

## Indices of Deprivation 2000

regeneration

## Further Information

Further copies of this summary are available from:

David Walters  
Housing Support Unit  
Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions  
2/C6, Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London SW1E 5DU  
Fax : 020 7944 4527  
Email: [h\\_r\\_summaries@detr.gsi.gov.uk](mailto:h_r_summaries@detr.gsi.gov.uk)

Summaries of all completed DETR regeneration and housing research projects are also available via the DETR web site: <http://www.regeneration.detr.gov.uk> , <http://www.housing.detr.gov.uk> respectively.

The DETR publishes free information leaflets on a range of housing topics. For a copy of the Housing Publications Order Form please contact:

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions  
DETR Free Literature  
PO Box No 236  
Wetherby LS23 7NB  
Tel: 0870 1226 236  
Fax: 0870 1226 237  
Email: [detr@twoten.press.net](mailto:detr@twoten.press.net)

Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions  
Eland House  
Bressenden Place  
London SW1E 5DU  
Telephone 020 7944 3000  
Internet service <http://www.detr.gov.uk/>

© Crown Copyright 2000

*Copyright in the typographical arrangement and design vests in the Crown.*

*Extracts of this publication may be made for non-commercial in-house use, subject to the source being acknowledged.*

*Applications for reproduction should be made in writing to The Copyright Unit, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, St Clements House, 1-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ.*

Published by the Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions. Printed in the UK, August 2000 on paper comprising 75% post-consumer waste and 25% ECF pulp.

Product code 00HC0012/23.

# CONTENTS

<b>INTRODUCTION</b>	3
<b>CHAPTER 1</b>	
Background	4
<b>CHAPTER 2</b>	
Domains and Indicators	6
<b>CHAPTER 3</b>	
Population estimates	10
<b>CHAPTER 4</b>	
Methodology	11
<b>CHAPTER 5</b>	
Presentation of results and interpretation	13
<b>CHAPTER 6</b>	
Guidance	17
<b>CHAPTER 7</b>	
Comparing the Indices of Deprivation 2000 with the 1998 ILD	21
<b>Appendix A</b>	
Consultation	23
<b>Appendix B</b>	
Data sources	24
<b>Appendix C</b>	
Table of District Level Summaries	26
<b>Appendix D</b>	
Flow chart of Index of Multiple Deprivation methodology	42

# INTRODUCTION

In December 1998 the Department of Social Policy and Social Work at the University of Oxford was commissioned by the Department of the Environment, Transport & the Regions (DETR) to review and update the 1998 Index of Local Deprivation (ILD).

The new Index of Multiple Deprivation 2000 (IMD 2000) is a ward level Index, made up of six ward level Domain Indices. Summary measures of the IMD are presented at district level. The ward level Indices, together with the district level summaries are referred to as the Indices of Deprivation 2000 (ID 2000).

The project team comprises Michael Noble, Bruce Penhale, George Smith, Gemma Wright, Chris Dibben, Tom Owen and Myfanwy Lloyd from Oxford University. The methodological advisors are David Firth (Senior Fellow in Statistics for the Social Sciences) and Clive Payne (Senior Research Fellow) from Oxford University. We were helped considerably by an advisory panel of senior academics and practitioners, as well as a DETR steering group on which many Government Departments were represented.

This report outlines the indicators and domains which were used to construct the IMD 2000. It also summarises the procedures taken to create the overall Index and provides summaries of the Index at the local authority level. The ward level Indices and district level summary measures can be obtained from the DETR website at <http://www.detr.gov.uk> under housing or regeneration.

In addition, a report, *Response to the Formal Consultations on the Indices of Deprivation 2000* deals in detail with the questions and comments raised during the whole process of consultation. For details of how to obtain the reports please check the DETR website: <http://www.detr.gov.uk> under housing or regeneration.

A full report, covering the domains and indicators; the methodology for creating the Domain Indices and the overall IMD 2000 at ward level; the district level summary measures; and an analysis of the patterns of deprivation, will be published later in the year.

# CHAPTER 1

## Background

In December 1998, the DETR commissioned the University of Oxford to carry out a review of the previous 1998 Index of Local Deprivation in the light of:

1. The criticisms of the 1998 ILD and the 1991 ILC which it updated. These were:
  - i) The sub-district level indicators were out of date.
  - ii) The chi squared method needed to be reviewed.
2. Better small area data at the sub district level was about to come on stream for the first time.

A summary of the 1998 ILD is available on the DETR website: [www.detr.gov.uk](http://www.detr.gov.uk)

The ID 2000 is made up of:

- Six Domain Indices at ward level (Income, Employment, Health Deprivation and Disability, Education Skills and Training, Housing and Geographical Access to Services).
- An overall ward level Index of Multiple Deprivation 2000 (IMD 2000).
- A supplementary Child Poverty ward level Index.
- Six summaries at the local authority district level of the overall IMD 2000.

The new IMD 2000 is an innovative and detailed ward level Index with local authority level presentations. It is based on six separate 'domains' of deprivation:

- Income.
- Employment.
- Health Deprivation and Disability.
- Education, Skills and Training.
- Housing.
- Geographical Access to Services.

These each contain information essential to local authorities and others about their areas and the nationwide picture. The IMD 2000 uses up-to-date information from 33 indicators to describe deprivation at ward level. This includes information from previously untapped data sources, such as Department of Social Security (DSS) benefits data and University and Colleges Admissions Service (UCAS) data. Most of the indicators can be updated regularly, and so form the basis for a dynamic Index. In addition to the Domain Indices, the overall ward level Index of Multiple Deprivation brings this substantial amount of knowledge and information together for the first time.

Drawing together these indicators for the first time gives the IMD 2000 a major advantage over previous indices; the range of indicators at ward level enables a focus on deprivation at a small geographical level which was not possible before. This is an improvement on the 1998 ILD which was able to present very little information at ward level, and the information that was included was based on the 1991 Census and therefore was increasingly out of date. In addition, the ward level information allows the new Index to be presented in six ways to represent overall deprivation and pockets of deprivation at local authority level. This will be dealt with in detail in the '**Presentation of Results and Interpretation**' chapter.

The Index team was committed throughout the project to full consultation on the proposals and methodology of the Index. See Appendix A for details.

## CHAPTER 2

# Domains and Indicators

The Index is based on the premise that multiple deprivation is made up of separate dimensions, or 'domains' of deprivation. These domains reflect different aspects of deprivation. Each domain is made up of a number of indicators which cover aspects of this deprivation as comprehensively as possible. The criteria for selecting the indicators are that they should be statistically robust, up to date, available at a small area level for the whole of England and that they should directly measure a major aspect of the dimension of deprivation under consideration. This necessarily restricts the indicators which can be included. Nevertheless, this review has incorporated data sources hitherto unused for measuring deprivation. The Index is based on the broadest range of data possible in the country to date. Each of the domains is measured at ward level, using the administrative boundaries as at **1<sup>st</sup> April 1998**. The domains and indicators in the ID 2000 are as follows:

## Income

### Income Deprivation: Summary of Indicators

- Adults in Income Support households (DSS) for 1998
- Children in Income Support households (DSS) for 1998
- Adults in Income Based Job Seekers Allowance households (DSS) for 1998
- Children in Income Based Job Seekers Allowance households (DSS) for 1998
- Adults in Family Credit households (DSS) for 1999
- Children in Family Credit households (DSS) for 1999
- Adults in Disability Working Allowance households (DSS) for 1999
- Children in Disability Working Allowance households (DSS) for 1999
- Non-earning, non-IS pensioner and disabled Council Tax Benefit recipients (DSS) for 1998 apportioned to wards

The Income domain measures people who are on a low income. We consider income deprivation to be one of the most important aspects of deprivation. The indicators in this domain are in the form of non-overlapping counts of people in families in receipt of means tested benefits.

The proportion of children under 16 living in means tested benefit reliant families has been separately presented. This is presented as a supplementary Child Poverty Index at ward level but it is not included in the overall Index of Multiple Deprivation as the children are already counted within the Income Domain.

# Employment

## Employment Deprivation: Summary of Indicators

- Unemployment claimant counts (JUVOS, ONS) average of May 1998, August 1998, November 1998 and February 1999
- People out of work but in TEC delivered government supported training (DfEE)
- People aged 18-24 on New Deal options (ES)
- Incapacity Benefit recipients aged 16-59 (DSS) for 1998
- Severe Disablement Allowance claimants aged 16-59 (DSS) for 1999

'Employment deprived' are defined as those who want to work but are unable to do so through unemployment, sickness or disability. The domain measures forced exclusion from the world of work. This is seen as a separate deprivation from the income deprivation to which lack of employment may lead. The indicators in this domain constitute non overlapping counts of those excluded from the labour market through unemployment, ill health or disability.

# Health Deprivation and Disability

## Health Deprivation and Disability: Summary of Indicators

- Comparative Mortality Ratios for men and women at ages under 65. District level figures for 1997 and 1998 applied to constituent wards (ONS)
- People receiving Attendance Allowance or Disability Living Allowance (DSS) in 1998 as a proportion of all people
- Proportion of people of working age (16-59) receiving Incapacity Benefit or Severe Disablement Allowance (DSS) for 1998 and 1999 respectively
- Age and sex standardized ratio of limiting long-term illness (1991 Census)
- Proportion of births of low birth weight (<2,500g) for 1993-97 (ONS)

This domain identifies people whose quality of life is impaired by either poor health or disability. While ill health is closely intertwined with other aspects of deprivation, it is also an important aspect of deprivation in its own right. Premature death is the ultimate manifestation of this, but chronic ill health and disability will also greatly impair the quality of people's lives.



## Education, Skills and Training

### Education, Skills and Training Deprivation: Summary of Indicators

- Working age adults with no qualifications (3 years aggregated LFS data at district level, modelled to ward level) for 1995-1998
- Children aged 16 and over who are not in full-time education (Child Benefit data – DSS) for 1999
- Proportions of 17-19 year old population who have not successfully applied for HE (UCAS data) for 1997 and 1998
- KS2 primary school performance data (DfEE, converted to ward level estimates) for 1998
- Primary school children with English as an additional language (DfEE) for 1998
- Absenteeism at primary level (all absences, not just unauthorised) (DfEE) for 1998

This domain measures education deprivation in as direct a way as possible. This is predominantly measured by lack of qualifications amongst adults and children of different ages in a local area. Indicators of children aged 16 and over who are not in full time education and the proportion of 17 year olds who have not successfully applied for higher education have also been included. Both of these participation measures are important aspects of area deprivation.

## Housing

### Housing Deprivation: Summary of Indicators

- Homeless households in temporary accommodation (Local Authority HIP Returns) for 1997-98
- Household overcrowding (1991 Census)
- Poor private sector housing (modelled from 1996 English House Condition Survey and RESIDATA)

This domain identifies people living in unsatisfactory housing, and, in the extreme case, homelessness.

