The English Indices of Deprivation 2004: Summary (revised)
Introduction

The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) commissioned the Social Disadvantage Research Centre (SDRC) at the Department of Social Policy and Social Research at the University of Oxford to update the Indices of Deprivation 2000 (ID 2000) for England. Following two extensive public consultations, an academic peer review and a significant programme of work, the new Indices of Deprivation 2004 were produced in 2004.

The new Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004 (IMD 2004) is a Super Output Area (SOA) level measure of multiple deprivation and is made up of seven SOA level Domain Indices. There are also two supplementary Indices (Income Deprivation Affecting Children and Income Deprivation Affecting Older People). Summary measures of the IMD 2004 are presented at district and county level. The SOA level Domain Indices and IMD 2004, together with the district and county level summaries are referred to as the Indices of Deprivation 2004 (ID 2004).

The new ID 2004 are based on the approach, structure and methodology that were used to create the previous ID 2000. The ID 2004 updates the ID 2000 in two key ways: first, more up-to-date data has been used; and second, new measures have been incorporated as new and improved data sources have become available. The new Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004 contains seven Domains which relate to Income deprivation, Employment deprivation, Health deprivation and disability, Education, skills and training deprivation, Barriers to Housing and Services, Living environment deprivation and Crime.

This summary report outlines the components of the new ID 2004. The Office of the Deputy Prime Minister will publish a full report about the ID 2004.
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The concept of multiple deprivation

The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004 (IMD 2004) is a measure of multiple deprivation at the small area level. The model of multiple deprivation which underpins the IMD 2004 is based on the idea of distinct dimensions of deprivation which can be recognised and measured separately. These are experienced by individuals living in an area. People may be counted in one or more of the domains, depending on the number of types of deprivation that they experience. The overall IMD is conceptualised as a weighted area level aggregation of these specific dimensions of deprivation.
Domains and indicators

The IMD 2004 contains seven Domains of deprivation: Income deprivation, Employment deprivation, Health deprivation and disability, Education, skills and training deprivation, Barriers to Housing and Services, Living environment deprivation and Crime. Each Domain contains a number of indicators. The criteria for inclusion of these indicators are that they should be ‘domain specific’ and appropriate for the purpose (as direct as possible measures of that form of deprivation); measuring major features of that deprivation (not conditions just experienced by a very small number of people or areas); up-to-date; capable of being updated on a regular basis; statistically robust; and available for the whole of England at a small area level in a consistent form.

Data time point, spatial scale and denominators

Where possible, the indicators relate to 2001. The Domains, the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004 and the two supplementary Indices (Income Deprivation Affecting Children and Income Deprivation Affecting Older People) are all presented at Super Output Area (SOA) Lower Layer. Summaries of the IMD 2004 are presented at district and county levels.

When 2001 Census numerators were used, the denominators were also drawn from the Census. However, when non-Census numerators were used, the denominators were mainly based on the 2001 Mid-Year Estimates (MYEs).

The Domains

Income Deprivation Domain

The purpose of this Domain is to capture the proportion of the population experiencing income deprivation in an area.

- Adults and children in Income Based Job Seekers Allowance households (2001).
- Adults and children in Working Families Tax Credit households whose equivalised income (excluding housing benefits) is below 60% of median before housing costs (2001).
- Adults and children in Disabled Person’s Tax Credit households whose equivalised income (excluding housing benefits) is below 60% of median before housing costs (2001).
- National Asylum Support Service supported asylum seekers in England in receipt of subsistence only and accommodation support (2002).

In addition, an Income Deprivation Affecting Children Index and an Income Deprivation Affecting Older People Index were created.

Employment Deprivation Domain

This domain measures employment deprivation conceptualised as involuntary exclusion of the working age population from the world of work.

- Unemployment claimant count (JUVOS) of women aged 18-59 and men aged 18-64 averaged over 4 quarters (2001).

2 Mid-2001 Population Estimates – Provisional Results from the Manchester Matching Exercise. Released by the Office of National Statistics on 4th November 2003. As the 2001 MYEs are produced at district level, SOA level denominators were created by apportioning the 2001 MYEs to the SOA level using Census derived ratios.
• Participants in New Deal for the 18-24s who are not included in the claimant count (2001).
• Participants in New Deal for 25+ who are not included in the claimant count (2001).
• Participants in New Deal for Lone Parents aged 18 and over (2001).

**Health Deprivation and Disability Domain**

This domain identifies areas with relatively high rates of people who die prematurely or whose quality of life is impaired by poor health or who are disabled, across the whole population.

• Years of Potential Life Lost (1997-2001).
• Comparative Illness and Disability Ratio (2001).
• Measures of emergency admissions to hospital (1999-2002).
• Adults under 60 suffering from mood or anxiety disorders (1997-2002).

**Education, Skills and Training Deprivation Domain**

This Domain captures the extent of deprivation in terms of education, skills and training in a local area. The indicators fall into two sub-domains: one relating to education deprivation for children/young people in the area and one relating to lack of skills and qualifications among the working age adult population.

• Average points score of children at Key Stage 2 (2002).
• Average points score of children at Key Stage 3 (2002).
• Average points score of children at Key Stage 4 (2002).
• Proportion of young people not staying on in school or school level education above 16 (2001).

**Sub Domain: Skills**

• Proportions of working age adults (aged 25-54) in the area with no or low qualifications (2001).

