

Indices of Deprivation 2007: Analysis of Employment Domain

February 2009

Produced by the Research & Information Team,
Leicestershire County Council.

For more information on this report , please contact:

Roger Beecham
Research Officer
Research & Information Team
Leicestershire County Council
County Hall
Glenfield
LE3 8RA
T: 0116 305 5507
E: rbeecham@leics.gov.uk

Alternatively, please visit Leicestershire Research and Statistics Online:
www.lsr-online.org

Whilst every effort has been made to ensure the accuracy of the data contained in this report, the County Council can accept no responsibility for any errors or omissions.

Contents

1.	Introduction	4
2.	Employment Deprivation in Leicestershire	6
3.	Top 10 most/least deprived neighbourhoods	8
4.	How has Employment Deprivation changed since 2004?	9
5.	Employment Deprivation against other ID themes	10
6.	Policy Implications	13
7.	Conclusions	15

I Introduction

Worklessness as a Policy Problem

The UK has in the last 15-20 years successfully negotiated economic transition. Attitudes to business have changed, placing a greater emphasis on entrepreneurialism, innovation and improving productivity and (the current financial crisis aside) the country has managed to reposition itself as a post-industrial success story. Recent figures demonstrate that over 29million people in the UK are in employment - a working age employment rate of 74.2%¹. However, these successful accounts, and the way in which unemployment is measured, often hide the fact that there are continuing and growing levels of inactivity among certain groups².

Part of this problem of hidden worklessness can be linked to structural change³. The falling demand for industrially skilled labour from the mid-1970s resulted in a growing population of workers who lacked the necessary skills, motivation, self-esteem and physical and mental health to compete in the contemporary labour market. For these individuals social security might have been the most realistic option. Incapacity Benefit (IB) payments in particular were more financially generous than unemployment benefits and looser surveillance meant that with IB the pressure to take-up work was also minimal. Any significant falls in unemployment claims were therefore offset by a new and growing population of IB claimants³. Leicestershire has not been immune to these processes and whilst employment rates in the county are high, almost half of all Leicestershire's benefit claimants (47%) are incapacity related and a high proportion of these are within the former

industrial districts of North West Leicestershire and Charnwood⁴.

The definitional problem - the fact that worklessness under IB claims remains hidden - consists in the fact that traditionally employment in the UK has either been measured by the claimant count - those receiving Job Seekers' Allowance (JSA) - or the International Labour Organisation's (ILO) definition - individuals who are out-of-work, who are available to start work in the next two weeks and who have looked for work in the last four weeks. If the benefit that an individual claims does not require them to look for work (like Incapacity Benefit) and if they perceive that there is not suitable work available to them and therefore stop looking for work, that individual is excluded from both definitions.

The *Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research* has recently attempted to estimate the extent of unemployment outside the claimant count and ILO measure by:

- taking the claimant count;
- estimating unemployment outside of this by using the ILO definition; and
- approximating the hidden unemployed that can be found within Incapacity Benefit claimants³.

Whilst the *Real Employment* measure has helped to map the extent of unemployment in the UK, it only works as locally as District level. Worklessness is, however, symptomatic of a complex mix of local and non-local structural, cultural, educational and more personal factors but is seen to be constituted at

an extremely local level⁵. Central government has recognised the need to take account of this specificity instituting the Social Disadvantage Research Centre and the Indices of Deprivation measure for England.

Indices of Deprivation: Employment Domain

First published in 2004 and subsequently in 2007, the English Indices of deprivation (ID) captures the level of deprivation in small neighbourhoods through its use of Lower Super Output Areas (LSOAs)* - neighbourhoods made up of between 1,000 and 3,000 people. The measures are based on a range of indicators, grouped under the following themes:

- Income
- Employment
- Crime
- Health, Deprivation and Disability
- Education, Skills and Training
- Barriers to Housing and Services
- Living Environment

The Employment domain within ID defines employment deprivation as the “*involuntary exclusion of the working-age population from the world of work*”, and is approximated using the following indicators:

- Claimants of out-of-work benefits such as income support, IB and JSA
- Participants on the New Deal who are in receipt of JSA
- Participants in the New Deal for Lone Parents
- Participants in the New Deal for 18-24s who are not in receipt of JSA

*For clarity, LSOAs will now be referred to as neighbourhoods.

