.03	**24.19**	2.39	1.86	64.75	84.87	**20.12**

Figure 2 – table of results comparing S5 performance to S6 performance

Here we see S5 and S6 pupils' performance on the questionnaire post-training is broadly similar in areas of knowledge. The exception to this is on the question relating to pavement parking. The S6 group performed poorly after training and this can be explained as one of the S6 sessions ran out of time to cover this topic. This made up 45 participants. Their post test score of only 33.3% correct answers on the parking questions versus 80% for the rest of the cohort and 75.68% correct for the rest of the S6 cohort is stark.

All other scores can be seen as broadly similar between the two cohorts.

Results, viewed as bar charts, are available within a Flourish story.

Qualitative focus group analysis

Three focus groups were conducted with 12 participants (4 in each group) to explore attitudes towards the training (see Appendix B for focus group guide).

The recordings have been transcribed and annotated with themes and points of noted annotated in each transcription (and into this report) with the following colours to denote which recording the comments emerged from:

Comments recording **[1]** – see appendix C for the transcribed recording and D for the annotated recording

Comments recording **[2]** – see appendix E for the transcribed recording and F for the annotated recording

Comments recording **[3]–** see appendix G for the transcribed recording and H for the annotated recording

The below shows only selected quotes from each interview - a full list of quotes can be found in Appendix I.

The recordings were analysed against the key research questions stated:

- Do participants expect to change their decision making as a result?
- Which content resonates most with an audience?
- Was the session enjoyable?

Dealing with each of these items in turn:

- **Do participants expect to change their decision making as a result?**

We see clear evidence of participants discussing a change to their potential decision making as a result. It is hard to draw firm conclusions from the focus groups as we are not analysing actual behaviour. However, the following quotes prove useful to illustrate changing attitudes as a result of the training:

I thought it was quite effective. I learned quite a lot and like, I've remembered it really well. Like, when I start driving I'm sure I will think back and remember it when I see a cyclist on the road. And know what to do. [1]	*I think it was quite good because sometimes when you're revising for your theory it feels like, "oh, this is just something that I've got to learn" rather than "this can actually happen". I think it was one of the videos where it showed the guy trying to overtake the bike, I think it was the lorry, and the spaces that you got – and it almost cemented it for me. It was just like – you've got to give a different amount of space for different people. It's basically responsibilities of the road. And with the theory, you don't get that revising for it. [2]*	*It was very much an addition to a driving lesson [2]*

The key themes identified here are that the training adds a layer of **contextual understanding** from the information already known/what is taught to people. For some who are already learning this seems to allow them to better understand the "why's" of the rules and provide a concrete **context and reasoning** to them.

The idea that the information about interactions with VRUs is learned as a fact but without the reasoning is where this training fills in the gap in knowledge here. It provides a memorable framework on which to remember the information and crucially the why of the rule.

Many Highway Code rules don't require an understanding of the "why" because it is often self-explanatory due to clear safety issues. If the driver is not a bike rider and has not experienced a close pass then they are far less likely to understand why the rules governing safe overtaking space are in place. The comment that this form of training is more beneficial for learning than an app is interesting as this participant stated an idea of learning without context – you just keep answering until you are correct but without the memorable contextual layer.

It is interesting that many of the focus group participants specifically said the knowledge around the space to leave to people on bikes was new to them – in the pre-course questionnaire participants' baseline knowledge on this topic was high (91.98%). This is perhaps a flaw with the question as the phrasing perhaps leads participants to guess an answer which they are led to by the question. Consideration of rephrasing this question with an S5/S6 year group to assess baseline knowledge would be beneficial.

The other theme emerging here was the idea that it reinforced the responsibility of driving to the learner cohort.

- **Which content resonates most with an audience?**

The content felt relevant to the audience with participants independently bringing up remembering the content covered about **how to appropriately overtake VRUs** as well as **increased tolerance** and knowledge about riders being in **different road positions** all emerging in focus groups**:**

Like, it just gives you like basics for like, what do to when you encounter cyclists. [3]	*It was very helpful – like the distances, like that was in my highway code and I can visualise how much I need to leave a cyclist and someone walking and a horse but it was nice to reinstate that and be like, yeah, that is how far. [1]*	*I thought it was definitely useful. I didn't know about the certain kind of space you had to leave between the cyclist and the car. So I learned a lot. [3]*
I think drivers need to be more tolerant of them and not kind of be short tempered with them because they are also people and have their worries on the road so we should give them respect. [1]	*I think as a cyclist on the road it would make me feel a lot more hopeful that people would actually know what to do when they come past me. [3]*	*Before your course, I've always just seen cyclists on the side of the road. I never knew they could go in the centre. After your course it really did bring to light like, how beneficial that is for cyclists. [2]*
Cycling in the middle, especially when you're coming into like, the key points. I think in a lot of cycle lanes your probably not given enough room when you come into tight corners. I think it gives a lot more awareness to people. [2]	*I think what's there is great and think that something like that might put people off and be more likely that that's what they'd remember from it rather than if you're seeing like a bad car accident but then told, "always stay 2 meters from a horse" there's one thing you're more likely to remember. [1]*	*The one thing that surprised me was the perspective of a biker – as like a car is driving past them. I didn't realise how terrifying that could be for a cyclist. [2]*

Themes here also show that the presentation resonates with participants about **how they view VRUs and think of themselves as a VRU** (particularly with regards their rights/priority as a pedestrian) – the idea that participants see the training as "hopeful" and "reassuring" for driver interactions around them as a VRU is particularly striking. The idea of presenting **different perspectives of road users** was an emerging theme here which resonated with participants which was not solely focussed on people on bikes. The content on horses and pedestrians has been absorbed.