It was not possible to obtain information on poor condition public sector housing during the course of the review. It is important that a future version of the Index will review how social housing conditions may be incorporated.

# Geographical Access to Services

## Geographical Access to Services: Summary of Indicators

- Access to a post office (General Post Office Counters) for April 1998
- Access to food shops (Data Consultancy) 1998
- Access to a GP (NHS, BMA, Scottish Health Service) for October 1997
- Access to a primary school (DfEE) for 1999

Access to essential services is an important aspect of people's everyday lives. While this is true for all people, we have focused solely on people with low incomes (on benefits) for the first three indicators as they are more likely to be experiencing the disadvantage of lack of access to services more acutely than those on higher incomes, who are in principle more able to afford public or private transport. Access to primary schools was measured for all 5-8 year olds.

## Domains not included in the ID 2000

### CRIME AND SOCIAL ORDER DOMAIN

Crime and disorder is an important domain. However data of the right quality and form has not been available to us during the review of the Index, so this domain is not included in the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2000. It was concluded that household contents insurance premiums is not an adequate proxy for crime. Local crime and disorder audits and Basic Command Unit data were examined, but were not available in a nationally consistent form at either district or ward level. It is important that this work is taken forward to form the basis for a crime domain in future versions of the index.

### PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT DOMAIN

There is no domain at present due to a lack of national, robust data that could be applied at small area levels. It is nevertheless important, and there is widespread support for its inclusion in future versions of the Index when there is more up to date nationwide data on, for example, land quality and use, emissions, and water and air quality available.

## CHAPTER 3

# Population estimates

Population estimates were needed in order to have appropriate denominators with which to calculate the rates or proportions of the incidences of particular deprivation indicators. For example, to calculate the rate of unemployment in a ward, the total working age ward population needs to be known. Population estimates do not exist below Local Authority level for 1998, and needed to be constructed at ward level. The Index team constructed population estimates by apportioning 1998 Office for National Statistics (ONS) mid-year estimates to wards. This was a sophisticated procedure that included the use of benefit data and 'Estimating with Confidence' figures (refined Census population estimates produced by Manchester University) to help allocate the ONS district-level estimates. The ward estimates were subject to an extensive consultation with local authorities before being finalised.

# CHAPTER 4

## Methodology

The stages involved in constructing the Index are shown in the flow chart in **Appendix D**<sup>1</sup>. For a more detailed explanation of the methodology see the forthcoming *Final Report*.

### COMBINING THE INDICATORS TO FORM DOMAIN INDICES

Indicators for all six domains were produced at ward level. In some wards small 'at risk' populations can result in unreliable figures. In the Health, Education, Access and Housing domains the problem of small numbers, and unreliable scores was addressed by a technique known as 'shrinkage estimation', (see Stage 1 of **Appendix D**). This makes the unreliable ward scores more reliable by 'borrowing strength' from the district mean (which may be more or less deprived). In practice, shrinkage only has a measurable impact where the population at risk is small. This is because the standard errors are more likely to be large in areas with small populations.

The indicators in each domain were combined to create a Domain Index (see Stage 2 of **Appendix D**), and the six Domain Indices, (Income, Employment, Health Deprivation and Disability, Education Skills and Training, Housing and Geographical Access to Services) were combined to make the overall ward level Index of Multiple Deprivation. The supplementary Child Poverty Index was also constructed at ward level. The indicators all measure deprivation independently of population size.

For the Income and Employment domains the domain scores are presented as a simple rate, using appropriate denominators, as these domains present the percentage of the population affected by this type of deprivation. This is also the case with the Child Poverty Index. The Health, Housing, Education and Access domains could not be combined in this way for a number of reasons. First, because the individual indicators may be measured in different ways. For example, in the Health Domain it would not be appropriate to simply add a comparative mortality ratio to a proportion of people receiving Attendance Allowance as these are on different metrics. Second, there might be overlap between indicators within a domain. A simple combination of these indicators could result in double counting.

Instead, these four domains were each combined using Factor Analysis. Factor Analysis is a scientific procedure which deals with both the problems outlined above. Further details on this will be contained in the final report

### COMBINING THE DOMAIN INDICES INTO AN OVERALL WARD LEVEL INDEX

Once we have calculated 6 separate domains scores for every ward we then need to combine these into an overall Index. As with the indicators, the domains cannot be simply added because they are not all on the same scale. So for example, if we look at the Income Domain the most deprived ward has an Income Domain Index score of 74.3.

<sup>1</sup> The chart in Appendix D has been reproduced, with amendments, with permission from Torbay Borough Council.

In this case the score means that 74.3% of the population of that ward live in families reliant on means tested benefits. On the other hand, in the Health Domain the most deprived ward has a score of 3.4. This is the score generated by the weighted combination of individual Health Domain indicators. Thus, in order to combine the domains, they must be converted or **standardised to a uniform metric**. This was achieved by ranking the domain scores. The distributions can now be said to be on the same metric or 'standardised'. Having standardised the domains, they must be 'transformed' (see Stage 3 of **Appendix D**).

Transformation is required to ensure that each domain is **transformed to a common distribution**. This is necessary because if you combine domains with different distributions this would result in misleading results with some domains having unanticipated disproportionate effects on the overall Index score. Transformation is also necessary so that a desired degree of 'cancellation' can be introduced when combining the domains. This means that when combining domains, the deprivation in one domain is not fully 'cancelled out' by lack of deprivation in another domain. Having considered other options, it was decided that the exponential transformation of the ranks was most suitable for this function.

The exponential transformation method has the advantages that every domain is converted to an identical distribution with the same maximum and minimum values, while emphasising the most deprived 'tail' of the distribution. The explanation of this method is discussed in detail in the forthcoming *Final Report*.

## DOMAIN WEIGHTS

Combining domains to form an overall ward level Index involved weighting to ensure that weights for each domain are explicit. From the outset it was proposed that the Income and Employment Domains should carry more weight than the other domains, a position supported by academic literature and by respondents to the consultation. It was therefore inappropriate to simply sum the Domain Indices because this would have given each Domain Index equal weight in the procedure. It was also proposed that the most robust domains should carry the most weight. This means that the contribution of each domain to the overall Index varies, (this is discussed in more detail in the forthcoming *Final Report*). As a result of these two criteria the weights selected are as follows:

- Income 25%
- Employment 25%
- Health Deprivation and Disability 15%
- Education, Skills and Training 15%
- Geographical Access to Services 10%
- Housing 10%

These weights are applied to the domains accordingly and the weighted domains were summed to generate the overall Index of Multiple Deprivation (see Stage 4 of **Appendix D**).

## CHAPTER 5

# Presentation of results and interpretation

## Ward Level Results

At the ward level there are eight Indices for each ward in the country: six Domain Indices (which are combined to make the overall Index of Multiple Deprivation); an overall Index of Multiple Deprivation and a supplementary Child Poverty Index. These eight Indices are also each assigned a national rank. There are 8,414 wards in England. The most deprived ward for each Index is given a rank of 1, and the least deprived ward is given a rank of 8414, for presentation. The ranks show how a ward compares to all the other wards in the country and are easily interpretable. However, the scores indicate the distances between each rank position, as these will vary. The only exceptions are the wards in the Isles of Scilly and the City of London which were combined to create a single ward for each area because of the small number of inhabitants.

### THE SIX DOMAIN INDICES AND RANKS

Each Domain Index consists of the combined indicators in that domain (this is the factor analysis score in the case of the Health, Education, Housing and Geographical Access to Services Domains, and a rate for the Income and Employment domains). These are then ranked. These domain Indices can be used to describe each type of deprivation in an area. This is important as it allows users of the Index to focus on particular types of deprivation, and to compare this across wards. There may be great variation within a district, and the ward level Domain Indices allow for a sophisticated analysis of deprivation information.

The scores for the Income and Employment Domains are rates. So for example if a ward scores 38.6 in the Income Domain, this means that 38.6% of the ward's population are Income Deprived. The same applies to the Employment Domain. The scores for the remaining four domains are not rates. Within a domain, the higher the score, the more deprived a ward is. However, the factor scores should not be compared between domains as they have different minimum and maximum values, and ranges. To compare between domains, the ranks should be used. A rank of 1 is assigned to the most deprived ward, and a rank of 8414 is assigned to the least deprived ward, for presentation.

### THE OVERALL INDEX OF MULTIPLE DEPRIVATION 2000

The overall Index of Multiple Deprivation 2000 describes the ward by combining information from all six domains: Income, Employment, Health, Education, Housing and Access. These were combined in two stages; first each domain was transformed to a standard distribution – the exponential distribution described above. Then the domains were combined using the explicit domain weights chosen. The overall ward level IMD 2000 is then ranked in the same way as the Domain Indices.

The IMD 2000 score is the combined sum of the weighted, exponentially transformed domain rank of the domain score. Again, the bigger the IMD 2000 score, the more deprived the ward. However, because of the exponential distribution, it is not possible to say, for example, that a ward with a score of 40 is twice as deprived as a ward with a score of 20. In order to make comparisons between wards we would recommend using the ranks. The IMD 2000 is ranked in the same way as the Domain Indices, that is, a rank of 1 is assigned to the most deprived ward, and a rank of 8414 is assigned to the least deprived ward, for presentation.

## THE SUPPLEMENTARY CHILD POVERTY INDEX

The Child Poverty Index is a subset of the Income Domain Index, and shows the percentage of children in each ward that live in families that claim means tested benefits (Income Support, Job Seekers Allowance (Income Based), Family Credit and Disability Working Allowance). The Child Poverty Index is not combined with the other domains into the overall Index of Multiple Deprivation as child poverty is already captured in the Income Domain. A Child Poverty Index score of, for example, 24.6 means that 24.6% of 0-16 year olds in that ward are living in families claiming means tested benefits.

For further details about how to interpret the ward level Indices, see the **Guidance** Section.

## District Level Presentations

Six summary measures of the overall IMD 2000 have been produced at district level which describe differences between districts. The summary measures at district level focus on different aspects of multiple deprivation in the area. No single summary measure is favoured over another, as there is no single best way of describing or comparing districts. The district level summaries of the IMD 2000 are presented in **Appendix C**.

Districts are complex to describe as a whole or to compare for several reasons. First, districts can vary enormously in population size. Further, some districts may have a more 'mixed' population, containing more variation in deprivation and in some places deprivation may be concentrated in severe pockets rather than being more evenly spread. This makes an 'overall picture' more difficult to establish.

Six measures have been devised which take account of these issues, and which describe the district in different ways: looking at the most deprived populations, the most deprived wards, as well as the average of the wards, to get six meaningful descriptions of deprivation at district level. More subtle descriptions of deprivation across a district can be established by a close analysis of the wards within that district, as the ward level Index contains the most detailed account of local deprivation. At the ward level much more information is retained than with the district level summaries.

