simd Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation

2009 General Report

NATIONAL STATISTICS

one scotland
SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT

Scottish Index of
Multiple Deprivation

2009 General Report

A Scottish Government National Statistics Publication

ISBN: 978-0-7559-8149-6

The Scottish Government
St Andrew's House
Edinburgh
EH1 3DG

Produced for the Scottish Government by RR Donnelley B61831 10/09

Published by the Scottish Government, October 2009

Further copies are available from
Office of the Chief Statistician
IN.04, St Andrew's House
Regent Road
Edinburgh
EH1 3DG

The text pages of this document are printed on recycled paper and are 100% recyclable

Contents

1. Summary

1.1. The Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) presents a picture of multiple deprivation across Scotland. The Scottish Government has used this method to track multiple deprivation since the development of the first Index of Multiple Deprivation in 2004. Taken together the three indices (2004, 2006 and 2009) provide a series of snapshots in time of the concentrations of multiple deprivation across the country. Although the SIMD as it currently stands has only been in existence since 2004 there is a long history of indices being produced and used both in central and local government. The benefits over previous approaches that the SIMD provides include regular updates, the opportunity to incorporate the most recent and appropriate data into these updates and a stable base geography so that change can be measured over time.

1.2. The picture painted in this most recent update to the Index is based mainly around data from 2008 and while the economic situation has changed since then it is still a valid picture of the distribution of deprivation. Whilst the recession will have had a rapid impact on employment and incomes, some of these changes may be relatively short term. Investigations were carried out to look at the impact of including more recent unemployment data in the Index but the effect on the overall distribution was negligible. Full details of this analysis is available on the SIMD web pages. The Index also looks beyond the economic situation and covers a range of other life circumstances of the people of Scotland including health, education, access to services, housing and crime which take longer to change.

1.3. The picture of multiple deprivation across Scotland has changed since 2004. There have been real changes in people's lives, both positive and negative but there have also been changes in how well we are able to measure and monitor these changes. Sometimes an improvement in measurement makes it look as if the situation for an area is actually worsening but this is not always the case. It can be that the improvement means that we are now getting a better picture of what was previously being obscured by less effective measurement.

Overall SIMD

1.4. SIMD 2009 shows some changes in the areas of Scotland which have the highest concentrations of multiple deprivation but four in every five datazones that were in the 15% most deprived on SIMD 2004 are still in the 15% most deprived on SIMD 2009. Glasgow continues to have the highest concentrations of multiple deprivation in Scotland by some considerable amount but it has seen a fall between SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2006 and again to SIMD 2009. This fall has meant increases in other Local Authorities partly due to the relative nature of the SIMD, however the concentrations of deprivation are becoming more spread out across the country. The five local authorities with the most datazones in the 15% most deprived in SIMD 2004 contained two thirds of the 15% most deprived datazones in Scotland. By SIMD 2009, the five local authorities with the highest numbers of deprived datazones contained only 58% of the deprived datazones in Scotland, with the 7 highest containing two thirds of the deprived datazones.

1.5. The five Local Authorities with the largest proportion of their datazones in the 15% most deprived are Glasgow, Inverclyde, Dundee City, West Dunbartonshire and North Ayrshire. North Ayrshire has replaced Clackmannanshire which has seen a fall in the proportion of its datazones in the 15% most deprived since SIMD 2006. North Ayrshire, along with South Ayrshire, Renfrewshire and West Lothian have seen the biggest increases in the proportion of datazones within the Local Authority in the 15% most deprived.

1.6. Of the datazones moving into the 15% most deprived, over 90% were in the 15-20% band in SIMD 2006, so were just outside the cut off and the majority have seen a worsening on a number of the domains, demonstrating that it is concentrations of multiple deprivation driving the changes and not just one aspect of deprivation.

1.7. In 2009, Glasgow has fewer datazones in the 15% most deprived and 30% fewer datazones in the 5% most deprived in Scotland since 2004. So although Glasgow still has the majority of datazones in the 5% most deprived, the distribution has changed slightly to be spread over other local authorities. North Lanarkshire, Inverclyde, Dundee City, and Fife all have at least 7 more datazones in the 5% most deprived in Scotland. South Ayrshire, Inverclyde, North Ayrshire, Dundee City, Fife and Dumfries & Galloway all had increasing numbers of datazones in the 5%, 10%, 15% most deprived across the 3 versions of the index, making them relatively worse off between 2004 and 2009. Only Glasgow's number of datazones has decreased in this manner. Other local authorities have fluctuated, or maintained numbers in each category.

SIMD Domains

1.8. Looking at the individual domains can tell a slightly different story to the overall SIMD rankings as each of these focus on different aspects of deprivation. So these can show what the biggest issues are for specific areas. Almost all of the most deprived datazones in the overall SIMD 2009 were also classed as deprived in at least three individual domains or topic areas. Approximately three quarters were deprived in four or more domains showing concentrations of multiple deprivation.

1.9. There are now more people classed as income deprived (15.1%) than in either of the two previous versions of the Index. We have seen a small increase since SIMD 2004 (from 15.0%) and an increase since SIMD 2006 (from 13.9%) across Scotland. This is because we are now able to use tax credit data to identify individuals in work with low incomes – this gives us a better picture of income deprivation than we have been able to get before. Across Scotland as a whole almost one in seven people are income deprived but in the most deprived areas this rises to just over one in three.

1.10. The employment domain shows that approximately one in eight of the working age population in Scotland are employment deprived and of these roughly one third live in the most employment deprived areas of the country. Overall the number of employment deprived people in Scotland has been falling steadily over the past few years and this is reflected in the different versions of the SIMD. It should be noted however that the data used in the employment domain covers a period before the recession and if you are specifically interested in employment deprivation more recent data is available, though the relative picture will not necessarily change.

1.11. In both the income and employment domains a similar pattern to the overall SIMD is evident with Glasgow having the largest share of the most deprived but improving over time.

1.12. There is an east – west divide in relation to the health domain. The most health deprived datazones are concentrated in three health boards – Ayrshire & Arran, Lanarkshire and Greater Glasgow & Clyde. This was the same in 2006. Over two thirds of the datazones classed as most deprived in 2009 have been in the most health deprived for all three versions of the Index which is to be expected as the causes of ill health have built up over time and in many cases changes made now will only show many years down the line.

1.13. In the education domain only three of the indicators are directly comparable with the previous version of the SIMD. All the datazones moving into the most deprived rankings have deteriorated in at least one of these indicators. Roughly half got worse on two and a similar number got worse on three. Of the datazones that moved out approximately half improved on at least three indicators. This suggests that there have been real changes within these areas.

1.14. The access domain highlights one of the major issues for the more rural areas of Scotland. The island local authorities Argyll & Bute, Eilean Siar, Orkney and Shetland show high levels of deprivation on this domain compared to the other domains. Over half of the remote rural datazones are classed as the most access deprived in Scotland and this has remained the same over all three versions of the Index.

1.15. The crime domain has seen approximately two thirds of deprived datazones remain in the most deprived between 2006 and 2009. The police force area with the highest proportion of datazones in the 15% most deprived on the crime domain is Strathclyde followed by Fife and Lothian & Borders. There is also a strong urban rural split with the higher levels visible in more urban areas. The relationship between the crime domains from both years is not as strong as that between some of the other domains across time. At a very small area level such as datazone, crime can be highly mobile and be 'pushed' from one area to another by increases in police or other action.

Key Facts

SIMD 2009 (Chapter 3)

- The most deprived datazone in SIMD 2009 is S01003279 in the Parkhead / Barrowfield area in the East of Glasgow.
- 742,300 people live in the 15% most deprived datazones in SIMD 2009. Of these, 266,500 (36%) are income deprived.
- 459,495 working age people live in the 15% most deprived datazones in SIMD 2009, of these 121,725 (26%) are employment deprived.
- Glasgow has seen a fall in the proportion of its datazones in the 15% most deprived from 48% to 44% from 2006.
- The five Local Authorities with the largest proportion of their datazones in the 15% most deprived are Glasgow (43.5%), Inverclyde (38.2%), Dundee (30.2%), West Dunbartonshire (26.3%) and North Ayrshire (24.0%). North Ayrshire has replaced Clackmannanshire which has seen a fall in the proportion of its datazones in the 15% most deprived since SIMD 2006.
- 31% of the 15% most deprived datazones in Scotland are within Glasgow City, this is a fall from 34% in SIMD 2006 and 38% in SIMD 2004.
- The 5 Local Authorities with the highest proportion of the most deprived datazones nationally contain 58% of the 15% most deprived datazones in Scotland. This is a fall from 67% in SIMD 2004.
- The Local Authorities with the largest numbers of the 15% most deprived datazones in Scotland are Glasgow City (30.9%) North Lanarkshire (9.1%), City of Edinburgh (6.1%), South Lanarkshire (5.9%) and Dundee City (5.5%) .
- The Health Boards with the largest proportion of their datazones in the 15% most deprived are Greater Glasgow & Clyde (30.4%), Ayrshire & Arran (18.3%), Lanarkshire (17.4%), Tayside (13.3%) and Fife (11.3%).
- The Health Boards with the largest proportions of the 15% most deprived datazones in Scotland are Greater Glasgow & Clyde (45.9%), Lanarkshire (12.9%), Ayrshire & Arran (9.0%), Lothian (8.8%) and Tayside (6.8%).

- Between them, these 5 Health Boards with the largest proportions of the most deprived datazones nationally contain 83% of the 15% most deprived datazones in Scotland.
- The datazones in the 5% most deprived contain the highest concentration of multiple deprivation. Glasgow City has 23% of its datazones in the 5% most deprived, followed by Inverclyde with 15.5% and Dundee with 10.1%.
- 49% of the datazones in the most deprived 5% according to SIMD 2009 are in Glasgow City, down from 52% in SIMD 2006. Edinburgh has the second highest proportion (6.8%) followed by North Lanarkshire (6.5%), though Edinburgh has also seen a fall since SIMD 2006. This shows that even in areas with the highest concentrations of deprivation there has been movement, some of which is due to demolition and new build.
- The proportion of the 15% most deprived datazones in Large Urban Areas has fallen from 64% in SIMD 2006 to 62% in SIMD 2009. Increases have been seen in Other Urban Areas and Small Towns. This demonstrates that levels of relative deprivation are being seen in other parts of Scotland as improvements are seen in Glasgow.

Change over time

- 81% of datazones in the most deprived 15% in SIMD 2009 were in the most deprived in the two previous versions of the SIMD so whilst there has been movement in and out of the 15% most deprived, four datazones in five have remained in the most deprived.
- The majority of areas that moved out of the 15% most deprived in SIMD 2006 have remained out, demonstrating maintained improvement. Of the datazones that moved out of the 15% most deprived between SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2006, 95 (79%) have remained out of the 15% most deprived on SIMD 2009
- Of the 120 datazones that moved into the 15% between SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2006, 66% have remained in the 15% most deprived.
- 93% of datazones in the 15% most deprived were in the 15% most deprived in 3 or more domains on SIMD 2009. 77% were in the 15% most deprived on four or more domains. This shows that the areas are experiencing concentrations of multiple deprivation and that it's not just one aspect of the index pushing them into the most deprived.
- The majority of datazones in the 5% most deprived in SIMD 2009 have been in the most deprived on all versions of the SIMD. Those in the 10-15% band are more likely to have moved in. Of the 325 datazones in the 5% most deprived in SIMD 2009, all except 1 were in the 15% most deprived in SIMD 2004. Only 59% of the datazones in the 10-15% most deprived in SIMD 2009 were in the most deprived in SIMD 2004.
- The areas with the most concentrated multiple deprivation have remained in the 15% most deprived whereas datazones nearer the cut off are more likely to have moved out. 95% of datazones in the 5% most deprived in SIMD 2004 are still in the 15% most deprived in SIMD 2009. Only two thirds of the datazones in the 10-15% most deprived in SIMD 2004 remain in the 15% most deprived in SIMD 2009.

Employment Domain (Chapter 4)

- The 2009 employment domain shows that 12% of the working age population are employment deprived. Of these, 33% live in one of the 15% most employment deprived datazones in Scotland.
- Glasgow City has the highest proportion of its working age population experiencing employment deprivation at 17%. Of these, almost two thirds live in the 15% most deprived datazones on the overall SIMD. In contrast, Aberdeenshire has the smallest percentage of its working age population employment deprived at 6%.

- Of the datazones in the 15% most deprived in the employment domain of SIMD 2009, 59% have remained in this category for all three versions of the SIMD. Glasgow City has the highest proportion (37%) of its datazones remaining in the 15% most deprived across the three SIMDs, showing concentrations of employment deprivation changing little since SIMD 2004.
- East Lothian and Moray saw datazones entering the 15% most employment deprived for the first time with 2 and 3 datazones respectively. North Lanarkshire gained the most at 22 new datazones, while Glasgow lost the most at 38 datazones. This shows some increases in other areas as Glasgow sees a fall. This is due to the relative nature of the SIMD.

Income Domain (Chapter 5)

- The inclusion of tax credit data within the income domain has seen an overall increase in the number of individuals classed as income deprived by the SIMD, as a new subset of people are now being included in the count.
- In the 2009 SIMD 36% of people living in the 15% most income deprived areas were income deprived compared to 12% in the rest of Scotland. Across Scotland as a whole approximately one in seven people or 15% of the population are income deprived.
- The largest concentration of income deprivation is in Glasgow with 33% of the 15% most deprived datazones, this was a fall from 34% in 2006. The next largest shares are in North Lanarkshire (8%), Edinburgh (6%) and Dundee City (6%).
- Between the 2006 SIMD and the 2009 SIMD 114 datazones moved into the 15% most deprived and 114 moved out. All of the datazones that have moved in have seen an increase in the proportion of the population that are income deprived whilst most of the datazones that have moved have seen decreases.
- Of the 862 datazones that have remained in the 15% most income deprived between the 2006 SIMD and the 2009 SIMD 776 were also in the 15% most deprived of the income domain in 2004**.**

Health Domain (Chapter 6)

- Glasgow has seen a fall in the percentage of its datazones in the 15% most deprived on the health domain from 49% to 46%. Inverclyde has the second highest local share of deprived datazones at 42%.
- Of the datazones in the 15% most deprived in the health domain on SIMD 2009, 70% have been in the 15% most deprived in each of the three updates to the domain.
- Over 90% of the datazones in the 15% most deprived on the health domain in Tayside, Forth Valley and Greater Glasgow & Clyde have been in the 15% most deprived on at least one previous update of the Health domain.
- East Glasgow and North Glasgow Community Health Partnership had 2/3 of their datazones in the 15% most health deprived on SIMD 2006. Both have seen a fall in the number of datazones in the 15% most health deprived in SIMD 2009 to 64% and 59% respectively.
- East Glasgow Community Health Partnership contains 10% of the most health deprived datazones in Scotland.

Education Domain (Chapter 7)

- Glasgow has the highest proportion (40%) of its datazones in the 15% most deprived on the education domain, followed by Dundee City (30%). Both have seen small falls since SIMD 2006.

- Aberdeen City and North Ayrshire have seen large increases in the percentage of datazones in the 15% most education deprived. Aberdeen City increased from 11% to 15%, North Ayrshire increased from 16% to 21%.
- The datazones moving into the 15% most deprived on the education domain have all seen a worsening in performance on at least one of the three indicators that are comparable with SIMD 2006. 91% got worse on at least two indicators and 45% on three.
- Of the datazones that moved out of the 15% most education deprived, 54% improved on two of the three indicators that are comparable with SIMD 2006 and 40% improved on all three. This demonstrates that areas have seen real as well as relative improvements.
- 10% of the datazones in Scotland have fallen in the 15% most education deprived on all three updates of the SIMD. 36% of the datazones in Glasgow and 19% of the datazones in Dundee City have appeared in the 15% most education deprived on the three updates to the SIMD.

Access Domain (Chapter 8)

- Over half of each of Scotland's island Local Authorities (Argyll & Bute, Eilean Siar, Orkney Islands and Shetland Islands) are access deprived whilst the cities of Edinburgh and Glasgow show almost no signs of access deprivation in SIMD 2009.
- Some local authorities, for example Argyll & Bute, Inverclyde and North Ayrshire, have relatively low drive times (a couple of minutes) but due to other areas having slightly quicker times, areas in these local authorities have been pushed into the 15% most deprived.
- Overall, using the 6-Fold Urban Rural Classification (2008), classes 1 to 3 have shown movement away from the 15% most access deprived datazones, and classes 4 to 6 have shown movement into the 15% most access deprived datazones.
- Over half of all datazones in Remote Rural Areas have been in the 15% most access deprived across all three versions of the SIMD. Around 30% of the datazones in Accessible Rural Areas are in a similar situation.

Crime Domain (Chapter 9)

- Glasgow City Local Authority has the largest share of datazones in the 15% most deprived in the SIMD 2009 crime domain at 18%. Edinburgh has 10%, North Lanarkshire 8%, Fife 7%, and Aberdeen 6%.
- Strathclyde Police Force Area has the largest national share of the 15% most deprived datazones in relation to crime at 49.4%. Dumfries & Galloway Police Force Area have the smallest national share at 2.2%.
- Despite having just under half the most deprived datazones in Scotland within the police force area, only 17.2% of datazones in Strathclyde are in the 15% most deprived. Fife has the second highest proportion at 15.2% and Lothian & Borders 15%.
- Dumfries & Galloway and Northern have the lowest proportion of datazones in the police force area in the 15% most deprived on the SIMD 2009 crime domain. Dumfries & Galloway has seen a fall since SIMD 2006, Northern has seen an increase.

2. Introduction.

The purpose of this report is to provide an overview of the background to and the results and analysis of the 2009 update to the Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation (SIMD) and its constituent domains.

What is the SIMD?

2.1. The SIMD is the Scottish Government's official tool for identifying small area concentrations of multiple deprivation across Scotland. It is relevant for the targeting of policies and resources aimed at tackling areas where there are concentrations of multiple deprivation. The SIMD provides a relative ranking for each of 6,505 small areas, or datazones, across Scotland. It ranks these areas from one, being the most deprived, to 6,505, being the least deprived.

Multiple Deprivation

2.2. The terms deprivation and poverty are sometimes used interchangeably. In this context, deprivation is about the range of problems that arise due to lack of resources or opportunities, not just financial. The income domain picks up the lack of money issue that could be perceived as actual poverty. That said there are different definitions of both poverty and deprivation. The SIMD is one measure of deprivation and takes the approach that deprivation is multi-dimensional. As a result, it is necessary to use data relating to multiple aspects of life in order to gain the fullest picture possible of deprivation across Scotland. The SIMD therefore consists of data from seven different subject areas or domains. The data from these domains are combined to produce an index that shows how deprived an area is in relation to all the other areas in Scotland.

Datazones

2.3. As previously mentioned, the SIMD is based on small areas called datazones. Datazones are a statistical geography that were developed in 2004. Datazones are population based with an average of 750 people living in each one. Because they are population based, datazones can vary hugely in size. In urban areas where people live very closely together, they can contain a few streets, while in more rural areas that are sparsely populated, they can cover miles. The datazone boundaries have remained stable since their creation in 2004, but the populations living within each datazone may have changed. For an analysis of the population drift please refer to the Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics User Forum (web link in Annex A).

Methodology

2.4. The methodology that is used to construct the SIMD 2009 is based on the approach developed by Oxford University for the Scottish Indices of Deprivation in 2003. This approach is widely accepted, with similar methodologies being used by England, Wales, and Northern Ireland. While similar methodologies are used across Great Britain and Northern Ireland, there are fundamental differences in the geographies and data used that mean that the indices are not comparable. A link to further information on this is available in Annex A. A general description is given here but full details of the methodology to create the 2009 SIMD are available in SIMD 2009 Technical Report.

Domains and Indicators

2.5. The domains used in the 2009 SIMD have remained the same as in the 2006 update (Income, Employment, Health, Education, Access to Services, Housing and Crime). Within each of these domains there are between two and eight indicators which were chosen for a number of reasons: (1) because of their ability to explain an aspect of deprivation, (2) because they are statistically robust, and (3) because of their availability at datazone level for the whole of Scotland.

Changes to the SIMD

2.6. The SIMD has National Statistics accreditation and as such, there is no political involvement in the choice of indicators or methodology used to construct the SIMD. Any changes that have been made have been done in conjunction with the SCOTSTAT Measuring Deprivation Advisory Group (MDAG). The MDAG consists of users and analysts in Local Authority areas, police forces, experts in particular issues and analysts from within the Scottish Government. The MDAG provides the Scottish Government with advice on a number of aspects relating to measuring deprivation. The advice covers the needs of users, development priorities, methodological options, quality and range of outputs and guidance. All minutes and papers from meetings of the MDAG are published on the Scottish Government website.

2.7. There have been some changes to the data used between 2006 and 2009. In the Income Domain for example, Tax Credit data has been included. These changes have been kept to a minimum. However, care should be taken when interpreting results where these changes have occurred. There is a summary of any changes at the beginning of each domain chapter and full details of the indicators and any changes are available in the Technical Report.

2.8. In total, there are 38 indicators in SIMD 2009. This is one more than in 2006. As well as providing an overall rank for each datazone, the SIMD also provides a rank for each datazone for each domain. Therefore, it is possible to look at the Health Domain in isolation for example and to see how each datazone ranks. A list of the indicators used in the SIMD is included in Annex B with full details available in the SIMD 2009 Technical Report on the Scottish Government website, (see Annex A for links).

Constructing the index

2.9. The domains included in the SIMD 2009 are:

- Income
- Employment
- Health
- Education, Skills and Training
- Access to Services
- Housing
- Crime

Each domain is made up of individual indicators which are listed in Annex B. The domains are calculated differently depending on the type of data used in each one.

