SOCIAL IMPACTS AND SOCIAL EQUITY ISSUES IN TRANSPORT WORKSHOP SERIES

Final Dissemination Event Report

JANUARY 2012

Prepared by Karen Lucas
TRANSPORT STUDIES UNIT, UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
Report Contents

CONTENTS

1. OVERVIEW OF THE WORKSHOP SERIES 2
   Aims and objectives
   The full programme of events
   Research outputs
   The scope of this report

2. FINAL DISSEMINATION EVENT 4
   Key aims and objectives
   Speakers
   Workshop outputs

3. THE KEY ISSUES 5
   Chair’s introduction
   Framing event
   Employment, education and training
   Health Perspectives
   Housing and Sustainable Communities
   Connectivity of Rural Communities
   Group discussion

4. BREAKOUT GROUP DISCUSSIONS 9
   Breakout Group A: Research
   Breakout Group B: Policy
   Breakout Group C: Practical delivery

5. FINAL OUTCOMES 13
   Research Perspective: Peter Jones
   Policy perspective: Nigel Dotchin:
   Practitioner perspective: Ralph Smyth

APPENDICES 17
   Workshop programme
   List of participants

Acknowledgements

Thanks go to Lucy Mahoney and Nora Steurer (TSU and Laura Lane (LSE) for their help in compiling this report and to Sally Pepperall (TSU) for her help with organising the final event.
1. **Overview the Workshop series**

Social issues form an important element of the transport policy challenge, but have been much less well explored and articulated than areas such as the economy and the environment. The social sciences have collectively carried out a wide range of research into social impacts and social equity, from a variety of different perspectives. Take up of this work in transport policy and research has been limited and patchy, however. Hence the priority under this theme was to expose and synthesize this diversity of work, and consider its applicability to contemporary policy and practice, by holding a series of linked Research into Practice events. Each seminar had a different focus and was led by a different institution, with the overall project being led by Dr Karen Lucas at the TSU.

1.1 **Aims and objectives**

The overall aim of the series is to promote interdisciplinary collaboration and capacity building to better equip researchers, policymakers and practitioners to address the social challenges in transport now and in the future within the UK context. It draws on state-of-the-art research and best practices across a wide range of disciplines both here and abroad, to identify gaps in knowledge and the appropriate methodologies and evidence base for addressing these.

1.2 **The full programme of Events**

1. Framing Event - University of Oxford, 14-15 September 2010
2. Employment and Training Workshop - University of Warwick, 2 December 2010
3. Transport and Health Workshop - 17-18 March 2011
4. Housing and Sustainable Communities Workshop - London School of Economics, 21 June 2011
5. Rural Connectivity Workshop - Aberdeen University, 3-4 October 2011

1.3 **Key Research Outputs**

- Slides of all the workshop presentations, six workshop reports and accompanying policy briefing notes for the series can be found [http://www.tsu.ox.ac.uk/research/ukrcse/](http://www.tsu.ox.ac.uk/research/ukrcse/)
- Two Transport Studies Unit Working Papers arising from the study are also available for download:
  - a literature review by Julia Markovich and Karen Lucas (with an annotated citations database compiled by Julia Markovich)
  - an analysis of the National Travel Survey by Gordon Stokes and Karen Lucas
- A Special Issue of the *Journal of Transport Geography* ‘Social Impacts and Equity Issues in Transport’ guest edited by Karen Lucas and Peter Jones with papers from the series by:
  - Social impacts and Equity Issues in Transport: an Introduction *K. Lucas and P. Jones*
  - The social consequences of transport decision-making: clarifying concepts, synthesising knowledge and assessing implications *P. Jones and K. Lucas*
  - Researching people’s lived experiences of the transport system *F. Hodgson*
  - Social Networks and Mobile Lives: The Implications for Transport and Social Equity *J. Urry*
1.4 **This scope of this report**

This report concerns the final dissemination workshop.
2. Final dissemination event

The final dissemination event was held at the Department of Transport offices in Marsham Street, London on November 2nd, 2011. The workshop participants came from a wide range of academic disciplines, central government departments, local government and non-governmental organisations, many of whom had attended all or some of the previous workshops.