**Barriers to Housing and Services Domain**

The purpose of this Domain is to measure barriers to housing and key local services. The indicators fall into two sub-domains: ‘geographical barriers’ and ‘wider barriers’ which also includes issues relating to access to housing, such as affordability.

**Sub Domain: Wider Barriers**

• Household overcrowding (2001).
• LA level percentage of households for whom a decision on their application for assistance under the homeless provisions of housing legislation has been made, assigned to SOAs (2002).
• Difficulty of Access to owner-occupation (2002).

**Sub Domain: Geographical Barriers**

• Road distance to GP premises (2003).
• Road distance to a supermarket or convenience store (2002).
• Road distance to a primary school (2001-2002).
• Road distance to a Post Office (2003).

**Crime Domain**

This Domain measures the incidence of recorded crime for four major crime themes, representing the occurrence of personal and material victimisation at a small area level.

• Burglary (4 recorded crime offence types, April 2002-March 2003).
• Theft (5 recorded crime offence types, April 2002-March 2003, constrained to CDRP level).
• Criminal damage (10 recorded crime offence types, April 2002-March 2003).
• Violence (14 recorded crime offence types, April 2002-March 2003).

The Living Environment Deprivation Domain

This Domain focuses on deprivation with respect to the characteristics of the living environment. It comprises two sub-domains: the ‘indoors’ living environment which measures the quality of housing and the ‘outdoors’ living environment which contains two measures about air quality and road traffic accidents.

Sub-Domain: The ‘indoors’ living environment
• Social and private housing in poor condition (2001).
• Houses without central heating (2001).

Sub-Domain: The ‘outdoors’ living environment
• Air quality (2001).
• Road traffic accidents involving injury to pedestrians and cyclists (2000-2002).

The methodological steps that were taken to create the IMD 2004 are described in the full report. The table below sets out the Domain weights which were used to combine the Domains into an Index of Multiple Deprivation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Domain Weights for the IMD 2004</th>
<th>Domain Weight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income deprivation</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment deprivation</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health deprivation and disability</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, skills and training deprivation</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barriers to housing and services</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Environment deprivation</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Outputs

1. Each of the 32,482 SOAs in England has been assigned a score and rank for the Index of Multiple Deprivation 2004 (IMD 2004); the seven Domain Indices; the sub-domains; and the two supplementary Indices (Income Deprivation Affecting Children and Income Deprivation Affecting Older People).

2. Six district level summary measures of the IMD 2004 have been produced. No single summary measure is favoured over another: there is no single best way of describing or comparing England’s 354 districts.
   • Local Concentration is the population weighted average of the ranks of a district’s most deprived SOAs that contain exactly 10% of the district’s population.
• Extent is the proportion of a district’s population living in the most deprived SOAs in the country.
• Income Scale is the number of people who are Income deprived.
• Employment Scale is the number of people who are Employment deprived.
• Average of SOA Ranks is the population weighted average of the combined ranks for the SOAs in a district.
• Average of SOA Scores is the population weighted average of the combined scores for the SOAs in a district.

3. County level summaries of the IMD 2004 have also been produced.

A glimpse of the results

SOA Level

England’s most deprived 20% of SOAs have the following characteristics on average:
• Just under a third of people are income deprived.
• One in five of women aged 18-59 and men aged 18-64 are employment deprived.
• Just under half of children live in families that are income deprived.
• Just under a third of older people are income deprived.

Table 2 summarises the most deprived 20% of SOAs on the IMD 2004 at Regional level, while Chart 1 shows this picture alongside England’s 20% least deprived SOAs by Region.
The Region which has the greatest percentage of its SOAs that fall in England’s most deprived 20% is the North East (38.1%), followed by the North West (32.8%). The North West has the greatest number of SOAs that fall in England’s most deprived 20% (1461), followed by London with 1260.

Local Authority District Level

In the ID 2004, 80 districts fell into the ‘most deprived 50’ on one or more of the six district level summaries. In the ID 2000, 81 districts fell into this category. Of the 81 districts in the ‘most deprived 50’ in the ID 2000, 75 remain within this category in the ID 2004.

Reasons for Change between the ID 2000 and the ID 2004

Reasons for change in rank position between the two Indices include:

- Real change will have taken place over time.
- The ID 2004 contains some new Domains and indicators.
- New geographical units were used for the ID 2004.
- Denominators have been recalibrated following the 2001 Census.
- The Extent measure was refined for the ID 2004.

Each of these points is addressed in the main report.
Table 2: Number of SOAs in the most deprived 20% of SOAs in England on the IMD 2004, by Government Office Region

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of SOAs in the most deprived 20% of SOAs in England</th>
<th>Number of SOAs in the Region</th>
<th>% of SOAs in each Region falling in most deprived 20% of SOAs in England</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>East</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>3,550</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Midlands</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>2,732</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>1,260</td>
<td>4,765</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North East</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>1,656</td>
<td>38.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North West</td>
<td>1,461</td>
<td>4,459</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East (excluding London)</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>5,319</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South West</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>3,226</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Midlands</td>
<td>917</td>
<td>3,482</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yorkshire &amp; the Humber</td>
<td>976</td>
<td>3,293</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chart 1: Percentage of SOAs in the most and least deprived 20% of SOAs in England on the IMD 2004 by Region