APPENDIX A

ESTIMATES OF SAMPLING ERRORS

Two types of errors affect the estimates from a sample survey: (1) nonsampling errors and (2) sampling errors. Nonsampling errors are the result of errors committed during data collection and data processing, such as failure to locate and interview the correct household, misunderstanding of the questions on the part of either the interviewer or the respondent, and data entry errors. Although numerous efforts were made during the implementation of NFHS-2 to minimize nonsampling errors, they are impossible to avoid and difficult to evaluate statistically.

Sampling errors, on the other hand, can be evaluated statistically. The sample of women selected in NFHS-2 is only one of many samples that could have been selected from the same population, using the same design and expected sample size. Each of these samples would yield results that differ somewhat from the results of the actual sample selected. The sampling error is a measure of the variability among all possible samples. Although the degree of variability is not known exactly, it can be estimated from the survey results.

The sampling error is usually measured by the *standard error* for a particular statistic (for example, a mean or percentage), which is the square root of the variance. The standard error can be used to calculate confidence intervals within which the true value for the population can reasonably be assumed to fall. For example, for any given statistic calculated from a sample survey, the value of that statistic will fall within a range, calculated as the value of the statistic plus or minus two times the standard error of that statistic, in 95 percent of all possible samples of identical size and design.

If the sample of women had been selected as a simple random sample, it would have been possible, for many statistics, to use straightforward formulas for calculating sampling errors. However, the NFHS-2 sample is the result of a multi-stage stratified sample design, and it is therefore necessary to use more complex formulas. The computer software used to calculate sampling errors for NFHS-2 is ISSA (the Integrated System for Survey Analysis). The linear Taylor series approximation method for variance estimation is used for estimates of means, proportions, and ratios. The JACKKNIFE repeated replication method is used with ISSA for variance estimation for more complex statistics such as fertility and mortality rates.

The ISSA package treats any percentage or average as a ratio estimate, r = y/x, where y represents the sample value for variable y, and x represents the number of cases in the group or subgroup under consideration. The variance of r is computed using the formula given below, with the standard error being the square root of the variance:

$$var(r) = \frac{1 - f}{x^2} \sum_{h=1}^{H} \left[\frac{m_h}{m_h - 1} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{m_h} z_{hi}^2 - \frac{z_h^2}{m_h} \right) \right]$$

in which

$$z_{hi} = y_{hi} - rx_{hi}$$
$$z_h = y_h - rx_h$$

where

h represents the stratum that varies from 1 to H, m_h is the total number of PSUs selected in the h^{th} stratum, y_{hi} is the sum of the values of variable y in PSU i in the h^{th} stratum, x_{hi} is the sum of number of cases in PSU i in the h^{th} stratum, f is the overall sampling fraction, which is so small that the program ignores it.

In addition to the standard error, ISSA computes the relative standard error, confidence limits for the estimates, and the design effect (DEFT) for each estimate. The design effect is defined as the ratio of the standard error using the given sample design to the standard error that would result if a simple random sample had been used. A DEFT value of 1.0 indicates that the sample design is as efficient as a simple random sample, while a value greater than 1.0 indicates the increase in the sampling error due to the use of a more complex and less statistically efficient design.

Sampling errors for NFHS-2 are calculated for selected variables considered to be of primary interest. The results in this appendix are presented for the state as a whole and for urban and rural areas separately, except for the variable on salt iodization for which the results are shown separately for large cities, small cities, towns, and rural areas. For each variable, the type of statistic (mean, proportion, ratio, or rate) and the base population are given in Table A.1. Table A.2 presents the value of the statistic (R), its standard error (SE), the relative standard error (SE/R), and the 95 percent confidence limits (R±2SE), for each variable. In addition, for all variables except the fertility and mortality rates, the table shows the unweighted number of cases (N), the weighted number of cases (WN), the standard error assuming a simple random sample (SER), and the design effect (DEFT).

Table A.1 List of selected variables for sampling errors, Bihar, 1998–99

Variable	Estimate	Base population
Sex ratio	Ratio	De facto household population
Illiterate	Proportion	De facto household population age 6 and above
Have tuberculosis	Rate	1,000 de jure household population
Salt iodized at 15 ppm or more	Proportion	Households
Illiterate	Proportion	Ever-married women age 15-49
High school complete and above	Proportion	Ever-married women age 15–49
Currently married	Proportion	Ever-married women age 15–49
Number of children ever born	Mean	Currently married women age 15-49
Number of living children	Mean	Currently married women age 15-49
Have ever used any method	Proportion	Currently married women age 15-49
Currently using any method	Proportion	Currently married women age 15-49
Currently using any modern method	Proportion	Currently married women age 15-49
Currently using pills	Proportion	Currently married women age 15-49
Currently using IUD	Proportion	Currently married women age 15-49
Currently using condoms	Proportion	Currently married women age 15-49
Currently using female sterilization	Proportion	Currently married women age 15-49
Currently using male sterilization	Proportion	Currently married women age 15-49
Currently using rhythm/safe period	Proportion	Currently married women age 15-49
Using public source for modern method	Proportion	Current users of modern methods
Do not want any more children	Proportion	Currently married women age 15-49
Want to delay birth at least 2 years	Proportion	Currently married women age 15-49
Ideal number of children	Mean	Ever-married women age 15–49
Ideal number of sons	Mean	Ever-married women age 15-49
Ideal number of daughters	Mean	Ever-married women age 15-49
Visited by health/family planning worker	Proportion	Ever-married women age 15–49
Received no antenatal check-up	Proportion	Births in past 3 years
Received iron and folic acid tablets or syrup	Proportion	Births in past 3 years
Received medical assistance during delivery	Proportion	Births in past 3 years
Received postpartum check-up	Proportion	Noninstitutional births in past 3 years
Had diarrhoea in past 2 weeks	Proportion	Children under age 3 years
Treated with ORS packets	Proportion	Children under age 3 with diarrhoea in past 2 weeks
Taken to a health facility/provider for diarrhoea	Proportion	Children under age 3 with diarrhoea in past 2 weeks
Showing a vaccination card	Proportion	Children age 12–23 months
Received BCG vaccination	Proportion	Children age 12–23 months
Received DPT vaccination (3 doses)	Proportion	Children age 12–23 months
Received polio vaccination (3 doses)	Proportion	Children age 12–23 months
Received measles vaccination	Proportion	Children age 12–23 months
Fully vaccinated	Proportion	Children age 12–23 months
Received Vitamin A	Proportion	Children age 12–35 months
Had reproductive health problem	Proportion	Currently married women age 15–49
Not involved in any decisionmaking	Proportion	Ever-married women age 15–49
Ever beaten or physically mistreated since	•	, and the second
age 15	Proportion	Ever-married women age 15–49
Not worked in past 12 months	Proportion	Ever-married women age 15–49
Anaemic women	Proportion	Ever-married women age 15-49
Anaemic children	Proportion	Children age 6–35 months
Fertility rates	Rate	All women, population
Mortality rates	Rate	Births, population
•		