2.1 Key aims and objectives

The workshop was designed to draw together and reflect on the key findings and recommendations of the previous workshops and to develop a set of recommendations for future research into social impacts and equity issues in transport and to suggest the future contribution of policy in this respect.

2.2 List of speakers

- Stephen Joseph, Chief Executive, Campaign for Better Transport
- Dr Karen Lucas, Transport Studies Unit, University of Oxford
- Dr Anne Green, Institute for Employment Research, University of Warwick
- Prof Tanja Pless-Mulloli, Institute of Health and Society
- Prof Anne Power, Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion
- Dr Mark Beecroft, Institute of Transport and Rural Research, Aberdeen University
- Professor Peter Jones, Centre for Transport Studies, University College London
- Nigel Dotchin, Head of Equalities and Opportunities Strategy, Department for Transport
- Ralph Smyth, Senior Campaigns Office, Campaign for Rural England

2.3 Workshop outputs

The main outputs from this event are this workshop report and a policy briefing note, which can be downloaded with the main presentations at http://www.tsu.ox.ac.uk/research/uktrcse/
3. The Key Issues

3.1 Chairs’ introduction

Stephen Joseph, Director of the Campaign for Better Transport, began by offering an overview of the key challenges for transport in the present UK political climate. He noted cuts in local transport spending whilst at the same time there is an intention for significant investment in new rail infrastructure, but with accompanying fares increases. Outside of the public transport sector the focus is on roads and unfettered car use. This is also in the context of liberalising planning reforms. Therefore, a big issue is what are the social impacts of this and how does it link to wider social impacts?

At the same time, local transport is facing significant financial pressures in terms of cut backs in general local authority funding, the Bus Service Operators Grant (BSOG) and the Integrated Transport Block Grant. There have already been significant cuts in local bus services: over 1000 have gone and 77% of councils say more may follow. At least one company is planning big fares increases. Travel planning, cycling and other spending has been slashed and local authority knowledge and capability has been cut.

He also predicted potential changes in concessionary fares regime will ensue. This is at a time when there is an increased need to travel as other services close/centralise and for public transport as cars become less affordable for many households in times of economic austerity.

He concluded that current transport policies and trends will have major social impacts and raise huge questions about social equity. He stressed the need to find ways of assessing and gathering evidence about these impacts. The key challenge is to make the evidence available to and easily comprehensible to decision makers and the wider public.

Following his presentation, each of the leaders of the previous five workshops summarised the key research and policy recommendations which had arisen from the presentations and group discussions at these events. This was followed by informal groups discussion with all the workshop participants.

3.2 Framing event

Dr Karen Lucas presented the main research and policy recommendations to arise from the first framing event. These were as follows:

Research recommendations

1. Provide a ‘lexicon’ of terminology, definitions and key concepts
2. Develop overarching frameworks to understand the social and distributional impacts (SDIs) of transport policy decisions, e.g. HSR2, road tolling, smarter choices
3. Provide innovative funding models for delivering effective public transport
4. Provide multi-disciplinary perspectives on the impacts of transport policy (land use, welfare/ health/ wellbeing/social capital outcomes, etc.)
5. Build social impact and equity scenarios for changing population and institutional structures

Policy recommendations

More guidance is needed on:
1. How social inequalities in transport can be addressed in context of ‘Big Society & ‘new localism’ agenda
2. How to address the apparent conflict between environmental and social goals
3. How to provide improved clarity on the social impacts of transport policy
4. How to measure and evaluate social impacts and distributional effects.
5. How to address these issues in cost-effective ways
3.3 Employment, education and training

Dr Anne Green presented the key recommendations from the Warwick workshop:

**Potential research areas**

1. The idea of ‘workplace’ replaced by ‘activity spaces for work’ as a focus for research
2. Spatial mobility as an important component in the ‘employability mix’
3. The role of a car in enhancing individuals’ abilities to access work – enhancing time and space flexibility
4. Social networks reinforcing (dis)advantage
5. ‘Mobility’ and ‘immobility’ as learned behaviours

**Policy recommendations**

1. ‘Workers to work’ – how & where can transport help? (And where not?)
2. Transport to support the Work Programme
3. Remote rural areas & breaking out of the low skills equilibrium (LSEq) – the role of transport
4. Work locations & travel: is ICT a panacea?
5. Links between paid & unpaid work in the ‘Big Society’ – what role for transport?