2.10. The income, employment, housing and crime domains are created by summing counts of people and dividing by the appropriate population denominator taken from the Census or Small Area Population Estimates (SAPEs). For the 2009 SIMD, the income and employment domains are constructed by counting the number of people claiming relevant benefits, and dividing by the total and working age population respectively. The populations are taken from the 2007 SAPE. Thus, the domain scores are a simple percentage.

2.11. The housing domain is the sum of people in households that are overcrowded or have no central heating, divided by the total household population from the 2001 Census. The crime domain is a count of selected recorded crimes, called SIMD crimes, divided by the 2007 SAPE total population, but is shown as a rate of SIMD crime per 10,000 population rather than a percentage of the population.

2.12. The health, education and access domains are constructed using factor analysis, which is a statistical technique that calculates weights for each indicator before they are added together to create the domain score. The indicators in these domains cannot simply be summed as they are not all counts and use different denominators. This means that the scores for these three domains are relative rather than absolute values and, as such, can not be used to measure absolute differences or absolute change.

2.13. The overall index is a weighted sum of the seven domain scores. Prior to weighting, the domains are standardised by ranking the scores. The ranks then undergo exponential transformation to avoid high ranks in one domain 'cancelling out' low ranks in another. The weights are applied to each of the domains, which are then combined to create the overall index. The weights are provided in Annex B. The resulting SIMD scores for each datazone are then ranked from one (most deprived) to 6,505 (least deprived).

2.14. A flow diagram summarising the SIMD 2009 methodology is available inside the back cover of this report.

Change over time

2.15. Due to the stable nature of datazones, it is possible to look at change over time from the 2004 SIMD to the 2006 update, through to the 2009 SIMD. As a result, this report contains not only the results and analysis of the 2009 SIMD, but also includes some analysis on the changes that have occurred since the SIMD was first published in 2004. It is important to bear in mind that not all change that has occurred will be considered real change, some of the change will be due to methodological change and some due to changes in the data. Also because of the relative nature of the SIMD some of the change seen will simply be to due to change in some datazones pushing others up or down the rankings. The report also contains guidance on how individuals can carry out their own analysis on change over time.

What is the SIMD for?

2.16. It is important to note that while the SIMD is the Scottish Government's official tool for measuring small area concentrations of multiple deprivation, it is not the only method of measuring deprivation. The SIMD has been developed for a specific purpose which is to identify small area concentrations of multiple deprivation. In attempting to use the SIMD, it is necessary to be clear about what exactly it is that is trying to be achieved. If the focus is on areas with high levels of multiple deprivation, then the SIMD can be used. If however, the focus is on all deprived people, then a different approach needs to be taken. In this case, it may be possible to use the underlying data from one of the domains rather than the overall index. However, as can be seen from Table 2.1 below of the Income Domain, not everyone living in a deprived area is deprived and not all deprived people live in deprived areas even when looking at individual domains.

Table 2.1: Levels of income deprivation in the most income deprived areas

	No. of Income Deprived People	Total Population	% Income Deprived
15% most income deprived	270,580	747,009	36%
Rest of Scotland	508,670	4,397,191	12%

2.17. Of the 742,300 people living in the 15% most income deprived areas in Scotland 36% of them are income deprived while in the rest of Scotland only 12% of the population are income deprived. This suggests that income deprivation is concentrated in certain areas but also shows that not all people living in deprived areas are deprived and not all deprived people live in deprived areas. The is further borne out by looking at the column titled 'No of Income Deprived People'. Here it can be seen that more income deprived people live outside the 15% most income deprived areas than live in them.

Uses of the SIMD

2.18. The SIMD can be used for :

- Identifying areas with high levels of deprivation.
- Identifying areas with specific issues e.g. health, that may not be considered deprived on the overall index.
- Comparing all the datazones in Scotland so the most/least deprived can be identified.
- Comparing Local Authorities or other larger geographical areas by looking at the proportion of the 15% most deprived datazones contained within each of the areas. Cut offs other than the 15% most deprived may also be appropriate.

Limitations of the SIMD

2.19. The SIMD cannot:

- Say how much more deprived one area is than another. The datazone ranked 50 is not twice as deprived as the one ranked 100 – in the same way as you cannot tell how much better the winner in a race performed than the person who came second. You need to look at the race times i.e. the underlying data to get an idea of the size of the difference between the two.
- Tell you if an area is affluent. The SIMD measures deprivation so at the lower end of the rankings (i.e. closer to 6505) all that can be said is that there is less deprivation. As mentioned earlier not all deprived people live in deprived areas and all people living in deprived areas are deprived. The SIMD only counts those classed as deprived.
- As the SIMD does not measure affluence it is also not possible to say that one area is more affluent than another or even relatively so.
- Be used to compare areas across the United Kingdom. While it is true that the indices for all the countries are based on the same methodology they all have a different base geography and use different indicators within the domains. The different indicators reflect things like different education systems and different availability of data.

3. SIMD 2009 results

Changes since SIMD 2006

3.1. The following changes in methodology have been made in the calculation of SIMD 2009 which will impact on the results:

- Income domain – inclusion of tax credits data to pick up low income in work families.
- Health domain – change in codes used in alcohol and drug use indicators.
- Education domain – new indicator of Not in Education, Employment or Training to replace previous proxy.
- Access domain – new methodology for calculating travel times and change to weighting of sub-domains.
- Housing domain – no new data is available so census data is used as in previous updates.

3.2. The impact of each of these changes are covered in detail in the technical report.

3.3. The correlation between the SIMD 2009 and SIMD 2006 domains are shown in Annex C. This shows that the overall index is very strongly correlated against SIMD 2006 with a Pearson's correlation of 0.98. The correlation between the individual domains is also strong, particularly for the four domains with the highest weights. This suggests that despite the methodological changes the SIMD 2009 is still comparable with SIMD 2006.

Overall results

3.4. Analysis of the SIMD tends to focus on the 15% most deprived but other cut offs, for example the 5% most deprived or the 20% most deprived may be more appropriate for particular policies or uses of the SIMD and these cut offs are included in the publication. Analysis using the SIMD needs to consider the purpose for which the SIMD has been designed ie to identify small area concentrations of multiple deprivation and not individuals living in deprivation. Some analysis in this report is by vigintile. Vigintiles are bands of 5%, ie vigintile 1 is the 5% most deprived and combining the first three vigintiles is the 15% most deprived datazones in Scotland.

3.5. The areas identified by the SIMD 2009 as multiply deprived are similar to those identified by the SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2004. 81% of datazones in the 15% most deprived on SIMD 2009 were in the 15% most deprived on SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2004. Only 8% of the datazones in the 15% most deprived on SIMD 2009 have never appeared in the 15% most deprived before.

3.6. The most deprived datazone in Scotland in the SIMD 2009 is S01003279 in the Parkhead / Barrowfield area in the East of Glasgow. Whilst this datazone contains a football stadium and it ranks highly on the crime domain as is expected in datazones with high influxes of people at particular times of the day, week or year, this domain carries a relatively low weight and it is the levels of income, employment, health and education deprivation that are driving the rank.

3.7. The most deprived area in SIMD 2006 in the Ferguslie Park area of Paisley is now ranked 2. The other datazones in the five most deprived areas are in Keppochhill and Possilpark in North Glasgow.

3.8. One datazone S01003031 in the Glenwood South area of Glasgow contained a number of tower blocks which have been demolished and will be replaced with new housing. This datazone has zero population in 2006 and 2007. As some indicators use data over a number of years, some data exists for this datazone and has been used to allocate a rank for it. This datazone was in the fifth decile in SIMD 2006 and is in the sixth decile for SIMD 2009.

Most deprived datazones by Local Authority

3.9. As the SIMD ranks cannot be averaged or aggregated to give scores for larger areas we look at the local and national share of deprived datazones. The local share is the proportion of deprived datazones in the Local Authority or other area of interest that fall in the 15% most deprived, or other cut off. The national share is the proportion of datazones in the 15% most deprived in Scotland that fall in a particular Local Authority area. For example in a Local Authority with 20 datazones, 10 of which are in the 15% most deprived, the local share of deprived datazones would be 50% ie half the datazones in the Local Authority are in the 15% most deprived, however the national share would be 1% as it has only 10 of the 976 datazones in the 15% most deprived. The local and national share of deprived datazones by Local Authority for a number of cut offs are shown in Tables 3.1 and 3.2.

3.10. Whilst the highest concentrations of the 15% most deprived areas are in Glasgow, the Local Authority has seen a fall in the number and proportion of its datazones that are in the 15% most deprived on the overall SIMD (Table 3.1) from 34% to 31% of the 976 datazones in the 15% most deprived in Scotland (the national share). This represents a fall from 48% to 44% of the datazones in Glasgow appearing in the 15% most deprived, the local share, (Table 3.2).

3.11. North Lanarkshire has seen a small increase in the number of datazones in the 15% most deprived meaning it now has 9% of the most 15% deprived datazones in Scotland. This is 21% of the datazones in the Local Authority but several other local authorities have a higher proportion of their datazones in the 15% most deprived, the second highest local share behind Glasgow is Inverclyde with 38% of its datazones in the 15% most deprived in Scotland.

3.12. The five Local Authorities with the largest proportion of their datazones in the 15% most deprived are Glasgow (43.5%), Inverclyde (38.2%), Dundee (30.2%), West Dunbartonshire (26.3%) and North Ayrshire (24.0%). North Ayrshire has replaced Clackmannanshire which has seen a fall in the proportion of its datazones in the 15% most deprived since SIMD 2006.

3.13. The 5 Local Authorities with the highest proportion of the most deprived datazones nationally contain 58% of the 15% most deprived datazones in Scotland. This is a fall from 67% in SIMD 2004 showing that concentrations of deprivation are becoming more spread out across the country. 67% of deprived datazones are now contained in the seven local authorities with the highest national share of deprived datazones. These are Glasgow City (30.9%) North Lanarkshire (9.1%), City of Edinburgh (6.1%), South Lanarkshire (5.9%), Dundee City (5.5%) and Fife (5.2%) and North Ayrshire (4.4%).

3.14. As with SIMD 2006, some Local Authorities have no datazones in the 15% most deprived. Moray now has one datazone but Eilean Siar, Orkney and Shetland still have none. This does not mean there is no deprivation in these Local Authorities, just that there are no concentrations of multiple deprivation in the 15% most deprived in Scotland. Eilean Siar has three datazones in the 30% most deprived in Scotland.

Table 3.1 National Share of deprived datazones by Local Authority

Local Authority	5% Most deprived data zones						10% Most deprived data zones						15% Most deprived data zones						20% Most deprived data zones					
	SIMD 2004		SIMD 2006		**SIMD 2009 V2 (Revised 19/07/10)**		SIMD 2004		SIMD 2006		**SIMD 2009 V2 (Revised 19/07/10)**		SIMD 2004		SIMD 2006		**SIMD 2009 V2 (Revised 19/07/10)**		SIMD 2004		SIMD 2006		**SIMD 2009 V2 (Revised 19/07/10)**	
	no. of data zones	national share (%)	no. of data zones	national share (%)	**no. of data zones**	**national share (%)**	no. of data zones	national share (%)	no. of data zones	national share (%)	**no. of data zones**	**national share (%)**	no. of data zones	national share (%)	no. of data zones	national share (%)	**no. of data zones**	**national share (%)**	no. of data zones	national share (%)	no. of data zones	national share (%)	**no. of data zones**	**national share (%)**
Aberdeen City	2	0.6	9	2.8	**5**	**1.5**	8	1.2	18	2.8	**14**	**2.2**	18	1.8	27	2.8	**28**	**2.9**	27	2.1	36	2.8	**34**	**2.6**
Aberdeenshire	0	0.0	2	0.6	**1**	**0.3**	1	0.2	2	0.3	**2**	**0.3**	2	0.2	6	0.6	**4**	**0.4**	4	0.3	8	0.6	**5**	**0.4**
Angus	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	1	0.2	**2**	**0.3**	3	0.3	8	0.8	**6**	**0.6**	6	0.5	9	0.7	**7**	**0.5**
Argyll & Bute	0	0.0	2	0.6	**2**	**0.6**	6	0.9	4	0.6	**7**	**1.1**	9	0.9	10	1.0	**10**	**1.0**	10	0.8	11	0.8	**11**	**0.8**
Clackmannanshire	2	0.6	2	0.6	**2**	**0.6**	4	0.6	9	1.4	**7**	**1.1**	10	1.0	15	1.5	**12**	**1.2**	16	1.2	17	1.3	**16**	**1.2**
Dumfries & Galloway	1	0.3	2	0.6	**3**	**0.9**	3	0.5	6	0.9	**9**	**1.4**	9	0.9	11	1.1	**11**	**1.1**	15	1.2	16	1.2	**19**	**1.5**
Dundee City	9	2.8	13	4.0	**18**	**5.5**	34	5.2	39	6.0	**40**	**6.1**	51	5.2	53	5.4	**54**	**5.5**	75	5.8	68	5.2	**70**	**5.4**
East Ayrshire	7	2.2	8	2.5	**10**	**3.1**	13	2.0	17	2.6	**20**	**3.1**	28	2.9	28	2.9	**27**	**2.8**	40	3.1	40	3.1	**46**	**3.5**
East Dunbartonshire	0	0.0	1	0.3	**1**	**0.3**	2	0.3	2	0.3	**2**	**0.3**	4	0.4	3	0.3	**4**	**0.4**	5	0.4	6	0.5	**6**	**0.5**
East Lothian	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	1	0.1	**3**	**0.3**	3	0.2	3	0.2	**5**	**0.4**
East Renfrewshire	1	0.3	1	0.3	**1**	**0.3**	2	0.3	1	0.2	**1**	**0.2**	5	0.5	3	0.3	**5**	**0.5**	8	0.6	8	0.6	**8**	**0.6**
Edinburgh, City of	25	7.7	27	8.3	**22**	**6.8**	44	6.8	46	7.1	**42**	**6.5**	61	6.3	63	6.5	**60**	**6.1**	70	5.4	76	5.8	**73**	**5.6**
Eilean Siar	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**
Falkirk	1	0.3	1	0.3	**3**	**0.9**	7	1.1	11	1.7	**11**	**1.7**	14	1.4	19	1.9	**17**	**1.7**	30	2.3	29	2.2	**25**	**1.9**
Fife	1	0.3	5	1.5	**8**	**2.5**	12	1.8	22	3.4	**28**	**4.3**	34	3.5	47	4.8	**51**	**5.2**	60	4.6	80	6.1	**85**	**6.5**
Glasgow City	226	69.5	169	52.0	**158**	**48.6**	325	49.9	269	41.3	**242**	**37.2**	374	38.3	330	33.8	**302**	**30.9**	404	31.1	371	28.5	**349**	**26.8**
Highland	3	0.9	3	0.9	**4**	**1.2**	7	1.1	8	1.2	**9**	**1.4**	9	0.9	17	1.7	**16**	**1.6**	17	1.3	24	1.8	**27**	**2.1**
Inverclyde	6	1.8	13	4.0	**17**	**5.2**	24	3.7	29	4.5	**34**	**5.2**	36	3.7	42	4.3	**42**	**4.3**	46	3.5	49	3.8	**51**	**3.9**
Midlothian	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	1	0.2	**1**	**0.2**	1	0.1	5	0.5	**4**	**0.4**	6	0.5	10	0.8	**8**	**0.6**
Moray	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**1**	**0.1**	0	0.0	2	0.2	**3**	**0.2**
North Ayrshire	6	1.8	9	2.8	**10**	**3.1**	16	2.5	23	3.5	**26**	**4.0**	33	3.4	33	3.4	**43**	**4.4**	50	3.8	48	3.7	**60**	**4.6**
North Lanarkshire	9	2.8	17	5.2	**21**	**6.5**	44	6.8	44	6.8	**49**	**7.5**	103	10.6	84	8.6	**89**	**9.1**	152	11.7	133	10.2	**131**	**10.1**
Orkney Islands	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**
Perth & Kinross	0	0.0	2	0.6	**2**	**0.6**	2	0.3	5	0.8	**4**	**0.6**	3	0.3	9	0.9	**6**	**0.6**	5	0.4	10	0.8	**10**	**0.8**
Renfrewshire	8	2.5	9	2.8	**12**	**3.7**	22	3.4	22	3.4	**29**	**4.5**	41	4.2	36	3.7	**43**	**4.4**	60	4.6	60	4.6	**57**	**4.4**
Scottish Borders	0	0.0	1	0.3	**0**	**0.0**	1	0.2	2	0.3	**2**	**0.3**	2	0.2	3	0.3	**5**	**0.5**	4	0.3	6	0.5	**6**	**0.5**
Shetland Islands	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**
South Ayrshire	1	0.3	5	1.5	**6**	**1.8**	7	1.1	8	1.2	**9**	**1.4**	13	1.3	13	1.3	**18**	**1.8**	20	1.5	21	1.6	**23**	**1.8**
South Lanarkshire	8	2.5	13	4.0	**9**	**2.8**	40	6.1	37	5.7	**32**	**4.9**	66	6.8	56	5.7	**58**	**5.9**	88	6.8	80	6.1	**79**	**6.1**
Stirling	3	0.9	5	1.5	**3**	**0.9**	5	0.8	5	0.8	**5**	**0.8**	6	0.6	7	0.7	**7**	**0.7**	8	0.6	10	0.8	**8**	**0.6**
West Dunbartonshire	6	1.8	5	1.5	**7**	**2.2**	20	3.1	17	2.6	**18**	**2.8**	32	3.3	33	3.4	**31**	**3.2**	44	3.4	40	3.1	**40**	**3.1**
West Lothian	0	0.0	1	0.3	**0**	**0.0**	2	0.3	3	0.5	**6**	**0.9**	9	0.9	14	1.4	**19**	**1.9**	28	2.2	30	2.3	**39**	**3.0**
Scotland	325	100.0	325	100.0	**325**	**100.0**	**651**	**100.0**	**651**	**100.0**	**651**	**100**	**976**	**100.0**	**976**	**100.0**	**976**	**100.0**	**1,301**	**100.0**	**1,301**	**100.0**	**1,301**	**100.0**

Note: The national share is the number of data zones in the local authority area in the vigintile as a proportion of the total number of data zones in the vigintile.