		Standard	Number		Standard error assuming	Design	Relative standard	Confider	nce limits
Variable/ residence	Value (R)	error (SE)	Unweighted (N)	Weighted (WN)	SRS (SER)	effect (DEFT)	error (SE/R)	R-2SE	R+2SE
Sex ratio (De	e facto hous	sehold populat	tion)						
Urban	932	28.009	2,146	2,201	24.394	1.148	0.030	876	988
Rural	955	8.305	17,181	17,112	8.392	0.990	0.009	939	972
Total	953	8.060	19,327	19,314	7.937	1.016	0.008	937	969
Illiterate (De	facto house	ehold populati	on age 6 and ab	ove)					
Urban	0.261	0.025	3,615	3,707	0.012	2.040	0.097	0.210	0.311
Rural	0.540	0.010	27,941	27,827	0.005	2.064	0.019	0.520	0.560
Total	0.507	0.011	31,556	31,534	0.005	2.326	0.022	0.485	0.529
Have tuberc	ulosis (1,00	0 <i>de jure</i> hous	sehold population	٦)					
Urban	6.290	1.504	4,223	4,330	1.443	1.043	0.239	3.282	9.299
Rural	10.347	0.763	34,478	34,339	0.627	1.216	0.074	8.821	11.874
Total	9.893	0.703	38,701	38,669	0.581	1.211	0.071	8.487	11.299
Salt iodized	at 15 ppm o	or more (Hous	eholds)						
Large city	0.773	0.121	75	77	0.049	2.483	0.156	0.532	1.000
Small city	0.837	0.054	159	163	0.029	1.838	0.065	0.729	0.945
Town	0.756	0.034	467	480	0.020	1.729	0.045	0.687	0.825
Rural	0.430	0.015	5,644	5,625	0.007	2.317	0.036	0.399	0.460
Total	0.469	0.016	6,345	6,345	0.006	2.478	0.033	0.438	0.500
Illiterate (Ev	er-married v	women age 15	-4 9)						
Urban	0.462	0.037	687	718	0.019	1.959	0.081	0.388	0.537
Rural	0.801	0.011	6,337	6,306	0.005	2.153	0.013	0.779	0.823
Total	0.766	0.012	7,024	7,024	0.005	2.372	0.016	0.742	0.790
High school	complete a	nd above (Eve	er-married wome	n age 15–49)					
Urban	0.278	0.035	687	718	0.017	2.023	0.124	0.209	0.347
Rural	0.063	0.007	6,337	6,306	0.003	2.179	0.106	0.049	0.076
Total	0.085	0.008	7,024	7,024	0.003	2.376	0.093	0.069	0.100
Currently ma	arried (Ever	-married wom	en age 15–49)						
Urban	0.942	0.007	687	718	0.009	0.828	0.008	0.928	0.957
Rural	0.949	0.004	6,337	6,306	0.003	1.361	0.004	0.941	0.956
Total	0.948	0.003	7,024	7,024	0.003	1.318	0.004	0.941	0.955
Number of c	hildren eve	r born (Currer	ntly married wom	en age 15–49	9)				
Urban	3.303	0.090	647	677	0.089	1.009	0.027	3.122	3.483
Rural	3.284	0.036	6,015	5,984	0.031	1.180	0.011	3.212	3.357
Total	3.286	0.034	6,662	6,661	0.029	1.163	0.010	3.218	3.353
Number of li	ving childre	n (Currently m	arried women a	ge 15–49)					
Urban	3.046	0.080	647	677	0.081	0.991	0.026	2.885	3.207
Rural	2.850	0.029	6,015	5,984	0.026	1.121	0.010	2.791	2.909
Total	2.870	0.028	6,662	6,661	0.025	1.116	0.010	2.814	2.925
Have ever u	sed any me	thod (Currentl	y married wome	n age 15–49)					
Urban	0.448	0.030	647	677	0.020	1.551	0.068	0.387	0.509
Rural	0.257	0.010	6,015	5,984	0.006	1.813	0.040	0.236	0.277
Total	0.276	0.010	6,662	6,661	0.005	1.878	0.037	0.256	0.297