3.4 Health Perspectives

Professor Tanja Pless-Mulloli presented the key messages from the Newcastle workshop:

**Research messages**

1. Interventions targeting whole populations may improve health but also exacerbate health inequalities
2. There is a need to understand transport choices and health links in context
3. There is still need to develop meaningful indicators for measuring and evaluating transport choices
4. Research and governance- transport and health need to be bridged and not treated as silos - all transport modes need to be inclusive to benefit health.

**Policy recommendations**

1. Need to link social and health inequalities with environmental justice and air quality
2. Use lessons from other sectors to develop transport and health interventions
3. Create networking and collaboration opportunities for researchers and policy makers
4. Economic outcomes need to be considered alongside quality of life and sustainability
5. Transport and health choices need to be embedded in new visions of the urban and rural fabric of a sustainable society

3.5 Housing and Sustainable Communities

Professor Anne Power presented the key messages from the LSE workshop:

**Research messages**

1. Research demonstrates very different problems in different types of deprived area
2. Density is a vexed and critical issue- ‘locked-in’ infrastructure causes environmental problems. Mono-tenure, out of town development and sprawl work against transport solutions and car culture also shapes people’s aspirations.
3. Deprived communities rely more strongly on local provision, e.g. schools, shops but access to services is not just about availability and cost, e.g. youth gangs, confidence also act as major barriers
4. The potential of walking, cycling underestimated, e.g. London / TFL, there are very useful models from Europe, where security and other modest measures e.g. bike lock up have worked
Policy recommendations
1. Local government must maintain public transport and find new creative solutions for car-reduced (car limited) areas
2. Better information and inter-connectedness between services, e.g. through franchise contracts for buses
3. Much stronger inter-connectedness between transport services and social need
4. Countering sprawl, raising density and innovating in low energy / low cost transport will have to go together - smarter growth and better infrastructure are key.
5. Counter-incentives to 'hyper-mobility' may work, e.g. soft measures can enhance cycling / walking / bus use

3.6 Connectivity of Rural Communities
Dr Mark Beecroft, presented the main findings from the Aberdeen workshop

Research issues
1. Who/what is the countryside for?
2. Diversity of rurality, but...
3. Clearly disadvantaged vs. urban
4. Social connectivity a strength, but...
5. Transport poverty and digital exclusion

Policy issues
1. ‘Joined up’ localism
2. Resilient rural transport networks
3. Exploiting the digital economy:
   a) Telepresence
   b) Handling data
4. Socially inclusive appraisal
5. Sustainable rural form

3.7 Group discussion
Stephen Joseph then chaired an open discussion from the floor, which was generated by the question:

Is there a general lack of awareness of what is already known about social impacts and equity issues in transport? If so, how can we better disseminate our findings?

The following issues were raised:

New data and communication
- We need a database of good practice examples. A website is not enough – we need actively communicated research evidence.
- Research needs to ally itself with stakeholder groups, e.g. more interaction with the Local Government Association and local authorities themselves.
- We need more evidence from case studies; use professional networks to get the findings out, data-sharing, e.g. the Merseyside Travel website has local research report on the social value of WorkWise benefits.

Work with others
- Currently, connections between research and policy are almost accidental. The promotion of good ideas is a huge responsibility for policy makers and academics. It is an on-going task for all
- A research communication plan is needed and should be linked to previous research instead of reinventing the wheel
- We need a project that brings together academics, politics, etc. At present we have failed to engage the DCLG or DH and NHS policy people. You need constant engagement and a mechanism for information exchange. Academia does not
have the capacity to do it. This network created by this project for instance will cease to exist once the project is completed unless someone else can take over the responsibility for it.

- Networks are important: Trust is needed, no longer acting as opponents, nor starting and stopping. Regional transport councils and Local authorities undertake lots of great projects, but no connection or coordination!
- Role of learning methods: Informal learning. The time is ripe to set something up. Who is going to take forward research and why would it interest them? There are great initiatives and a new policy landscape out there. Could the DfT take the network over?