Table 3.2 Local Share of deprived datazones by Local Authority

		5% Most deprived data zones						10% Most deprived data zones						15% Most deprived data zones						20% Most deprived data zones					
		SIMD 2004		SIMD 2006		**SIMD 2009 V2 (Revised 19/07/10)**		SIMD 2004		SIMD 2006		**SIMD 2009 V2 (Revised 19/07/10)**		SIMD 2004		SIMD 2006		**SIMD 2009 V2 (Revised 19/07/10)**		SIMD 2004		SIMD 2006		**SIMD 2009 V2 (Revised 19/07/10)**	
Local Authority	no. of data zones	no. of data zones	local share (%)	no. of data zones	local share (%)	**no. of data zones**	**local share (%)**	no. of data zones	local share (%)	no. of data zones	local share (%)	**no. of data zones**	**local share (%)**	no. of data zones	local share (%)	no. of data zones	local share (%)	**no. of data zones**	**local share (%)**	no. of data zones	local share (%)	no. of data zones	local share (%)	**no. of data zones**	**local share (%)**
Aberdeen City	267	2	0.7	9	3.4	**5**	**1.9**	8	3.0	18	6.7	**14**	**5.2**	18	6.7	27	10.1	**28**	**10.5**	27	10.1	36	13.5	**34**	**12.7**
Aberdeenshire	301	0	0.0	2	0.7	**1**	**0.3**	1	0.3	2	0.7	**2**	**0.7**	2	0.7	6	2.0	**4**	**1.3**	4	1.3	8	2.7	**5**	**1.7**
Angus	142	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	1	0.7	**2**	**1.4**	3	2.1	8	5.6	**6**	**4.2**	6	4.2	9	6.3	**7**	**4.9**
Argyll & Bute	122	0	0.0	2	1.6	**2**	**1.6**	6	4.9	4	3.3	**7**	**5.7**	9	7.4	10	8.2	**10**	**8.2**	10	8.2	11	9.0	**11**	**9.0**
Clackmannanshire	64	2	3.1	2	3.1	**2**	**3.1**	4	6.3	9	14.1	**7**	**10.9**	10	15.6	15	23.4	**12**	**18.8**	16	25.0	17	26.6	**16**	**25.0**
Dumfries & Galloway	193	1	0.5	2	1.0	**3**	**1.6**	3	1.6	6	3.1	**9**	**4.7**	9	4.7	11	5.7	**11**	**5.7**	15	7.8	16	8.3	**19**	**9.8**
Dundee City	179	9	5.0	13	7.3	**18**	**10.1**	34	19.0	39	21.8	**40**	**22.3**	51	28.5	53	29.6	**54**	**30.2**	75	41.9	68	38.0	**70**	**39.1**
East Ayrshire	154	7	4.5	8	5.2	**10**	**6.5**	13	8.4	17	11.0	**20**	**13.0**	28	18.2	28	18.2	**27**	**17.5**	40	26.0	40	26.0	**46**	**29.9**
East Dunbartonshire	127	0	0.0	1	0.8	**1**	**0.8**	2	1.6	2	1.6	**2**	**1.6**	4	3.1	3	2.4	**4**	**3.1**	5	3.9	6	4.7	**6**	**4.7**
East Lothian	120	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	1	0.8	**3**	**2.5**	3	2.5	3	2.5	**5**	**4.2**
East Renfrewshire	120	1	0.8	1	0.8	**1**	**0.8**	2	1.7	1	0.8	**1**	**0.8**	5	4.2	3	2.5	**5**	**4.2**	8	6.7	8	6.7	**8**	**6.7**
Edinburgh, City of	549	25	4.6	27	4.9	**22**	**4.0**	44	8.0	46	8.4	**42**	**7.7**	61	11.1	63	11.5	**60**	**10.9**	70	12.8	76	13.8	**73**	**13.3**
Eilean Siar	36	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**
Falkirk	197	1	0.5	1	0.5	**3**	**1.5**	7	3.6	11	5.6	**11**	**5.6**	14	7.1	19	9.6	**17**	**8.6**	30	15.2	29	14.7	**25**	**12.7**
Fife	453	1	0.2	5	1.1	**8**	**1.8**	12	2.6	22	4.9	**28**	**6.2**	34	7.5	47	10.4	**51**	**11.3**	60	13.2	80	17.7	**85**	**18.8**
Glasgow City	694	226	32.6	169	24.4	**158**	**22.8**	325	46.8	269	38.8	**242**	**34.9**	374	53.9	330	47.6	**302**	**43.5**	404	58.2	371	53.5	**349**	**50.3**
Highland	292	3	1.0	3	1.0	**4**	**1.4**	7	2.4	8	2.7	**9**	**3.1**	9	3.1	17	5.8	**16**	**5.5**	17	5.8	24	8.2	**27**	**9.2**
Inverclyde	110	6	5.5	13	11.8	**17**	**15.5**	24	21.8	29	26.4	**34**	**30.9**	36	32.7	42	38.2	**42**	**38.2**	46	41.8	49	44.5	**51**	**46.4**
Midlothian	112	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	1	0.9	**1**	**0.9**	1	0.9	5	4.5	**4**	**3.6**	6	5.4	10	8.9	**8**	**7.1**
Moray	116	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**1**	**0.9**	0	0.0	2	1.7	**3**	**2.6**
North Ayrshire	179	6	3.4	9	5.0	**10**	**5.6**	16	8.9	23	12.8	**26**	**14.5**	33	18.4	33	18.4	**43**	**24.0**	50	27.9	48	26.8	**60**	**33.5**
North Lanarkshire	418	9	2.2	17	4.1	**21**	**5.0**	44	10.5	44	10.5	**49**	**11.7**	103	24.6	84	20.1	**89**	**21.3**	152	36.4	133	31.8	**131**	**31.3**
Orkney Islands	27	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**
Perth & Kinross	175	0	0.0	2	1.1	**2**	**1.1**	2	1.1	5	2.9	**4**	**2.3**	3	1.7	9	5.1	**6**	**3.4**	5	2.9	10	5.7	**10**	**5.7**
Renfrewshire	214	8	3.7	9	4.2	**12**	**5.6**	22	10.3	22	10.3	**29**	**13.6**	41	19.2	36	16.8	**43**	**20.1**	60	28.0	60	28.0	**57**	**26.6**
Scottish Borders	130	0	0.0	1	0.8	**0**	**0.0**	1	0.8	2	1.5	**2**	**1.5**	2	1.5	3	2.3	**5**	**3.8**	4	3.1	6	4.6	**6**	**4.6**
Shetland Islands	30	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**	0	0.0	0	0.0	**0**	**0.0**
South Ayrshire	147	1	0.7	5	3.4	**6**	**4.1**	7	4.8	8	5.4	**9**	**6.1**	13	8.8	13	8.8	**18**	**12.2**	20	13.6	21	14.3	**23**	**15.6**
South Lanarkshire	398	8	2.0	13	3.3	**9**	**2.3**	40	10.1	37	9.3	**32**	**8.0**	66	16.6	56	14.1	**58**	**14.6**	88	22.1	80	20.1	**79**	**19.8**
Stirling	110	3	2.7	5	4.5	**3**	**2.7**	5	4.5	5	4.5	**5**	**4.5**	6	5.5	7	6.4	**7**	**6.4**	8	7.3	10	9.1	**8**	**7.3**
West Dunbartonshire	118	6	5.1	5	4.2	**7**	**5.9**	20	16.9	17	14.4	**18**	**15.3**	32	27.1	33	28.0	**31**	**26.3**	44	37.3	40	33.9	**40**	**33.9**
West Lothian	211	0	0.0	1	0.5	**0**	**0.0**	2	0.9	3	1.4	**6**	**2.8**	9	4.3	14	6.6	**19**	**9.0**	28	13.3	30	14.2	**39**	**18.5**
Scotland	**6,505**	**325**	**5.0**	**325**	**5.0**	**325**	**5.0**	**651**	**10.0**	**651**	**10.0**	**651**	**10.0**	**976**	**15.0**	**976**	**15.0**	**976**	**15.0**	**1,301**	**20.0**	**1,301**	**20.0**	**1,301**	**20.0**

Note: The local share is the number of data zones in the local authority area in the vigintile as a proportion of the total number of data zones in the local authority area.

3.15. Table 3.3 shows the proportion of income and employment deprived people in each Local Authority who live in the 15% most deprived datazones on SIMD 2009. The percentage of income deprived individuals ranges from 65% in Glasgow to zero and single figures in Local Authorities with fewer datazones in the 15% most deprived. A similar pattern is seen for employment deprivation. In Glasgow, the proportion of income and employment deprived individuals who live in the 15% most deprived datazones is very similar whereas in other areas the difference is more marked. Where the figures are low, deprivation is less concentrated in particular datazones and deprived individuals and households will be spread across the Local Authority area.

Table 3.3: Levels of income and employment deprivation in the 15% most deprived datazones by Local Authority

Local Authority	Number of income deprived people in 15% most deprived on SIMD 2009 V2 (Revised 19/07/10)	Number of income deprived people in Local Authority (Revised 19/07/10)	Percentage of income deprived population living in 15% most deprived data zones (Revised 19/07/10)	Number of employment deprived people in 15% most deprived on SIMD 2009 V2 (Revised 19/07/10)	Number of employment deprived people in Local Authority	Percentage of employment deprived population living in 15% most deprived data zones (Revised 19/07/10)
Aberdeen City	6,090	22,170	27%	2,845	11,915	24%
Aberdeenshire	960	18,960	5%	570	9,095	6%
Angus	1,600	14,020	11%	610	6,075	10%
Argyll & Bute	2,090	11,230	19%	935	5,085	18%
Clackmannanshire	3,130	8,150	38%	1,450	4,260	34%
Dumfries & Galloway	3,000	21,250	14%	1,240	9,315	13%
Dundee City	15,160	28,990	52%	6,710	13,940	48%
East Ayrshire	7,170	21,740	33%	3,220	10,290	31%
East Dunbartonshire	1,030	8,910	12%	465	4,700	10%
East Lothian	630	10,660	6%	275	5,020	5%
East Renfrewshire	1,070	7,920	14%	485	3,740	13%
Edinburgh, City of	18,150	55,900	32%	8,525	27,745	31%
Eilean Siar	-	3,960	-	-	1,585	-
Falkirk	3,860	20,890	18%	1,775	10,885	16%
Fife	12,460	51,450	24%	5,830	25,825	23%
Glasgow City	96,470	149,350	65%	43,590	67,890	64%
Highland	3,840	27,250	14%	1,650	12,215	14%
Inverclyde	10,030	16,700	60%	4,910	8,520	58%
Midlothian	870	9,990	9%	390	4,890	8%
Moray	130	9,750	1%	70	4,400	2%
North Ayrshire	10,780	26,060	41%	5,065	12,135	42%
North Lanarkshire	21,230	59,230	36%	9,855	29,565	33%
Orkney Islands	-	2,040	-	-	785	-
Perth & Kinross	1,210	14,090	9%	455	6,435	7%
Renfrewshire	10,970	27,050	41%	5,225	13,410	39%
Scottish Borders	1,250	12,700	10%	455	5,535	8%
Shetland Islands	-	1,860	-	-	850	-
South Ayrshire	4,460	16,760	27%	2,115	7,815	27%
South Lanarkshire	14,300	46,930	30%	6,575	23,285	28%
Stirling	1,710	9,770	17%	790	4,935	16%
West Dunbartonshire	8,450	19,420	44%	3,680	9,030	41%
West Lothian	4,430	24,150	18%	1,965	11,870	17%
Scotland	266,500	779,300	34%	121,725	373,040	33%

3.16. Table 3.4 shows the percentage of people living in the 15% most deprived datazones in SIMD 2009 who are income and employment deprived. Across Scotland, 36% of those living in the 15% most deprived are income deprived. This ranges from 24% in the Moray datazones in the 15% most deprived to 39% in Glasgow and 37% in Dundee.

3.17. The concentrations of employment deprivation range from 28% in Glasgow, Inverclyde and Stirling to 21% in East Lothian, Midlothian, Moray and Scottish Borders. The last column of the table shows that this figure has fallen since SIMD 2006 for all Local Authorities except for East Lothian, which reflects the fall seen across Scotland. This shows a reduction in the concentrations of employment deprivation, though levels will have changed in recent months. Further analysis of the impact of the economic downturn on the SIMD is available on the SIMD website. The percentage of income deprived individuals has increased across Scotland due to the inclusion of tax credit data in SIMD 2009.

Table 3.4: Percentage of the population living in the most deprived datazones who are income and employment deprived

	SIMD 2009								SIMD 2006
Local Authority	Population (2007)	Population in 15% most deprived datazones in SIMD 2009 V2 (Revised 19/07/10)	Number income deprived in 15% most deprived datazones (Revised 19/07/10)	Percentage of population in 15% most deprived datazones who are income deprived (Revised 19/07/10)	Working Age population (2007)	Working age population in 15% most deprived datazones in SIMD 2009 V2 (Revised 19/07/10)	Number employment deprived in 15% most deprived datazones (Revised 19/07/10)	Percentage of population in 15% most deprived datazones who are employment deprived	Percentage of population in 15% most deprived datazones who are employment deprived
Aberdeen City	209,260	19,206	6,090	32%	138,793	11,975	2,845	24%	28%
Aberdeenshire	239,160	3,285	960	29%	148,042	2,155	570	26%	31%
Angus	109,870	4,530	1,600	35%	64,938	2,680	610	23%	25%
Argyll & Bute	91,350	6,127	2,090	34%	54,002	3,555	935	26%	27%
Clackmannanshire	49,900	9,215	3,130	34%	31,176	5,680	1,450	26%	28%
Dumfries & Galloway	148,300	8,447	3,000	36%	86,138	5,140	1,240	24%	26%
Dundee City	142,150	40,958	15,160	37%	88,929	24,680	6,710	27%	29%
East Ayrshire	119,570	20,153	7,170	36%	73,746	12,170	3,220	26%	29%
East Dunbartonshire	104,850	3,077	1,030	33%	63,129	1,860	465	25%	27%
East Lothian	94,440	2,158	630	29%	56,129	1,300	275	21%	19%
East Renfrewshire	89,260	3,144	1,070	34%	53,078	1,910	485	25%	28%
Edinburgh, City of	468,070	50,040	18,150	36%	318,108	32,130	8,525	27%	30%
Eilean Siar	26,300	-	-	-	15,354	-	-	-	-
Falkirk	150,720	11,847	3,860	33%	94,225	6,880	1,775	26%	28%
Fife	360,500	38,009	12,460	33%	222,954	22,820	5,830	26%	28%
Glasgow City	581,940	244,413	96,470	39%	388,537	153,930	43,590	28%	31%
Highland	217,440	11,243	3,840	34%	132,067	6,965	1,650	24%	25%
Inverclyde	81,080	28,748	10,030	35%	49,996	17,545	4,910	28%	30%
Midlothian	79,510	3,033	870	29%	48,666	1,830	390	21%	22%
Moray	86,870	550	130	24%	52,615	335	70	21%	-
North Ayrshire	135,760	31,390	10,780	34%	82,188	19,010	5,065	27%	30%
North Lanarkshire	324,680	65,021	21,230	33%	204,418	39,770	9,855	25%	27%
Orkney Islands	19,860	-	-	-	11,937	-	-	-	-
Perth & Kinross	142,140	3,514	1,210	34%	84,773	2,035	455	22%	25%
Renfrewshire	169,600	30,835	10,970	36%	106,034	19,505	5,225	27%	28%
Scottish Borders	111,430	3,656	1,250	34%	65,745	2,205	455	21%	24%
Shetland Islands	21,950	-	-	-	13,425	-	-	-	-
South Ayrshire	111,690	13,162	4,460	34%	66,165	8,160	2,115	26%	29%
South Lanarkshire	309,500	43,980	14,300	33%	192,773	27,125	6,575	24%	29%
Stirling	88,190	4,815	1,710	35%	54,367	2,860	790	28%	32%
West Dunbartonshire	91,090	23,171	8,450	36%	57,287	14,375	3,680	26%	27%
West Lothian	167,770	14,573	4,430	30%	106,858	8,910	1,965	22%	23%
Scotland	5,144,200	742,300	266,500	36%	3,226,592	459,495	121,725	26%	29%

Most deprived datazones by Health Board and Community Health Partnership

3.18. The table in Annex D shows the local and national share of the 15% most deprived datazones by Health Board and Community Health Partnership. The Health Boards with the largest proportion of their datazones in the 15% most deprived are Greater Glasgow & Clyde (30.4%), Ayrshire & Arran (18.3%), Lanarkshire (17.4%), Tayside (13.3%) and Fife (11.3%).

3.19. The Health Boards with the largest proportions of the 15% most deprived datazones in Scotland are Greater Glasgow & Clyde (45.9%), Lanarkshire (12.9%), Ayrshire & Arran (9.0%), Lothian (8.8%) and Tayside (6.8%). Between them these 5 Health Boards with the largest proportions of the most deprived datazones nationally contain 83% of the 15% most deprived datazones in Scotland, with two thirds contained in the first three.

3.20. The Community Health Partnership with the highest concentrations of multiple deprivation are the North Glasgow and East Glasgow Community Health Partnerships, both with almost 60% of datazones in the area in the 15% most deprived, though both have seen a fall since SIMD 2006.

Most deprived datazones by Urban Rural Classification

3.21. Of the datazones in the 15% most deprived, around 92% are in Urban Areas and just under 2% are in Rural Areas, (1.3% are in Accessible Rural areas and 0.6% are in Remote Rural Areas). This is because populations in rural areas tend to be more mixed than in urban areas so the concentrations of population with similar characteristics are less likely to occur. These figures are shown in more detail in Table 3.5.

Table 3.5: Datazones in the 5, 10,15 and 20% most deprived on SIMD 2009 by Urban Rural Classification

	5% Most deprived data zones						10% Most deprived data zones					
	SIMD 2004		SIMD 2006		**SIMD 2009 V2 (Revised 19/07/10)**		SIMD 2004		SIMD 2006		**SIMD 2009 V2 (Revised 19/07/10)**	
Urban Rural Classification	no. of data zones	national share (%)	no. of data zones	national share (%)	**no. of data zones**	**national share (%)**	no. of data zones	national share (%)	no. of data zones	national share (%)	**no. of data zones**	**national share (%)**
Large Urban Areas	285	87.7	251	77.2	**241**	**74.2**	498	76.5	459	70.5	**434**	**66.7**
Other Urban Areas	35	10.8	66	20.3	**75**	**23.1**	123	18.9	164	25.2	**180**	**27.6**
Accessible Small Towns	1	0.3	5	1.5	**4**	**1.2**	8	1.2	11	1.7	**15**	**2.3**
Remote Small Towns	0	0.0	1	0.3	**2**	**0.6**	9	1.4	10	1.5	**13**	**2.0**
Accessible Rural	4	1.2	0	0.0	**1**	**0.3**	12	1.8	4	0.6	**5**	**0.8**
Remote Rural	0	0.0	2	0.6	**2**	**0.6**	1	0.2	3	0.5	**4**	**0.6**
Scotland	**325**	**100.0**	**325**	**100.0**	**325**	**100.0**	**651**	**100.0**	**651**	**100.0**	**651**	**100.0**

	15% Most deprived data zones						20% Most deprived data zones					
	SIMD 2004		SIMD 2006		**SIMD 2009 V2 (Revised 19/07/10)**		SIMD 2004		SIMD 2006		**SIMD 2009 V2 (Revised 19/07/10)**	
Urban Rural Classification	no. of data zones	national share (%)	no. of data zones	national share (%)	**no. of data zones**	**national share (%)**	no. of data zones	national share (%)	no. of data zones	national share (%)	**no. of data zones**	**national share (%)**
Large Urban Areas	674	69.1	626	64.1	**608**	**62.3**	807	62.0	770	59.2	**745**	**57.3**
Other Urban Areas	228	23.4	277	28.4	**291**	**29.8**	340	26.1	381	29.3	**403**	**31.0**
Accessible Small Towns	34	3.5	36	3.7	**37**	**3.8**	77	5.9	78	6.0	**84**	**6.5**
Remote Small Towns	15	1.5	19	1.9	**21**	**2.2**	22	1.7	29	2.2	**28**	**2.2**
Accessible Rural	23	2.4	12	1.2	**13**	**1.3**	48	3.7	30	2.3	**24**	**1.8**
Remote Rural	2	0.2	6	0.6	**6**	**0.6**	7	0.5	13	1.0	**17**	**1.3**
Scotland	**976**	**100.0**	**976**	**100.0**	**976**	**100.0**	**1,301**	**100.0**	**1,301**	**100.0**	**1301**	**100.0**

3.22. Whilst there is a low proportion of datazones in the 15% most deprived on the overall SIMD in rural areas, there is still deprivation in these datazones. It is possible to look at the numbers of people who are income and employment deprived in the 15% most deprived on the overall SIMD by the Urban Rural Classification.

3.23. Table 3.6 shows employment deprivation by 15% most deprived across the Urban Rural Classification. The deprived datazones with the highest percentage of employment deprived individuals are in Large Urban Areas and Remote Rural Areas, though each category of the Urban Rural Classification 2008 has around a quarter of the population in the 15% most employment deprived. Concentrations are lowest in Small Towns and Accessible Rural Areas. The percentage of the Scotland population who are employment deprived does vary by Urban Rural Classification, ranging from 13% in Large Urban Areas to 7% in Accessible Rural Areas.

3.24. As there are fewer concentrations of multiple deprivation in rural areas, the proportion of employment deprived individuals who live in the 15% most deprived areas is highest in Large Urban Areas with almost half of employment deprived individuals living in the 15% most deprived areas. This proportion falls to 5% in Rural Areas, meaning that 95% of individuals who are employment deprived live in datazones out with the 15% most deprived.

Table 3.6: Number and percentage of people employment deprived by Urban Rural Classification and 15% most deprived on SIMD 2009

	SIMD 2009 V2 15% most deprived (Revised 19/07/10)			Scotland			% of employment deprived population in 15% most deprived (Revised 19/07/10)
2008 Urban Rural Classification	No. employment deprived	Working Age Population (2007)	% of population employment deprived	No. employment deprived	Working Age Population (2007)	% of population employment deprived	
Large Urban Areas	80,680	297,495	27%	170,540	1,302,996	13%	47%
Other Urban Areas	33,260	129,320	26%	118,080	964,121	12%	28%
Accessible Small Towns	3,945	16,485	24%	29,340	280,443	10%	13%
Remote Small Towns	1,820	7,695	24%	11,690	108,417	11%	16%
Accessible Rural	1,305	5,760	23%	27,915	373,681	7%	5%
Remote Rural	725	2,730	27%	15,470	196,934	8%	5%
Scotland Total	121,735	459,490	26%	373,040	3,226,592	12%	33%

3.25. Similar patterns as with employment deprivation are seen with income deprived individuals as shown in Table 3.7. The only difference being higher percentages, with around 36% of the population income deprived in the 15% most deprived areas. 18% of the population in Large Urban Areas are income deprived compared with 9% in Accessible Rural Areas. As with employment deprivation, the proportion of income deprived people living within the 15% most deprived in each category of the Urban Rural Classification is highest in Large Urban Areas at 50% and lowest in Rural Areas at 5%.

Table 3.7: Percentage of income deprived people in the 15% Most deprived datazones on SIMD 2009 by Urban Rural Classification.

	SIMD 2009 V2 15% most deprived (Revised 19/07/10)			Scotland			% of income deprived population in 15% most deprived
2008 Urban Rural Classification	No. income deprived	Population (2007)	% of population income deprived	No. income deprived	Population (2007)	% of population income deprived	
Large Urban Areas	176,910	475,473	37%	357,300	1,998,881	18%	50%
Other Urban Areas	72,210	211,964	34%	240,380	1,555,063	15%	30%
Accessible Small Towns	8,530	27,463	31%	60,830	461,318	13%	14%
Remote Small Towns	4,390	13,209	33%	26,820	186,582	14%	16%
Accessible Rural	2,910	9,622	30%	57,770	608,170	9%	5%
Remote Rural	1,540	4,569	34%	36,140	334,186	11%	4%
Scotland Total	266,500	742,300	36%	779,250	5,144,200	15%	34%

Change over time

3.26. Whilst there have been changes to the SIMD methodology and indicators used over the three SIMDs it is still possible to look at change over time though care needs to be taken because of the changes.

How to do change over time analysis

3.27. The version or versions of the index to use will depend on the purpose of the analysis being carried out. Five possible scenarios looked at are:

Analysis at a point in time

The most deprived areas at the current point in time. Use SIMD 2009 as this highlights the most deprived areas based on the data available at the time of calculation (see technical note for details of data sources)

The most deprived areas in the past eg using survey data from 2005. Use the SIMD that uses data closest to the time period of the data source you are using, eg SIMD 2006 used 2004-05 data and 2004 population estimates.

Analysis over time

What has happened to the most deprived areas since 2004. Use the most deprived datazones highlighted in SIMD 2004 to see if there has been improvement in these areas, possibly in comparison with the 85% least deprived.
What has happened in the most deprived areas in the past. Use the datazones highlighted in the most recent SIMD and look back through time to see whether these areas have worsened, possibly in comparison with the 85% least deprived.
What has happened to the most deprived areas over time. In this case analysis needs to focus on the most deprived areas as a group within Scotland as defined by each update of the index, eg how do the most deprived areas in SIMD 2009 differ from those highlighted in SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2006.

3.28. When looking at change over time, changes in population need to be considered as datazone populations will increase and decrease over time due to new build housing and demolition. Population characteristics may also change eg an increase or decrease in school age children.