These measures are discussed individually below, and in greater detail in the forthcoming *Final Report*.

There are 354 local authority districts in England as of April 1998. For each measure each district is given a rank and score (with the exception of Extent, as explained below). For presentation, a rank of 1 indicates that the district is the most deprived according to the measure, and 354 is the least deprived. The meaning of the scores for each of the measures is detailed as follows.

## LOCAL CONCENTRATION

Local Concentration is the population weighted average of the ranks of a district's most deprived wards that contain exactly 10% of the district's population.

Local Concentration (formerly called 'Intensity' in the consultation documents) is an important way of identifying districts' 'hot spots' of deprivation. The Local Concentration measure defines the 'hot spots' by reference to a percentage of the district's population. We took the mean of the population weighted rank of a district's most deprived wards that capture *exactly* 10% of the district's population. In many cases this was not always a whole number of wards. For the purposes of calculating this score, the wards were ranked with the most deprived ward given the rank of 8414.

## EXTENT

Proportion of a district's population living in the wards which rank within the most deprived 10% of wards in the country.

The aim of this measure is to portray how widespread *high levels* of deprivation are in a district. It is the proportion of a district's population living in the wards which rank within the most deprived 10% of wards in England. It only includes districts which contain wards which fall within the top ten percent of the most deprived wards in England. Therefore some districts will not have an overall score for this measure. A rank of 158 indicates a district with no score.

## SCALE (TWO MEASURES)

Income Scale is the number of people who are Income deprived; Employment Scale is the number of people who are Employment deprived

These two measures are designed to give an indication of the sheer numbers of people experiencing Income deprivation and Employment deprivation at district level. The Income Scale score is a count of individuals experiencing income deprivation. The Employment Scale score is a count of individuals experiencing employment deprivation. It is useful to present both measures as they are real counts of the individuals experiencing these deprivations.

There are two further ways of describing districts using **all** of the wards:

## AVERAGE OF WARD RANKS

Population weighted average of the combined ranks for the wards in a district

This measure is useful because it summarizes the district taken as a whole, including both deprived and less deprived wards. All the wards in a district need to be included to obtain such an average, as that each ward contributes to the character of that district. This measure is calculated by averaging all of the ward ranks in each district. The ward ranks are first of all population weighted within a district to take account of the fact that ward size can vary significantly in that district. For the purposes of calculating this score, the wards were ranked with the most deprived ward given the rank of 8414.



## AVERAGE OF WARD SCORES

Population weighted average of the combined scores for the wards in a district

This measure also describes the district as a whole, taking into account the full range of ward scores across a district. The advantage of the Average of Ward Score measure is that it describes the wards by retaining the fact that the more deprived wards may have more 'extreme' scores, which is not revealed to the same extent if the ranks are used. This measure is calculated by averaging the ward scores in each district after they have been population weighted.

# CHAPTER 6

## Guidance

The ID 2000 is a new source of valuable information about spatial patterns of deprivation in England. Six Domain Indices have been constructed at ward level; a ward level overall Index of Multiple Deprivation; a supplementary Child Poverty Index at ward level; and six district level summaries of each of the IMD. These can all be used to help focus policy and intervention on deprived areas and particular types of deprivation.

### Ward Level Indices

#### USING SCORES AND RANKS

As outlined in the ‘**Presentation of Results and Interpretation**’ chapter, it is valid to compare wards *within* a domain using either the score or the rank. For example, it is valid to say that Ward A has a score of 58.12 and Ward B a score of 11.77 in the Income Domain, ranking 41 and 5667 respectively, and that Ward A is more deprived than Ward B.

However, when comparing a ward *between* domains, ranks should be used. It is not appropriate to compare Ward A’s score of 58.12 in the Income Domain and its score of 2.54 in the Health Domain. This is the case for all of the domains because the range and the minimum and maximum scores vary.

For the overall Index of Multiple Deprivation, wards can be compared using either the scores or ranks. But again, for any given ward, the IMD 2000 cannot be compared to other domains using the score: only the rank should be used. So, for example, Ward A ranks 41<sup>st</sup> on the Income Domain, and 24<sup>th</sup> on the IMD 2000.

Because the Income and Employment Domain scores are rates, it is possible to say that Ward X with a score of 40% is twice as deprived as Ward Y with a score of 20%. However, in the four other Domains, it is **not** possible to do this, as the scores are not rates. The domain ranks cannot be described in this manner either and it is not possible to say that Ward X with a rank of 100 is twice as deprived as Ward Y with a rank of 200.

**Table of scores and ranks for two example wards, plus ranges for all wards**

	Ward A	Ward B	Least deprived ward	Most deprived ward
Income Score	58.12	11.77	1.14	74.27
Income Rank	41	5667	8414	1
Employment Score	36.69	5.14	0.60	50.90
Employment Rank	20	6623	8414	1
Health Score	2.54	-1.43	-3.01	3.35
Health Rank	23	7955	8414	1
Education Score	1.41	-1.16	-2.86	3.08
Education Rank	464	7656	8414	1
Housing Score	1.20	-0.10	-3.28	3.36
Housing Rank	810	4522	8414	1
Access Score	-1.43	0.78	-2.78	2.95
Access Rank	8077	1744	8414	1
IMD 2000 Score	76.21	9.02	1.16	83.77
IMD 2000 Rank	24	6736	8414	1
Child Poverty Score	70.88	16.12	0.54	88.71
Child Poverty Rank	125	5574	8414	1

Thus, it is possible to say, for example, that Ward A is more Income deprived than Ward B, as 58.12% of Ward A's population are living in low income families compared with 11.77% in Ward B. Ward A ranks the 41<sup>st</sup> worst ward in the country for this Domain Index. The most deprived ward has 74.27% of its population living in income deprived families.

## Using the ward level Domain Indices and the overall Index of Multiple Deprivation 2000

### USING INDIVIDUAL DOMAIN INDICES AND THE OVERALL INDEX OF MULTIPLE DEPRIVATION 2000

Individual Domain Indices can be used to identify particular types of deprivation. For example, it is possible to describe a district's wards solely in terms of its Health deprivation. The ward level IMD 2000's main purpose is to describe the overall picture of multiple deprivation, based on the combined Income, Employment, Health, Housing, Education and Access Domain Indices.

### COMPARING DIFFERENT WARDS USING INDIVIDUAL DOMAIN INDEX RANKS AND IMD 2000 RANKS

The individual Domain Indices can be used to make comparisons between wards across England. For example, it is possible to say that 11 wards in District A are ranked in the most deprived 100 in the Income Domain compared with 0 wards in District B in the

Income Domain. The ward level index can be aggregated up to different spatial levels. For example, if it is known which wards fall within e.g. two Health Authorities, these could be compared in the same manner. Wards can be compared throughout the country using the IMD 2000 ranks.

### **COMPARING THE DOMAIN INDICES IN A SINGLE WARD**

It is valid to describe a ward in terms of more than one domain, and this will usually be entirely appropriate. For example, Ward A has a rank of 41 for the Income Domain and a rank of 23 for the Health Domain. However, these two pieces of information cannot be combined to make a single score or rank: the only accepted combination of the Domain Indices is the ward level IMD 2000 which incorporates all six Domain Indices. This is because combining the Domain Indices selectively does not take into account the compensation between domains, and the domain weights which were carefully selected and consulted upon during the construction of the IMD 2000.

### **RE-RANKING WITHIN A DISTRICT**

The ward ranks within a district for the Domain Indices and the overall IMD 2000 are the national ranks. Local authorities may wish to extract wards within their own area from the spreadsheet and re rank for local purposes e.g. a district with 21 wards might find it easier to use the indices by ranking their own wards 1 through 21. This is perfectly acceptable.

### **ADDING NEW DATA TO THE DOMAIN INDICES AND THE OVERALL IMD 2000**

Supplementary information cannot be incorporated into the Domain Indices and the IMD 2000 as they are constructed using agreed data sources from fixed points in time. However, additional information can of course be presented alongside the results to reach targeting or other decisions. It should be stressed that this point relates to the current indices. Any future changes or updating of the indices will need to explore whether further information, for example on new domains, can be incorporated.

### **SUMMARISING THE OVERALL IMD 2000 AT DISTRICT AND OTHER LEVELS**

The IMD 2000 can be summarised at district level (see below). As noted above, it can also be summarised for other area units, such as counties or health authorities, so long as they are made up of whole wards using boundaries as at 1<sup>st</sup> April 1998.

### **DOMAIN INDICES AND DOMAIN WEIGHTS**

The domain weights have been agreed through a process of consultation. Combining the Domain Indices using alternative weights should not be undertaken. Similarly, none of the Domain Indices should be removed from the IMD 2000. Multiple deprivation must take account of the substantial range of domains included in the IMD 2000.

## District Level Summaries of the Index of Multiple Deprivation

There are six district level summaries of the IMD 2000, which are outlined in **Presentation of Results and Interpretation** and the results are presented in **Appendix C**. These six summaries are equally valid ways of summarising the IMD 2000. No single summary measure is more important than the others. They cannot be combined into an overall district summary. By using each of the six summaries, a local authority can locate itself in the context of other local authorities within the country or within a region.

No single summary measure is more important the others and a particular summary measure should not be used in isolation from the other summary measures when using the Index to target resources nationally or regionally.

Further guidance about the use of the district level summaries of the IMD 2000 for policy purposes should be obtained from the DETR.

## CHAPTER 7

# Comparing the Indices of Deprivation 2000 with the 1998 ILD

Improvements in availability of data and in the methodology mean that the new Index measures multiple deprivation in a more appropriate and sophisticated way than before. This makes direct comparisons with the previous Indices difficult.

### NEW DATA

While a few indicators are the same, the new Index is based on a much larger and more up to date set of information. Some indicators from the previous index were deliberately dropped because the data was no longer considered sufficiently robust or up to date (e.g. on households lacking amenities, long term unemployment, home insurance weightings for house contents premium). The new Index includes data on groups not included in the previous index (e.g. the long term sick and disabled). It should also be recognised that the 1998 ILD uses 1996 and 1991 data, whereas much of the IMD 2000 data is from 1998/9. The reasons for these changes were fully set out during the consultation exercise and will be discussed further in the forthcoming *Final Report*.

### MORE INDICATORS

The new Index has created six separate domain scores based on a total of 33 indicators. The previous 1998 district level index was based on 12, equally weighted, indicators that were combined into a single score. The ward level index was only based on six indicators. The greater number of indicators and the explicit weightings in the new Index mean that it is conceptually clearer and more robust than its predecessors.