**Linking social equity to other issues**

- Social equity issues in transport are helped when they are linked to other issues (environment and urban sustainability; housing in relation to transport, health and equity, access to jobs)
- Lack of public transport is a big issue on the outskirts of cities: high rates of young pregnancies. No anonymous advice, no transport into the centre of the city. This leads to un-smart growth.
- America can be characterised as segregated, with un-smart growth, locked-in infrastructure, circling around car, racial lines, etc. Europe has much denser development. We need to fight back on stupid decisions.
- Politicians are constrained by electoral and population constraints. We need to keep and use urban infrastructure.
4. **Breakout Groups**

The participants were split into three mixed groups of academics, policy makers and practitioners to discuss and conclude on a final set of recommendations for future research, policy and practice.

- Group A was facilitated by Dr Karen Lucas, with Laura Lane as its rapporteur, and was responsible for considering a set of research recommendations.
- Group B was facilitated by Gordon Stokes with Lucy Mahoney as its rapporteur, and was responsible for identifying policy recommendations.
- Group C was facilitated by Ralph Smyth, with Nora Steurer as its rapporteur and was responsible for recommending some ideas for operationalising research and policy at the level of practice.

Each group was asked to discuss the key issues and bring a series of five key recommendations back to the final plenary session. The following three sections of this report offer a brief overview of the key points raised within each group.

The groups were asked to identify some of the high level questions that have been left unanswered by previous discussions and to develop some new thinking in relation to these; for example, the changing nature of work and work networks. They were also asked to pull together ideas about future research needs and possible pathways to get that work commissioned and funded. The participants were particularly asked to consider the following key questions:

- Has anything about the seminar series made people think about their research in a different way? Has anything different come to mind as a result of the seminars?
- Is it important to understand how social values are measured in different departments / sectors – this is unclear to us in research.
- Social value is a fairly dominant issue but how do we do it – how can we measure it?
- Would really like to know to what extent is transport a barrier to employment? How big an issue is it really?
- What are the possible pathways to achieving some of the research objectives?

4.1 **Breakout Group A: Research**

**Appraisal of social impacts**

It was generally agreed that there is already a substantial body of research in the UK and abroad which recognises the importance of measuring the social impacts of policy decisions, e.g. DWP in UK, Social Impact Assessment (SIA) in EU and Environmental Justice (EJ) Title VI assessment in USA. Designing integrated and balanced policies from the outset is difficult.

Some fundamental academic research is needed to demonstrate people’s experiences of living with certain benefits and disbenefits and the longer term social consequences of transport decisions.

It was recognised that cost-benefit analysis (CBA) is a growing area within government and is is likely to remain the main appraisal tool for the near future. Each department is trying to do some cost benefit work. There is a move within orthodox cost-benefit analysis thinking to incorporate social as well as just economic aspects.

In DWP, health and crime impacts are used as well as fiscal benefits; also winners and losers analysis is used when thinking about policy, judging one investment against another. For example, Iain Duncan Smith has a very clear focus on social justice – this will lead us into working with other government departments.

In DfT, health benefits are being valued quite highly, e.g. people who switch to bus use are usually those who were walking or cycling before – should we calculate the health costs of this?
Research is needed to understand how to measure and monetarize the social impacts of transport spending and other budgetary decisions, so that these values can be incorporated within CBA calculations.

**Land Use & Land Use Planning**

General rules about population and urban density, economic performance and the provision of different forms of transport are not well understood in practice – there are different levels of density and connectedness to the labour market. Example of Tower Hamlets is interesting: this is a very deprived borough that performs very badly on the Index of Multiple Deprivation and yet is very connected.

Spatial inequality is a reflection of more general inequality – people with less choice live in places that are less desirable. The same planning mistakes are made against the same people over and over again. There are links between social disadvantage; there is a need to sift out the generic from the specific.

Research could usefully explore these relations to ask questions such as: How far is land use self-sustaining? Are connectivity, flexible labour markets and greater resilience linked? What are the agglomeration effects? Are there areas of resilience? How long can you have low levels of labour market activity before the economy stagnates?

**Connectivity (Urban and Rural)**

It is extremely expensive to subsidise public transport in rural areas and often not necessarily any better environmentally. Something that came up within the Aberdeen seminar – the modal shift in urban areas is in a different context to rural areas – there is no policy priority for a modal shift in the rural context.