3.29. Table 3.8 below shows the change in populations since SIMD 2006. Just over two thirds of datazones have seen very little change in population. Only 4% of datazones have seen a population increase or decrease of greater than 20%. Three quarters of those seeing a large change in population have remained in the 85% least deprived compared to SIMD 2006. Annex E contains a table showing population by SIMD vigintile for SIMD 2004, SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009. Vigintiles are five percent bands ie vigintile 1 is the 5% most deprived datazones.

Table 3.8: Datazone movement between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009 compared to population changes

Population change compared with datazone movement between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009 V2		
Datazone movement	**Population change**	**Number of datazones (Revised 19/07/10)**
Moved into 15%MD	Change of less than 5%	76
	Decrease of between 5 and 20%	21
	Increase of between 5 and 20%	8
Moved into 15%MD Total		105
Moved out of 15%MD	Change of less than 5%	51
	Decrease greater than 20%	8
	Decrease of between 5 and 20%	15
	Increase of between 5 and 20%	21
	Increase of greater than 20%	10
Moved out of 15%MD Total		105
Remained in 15%MD	Change of less than 5%	514
	Decrease greater than 20%	18
	Decrease of between 5 and 20%	181
	Increase of between 5 and 20%	129
	Increase of greater than 20%	29
Remained in 15%MD Total		871
Remained in 85%LD	Change of less than 5%	3,754
	Decrease greater than 20%	12
	Decrease of between 5 and 20%	667
	Increase of between 5 and 20%	798
	Increase of greater than 20%	193
remained in 85%LD Total		5,424
Scotland Total		6,505

3.30. More details regarding use of the index for change over time analysis can be found on the SIMD website, link in Annex A.

Change over time analysis results

Datazones remaining in the 15% most deprived

3.31. Chart 3.1 shows that of the datazones in the 15% most deprived on SIMD 2004, 81% have remained in the 15% most deprived on all three updates to the index. In seven Local Authorities, all the datazones in the 15% most deprived on SIMD 2004 have remained in the 15% most deprived on both SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009. So the majority of the deprived areas have remained the same over the updates. East Renfrewshire is the Local Authority with the smallest proportion of its datazones remaining in the 15% most deprived though it only had 5 in the 15% most deprived in SIMD 2004

Chart 3.1: Movement of datazones appearing in the 15% most deprived on SIMD 2004 by Local Authority*



*The number of datazones in the 15% most deprived for each Local Authority is shown in brackets after the name.

Datazone movement between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009

3.32. Table 3.9 shows the movement of datazones by vigintile between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009. 105 datazones moved out of the 15% most deprived with 105 moving in. Of the datazones moving out, 78% moved to the 15-20% band and another 16% moved to the 20-25% band, so they haven't moved a long way up the distribution. Of the datazones moving in, 92% moved in from the 15-20% band so were still relatively deprived in SIMD 2006. The datazone moving from vigintile 4 to vigintile 13 is a result of demolition and new build.

Table 3.9 Movement of datazones between vigintiles, SIMD 2006 to SIMD 2009

SIMD 2006 Vigintile	SIMD 2009 V2 Vigintile (Revised 19/07/10)																			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
1	**272**	43	9	1																
2	52	**205**	54	10	1	1		3												
3	1	74	**161**	71	16	2														
4		3	94	**145**	66	11	4		1				1							
5		1	6	86	**147**	64	16	4	1											
6			1	12	71	**144**	61	26	8	3										
7					22	75	**119**	74	25	8	1		1							
8					2	26	83	**103**	80	21	10									
9						3	29	79	**110**	74	25	5								
10							10	27	72	**103**	75	26	9	3	1					
11							3	6	23	80	**101**	70	32	9	1					
12								1	4	26	74	**116**	76	22	6					
13								2	1	8	30	76	**98**	84	22	4				
14											7	27	74	**107**	92	16	3			
15										2	2	5	23	73	**117**	80	21	2		
16										1			8	23	60	**125**	82	25	1	
17													3	4	23	75	**119**	84	16	1
18														1	3	24	75	**130**	82	11
19																1	24	73	**160**	67
20																	1	12	66	**246**

Vigintile 1 = the most deprived 5% of datazones.

Datazones moving into the 15% most deprived on SIMD 2009

3.33. Table 3.10 shows the datazones moving into the 15% most deprived datazones in SIMD 2009 and their vigintile in SIMD 2006. 92% of the datazones that moved into the 15% most deprived moved from the 15-20% band. Only one datazone, in West Lothian, moved in from vigintile 6 whilst only North Ayrshire and West Lothian had more than one datazone moving in from the fifth vigintile. North Lanarkshire and Fife also saw large numbers of datazones moving into the 15% most deprived.

3.34. Of the datazones moving into the 15% most deprived in North Ayrshire, all 11 saw a worsening in rank on both the employment and education domains. Eight of the 11 datazones got worse on the income domain, 8 got worse on Health and 8 got worse on Access. Seven of the eleven saw a reduction in rank on at least five of the six domains that have changed between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009. 10 of the 11 saw an identifiable increase (greater than disclosure control) in the proportion of people income deprived which will be in part caused by the inclusion of tax credit data in the income domain. Only four datazones saw an increase in the percentage employment deprived, though of the rest the rounded percentage stayed the same or the reduction in the percentage was very small, whereas Scotland overall saw a reduction in the number and percentage employment deprived meaning the small improvements in these datazones is a relative worsening. This means that the areas are experiencing multiple deprivation and are experiencing deprivation at relatively higher levels than before.

3.35. In North Lanarkshire, 10 of the 11 saw a reduction in rank on the employment domain and 8 on the income domain. Nine of the 11 datazones got worse on at least four of the six domains that have changed since SIMD 2006. Five datazones saw an increase in the levels of employment deprivation. As levels of employment deprivation

across Scotland improved between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009, these areas will have got relatively worse.

3.36. In Fife, all the datazones moving in were in vigintile 4 or 5 on SIMD 2004, so over the 3 SIMDs have remained at the most deprived end. Eight of the 10 datazones moving in saw a worsening on the income domain, seven saw a worsening in at least three of the income, employment, health and education domains, again showing higher levels of deprivation than in the previous update to the SIMD.

Table 3.10: Datazones moving into the most deprived 15% between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009 by SIMD 2006 Vigintile.

Local Authority	SIMD 2006 Vigintile 4	5	6	Total data zones
Aberdeen City	3			3
Clackmannanshire	1			1
Dumfries & Galloway	1			1
Dundee City	6			6
East Ayrshire	2			2
East Dunbartonshire	1			1
East Lothian	2			2
East Renfrewshire	2			2
Edinburgh, City of	4			4
Falkirk	1			1
Fife	10			10
Glasgow City	7	1		8
Highland	3			3
Inverclyde	3			3
Midlothian	1			1
Moray	1			1
North Ayrshire	7	4		11
North Lanarkshire	11			11
Renfrewshire	8			8
Scottish Borders	2			2
South Ayrshire	6			6
South Lanarkshire	8			8
Stirling	1			1
West Lothian	6	2	1	9
Grand Total	97	7	1	105

Datazones moving out of the 15% most deprived on SIMD 2009

3.37. Table 3.11 shows the datazones moving out of the 15% most deprived by Local Authority. 85% moved from the 10-15% band and another 14% moved from the 5-10% band. The datazone in Glasgow that moved from the most deprived 5% is due to demolition and new build in recent years.

3.38. Of the 36 datazones in Glasgow moving out of the 15% most deprived, all but five have seen an improvement in rank on the income domain, all but two have seen an improvement in rank on the employment domain. 31 of the datazones have seen an improvement in health rank and 26 have seen an improvement in the education domain.

3.39. Of the Glasgow datazones moving out of the 15% most deprived around 3 in 5 have seen a reduction in income deprivation since SIMD 2006, despite the addition of tax credit data to include low income in work families. All except one of the 36 datazones

has seen a decrease in the proportion of people employment deprived. The one datazone that hasn't seen a decrease still has the same proportion as in SIMD 2006. This shows improvement relative to the rest of Scotland.

Table 3.11: Datazones moving out of the most deprived 15% between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009 by SIMD 2006 Vigintile.

Local Authority	SIMD 2006 Vigintile 1	2	3	Total data zones
Aberdeen City			2	2
Aberdeenshire			2	2
Angus			2	2
Clackmannanshire			4	4
Dumfries & Galloway			1	1
Dundee City		1	4	5
East Ayrshire			3	3
Edinburgh, City of		2	5	7
Falkirk			3	3
Fife		1	5	6
Glasgow City	1	9	26	36
Highland			4	4
Inverclyde			3	3
Midlothian			2	2
North Ayrshire			1	1
North Lanarkshire		2	4	6
Perth & Kinross			3	3
Renfrewshire			1	1
South Ayrshire			1	1
South Lanarkshire			6	6
Stirling			1	1
West Dunbartonshire			2	2
West Lothian			4	4
Scotland	1	15	89	105

Datazones moving out of the 15% most deprived in SIMD 2006

3.40. Of the datazones that moved out of the 15% most deprived between SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2006, 95 (79%) have remained out of the 15% most deprived on SIMD 2009, showing maintained improvement.

Datazones moving into the 15% Most deprived in SIMD 2006

3.41. Of the 120 datazones that moved into the 15% between SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2006, 66% have remained in the 15% most deprived in SIMD 2009.

Concentrations of deprivation in the 15% most deprived datazones

3.42. A measure of levels of concentrations of deprivation is the number of domains where a datazone falls in the 15% most deprived ie how many aspects of deprivation is the population of a datazone experiencing. Chart 3.2 shows, for the datazones in the 15% most deprived in SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009, how many of the individual domains the datazone was in the 15% most deprived for. All datazones in the 15% most deprived were in the 15% most deprived on at least one domain. Over 90% of the datazones were in the 15% most deprived on three or more domains on both SIMD 2006 and 2009. The proportion of the most deprived datazones in the 15% most deprived on 6 or more

domains has fallen slightly between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009, showing that concentrations of multiple deprivation have reduced slightly.

Chart 3.2: Datazones in the 15% most deprived in the overall SIMD which are also in the 15% most deprived in individual domains



Have the areas moving out of the 15% most deprived got better?

3.43. Table 3.12 shows that of the datazones that were in the 15% most deprived on SIMD 2004, 817 (84%) are still in the most deprived on SIMD 2009. Of the datazones in the most deprived 5% on SIMD 2004, 95% are still in the 15% in SIMD 2009 compared to only two thirds of those in the 10-15%.

3.44. Of the datazones in the 15% most deprived in SIMD 2009, almost all the datazones in the 5% most deprived have remained in the 15% most deprived since SIMD 2004. 41% of the datazones in the 10-15% most deprived have moved into the 15% most deprived since SIMD 2004. This suggests that the areas with the highest concentrations of deprivation are staying in the 15% most deprived but there is movement in and out of the 15% from areas near the cut off. This is backed up by Table 3.9 which shows that the majority of the 5% most deprived on SIMD 2006 remained in the 5% most deprived on SIMD 2009. In Glasgow City over a third of the 5% most deprived datazones in 2004 moved out of that category but only 7% moved out of the 15% most deprived.

Table 3.12: Datazone movement for datazones in the 15% most deprived in SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2009

SIMD 2004	In most deprived in SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2009 V2		Moved out of most deprived between SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2009 V2	
	Number	%	Number	%
0-5% Most Deprived	308	94.8%	17	5.2%
5-10% Most Deprived	293	89.9%	33	10.1%
10-15% Most Deprived	216	66.5%	109	33.5%
Total (0-15% Most Deprived)	817	83.7%	159	16.3%

SIMD 2009	In most deprived in SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2009 V2		Moved into most deprived between SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2009 V2	
	Number	%	Number	%
0-5% Most Deprived	324	99.7%	1	0.3%
5-10% Most Deprived	300	92.0%	26	8.0%
10-15% Most Deprived	193	59.4%	132	40.6%
Total (0-15% Most Deprived)	817	83.7%	159	16.3%

3.45. All the domains within the SIMD have changed between SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2009 except for the employment domain. This domain is a percentage of the population claiming employment related benefits so can be used to look at levels of deprivation in the most deprived areas. Table 3.13 groups the datazones in Scotland into four groups according to the movement between SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2009.

3.46. This table shows that between SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2009, those datazones that moved into the 15% most deprived saw levels of employment deprivation remaining stable. All other areas saw a reduction which means the areas moving in got relatively worse. The areas that stayed in the 15% most deprived saw a reduction in levels of employment deprivation over the three updates to the index but levels are still much higher than the rest of Scotland. Unsurprisingly the largest improvement was seen in the areas that moved out of the 15% most deprived.

Table 3.13: Levels of employment deprivation in datazones moving into and out of the 15% most deprived.

Data zone movement between SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2009 V2	Level of employment deprivation		
	SIMD 2004	SIMD 2006	SIMD 2009 V2
Data zones moving into 15% most deprived	22%	23%	22%
Data zones moving out of 15% most deprived	27%	22%	17%
Data zones staying in the 15% most deprived	32%	30%	27%
Data zones staying in the 85% least deprived	11%	10%	9%

3.47. It is also possible to look at indicators for individual datazones to see whether an area has improved. The indicators used to calculate the SIMD are available on the SIMD and Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics web sites and an example of this is included as a case study at the end of the report.

4. Employment Domain

4.1. The employment domain identifies the proportion of people from the resident working age population who are unemployed or who are not involved in the labour market due to ill-health or disability. Being out of work is acknowledged to be a key factor of deprivation. As a result, the employment domain contributes significantly to the overall weighting of the SIMD. The indicators used in the employment domain have remained the same over the three versions of the SIMD and are listed in Annex B along with their relative weights. The SIMD 2009 Technical Report includes further information about the indicators used.

4.2. The data used to calculate the domain is from the 2008 calendar year to match with previous employment domains and with other indicators of the SIMD. An analysis of the effect of using more recent data to capture the effects of the economic downturn over the last year is available on the SIMD website (See link in Annex A). This shows that the impact is minimal due to the relative nature of the SIMD.

Changes since SIMD 2006

4.3. The indicators used are the same as for both SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2006. This makes it possible to assess change in terms of both the datazone ranks (relative change), as well as changes in terms of the numbers and distribution of employment deprived people (absolute change).

4.4. The employment domain in SIMD 2009 is very highly correlated with the SIMD 2006 employment domain with a Pearson's correlation coefficient of 0.97.

Employment Deprivation Across Scotland

4.5. The SIMD 2009 shows that across Scotland, 12% of the working age population are employment deprived (373,040 people). Of these, 33% (121,465 people) live in the 15% most employment deprived datazones in Scotland (see Chart 4.1). A third of the working age population in the 5% most deprived datazones are employment deprived, falling to a quarter in the datazones ranked 5-10% most employment deprived and then 22% in the datazones ranked 10-15%.

Chart 4.1: Percentage of working age people who are employment deprived in the SIMD 2004, SIMD 2006, and SIMD 2009, by employment domain vigintiles.



4.6. Glasgow City has the highest proportion of employment deprived people with 17% of its working age people in this category (67,890 employment deprived of 388,537 working age people). Aberdeenshire has the least amount of employment deprived people at 6% (9,095 people of 148,042 working age people) (see Table 4.1)

4.7. All local authorities saw numbers of employment deprived decrease, with the highest percentage decrease in the Shetland Islands, by 16% (160 people).

Table 4.1: Percentage of working age people who are employment deprived in the SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009, by Local Authority area.

Local Authority	Employment Deprived People by Local Authority				
	SIMD 2006		SIMD 2009		
	Count	% Working Age Population	Count	% Working Age Population	Change in No of Deprived 2009 - 2006
Aberdeen City	13,635	10%	11,915	9%	-1,720
Aberdeenshire	10,335	7%	9,095	6%	-1,240
Angus	6,720	10%	6,075	9%	-645
Argyll & Bute	5,530	10%	5,085	9%	-445
Clackmannanshire	4,670	16%	4,260	14%	-410
Dumfries & Galloway	9,885	11%	9,315	11%	-570
Dundee City	14,915	17%	13,940	16%	-975
East Ayrshire	11,295	15%	10,290	14%	-1,005
East Dunbartonshire	5,245	8%	4,700	7%	-545
East Lothian	5,180	10%	5,020	9%	-160
East Renfrewshire	4,255	8%	3,740	7%	-515
Edinburgh, City of	29,300	10%	27,745	9%	-1,555
Eilean Siar	1,830	12%	1,585	10%	-245
Falkirk	11,855	13%	10,885	12%	-970
Fife	28,240	13%	25,825	12%	-2,415
Glasgow City	76,250	20%	67,890	17%	-8,360
Highland	13,555	11%	12,215	9%	-1,340
Inverclyde	9,535	19%	8,520	17%	-1,015
Midlothian	5,215	11%	4,890	10%	-325
Moray	4,785	9%	4,400	8%	-385
North Ayrshire	13,130	16%	12,135	15%	-995
North Lanarkshire	33,505	17%	29,565	14%	-3,940
Orkney Islands	900	8%	785	7%	-115
Perth & Kinross	6,900	9%	6,435	8%	-465
Renfrewshire	14,750	14%	13,410	13%	-1,340
Scottish Borders	5,560	9%	5,535	8%	-25
Shetland Islands	1,010	8%	850	6%	-160
South Ayrshire	8,550	13%	7,815	12%	-735
South Lanarkshire	26,270	14%	23,285	12%	-2,985
Stirling	5,310	10%	4,935	9%	-375
West Dunbartonshire	9,775	17%	9,030	16%	-745
West Lothian	12,040	12%	11,870	11%	-170
Scotland	**409,907**	**13%**	373,040	**12%**	-36,892

Source: SAPE 2004 (SIMD 2006) and SAPE 2007 (SIMD 2009).

Employment Deprivation by Local Authority

4.8. Chart 4.2 shows the spread of the 15% most deprived datazones in the employment domain by Local Authority. Almost half of the datazones in Glasgow are in the 15% most deprived in the employment domain, with a slight decrease in SIMD 2009. Inverclyde has the second highest percentage, but has seen a slightly larger decrease between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009. This fall means other areas will see an increase in levels of deprived datazones.

4.9. Between 2006 to 2009, Dundee City and North Ayrshire's proportion of datazones in the 15% most employment deprived has risen the most by 4% each. Glasgow City still has the highest proportion of datazones in the 15% most deprived in this domain at 42% in 2009. The most employment deprived datazone in Scotland is in the Barrowfield area in the East of Glasgow City.

4.10. Within the employment domain, North Lanarkshire had the most datazones moving into the 15% most deprived, at 11 new datazones. In the opposite direction, Glasgow saw 21 of its datazones moving out of the 15% most deprived.

4.11. The five Local Authorities with the highest levels of employment deprivation are Glasgow City, Inverclyde, Dundee City, West Dunbartonshire and North Ayrshire. Clackmannanshire was in this list in SIMD 2006 but has now been replaced by North Ayrshire. Clackmannanshire has seen a fall from 25% of its datazones in the 15% most deprived to 18%.

Chart 4.2: Proportion of datazones in each Local Authority in the 15% most deprived of the employment domain of SIMD 2009



Change over time

4.12. There has been no change in the methodology used in the employment domain since SIMD 2004. Therefore, the employment domain can be directly compared with the previous results.

4.13. As shown in Chart 4.1, overall, the number of employment deprived people has decreased across all three SIMDs. The numbers have fallen from 435,037 in SIMD 2004, to 409,907 for SIMD 2006, and to 373,040 people for SIMD 2009. These figures are based on 2002, 2005 and 2008 calendar year data respectively, and so reflect pre-economic recession activity.

4.14. Of the datazones in the 15% most deprived in the employment domain of SIMD 2009, 59% have remained in this category for the past 3 SIMDs. Glasgow City has the highest proportion (37%) of the datazones remaining in the 15% most deprived across

the three SIMDs (see Chart 4.3). These are similar patterns to those for the overall SIMD.

Chart 4.3: Share of datazones that have remained in the 15% most employment deprived across SIMD 2004, 2006 and 2009 by Local Authority



4.15. Table 4.2 shows the number of datazones in the 15% most employment deprived by Local Authority across all three versions of the SIMD. Glasgow has seen a drop of over 18% from 2004 to 2009, and along with North Lanarkshire, is the only Local Authority to see a consistent reduction across time. All other Local Authorities have either fluctuated or seen increases.

Table 4.2: Number of datazones in the 15% most deprived on the employment domain by Local Authority

	Datazones in 15% most employment deprived		
Local Authority	2004	2006	2009
Aberdeen City	9	27	24
Aberdeenshire	2	6	4
Angus	4	7	7
Argyll & Bute	9	9	9
Clackmannanshire	13	16	12
Dumfries & Galloway	10	13	14
Dundee City	47	53	61
East Ayrshire	25	31	29
East Dunbartonshire	3	4	3
East Lothian	0	0	2
East Renfrewshire	7	6	7
Edinburgh, City of	49	57	54
Eilean Siar	0	0	0
Falkirk	22	22	20
Fife	49	67	67
Glasgow City	355	310	289
Highland	10	15	14
Inverclyde	37	46	42
Midlothian	2	1	2
Moray	1	0	3
North Ayrshire	35	36	43
North Lanarkshire	105	80	91
Orkney Islands	0	0	0
Perth & Kinross	1	7	5
Renfrewshire	44	39	44
Scottish Borders	2	2	2
Shetland Islands	0	0	0
South Ayrshire	13	15	18
South Lanarkshire	74	62	57
Stirling	7	6	6
West Dunbartonshire	32	29	31
West Lothian	9	10	16
Scotland	976	976	976

5. Income Domain

5.1. The income domain identifies areas where there are concentrations of individuals and families living on low incomes. This is done by looking at the numbers of people, both adult and children, who are receiving or are dependent on benefits related to income or tax credits. It is not possible to look at actual income as there are no data available on this at datazone level, so the indicators used in this domain are known as proxy indicators. There is a full list of these indicators and the weights that are used in Annex B.