		Standard	Number		Standard error assuming	Design	Relative standard	Confider	nce limits
Variable/ residence	Value (R)	error (SE)	Unweighted (N)	Weighted (WN)	SRS (SER)	effect (DEFT)	error (SE/R)	R-2SE	R+2SE
Currently us	sing any me	thod (Currently	y married wome	n age 15–49)					
Urban	0.389	0.028	647	677	0.019	1.455	0.072	0.333	0.445
Rural	0.229	0.010	6,015	5,984	0.005	1.763	0.042	0.210	0.248
Total	0.245	0.010	6,662	6,661	0.005	1.804	0.039	0.226	0.264
,	0 ,	`	Currently marrie	ed women age	15–49)				
Urban	0.354	0.025	647	677	0.019	1.356	0.072	0.303	0.405
Rural	0.209	0.009	6,015	5,984 6,661	0.005	1.732	0.043	0.191	0.227
Total	0.224	0.009	6,662	6,661	0.005	1.756	0.040	0.206	0.242
-		-	d women age 15						
Urban	0.029	0.006	647	677	0.007	0.940	0.215	0.016	0.041
Rural	0.008	0.001 0.001	6,015	5,984 6,661	0.001	1.026 1.052	0.149 0.129	0.005 0.007	0.010
Total	0.010		6,662	6,661	0.001	1.052	0.129	0.007	0.012
-		-	d women age 15						
Urban	0.012	0.004	647	677	0.004	0.961	0.341	0.004	0.020
Rural	0.004	0.001	6,015	5,984	0.001	1.292	0.248	0.002	0.007
Total	0.005	0.001	6,662	6,661	0.001	1.233	0.207	0.003	0.007
Currently us	sing condon	ns (Currently n	narried women a	ige 15–49)					
Urban	0.030	0.009	647	677	0.007	1.284	0.288	0.013	0.047
Rural	0.004	0.001	6,015	5,984	0.001	1.132	0.219	0.002	0.006
Total	0.007	0.001	6,662	6,661	0.001	1.265	0.185	0.004	0.010
Currently us	sing female	sterilization (C	urrently married	women age	15–49)				
Urban	0.266	0.020	647	677	0.017	1.175	0.077	0.225	0.307
Rural	0.183	0.008	6,015	5,984	0.005	1.679	0.046	0.167	0.200
Total	0.192	800.0	6,662	6,661	0.005	1.650	0.041	0.176	0.208
Currently us	sing male st	erilization (Cui	rently married w	omen age 15	5–49)				
Urban	0.017	0.007	647	677	0.005	1.325	0.400	0.003	0.030
Rural	0.009	0.001	6,015	5,984	0.001	1.099	0.149	0.006	0.012
Total	0.010	0.001	6,662	6,661	0.001	1.147	0.142	0.007	0.012
Currently us	sing rhythm/	/safe period (C	urrently married	women age	15–49)				
Urban	0.015	0.004	647	677	0.005	0.913	0.290	0.006	0.024
Rural	0.008	0.001	6,015	5,984	0.001	1.165	0.167	0.005	0.011
Total	0.009	0.001	6,662	6,661	0.001	1.131	0.148	0.006	0.011
Using public	source for	modern metho	od (Current user	s of modern r	nethods)				
Urban	0.560	0.030	229	239	0.033	0.898	0.053	0.501	0.619
Rural	0.809	0.013	1,260	1,250	0.011	1.172	0.016	0.783	0.835
Total	0.769	0.013	1,489	1,490	0.011	1.229	0.017	0.742	0.796
Do not want	t any more	children (Curre	ently married wo	men age 15-4	49)				
Urban	0.311	0.026	647	677	0.018	1.428	0.084	0.259	0.363
Rural	0.301	0.007	6,015	5,984	0.006	1.242	0.024	0.287	0.316
Total	0.302	0.007	6,662	6,661	0.006	1.260	0.023	0.288	0.316
Want to dela	ay birth at le	east 2 years (C	Currently married	l women age	15–49)				
Urban	0.159	0.015	647	677	0.014	1.048	0.095	0.129	0.189
Rural	0.158	0.006	6,015	5,984	0.005	1.173	0.035	0.147	0.169
Total	0.158	0.005	6,662	6,661	0.004	1.158	0.033	0.148	0.169