Multifunctional hubs could help to provide density but in a different sense to that used in urban terms – co-location of services is important (the idea of poly-nuclear labour markets rather than along radial spokes; so theoretically more flexible).

There is a big unsolved issue about different forms of connectivity in terms of urban and rural form and what is most appropriate.

**Inequality & Employment**

The current government is trying to address the causes of inequality – what are the underlying drivers of inequality – early intervention is vital. This offers the opportunity to align discussions and provide more cost-effective solutions to some of our problems. Could we do this addressing the relationship between health, employment and transport?

Employee selection is also an issue – are employers more likely to employ people who live nearby and are therefore seen to be more reliable? In a more flexible labour market people can self-organise – are there ways of introducing flexibility into the system?

The example of the Let’s Get Moving (Merseytravel scheme) was given. It has neighbourhood transport teams based in Job Centres who can there and then answer any questions and provide advice on how to travel to the job that may be available. Obviously most important to match the person to the skills and job but also need to ensure they are able to get there.

Within the question of whether transport is a barrier to employment – has there been any work done broken down by type of unemployment/ inactivity e.g. long-term incapacity benefit claimants vis-a-vis short duration benefit claimants, etc?

**Key priorities for future research Group A**

1. Understanding the social value of transport in terms of:
   a. Measuring social impacts
   b. Collective vs. individual
   c. Facilitating other activities
   d. Health
2. Connectivity and how to maintain and support:
a. Labour markets  
b. Social networks  
c. Poly-nuclear structures  
d. Resilience  

3. Analysis of travel trend analysis and patterns of social disadvantage over time  
a. Timelines / early intervention  
b. Reinventing ‘context’ of transport  
c. Travel distance and job uptake (willingness to travel vs. ability to do so)  
d. Why don’t people travel – patterns of immobility  

4. Further exploring the role of the digital economy and social exclusion / inclusion factors – substitution activity.  

4.2 Breakout Group B: Policy  

Getting messages across  
The main theme of the discussion was that those present felt they had a basic understanding of the social issues that surrounded transport, but that these messages were not getting across to ‘higher’ decision makers. While there were areas where research would be useful, the pressing issue was to find ways to get the messages across to a wider audience. The issues discussed included:  

• Research needs to be pragmatic and ethics driven – remember who is paying. What do they want from your research? Researchers need to ask themselves “What is the research for? What drives policy?”  
• Grants for research should be seen as being there to change something rather than just about getting published. Need to have research of relevance to people and individuals as well as policy and academics  
• Research is done on policy but lacks in direct application to practice – should more research miss policy and concentrate on practice? We need a step change so we are friendly to government and practice  
• What actually gets the message across? This is key. More mapping, statistics and concrete evidence to convince people on, e.g. spatial distribution of poverty (poor forced further out of the city) – links between social research and what can convince people  
• Overcome problem of commissioning of studies which repeat previous studies – better knowledge exchange needed  
• Research is often conducted but not properly disseminated to policy makers and practitioners  

Appraisal methodology  
It was felt that current appraisal methods ignored most of the social impacts of transport. The discussion was largely about whether social aspects could be included in cost benefit type analyses as monetary values, or whether this ‘devalued’ them. The consensus was that it was necessary to work on valuing costs and benefits to get the messages across, but that this was unfortunate given the non-monetary value of many benefits.  

• Evidence and understanding of the advantages and disadvantages, quantified monetarily  
• Price the impacts of schemes on society  
• We need to think “This is what we want to measure because it is meaningful”  

Clarification of social and health benefits of transport  
Linked to the discussion on appraisal methodology it was recognised that much research was needed on quantifying the cross sector benefits of transport as most of the social benefits were not in the transport sphere, but in health and social policy, and others. Attempts had been made in the last ten years to quantify, but most had been small scale
pilot projects which had not been able to provide a body of knowledge to provide quantification.

- There should be more independent academic evaluations of projects (best practice) and policy makers should also pay attention to impacts of research and how studies relate to their policies.
- Better research collaborations (interdisciplinary) are needed. We understand many of the cross-sectoral benefits but there is a lack of skills for researchers in setting up networks.
- Be more tangible in gaining evidence of impacts.
- Funding directed at exploring and solving specific issues rather than attempting to cover all aspects.