Changes since SIMD 2006

5.2. Five of the six indicators used in this domain have remained the same as in SIMD 2006. The sixth indicator relates to Working and Child Tax Credit and is a new addition to the domain. In the 2004 SIMD data on Disability Tax Credit and Working Families Tax Credit (WFTC) was used but this was no longer available for the 2006 SIMD. They had been replaced by Working and Child Tax Credit (WTC and CTC). There was no data available relating to WTC and CTC for the 2006 version of the index so no tax credit data was used. This data is now available and has been reintroduced into the SIMD for 2009. Analysis of the impact of this change to the domain is available on the SIMD website.

5.3. Despite this change the income domain for 2009 is very highly correlated with the domain from 2006, with a Pearson's correlation coefficient of 0.97.

Income Deprivation across Scotland

5.4. Because the income domain is a count it is possible to comment on the numbers of income deprived people across Scotland and where they are living. Chart 5.1. below shows the percentage of income deprived people in SIMD 2004, 2006 and 2009 by income domain vigintiles.

5.5. In the 2009 SIMD 36% of people living in the 15% most income deprived areas were income deprived compared to 12% in the rest of Scotland. Part of the reason for the fall between SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2006 is because tax credit data was not included in SIMD 2006 as it was not available. This meant low income in work families were not counted as income deprived. Tax credit data has been included in SIMD 2009 which will account for some of the increase. Further analysis of the impact of inclusion of tax credit data is available on the SIMD website.

5.6. Across Scotland as a whole approximately one in seven people or 15% of the population are income deprived.

Chart 5.1. Percentage of income deprived people in SIMD 2004, 2006 and 2009, by income domain vigintiles



Income Deprivation by Local Authority

5.7. Chart 5.2, below, shows the spread of the 15% most deprived datazones in the income domain in each Local Authority for 2006 and 2009. The largest concentrations of income deprivation are in Glasgow for both 2006 (34%) and 2009 (33%). The next largest shares of the 15% most income deprived areas are in North Lanarkshire (8%), Dundee (6%) and Edinburgh (6%).

Chart 5.2: Proportion of datazones in the 15% most deprived on the income domain of SIMD 2006 and 2009 by Local Authority



5.8. Table 5.1. shows the number of income deprived people living in each Local Authority area. It also shows how this count compares nationally as a percentage of the Scottish total. As might be expected Glasgow has the largest share with 19% of the total

number of income deprived people in the country. Following the same pattern that is evident in the datazone distribution North Lanarkshire has the next biggest share with 8% but Fife is replaced by Edinburgh in the three Local Authorities with the highest levels of income deprivation.

Table 5.1: Number of Income Deprived People in each Local Authority, SIMD 2009

Local Authority	Number of Data Zones	Number of income deprived people SIMD 2009	% of Scotland total
Aberdeen City	267	22,170	2.8%
Aberdeenshire	301	18,960	2.4%
Angus	142	14,020	1.8%
Argyll & Bute	122	11,230	1.4%
Clackmannanshire	64	8,150	1.0%
Dumfries & Galloway	193	21,250	2.7%
Dundee City	179	28,990	3.7%
East Ayrshire	154	21,740	2.8%
East Dunbartonshire	127	8,910	1.1%
East Lothian	120	10,660	1.4%
East Renfrewshire	120	7,920	1.0%
Edinburgh, City of	549	55,900	7.2%
Eilean Siar	36	3,960	0.5%
Falkirk	197	20,890	2.7%
Fife	453	51,450	6.6%
Glasgow City	694	149,350	19.2%
Highland	292	27,250	3.5%
Inverclyde	110	16,700	2.1%
Midlothian	112	9,990	1.3%
Moray	116	9,750	1.3%
North Ayrshire	179	26,060	3.3%
North Lanarkshire	418	59,230	7.6%
Orkney Islands	27	2,040	0.3%
Perth & Kinross	175	14,090	1.8%
Renfrewshire	214	27,050	3.5%
Scottish Borders	130	12,700	1.6%
Shetland Islands	30	1,860	0.2%
South Ayrshire	147	16,760	2.2%
South Lanarkshire	398	46,930	6.0%
Stirling	110	9,770	1.3%
West Dunbartonshire	118	19,420	2.5%
West Lothian	211	24,150	3.1%
Scotland	6,505	779,300	100.0%

Change over time

5.9. The addition of the tax credit data has resulted in increases in the numbers of income deprived people being counted across the country. However the other indicators within this domain have remained the same. It is therefore possible to look at the underlying data for these indicators to see if there have been real changes in datazones that have moved into and out of the 15% most deprived.

5.10. Between the 2006 SIMD and the 2009 SIMD 114 datazones moved into the 15% most deprived and 114 moved out. All of the datazones that have moved in have seen an increase in the proportion of the population that are income deprived whilst most of the datazones that have moved out have seen decreases even with the inclusion of tax credit data to pick up low income in work families.

5.11. Of the 862 datazones that have remained in the 15% most income deprived between the 2006 SIMD and the 2009 SIMD 776 were also in the 15% most deprived of the income domain in 2004.

5.12. Chart 5.3, below, shows the spread of the 15% most income deprived datazones across each of the local authorities. It also shows how many of the datazones that are in the 15% most deprived have been there for one, two or three versions of the SIMD. Datazones in the 15% most deprived on three updates to the index show concentrations of deprivation still remain.

Chart 5.3: Datazones in the 15% most deprived (Income Domain) in SIMD 2009 showing the numbers of versions of the index for which they've been in the 15% most deprived



6. Health Domain

6.1. The health domain identifies areas with a higher than expected level of ill-health or mortality for the age-sex profile of the population. The indicators used in the health domain are listed in Annex B along with their relative weights.

Changes since SIMD 2006

6.2. The indicators used are the same as for SIMD 2006, although some changes have been made to the codes used in the indicators for both hospital episodes relating to alcohol use and hospital episodes relating to drug use. Analysis of the impact of this change on the domain is available on the SIMD website.

6.3. The health domain in SIMD 2009 is very highly correlated with the SIMD 2006 health domain, with a Pearson's correlation coefficient of 0.97.

Health Deprivation by Local Authority

6.4. Chart 6.1 shows the spread of the 15% most deprived datazones in the health domain, by Local Authority area. Almost half of the datazones in Glasgow City are in the 15% most deprived on the health domain, although this proportion has fallen since SIMD 2006. Inverclyde has the second highest percentage and has seen an increase between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009.

6.5. Some Local Authorities such as North, South and East Ayrshire and West Lothian have seen large increases in the percentage of their datazones in the 15% most deprived. These changes are apparent even when using the old codes for the alcohol and drug indicators so it is not this change driving the increase and shows a relative worsening over time.

6.6. Glasgow, Stirling, South Lanarkshire, Clackmannanshire, Dundee and Eilean Siar have all seen falls in the number of datazones in the 15% most deprived on the health domain.

Chart 6.1: Proportion of datazones in the 15% most deprived on the health domain of SIMD 2009 by Local Authority



Health Deprivation by Health Board

6.7. Table 6.1 shows the percentage of datazones in each Community Health Partnership and Health Board area that were in the 15% most deprived in the health domain in SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009.

6.8. The Health Board that has seen the biggest increase in deprived datazones is Ayrshire & Arran (increasing from 16.0% of datazones in the 15% most deprived, to 20.6%). Forth Valley and Tayside have seen the largest drops. Greater Glasgow & Clyde has also seen a drop but remains the Health Board with the highest levels of deprivation with a third of its datazones in the 15% most deprived and containing half of the deprived datazones in Scotland.

6.9. The Community Health Partnerships with the highest proportion of their datazones in the 15% most deprived are North Glasgow and East Glasgow, with 58.8% and 64.3% respectively, though this is a fall for both from two thirds of their datazones in the 15% most deprived in SIMD 2006.

Change over time

6.10. There have been changes in methodology used in the health domain over the three versions of the SIMD, so care needs to be taken when comparing the health domain over time. However it is possible to look at the three versions of the index to identify, for those areas in the 15% most deprived in the health domain on SIMD 2009, the numbers of versions of the domain for which they've been in the 15% most deprived (1, 2 or 3).

Table 6.1: Local and National share of datazones in the 15% most deprived on the health domain, by Health Board and Community Health Partnership

Community Health Partnership / Health Board name (Health Boards in bold)	Total number of data zones	15% Most deprived data zones					
		SIMD 2006			SIMD 2009		
		No. of data zones	% of local area	% of Scotland	No. of data zones	% of local area	% of Scotland
East Ayrshire Community Health Partnership	154	31	20.1%	3.2%	39	25.3%	4.0%
North Ayrshire Community Health Partnership	179	31	17.3%	3.2%	38	21.2%	3.9%
South Ayrshire Community Health Partnership	147	15	10.2%	1.5%	22	15.0%	2.3%
Ayrshire & Arran	**480**	**77**	**16.0%**	**7.9%**	**99**	**20.6%**	**10.1%**
Scottish Borders Community Health & Care Partnership	130	4	3.1%	0.4%	6	4.6%	0.6%
Borders	**130**	**4**	**3.1%**	**0.4%**	**6**	**4.6%**	**0.6%**
Dumfries & Galloway Community Health Partnership	193	11	5.7%	1.1%	10	5.2%	1.0%
Dumfries & Galloway	**193**	**11**	**5.7%**	**1.1%**	**10**	**5.2%**	**1.0%**
Dunfermline & West Fife Community Health Partnership	174	4	2.3%	0.4%	5	2.9%	0.5%
Glenrothes & North East Fife Community Health Partnership	155	2	1.3%	0.2%	3	1.9%	0.3%
Kirkcaldy & Levenmouth Community Health Partnership	124	8	6.5%	0.8%	9	7.3%	0.9%
Fife	**453**	**14**	**3.1%**	**1.4%**	**17**	**3.8%**	**1.7%**
Clackmannanshire Community Health Partnership	64	10	15.6%	1.0%	8	12.5%	0.8%
Falkirk Community Health Partnership	197	12	6.1%	1.2%	7	3.6%	0.7%
Stirling Community Health Partnership	110	13	11.8%	1.3%	9	8.2%	0.9%
Forth Valley	**371**	**35**	**9.4%**	**3.6%**	**24**	**6.5%**	**2.5%**
Aberdeen City Community Health Partnership	267	43	16.1%	4.4%	44	16.5%	4.5%
Aberdeenshire Community Health Partnership	301	5	1.7%	0.5%	3	1.0%	0.3%
Moray Community Health & Social Care Partnership	116	1	0.9%	0.1%	1	0.9%	0.1%
Grampian	**684**	**49**	**7.2%**	**5.0%**	**48**	**7.0%**	**4.9%**
East Dunbartonshire Community Health Partnership	127	3	2.4%	0.3%	5	3.9%	0.5%
East Glasgow Community Health & Care Partnership	157	105	66.9%	10.8%	101	64.3%	10.3%
*East Renfrewshire Community Health & Care Partnership **	117	7	6.0%	0.7%	7	6.0%	0.7%
Inverclyde Community Health Partnership	110	43	39.1%	4.4%	46	41.8%	4.7%
North Glasgow Community Health & Care Partnership	119	80	67.2%	8.2%	70	58.8%	7.2%
Renfrewshire Community Health Partnership	214	44	20.6%	4.5%	50	23.4%	5.1%
South East Glasgow Community Health & Care Partnership	124	42	33.9%	4.3%	37	29.8%	3.8%
South West Glasgow Community Health & Care Partnership	134	62	46.3%	6.4%	65	48.5%	6.7%
West Dunbartonshire Community Health Partnership	118	21	17.8%	2.2%	25	21.2%	2.6%
West Glasgow Community Health & Care Partnership	160	51	31.9%	5.2%	48	30.0%	4.9%
*North Lanarkshire Community Health Partnership **	22	1	4.5%	0.1%	0	0.0%	0.0%
*South Lanarkshire Community Health Partnership **	71	26	36.6%	2.7%	25	35.2%	2.6%
Greater Glasgow & Clyde	**1473**	**485**	**32.9%**	**49.7%**	**479**	**32.5%**	**49.1%**
Argyll & Bute Community Health Partnership	122	8	6.6%	0.8%	9	7.4%	0.9%
Mid Highland Community Health Partnership	122	6	4.9%	0.6%	7	5.7%	0.7%
North Highland Community Health Partnership	57	4	7.0%	0.4%	5	8.8%	0.5%
South East Highland Community Health Partnership	113	8	7.1%	0.8%	10	8.8%	1.0%
Highland	**414**	**26**	**6.3%**	**2.7%**	**31**	**7.5%**	**3.2%**
*East Renfrewshire Community Health & Care Partnership **	3	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
*North Lanarkshire Community Health Partnership **	396	95	24.0%	9.7%	96	24.2%	9.8%
*South Lanarkshire Community Health Partnership **	327	39	11.9%	4.0%	25	7.6%	2.6%
Lanarkshire	**726**	**134**	**18.5%**	**13.7%**	**121**	**16.7%**	**12.4%**
East Lothian Community Health Partnership	120	1	0.8%	0.1%	1	0.8%	0.1%
Midlothian Community Health Partnership	112	7	6.3%	0.7%	6	5.4%	0.6%
West Lothian Community Health & Care Partnership	211	19	9.0%	1.9%	35	16.6%	3.6%
Edinburgh Community Health Partnership	549	59	10.7%	6.0%	54	9.8%	5.5%
Lothian	**992**	**86**	**8.7%**	**8.8%**	**96**	**9.7%**	**9.8%**
Orkney Community Health Partnership	27	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Orkney	**27**	**0**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**
Shetland Community Health Partnership	30	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Shetland	**30**	**0**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**
Angus Community Health Partnership	142	2	1.4%	0.2%	1	0.7%	0.1%
Dundee Community Health Partnership	179	43	24.0%	4.4%	38	21.2%	3.9%
Perth & Kinross Community Health Partnership	175	8	4.6%	0.8%	6	3.4%	0.6%
Tayside	**496**	**53**	**10.7%**	**5.4%**	**45**	**9.1%**	**4.6%**
Western Isles Community Health Partnership	36	2	5.6%	0.2%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Western Isles	**36**	**2**	**5.6%**	**0.2%**	**0**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**
Scotland	**6505**	**976**	**15.0%**	**100.0%**	**976**	**15.0%**	**100.0%**
* These Community Health Partnerships are split across two health boards. Data zones have been counted in the Health Board in which they fall. Totals and percentages for these CHPs are:							
East Renfrewshire Community Health & Care Partnership	*120*	*7*	*5.8%*	*0.7%*	*7*	*5.8%*	*0.7%*
North Lanarkshire Community Health Partnership	*418*	*96*	*23.0%*	*9.8%*	*96*	*23.0%*	*9.8%*
South Lanarkshire Community Health Partnership	*398*	*65*	*16.3%*	*6.7%*	*50*	*12.6%*	*5.1%*

6.11. Of the datazones in the 15% most deprived in the health domain on SIMD 2009 in Scotland, over 70% have been in the 15% most deprived in each of the three versions of the domain (Chart 6.2). Greater Glasgow & Clyde Health Board has the highest percentage (87%) of datazones remaining in the 15% most deprived over all three versions of the domain. Borders and Fife Health Boards have the highest proportion of new datazones in the 15% most deprived. These Health Boards have seen increases in the number of datazones in the 15% most health deprived in SIMD 2009 which explains this.

Chart 6.2: Datazones in the 15% most deprived (Health Domain) in SIMD 2009 showing the numbers of versions of the index for which they've been in the 15% most deprived*



** Number in brackets shows the number of datazones in each Health Board in the 15% most deprived on the Health domain of SIMD 2009*

6.12. Analysis of the data behind the health domain can show whether there has been an absolute improvement in those datazones that have moved out of the 15% most deprived. Five of the seven indicators in the health domain have not changed since SIMD 2006 so an improvement or worsening in these indicators will show whether things are getting better.

6.13. Of the 139 datazones that moved out of the 15% most deprived, 97 (70%) experienced an improvement in 3 or more of the indicators. 89 datazones (64% of those moving out) experienced an improvement in both the Comparative Illness Factor and the Emergency Admissions indicator (which together make up 60% of the domain). 138 datazones (99% of those moving out) experienced an improvement in at least one of the indicators.

6.14. Of the datazones moving into the 15% most deprived, 91% saw a worsening on three or more of the indicators. 63% saw a worsening on Comparative Illness Factor and Emergency Admissions with 99% seeing a worsening on at least one. This shows that absolute changes were at least part of the driver for datazones moving in or out of the 15% most deprived on the health domain.

6.15. Of the datazones that have moved out of the 15% most deprived, 60% have moved to the 15-20% most deprived band and another quarter to the 10-25% most deprived band. Of the datazones moving in, two-thirds have moved from the 15-20% most deprived band and another quarter have moved from the 20-25% most deprived band.

7. Education Domain

7.1. The education domain includes indicators that measure both outcomes of education deprivation, such as children and adults with a lack of qualifications, and causes of education deprivation such as absenteeism and lack of progression to further and higher education. A full list of indicators and the relative weights is provided in Annex B.

Changes since SIMD 2006

7.2. The indicators used in SIMD 2009 are the same as for SIMD 2006, except for the indicator 'People aged 16-18 not in full time education' which has been replaced by 'People aged 16-19 not in full time education, employment or training' and uses slightly different data sources. Full details of the change can be found in the SIMD 2009 technical report. The indicator 'Working age people with no qualifications' uses census data so this data has not changed since SIMD 2006.

7.3. The change to the Not in Education, Employment or Training indicator means that care needs to be taken when comparing the 2009 education domain with SIMD 2006. The two domains are still highly correlated with a Pearson's correlation coefficient of 0.96.

Education Deprivation by Local Authority

7.4. Chart 7.1 shows the proportion of datazones in each Local Authority in the 15% most deprived in the education domain, the local share. 40% of Glasgow's datazones are in the 15% most deprived in the education domain of the SIMD 2009. This is a fall from 44% in SIMD 2006. Falkirk and Clackmannanshire have also seen large decreases in the proportion of datazones in the 15% most education deprived, 6% and 5% respectively.

7.5. Increases in numbers of datazones in the 15% most education deprived have been seen in several Local Authorities with the largest in Aberdeen City and North and South Ayrshire.

7.6. Analysis of the indicators used within the education domain shows that the datazones moving into the 15% most deprived have all seen a worsening in performance on at least one of the three indicators that are comparable with SIMD 2006. 91% got worse on at least two indicators and 45% on all three.

7.7. Of the datazones that moved out of the 15% most deprived, 54% improved on two of the three indicators that are comparable with SIMD 2006 and 40% improved on all three. This demonstrates that areas have seen real as well as relative improvements.

Chart 7.1: Proportion of datazones in each Local Authority in the 15% most deprived on the Education domain of SIMD 2009, the Local Share of deprived datazones



Change over time

7.8. There have been changes in methodology used in the education domain over the three updates of the SIMD, however each index used the best indicators available at the time to identify deprived areas. It is therefore possible to look at the three versions of the index to identify which areas have been in the 15% most deprived on the education domain across the updates to the index.

7.9. Chart 7.2 shows the proportion of each Local Authorities datazones that are in the 15% most deprived in the SIMD 2009 education domain split by the number of times the datazone has fallen into the 15% most deprived. 10% of the datazones in Scotland have fallen in the 15% most deprived on all three updates to the index with another 3% having been in once before.

7.10. These proportions vary by Local Authority. 40% of the datazones in Glasgow City are in the 15% most deprived on the SIMD 2009 education domain, with 36% of the datazones in Glasgow having been in the most deprived on all three updates to the SIMD. Clackmannanshire, Edinburgh, Falkirk and West Dunbartonshire also have relatively high proportions of datazones that have been in the most deprived on the education domain for all three updates to the SIMD suggesting continuing levels of deprivation in these areas.

7.11. Other Local Authorities such as Aberdeen City, Fife and South Ayrshire have a smaller proportion of datazones that have been in the 15% for the three updates but these are explained by increases in deprived datazones seen in these areas on the education domain of SIMD 2009.

Chart 7.2: Percentage of each local Authorities datazones in the 15% most deprived on the SIMD 2009 education domain by the number of times they've been in the 15% most deprived



8. Geographic Access Domain

8.1. The access domain is intended to capture the issues of financial cost, time and inconvenience of having to travel to access basic services. This domain differs from the other domains as it consists of two sub-domains. One looks at public transport times to services and the other looks at drive times. This attempts to account for the fact that not everyone will have access to a car and so may be dependent on public transport. The domain measures aspects of access deprivation that are relevant to all people as it is important to be able to access key services in rural and urban areas. The indicators used in the access domain are listed in Annex B along with their relative weights.

Changes since SIMD 2006

8.2. The drive time : public transport weights for the sub-domains have been changed from ¾ : ¼ in SIMD 2006 to ⅔ : ⅓ in SIMD 2009. Analysis on the impact of this change on the domain is available on the SIMD website.

8.3. No changes have been made to the domain indicators since SIMD 2006. However, since there has been a change in the computer model used to calculate the travel times for both driving and public transport, the indicators are not directly comparable between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009. More information on this change is available on the SIMD website.

8.4. Despite the changes in the access domains between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009 the two domains are highly correlated with a Pearson's correlation coefficient of 0.92.

Access Deprivation by Local Authority

8.5. Chart 8.1 shows the proportion of the datazones in the 15% most deprived datazones in the access domain by Local Authority. Over half of each of Scotland's island Local Authorities are access deprived. 86% of the datazones in Eilean Siar are in the 15% most deprived on the access domain. Shetland Islands and Orkney Islands follow with 73% (no change) and 67% (up 8%), respectively. Argyll & Bute is the fourth most access deprived with 57% (up 14%).