Several participants also mentioned that the information about **points on their license** and **drug driving** had resonance:

I think the points. I never realised you could get 3 points for just speeding. I think a lot of people maybe forget that. That it's an easy offence to get caught for and you're then one mistake away from getting your license taken away and your insurance - it's already so expensive! [2]	*It's good to know that it's so easy to get 3 points and once you get another one – that's it -your license is gone. And you're going to have high insurance for ages and it's good to know that. [2]*

It was also evident that participants were aware of drink driving laws but perhaps not drug driving in the same way although there was some discussion in one focus group that this had been covered by input from Police Scotland. It was also evident that participants identified that they did not realise the **rate of deaths on the** road and that this resonated with them after training (particularly around ideas of responsibility explored above).

> *I would say the think that surprised me was the amount of deaths on the roads. I think that's the main thing – I didn't realise there was so many still. [2]*

- **Was the session enjoyable?**

The feedback on the sessions was that it was **enjoyed** by participants in a format which was engaging – any critical feedback focussed on the length of the session (being too short). **The questions throughout the presentation coupled with an interactive presentation and the questionnaire at the beginning and end of the presentation were identified as a positive learning environment**.

I thought it was quite engaging. Asking questions back and forth with people and giving responses [2]	*Doing the same questions twice as well made you think about it a lot more. [1]*	*I liked how it wasn't just a boring school lesson. It was interactive. And, it well, people, especially kids pick up information a lot better that way. Actually getting like, fun learning. [3]*
I think it was quite refreshing for learning about road safety for it not to be something grim. And being more of a positive talk than what I am used to. [3].	*I would say it was definitely worth it. There was loads of information. Very useful information and definitely stuff that I didn't know and that everyone should also think the same. [2]*	*I found it useful, especially if like, you're only starting out learning to drive. [3]*

Limitations of the work

- The sessions are delivered in a 45-50 minute session and including the survey at the start and end of this means that the delivery is rushed and a large amount of topics are covered. We see from the results that when a topic is not covered (e.g. pavement parking) that participants knowledge of this is impacted.
- A lack of statistical analysis on the data means that we are unable to ascertain if there are significant differences between groups pre and post training, but we can speak in general trends.
- Due to the constraints of working with multiple schools, the delivery and evaluation was performed by one individual. We are unable to draw conclusions about the delivery of this presentation from wider members of Cycling Scotland's pool of instructors – it is likely that following this session CPD will be required for instructors delivering this training to ensure consistency based on these findings.
- Focus group participants may have felt less confident providing constructive feedback to the evaluator as they also delivered the input.
- There is potential that the phrasing of one of the questions around leaving 1.5m to people on bikes when overtaking is leading and participants answering this are not actually sure of the answer as from focus groups there is a mismatch between knowledge on this before the training and the answer given on the pre-course questionnaire.

Discussion

Using the evaluation questions identified for the research to frame this discussion,

Does current content/delivery alter attitudes of participants towards vulnerable road users (VRUs)?

Questionnaire results from pre and post training clearly show an improvement across all questions assessing attitudes and focus group discussions highlighted that participants understand their responsibilities around VRUs as well as what this means (e.g. the space required to overtake safely) and crucially the context of this. The provision of the context to the rule is crucial here. We see participants scoring highly on their knowledge of the space required to overtake a rider but in focus groups a theme was that drivers did not understand the "why" of this rule which the presentation clearly provided. Context and understanding are more likely to allow the participant to empathise with other road users.

Does the current content/delivery increase the knowledge of participants towards VRUs?

Results from the questionnaire clearly show an increase in knowledge towards VRUs across all questions. Interestingly, the question around Hierarchy of Responsibility was answered correctly by nearly all respondents pre-presentation – this may be that this is being taught well in a younger age group or it could be a problem with the question and consideration should be given to a way of asking this question differently. Focus groups showed that the knowledge around the space required to overtake VRUs (the conversations focused on people on bikes and people on horses) was a knowledge area that increased, as was information about road positioning for people on bikes and generally what the experience of riding a bike on a road is like – with empathy towards other road users emerging in discussions. Participants identified a knowledge increase in their own rights as a pedestrian.

Do participants expect to change their decision making as a result?