### METHODOLOGICAL CHANGES

The method used to combine the indicators into the overall Index score has changed from that used in the 1998 ILD. The signed chi-square method was used in the previous index, and factor analysis and exponential transformation in the new Index. The signed chi-square method conflates the seriousness of the deprivation with the amount, and thus gives larger scores for larger areas at *both* ends of the scale (i.e. areas with larger populations are likely to have either very high non-deprived or very high deprived scores; smaller areas are likely to have moderate scores even where the rate of deprivation is very high or very low). The exponential transformation used in the new Index appropriately gives most weight to the deprived end of the scale. The new Index treats the seriousness of the problem separately from sheer amount, but we have also introduced two direct measures of the scale of Income and Employment deprivation. Moreover, as the result of extensive consultation, our district level summaries are calculated in a different way from the previous Index. They are described in the previous section '**Presentation of Results and Interpretation**'.

## REAL CHANGE IN DEPRIVATION

New data and an improved methodology make the new Index a better and more accurate measure of multiple deprivation. Though these revisions will result in differences between the 1998 ILD and the new Index, there may well be some instances of real change in patterns of deprivation between 1991-1996 and 1999.

A more in-depth analysis of change will be published in the forthcoming *Final Report*.

# APPENDIX A

## Consultation

All local authorities were invited to take part in the consultation, and many other public bodies and interested groups contributed to the process. In addition, the Index team was guided by an advisory panel of academics and practitioners, and a steering group comprised mainly of members of other government departments, convened by the DETR. The project website enabled users to download reports as well as to engage in discussion. There were two formal stages of consultation on the Index, and extensive communication with local authorities and other interested groups throughout the project. The Index team received well over 100 responses at each stage of consultation containing a wide range of comments, suggestions and support. These were examined extremely carefully, and many proposals were taken on board. At each stage the reports dealt comprehensively with the many suggestions put forward during the consultation process.

The reports for consultation were as follows:

*Measuring Multiple Deprivation at the Local Level*, March 1999

*Ward Level Population Estimates for the 1999 Index of Local Deprivation*, August 1999

*Final Consultation on Ward Level Population Estimates*, September 1999

*Report for Formal Consultation Stage 1: Domains and Indicators*, July 1999

*Report for Formal Consultation Stage 2: Methodology for an Index of Multiple Deprivation*, December 1999, with a *Technical Annexe*

Three newsletters were also released to provide updates about the project.

A further report, *Response to the Formal Consultations on the Indices of Deprivation 2000 (ID 2000)* deals in detail with the questions and comments raised during the whole process of consultation. This document contains a fuller explanation of the methodology, including shrinkage and factor analysis, than it has been possible to include in this short summary.

The reports are available from the DETR website at <http://www.detr.gov.uk> under housing or regeneration.



## APPENDIX B

# Data sources<sup>2</sup>

**Data Consultancy** (01753 848 300)

Location of food retailers (Geographical Access to Services)

**DfEE** (0870 000 2288)

People out of work but in training (Employment)

Absenteeism at a primary level (Education)

KS2 primary school performance (Education)

Primary school children with English as a second language (Education)

Location of primary schools (Geographical Access to Services)

**DSS** (020 7712 2171)

Income Support Recipients (Income, Geographical Access to Services)

Income Based Job Seekers Allowance Recipients (Income, Geographical Access to Services)

Family Credit Recipients (Income, Geographical Access to Services)

Disability Working Allowance Recipients (Income, Health, Geographical Access to Services)

Pensioner Council Tax Benefit Recipients (Income)

Disabled Council Tax Benefit Recipients (Income)

Incapacity Benefit Recipients (Employment, Health)

Severe Disability Allowance Recipients (Employment, Health)

Attendance Allowance Recipients (Health)

Child Benefit Recipients (Education, Geographical Access to Services)

**Employment Service**

People on 'New Deal' options (Employment)

**English House Condition Survey** (DETR: 020 7944 3000)

Private sector housing quality (Housing)

**Essex Data Archive: LFS LA Data**

Labour Force Survey 1995-1998 (Education)

**General Post Office Counters** (08457 223 344)

Location of Post Offices (Geographical Access to Services)

**Local Authority HIP Returns** (DETR: 020 7944 3000)

Homeless households in temporary accommodation (Housing)

<sup>2</sup> The provision of raw data is dependent on the nature of the request and data suppliers' agreement, for example there may be confidentiality restrictions associated with the data at a very small area level.

**NHS, BMA, Scottish Health Services** (NHS Executive Head Quarters: 0133 254 5000;  
BMA: 020 7387 4499; General Medical Practitioner Database, ISD Scotland, National  
Health Service in Scotland: 0131 551 8899)  
Location of GP's (Geographical Access to Services)

**ONS** (020 7533 6094)

Unemployment claimant counts (Employment)

Comparative mortality ratios for men and women under 65 at district level (Health)

Births of low birth weight (<2,500g) (Health)

1991 Census – Limiting long-term illness (Health)

1991 Census – Household overcrowding (Housing)

**Residata** (ISL Ltd.: 020 7357 2312)

Private sector housing quality (Housing)

**UCAS** (01242 222444)

Successful applicants to higher education, 1997, 1998 (Education)

# APPENDIX C

## District Level Summaries of the Ward Level Index of Multiple Deprivation

DETR LA Code	LA Code	LA Name	Number of Employment Deprived*	Rank of Employment Scale	Number of Income Deprived*	Rank of Income Scale	Average Ward Scores	Rank of Average Ward Scores	Average Ward Ranks	Rank of Average Ward Ranks	Extent Scores	Extent Rank	Local Concentration Score	Local Concentration Rank
3805	45UB	Adur	2250	310	10295	301	20.05	180	4464.78	171	.00	158=	6409.24	236
905	16UB	Allerdale	6982	127	20696	160	27.80	98	5432.91	112	14.73	82	8183.11	50
2905	35UB	Alnwick	1779	329	6125	342	23.65	141	5191.88	128	6.34	128	7495.40	138
1005	17UB	Amber Valley	6037	153	20937	158	21.58	158	4708.59	159	.00	158=	7140.86	177
3810	45UC	Arun	5253	178	23964	141	18.20	204	4004.81	200	.00	158=	7214.34	170
3005	37UB	Ashfield	8159	106	28230	112	36.25	55	6888.37	31	14.77	80	7859.30	96
2205	29UB	Ashford	4133	215	17757	197	19.00	191	4062.45	198	3.78	153	7492.22	141
405	11UB	Aylesbury Vale	4429	201	18390	189	11.57	292	2132.91	309	.00	158=	6433.06	233
3505	42UB	Babergh	2780	289	12241	276	15.01	242	3348.45	240	.00	158=	6499.26	226
5060	AB	Barking and Dagenham	11569	75	49020	64	37.85	47	6972.41	24	17.37	74	7750.39	109
5090	AC	Barnet	14042	60	53221	57	16.63	223	3749.37	220	.00	158=	6642.63	216
4405	CC	Barnsley	23357	21	67361	41	42.53	19	7129.74	16	39.49	29	8266.14	32
910	16JC	Barrow-in-Furness	8385	102	20370	164	41.53	24	6995.67	23	43.22	22	8284.70	29
1505	22UB	Basildon	8203	104	36583	89	25.54	117	4934.25	144	13.07	90	7694.39	117
1705	24UB	Basingstoke and Deane	4073	217	17523	200	11.30	298	2243.36	301	.00	158=	6011.82	259
3010	37UC	Bassetlaw	8094	109	24339	139	31.23	79	6117.15	74	14.54	84	8138.07	58

DETR LA Code	LA Code	LA Name	Number of Employment Deprived*	Rank of Employment Scale	Number of Income Deprived*	Rank of Income Scale	Average of Ward Scores	Rank of Average of Ward Scores	Average of Ward Ranks	Rank of Average of Ward Ranks	Extent Scores	Extent Rank	Local Concentration Score	Local Concentration Rank
3330	HA	Bath and North East Somerset	6352	143	26185	121	13.71	261	2904.59	268	.00	158=	6277.74	244
205	09UD	Bedford	6754	131	26333	119	20.92	165	4261.77	188	5.02	142	7650.33	123
2910	35UC	Berwick-upon-Tweed	1511	344	5825	343	27.20	103	5878.79	86	.00	158=	7259.00	164
5120	AD	Bexley	9359	92	35736	92	16.97	221	3419.78	237	.00	158=	7325.97	160
4605	CN	Birmingham	84679	1	364248	1	41.59	23	6749.98	43	35.99	37	8346.47	15
2405	31UB	Blaby	2767	290	9941	304	10.00	314	2000.35	314	.00	158=	3934.32	330
2305	EX	Blackburn with Darwen	12002	71	52082	59	45.65	10	6926.72	26	51.23	15	8345.38	16
2310	EY	Blackpool	13750	62	44168	70	39.52	31	6884.34	32	33.06	44	8240.27	34
2915	35UD	Blyth Valley	7034	126	20891	159	32.12	76	5850.72	88	26.19	56	8027.80	73
1010	17UC	Bolsover	6071	152	19527	176	39.80	30	7052.35	20	34.15	41	8214.18	44
4205	BL	Bolton	19080	39	75918	28	33.61	65	6067.29	78	33.56	43	8306.31	23
2505	32UB	Boston	2830	286	12423	274	24.54	131	5441.69	109	.00	158=	7425.99	152
1205	HN	Bournemouth	10704	82	36942	88	25.50	118	5294.84	118	10.65	100	7987.62	84
305	MA	Bracknell Forest	2849	285	12255	275	9.74	317	1942.14	315	.00	158=	4656.90	315
4705	CX	Bradford	34779	6	158210	5	39.26	33	6337.07	64	33.59	42	8343.45	17
1510	22UC	Braintree	4937	182	21638	156	16.06	228	3689.30	227	.00	158=	5783.73	269
2605	33UB	Breckland	4619	194	20242	166	20.03	181	4540.50	167	.00	158=	7151.48	175
5150	AE	Brent	20322	32	72381	33	33.53	68	6423.97	58	14.90	78	8103.04	60
1515	22UD	Brentwood	2089	315	7980	321	9.93	315	2074.42	311	.00	158=	3816.74	333
3205	39UB	Bridgnorth	1779	330	7350	327	13.77	259	3174.61	249	.00	158=	5042.49	303
1440	ML	Brighton and Hove	19627	35	58325	50	28.46	95	5739.55	94	8.85	110	7919.40	92
110	HB	Bristol, City of	25786	13	95723	13	28.47	94	5316.57	116	14.66	83	8036.82	71
2610	33UC	Broadland	4268	208	14971	231	12.42	281	2724.61	279	.00	158=	5382.02	288
5180	AF	Bromley	11275	78	41603	76	12.64	275	2432.15	292	.00	158=	6944.92	196