8.6. The cities of Edinburgh and Glasgow show almost no signs of access deprivation in SIMD 2006 or SIMD 2009.

8.7. Some Local Authorities, for example Argyll & Bute, Inverclyde and North Ayrshire see the numbers of access deprived datazones increasing as they have large proportions of datazones in the 15% most deprived on the drive time sub-domain. Analysis of the data shows that for a large number of these datazones, the actual drive times are relatively low (a couple of minutes) but due to other areas having slightly quicker times, these areas are pushed into the 15% most deprived.

Chart 8.1: Proportion of datazones in each Local Authority in the 15% most deprived on the Access Domain of SIMD 2009 and the sub-domains



Access Deprivation by Urban Rural Classification

8.8. Table 8.1 shows the percentage of datazones in each category of the Urban Rural Classification 2008 that were in the 15% most deprived on the access domain in SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009.

8.9. Three quarters of Remote Rural Areas and over half of Accessible Rural Areas are access deprived. Less than 10% of each of the remaining classes are access deprived.

8.10. Over three quarters of the 15% most access deprived datazones in Scotland are found in Accessible Rural Areas and Remote Rural Areas.

8.11. Overall, classes 1 to 3 have shown falls in their respective values for the number of datazones in the 15% most access deprived datazones, and classes 4 to 6 have shown rises.

Table 8.1: National Share of datazones in the 15% most deprived on the access domain by Urban Rural Classification

Urban Rural Classification (2008)	Total Number of Data Zones	15% Most Deprived Data Zones					
		SIMD 2006			SIMD 2009		
		No. of Data Zones	% of Class	% of Scotland	No. of Data Zones	% of Class	% of Scotland
1 Large Urban Areas	2,454	38	1.5%	3.9%	14	0.6%	1.4%
2 Other Urban Areas	2,019	136	6.7%	13.9%	126	6.2%	12.9%
3 Accessible Small Towns	601	47	7.8%	4.8%	38	6.3%	3.9%
4 Remote Small Towns	252	17	6.7%	1.7%	23	9.1%	2.4%
5 Accessible Rural	742	421	56.7%	43.1%	439	59.2%	45.0%
6 Remote Rural	437	317	72.5%	32.5%	336	76.9%	34.4%
Scotland	**6,505**	**976**	**15.0%**	**100.0%**	**976**	**15.0%**	**100.0%**

Change Over Time

8.12. There have been changes in methodology used in the access domain over the three updates of the SIMD, however each domain was the best measure of accessibility available at the time to identify deprived areas. It is therefore possible to look at which areas have appeared in the 15% most access deprived on the three versions of the SIMD. More details on the methodology changes can be found in the technical report.

8.13. Chart 8.2 shows that most of the datazones from Rural Areas (Accessible and Remote) in the 15% most access deprived for SIMD 2009 have been deprived across all three versions of the SIMD.

8.14. All datazones from Large Urban Areas and Remote Small Towns in the 15% most access deprived for SIMD 2009 are in the most deprived for the first time, though this is only a small number of datazones. The lack of change in Rural Areas is unsurprising as access to services in these areas is difficult to change.

Chart 8.2: Datazones in the 15% most deprived (access domain) in SIMD 2009 showing the numbers of versions of the SIMD for which they have been in the 15% most deprived



8.15. Chart 8.3 shows over half of all datazones in Remote Rural Areas have been in the 15% most access deprived across all three versions of the SIMD. Around 30% of the datazones in Accessible Rural Areas are in a similar situation.

8.16. Less than 4% of datazones in Large Urban Areas have been in the 15% most access deprived for one or more versions of the SIMD.

Chart 8.3: Proportion of datazones in the 15% most deprived (access domain) for one, two, three or none of the SIMD versions by Urban Rural Classification



9. Crime Domain

9.1. The SIMD crime domain measures the rate of recorded SIMD crime at small area level using 2007/08 recorded crime data and is based on five indicators of broad crime types: crimes of violence; domestic house breaking; vandalism; drug offences; and minor assault. The indicators used were chosen on the basis of 1) relevance to impact on the local neighbourhood and 2) the availability of data. The crime domain score is a sum of the recorded crimes in each of the indicators and is referred to as 'SIMD crime' rather than total crime, as it does not include all recorded crimes. The indicators used in the crime domain are listed in Annex B.

9.2. The SIMD crime rate uses the resident population as the denominator. As such, the rates do not take into account short term increases in population, such as city centre daytime increases due to workers and shoppers or an increase due to regular events such as football matches or less regular events such as music festivals. This should be taken into account when comparing results across datazones.

Changes since SIMD 2006

9.3. No changes have been made to the domain indicators since SIMD 2006. As a result, the indicators and the overall domains between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009 are directly comparable.

9.4. The crime domains between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009 are positively correlated with a Pearson's correlation coefficient of 0.84.

SIMD Crime by Local Authority

9.5. Chart 9.1 shows that of the 976 15% most deprived datazones in terms of SIMD crime, Glasgow contains the most at 18% (179 datazones) however, this has fallen from 22% (213 datazones) in SIMD 2006 and is a local share of 26%.

9.6. Edinburgh (10%, 100 datazones), North Lanarkshire (8%, 80 datazones), Fife (7%, 69 datazones) and Aberdeen (6%, 56 datazones) contribute the next highest number of deprived datazones in terms of SIMD crime.

Chart 9.1: National share of datazones in the 15% most deprived on the crime domain by Local Authority



SIMD Crime by Police Force Areas

9.7. For SIMD 2009, Strathclyde Police Force Area has the largest number of datazones in the 15% most deprived in relation to crime, at 482 (49.4%) of Scotland's 976 datazones. This is a slight fall from 500 (51.2%) in SIMD 2006. Dumfries & Galloway have the smallest number, at 21 (2.2%) of the total number of datazones in the 15% most deprived datazones in Scotland in the crime domain of SIMD 2009.

9.8. The Lothian & Borders Police Force Area has seen the largest rise of 2.3% in the number of datazones in the police force area that fall in the 15% most deprived in the crime domain of SIMD 2009. The biggest fall of 2.4% can be seen in the Fife Police Force Area.

9.9. Strathclyde Police Force Area had the largest proportion of datazones in the police force area in the 15% most deprived in the crime domain of SIMD 2009, at 17.2% (down from 17.9% in 2006). Northern and Dumfries & Galloway had the smallest proportions, at 10.9% (8.3% and 12.4% in SIMD 2006, respectively).

Table 9.1: Share of 15% most deprived datazones in the crime domain of SIMD 2009, by Police Force Area

Police Force Area	Total number of datazones	15% Most Deprived Data Zones					
		SIMD 2006			SIMD 2009		
		No. of datazones	% of datazones in Police Force Area	% Share of Scotland's 15% Most Deprived	No. of datazones	% of datazones in Police Force Area	of Scotland's 15% Most Deprived
Central	371	43	11.6%	4.4%	52	14.0%	5.3%
Dumfries & Galloway	193	24	12.4%	2.5%	21	10.9%	2.2%
Fife	453	93	20.5%	9.5%	69	15.2%	7.1%
Grampian	684	83	12.1%	8.5%	82	12.0%	8.4%
Lothian and Borders	1,122	145	12.9%	14.9%	168	15.0%	17.2%
Northern	385	32	8.3%	3.3%	42	10.9%	4.3%
Strathclyde	2,801	500	17.9%	51.2%	482	17.2%	49.4%
Tayside	496	56	11.3%	5.7%	60	12.1%	6.1%
Scotland	**6,505**	**976**	**15.0%**	**100.0%**	**976**	**15.0%**	**100.0%**

SIMD Crime by Urban Rural Classification

9.10. Table 9.2 shows that the proportion and share of datazones in the 15% of areas that are most deprived in relation to crime, in terms of SIMD crime in 2009, are highest in Large Urban Areas. There is a clear urban rural split in the distribution, with low proportions of datazones in the 15% most deprived areas in terms of SIMD crime in Rural Areas (Accessible and Remote).

Table 9.2: Share of 15% most deprived datazones in terms of SIMD crime, by Urban Rural Classification

Urban Rural Classification (2008)	Total No. of datazones	15% Most Deprived Data Zones					
		SIMD 2006			SIMD 2009		
		No. of datazones	% of datazones in Urban Rural Class	% Share of 15% Most Deprived	No. of datazones	% of datazones in Urban Rural Class	% Share 15% Most Deprived
1. Large Urban Areas	2,454	495	20.2%	50.7%	498	20.3%	51.0%
2. Other Urban Areas	2,019	371	18.4%	38.0%	345	17.1%	35.3%
3. Accessible Small Towns	601	54	9.0%	5.5%	60	10.0%	6.1%
4. Remote Small Towns	252	45	17.9%	4.6%	43	17.1%	4.4%
5. Accessible Rural	742	8	1.1%	0.8%	21	2.8%	2.2%
6. Remote Rural	437	3	0.7%	0.3%	9	2.1%	0.9%
Scotland	**6,505**	**976**	**15.0%**	**100.0%**	**976**	**15.0%**	**100.0%**

9.11. Table 9.3 shows that the SIMD Crime rate is higher in Remote Small Towns (522 SIMD crimes per 10,000 population) than in Accessible Small Towns (401 SIMD crimes per 10,000 population).

Table 9.3: Count and rate of SIMD crime, by Urban Rural Classification

Urban Rural Classification (2008)	Total Population 2007	Number of SIMD Crimes	SIMD Crimes per 10,000 Population
1 Large Urban Areas	1,998,881	122,986	615
2 Other Urban Areas	1,555,063	83,440	537
3 Accessible Small Towns	461,318	18,486	401
4 Remote Small Towns	186,582	9,747	522
5 Accessible Rural	608,171	15,100	248
6 Remote Rural	334,186	7,444	223
Scotland	**5,144,201**	**257,203**	**500**

Change Over Time

9.12. Table 9.4 shows that in the crime domain, 302 datazones moved into the 15% most deprived in relation to crime, pushing the same number of datazones out of this category. Of those that moved into the 15% most deprived, the majority (289 datazones) saw crime rates increasing. Of those moving out of this category, all 302 datazones had a decrease in crime rates between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009. These figures show that absolute change is driving the change in ranks but as this is only the second year of crime data collected for the SIMD it is not possible to tell how much of this change is down to fluctuations in crime at small area level.

Table 9.4: Change in crime rate by datazone, from SIMD 2006 crime domain to SIMD 2009 crime domain

Movement in crime domain between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009	Change in Crime rate				
	Crime Rate Down	Change less than 5%	Crime Rate Up	2006 values supressed	Scotland total
Remained in 15% most deprived	359	101	214		674
Moved into 15% most deprived		12	289	1	302
Moved out of 15% most deprived	302				302
Remained in the 85% least deprived	2,592	383	1,815	437	5,227
Scotland	**3,253**	**496**	**2,318**	**438**	**6,505**

9.13. Table 9.5 shows that 69% of the datazones in the 15% most deprived in relation to crime in Scotland in SIMD 2009 have remained in the 15% most deprived since SIMD 2006. This percentage varies across the police force areas with Northern seeing 55% and Fife seeing 83% of the most deprived datazones remaining in the 15% most deprived. Two thirds of the datazones remaining in the 15% most deprived are in Strathclyde and Lothian & Borders, though 60% of Scotland's datazones fall within these two police force areas.

Table 9.5: Shift of datazones in the crime domain's 15% most deprived, from SIMD 2006 to SIMD 2009

Police Force Area	Total datazones in Police Force Area	Datazone movement in the Crime domain between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009		
		Datazones moving out of 15% most deprived	Datazones remaining in 15% most deprived	Datazones moving into 15% most deprived
Central	371	13	30	22
Dumfries & Galloway	193	8	16	5
Fife	453	36	57	12
Grampian	684	19	64	18
Lothian and Borders	1,122	42	103	65
Northern	385	9	23	19
Strathclyde	2,801	158	342	140
Tayside	496	17	39	21
Scotland	6,505	302	674	302

10. Housing Domain

10.1. The SIMD housing domain is intended to focus on the inadequacy of housing and to cover the suitability and physical condition of housing.

10.2. The housing domain contains indicators that are based on the proportion of the household population that experience overcrowding or are without central heating. Data from surveys such as the Scottish House Conditions Survey are not suitable for inclusion in the SIMD due to small sample sizes, and despite exploration of a number of housing related indicators nothing suitable for use in this domain has been found in administrative data sources. The domain, therefore includes indicators from the 2001 census and as such, the data have not been updated for SIMD 2009 and the domain remains the same as in SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2006. No analysis of the data is included here.

11. Case Study – Highland

11.1. The purpose of including a case study within this report is to give some examples of how the SIMD and its constituent domains can be used independently, together and with other data. Although the SIMD has been designed for a specific purpose, it can be used flexibly depending on the particular area of interest or focus of the analysis.

11.2. For the purposes of this case study, the data and ranks pertaining to one Local Authority will be used. However, any analysis that is shown here can just as easily be applied to any large geographical area and any data – provided the data is available at datazone level.

Summary of SIMD 2009 results for Highland

11.3. In the SIMD 2009 Highland has a total of 16 datazones in the 15% most deprived, which equates to 1.6% of the national total and 5.5% of all the datazones in Highland. This was a drop of one datazone from SIMD 2006. Table 11.1 gives the numbers of datazones in the 15% most deprived for each of the domains for Highland.

Table 11.1: Summary of SIMD 2009 results for Highland

Domain	No of datazones in 15% Most Deprived	National Share	Local Share
Access	127	13.00%	43.50%
Crime	36	3.70%	12.30%
Health	22	2.30%	7.50%
Education	20	2.00%	6.80%
Income	16	1.60%	5.50%
Overall SIMD	16	1.60%	5.50%
Employment	14	1.40%	4.80%
Housing	2	0.20%	0.70%

Using the SIMD Results

11.4. The above table shows that while Highland has a relatively small proportion of the datazones described as deprived by the overall SIMD rank, the individual domains give a different picture and suggests areas for further investigation.

11.5. One way of using these results is to look at the change that has occurred between the previous version of the SIMD and this one. This will give a general idea of how the Local Authority area is performing relative to the rest of Scotland. For example, it is possible to see if the national share of the 15% most education deprived datazones is increasing or decreasing. This approach will however only give a relative picture – it will not show anything about the actual changes that have occurred in the three years between indices. This can be done though by looking at the individual indicators within the domain.

Analysis of the education domain indicators

11.6. Looking at the education domain for Highland, it can be seen that between SIMD 2006 and 2009, the number of datazones in the 15% most deprived jumped from thirteen to twenty. Of the original thirteen, eleven remained in the 15% most deprived, which means that two moved out and nine moved in. Did the two that moved out actually improve? And did the nine that moved in really get worse?

11.7. Looking at the actual data in Table 11.2, below for the two indicators that can be compared, it can be seen that for the datazones that moved into the 15% most deprived the absence rate increased between 2006 and 2009 and the SQA tariff score on the whole decreased. The opposite is true for those datazones that moved out.

Table 11.2: Absence rate and SQA tariff score for movers into and out of 15% most education deprived in Highland

	Absence Rate		SQA Tariff Score	
Moved in.	**2006**	**2009**	**2006**	**2009**
S01003790	8.4	9.7	142	121
S01003796	8.1	8.5	98	122
S01003833	10.9	11.1	169	123
S01003856	11.3	15.3	158	107
S01003922	7.3	9.7	150	112
S01003928	8.3	10.0	138	130
S01003931	6.7	9.3	129	118
S01003976	9.7	10.0	120	112
S01003978	7.5	10.4	163	128
Moved out.				
S01003724	9.9	7.0	104	164
S01003822	13.1	11.4	119	121

Analysis of the health domain indicators

11.8. As well as looking at a whole Local Authority or large area, it is also possible to use the SIMD to look at a particular part of Scotland. Chart 11.1 below shows the domain ranks for the datazones that make up Fort William. None of these datazones fall into the 15% most deprived on the overall SIMD. Looking more closely at the health domain ranks it can be seen that datazone S01003731 – Fort William Central, has the lowest rank of the group at 563. It is possible to further analyse the health domain indicators to see which aspects of the health domain are of most interest in this particular datazone. This data is displayed in Chart 11.2., below. Highland Local Authority have named all their datazones and these names are included here.

Chart 11.1: 2009 domain ranks for the datazones in Fort William



11.9. Chart 11.2 shows the range of each indicator in the health domain for Highland using box plots. A full description of what box plots do is available at the beginning of chapter 12. The values for the datazone of interest are highlighted on each range. The higher up the line the dot representing S01003731 lies the closer it is to the highest or worst value in Highland. The box represents the middle 50% of datazones with the lines representing the most and least deprived 25% and the end of the lines the most and least deprived.

11.10. The first five indicators on the chart show values in the top 25% for Highland, with the highest being hospital admissions for drug use. This would seem to suggest that drug use is an issue in this particular area. On the other hand the proportion of the population being prescribed drugs for anxiety, depression or psychosis falls below the median for Highland.

Chart 11.2: Health indicator ranges for Highland



* The data used in this analysis is all available on both the SIMD website and the Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics website.

Using the domains together

11.11. Looking at Table 11.1. above, from the data used to construct the SIMD, it appears that access to services is the most widespread issue for people living in Highland. This may not be much of a surprise, given the size of Highland. However, this data can be used in conjunction with the other domain data to give more detailed pictures of specific areas.

11.12. It is possible to look at where domains overlap. So if there is, for example, a large overlap between access and employment deprivation, then a relevant question might be 'Do the people in that area need job training or better public transport links?'

5, 10, 15, or 20%? Nationally or Locally?

11.13. The descriptions so far have looked at using the 15% most deprived nationally. This is the level of analysis that is initially recommended by the Scottish Government but it is

by no means the only way that analysis can be done. Different policy needs will dictate different levels of analysis.

11.14. Within Highland for example, there may be a policy focus to decrease the number of employment deprived people. If the areas classed as employment deprived relative to Scotland as a whole were targeted, then that would mean that 14 datazones with approximately 1,600 employment deprived people would be the focus of the policy. If the decision was made to look at the 15 or 20% most employment deprived areas within Highland, that could see up to around 4,600 individuals being targeted instead. For each policy it will be necessary to look at the SIMD and domains and decide on the most appropriate domains, indicators and cut offs to use for a given purpose.

Using other data with the SIMD

11.15. It is also possible to analyse other data using the SIMD ranks. In fact, much of the analysis done by Scottish Government analysts is also broken down using SIMD ranks or decile (10% band). The General Register Office for Scotland, for example, produce an annual publication which gives details of estimates of the number and types of households and dwellings in Scotland. Some of the data presented within this publication is broken down by SIMD decile.

11.16. Looking again at Highland, it is possible to analyse other data, for example data relating to breastfeeding, to see if there are any differences between the most deprived areas in Highland (say 20%) and the rest of the Local Authority. This, and other, data is available at datazone level on the Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics website. Table 11.3., below, shows the results of this brief analysis. It shows that in 2008 the rate of children breastfeeding at the 6 – 8 week review was lower in the more deprived areas of Highland.

Table 11.3: Children Breastfeeding at the 6 to 8 week review

	No. breastfeeding	% breastfeeding
20% most deprived datazones in Highland	122	29.05
Rest of Local Authority	587	47.15
Local Authority as a whole	709	42.71

11.17. There may be more detailed or additional data sources available for parts of Scotland collected and held in local areas or even local data such as that collated by Social Work or Education Departments, this may be available to Community Planning Partners for further analysis. Much of this data will not be initially available by datazone but any data with a post code attached can be matched to datazones using the post code look up tables that are available both on Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics and the SIMD web pages. In this way it could be possible to identify if there are specific issues for children in deprived areas or to identify that these issues are not specific to areas of high deprivation.

11.18. The SIMD guidance leaflet contains more information about what the SIMD can and can't be used for and the SIMD team are always happy to advise on the use of the SIMD and its constituent parts.

12. Local Authority Analysis

12.1 The following pages contain analysis by Local Authority in the form of maps and charts. The data shown on the charts and maps is all taken from the SIMD 2009 and its constituent domains. Some include comparisons with SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2006. These pages give a feel for the sort of analysis possible using the SIMD and have been selected for this purpose and to identify some key findings for each area. Further charts, maps and analysis for each Local Authority are available on the SIMD website and through the interactive mapping website.

12.2 The charts on the following pages consist of bar charts, box plots and bar code charts. The latter two are explained below.

Box Plots

12.3 Box plots show the minimum and maximum value for an area on a particular indicator eg the highest and lowest ranked datazone as lines. The box in the middle of the chart shows the middle 50% of values and the middle value, ie a quarter of datazones will lie below the box and a quarter above.



Bar code charts

12.4 Bar code charts show how the levels of deprivation in a Local Authority compared with the rest of Scotland. Each bar on the bar code represents a datazone and is positioned according to its deprivation rank, ie the more deprived a datazone is, the further to the left it will be positioned. A concentration of lines close together shows as a black block, if one appears at the left hand end of the scale it shows a concentration of deprived areas. A concentration at the right hand end shows a concentration of areas at the least deprived end of the distribution (as in the example below).

12.5 Some Local Authorities will have no concentrations of lines as they will have a small number of datazones spread across the scale. Larger Local Authorities may have several concentrations along the distribution.

Local Authority bar code charts

Each bar represents a single datazone placed on a scale from most deprived to least deprived according to the SIMD 2009 rank. Concentrations of datazones in a Local Authority with similar ranks show up as dark blocks, for example at the most deprived end of the scale in Glasgow.

LOCAL AUTHORITY *Most Deprived* →→→→→→→ *Least Deprived*



Aberdeen City

The 25% most deprived datazones in Aberdeen City all rank in the 30% most deprived nationally. Health, Education, Housing and Access are driving this trend with the median and 25% most deprived datazones below that for the overall SIMD. In SIMD 2006 Aberdeen had 43 datazones in the 15% most health deprived and it has 44 in SIMD 2009. Comparing this map to one for SIMD 2006 shows the datazones moving out to mainly be in the 10-15% band for SIMD 2006 and those moving in have come from the 15-20% band.