		Standard	Number	of cases	Standard error assuming	Design	Relative standard	Confider	nce limits
Variable/ residence	Value (R)	error (SE)	Unweighted (N)	Weighted (WN)	SRS (SER)	effect (DEFT)	error (SE/R)	R-2SE	R+2SE
Ideal numbe	er of childre	n (Ever-marrie	d women age 1	5–49)					
Urban	2.802	0.074	662	693	0.041	1.799	0.026	2.655	2.949
Rural	3.312	0.028	5,883	5,856	0.015	1.892	0.008	3.256	3.367
Total	3.258	0.028	6,545	6,549	0.014	1.983	0.008	3.202	3.313
ldeal numbe	er of sons (E		omen age 15–4	,					
Urban	1.541	0.057	662	693	0.033	1.730	0.037	1.428	1.655
Rural	1.925	0.021	5,878 6 540	5,851	0.011	1.935	0.011	1.883	1.966
Total	1.884	0.021	6,540	6,544	0.010	2.014	0.011	1.842	1.926
	ŭ	`	ried women age	,					
Urban	1.107	0.034	662 5 979	693 5 951	0.022	1.516	0.031	1.040	1.175
Rural Total	1.294 1.274	0.012 0.012	5,878 6,540	5,851 6,544	0.008 0.008	1.480 1.541	0.009 0.009	1.270 1.250	1.319 1.299
			•	,		1.541	0.003	1.200	1.233
	-	-	er (Ever-married	_		4.0==		0.00=	
Urban Rural	0.018 0.025	0.005 0.003	687 6,337	718 6,306	0.005 0.002	1.072 1.553	0.304 0.123	0.007 0.019	0.029 0.031
Rurai Total	0.025	0.003	6,337 7,024	6,306 7,024	0.002	1.553	0.123	0.019	0.031
			hs in past 3 year		0.002	1.020	0.110	0.010	0.020
					0.000	4 400	0.457	0.200	0.400
Urban Rural	0.306 0.656	0.048 0.018	245 2,703	258 2,689	0.032 0.010	1.493 1.829	0.157 0.027	0.209 0.620	0.402 0.692
Total	0.625	0.018	2,948	2,947	0.010	1.847	0.028	0.590	0.661
Received ire	on and folic	acid tablets or	syrup (Births in	past 3 years))				
Urban	0.461	0.049	245	258	0.032	1.527	0.106	0.364	0.558
Rural	0.220	0.012	2,703	2,689	0.008	1.461	0.053	0.304	0.243
Total	0.241	0.012	2,948	2,947	0.008	1.540	0.050	0.217	0.265
Received m	edical assis	stance during o	delivery (Births ir	n past 3 years	:)				
Urban	0.519	0.053	245	258	0.035	1.535	0.103	0.412	0.625
Rural	0.206	0.015	2,703	2,689	0.008	1.791	0.103	0.412	0.023
Total	0.234	0.015	2,948	2,947	0.008	1.788	0.064	0.204	0.264
Received po	stpartum c	heck-up (Noni	nstitutional births	s in past 3 yea	ars)				
Urban	0.100	0.022	143	150	0.025	0.893	0.225	0.055	0.145
Rural	0.100	0.022	2,347	2,330	0.023	1.191	0.223	0.033	0.145
Total	0.100	0.007	2,490	2,480	0.006	1.173	0.070	0.086	0.115
Had diarrho	ea in past 2	weeks (Child	ren under age 3	years)					
Urban	0.156	0.024	232	244	0.024	1.014	0.155	0.108	0.205
Rural	0.179	0.009	2,463	2,448	0.008	1.162	0.050	0.161	0.197
Total	0.177	0.008	2,695	2,692	0.007	1.147	0.048	0.160	0.194
Treated with	ORS pack	ets (Children u	under age 3 with	diarrhoea in	past 2 weeks)				
Urban	0.281	0.084	36	38	0.075	1.126	0.299	0.113	0.449
Rural	0.143	0.017	440 476	439 477	0.017	1.014	0.119	0.109	0.177
Total	0.154	0.017	476	477	0.017	1.022	0.111	0.120	0.188
Taken to a h	nealth facilit	y/provider for	diarrhoea (Child	ren under age	e 3 with diarrho	pea in past	2 weeks)		
Urban	0.389	0.060	36	38	0.081	0.744	0.155	0.269	0.510
Rural	0.513	0.025	440 476	439 477	0.024	1.038	0.049	0.462	0.563
Total	0.503	0.024	476	477	0.023	1.018	0.047	0.455	0.550

		Standard	Number o	of cases	Standard error assuming	Design	Relative standard	Confider	nce limits
Variable/ residence	Value (R)	error (SE)	Unweighted (N)	Weighted (WN)	SRS (SER)	effect (DEFT)	error (SE/R)	R-2SE	R+2SE
Showing a v	accination	card (Children	age 12–23 mon	ths)					
Urban	0.203	0.052	76	80	0.046	1.123	0.255	0.100	0.306
Rural	0.171	0.014	806	802	0.013	1.043	0.081	0.143	0.199
Total	0.174	0.013	882	882	0.013	1.047	0.077	0.147	0.201
Received Bo	CG vaccina	•	age 12–23 mont	,					
Urban	0.635	0.074	76	80	0.055	1.347	0.117	0.487	0.783
Rural	0.351	0.020	806	802	0.017	1.178	0.057	0.312	0.391
Total	0.377	0.020	882	882	0.016	1.220	0.053	0.337	0.417
Received Di	PT vaccina	tion (3 doses)	(Children age 12	2–23 months)					
Urban	0.370	0.063	76	80	0.055	1.134	0.169	0.245	0.495
Rural	0.230	0.017	806	802	0.015	1.122	0.073	0.196	0.263
Total	0.242	0.016	882	882	0.014	1.136	0.068	0.209	0.275
Received po	olio vaccina	tion (3 doses)	(Children age 12	2–23 months)					
Urban	0.540	0.052	76	80	0.057	0.914	0.096	0.436	0.645
Rural	0.397	0.021	806	802	0.017	1.193	0.052	0.356	0.438
Total	0.410	0.020	882	882	0.017	1.183	0.048	0.371	0.449
Received m	easles vac	cination (Child	ren age 12–23 m	nonths)					
Urban	0.398	0.063	76	80	0.056	1.127	0.159	0.272	0.524
Rural	0.143	0.014	806	802	0.012	1.148	0.100	0.115	0.172
Total	0.166	0.015	882	882	0.013	1.182	0.090	0.136	0.196
Fully vaccin	ated (Childi	ren age 12–23	months)						
Urban	0.224	0.038	76	80	0.048	0.796	0.169	0.148	0.300
Rural	0.099	0.012	806	802	0.011	1.094	0.116	0.076	0.122
Total	0.110	0.011	882	882	0.011	1.078	0.103	0.088	0.133
Received Vi	tamin A (Cl	nildren age 12	-35 months)						
Urban	0.194	0.040	142	150	0.035	1.130	0.204	0.115	0.273
Rural	0.093	0.009	1,622	1,613	0.007	1.241	0.097	0.075	0.111
Total	0.102	0.009	1,764	1,762	0.007	1.238	0.089	0.083	0.120
Had reprodu	ıctive healtl	h problem (Cu	rrently married w	omen age 15	5–49)				
Urban	0.371	0.025	647	677	0.019	1.319	0.068	0.321	0.421
Rural	0.451	0.010	6,015	5,984	0.006	1.634	0.023	0.430	0.472
Total	0.442	0.010	6,662	6,661	0.006	1.624	0.022	0.423	0.462
Not involved	I in any dec	sisionmaking (I	Ever-married wo	men age 15–	49)				
Urban	0.104	0.018	687	718	0.012	1.577	0.177	0.067	0.141
Rural	0.139	0.009	6,337	6,306	0.004	2.042	0.064	0.121	0.156
Total	0.135	0.008	7,024	7,024	0.004	2.008	0.061	0.119	0.151
Ever beaten	or physica	lly mistreated	since age 15 (Ev	er-married w	omen age 15-	-49)			
Urban	0.189	0.024	687	718	0.015	1.593	0.126	0.142	0.237
Rural	0.275	0.008	6,337	6,306	0.006	1.506	0.031	0.258	0.292
Total	0.266	0.008	7,024	7,024	0.005	1.534	0.030	0.250	0.282
Not worked	in past 12 r	months (Ever-r	married women a	age 15–49)					
Urban	0.869	0.015	687	718	0.013	1.130	0.017	0.840	0.899
Rural	0.720	0.011	6,337	6,306	0.006	2.034	0.016	0.698	0.743
Total	0.736	0.011	7,024	7,024	0.005	2.044	0.015	0.714	0.757