DETR LA Code	LA Code	LA Name	Number of Employment Deprived*	Rank of Employment Scale	Number of Income Deprived*	Rank of Income Scale	Average Ward Scores	Rank of Ward Scores	Average Ward Ranks	Rank of Ward Ranks	Extent Scores	Extent Rank	Local Concentration Score	Local Concentration Rank
1805	47UB	Bromsgrove	2971	274	9923	305	11.50	295	2388.35	293	.00	158=	5168.97	299
1905	26UB	Broxbourne	2919	281	12800	268	14.14	255	3190.53	248	.00	158=	5877.08	263
3015	37UD	Broxtowe	5254	177	18403	188	17.41	216	3779.98	219	.00	158=	6973.36	192
2315	30UD	Burnley	7243	119	27530	114	37.86	46	6637.25	49	23.14	62	8317.78	21
4210	BM	Bury	11476	77	40498	78	24.58	130	5124.97	135	6.24	131	7594.41	126
4710	CY	Calderdale	12134	69	49381	63	28.14	97	5663.79	97	16.82	75	7999.93	80
505	12UB	Cambridge	4617	195	16389	215	14.72	249	2956.45	263	.00	158=	6827.64	204
5210	AG	Camden	17777	44	57408	51	36.56	54	6480.34	56	37.01	34	8162.46	56
3405	41UB	Cannock Chase	5385	172	20152	169	25.32	121	5496.56	105	6.54	126	7446.41	147
2210	29UC	Canterbury	6284	145	25704	128	19.93	184	4602.22	165	.00	158=	6606.54	219
805	15UB	Caradon	3972	220	15326	224	20.06	179	4731.48	157	.00	158=	6084.28	256
915	16UD	Carlisle	6605	135	20331	165	24.73	128	5254.70	122	5.55	135	7564.78	131
810	15UC	Carrick	5307	175	19583	175	25.75	116	5639.45	98	6.53	127	7369.51	155
2920	35UE	Castle Morpeth	2932	280	7935	322	20.47	172	4288.14	187	4.11	150	7556.76	132
1520	22UE	Castle Point	3553	236	14097	241	17.84	210	3903.73	210	.00	158=	6531.48	223
2410	31UC	Charnwood	5765	160	22696	150	13.57	265	2883.80	269	.00	158=	6667.36	214
1525	22UF	Chelmsford	4865	189	18782	182	10.08	313	2027.36	313	.00	158=	4909.11	307
1605	23UB	Cheltenham	4682	191	17097	209	15.52	236	3053.07	258	.00	158=	6947.09	195
3105	38UB	Cherwell	3509	241	15276	225	11.53	293	2316.32	296	.00	158=	6178.21	250
605	13UB	Chester	6559	137	21855	155	21.26	163	4319.52	184	10.05	103	8021.34	75
1015	17UD	Chesterfield	8095	108	25847	126	30.25	83	5893.09	83	8.29	118	7783.81	104
1305	20UB	Chester-le-Street	4362	204	12575	270	25.22	124	5210.35	126	8.72	111	7700.24	113
3815	45UD	Chichester	2955	276	14760	232	13.07	271	2908.52	266	.00	158=	5527.53	280
415	11UC	Chiltern	1886	325	7678	325	6.26	350	866.44	350	.00	158=	3906.23	332

DETR LA Code	LA Code	LA Name	Number of Employment Deprived*	Rank of Employment Scale	Number of Income Deprived*	Rank of Income Scale	Av. of Ward Scores	Rank of Av. of Ward Scores	Av. of Ward Ranks	Rank of Av. of Ward Ranks	Extent Scores	Extent Rank	Local Concentration Score	Local Concentration Rank
2320	30UE	Chorley	5614	164	17891	196	20.17	178	4492.68	169	.00	158=	6986.71	191
1210	19UC	Christchurch	1552	341	7159	331	17.07	219	3870.82	212	.00	158=	6840.00	203
5030	AA	City of London	293	353	748	353	15.99	232	3976.00	205	.00	158=	3976.00	329
1530	22UG	Colchester	6808	129	25532	132	17.63	213	3791.74	218	5.12	140	7122.20	178
610	13UC	Congleton	3384	253	11138	288	11.53	294	2456.48	291	.00	158=	5480.61	282
920	16UE	Copeland	6239	147	16631	212	33.01	72	6139.89	72	14.77	81	8147.50	57
2805	34UB	Corby	3468	246	12877	266	28.59	92	5958.44	82	.00	158=	7251.00	167
1610	23UC	Cotswold	1764	331	9087	313	9.16	324	1727.63	322	.00	158=	3754.43	335
1850	GA	County of Herefordshire	6946	128	29405	107	19.94	183	4558.10	166	.00	158=	7063.66	186
4610	CQ	Coventry	21512	27	85813	20	33.57	67	6102.05	75	28.76	50	8173.14	51
2705	36UB	Craven	1739	332	7203	329	12.58	276	2754.03	276	.00	158=	5451.66	284
3820	45UE	Crawley	3255	259	15972	222	18.31	199	3984.01	203	.00	158=	6666.00	215
615	13UD	Crewe and Nantwich	5500	168	20983	157	18.67	195	3832.36	215	4.73	144	7291.56	162
5240	AH	Croydon	17219	45	68396	38	21.04	164	4437.16	174	2.84	156	7342.92	159
1910	26UC	Dacorum	3962	221	18195	192	10.33	311	2071.91	312	.00	158=	5273.66	294
1310	EH	Darlington	7786	114	26189	120	29.34	88	5530.66	103	17.68	73	8015.48	76
2215	29UD	Dartford	3868	226	13785	248	18.83	193	3957.39	206	4.04	151	7207.43	171
2810	34UC	Daventry	2001	320	8352	319	10.78	306	2196.15	305	.00	158=	4696.65	313
1020	FK	Derby	16173	52	60588	48	30.06	84	5525.09	104	22.81	65	8230.81	39
1045	17UF	Derbyshire Dales	2327	308	8445	317	13.66	262	3067.36	256	.00	158=	5600.77	274
1315	20UD	Derwentside	8152	107	26476	117	37.86	45	6758.48	41	27.80	52	8209.00	45
4410	CE	Doncaster	26035	12	86594	19	38.97	36	6794.02	38	50.07	16	8093.11	62
2220	29UE	Dover	6427	139	23656	143	25.22	123	5263.01	120	9.69	105	7696.04	115
4615	CR	Dudley	16780	47	71189	34	24.58	129	4950.28	142	8.08	120	7709.32	112

DETR LA Code	LA Code	LA Name	Number of Employment Deprived*	Rank of Employment Scale	Number of Income Deprived*	Rank of Income Scale	Average Ward Scores	Rank of Ward Scores	Average Ward Ranks	Rank of Ward Ranks	Extent Scores	Extent Rank	Local Concentration Score	Local Concentration Rank
1320	20UE	Durham	6213	148	16606	213	23.56	142	4744.93	155	5.52	136	7546.95	135
5270	AJ	Ealing	19168	38	68258	39	26.78	107	5564.62	101	5.02	141	7555.45	133
1325	20UF	Easington	13230	65	33982	96	55.41	7	7893.12	4	78.49	6	8379.95	8
510	12UC	East Cambridgeshire	2045	318	9002	315	12.39	283	2800.45	274	.00	158=	4442.00	318
1105	18UB	East Devon	4658	193	19887	172	15.64	235	3661.82	229	.00	158=	5816.46	266
1240	19UD	East Dorset	2119	314	9722	308	10.75	307	2234.00	302	.00	158=	4595.08	317
1710	24UC	East Hampshire	2794	288	12081	280	10.47	310	2160.40	308	.00	158=	4027.26	328
1915	26UD	East Hertfordshire	2945	277	12468	273	7.11	344	1105.14	344	.00	158=	3684.51	337
2510	32UC	East Lindsey	8166	105	28750	109	31.27	78	5999.69	79	24.15	59	8065.83	67
2815	34UD	East Northamptonshire	2366	306	10961	291	12.88	272	2849.08	270	.00	158=	5377.70	289
2050	FB	East Riding of Yorkshire	15112	58	53997	54	17.91	208	3802.29	217	.00	158=	7243.89	168
3410	41UC	East Staffordshire	4957	181	20158	168	21.72	157	4326.89	183	8.47	114	7617.83	124
1410	21UC	Eastbourne	4481	199	19876	173	22.94	150	5120.59	136	.00	158=	6679.00	213
1715	24UD	Eastleigh	3364	255	13989	245	10.56	309	2177.38	306	.00	158=	4857.01	310
925	16UF	Eden	1728	334	5749	346	14.78	248	3447.41	236	.00	158=	5804.88	267
620	13UE	Ellesmere Port and Neston	5124	179	17168	207	26.45	112	4732.43	156	24.23	58	8080.32	65
3605	43UB	Elmbridge	2517	301	10961	292	5.48	351	703.77	351	.00	158=	3771.06	334
5300	AK	Enfield	16159	53	63667	45	26.79	106	5276.34	119	11.62	95	7895.01	93
1535	22UH	Epping Forest	4299	206	17236	203	14.94	244	3254.44	245	.00	158=	6418.71	235
3610	43UC	Epsom and Ewell	1814	327	5677	347	8.00	335	1360.03	336	.00	158=	5398.00	286
1025	17UG	Erewash	5925	157	22549	152	23.48	143	5083.90	138	3.37	155	7354.23	157
1110	18UC	Exeter	6558	138	22775	149	23.82	140	5235.98	123	5.27	137	7575.65	129
1720	24UE	Fareham	2570	297	10902	293	7.04	346	1069.58	345	.00	158=	4034.25	327
515	12UD	Fenland	3938	222	17480	201	23.84	139	5220.36	125	6.97	123	7462.53	144