This question is difficult to assess in this context as of the 12 participants there was:

- One driver
- One who had taken a test and failed
- Two learning (practical and theory)
- Two learning for theory only
- Six had no learning experience

However, discussions in focus groups did not display any attitudes suggesting any disagreement with the content. Returning to the theme of the context of what it is like to be a person on a bike and why the rules are in place we would expect this to lead to a lasting empathy and therefore behaviour change. This quote from the third focus group is an example of this: "When I start driving I'm sure I will think back and remember it when I see a cyclist on the road. And know what to do."

Which content resonates most with an audience?

A repeat theme in discussions was that participants remembered how to appropriately overtake a range of VRUs as well as showing increased tolerance/understanding of VRUs and knowledge about riders being in different road positions. These factual items stuck with participants.

The concept of responsibility as a driver is something which clearly resonated with this audience and was linked to the statistics shown around road safety.

Interestingly, the presentation resonated with participants about how they view VRUs and think of themselves as a VRU (particularly with regards their rights/priority as a pedestrian). The idea that participants see the training as "hopeful" and "reassuring" for driver interactions around them as a VRU is particularly striking.

Several participants also mentioned that the information about points on their license and drug driving had resonance.

Was the session enjoyable?

As explored in more detail above, the feedback on the sessions was that it was enjoyed by participants in a format which was engaging and that they would recommend it to classmates. The questions throughout the presentation coupled with an interactive presentation and the questionnaire at the beginning and end of the presentation were identified as a positive learning environment.

The overarching question of "**Is classroom-based delivery of RUAT effective?**" can be answered affirmatively – we see increased performance in knowledge and shifting attitudes post training with messaging delivered in a style participants enjoyed and which resonated with them.

Reassuringly, we do not see any stark differences between S5 and S6 participants in questionnaire performance or in focus groups – the presentation has value at both age groups.

Further work

Several questions here could perhaps be rephrased – the difference between performance on questionnaire and ideas explored in the focus group around distance to give to people on bikes was stark. This may be that participants know the answer but the context is new to them or it may

be that the question leads them to answer it correctly even without prior knowledge due to phrasing and knowing they are about to get a presentation from Cycling Scotland. An alternative to this would be an open question – "how much space should a person driving a car at 30mph give to a person riding a bike when they overtake them?" This could be further explored by a question, "why?". This could be run as a brief sub study to assess this specific question with a school who have had no training input to date.

The high pre-training rate of correct answers regarding hierarchy of road users was also interesting and again, this may be because based on what is presented, it is the only logical answer.

The delivery of this presentation was enjoyed by participants – particularly the interactive nature and questions to test learning. A CPD session based on findings from this study for the Cycling Scotland Tutor pool delivering this work should be considered.

A statistical analysis of the data would be beneficial to allow for significance test of pre/post-training results.

The suggestion that the pre and post questionnaire was a useful learning aid is useful but with time constraints in these sessions not practicable to implement.

Recommendations from evaluator

RUAT in this format is fit for purpose and can be delivered to both a S5 and S6 age group effectively and at the same time. Emphasis should be placed on these sessions being an **extension to a participant's driving lessons** rather than a road safety intervention. This training is able to provide **context to key Highway Code rules which enable a greater understanding on why the rule is in place**. CPD sessions should be offered to those delivering the sessions placing an emphasis on the content which resonates most with the audience (e.g. context of rules, insurance implications, points) and that this is **designed to improve their skills as a driver, not a bike rider**.

If budget allows, further evaluation work is required regarding the phrasing of some of the questions used to further assess their suitability.

Implications for Cycling Scotland and recommendations for next steps (written by the Head of Education and Training)

Cycling Scotland works with others to get more people cycling, more safely and easily in a better environment. We recognise that perception of road risk is a major barrier to more people choosing to cycle, and also the role that training can have in supporting safe road use.

Existing evaluation of Road User Awareness Training demonstrates that training does have a positive influence on driver attitudes and behaviours. However, this training remains voluntary, and in order to expand the reach of training in the school setting, course content and format has been adapted to fit the time constraints in the school setting.

The evaluation results give us confidence that Road User Awareness Training delivered to S5 and S6 pupils has a positive impact in promoting safer road use among younger drivers. This is reinforced both through survey data and in feedback gathered through focus groups.

Cycling Scotland will continue to promote delivery in this format, whilst developing content and materials for both instructors and schools to take account of these findings. Changes to be introduced include:

- Update to the slide decks with guidance for instructors to focus on material that brings context to existing rules, and supports young people on their journey to achieving their

driving licence (especially those who are currently learning to drive), and for all to become safer road users
- Orientation and training for existing instructors, to maximise the benefit of training to young people.

The one year funding cycle does not allow for any monitoring of the impact of training on actual driving behaviours. Cycling Scotland will continue to work with partners, and review other national data sets, including the Road Safety Information Tracking Study (RITS), to identify further areas for development.

About:

Josh Wood, of South West Scotland Cycle Training, is a qualified National Standard Cycle Trainer, with extensive professional experience of delivering training to drivers. Josh has spent 18 years developing and delivering evaluation of active travel projects, as well as peer reviewed academic research of clinical trials.

The findings of this report were reviewed by Dr Paul Kelly of the Physical Activity for Health Research Centre, University of Edinburgh).