Table A.2 S	Sampling er	rors, Bihar, 19	98-99 (Contd.)						
		Standard	Number	of cases	Standard error assuming	Design	Relative standard	Confider	ice limits
Variable/ residence	Value (R)	error (SE)	Unweighted (N)	Weighted (WN)	SRS (SER)	effect (DEFT)	error (SE/R)	R-2SE	R+2SE
Anaemic wo	men (Ever-	-married wome	en age 15–49)						
Urban Rural Total	0.596 0.639 0.634	0.029 0.012 0.011	571 5,652 6,223	637 5,586 6,223	0.021 0.006 0.006	1.418 1.809 1.771	0.049 0.018 0.017	0.538 0.615 0.613	0.654 0.662 0.656
Anaemic chi	ildren (Child	dren age 6–35	months)						
Urban Rural Total	0.807 0.813 0.813	0.037 0.013 0.013	149 1,511 1,660	167 1,490 1,657	0.032 0.010 0.010	1.153 1.333 1.309	0.046 0.016 0.015	0.732 0.786 0.787	0.882 0.840 0.838

Table A.2 Sa	ampling erro	rs, Bihar, 199	8-99 (Contd.))	
Variable/	Value	Standard error	Relative standard error	Confiden	ice limits
residence	(R)	(SE)	(SE/R)	R-2SE	R+2SE
Total fertility	rate (Womer	n age 15–49)			
Urban Rural Total	2.748 3.588 3.489	0.167 0.080 0.074	0.061 0.022 0.021	2.414 3.427 3.341	3.081 3.749 3.636
Age-specific	fertility rate (Women age	15–19)		
Urban Rural Total	0.072 0.119 0.113	0.009 0.005 0.005	0.125 0.044 0.042	0.054 0.108 0.103	0.090 0.129 0.123
Age-specific	fertility rate (Women age	20–24)		
Urban Rural Total	0.200 0.226 0.223	0.019 0.006 0.006	0.094 0.029 0.027	0.162 0.213 0.211	0.238 0.239 0.235
Age-specific	fertility rate (Women age	25–29)		
Urban Rural Total	0.160 0.182 0.180	0.020 0.006 0.006	0.123 0.034 0.033	0.120 0.170 0.168	0.199 0.195 0.192
Age-specific	fertility rate (Women age	30–34)		
Urban Rural Total	0.088 0.115 0.112	0.020 0.007 0.006	0.222 0.058 0.057	0.049 0.102 0.099	0.127 0.129 0.124
Age-specific	fertility rate (Women age	35–39)		
Urban Rural Total	0.030 0.053 0.050	0.010 0.005 0.005	0.322 0.095 0.091	0.011 0.043 0.041	0.050 0.063 0.059
Age-specific	fertility rate (Women age	40–44)		
Urban Rural Total	0.000 0.020 0.018	0.000 0.004 0.003	NC 0.173 0.175	0.000 0.013 0.011	0.000 0.027 0.024
Age-specific	fertility rate (Women age	45–49)		
Urban Rural Total	0.000 0.003 0.002	0.000 0.002 0.001	NC 0.577 0.576	0.000 0.000 0.000	0.000 0.006 0.005

Table A.2 S	ampling erro	ors, Bihar, 199	8-99 (Contd.	.)	
Variable/	Value	Standard	Relative standard	Confide	nce limits
residence	(R)	error (SE)	error (SE/R)	R-2SE	R+2SE
Neonatal mo	ortality rate (5-year period	preceding su	rvey)	
Urban Rural Total	32.751 47.810 46.476	10.480 3.703 3.495	0.320 0.077 0.075	11.791 40.404 39.487	53.711 55.216 53.465
Infant mortal	lity rate ₁q₀ (5-year period	preceding su	rvey)	
Urban Rural Total	53.300 74.810 72.924	10.956 4.579 4.293	0.206 0.061 0.059	31.388 65.652 64.338	75.212 83.969 81.511
Child mortali	ity rate 4q1 (5	5-year period p	oreceding sur	vey)	
Urban Rural Total	15.803 36.493 34.686	8.037 2.759 2.628	0.509 0.076 0.076	0.000 30.974 29.429	31.877 42.012 39.942
Under-five m	nortality rate	₅q₀ (5-year pe	riod precedin	ig survey)	
Urban Rural Total	68.261 108.573 105.081	13.476 5.515 5.207	0.197 0.051 0.050	41.308 97.543 94.666	95.213 119.603 115.495
Crude death	rate (Based	l on Househol	d Questionna	ire)	
Urban Rural Total	8.317 11.641 11.269	1.056 0.560 0.527	0.127 0.048 0.047	6.206 10.521 10.215	10.429 12.761 12.323
Crude birth r	ate (Based o	on women's b	irth history)		
Urban Rural Total	22.329 28.813 28.106	1.314 0.585 0.542	0.059 0.020 0.019	19.701 27.644 27.023	24.957 29.982 29.190
NC: Not calc	ulated beca	use denomina	tor is 0.000.		