DETR LA Code	LA Code	LA Name	Number of Employment Deprived*	Rank of Employment Scale	Number of Income Deprived*	Rank of Income Scale	Average of Ward Scores	Rank of Ward Scores	Average of Ward Ranks	Rank of Ward Ranks	Extent Scores	Extent Rank	Local Concentration Score	Local Concentration Rank
3510	42UC	Forest Heath	1545	342	7030	334	14.08	257	3337.24	242	.00	158=	4655.96	316
1615	23UD	Forest of Dean	3545	238	13192	260	19.83	186	4624.09	164	.00	158=	6640.00	217
2325	30UF	Fyde	3134	268	11216	287	14.93	245	3458.04	235	.00	158=	5857.69	264
4505	CH	Gateshead	19388	36	59590	49	38.65	41	6698.43	46	38.63	32	8235.24	37
3020	37UE	Gedling	5672	163	19235	178	18.47	197	4063.58	197	.00	158=	6787.06	205
1620	23UE	Gloucester	6100	150	23004	148	24.45	134	4667.76	162	13.80	87	7835.21	101
1725	24UF	Gosport	3257	258	14155	238	18.82	194	4313.12	185	.00	158=	6161.42	253
2230	29UG	Gravesham	5114	180	18832	180	21.84	154	4647.82	163	.00	158=	7115.51	180
2615	33UD	Great Yarmouth	7384	118	26035	124	37.96	43	6584.13	52	36.83	35	8388.31	5
5330	AL	Greenwich	17178	46	66296	42	37.87	44	6651.36	48	29.86	47	8091.52	63
3615	43UD	Guildford	2984	272	12560	271	8.88	328	1635.79	328	.00	158=	4891.73	309
5360	AM	Hackney	24024	18	89244	17	57.26	4	8053.18	2	100.00	1	8328.89	20
625	ET	Halton	12700	66	39303	81	42.86	16	7097.42	18	53.41	13	8234.54	38
2710	36UC	Hambleton	2935	279	10247	302	12.67	274	2808.68	273	.00	158=	5346.01	292
5390	AN	Hammersmith and Fulham	12543	67	42090	74	31.57	77	6194.30	68	10.86	99	8013.47	77
2415	31UD	Harborough	1825	326	7461	326	7.72	338	1265.29	338	.00	158=	3186.09	346
5420	AP	Haringey	21789	25	79492	26	42.30	20	6805.47	37	39.84	28	8289.33	27
1540	22UJ	Harlow	3906	224	17628	199	30.30	82	6341.17	63	.00	158=	7263.07	163
2715	36UD	Harrigate	4927	184	18723	183	11.09	301	2319.81	295	.00	158=	5211.06	298
5450	AQ	Harrow	8673	98	33530	98	16.03	230	3725.02	222	.00	158=	5464.24	283
1730	24UG	Hart	1240	351	5287	350	4.43	354	359.82	354	.00	158=	1297.27	354
705	EB	Hartlepool	10924	79	34518	95	47.67	8	7243.32	10	56.47	11	8371.35	10
1415	21UD	Hastings	7092	124	25784	127	39.22	35	6923.36	27	27.97	51	8196.00	48
1735	24UH	Havant	5787	159	25580	131	24.29	137	4805.07	150	5.78	134	7889.45	94



DETR LA Code	LA Code	LA Name	Number of Employ- ment Deprived*	Rank of Employ- ment Scale	Number of Income Deprived*	Rank of Income Scale	Av. of Ward Scores	Rank of Av. of Ward Scores	Av. of Ward Ranks	Rank of Av. of Ward Ranks	Extent Scores	Extent Rank	Local Concent- ration Score	Local Concent- ration Rank
5480	AR	Havering	9793	87	37143	87	16.62	224	3525.09	233	.00	158=	7142.97	176
1920	26UE	Hertsmere	2798	287	12788	269	11.82	291	2486.80	290	.00	158=	5801.57	268
1030	17UH	High Peak	4208	212	14437	235	18.23	202	4085.12	193	3.97	152	7029.64	187
5510	AS	Hillingdon	10137	84	41284	77	18.30	200	4004.02	201	.00	158=	6580.64	221
2420	31UE	Hinckley and Bosworth	3297	256	13077	263	13.16	269	2915.61	265	.00	158=	5222.19	296
3825	45UF	Horsham	2444	303	11230	286	6.92	347	1037.08	346	.00	158=	2803.90	349
5540	AT	Hounslow	11874	73	46527	67	25.76	115	5634.57	99	.00	158=	7119.76	179
520	12UE	Huntingdonshire	4522	197	18256	191	10.97	303	2212.03	303	.00	158=	5635.73	273
2330	30UG	Hyndburn	6356	142	23550	145	37.18	51	6725.69	45	26.94	53	8238.50	35
3515	42UD	Ipswich	7107	123	28840	108	26.47	110	5374.54	115	.00	158=	7551.41	134
2130	MW	Isle of Wight	8696	97	31720	99	29.34	87	6123.00	73	4.22	149	7516.43	137
835	15UH	Isles of Scilly	33	354	181	354	9.12	325	1708.00	326	.00	158=	1708.00	353
5570	AU	Islington	19822	33	65551	43	45.27	11	7564.91	8	57.98	9	7997.79	81
3905	46UB	Kennet	2152	313	9071	314	12.01	289	2600.21	285	.00	158=	4996.06	304
5600	AW	Kensington and Chelsea	9367	91	28483	110	20.70	171	3985.71	202	10.52	101	7862.80	95
815	15UD	Kerrier	6663	134	24117	140	34.07	59	6493.11	55	29.44	49	7846.43	98
2820	34UE	Kettering	3397	252	14292	237	15.83	233	3403.73	238	.00	158=	6681.18	211
2635	33UE	King's Lynn and West Norfolk	6745	132	27019	116	24.79	127	5162.81	131	9.42	107	7857.93	97
2035	FA	Kingston upon Hull, City of	25437	15	99995	11	44.72	13	7161.49	14	47.46	17	8356.93	12
5630	AX	Kingston upon Thames	4674	192	16589	214	9.83	316	1895.95	318	.00	158=	5077.75	301
4715	CZ	Kirklees	23680	19	102619	8	30.01	85	5746.81	93	12.67	92	7923.16	90
4305	BX	Knowsley	21093	28	69958	36	58.22	2	7777.50	6	79.13	5	8404.23	3
5660	AY	Lambeth	24684	17	84792	21	38.29	42	7051.98	21	14.87	79	7950.58	87
2335	30UH	Lancaster	8916	95	30653	102	26.12	113	5220.66	124	11.51	96	7834.62	102

DETR LA Code	LA Code	LA Name	Number of Employment Deprived*	Rank of Employment Scale	Number of Income Deprived*	Rank of Income Scale	Average Ward Scores	Rank of Average Ward Scores	Average Ward Ranks	Rank of Average Ward Ranks	Extent Scores	Extent Rank	Local Concentration Score	Local Concentration Rank
4720	DA	Leeds	45080	4	181371	4	25.78	114	4872.59	146	19.10	71	8009.06	78
2425	FN	Leicester	22188	23	98175	12	40.17	28	6821.24	35	47.10	18	8235.82	36
1425	21UF	Lewes	3511	240	14122	240	18.14	206	4071.84	196	.00	158=	6950.92	194
5690	AZ	Lewisham	20746	29	73960	31	36.79	53	6889.25	30	16.65	76	7930.99	89
3415	41UD	Lichfield	3513	239	13246	258	14.29	253	3031.68	260	.00	158=	6623.82	218
2515	32UD	Lincoln	6720	133	24642	136	33.76	61	6654.28	47	.00	158=	7452.21	146
4310	BY	Liverpool	65587	2	202105	2	58.05	3	7790.06	5	72.19	7	8407.91	2
210	KA	Luton	10712	81	45909	68	28.88	91	5778.60	91	13.63	88	7921.55	91
630	13UG	Macclesfield	5450	170	20031	171	11.50	296	2363.59	294	.00	158=	5837.76	265
2235	29UH	Maldstone	5367	173	20578	163	14.78	247	3011.27	261	4.69	145	7433.02	150
1545	22UK	Maldon	2054	317	8399	318	16.09	227	3694.50	226	.00	158=	6027.11	257
1820	47UC	Malvern Hills	2542	299	10801	295	14.58	251	3248.12	247	.00	158=	6368.55	237
4215	BN	Manchester	50773	3	182325	3	55.92	6	7703.13	7	79.29	4	8401.75	4
3025	37UF	Mansfield	8778	96	28186	113	38.94	37	6903.66	29	38.31	33	8108.30	59
2275	LC	Medway	12016	70	45179	69	20.87	166	4491.15	170	.00	158=	7025.67	188
2430	31UG	Melton	1317	349	5816	344	11.01	302	2289.36	298	.00	158=	4922.01	306
3305	40UB	Mendip	4267	209	17234	204	17.52	214	4081.19	194	.00	158=	6213.67	246
5720	BA	Merton	8016	110	31091	100	18.37	198	3921.93	209	.00	158=	6771.51	208
215	09UC	Mid Bedfordshire	2881	282	13085	262	9.00	327	1672.55	327	.00	158=	3528.61	341
1135	18UD	Mid Devon	2943	278	12118	279	20.46	173	4832.54	148	.00	158=	6140.92	255
3520	42UE	Mid Suffolk	2402	305	10533	299	12.03	288	2710.66	280	.00	158=	4046.17	326
3830	45UG	Mid Sussex	2679	294	11623	284	6.60	349	978.80	349	.00	158=	3518.86	342
715	EC	Middlesbrough	15741	56	52876	58	47.27	9	6732.97	44	59.86	8	8410.83	1
420	MG	Milton Keynes	8566	100	37903	84	19.92	185	4227.41	190	6.06	132	7694.52	116

DETR LA Code	LA Code	LA Name	Number of Employ- ment Deprived*	Rank of Employ- ment Scale	Number of Income Deprived*	Rank of Income Scale	Average Ward Scores	Rank of Ward Scores	Average Ward Ranks	Rank of Av. of Ward Ranks	Extent Scores	Extent Rank	Local Concent- ration Score	Local Concent- ration Rank
3620	43UE	Mole Valley	1590	338	6878	338	6.63	348	1009.93	348	.00	158=	3674.77	338
1740	24UJ	New Forest	5355	174	23637	144	12.52	279	2785.13	275	.00	158=	4894.77	308
3030	37UG	Newark and Sherwood	5933	156	22013	153	25.31	122	4947.61	143	11.27	97	7842.11	99
4510	CJ	Newcastle upon Tyne	27050	10	88837	18	40.44	26	6420.23	59	41.02	24	8382.56	6
3420	41UE	Newcastle-under-Lyme	7121	122	23342	146	24.23	138	5159.70	132	8.59	112	7574.35	130
5750	BB	Newham	23396	20	103662	7	56.18	5	8013.27	3	95.38	3	8302.77	24
820	15UE	North Cornwall	4422	202	18093	193	26.53	109	5808.60	89	.00	158=	7101.02	182
1115	18UE	North Devon	4870	188	18558	185	24.38	135	5199.11	127	9.87	104	7735.31	111
1215	19UE	North Dorset	1590	339	7787	323	12.81	273	2907.31	267	.00	158=	4728.49	312
1035	17UJ	North East Derbyshire	5936	155	19770	174	23.12	146	4782.55	151	7.17	122	7685.68	118
2545	FC	North East Lincolnshire	11692	74	47848	65	32.91	73	6070.26	77	19.75	70	8165.66	55
1925	26UF	North Hertfordshire	3616	234	17204	205	12.45	280	2678.18	281	.00	158=	5414.61	285
2520	32UE	North Kesteven	3547	237	13189	261	16.01	231	3747.68	221	.00	158=	6019.20	258
2540	FD	North Lincolnshire	9204	93	35022	93	24.98	126	5312.90	117	6.30	130	7650.98	122
2620	33UF	North Norfolk	4399	203	18415	187	21.54	159	5033.42	139	.00	158=	6597.60	220
3210	39UC	North Shropshire	2258	309	9362	310	20.70	170	4854.82	147	.00	158=	6148.42	254
130	HC	North Somerset	8001	111	29515	105	16.06	229	3115.97	252	9.12	108	7761.69	107
4515	CK	North Tyneside	16355	50	56088	53	33.34	69	6142.71	71	26.21	55	8228.21	40
3705	44UB	North Warwickshire	2705	293	10755	297	18.89	192	4423.87	175	.00	158=	6172.88	251
2435	31UH	North West Leicestershire	4104	216	13976	246	18.23	201	4078.81	195	.00	158=	7095.55	183
3910	46UC	North Wiltshire	3276	257	15045	228	10.90	304	2172.57	307	.00	158=	5546.21	278
2825	34UF	Northampton	9515	89	39747	80	22.01	151	4503.20	168	.00	158=	7438.41	149
2625	33UG	Norwich	9904	86	35941	91	33.59	66	6325.22	65	12.46	93	7992.27	83
3035	FY	Nottingham	25733	14	100600	10	44.75	12	7212.48	12	53.35	14	8310.73	22