- Participants in the New Deal for 25+ who are not in receipt of JSA

These indicators are summed and expressed as a rate of the relevant (working age) population. A single score is allocated for each neighbourhood (or LSOA) in England – 32,482 in total – before being ranked from 1 to 32,482; ‘1’ being the most deprived and 32,482 being the least deprived.

This report will use ID data to help better understand worklessness across Leicestershire. It looks at employment deprivation between and within the county before testing the relationship between employment deprivation and other forms of deprivation measured by ID. It concludes by thinking through some of the policy implications of the ID data in the context of Leicestershire and its Local Area Agreement (LAA) target of reducing the proportion of 16-64 year olds on out-of-work benefits from 5.6% to 3.7% by 2010/11.


2 Employment Deprivation in Leicestershire

ED in Leicestershire: England position

Compared with neighbourhoods across the country, Leicestershire does not suffer from high levels of employment deprivation. Figure 2.1 shows the spread of the county's neighbourhoods by the 10% most-to-least employment deprived neighbourhoods nationally. In total, 151 of the 396 neighbourhoods (38%) in Leicestershire lie within England's 20% least employment deprived neighbourhoods, whilst just 6 (2%) lie within the 20% most employment deprived neighbourhoods.


Figure 2.2 demonstrates this disparity spatially, each hexagon representing an individual neighbourhood. While differences in employment deprivation do exist between districts - most notably between Harborough and North West Leicestershire - that the dark purple neighbourhoods (the 6 neighbourhoods within the 20% most deprived neighbourhoods nationally) are not necessarily contained within a single/coherent geographical area, suggests that more severe levels of employment deprivation are constituted only at a very local (neighbourhood) level.

Figure 2.1 National ranks for neighbourhoods in Leicestershire by decile



Source: IMD2007

Figure 2.2 ED by 20% most-least deprived neighbourhoods in England: 6 Leicestershire neighbourhoods are in the 20% most deprived nationally



Source: IMD2007

ED in Leicestershire: County Picture

Since we are concerned with employment deprivation within Leicestershire, it makes sense to rank neighbourhoods in relation to their county position (figure 2.3). Here a more distinct picture emerges between the districts. North West Leicestershire and Oadby and Wigston are the most employment deprived districts. Thirty-nine percent of North West Leicestershire's neighbourhoods lie within the county's 20% most employment deprived neighbourhoods and just 4% lie within the 20% least employment deprived neighbourhoods in Leicestershire; these figures for Oadby and Wigston are 31% and 8% respectively. Harborough compares most favourably with just 9% of its neighbourhoods within the county's 20% most deprived neighbourhoods and 45% in the 20% least deprived neighbourhoods in the county (figure 2.4).

Looking at levels of employment deprivation using county ranks identifies where certain districts are comparatively more employment deprived than others. However, as demonstrated in figure 2.2, severe worklessness is constituted at neighbourhood level and is not necessarily particular to North West Leicestershire - the most employment deprived when viewed at district-level. Moreover, districts cover relatively large geographical areas and, as a result, will contain a diverse mix of people and neighbourhoods. For example Charnwood, the largest district in terms of population, has a relatively even spread of neighbourhoods within the 20% most-to-least employment deprived neighbourhoods when using county ranks (figure 2.4). It is therefore unfair to label employment deprivation (or worklessness) as a district-specific problem.

Figure 2.3 ED by most/ least deprived neighbourhoods in the County




Figure 2.4: Proportion of neighbourhoods (LSOAs) within 20% most-to-least deprived neighbourhoods in Leicestershire by district

District	20% Most Deprived				20% Least Deprived	Base (LSOAs)
	20-40%	40-60%	60-80%	80-100%		
North West Leicestershire	39%	26%	21%	11%	4%	57
Oadby and Wigston	31%	14%	31%	17%	8%	36
Charnwood	23%	16%	15%	20%	26%	100
Hinckley and Bosworth	15%	26%	20%	26%	14%	66
Blaby	8%	28%	25%	27%	12%	60
Melton	13%	10%	17%	20%	40%	30
Harborough	9%	13%	17%	17%	45%	47

Source: IMD2007

3 Top 10 most/least deprived neighbourhoods

Thinking about more serious levels of employment deprivation across the county, then, figure 3.1 identifies Leicestershire’s 10 most employment deprived neighbourhoods. With a national rank of 1,013 (out of a 32,482) and, in real terms, over a quarter (26%) of its working age population claiming an out-of-work benefit, Loughborough Bell Foundry stands out as the most employment deprived neighbourhood. There are also significant variations within this group. Loughborough Bell Foundry and Greenhill North East are within the 10% most deprived neighbourhoods nationally whilst Measham Centre, Loughborough Dishley East, Oadby Industrial Estate and Loughborough Canal South lie within the 20-30% most deprived neighbourhoods nationally and between Loughborough Bell Foundry and Loughborough Canal South rates of worklessness vary by 12%. Again, that four different districts are represented might suggest that severe worklessness cannot be reduced to district-level circumstances.

