

## **Alternative Claimant Count as an Indicator of Economic Performance**

### **Introduction**

One powerful and easy way of looking at fluctuations within economies at local authority level is to consider the trends around the number of people claiming unemployment related benefits and flows on and off the register. This information is available from the Department for Work and Pensions.

This analysis is provided as part of the RSN Economic Profiling service. The RSN also offers a wide range of analysis and information for rural areas.

- How does it work?

The analysis includes benchmarked information for our member authorities. There are two spreadsheets attached to this analysis:

- Claimant Flows August 2019
- Claimants as % of the working population June 2019

You can click your authority on the drop down box on the spreadsheet to see the quartile trend for your authority. You can also compare how it performs against categories of authority by using the box below, for example the district average, or Mainly Rural authorities.

We will update this analysis on a quarterly basis.

### **Alternative Claimant Count Flow Commentary**

The graph in the attached analysis shows the claimant flow up to the period August 2019.

Where the flow of claimants is 1, there is no net change in the total number of claimants. Figures greater than one mean that there are more people signing on to claim for an unemployment related benefit than there are leaving the register. A figure less than 1 shows that more people are leaving the register than joining it. You can use these figures to help gauge the relative dynamism of the labour market in each local authority.

Table showing the 10 worst performing Local Authority areas:

Authority	Categorisation	Flow
Fareham	Urban with City and Town	1.752
Wycombe	Urban with Significant Rural (rural including hub towns 26-49%)	1.614
Waverley	Largely Rural (rural including hub towns 50-79%)	1.596
South Northamptonshire	Mainly Rural (rural including hub towns >=80%)	1.532
Blaby	Urban with City and Town	1.453
Stockport	Urban with Major Conurbation	1.424
Gedling	Urban with Minor Conurbation	1.395
Nottingham	Urban with Minor Conurbation	1.392
North East Derbyshire	Urban with City and Town	1.384
North West Leicestershire	Largely Rural (rural including hub towns 50-79%)	1.380

3 of these local authority areas are classed as Predominantly Rural, 1 is classed as Urban with Significant Rural, and 6 are classed as Predominantly Urban.

Table showing the 10 best performing Local Authority areas:

Authority	Categorisation	Flow
Brentwood	Urban with Significant Rural (rural including hub towns 26-49%)	0.713
Surrey Heath	Urban with City and Town	0.769
South Tyneside	Urban with Major Conurbation	0.807
Christchurch	Urban with City and Town	0.815
Epsom & Ewell	Urban with Major Conurbation	0.848
South Lakeland	Mainly Rural (rural including hub towns >=80%)	0.869
Barnsley	Urban with Minor Conurbation	0.882
Copeland	Mainly Rural (rural including hub towns >=80%)	0.882
Epping Forest	Urban with Significant Rural (rural including hub towns 26-49%)	0.894
East Northamptonshire	Largely Rural (rural including hub towns 50-79%)	0.913

5 of the best performing authorities when looking at claimant flow ratio are classed as being Predominantly Urban, 2 are classed as Urban with Significant Rural and 3 are classed as Predominantly Rural.

### **Alternative Claimant Count Commentary**

We have also analysed Alternative Claimant Count to give RSN members a simple overview of how their authority can be benchmarked with other authorities. They can also see trends which can help provide a fuller picture of economic performance and the direction of travel.

Table showing local authorities with the 10 highest levels of claimants (June 2019) :

Local Authority	Categorisation	LEP	Alternative claimant count as proportion of working population%
Birmingham	Urban with Major Conurbation	Greater Birmingham and Solihull	9.7%
Middlesbrough	Urban with City and Town	Tees Valley	9.4%
Wolverhampton	Urban with Major Conurbation	Black Country LEP	9.0%
Hartlepool	Urban with City and Town	Tees Valley LEP	8.7%
South Tyneside	Urban with Major Conurbation	North Eastern	8.6%
Blackpool	Urban with City and Town	Lancashire	8.5%
Kingston upon Hull	Urban with City and Town	Humber LEP	7.9%
Burnley	Urban with City and Town	Lancashire LEP	7.5%
Blackburn with Darwen	Urban with City and Town	Lancashire LEP	7.2%
Bradford	Urban with Major Conurbation	Leeds City Region LEP	7.1%

Table showing local authorities with the 10 lowest levels of claimants (June 2019) :

Local Authority	Categorisation	LEP	Alternative claimant count as proportion of working population%
City of London	Urban with Major Conurbation	London	0.9%
Hart	Urban with Significant Rural (rural including hub towns 26-49%)	Enterprise M3	1.1%
Mid Sussex	Urban with City and Town	Coast to Capital	1.2%
South Cambridgeshire	Largely Rural (rural including hub towns 50-79%)	Greater Cambridge & Greater Peterborough	1.3%
Mole Valley	Urban with Significant Rural (rural including hub towns 26-49%)	Coast to Capital	1.3%
Guildford	Urban with City and Town	Enterprise M3	1.3%
Surrey Heath	Urban with City and Town	Enterprise M3	1.4%
Waverley	Largely Rural (rural including hub towns 50-79%)	Enterprise M3	1.4%
South Lakeland	Mainly Rural (rural including hub towns $\geq 80\%$ )	Cumbria	1.4%
Wokingham	Urban with City and Town	Thames Valley Berkshire	1.4%

For the ten authorities with lowest levels of claimant as at June 2019 listed above, 3 are classed as Predominantly Rural, 2 are Urban with Significant Rural, and 5 is Predominantly Urban.