DETR LA Code	LA Code	LA Name	Number of Employment Deprived*	Rank of Employment Scale	Number of Income Deprived*	Rank of Income Scale	Av. of Ward Scores	Rank of Av. of Ward Scores	Av. of Ward Ranks	Rank of Av. of Ward Ranks	Extent Scores	Extent Rank	Local Concentration Score	Local Concentration Rank
3710	44UC	Nuneaton and Bedworth	6572	136	25584	130	26.46	111	5464.35	108	5.85	133	7375.61	154
2440	31UJ	Oadby and Wigston	1791	328	7139	333	14.86	246	3339.29	241	.00	158=	6330.49	240
4220	BP	Oldham	16695	48	69402	37	38.87	38	6357.90	61	35.28	39	8337.87	18
3215	39UD	Oswestry	1914	323	7165	330	24.46	133	5488.72	106	.00	158=	6932.73	197
3110	38UC	Oxford	5876	158	24399	137	20.75	168	4398.37	176	8.45	115	7576.16	128
2340	30UJ	Pendle	6326	144	25273	135	37.39	50	6322.39	66	38.98	30	8337.07	19
825	15UF	Penwith	5290	176	18802	181	37.59	49	6945.94	25	23.12	63	8002.98	79
525	JA	Peterborough	8535	101	40245	79	27.34	100	5158.65	133	15.68	77	8094.29	61
1120	HG	Plymouth	19344	37	62867	46	30.35	81	5889.33	84	13.83	86	7954.65	86
1220	HP	Poole	5509	167	23775	142	17.18	217	3895.96	211	.00	158=	6447.05	229
1745	MR	Portsmouth	10855	80	43086	71	25.39	119	5260.34	121	8.33	117	7754.85	108
2345	30UK	Preston	10073	85	37700	86	33.22	70	5732.19	95	30.89	46	8205.05	46
1225	19UG	Purbeck	1480	345	7155	332	15.64	234	3722.94	223	.00	158=	5757.59	271
315	MC	Reading	5706	162	26156	122	19.73	188	4251.29	189	.00	158=	7224.31	169
5780	BC	Redbridge	12481	68	46764	66	21.92	153	4747.59	154	.00	158=	7310.11	161
710	EE	Redcar and Cleveland	13974	61	41743	75	39.38	32	6612.55	50	41.54	23	8380.47	7
1825	47UD	Redditch	3829	228	17176	206	22.98	149	5028.08	140	.00	158=	7167.91	174
3625	43UF	Reigate and Banstead	3204	261	13058	264	9.71	319	1867.84	319	.00	158=	4962.42	305
830	15UG	Restormel	6092	151	21883	154	28.51	93	6187.71	69	.00	158=	6924.92	198
2350	30UL	Ribble Valley	1987	321	5369	349	12.30	285	2645.66	282	.00	158=	5241.01	295
5810	BD	Richmond upon Thames	5520	166	18616	184	7.50	341	1208.02	341	.00	158=	3514.60	343
2720	36UE	Richmondshire	1478	346	5807	345	14.35	252	3251.23	246	.00	158=	5765.23	270
4225	BQ	Rochdale	18424	41	67972	40	40.54	25	6757.62	42	38.76	31	8352.22	13
1550	22UL	Rochford	2590	296	10340	300	11.88	290	2488.05	289	.00	158=	5394.29	287

DETR LA Code	LA Code	LA Name	Number of Employment Deprived*	Rank of Employment Scale	Number of Income Deprived*	Rank of Income Scale	Average Ward Scores	Rank of Ward Scores	Average Ward Ranks	Rank of Ward Ranks	Extent Scores	Extent Rank	Local Concentration Score	Local Concentration Rank
2355	30UM	Rossendale	4532	196	16252	217	30.84	80	6306.69	67	.00	158=	7452.35	145
1430	21UG	Rother	3506	242	15088	227	18.22	203	4117.03	192	.00	158=	7004.02	190
4415	CF	Rotherham	20717	30	73291	32	37.79	48	6821.75	34	23.86	60	8278.45	31
3715	44UD	Rugby	3184	265	13671	254	16.50	225	3646.82	230	.00	158=	6679.32	212
3630	43UG	Runnymede	1735	333	7733	324	9.20	323	1726.72	323	.00	158=	4190.13	322
3040	37UJ	Rushcliffe	3494	243	11804	283	9.34	322	1774.45	320	.00	158=	4660.24	314
1750	24UL	Rushmoor	2469	302	10971	290	12.53	277	2548.01	287	.00	158=	6252.55	245
2445	FP	Rutland	637	352	3196	352	7.94	337	1319.74	337	.00	158=	3093.80	348
2725	36UF	Ryedale	1571	340	6999	336	14.95	243	3572.18	232	.00	158=	5073.83	302
4230	BR	Salford	20440	31	75480	29	41.79	21	6907.30	28	39.85	27	8280.95	30
3915	46UD	Salisbury	3472	245	15004	230	13.73	260	3033.66	259	.00	158=	6179.36	248
4620	CS	Sandwell	21957	24	100968	9	42.70	17	7242.34	11	45.85	19	8170.86	52
2730	36UG	Scarborough	7059	125	25373	134	26.87	105	5631.11	100	11.82	94	7769.83	106
1330	20UG	Sedgefield	8384	103	25680	129	36.97	52	6776.23	39	21.11	68	8039.45	70
3310	40UC	Sedgemoor	4934	183	20066	170	21.98	152	4781.38	152	.00	158=	7088.40	185
4320	CA	Sefton	24809	16	78562	27	32.75	74	5883.95	85	32.38	45	8219.71	43
2735	36UH	Selby	3444	249	11388	285	17.69	212	3861.71	213	.00	158=	7365.39	156
2245	29UK	Sevenoaks	3196	262	13685	251	11.45	297	2274.08	299	.00	158=	6164.95	252
4420	CG	Sheffield	41874	5	151264	6	34.00	60	5773.71	92	29.85	48	8348.24	14
2250	29UL	Shepway	6141	149	22653	151	26.59	108	5553.74	102	4.36	148	7683.35	119
3220	39UE	Shrewsbury and Atcham	4209	211	16077	220	16.90	222	3832.87	214	.00	158=	6563.77	222
320	MID	Slough	5478	169	25410	133	25.35	120	5482.05	107	.00	158=	7023.00	189
4625	CT	Solihull	9116	94	33911	97	17.52	215	2985.12	262	20.10	69	7945.99	88
220	09UE	South Bedfordshire	3808	231	16154	218	15.12	240	3266.81	244	.00	158=	6773.79	207

DETR LA Code	LA Code	LA Name	Number of Employment Deprived*	Rank of Employment Scale	Number of Income Deprived*	Rank of Income Scale	Average of Ward Scores	Rank of Average of Ward Scores	Average of Ward Ranks	Rank of Average of Ward Ranks	Extent Scores	Extent Rank	Local Concentration Score	Local Concentration Rank
410	11UE	South Bucks	1276	350	5572	348	7.58	339	1234.36	339	.00	158=	4215.51	321
530	12UG	South Cambridgeshire	2969	275	10672	298	7.33	342	1125.66	342	.00	158=	3598.29	340
1040	17UK	South Derbyshire	3822	229	12224	277	17.12	218	3809.85	216	.00	158=	6484.69	228
1635	HD	South Gloucestershire	7237	120	29844	104	11.16	299	2301.21	297	.00	158=	5216.85	297
1125	18UG	South Hams	3483	244	13684	252	18.16	205	4182.54	191	.00	158=	6444.92	230
2525	32UF	South Holland	2980	273	11949	282	18.62	196	4354.22	179	.00	158=	6178.78	249
2530	32UG	South Kesteven	4274	207	18967	179	13.64	263	2731.74	277	4.86	143	6900.48	200
930	16UG	South Lakeland	3977	218	12894	265	13.15	270	2930.75	264	.00	158=	5558.13	277
2630	33UH	South Norfolk	3865	227	15036	229	13.60	264	3082.12	255	.00	158=	5346.16	291
2830	34UG	South Northamptonshire	1691	336	7329	328	7.06	345	1009.93	347	.00	158=	2009.15	352
3115	38UD	South Oxfordshire	2758	291	12015	281	8.37	331	1442.84	333	.00	158=	4380.40	320
2360	30UN	South Ribble	4877	187	16357	216	17.02	220	3714.57	224	.00	158=	6966.09	193
3225	39UF	South Shropshire	1598	337	6569	339	20.37	176	4694.06	160	.00	158=	6320.44	241
3325	40UD	South Somerset	5423	171	24340	138	15.42	237	3521.51	234	.00	158=	6422.58	234
3430	41UF	South Staffordshire	3821	230	14624	233	14.08	256	3151.89	251	.00	158=	5583.76	276
4520	CL	South Tyneside	16261	51	53696	55	43.94	15	7177.45	13	57.62	10	8166.52	54
1755	MS	Southampton	13403	64	52034	60	29.16	89	6094.12	76	6.60	125	7495.01	139
1555	KF	Southend-on-Sea	10490	83	38898	82	23.26	145	5147.66	134	.00	158=	6879.62	201
5840	BE	Southwark	22900	22	81025	23	44.54	14	7285.05	9	56.44	12	8195.00	49
3635	43UH	Spelthorne	2568	298	9867	307	10.66	308	2200.13	304	.00	158=	4825.19	311
1930	26UG	St. Albans	3452	248	13235	259	8.19	333	1538.97	331	.00	158=	3929.78	331
3525	42UF	St. Edmundsbury	3369	254	13549	256	15.10	241	3303.95	243	.00	158=	6720.72	209
4315	BZ	St. Helens	18071	43	51801	61	38.71	40	6814.93	36	35.92	38	8221.90	42
3425	41UG	Stafford	4919	185	17463	202	14.02	258	3091.32	253	.00	158=	5990.98	261