**Long term future social impacts**

Many of the social impacts arise out of long term strategies and overarching themes in policy, and there was a need to look at long term future scenarios. For example, the impacts of high levels of car ownership on the isolation of those in rural communities without cars has taken decades to evolve, and interact with other developments such as the greater distances between extended families.

- Disjunction between strategies and schemes – futures work could help develop strategies to help social issues.
- Study life course (child, adult, elderly life issues) and how transport impacts on them.
- Infrastructure for elderly and other groups in society.
- Get to a situation where social problems leads infrastructure (rather than vice versa).

**Key priorities for future research Group B**

1. Framework for communicating impacts of transport on health, society and inequality (cost benefit/appraisal framework)
   a. Research outputs having impacts,
   b. E.g. mapping, statistics and quantitative research
2. Research on actual impacts and drawing together what has already been found (interdisciplinary)
3. Futures research – ageing, digital, disability (all future potential impacts)
4. Pedestrian network is an example of an area needing immediate research. Research on:
   a. Impacts of large changes vs. minor changes
   b. How do we get people to walk more?
5. Relate big issues to big infrastructure

**4.3 Breakout Group C: Practical Delivery**

**Key overarching issues**

There was some general discussion of the issue of spatial clustering versus sprawl and how these link to equity issues in transport. A second general issue was the measurement and appraisal of social impacts and equity in transport and whether alternative indices and tools are needed. The Social Return on Investment (SRI) approach was discussed as having good potential as an alternative assessment tool.

**Data collection issues: Who has a voice?**

In terms of definitions and over-arching theory, as well as in the collection of data the question was asked as to the voice of the excluded: where do the subjects of this research topic fit in? Are they included into the research process and community decisions?

The huge information divide that currently exists between both rich and poor populations groups, but also rural and urban communities (including with ICT) offers both a potential
danger: information divide and damage to local shops, but also opportunities. What biases exist? How are they changing? Which are constant?

Community Hubs
The group also discussed the potential for creating new community hubs (community facilities such as a bus service, and the multi-use of facilities) to give people on low incomes better access to services. The question was asked how to choose priorities in terms of what communities were chosen? Who has the power to decide?

Other more generic barriers to and support for community development were discussed, many of which also apply beyond the field of, i.e. funding, how to ensure a constant evaluation? How to audit communities, whether to give over the responsibility for budgets to community, how to empower communities and how to limit bureaucracy?

Institutional Issues
A number of legislative and institutional issues and barriers to better service delivery were also identified in terms of:
• Health & Safety regulation and deregulation
• Health & Transport
• Who delivers transport other than commercial providers and how they can be brought to the table?
• What basics standards for transport are needed everywhere (focusing particularly on rural areas)?

Key priorities for future research Group C
2. Working out private and public partnerships (PPPs) in transport services & community hubs.
3. Understanding who is disadvantaged in the new delivery models and possible safety nets.
4. How to take into the social impact of spatial planning policy into account (e.g. Urban sprawl) on patterns of transport division.
5. Understanding ways of using, and implications of, ICT in effective transport evaluations.
6. Understanding the impacts of changing ICT on patterns of transport and social equity.
5. Final Outcomes

In the final plenary session a representative from each group first reported on their key recommendations for taking the social impacts and equity issues research agenda forward (see above sections). This was followed by a final round-up of the issues from an academic, policy and practical delivery perspective by three invited speakers, Professor Peter Jones (UCL), Nigel Dotchin (DfT) and Ralph Smyth (CPRE).

5.1 Final round-up from an academic perspective: Professor Peter Jones

Professor Jones identified four generic areas for future research:

1. The scoping and framing of the research:
   - Currently, it is unclear what is meant by a ‘social impact’ and the area seems to have been marginalised and ‘ghettoised’ – seen as of lesser importance than economic and environmental impacts.
   - It would be more fruitful to frame the issue differently, recognising that policy measures and other exogenous factors have impacts, and that these impacts usually have an economic, environmental and social dimension. Further, that all three are potentially capable of being monetised in a variety of ways: financial savings, willingness to pay, etc.
   - Similarly, distributional consequences (spatially, socially and temporally) can result from economic, environmental and social impacts.