Unsurprising, thinking about figure 2.1 (which shows the spread of neighbourhoods in Leicestershire in terms of the 10% most-to-least employment deprived nationally), there is significantly less variation in rank and unemployment rate within the top 10 least deprived neighbourhoods in Leicestershire (figure 3.2).

Figure 3.1: Top 10 most employment deprived neighbourhoods in Leicestershire

Neighbourhood name	District	Rank (England)	ID-defined unemployment rate*
1 Loughborough Bell Foundry	Charnwood	1013	26%
2 Greenhill North East	North West Leicestershire	2257	22%
3 Loughborough Warwick Way	Charnwood	4130	18%
4 Greenhill Centre	North West Leicestershire	4356	18%
5 Hinckley Trinity West	Hinckley and Bosworth	4595	18%
6 Hinckley Westfield Junior School	Hinckley and Bosworth	5297	16%
7 Measham Centre	North West Leicestershire	6643	15%
8 Loughborough Dishley East	Charnwood	7039	14%
9 Oadby Industrial Estate	Oadby and Wigston	7133	14%
10 Loughborough Canal South	Charnwood	7150	14%

*Aggregate of claimants based on out-of-work claimants and participants in the New Deal expressed as a rate of working age population

Source: IMD2007

Figure 3.2: Top 10 least employment deprived neighbourhoods in Leicestershire

Neighbourhood name	District	Rank (England)	ID-defined unemployment rate*
396 Little Bowden East	Harborough	32373	2%
395 Loughborough Holywell	Charnwood	32315	2%
394 Loughborough Oxford Street	Charnwood	32196	2%
393 Loughborough Outwoods North	Charnwood	32033	2%
392 Melton Sysonby East	Melton	31921	2%
391 Mountsorrel South West	Charnwood	31547	3%
390 Broughton Astley North	Harborough	31544	3%
389 Loughborough Shelthorpe South	Charnwood	31525	3%
388 Rearsby, Ratcliffe & Cossington	Charnwood	31508	3%
387 Barrow North	Charnwood	31505	3%

*Aggregate of claimants based on out-of-work claimants and participants in the New Deal expressed as a rate of working age population

Source: IMD2007

4 How has ED changed since 2004?

The method for collecting and calculating ID scores in 2007 is consistent with 2004 and the two datasets can be compared directly. Figure 4.1 shows the change in Leicestershire's employment deprivation in terms of national ranks between the two collection years. Leicestershire has improved its position nationally, particularly in the least employment deprived neighbourhoods. Since 2004, there has been a net change of 14 neighbourhoods moving into the 30% least deprived neighbourhoods and 18 have moved into the 10% least employment deprived neighbourhoods. The corollary is that there has been little change in the numbers of neighbourhoods within the most deprived neighbourhoods. There has been no change in the number of neighbourhoods in Leicestershire that lie within the 30% most deprived nationally and where, in 2007, 6 of the county's neighbourhoods were within the 20% most deprived neighbourhoods nationally, in 2004 this figure was 7.

Thinking about the 10 most and least deprived neighbourhoods in the county, then, almost all (9 out of the 10) of the most employment deprived neighbourhoods have seen an upward movement (a negative change) in their national rank and this is the reverse for the 10 least employment deprived neighbourhoods (figure 4.2 and 4.3). That the top 4 most employment deprived neighbourhoods - Loughborough Bell Foundry, Greenhill North East, Loughborough Warwick Way and Greenhill Centre - have not changed their relative position since 2004 might also suggest that severe employment deprivation is entrenched and difficult to shift.