Box plot: summary of local authority domain ranks in SIMD 2009



Map: change in 15% most deprived datazones on the health domain in SIMD 2009



Aberdeenshire

Aberdeenshire has most of its datazones in the least deprived in terms of SIMD ranks across all 3 years. The percentage of datazones in decile two has fallen since SIMD 2006 but the percentage in decile three and four has risen. The most deprived datazones on the education domain are clustered in the urban areas of Fraserburgh and Peterhead with both areas having datazones in the 10% most deprived in Scotland.

Decile graph: distribution of local authority datazone ranks in each decile in the SIMD



Map: most deprived datazones on the education domain in SIMD 2009



Angus

Angus has seen an increase in the percentage of datazones in the 10% most deprived since SIMD 2004. However the distribution of datazones has remained similar overtime. The map shows that the majority of income deprived datazones in Angus are in Arbroath with datazones in the 5 and 10% most deprived on the income domain. A small number of income deprived datazones are found in Forfar and Brechin.

Box plot: summary of local authority domain ranks in SIMD 2009



Map: most deprived datazones on the income domain in SIMD 2009



Argyll & Bute

Three quarters of Argyll & Bute datazones are out with the 30% most deprived on the SIMD 2009, however there are still deprived datazones in the Local Authority. Over half of the datazones in Argyll & Bute are in the 15% most deprived on the access domain. Housing is also an issue though this is reflecting census data. The most deprived areas in the SIMD 2009 crime domain are predominantly grouped together in urban, more densely populated areas. The large rural datazone on the edge of Helensburgh includes the main route along Loch Lomond and several tourist and holiday destinations which will mean large influxes of people throughout the year compared to the resident population.

Box plot: summary of local authority domain ranks in SIMD 2009



Map: most deprived datazones on the crime domain in SIMD 2009



These maps are based on Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office © Crown copyright 2009. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. Scottish Government Licence number: 100020540 2009.

Clackmannanshire

Clackmannanshire's distribution of datazone ranks tended to follow a similar pattern in each of the SIMD updates. That is, peaks at the most deprived end and around deciles 5, 6 and 7. The increase in datazones in decile one has been reversed in the SIMD 2009 update though there has been an increase in decile 2. The map shows that deprivation in relation to crime is mostly in Alloa. The number of datazones in the 15% most deprived on the crime domain has risen from 7 to 13 with several of those moving in ranked in the 15-20% most deprived on SIMD 2006.

Decile graph: distribution of local authority datazone ranks in each decile in the SIMD



Map: change in 15% most deprived datazones on the crime domain in SIMD 2009



Dumfries & Galloway

The domains of the SIMD follow different patterns to the overall SIMD within Dumfries & Galloway. In the health and housing domains, three quarters of datazones are out with the 40% most deprived. In the access domain, half the datazones fall within the 30% most deprived. The map shows the SIMD 2009 crime domain, the most deprived datazones are found in Dumfries and Annan, apart from one large rural datazone. This datazone includes the land used for a large music festival which is likely to have impacted on the number of crimes recorded in this datazone, though only the resident population is used to calculate the crime rate and rank.

Box plot: summary of local authority domain ranks in SIMD 2009



Map: most deprived datazones on the crime domain in SIMD 2009



Dundee City

On the overall SIMD 2009, and on the individual domains (aside from access and crime), Dundee City's datazone ranks are concentrated more towards the most deprived. On each of these domains including the overall SIMD 2009, half of its datazones have a rank of around 2,000 or less. The income, employment and housing domains have a median and 25% most deprived lower than that for the overall SIMD. The map shows that in terms of the education domain, movement of datazones into and out of the most deprived tend to happen on the boundaries of datazones in the 15% most deprived.

Box plot: summary of local authority domain ranks in SIMD 2009



Map: change in 15% most deprived datazones on the education domain in SIMD 2009



East Ayrshire

Over the SIMDs, the distribution of datazones for each decile of deprivation has remained similar, with the highest percentage of datazones in deciles one to four. The map shows that datazones in the 20% most deprived in Scotland are typically smaller in size and are grouped together in small concentrated areas with the largest concentration around Kilmarnock. The larger, more rural datazones are generally found to be in the 40-60% and 60-80% bands.

Decile graph: distribution of local authority datazone ranks in each decile in the SIMD



Map: levels of deprivation in the overall SIMD 2009 by National quintiles (0-20% band of deprivation shows 20% most deprived datazones in Scotland)



East Dunbartonshire

The majority of the datazones in East Dunbartonshire are at the least deprived end of the SIMD. In the employment and health domains, the 25% most deprived and medians are below that for the overall SIMD. The access domain also identifies deprivation in this area with a quarter of datazones falling in the 30% most deprived. The map shows the datazones that have moved in or out of the 15% most deprived on the access domain since SIMD 2009, overall the Local Authority has seen a fall from ten datazones to eight.

Box plot: summary of local authority domain ranks in SIMD 2009



Map: change in 15% most deprived datazones on the access domain in SIMD 2009



East Lothian

The overall SIMD ranks in East Lothian are similarly distributed for SIMD 2004, 2006, and 2009. However, there has been a slight shift in the distribution towards the most deprived with a rise since SIMD 2004 in the number of datazones in deciles 2 and 3. The map shows that the most deprived datazones on the education domain are in the Prestonpans and Tranent, though there are also datazones in the 15-20% band.

Decile graph: distribution of local authority datazone ranks in each decile in the SIMD



Map: most deprived datazones on the education domain in SIMD 2009



East Renfrewshire

For the overall SIMD, this Local Authority has mostly least deprived datazones, although it still contains datazones in the most deprived in Scotland. In terms of individual domains, the distribution of the education domain leans more towards the least deprived. The map shows the health domain for East Renfrewshire, there was a relatively small movement of datazones from SIMD 2006 to SIMD 2009 into and out of the 15% most health deprived. Those moving out were in the 10-15% band and those moving in were in the 15-20% band on SIMD 2006. The rest of the Local Authority does not appear in the 15% most health deprived.

Box plot: summary of local authority domain ranks in SIMD 2009



Map: change in 15% most deprived datazones on the health domain in SIMD 2009



Edinburgh, City of

Edinburgh has seen little change in the distribution of datazones across the SIMD deciles between SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2009. Over 30% of Edinburgh's datazones are in the least deprived SIMD decile. The map shows that there has been some movement in the datazones highlighted in the 15% most deprived on the crime domain of SIMD 2009. Edinburgh has seen an increase from 77 datazones in the 15% most deprived on the crime domain of SIMD 2006 to 100 on SIMD 2009.

Decile graph: distribution of local authority datazone ranks in each decile in the SIMD



Map: change in 15% most deprived datazones on the crime domain in SIMD 2009



Eilean Siar

Eilean Siar has no datazones in the 15% most deprived in terms of overall SIMD 2009. However, on the access domain, it has most of its datazones in the 15% most deprived, with most having ranks of below 500. The 25% most health deprived datazones in the Local Authority are also low relative to other domains. Locally, the 20% most deprived datazones on the overall SIMD 2009 are not concentrated anywhere in Eilean Siar. Smaller deprived datazones in built up areas such as in Stornoway will not show up due to the scale of the map.

Box plot: summary of local authority domain ranks in SIMD 2009



Map: levels of deprivation in the overall SIMD 2009 by Local Authority quintiles (0-20% band of deprivation shows 20% most deprived datazones in local authority area)



Falkirk

A quarter of datazones in Falkirk are in the 30% most deprived. The employment domain and education domain have medians and the 25% most deprived lower than that for the overall SIMD. Falkirk has seen a fall in the number of datazones in the 15% most deprived on the education domain from 39 datazones to 28, though they are still spread across the Local Authority area.

Box plot: summary of local authority domain ranks in SIMD 2009



Map: change in 15% most deprived datazones on the education domain in SIMD 2009



Fife

Datazones in Fife are equally distributed among the most to the least deprived in terms of SIMD 2009 rankings, with fewer datazones in decile 1, the 10% most deprived, though the numbers in the most deprived decile has been increasing on each update to the SIMD. The map shows the SIMD 2009 access domain for Fife. Fife has seen a fall in the number of it's datazones in the 15% most access deprived from 67 datazones to 54, around 12% of Fife's datazones. These are spread across the Local Authority area.

Decile graph: distribution of local authority datazone ranks in each decile in the SIMD



Map: most deprived datazones on the access domain in SIMD 2009



Glasgow City

In each SIMD, Glasgow has seen a gradual improvement in its SIMD rankings with a concentration of its most deprived datazones shifting towards the less deprived end of the scale. In SIMD 2004, Glasgow had 374 datazones in the 15% most deprived. In SIMD 2006 this had fallen to 330 and in SIMD 2009 this has fallen further to 302. The number of datazones in the most deprived 5% has also fallen from 226 to 169 to 158, from 33% to 23% of the Local Authority.

Despite these decreases, the map shows that deprived datazones are spread across the city of Glasgow, though when compared with a similar map for SIMD 2006, the reduction of datazones in the 5% most deprived is obvious.

Barcode charts: distribution of local authority SIMD 2009 ranks



Map: most deprived datazones in the overall SIMD 2009



Highland

The overall distribution of datazones in Highland across the overall SIMD has changed little over the three versions of the index, however Highland has seen an increase in the proportion of datazones in the first 2 deciles. The map shows the deprived datazones across the Local Authority on the overall SIMD by 20% band. Due to the scale of the map, the datazones in built up areas such as Inverness and Fort William do not show up, however it does highlight several datazones in the 20% most deprived in Highland in more rural parts of the Local Authority.

Decile graph: distribution of local authority datazone ranks in each decile in the SIMD

Map: levels of deprivation in the overall SIMD 2009 by Local Authority quintiles (0-20% band of deprivation shows 20% most deprived datazones in local authority area)



Inverclyde

Around 45% of datazones in Inverclyde are ranked in Scotland's 20% most deprived datazones in SIMD 2009. Inverclyde has seen an increase in the proportion of it's datazones in the 10% most deprived and a decrease in datazones in the 10-20% most deprived over the three versions of the SIMD. The map shows that many of the datazones in the 15% most deprived on the employment domain in SIMD 2006 remained in the most deprived in SIMD 2009. Those datazones that moved out were mainly in the 10-15% band in SIMD 2006. Those moving in were in the 15-20% band of the employment domain.

Decile graph: distribution of local authority datazone ranks in each decile in the SIMD



Map: change in 15% most deprived datazones on the employment domain in SIMD 2009



Midlothian

In the overall ranks for SIMD 2009, only a small percentage of Midlothian's datazones are in decile 1, the most deprived decile. There is a fall in the number of datazones in the second decile and an increase in the third decile since SIMD 2006. Midlothian has seen a decrease from 10 to 8 datazones in the 20% most deprived between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009. These are shown on the map below as three distinct concentrations.

Decile graph: distribution of local authority datazone ranks in each decile in the SIMD



Map: levels of deprivation in the overall SIMD 2009 by National quintiles (0-20% band of deprivation shows 20% most deprived datazones in Scotland)



Moray

More than half the datazones in Moray are in the 50% least deprived on the overall SIMD. The income, employment, education, access and crime domains all have medians and 25% most deprived lower than the overall SIMD. The map shows deprivation quintiles for SIMD 2009 for the Local Authority. The majority of datazones in the 20% most deprived are around Forres and Elgin, though there are other datazones in towns across the Local Authority area, for example around Buckie.

Box plot: summary of local authority domain ranks in SIMD 2009



Map: levels of deprivation in the overall SIMD 2009 by Local Authority quintiles (0-20% band of deprivation shows 20% most deprived datazones in local authority area)



North Ayrshire

North Ayrshire has seen an increase in the number of it's datazones in the 15% most deprived. In SIMD 2004 and SIMD 2006 33 datazones fell in the 15% most deprived nationally. This has increased to 43 on SIMD 2009. North Ayrshire has also seen an increase in the number of datazones in the 5 and 10% most deprived. The number in the 5% most deprived has gone from 6 to 10 and the number in the 10% most deprived from 16 to 26.

The map shows the most deprived datazones on SIMD 2009. In North Ayrshire, the datazones in the 10% most deprived are concentrated in the built up areas of Kilwinning, Irvine, and along the coast in Stevenson, Saltcoats and Ardrossan. There are deprived datazones out with these areas but these are mostly in the 10-15% or the 16-20% band.

Barcode charts: distribution of local authority SIMD 2009 ranks

Map: most deprived datazones in the overall SIMD 2009



North Lanarkshire

Throughout the various updates of the SIMD, there has been a small increase in the most deprived decile and a decrease in the percentage of datazones in decile two. The overall distribution has not changed though, with a peak in deciles 2 and 3. The map shows the employment domain for SIMD 2009. The largest concentrations of datazones in the most deprived 10% are in Airdrie, Coatbridge, Motherwell and Wishaw, though datazones in the 15% most deprived are spread across the Local Authority.

Decile graph: distribution of local authority datazone ranks in each decile in the SIMD



Map: most deprived datazones on the employment domain in SIMD 2009



Orkney Islands

SIMD Crime is particularly low with 75% of datazones having a rank in the 25% least deprived in Scotland on the domain. The housing and access domains show levels of deprivation higher than that for the overall SIMD. The map shows deprivation quintiles within Orkney for SIMD 2009. Generally, datazones on the islands furthest away from the mainland are in the 20% most deprived datazones within the Local Authority in SIMD 2009. The 20% least deprived datazones within Orkney Local Authority in SIMD 2009 are found around Kirkwall.

Box plot: summary of local authority domain ranks in SIMD 2009



Map: levels of deprivation in the overall SIMD 2009 by Local Authority quintiles (0-20% band of deprivation shows 20% most deprived datazones in local authority area)



Perth & Kinross

75% of datazones in Perth & Kinross are in the 50% least deprived and similar patterns are seen on all the domains except for the access domain. Half of datazones are ranked in the 40% most access deprived with 25% in the 15% most deprived. The map shows the overall SIMD by 20% bands within the local authority. The most deprived areas within Perth & Kinross are found in Perth and Crieff with a small number of datazones in Blairgowrie. The larger rural datazones show as being the least deprived.

Box plot: summary of local authority domain ranks in SIMD 2009



Map: levels of deprivation in the overall SIMD 2009 by Local Authority quintiles (0-20% band of deprivation shows 20% most deprived datazones in local authority area)



Renfrewshire

Over a quarter of datazones in Renfrewshire are in Scotland's 20% most deprived datazones. Renfrewshire has seen an increase in the proportion of it's datazones in the 10% most deprived in SIMD 2009 and a decrease in the percentage in decile two. The map shows levels of income deprivation in the Local Authority. Datazones moving into the 15% most deprived were mostly in the 15-20% most deprived on SIMD 2006, so the inclusion of tax credit data in this domain has not identified completely new areas.

Decile graph: distribution of local authority datazone ranks in each decile in the SIMD



Map: change in 15% most deprived datazones on the income domain in SIMD 2009



Scottish Borders

Generally, the spreads of SIMD ranks in the Scottish Borders across all the domains are rather similar. On the overall SIMD, the 25% most deprived datazones in the local authority are ranked around 3,000 or less. In the access domain, 50% of datazones are ranked less than 3,000. The map shows levels of deprivation in the health domain on SIMD 2009. There are concentrations of health deprivation in the 10% most deprived in the Galashiels and Langlee area and around Hawick, with smaller areas of less concentrated deprivation in other towns.

Box plot: summary of local authority domain ranks in SIMD 2009



Map: most deprived datazones on the health domain in SIMD 2009



Shetland Islands

In SIMD 2004, Shetland Islands had a relatively small spread of ranks with datazones found only in deciles 5 to 9. Through SIMD 2006 and into SIMD 2009, there has been a shift in distribution towards the most deprived with datazones now also found in decile 4, and less so in deciles 8 and 9. Nearly all of the Shetland Islands are in the 5% most deprived on the access domain. The exceptions are datazones nearer Lerwick and Scalloway, which are in the 11-15% band or the 16-20% band of access deprivation. Those in Lerwick itself are not access deprived.

Decile graph: distribution of local authority datazone ranks in each decile in the SIMD



Map: most deprived datazones on the access domain in SIMD 2009



South Ayrshire

Since SIMD 2004, South Ayrshire has seen an increase in the local share of the 10% and 20% most deprived datazones in Scotland, though the overall pattern across the deciles has changed little. On the income domain, datazones in the 15% most deprived remain largely the same from SIMD 2006 to SIMD 2009, the Local Authority had 14 in the 15% most deprived on SIMD 2006 and has 16 on SIMD 2009. Most of the income deprived datazones are in and around Ayr as shown on the map. The datazones that have moved out were in the 10-15% on SIMD 2006 and those that moved in were in the 15-20% band.

Decile graph: distribution of local authority datazone ranks in each decile in the SIMD



Map: change in 15% most deprived datazones on the income domain in SIMD 2009



South Lanarkshire

South Lanarkshire has a fairly even spread of datazones across all the SIMD deciles. Since SIMD 2004, fewer datazones are found in deciles 1 and there has been a slight increase in the percentage of datazones in decile 2 since SIMD 2006. The map shows the most deprived datazones on the overall SIMD 2009. The largest concentration of deprived datazones is around Hamilton, but there are also deprived datazones spread across the Local Authority Area. South Lanarkshire has 58 datazones in the 15% most deprived on SIMD 2009.

Decile graph: distribution of local authority datazone ranks in each decile in the SIMD



Map: most deprived datazones in the overall SIMD 2009



Stirling

Datazones in Stirling are more concentrated at the least deprived end of the distribution on the overall SIMD. However the Local Authority contains datazones ranging from among the most deprived to amongst the least deprived in Scotland on the overall SIMD and the Income and Employment domains. The map shows the datazones in Stirling in the 15% most deprived on the overall SIMD 2009, which remain largely the same as in SIMD 2006 with these datazones generally clustered around the Raploch area. One datazone has moved out of the 15% most deprived since 2006 with another one moving in at Cowie.

Box plot: summary of local authority domain ranks in SIMD 2009



Map: change in 15% most deprived datazones in the overall SIMD 2009



West Dunbartonshire

The chart indicates that half the datazones in West Dunbartonshire are ranked 2000 or less in the overall SIMD with similar patterns showing in the income, employment, health and crime domains. The 25% most income and employment deprived datazones in the Local Authority fall in the 15% most deprived in Scotland. The map shows the most income deprived datazones in SIMD 2009, these are concentrated in the South East and the West of the Local Authority area, with those in the South East bordering deprived datazones in other Local Authorities. The Local Authority has seen a fall from 36 to 32 datazones in the 15% most income deprived between SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009.

Box plot: summary of local authority domain ranks in SIMD 2009



Map: most deprived datazones on the income domain in SIMD 2009



West Lothian

A relatively small percentage of West Lothian's datazones are found in the most deprived decile in terms of SIMD 2009 overall rank, though this percentage has increased with each update to the SIMD. The percentage of datazones in the second decile has also increased. The map shows the most health deprived datazones in West Lothian. There is a concentration of deprived datazones in Livingston but there are also health deprived datazones spread across the Local Authority area.