DETR LA Code	LA Code	LA Name	Number of Employ- ment Deprived*	Rank of Employ- ment Scale	Number of Income Deprived*	Rank of Income Scale	Average Ward Scores	Rank of Ward Scores	Average Ward Ranks	Rank of Av. of Ward Ranks	Extent Scores	Extent Rank	Local Concent- ration Score	Local Concent- ration Rank
3435	41UH	Staffordshire Moorlands	4897	186	13655	255	19.21	190	4360.34	178	4.42	147	7198.99	172
1935	26UH	Stevenage	3426	250	17131	208	20.41	174	4731.23	158	.00	158=	6875.94	202
4235	BS	Stockport	14766	59	56228	52	19.50	189	3980.97	204	3.58	154	7477.46	143
720	EF	Stockton-on-Tees	15172	57	51055	62	32.28	75	5434.84	111	35.23	40	8293.39	26
3440	GL	Stoke-on-Trent	21612	26	70219	35	39.24	34	7005.42	22	26.53	54	7977.96	85
3720	44UE	Stratford-on-Avon	2854	284	12811	267	9.72	318	1921.07	316	.00	158=	3494.60	344
1625	23UF	Stroud	3794	232	15470	223	12.53	278	2730.48	278	.00	158=	5275.38	293
3530	42UG	Suffolk Coastal	3876	225	15186	226	12.28	286	2633.93	283	.00	158=	5537.92	279
4525	CM	Sunderland	30302	8	93257	15	42.58	18	7144.29	15	40.55	26	8295.98	25
3640	43UJ	Surrey Heath	1336	348	6238	341	5.16	352	626.60	352	.00	158=	3212.64	345
5870	BF	Sutton	6776	130	25884	125	14.72	250	3088.82	254	.00	158=	6908.10	199
2255	29UM	Swale	6410	140	26103	123	25.19	125	5382.68	114	5.19	139	7699.67	114
3920	HX	Swindon	7539	116	30549	103	18.09	207	3663.86	228	9.63	106	7615.86	125
4240	BT	Tameside	16644	49	61279	47	35.14	57	6771.16	40	10.06	102	8022.54	74
3445	41UK	Tamworth	3790	233	16032	221	24.54	132	5437.39	110	.00	158=	7412.00	153
3645	43UK	Tandridge	1906	324	7028	335	9.08	326	1710.84	325	.00	158=	4440.40	319
3315	40UE	Taunton Deane	4821	190	18538	186	19.75	187	4373.09	177	5.20	138	7494.24	140
1335	20UH	Teesdale	1405	347	4180	351	20.74	169	4442.32	173	.00	158=	7446.21	148
1130	18UH	Teignbridge	5714	161	23254	147	21.51	160	4895.56	145	.00	158=	6785.19	206
3230	GF	Telford and Wrekin	8603	99	37894	85	28.28	96	5676.53	96	13.49	89	7666.23	120
1560	22UN	Tending	7732	115	31036	101	29.16	90	5786.57	90	12.87	91	8081.51	64
1760	24UN	Test Valley	2740	292	12204	278	10.29	312	1906.80	317	.00	158=	5992.37	260
1630	23UG	Tewkesbury	2228	311	9211	312	12.40	282	2580.32	286	.00	158=	6361.02	239
2260	29UN	Thanet	9538	88	38085	83	33.61	64	6419.39	60	21.48	67	8046.53	69

DETR LA Code	LA Code	LA Name	Number of Employment Deprived*	Rank of Employment Scale	Number of Income Deprived*	Rank of Income Scale	Average of Ward Scores	Rank of Average of Ward Scores	Average of Ward Ranks	Rank of Average of Ward Ranks	Extent Scores	Extent Rank	Local Concentration Score	Local Concentration Rank
1940	26UJ	Three Rivers	2192	312	9635	309	9.48	321	1712.01	324	.00	158=	6442.04	231
1565	KG	Thurrock	7122	121	28419	111	27.22	101	5408.89	113	8.36	116	7815.71	103
2265	29UP	Tonbridge and Malling	3218	260	13679	253	11.15	300	2253.18	300	.00	158=	5637.03	272
1140	HH	Torbay	9483	90	34533	94	33.16	71	6605.58	51	.00	158=	7543.96	136
1145	18UK	Torridge	3412	251	12552	272	26.87	104	5854.18	87	2.72	157	7104.96	181
5900	BG	Tower Hamlets	19757	34	92944	16	61.34	1	8125.23	1	96.99	2	8368.58	11
4245	BU	Trafford	11943	72	42719	73	20.28	177	3946.18	207	8.96	109	8046.87	68
2270	29UQ	Tunbridge Wells	3153	267	14064	242	12.13	287	2615.66	284	.00	158=	5486.20	281
2925	35UF	Tynedale	2859	283	8629	316	17.76	211	4050.49	199	.00	158=	6488.95	227
1570	22UQ	Uttlesford	1522	343	6408	340	8.63	330	1561.64	330	.00	158=	3103.46	347
3120	38UE	Vale of White Horse	2339	307	10779	296	8.01	334	1379.22	335	.00	158=	4179.81	323
635	13UH	Vale Royal	6279	146	20595	162	20.85	167	4306.57	186	4.62	146	7482.40	142
4725	DB	Wakefield	26301	11	81594	22	34.37	58	6344.55	62	23.04	64	8032.70	72
4630	CU	Walsall	18106	42	79541	25	38.72	39	6499.57	54	45.12	20	8251.13	33
5930	BH	Waltham Forest	15919	54	65324	44	33.67	62	6514.60	53	19.08	72	7773.46	105
5960	BJ	Wandsworth	15899	55	53498	56	23.06	148	5106.02	137	.00	158=	7254.06	165
2930	35UG	Wansbeck	6407	141	17674	198	40.22	27	7110.00	17	36.75	36	8197.44	47
640	EU	Warrington	11491	76	35967	90	21.73	156	4340.99	181	8.21	119	7580.16	127
3725	44UF	Warwick	4431	200	17918	195	13.49	266	2823.12	272	.00	158=	6522.74	224
1945	26UK	Watford	3045	270	13760	249	16.34	226	3698.70	225	.00	158=	5957.64	262
3535	42UH	Waveney	7440	117	27138	115	29.74	86	5974.14	80	21.80	66	7995.29	82
3650	43UL	Waverley	2405	304	11128	289	7.57	340	1218.97	340	.00	158=	3632.73	339
1435	21UH	Wealden	3555	235	16078	219	10.89	305	2109.66	310	.00	158=	5585.02	275
1340	20UJ	Wear Valley	6013	154	19400	177	41.62	22	7084.47	19	44.84	21	8285.31	28



DETR LA Code	LA Code	LA Name	Number of Employ- ment Deprived*	Rank of Employ- ment Scale	Number of Income Deprived*	Rank of Income Scale	Average Ward Scores	Rank of Av. of Ward Scores	Average Ward Ranks	Rank of Av. of Ward Ranks	Extent Scores	Extent Rank	Local Concent- ration Score	Local Concent- ration Rank
2835	34UH	Wellingborough	3185	264	13957	247	21.82	155	4327.60	182	.00	158=	7428.59	151
1950	26UL	Welwyn Hatfield	3081	269	14126	239	13.38	268	2829.59	271	.00	158=	6368.03	238
310	MB	West Berkshire	3162	266	14338	236	8.83	329	1624.17	329	.00	158=	4166.57	324
1150	18UL	West Devon	2040	319	8019	320	19.99	182	4692.75	161	.00	158=	6295.13	242
1230	19UH	West Dorset	3192	263	14045	243	15.33	239	3609.44	231	.00	158=	5373.10	290
2365	30UP	West Lancashire	7904	113	26473	118	27.68	99	5180.68	130	23.27	61	8169.58	53
2535	32UH	West Lindsey	4191	213	14548	234	23.09	147	4778.54	153	7.63	121	7837.29	100
3125	38UF	West Oxfordshire	1977	322	9352	311	8.35	332	1458.22	332	.00	158=	3709.59	336
3320	40UF	West Somerset	1704	335	6921	337	27.22	102	5960.48	81	.00	158=	7092.92	184
3925	46UF	West Wiltshire	3923	223	16944	210	14.15	254	3173.31	250	.00	158=	6182.27	247
5990	BK	Westminster	13534	63	43085	72	24.34	136	4995.93	141	11.22	98	7739.69	110
1235	19UJ	Weymouth and Portland	3977	219	13530	257	23.48	144	5187.90	129	6.66	124	7351.12	158
4250	BW	Wigan	27768	9	75226	30	33.64	63	6479.72	57	14.52	85	8076.51	66
1765	24UP	Winchester	2541	300	10836	294	7.98	336	1385.62	334	.00	158=	4099.14	325
325	ME	Windsor and Maidenhead	3017	271	13731	250	7.16	343	1121.44	343	.00	158=	2560.43	350
4325	CB	Wirral	31291	7	95421	14	36.17	56	6150.25	70	25.67	57	8371.56	9
3655	43UM	Woking	2056	316	9898	306	9.53	320	1737.96	321	.00	158=	6278.02	243
330	MF	Wokingham	2615	295	10188	303	4.89	353	534.29	353	.00	158=	2126.79	351
4635	CW	Wolverhampton	18836	40	80096	24	40.15	29	6858.68	33	40.60	25	8223.32	41
1835	47UE	Worcester	4256	210	17931	194	20.38	175	4352.82	180	.00	158=	7175.94	173
3835	45UH	Worthing	4165	214	16726	211	17.90	209	3922.73	208	.00	158=	6703.99	210
1840	47UF	Wychavon	3465	247	14016	244	13.42	267	3066.90	257	.00	158=	5154.36	300
425	11UF	Wycombe	4334	205	20656	161	12.33	284	2499.19	288	.00	158=	6507.97	225
2370	30UQ	Wyre	5560	165	20212	167	21.29	162	4444.52	172	8.49	113	7651.55	121

DETR LA Code	LA Code	LA Name	Number of Employment Deprived*	Rank of Employment Scale	Number of Income Deprived*	Rank of Income Scale	Av. of Ward Scores	Rank of Av. of Ward Scores	Av. of Ward Ranks	Rank of Av. of Ward Ranks	Extent Scores	Extent Rank	Local Concentration Score	Local Concentration Rank
1845	47UG	Wyre Forest	4517	198	18378	190	21.42	161	4809.24	149	6.33	129	7251.17	166
2740	FF	York	7988	112	29491	106	15.42	238	3385.06	239	.00	158=	6437.77	232

\* Numbers of Income and Employment deprived have been rounded to the nearest whole number

# APPENDIX D: Methodology for the index of multiple deprivation – at ward level