Figure 4.1: National ranks for neighbourhoods in Leicestershire by decile (2004 and 2007)




Figure 4.2 10 most employment deprived neighbourhoods deprived

Neighbourhood name	District	Rank (England)	Change in England rank since 2004*	Change in County rank since 2004	ID-defined unemployment rate**
1 Loughborough Bell Foundry	Charnwood	1013	77	0	26%
2 Greenhill North East	North West Leicestershire	2257	278	0	22%
3 Loughborough Warwick Way	Charnwood	4130	232	0	18%
4 Greenhill Centre	North West Leicestershire	4356	392	0	18%
5 Hinckley Trinity West	Hinckley and Bosworth	4595	2758	6	18%
6 Hinckley Westfield Junior School	Hinckley and Bosworth	5297	2004	4	16%
7 Measham Centre	North West Leicestershire	6643	758	5	15%
8 Loughborough Dishley East	Charnwood	7039	621	1	14%
9 Oadby Industrial Estate	Oadby and Wigston	7133	1800	6	14%
10 Loughborough Canal South	Charnwood	7150	1995	6	14%

* Denotes negative change; ■ denotes positive change

**Aggregate of claimants based on out-of-work claimants and participants in the New Deal expressed as a rate of working age population

Figure 4.3 10 least employment deprived neighbourhoods

Neighbourhood name	District	Rank (England)	Change in England rank since 2004*	Change in County rank since 2004	ID-defined unemployment rate**
396 Little Bowden East	Harborough	32373	252	71	2%
395 Loughborough Holywell	Charnwood	32315	157	83	2%
394 Loughborough Oxford Street	Charnwood	32196	2117	21	2%
393 Loughborough Outwoods North	Charnwood	32033	1888	12	2%
392 Melton Sysonby East	Melton	31921	57	10	2%
391 Mountsorrel South West	Charnwood	31547	916	2	3%
390 Broughton Astley North	Harborough	31544	1130	21	3%
389 Loughborough Shelthorpe South	Charnwood	31525	1440	27	3%
388 Rearsby, Ratcliffe & Cossington	Charnwood	31508	3912	1	3%
387 Barrow North	Charnwood	31505	3656	1	3%

* Denotes negative change; ■ denotes positive change

**Aggregate of claimants based on out-of-work claimants and participants in the New Deal expressed as a rate of working age population

Source: IMD2007

5 Employment deprivation against other ID themes

Our analysis of the employment domain so far suggests that, as a whole, Leicestershire scores relatively well against the 32,482 neighbourhoods that make up the country. It has also demonstrated that, although certain districts in Leicestershire perform better than others, significant disparities in employment deprivation can be found at a smaller, neighbourhood level and for Leicestershire's worst performing neighbourhoods the situation is apparently worsening. In this instance, it makes sense to think through some other people-related deprivations which drive, and are symptoms of, worklessness - the skills, income, health, housing and crime deprivations which fold into each other to make worse a neighbourhood's labour market competitiveness. Perhaps the most obvious here are the measures for Education, Skills and Training (EST) and Health.

Employment and EST

The EST domain is split into two sub-domains - young people's (16-24) educational attainment and the level of skills/qualifications held by adults (25-54). The young people's sub-domain takes into account a range of indicators, including average scores at Key Stage 2, 3 and 4, pupil absentee rates, numbers not entering Higher Education and rates of young people remaining in post-16 education. The adult sub-domain is measured using one indicator; the proportion of adults (25-54) with no or low skills or qualifications. Together the two sub-domains represent the flow and stock of educational disadvantage; the young peoples' sub-domain measuring a neighbourhood's deprivation in attaining qualifications and the skills sub-domain identifying

skills/training deprivation in the resident working age population.


Figure 5.1 shows the relationship between the Employment and EST domain. As might be expected, there is a largely positive correlation; low levels of employment deprivation usually mean low levels of EST deprivation. This general tendency can be seen spatially in figures 5.2 and 5.3, where there is relative consistency between EST and employment in the more deprived neighbourhoods (the dark and light purple hexagons) and the less deprived neighbourhoods (the dark and light green hexagons) in the county.

There are examples where this is not the case - where a neighbourhood is employment deprived but performs relatively well educationally or where a neighbourhood is weak educationally but does not suffer from particularly high levels of worklessness. For example, with 26% of its working age population claiming out-of-work benefits Loughborough Bell Foundry is the most employment deprived neighbourhood in the County, yet in EST it ranks 13,985 (out of 32,482) in England and 149 (out of 396) in the county. This pattern is reversed for Loughborough Ashby West, which has low levels of worklessness (3%) but with a national rank of 4,355 and a county rank of 14, it performs poorly in terms of EST.

In addition, when comparing the national ranks in EST and employment deprivation overall, EST emerges as the most deprived domain; the median rank in the county for EST is 16,796, whilst for employment deprivation it is 24,088.