Decile graph: distribution of local authority datazone ranks in each decile in the SIMD



Map: most deprived datazones on the health domain in SIMD 2009



ANNEX A: Useful links

SIMD website (including links to reports, data, mapping and previous SIMD outputs) www.scotland.gov.uk/simd

SIMD 2009 General Report www.scotland.gov.uk/simd2009report

SIMD 2009 Technical Report www.scotland.gov.uk/simd2009technical

SIMD 2009 Statistical Compendium www.scotland.gov.uk/simd2009compendium

SIMD 2009 Guidance Leaflet www.scotland.gov.uk/simd2009leaflet

Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics (SNS) User Forum www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/sns

Scottish Neighbourhood Statistics (SNS) website www.sns.gov.uk

Scottish Government Urban Rural Classification http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Topics/Statistics/About/Methodology/UrbanRuralClassification

Datazone population estimates www.gro-scotland.gov.uk/statistics/publications-and-data/small-area-population-estimates/index.html

Indices of deprivation across the UK www.neighbourhood.statistics.gov.uk/dissemination/Info.do?page=aboutneighbourhood/indicesofdeprivation/indices-of-deprivation.htm

ANNEX B: SIMD 2006 and 2009 domain and indicator weights

The table below lists all the domains and indicators used in the SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009, along with their weighting (where applicable) within the domain and within the overall SIMD. Where indicators have been changed a brief explanation is given. For full details, please see the SIMD 2009 technical report.

a) Domain weights in SIMD 2004, SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009

2004 Domains	2004 Weight	% of overall weight 2004	2006 domains	2006 weight	% of overall weight 2006	2009 Domains	2009 Weight	% of overall weight 2009
Income	6	29	Income	12	28	Income	12	28
Employment	6	29	Employment	12	28	Employment	12	28
Health	3	14	Health	6	14	Health	6	14
Education	3	14	Education	6	14	Education	6	14
Housing	1	5	Housing	1	2	Housing	1	2
Access	2	10	Access	4	9	Access	4	9
			Drive times	*0.75*		*Drive times*	*0.66*	
			Public transport	*0.25*		*Public transport*	*0.33*	
			Crime	2	5	Crime	2	5

b) Indicators used in SIMD 2006 and SIMD 2009

Income domain (Weight =12)

2006 Indicators	2006 Weight	2009 Indicators	2009 Weight	Main reason for change
Number of Adults (aged 16-60) receiving Income Support (DWP April 2005)	N/A	Number of Adults (aged 16-60) receiving Income Support (DWP April 2008)	N/A	No change
Number of Children (aged 0-15) dependent on a recipient of Income Support (DWP April 2005)	N/A	Number of Children (aged 0-15) dependent on a recipient of Income Support (DWP Aug 2008)	N/A	Updated at time of SIMD 2009 v2 revision
Number of Adults (aged 60 plus) receiving Guaranteed Pension Credit (DWP May 2005)	N/A	Number of Adults (aged 60 plus) receiving Guaranteed Pension Credit (DWP May 2008)	N/A	No change
Number of Adults receiving (all) Job Seekers Allowance (DWP April 2005)	N/A	Number of Adults receiving (all) Job Seekers Allowance (DWP April 2008)	N/A	No change
Number of children (aged 0-15) dependent on a recipient of Job Seekers Allowance (All) (DWP April 2005)	N/A	Number of children (aged 0-15) dependent on a recipient of Job Seekers Allowance (All) (DWP Aug 2008)	N/A	Updated at time of SIMD 2009 v2 revision
		Number of Adults and Children in Tax Credit Families on low incomes (HMRC August 2008)		New indicator added to identify low income families in work. Updated at time of SIMD 2009 v2 revision

Employment domain (Weight = 12)

2006 Indicators	2006 Weight	2009 Indicators	2009 Weight	Main reason for change
Unemployment Claimant Count averaged over 12 months, men aged under 65 and women aged under 60 (NOMIS 2005)	N/A	Unemployment Claimant Count averaged over 12 months, men aged under 65 and women aged under 60 (NOMIS 2008)	N/A	No change
Incapacity Benefit recipients, men aged under 65 and women aged under 60 (DWP August 2005)	N/A	Incapacity Benefit recipients, men aged under 65 and women aged under 60 (DWP August 2008)	N/A	No change
Severe Disablement Allowance recipients, men aged under 65 and women aged under 60 (DWP August 2005)	N/A	Severe Disablement Allowance recipients, men aged under 65 and women aged under 60 (DWP August 2008)	N/A	No change
Compulsory New Deal participants – New Deal for the under 25s and New Deal for the 25+ not included in the unemployment claimant count (DWP August 2005)	N/A	Compulsory New Deal participants – New Deal for the under 25s and New Deal for the 25+ not included in the unemployment claimant count (DWP August 2008)	N/A	No change

Health domain (Weight = 6)

2006 Indicators	2006 Weight	2009 Indicators	2009 Weight	Main reason for change
Standardised Mortality Ratio (ISD 2001-2004)	0.08	Standardised Mortality Ratio (ISD 2004-2007)	0.08	No change
Hospital Episodes related to alcohol use (ISD 2001-2004)	0.14	Hospital Episodes related to alcohol use (ISD 2004-2007)	0.14	Minor change to codes used to define episodes to reflect national guidance
Hospital Episodes related to drug use (ISD 2001-2004)	0.06	Hospital Episodes related to drug use (ISD 2004-2007)	0.06	Minor change to codes used to define episodes to reflect national guidance
Comparative Illness Factor (DWP 2005)	0.33	Comparative Illness Factor (DWP 2008)	0.32	No change
Emergency Admissions to hospital (ISD 2001-2004)	0.32	Emergency Admissions to hospital (ISD 2004-2007)	0.33	No change
Proportion of population being prescribed drugs for anxiety, depression or psychosis (ISD 2004)	0.05	Proportion of population being prescribed drugs for anxiety, depression or psychosis (ISD 2007)	0.05	No change
Proportion of live singleton births of low birth weight (ISD 2001-2004)	0.02	Proportion of live singleton births of low birth weight (ISD 2004-2007)	0.02	No change

Education domain (Weight = 6)

2006 Indicators	2006 Weight	2009 Indicators	2009 Weight	Main reason for change
School pupil absences (2003/4-2004/5)	0.21	School pupil absences (2006/7-2007/8)	0.24	No change
Pupil performance on SQA at stage 4 (2002/3-2004/5)	0.31	Pupil performance on SQA at stage 4 (2005/6-2007/8)	0.25	No change
Working age people with no qualifications (2001 census)	0.24	Working age people with no qualifications (2001 census)	0.26	No change, no update to this indicator, still using census data as best source available
17-21 year olds enrolling into higher education (HESA 2002/3-2004/5)	0.16	17-21 year olds enrolling into higher education (HESA 2005/6-2007/8)	0.15	No change
People aged 16-18 not in full time education (DWP 2005, HESA 2004/5)	0.07	16-19 not in education, employment or training (School leavers data SG 2006/7-2007/8 DWP 2007-2008)	0.09	Replacement indicator to better measure population not in education, employment or training

Housing Domain (Weight = 1)

2006 Indicators	2006 Weight	2009 Indicators	2009 Weight	Main reason for change
Persons in households that are overcrowded (2001 Census)	N/A	Persons in households that are overcrowded (2001 Census)	N/A	No change – no update to indicator as no suitable replacement data found.
Persons in households without central heating (2001 Census)	N/A	Persons in households without central heating (2001 Census)	N/A	No change – no update to indicator as no suitable replacement data found.

Access domain (Weight = 4)

Drive time sub-domain (2006 weight = 0.75 2009 Weight = 0.66)

2006 Indicators	2006 Weight	2009 Indicators	2009 Weight	Main reason for change
Drive time to a GP	0.21	Drive time to a GP	0.22	New computer model used for calculations
Drive time to a petrol station	0.13	Drive time to a petrol station	0.15	New computer model used for calculations
Drive time to a post office	0.13	Drive time to a post office	0.14	New computer model used for calculations. Definition of post offices changed to exclude some outreach services
Drive time to shopping facilities	0.27	Drive time to shopping facilities	0.24	New computer model used for calculations. Change to dataset now means more regional centres included as shopping centres
Drive time to a primary school	0.12	Drive time to a primary school	0.09	New computer model used for calculations
Drive time to a secondary school	0.14	Drive time to a secondary school	0.15	New computer model used for calculations
Total	1.00	Total	1.00	

Public transport sub-domain (2006 weight =0.25 2009 Weight = 0.33)

2006 Indicators	2006 Weight	2009 Indicators	2009 Weight	Main reason for change
Public transport time to a GP	0.56	Public transport time to a GP	0.51	New computer model used for calculations
Public transport time to a Post Office	0.25	Public transport time to a Post Office	0.25	New computer model used for calculations. Definition of post offices changed to exclude some outreach services
Public transport time to Shopping Facilities	0.19	Public transport time to Shopping Facilities	0.24	New computer model used for calculations. Change to dataset now means more regional centres included as shopping centres
Total	1.00	Total	1.00	

Crime domain (Weight = 2)

2006 Indicators	2006 Weight	2009 Indicators	2009 Weight	Main reason for change
Recorded crimes of violence 2004 calendar year	N/A	Recorded crimes of violence 2007/08 financial year	N/A	Move to financial year to move in line with other published statistics. No change to indicator
Recorded domestic housebreaking 2004 calendar year	N/A	Recorded domestic housebreaking 2007/08 financial year	N/A	Move to financial year to move in line with other published statistics. No change to indicator
Recorded vandalism 2004 calendar year	N/A	Recorded vandalism 2007/08 financial year	N/A	Move to financial year to move in line with other published statistics. No change to indicator
Recorded drug offences 2004 calendar year	N/A	Recorded drug offences 2007/08 financial year	N/A	Move to financial year to move in line with other published statistics. No change to indicator
Recorded minor assault 2004 calendar year	N/A	Recorded minor assault 2007/08 financial year	N/A	Move to financial year to move in line with other published statistics. No change to indicator

ANNEX C: Correlation matrix

a) Relationship between the overall SIMD 2009 rank and the SIMD 2009 domain ranks

This table shows the relationship between the ranks of the overall SIMD 2009 and the component domains.

		SIMD 2009 Version 2							
		SIMD 2009 Overall	Income	Employment	Health	Education	Access	Crime	Housing
SIMD 2009 Version 2	SIMD 2009 Overall	**1.00**	0.97	0.96	0.93	0.92	-0.19	0.69	0.71
	Income		**1.00**	0.95	0.91	0.89	-0.30	0.69	0.70
	Employment			**1.00**	0.92	0.87	-0.28	0.68	0.66
	Health				**1.00**	0.85	-0.32	0.69	0.67
	Education					**1.00**	-0.27	0.66	0.70
	Access						**1.00**	-0.49	-0.39
	Crime							**1.00**	0.56
	Housing								**1.00**

b) Relationship between the SIMD 2006 ranks and SIMD 2009 ranks

This table shows the relationship between the ranks of the overall ranks and component domains of the SIMD 2006 and the overall ranks and component domains of SIMD 2006.

		SIMD 2009 Version 2							
		SIMD 2009 Overall	Income	Employment	Health	Education	Access	Crime	Housing
SIMD 2006	SIMD 2006 Overall	**0.98**	0.95	0.95	0.92	0.91	-0.21	0.68	0.73
	Income	0.96	**0.97**	0.94	0.92	0.89	-0.33	0.70	0.72
	Employment	0.95	0.93	**0.97**	0.92	0.87	-0.28	0.68	0.67
	Health	0.93	0.91	0.91	**0.97**	0.86	-0.32	0.69	0.69
	Education	0.89	0.87	0.85	0.84	**0.96**	-0.28	0.64	0.72
	Access	-0.22	-0.32	-0.30	-0.34	-0.28	**0.92**	-0.52	-0.41
	Crime	0.67	0.67	0.66	0.68	0.65	-0.48	**0.84**	0.55
	Housing	0.71	0.70	0.66	0.67	0.70	-0.39	0.56	**1.00**

Pearson correlation coefficients are shown for each pair wise comparison. A value of greater than zero indicates a positive relationship between the pair and a value of less than zero indicates a negative relationship. The closer the coefficient is to positive or negative one the stronger the relationship between the pair of variables. A coefficient of greater than , positive or negative 0.6 indicates a statistically significant relationship.

ANNEX D: Datazones in the 15% most deprived on the overall SIMD by Health Board and Community Health Partnership

Community Health Partnership / Health Board name (Health Boards in bold)	Total number of data zones	15% Most deprived data zones (Overall SIMD) SIMD 2006 No. of data zones	SIMD 2006 % of local area	SIMD 2006 % of Scotland	SIMD 2009 No. of data zones	SIMD 2009 % of local area	SIMD 2009 % of Scotland
East Ayrshire Community Health Partnership	154	28	18.2%	2.9%	27	17.5%	2.8%
North Ayrshire Community Health Partnership	179	33	18.4%	3.4%	43	24.0%	4.4%
South Ayrshire Community Health Partnership	147	13	8.8%	1.3%	18	12.2%	1.8%
Ayrshire & Arran	**480**	**74**	**15.4%**	**7.6%**	**88**	**18.3%**	**9.0%**
Scottish Borders Community Health & Care Partnership	130	3	2.3%	0.3%	5	3.8%	0.5%
Borders	**130**	**3**	**2.3%**	**0.3%**	**5**	**3.8%**	**0.5%**
Dumfries & Galloway Community Health Partnership	193	11	5.7%	1.1%	11	5.7%	1.1%
Dumfries & Galloway	**193**	**11**	**5.7%**	**1.1%**	**11**	**5.7%**	**1.1%**
Dunfermline & West Fife Community Health Partnership	174	19	10.9%	1.9%	17	9.8%	1.7%
Glenrothes & North East Fife Community Health Partnership	155	3	1.9%	0.3%	7	4.5%	0.7%
Kirkcaldy & Levenmouth Community Health Partnership	124	25	20.2%	2.6%	27	21.8%	2.8%
Fife	**453**	**47**	**10.4%**	**4.8%**	**51**	**11.3%**	**5.2%**
Clackmannanshire Community Health Partnership	64	15	23.4%	1.5%	12	18.8%	1.2%
Falkirk Community Health Partnership	197	19	9.6%	1.9%	17	8.6%	1.7%
Stirling Community Health Partnership	110	7	6.4%	0.7%	7	6.4%	0.7%
Forth Valley	**371**	**41**	**11.1%**	**4.2%**	**36**	**9.7%**	**3.7%**
Aberdeen City Community Health Partnership	267	27	10.1%	2.8%	28	10.5%	2.9%
Aberdeenshire Community Health Partnership	301	6	2.0%	0.6%	4	1.3%	0.4%
Moray Community Health & Social Care Partnership	116	0	0.0%	0.0%	1	0.9%	0.1%
Grampian	**684**	**33**	**4.8%**	**3.4%**	**33**	**4.8%**	**3.4%**
East Dunbartonshire Community Health Partnership	127	3	2.4%	0.3%	4	3.1%	0.4%
East Glasgow Community Health & Care Partnership	157	97	61.8%	9.9%	89	56.7%	9.1%
*East Renfrewshire Community Health & Care Partnership **	117	3	2.6%	0.3%	5	4.3%	0.5%
Inverclyde Community Health Partnership	110	42	38.2%	4.3%	42	38.2%	4.3%
North Glasgow Community Health & Care Partnership	119	78	65.5%	8.0%	69	58.0%	7.1%
*North Lanarkshire Community Health Partnership **	22	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Renfrewshire Community Health Partnership	214	36	16.8%	3.7%	43	20.1%	4.4%
South East Glasgow Community Health & Care Partnership	124	40	32.3%	4.1%	38	30.6%	3.9%
*South Lanarkshire Community Health Partnership **	71	22	31.0%	2.3%	21	29.6%	2.2%
South West Glasgow Community Health & Care Partnership	134	65	48.5%	6.7%	59	44.0%	6.0%
West Dunbartonshire Community Health Partnership	118	33	28.0%	3.4%	31	26.3%	3.2%
West Glasgow Community Health & Care Partnership	160	50	31.3%	5.1%	47	29.4%	4.8%
Greater Glasgow & Clyde	**1473**	**469**	**31.8%**	**48.1%**	**448**	**30.4%**	**45.9%**
Argyll & Bute Community Health Partnership	122	10	8.2%	1.0%	10	8.2%	1.0%
Mid Highland Community Health Partnership	122	6	4.9%	0.6%	5	4.1%	0.5%
North Highland Community Health Partnership	57	3	5.3%	0.3%	4	7.0%	0.4%
South East Highland Community Health Partnership	113	8	7.1%	0.8%	7	6.2%	0.7%
Highland	**414**	**27**	**6.5%**	**2.8%**	**26**	**6.3%**	**2.7%**
*East Renfrewshire Community Health & Care Partnership **	3	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
*North Lanarkshire Community Health Partnership **	396	84	21.2%	8.6%	89	22.5%	9.1%
*South Lanarkshire Community Health Partnership **	327	34	10.4%	3.5%	37	11.3%	3.8%
Lanarkshire	**726**	**118**	**16.3%**	**12.1%**	**126**	**17.4%**	**12.9%**
East Lothian Community Health Partnership	120	1	0.8%	0.1%	3	2.5%	0.3%
Edinburgh Community Health Partnership	549	63	11.5%	6.5%	60	10.9%	6.1%
Midlothian Community Health Partnership	112	5	4.5%	0.5%	4	3.6%	0.4%
West Lothian Community Health & Care Partnership	211	14	6.6%	1.4%	19	9.0%	1.9%
Lothian	**992**	**83**	**8.4%**	**8.5%**	**86**	**8.7%**	**8.8%**
Orkney Community Health Partnership	27	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Orkney	**27**	**0**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**
Shetland Community Health Partnership	30	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Shetland	**30**	**0**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**
Angus Community Health Partnership	142	8	5.6%	0.8%	6	4.2%	0.6%
Dundee Community Health Partnership	179	53	29.6%	5.4%	54	30.2%	5.5%
Perth & Kinross Community Health Partnership	175	9	5.1%	0.9%	6	3.4%	0.6%
Tayside	**496**	**70**	**14.1%**	**7.2%**	**66**	**13.3%**	**6.8%**
Western Isles Community Health Partnership	36	0	0.0%	0.0%	0	0.0%	0.0%
Western Isles	**36**	**0**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**	**0**	**0.0%**	**0.0%**
Scotland	**6505**	**976**	**15.0%**	**100.0%**	**976**	**15.0%**	**100.0%**
* These Community Health Partnerships are split across two health boards. Data zones have been counted in the Health Board in which they fall. Totals and percentages for these CHPs are:							
East Renfrewshire Community Health & Care Partnership	*120*	*3*	*2.5%*	*0.3%*	*5*	*4.2%*	*0.5%*
North Lanarkshire Community Health Partnership	*418*	*84*	*20.1%*	*8.6%*	*89*	*21.3%*	*9.1%*
South Lanarkshire Community Health Partnership	*398*	*56*	*14.1%*	*5.7%*	*58*	*14.6%*	*5.9%*

ANNEX E: Population changes

When datazones were created, one of the aims was that they had similar population with a mean of 750 and an ideal range of between 500 and 1,000 people in each. Even when created not all fell within this range because of the other factors used in the creation of zones, existing boundaries, social homogeneity and compactness of shape. Since the creation of datazones the populations in some have increased and some decreased due to demolition and new build The datazone boundaries have not changed as the purpose of them is to provide a fixed area over time.

The change in populations within datazones will also affect the proportion of individuals in each vigintile, decile or quintile of the SIMD. The table below shows the population by Vigintile for each of the SIMD updates. The vigintile populations ranged from 4.75% to 5.20% in SIMD 2004, reduced slightly in SIMD 2006 to 4.84% and 5.17% and have increased again in SIMD 2009 to 4.77% and 5.30%. As the purpose of the SIMD is to identify deprived areas the variation in populations does not have a large impact on the results as all the domains use datazone populations as the denominator in the calculations. Datazone populations could be an issue when using the SIMD to allocate funding for example. In this case the advice is to population weight the funding ie work out how many people live in the deprived areas of interest then allocate on a per head basis.

Population by vigintile for SIMD 2004, 2006 and 2009

SIMD Vigintiles	SIMD 2004 - 2001 Small Area Population Estimate	Percentage of Scotland population	SIMD 2006 - 2004 Small Area Population Estimate	Percentage of Scotland population	SIMD 2009 - 2007 Small Area Population Estimate	Percentage of Scotland population
1 - most deprived	263,043	5.19%	246,044	4.84%	245,232	4.77%
2	262,395	5.18%	252,984	4.98%	247,098	4.80%
3	253,788	5.01%	252,334	4.97%	249,970	4.86%
4	253,086	5.00%	251,119	4.94%	250,810	4.88%
5	253,962	5.01%	248,491	4.89%	252,755	4.91%
6	252,986	5.00%	251,104	4.94%	249,041	4.84%
7	250,959	4.96%	252,162	4.97%	252,570	4.91%
8	253,925	5.01%	250,178	4.93%	253,522	4.93%
9	251,080	4.96%	253,698	5.00%	251,690	4.89%
10	248,491	4.91%	252,225	4.97%	262,611	5.10%
11	246,955	4.88%	253,212	4.99%	255,155	4.96%
12	246,471	4.87%	246,023	4.84%	253,589	4.93%
13	240,667	4.75%	250,497	4.93%	261,250	5.08%
14	253,047	5.00%	256,485	5.05%	261,787	5.09%
15	250,116	4.94%	262,149	5.16%	272,797	5.30%
16	251,688	4.97%	262,391	5.17%	264,925	5.15%
17	254,066	5.02%	256,350	5.05%	270,308	5.25%
18	255,691	5.05%	259,872	5.12%	265,258	5.16%
19	258,629	5.11%	260,260	5.12%	258,180	5.02%
20 - least deprived	263,155	5.20%	260,822	5.14%	265,652	5.16%
Scotland population	5,064,200		5,078,400		5,144,200	

AN OFFICIAL STATISTICS PUBLICATION FOR SCOTLAND

Official and National Statistics are produced to high professional standards set out in the Code of Practice for Official Statistics at http://www.statisticsauthority.gov.uk/assessment/code-of-practice/codeof-practice-for-official-statistics.pdf. Both undergo regular quality assurance reviews to ensure that they meet customer needs and are produced free from any political interference.

Statistics assessed, or subject to assessment, by the UK Statistics Authority carry the National Statistics label, a stamp of assurance that the statistics have been produced and explained to high standards and that they serve the public good.

Further information about Official and National Statistics can be found on the UK Statistics Authority website at www.statisticsauthority.gov.uk

SCOTTISH GOVERNMENT STATISTICIAN GROUP

Our Aim

To provide relevant and reliable information, analysis and advice that meet the needs of government, business and the people of Scotland.

For more information on the Statistician Group, please see the Scottish Government website at www.scotland.gov.uk/statistics

Correspondence and enquiries

Enquiries on this publication should be addressed to:
Matt Perkins
Office of the Chief Statistician
Scottish Government
1N.04, St Andrews House
EDINBURGH EH1 3DG
Telephone: (0131) 244 0442
e-mail: statistics.enquiries@scotland.gsi.gov.uk

General enquiries on Scottish Government statistics can be addressed to:
Office of the Chief Statistician
Scottish Government
1N.04, St Andrews House
EDINBURGH EH1 3DG
Telephone: (0131) 244 0442
e-mail: statistics.enquiries@scotland.gsi.gov.uk

Further contact details, e-mail addresses and details of previous and forthcoming publications can be found on the Scottish Government Website at www.scotland.gov.uk/statistics

Complaints and suggestions

If you are not satisfied with our service, please write to the Chief Statistician, Mr Rob Wishart, 1N.04, St Andrews House, Edinburgh, EH1 3DG, Telephone: (0131) 244 0302, e-mail rob.wishart@scotland.gsi.gov.uk. We also welcome any comments or suggestions that would help us to improve our standards of service.

ScotStat

If you would like to be consulted about new or existing statistical collections or receive notification of forthcoming statistical publications, please register your interest on the Scottish Government ScotStat website at www.scotland.gov.uk/scotstat

Crown Copyright

SIMD 2009 Methodology



Scottish Index of Multiple Deprivation 2009



This document is also available on the Scottish Government website:
www.scotland.gov.uk

RR Donnelley B61831 10/09

Further copies of this document can be obtained by contacting the Office of the Chief Statistician using the details below.

Office of the Chief Statistician
1N.04, St Andrew's House
Regent Road
Edinburgh
EH1 3DG
(0131) 244 0442

General queries about the SIMD can be directed to
neighbourhood.statistics@scotland.gsi.gov.uk
or the telephone number listed above.

ISBN 978-0-7559-8149-6

9 780755 981496