NC: Not calculated because denominator is 0.000. SRS: Simple random sample

APPENDIX B

DATA QUALITY TABLES

The purpose of this appendix is to provide the data user with an overview of the general quality of the NFHS-2 data. Whereas Appendix A is concerned with sampling errors and their effects on the survey results, the tables in this appendix refer to possible *nonsampling* errors: for example, rounding or heaping on certain ages or dates; omission of events occurring further in the past; deliberate distortion of information by some interviewers in an attempt to lighten their workload; noncooperation of the respondent in providing information; or refusal to have children measured for height and weight or tested for anaemia. A description of the likely magnitude of such nonsampling errors is provided in this appendix.

The distribution of the *de facto* household population by single years of age and sex is presented in Table B.1. In many (but not all) cases, the respondent was the head of the household. It is well documented that ages are poorly reported in most parts of India. Ages are of little relevance to much of the rural population in particular, and no amount of probing will ensure that ages are properly recorded. In interviewer training for NFHS-2, a great deal of emphasis was placed on obtaining as accurate information as possible on ages and dates of events. Nevertheless, it is clear that age reporting in NFHS-2 shares the same problems inherent in all Indian censuses and surveys. Heaping on ages ending in 0, 2, 5, and 8 is considerable and is particularly severe in the older age groups. Another measure of the quality of the NFHS-2 age data is the percentage of persons whose ages were recorded as not known or missing. In Bihar, information on age was missing for only 6 persons out of 37,713 persons who stayed in the sample households the night before the interview.

Table B.2 examines the possibility that some eligible women (that is, ever-married women age 15–49) were not properly identified in NFHS-2. In some surveys, interviewers may try to reduce their workload by pushing women out of the eligible age range or recording ever-married women as never married so that they will not have to be interviewed. If such practices were being followed to a noticeable extent, Table B.2 would normally show (1) a shortage of ever-married women in the 45–49 age group and an excess in the 50–54 age group or (2) an unusually low proportion of ever-married women by age. Neither of these patterns is evident in the NFHS-2 data. It can, therefore, be concluded that there was no concerted effort to misidentify eligible women in NFHS-2 in Bihar.

One traditional measure of the quality of data is the extent to which information is missing on key variables. Although completeness of responses does not necessarily indicate that the results are accurate, the existence of missing information for a large number of cases would suggest that data collection was not carried out with sufficient care. In NFHS-2 in Bihar, the extent of missing information is very low for age at death, age at first marriage, woman's education, and prevalence of diarrhoea in the two weeks preceding the survey (Table B.3). Missing information is higher for the month of birth of children born in the past 15 years. It is important to note, however, that the year of birth is reported almost in every case in which the month is missing. Data on height and weight of children and woman's haemoglobin level are available for more than 88 percent of the members of the respective reference groups. Missing information is highest (24 percent) for children's haemoglobin level. The response rates are

Table B.1 Household age distribution

Single-year age distribution of de facto household population by sex (weighted), Bihar, 1998–99

	Ma	ale	Fem	nale		Ma	ale	Fen	nale
Age	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Age	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
< 1	514	2.7	465	2.5	38	256	1.3	234	1.3
1	477	2.5	459	2.5	39	128	0.7	159	0.9
2	465	2.4	478	2.6	40	289	1.5	191	1.0
3	516	2.7	467	2.5	41	128	0.7	121	0.7
4	567	2.9	538	2.9	42	254	1.3	232	1.3
5	651	3.4	582	3.2	43	68	0.4	84	0.5
6	711	3.7	640	3.5	44	100	0.5	124	0.7
7	477	2.5	496	2.7	45	260	1.3	175	1.0
8	723	3.7	662	3.6	46	153	0.8	149	0.8
9	469	2.4	426	2.3	47	66	0.3	109	0.6
10	659	3.4	605	3.3	48	223	1.2	150	0.8
11	379	2.0	364	2.0	49	99	0.5	48	0.3
12	684	3.5	635	3.4	50	221	1.1	64	0.3
13	351	1.8	377	2.0	51	120	0.6	67	0.4
14	465	2.4	447	2.4	52	162	0.8	150	0.8
15	383	2.0	328	1.8	53	62	0.3	87	0.5
16	447	2.3	437	2.4	54	64	0.3	99	0.5
17	239	1.2	281	1.5	55	149	0.8	148	0.8
18	508	2.6	471	2.6	56	123	0.6	156	0.8
19	249	1.3	320	1.7	57	40	0.2	63	0.3
20	353	1.8	370	2.0	58	129	0.7	135	0.7
21	225	1.2	297	1.6	59	60	0.3	62	0.3
22	410	2.1	426	2.3	60	248	1.3	136	0.7
23	219	1.1	234	1.3	61	63	0.3	77	0.4
24	291	1.5	339	1.8	62	139	0.7	129	0.7
25	353	1.8	352	1.9	63	40	0.2	41	0.2
26	350	1.8	388	2.1	64	49	0.3	46	0.2
27	158	0.8	172	0.9	65	164	0.9	103	0.6
28	339	1.8	404	2.2	66	58	0.3	54	0.3
<u> 2</u> 9	163	0.8	257	1.4	67	22	0.1	36	0.2
30	387	2.0	314	1.7	68	80	0.4	75	0.4
31	145	0.8	201	1.1	69	25	0.1	31	0.2
32	377	2.0	340	1.8	70+	493	2.6	295	1.6
33	114	0.6	134	0.7	Don't			_00	
34	164	0.8	184	1.0	know/				
35	399	2.1	295	1.6	missing	2	0.0	4	0.0
36	313	1.6	278	1.5		_	0.0	•	0.0
37	83	0.4	107	0.6	Total	19,314	100.0	18,399	100.0