This might suggest that high levels of educational achievement and training do not always impact so heavily on levels of employment/employability. Without more statistical and anecdotal evidence around local labour markets - in terms of occupational structure and recruitment needs - it is difficult to explain and read too much into this claim. Moreover, the general tendency in figure 5.1 still suggests a correlation between EST and levels of worklessness in Leicestershire.

Figure 5.2 Education deprivation by county rank




Source: IMD2007

Figure 5.1 Employment deprivation (rate) by EST (England rank)



Source: IMD2007

Figure 5.3: Employment deprivation by county



Source: IMD2007

Employment and Health

The ID Health domain takes account of both physical and mental health, combining Years of Potential Life Lost (YPLL) data; Comparative Illness and Disability Ratio; measures of acute morbidity; and the proportion of adults under 60 suffering from mood or anxiety disorders.

Here there is a strong correlation between the two domains with high levels of worklessness mapping onto poor performance in Health by rank. Worryingly, the top four most employment deprived neighbourhoods (in both 2004 and 2007) - Loughborough Bell Foundry, Greenhill North East, Loughborough Warwick Way and Greenhill Centre - also appear in the same order as the top 4 most deprived neighbourhoods in terms of health, supporting the idea that severe levels of deprivation are both very localised and entrenched.

This close correlation between employment and health deprivation is reinforced in the Leicestershire median national ranks for both domains. The median rank for Employment in the county is 24,088, which is remarkably close to the median rank for Health at 24,076.

Figure 6.1 Employment deprivation (rate) by Health (England rank)





Figure 6.2 Employment Domain Decile




Hex LSOA Domains by IMD2007 EMPL DEC C

Top 10%	(39)
2 to 5.5	(159)
5.5 to 9.5	(158)
bottom 10%	(40)

Source:IMD2007

Figure 6.3 Health Domain Decile County (County ranks)



Hex LSOA Domains by IMD2007 HLTH DEC C

top 10%	(39)
2 to 5.5	(159)
5.5 to 9.5	(158)
bottom 10%	(40)

Source:IMD2007

6 Discussion: Policy Implications

Worklessness and economic transition

This document has been framed around the idea that worklessness is a function of how both an area and people respond to economic transition. Our understanding here is that structural change, the crisis around the UK's blue-collar industries and the emergence of competitive service sector industries (particularly financial and business services) has resulted in a hollowing out of the labour market. The hollowing out is characterised by two key movements; a rapid growth in the share of employment accounted for by managerial, professional and associated jobs requiring higher skills - knowledge workers - and, as a corollary, a number of jobs at the bottom end of the labour market (for those with lower level skills or from skilled trade, operative and elementary occupations) aimed at largely servicing this group of knowledge workers. The latter is usually associated with personal and customer service roles and with modest financial rewards. People and places which have struggled to respond to these changes - usually those with an industrial past - have experienced sustained economic, social and health deprivation, which has reinforced a cycle of decline⁶.

A problem of labour market supply or demand?

Recent policiesⁱⁱ aimed at tackling worklessness in such deprived areas have aimed at a balance between tackling people-related supply-side barriers to entering the labour market (which we have considered) and boosting local demand through providing jobs locally. Many people have argued that the balance should be with affecting local job provision (or manipulating

ⁱⁱSince 1999 and the Labour government's New Deal programme

demand)⁷. The main argument here is that those who are on the edge of labour market exclusion, usually lacking in skills, are forced into jobs which are comparatively low-paid. Local job provision matters to these people since they weigh up, amongst other things, the wages they earn with the loss of secure income (in welfare payments) and the cost of travelling to work. If the cost of the latter is significant, then people at the lower end of the labour market may forgo employment. One of Leicestershire's LAA targets, like that of many authorities, is to reduce the proportion of working age population on out-of-work benefits and it is useful here to think about how ID data can help in identifying where the balance between local job provision and people-related barriers should lie.


It is loosely the case that for Leicestershire there has been a people-related cycle of decline in certain neighbourhoods. This is evidenced by the consistency in most neighbourhoods' performance in terms of employment, EST and Health; so where there are high levels of worklessness, there are usually weak scores on EST and Health. Given this, it makes sense to continue with policy aimed at up-skilling and engaging individuals suffering from worklessness within a neighbourhood. However, the patchiness and extremely localised nature of severe employment deprivation (as opposed to there being a coherent cluster of neighbourhoods which suffer from employment deprivation) makes it unclear whether or not worklessness is also a problem of local job provision.