2. Communicating the issues:
   - Improved communication is key to making substantial progress in research and policy making, but there are major impediments and barriers.
   - Communication is a major problem across academic disciplines. The academic world is a ‘Tower of Babel’, with each discipline having its own, difficult-to-penetrate language. Often different terms are used in different disciplines to describe essentially the same concept; and – more worrying – sometimes the same word can have different meanings. There are also vast differences in methodology, and in what is considered ‘valid’ evidence.
   - Many people recognise the potential benefits from closer working across disciplines, but it is hard work and there are few incentives. Although the rhetoric of cross discipline cooperation is commonplace, the REF and academic promotion are still largely based on ‘within discipline’ measures of prestige.
   - Equivalent problems are to be found in the policy arena, with limited cross sector dialogue and cooperation. Again, there are language problems, but many other barriers too: lack of understanding of different administrative cultures and structures, different priorities and incentive structures, and different rationale for action and procedures for making business cases.

3. Two specific ideas for future research
   - Dynamic issues and cumulative effects, looking at how social impacts arise, how they might accumulate over time, and what opportunities may arise at specific points in time (e.g. changes in personal circumstances, or policy ‘windows’) to address the problems.
   - Causes and consequences of lack of travel, due to limited travel horizons (e.g. limiting job search), or suppressed demand due to fear of travelling in certain areas or at particular times.

4. Enhanced policy application

He suggested that researchers need to improve the ways in which they:
   - Articulate the nature of social impacts, including the development of key performance indicators;
   - Establish the relative importance of social impacts, for different groups; and
• Measure the costs of social impacts and the benefits to be derived from addressing them.
• The latter might be done in various ways, from financial savings, to stated willingness to pay, to improvements in quality of life. This, in turn, should help to justify funding of further research and case study applications.

5.2 Final round-up from a policy perspective: Nigel Dotchin

Nigel Dotchin concluded that the workshop had demonstrated the importance of understanding social impacts and social equity issues for improved policy decision making and practical delivery of transport services. At a time of reduced resources, it was imperative to have hard evidence and proper evaluation. For the Department of Transport, the timing was apposite because of the current business planning round. The Department’s ‘vision’ was currently focused on economic growth and carbon reduction, so the challenge was to ensure that social issues were not overlooked, and addressed in a way that reflected the new approaches of the Coalition.

5.3 Final round-up from a practitioner perspective: Ralph Smyth

Ralph Smyth concluded by highlighting the challenges and opportunities that the localism agenda posed, both for practical delivery as well as policy. Although there is cross-party consensus for an end to centralisation, localism could mean different things. A hands-off localism could be a fig leaf to absolve responsibility for unequal impacts, such as the loss of remaining bus services in rural areas.

In order for localism to drive improved performance needed three elements. First is a policy framework that gives sufficient direction and co-ordination but also flexibility for local areas to flourish. Second is sufficient funding, whether from government or new local funding streams, though these themselves may have particular impacts. Finally, relying on the ballot box is not enough: civil society needs to be empowered both to work in partnership and to hold local councils to account. Research is vital not just to discover both what works best but to enable the preparation of Equalities Impact Assessments, which were now being used to found legal challenges against bad decisions. There were great opportunities for NGOs and academics to work together.

5.4 Publications from the workshop

A Special Issue of the Journal of Transport Geography on Social Impact and Equity Issues in Transport will be published in March 2012. The following papers are included:

GUEST EDITORIAL

PAPERS
The social consequences of transport decision-making: clarifying concepts, synthesising knowledge and assessing implications P. Jones and K. Lucas

Researching people’s lived experiences of the transport system F. Hodgson

Social Networks and Mobile Lives: The Implications for Transport and Social Equity J. Urry

Rapid Change or Slow Evolution? Changing places of work and its consequences A. Felstead

Social inequality, disadvantaged neighbourhoods and transport deprivation: an assessment of the historical influence of housing policies A. Power

The social consequences of broken urban structures: a case study of Belfast M. Hackett and K. Sterrett

