

## SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

### Key influences on motivations for utility cycling (cycling for transport to and from places)

Kristiann C. Heesch<sup>A,C</sup> and Shannon Sahlqvist<sup>B</sup>

<sup>A</sup>Queensland University of Technology, Institute of Health & Biomedical Innovation and the School of Public Health and Social Work, Brisbane, Qld 4059, Australia.

<sup>B</sup>School of Exercise and Nutrition Sciences and Centre for Physical Activity and Nutrition Research, Deakin University, Geelong Waurin Ponds Campus, Geelong, Vic. 3220, Australia.

<sup>C</sup>Corresponding author. Email: k.heesch@qut.edu.au

#### The analytic approach in detail

Respondents were asked one of two open-ended questions. As discussed in the main manuscript, utility cyclists were asked, ‘What would encourage you to cycle more for transport (cycling as a means of getting to and from places)?’ Non-utility cyclists were asked, ‘Thinking about the usual way you get to and from places, what would encourage you to cycle for transport?’ Participants recorded their responses in a textbox, and responses ranged from two to three word responses to more nuanced discussions of to 103 words. Each question was designed to capture respondents’ initial thoughts, and therefore the most important motivator(s) rather than all possible factors that facilitate utility cycling.

An ecological model served as the framework for coding of the data. Ecological models suggest that policy, physical environmental, social-cultural environmental and individual factors impact physical activity behaviour. In this study, data were coded to identify influences on motivation within each of these levels of influence on behaviour.

For the analyses, open and axial coding procedures described by Strauss and Corbin<sup>1</sup> were followed. First, the authors independently reviewed the data to develop initial categories of the key influences on motivations and to give labels to them. Categories were discussed in team meetings, and consensus was used to determine the final categories. Next, KH imported the qualitative data into NVivo 10 qualitative analysis software (QSR International, Melbourne) for more in depth analysis of the categories. Specifically, she critically evaluated the appropriateness of labels given the categories, noted the range of content within each categories, and evaluated the similarities and differences among categories. New labels were given to some categories to better capture the content within the categories. Categories with overlapping content were merged. Last, categories were grouped together under high order abstractions (i.e., the ecological model factors), She then summarised the findings, in consultation with SS.

<sup>1</sup>Strauss DW, Corbin JM. *Basics of qualitative research: techniques and procedures for developing grounded theory*. 4th ed. Thousand Oaks, CA (USA): Sage;1998.