Note: The *de facto* population includes all usual residents and visitors who stayed in the household the night before the interview.

acceptable for the height and weight and child haemoglobin level since in any survey many children cannot be measured because they are not at home or they are ill at the time of the survey. In some cases when the child was at home, either the child refused to be measured or the mother refused to allow the child to be measured because of cultural beliefs. Before undertaking haemoglobin measurements, a separate 'informed consent' statement was read to the respondent explaining that participation in the haemoglobin testing was completely voluntary. At this point, some women declined to take part in the anaemia testing and/or to have their children participate.

Table B.2 Age distribution of eligible and interviewed women

Age distribution of the *de facto* household population of women age 10–54 and of interviewed women age 15–49, and percentage of eligible women who were interviewed (weighted), Bihar, 1998–99

		Ever-	Interviewed	l women	Davaget
Age	All women	married women	Number	Percent	Percent interviewed
10-14	2,427	14	NA	NA	NA
15-19	1,836	685	660	9.4	96.3
20-24	1,666	1,446	1,385	19.8	95.8
25-29	1,573	1,536	1,481	21.1	96.4
30-34	1,173	1,168	1,130	16.1	96.8
35-39	1,074	1,072	1,033	14.7	96.4
40-44	751	751	719	10.3	95.7
45-49	631	630	599	8.6	95.1
50-54	466	466	NA	NA	NA
15–49	8,704	7,288	7,008	100.0	96.1

Note: The *de facto* population includes all usual residents and visitors who stayed in the household the night before the interview. For all columns, the age distribution is taken from ages reported in the Household Questionnaire. The total number of interviewed women in this table differs from the total number in earlier tables because this table uses household weights rather than women's weights for the calculations.

NA: Not applicable

Table B.3 Completeness of reporting

Percentage of observations with missing information for selected demographic and health indicators (weighted), Bihar, 1998–99

Indicator	Reference group	Percentage missing information	Number of cases
Birth date	Births in past 15 years		
Month only	, ,	1.20	16,022
Month and year		0.04	16,022
Age at death	Deaths to births in past 15 years	0.46	1,786
Age at first marriage	Ever-married women age 15-49	0.69	7,024
Woman's education	Ever-married women age 15-49	0.00	7,024
Anthropometry	Living children age 0-35 months		
Height	3	10.22	2,732
Weight		10.25	2,732
Height or weight		10.52	2,732
Woman's haemoglobin level	Ever-married women age 15-49	11.65	7,024
Child's haemoglobin level	Living children age 6–35 months	23.59	2,161
Diarrhoea in past 2 weeks	Living children age 1–35 months	0.35	2,692

Another measure of data quality is the completeness and accuracy of information on births. Table B.4 examines the distribution of births by calendar year to identify any unusual patterns that may indicate that births have been omitted or that the ages of children have been displaced. Overall, 99 percent of living children listed in the birth history had complete birth dates recorded, as did 97 percent of children who had died. The completeness of data on birth dates for both surviving and nonsurviving children is excellent, particularly in recent years. The annual data on the number of births can be examined to see if there is an abnormally large decline in the number of births after January 1995, the cutoff point for the health questions and measurements made on young children in the survey. It is typical for the annual number of births to fluctuate somewhat, so small annual fluctuations are to be expected. However, the sharp drop in the annual number of births between 1992–94 and 1995–98 (particularly for nonsurviving children) suggests that there has been some omission of recent births or displacement of birth dates that could result in an underestimate of both fertility and infant mortality rates for recent years.

Many surveys that include both demographic information and health information for children below a specified age have been subject to a substantial amount of age displacement. In particular, there is often a tendency for interviewers to 'age' children out of the eligible period for asking health questions. This problem was well known before NFHS-2 began; therefore, interviewer training stressed this issue to try to reduce the extent of biases due to age displacement. Apparently, the training was not entirely successful in avoiding this type of problem, however.

Table B.5 presents information on the reporting of age at death in days. Results from the table suggest that early infant deaths have not been seriously underreported in Bihar, because the ratios of deaths under seven days to all neonatal deaths are consistently high (a ratio of less than 25 percent is often used as a guideline to indicate underreporting of early neonatal deaths). The ratios are 77 for 0–4 years, 78 for 5–9 years, and 71 for 10–14 years preceding the survey. Although there was no severe underreporting of early neonatal deaths in NFHS-2, there was some misreporting of age at death due to a preference for reporting the age at death at 6, 8, 12, 15, and 20 days (Table B.5).

Table B.6 shows the percentage of infant deaths that occurred during the neonatal period. These percentages are also consistently high for the different time periods preceding the survey, suggesting that there is no major omission of early deaths. One problem that is inherent in most retrospective surveys is heaping of the age at death on certain digits, e.g., 6, 12, and 18 months. Misreporting of age at death will bias estimates of the age pattern of mortality if the net result of misreporting is the transference of deaths between age segments for which the rates are calculated. For example, an overestimate of child mortality relative to infant mortality may result if children dying during the first year of life are reported as having died at age one or older. Thus, heaping at 12 months can bias the mortality estimates because a certain fraction of these deaths may have actually occurred during infancy (that is, at ages 0–11 months). In this case, heaping would bias the infant mortality rate downward and the child mortality rate upward.