A Public Health Perspective on Transport Policy Priorities E. Milne

Towards an interdisciplinary science of transport and health: A case study on school travel S. Hodgson, A. Namdeom, V. Araujo-Soares and T. Pless-Mulloli
Skills, transport and economic development: evidence from a rural area in England D. Owen, T. Hogarth and A. Green

Accessibility and capability: the minimum transport needs and costs of rural households N. Smith, D. Hirsch and A. Davis

Transport poverty meets the digital divide: accessibility and connectivity in rural communities N.R. Velaga, M. Beecroft, J.D. Nelson, D. Corsar and P. Edwards

5.5 Developing future research and policy agendas

A number of key priorities for future research and policy emerged from the breakout group discussions and feedback presentations, as identified above. These are ongoing and will be taken forward as part of the final reporting process.

The Environmental Audit Committee for the House of Commons will shortly be gathering evidence for a cross-government enquiry on the issue of transport poverty. For further information on how to participate in this exercise contact Lee Nicholson nicholsonla@parliament.uk

The project has also led to new collaborations, PhD projects and additional funding opportunities in the five collaborating institutions:

- Dr Lucas continues her research of the relationships between transport poverty and social disadvantage through a two-year ESRC-funded mid-career fellowship. [http://www.tsu.ox.ac.uk/research/mrtpsd/](http://www.tsu.ox.ac.uk/research/mrtpsd/)
- The Transport Studies Unit (TSU) has secured further funding from the European Union to facilitate a series of further researcher and policy-maker exchanges with the Universities of Ghent in Belgium and Concepcion in Chile on the subject of transport and social exclusion. [http://www.tsu.ox.ac.uk/research/TranSENDaNC/](http://www.tsu.ox.ac.uk/research/TranSENDaNC/)
- The overarching theme for this year’s annual TSU seminar series is Socio-spatial inequity, transport and mobilities. There will be 8 evening seminars 5–7pm from 18th January – 7th March 2012 each by a different prominent expert in the field. The full programme can be found at [http://www.tsu.ox.ac.uk/events/ht12_seminars/](http://www.tsu.ox.ac.uk/events/ht12_seminars/)
- The Faculties of Medicine and Transport at Newcastle University have jointly awarded a PhD fellowship on Understanding Transport Choices.
- The Institute of Health and Society at Newcastle University are working towards proposal under National Institute of Health Research (NIHR) Sustainable Transport Call with Tyne and Wear Sustainable Transport Authority.

10. Further information

If you are interested in finding out more about the workshop series or have any other general queries about the programme please contact karen.lucas@ouce.ac.uk
Appendix 1: Workshop Programme

10.00  Welcome and introduction to the day  
Stephen Joseph, Chief Executive, Campaign for Better Transport

10.15  Presentation of Framing Event: Key Issues  
Dr Karen Lucas, Transport Studies Unit, University of Oxford

10.30  Presentation of Workshop 1: Employment, Education and Training Perspectives  
Dr Anne Green, Institute for Employment Research, University of Warwick

10.45  Presentation of Workshop 2: Health Perspectives  
Prof. Tanja Pless-Mulloli, Institute of health and Society, Newcastle University

11.00  Presentation of Workshop 3: Issues for Housing and Sustainable Communities  
Prof. Anne Power, Centre for the Analysis of Social Exclusion, LSE

11.15  Presentation of Workshop 4: Connectivity of Rural Communities  
Dr Mark Beecroft, Centre for Transport Research, University of Aberdeen

11.30  Question and Answer session from the floor  
Chair: Stephen Joseph

12.00  LUNCH

13.00  Workshop breakout sessions to identify recommendations for future research into policy and practice

14.30  COFFEE BREAK

15.00  Plenary session to present key recommendations from each group

15.30  Final round-up  
Professor Peter Jones, UCL (research perspectives)  
Nigel Dotchin, Head of Disability and Equalities, DfT (policy perspectives)  
Ralph Smyth, Senior Transport Campaigner, CPRE (practitioner perspectives)

16.00  CLOSE
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9. Nigel Dotchin  Equalities and Opportunities Division, Department of Transport
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12. Anne Green  IER, University of Warwick
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41. Stephen Smith  Department for Transport
42. Ralph Smyth  Campaign for Rural England (CPRE)
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