ID data on employment deprivation within Leicester City is useful here. Figure 6.1 shows the spread of neighbourhoods in Leicester City and Leicestershire

County by the 10% most-to-least deprived neighbourhoods nationally (based on national ranks). With a median (England) rank of 8,203 and almost a quarter (24%) of its neighbourhoods in the 10% most deprived neighbourhoods nationally, Leicester City is significantly more employment deprived than the county. Whilst this might not be surprising (urban areas suffer from their own distinct social problems) in weighing up the extent to which worklessness policy should address demand or supply-side barriers it does raise significant questions.

Cities, as economic cores, usually demand a diverse workforce in terms of skills and pay levels and therefore offer a broad range of opportunities. As alluded to earlier, for those on the edge of labour market exclusion who, lacking in skills, are constrained geographically, proximity to an urban centre is extremely important. Since in Leicester City employment deprivation is comparatively so high, where there is by implication a relatively high and diverse proportion of jobs provided locally, worklessness here cannot be reduced to spatial factors – the exclusion of low skilled, low paid people from the labour market due to a lack of geographical mobility. For Leicestershire, the fact that all 6 of its neighbourhoods within the most deprived 20% nationally have an urban classification (figure 6.2), coupled with the fact that there are no clear geographically defined groups of neighbourhoods which suffer from severe levels of worklessness, might provide further weight to the argument for privileging skills, social and other more personal barriers to the labour market ahead of local job creation.

Figure 6.1 Neighbourhood ranks as a proportion of all neighbourhoods in Leicestershire and Leicester City by decile



Median Rank	
City	8,203
County	24,088

Figure 6.2 The most employment deprived neighbourhoods in Leicestershire have an urban classification

	Most deprived 20% (England)	Least deprived 20% (England)
Urban > 10k	100%	60%
Town and Fringe	0%	21%
Village	0%	19%
Base	6	151

7 Conclusions

This analysis of the employment domain has argued that, as a whole and compared nationally, Leicestershire is not employment deprived. The county has improved its relative position since 2004 and this is especially the case for Leicestershire's more affluent neighbourhoods. There are, however, certain neighbourhoods which do suffer from high levels of worklessness; in these neighbourhoods, employment deprivation is expressed/represented extremely locally and there has been little positive change in the 3 years between 2004 and 2007. Comparisons across other ID domains show that high levels of employment deprivation are usually also characterised by high levels of EST and health deprivation. In terms of Leicestershire's LAA target and policy interventions aimed at reducing worklessness, since there are no clearly defined geographical areas (above neighbourhood level) which suffer from extreme levels of deprivation in the county, and that employment deprivation in the city is so high, we have tentatively suggested emphasis should be placed on removing people-related barriers to the labour market ahead of affecting local job provision. Before making any value claims or judgements, however, there is a need for deeper research into local labour markets (particularly between Leicester City and Leicestershire County), business recruitment needs and anecdotal evidence around individual stories of worklessness. Moreover, the current recession, which is expected to hit across most industrial and occupational sectors⁸, will bring new labour market challenges and local statistical intelligence will need to catch up with this.

References

¹ONS, Q3 2008. Accessed on the internet at: <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/cci/nugget.asp?ID=12>

² Marshal, A.(2005) “Towards full employment—Tackling Inactivity”, *IPPR*

³ Beatty, Fothergill, Gore and Powell (2007) “The Real Level of Unemployment”, Centre for Regional Economic and Social Research

⁴Neale, I, (2008) “Economy” in *This is Leicestershire: An evidence base for the new county-wide Sustainable Community Strategy & Local Area Agreement*

⁵Centre for Economic Performance (2006) “Incapacity Benefit Reform:Tackling the Rise in Labour Market Inactivity”. Published on the Internet at: http://cep.lse.ac.uk/briefings/pa_incapacity_benefit.pdf

⁶Communities and Local Government (2008) “Lifting the Burdens Task Force: Lifting the Burdens from Economic Development and Regeneration”. Published on the Internet at: <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/507390/pdf/996433.pdf>

⁷Green, A. and Owen, D. (2006) “The geography of poor skills and access to work”, *Joseph Rowntree Foundation*. Published on the Internet at: <http://www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/eBooks/1859354300.pdf>

⁸Wintour, P. and Stratton, A. (2008) “Purnell: unemployment will bite deep” *The Guardian* Saturday 18th October