Table B.4 Births by calendar year

Number of births, percent with complete birth date, sex ratio at birth, and calendar year ratio for children still alive at the time of the survey (L), children who died by the time of the survey (D), and total children (T), by calendar year (weighted), Bihar, 1998–99

	N	lumber of b	oirths	Percent w	ith complete	birth date1	S	Sex ratio at birt	h ²	Cal	endar year ı	ratio ³
Calendar year	L	D	Т	L	D	Т	L	D	Т	L	D	Т
1999	118	5	123	100.0	100.0	100.0	826	0	767	NA	NA	NA
1998	982	65	1,047	99.9	100.0	99.9	930	974	933	NC	NC	NC
1997	859	60	918	99.6	100.0	99.6	934	809	926	NC	NC	NC
1996	884	100	984	99.4	100.0	99.5	1,007	692	970	103.1	157.0	106.8
1995	856	68	923	99.4	100.0	99.4	916	835	910	84.8	52.6	81.1
1994	1,135	157	1,292	99.1	96.6	98.8	930	1,202	960	115.4	157.4	119.2
1993	1,111	132	1,244	99.2	94.5	98.7	950	940	949	95.1	82.2	93.6
1992	1,202	165	1,367	98.8	96.1	98.5	890	1,012	904	120.1	122.1	120.3
1991	890	138	1,027	98.5	97.7	98.4	963	1,038	973	73.1	83.2	74.4
1990	1,231	166	1,397	98.4	96.9	98.2	921	1,091	940	143.0	123.3	140.4
1989	832	131	963	98.7	97.6	98.6	912	1,420	968	72.6	87.0	74.3
1988	1,062	136	1,198	98.8	100.0	98.9	897	1,109	919	137.2	117.7	134.7
1993–97	4,844	518	5,362	99.3	97.6	99.1	947	925	944	NA	NA	NA
1988–92	5,217	735	5,952	98.6	97.6	98.5	915	1,117	937	NA	NA	NA
1983–87	3,750	574	4,323	98.7	97.4	98.5	977	1,124	996	NA	NA	NA
1978–82	2,739	466	3,204	98.7	96.0	98.3	849	1,005	870	NA	NA	NA
1977 or earlier	2,418	612	3,029	98.5	97.0	98.2	814	887	828	NA	NA	NA
All	20,066	2,974	23,040	98.9	97.2	98.7	912	1,008	924	NA	NA	NA

NA: Not applicable

NC: Not calculated because full-year data were not collected for 1998 and 1999 (the survey began during 1998)

¹ Both year and month of birth given $^2(B_t/B_m)x1000$, where B_t and B_m are the numbers of female and male births, respectively

 $^{^{3}[2}B_{x}/(B_{x-1}+B_{x+1})]x100$, where B_{x} is the number of births in calendar year x

Table B.5 Reporting of age at death in days

Distribution of reported deaths under 1 month of age by age at death in days and percentage of early neonatal deaths for births during five-year periods preceding the survey (weighted), Bihar, 1998–99

	Years preceding survey				
Age at death (days)	0–4	5–9	10–14	0–14	
< 1	45	59	42	147	
1	54	73	65	192	
2	20	29	16	65	
3	16	36	11	63	
4	11	17	10	38	
5	12	14	9	35	
6	22	21	13	57	
7	9	10	5	24	
8	7	10	14	31	
9	8	8	3	19	
10	4	11	4	19	
11	3	3	2	8	
12	2	5	10	17	
13	0	2	1	3	
14	0	0	1	1	
15	4	5	11	20	
16	0	0	1	1	
17	1	0	0	1	
18	1	2	4	7	
19	0	0	0	0	
20	5	6	2 2	13	
21	1	2 2 0	2	5	
22 23	0 0	2	3 0	5 0	
	1			0	
24 25	1	2 0	0 2	3 3	
26 26	1	0	0	1	
27	0	0	0	0	
28	1	0	0	1	
29	0	0	0	0	
30	5	0	3	8	
00	5	U	3	U	
0–30	236	317	235	787	
Percent early neonatal ¹	77.0	78.4	71.0	75.8	

Examination of the distribution of deaths under age two years during the 15 years before the survey by month of death (Table B.6) indicates there is some heaping of deaths at 6, 12, and 18 months of age. Digit preference appears not to be serious enough to alter substantially the mortality rates calculated here. Because the extent of heaping on 12 months is minor, probably due to the strong emphasis on this potential problem during training of the interviewers, adjustment of the infant and child mortality rates is unnecessary.

Table B.6 Reporting of age at death in months

Distribution of reported deaths under two years of age by age at death in months and percentage of neonatal deaths for births during five-year periods preceding the survey (weighted), Bihar, 1998–99

	Years preceding survey					
Age at death (months)	0–4	5–9	10–14	0–14		
<1	236	317	235	787		
1	22	22	16	61		
2	19	24	19	62		
3	16	21	14	51		
4	8	15	7	30		
5	7	5	5	17		
6	15	23	14	53		
7	8	13	6	27		
8	6	9	9	24		
9	2 7	5	17	24		
10	7	7	5	19		
11	4	11	9	24		
12	10	8	13	31		
13	6	12	8	26		
14	1	12	11	24		
15	3 2	5	5	13		
16	2	5 3 2	4	8		
17	1	2	4	7		
18	4	17	16	36		
19	0	2 0	2	4		
20	0	0	1	1		
21	1	3	0	4		
22	1	1	3	5		
23	2	0	1	3		
1 year	7	13	7	27		
Missing	3	1	0	4		
0–11	350	472	356	1,178		
Percent neonatal ¹	67.3	67.1	66.0	66.8		
¹ Deaths during the first month divided by deaths during the first year						