

PD-ARU-456
PROJECT #391-11-037.1 & 256.1 112095
STATISTICAL DEVELOPMENT
ACTIVITY REPORT - PAKISTAN TEAM

December 1971

PK
31549
P152a
Dec. 1971

I. Highlights

Population Census: The outbreak of War on the subcontinent on December 3 came as the finishing touches were being made on the report on the Coverage Evaluation of the Rawalpindi Test Census conducted in June 1971. Other reports in progress on the problems encountered in the CES and HED pretests in the Rawalpindi area were unfinished when the statistical advisory team and their families were evacuated to Tehran on Sunday December 5. Dr. Larson who was scheduled to leave post on December 5 for reassignment to Washington, did in fact begin his journey on the scheduled date but under somewhat unexpected circumstances. From Tehran Dr. Larson continued onto Washington on Monday December 6. The Schiro and Schulz families returned to Karachi on Wednesday December 29, from their safehaven post in Tehran.

The proposed pretests of the CES and HED procedures following the Test Census of Hyderabad conducted in October 1971 were thrown off schedule and at this writing no definite date has been set for continuing with the Hyderabad pretest. The Rawalpindi experience showed clearly that both the Census Organization and the CSO will have to conduct additional tests to improve their capability to conduct an adequate Census of Population by Population Census Organization and an adequate Census Evaluation Survey and Housing, Economic and Demographic Survey to be conducted by CSC following the Census of Population.

With the problems facing the new government it may be sometime before a decision is made as to whether to proceed with the Census of Population in December 1972. This absence of decision should however not justify any relaxation of preparations for the forthcoming Census by either the Population Census Organization or the CSO, since so much needs to be done in the way of improving procedures and controls.

At this point it may be appropriate to point out that the Census Evaluation Survey conducted in Rawalpindi following the Test Census conducted by the Population Census Organization showed that the Census enumerators failed to enumerate 10.0% of the rural population and 16.4% of the urban population. However because of "erroneous" inclusions of persons (who should not have been counted as "residents of the Rawalpindi area") the "net error" in the rural areas was an undercount of 8.5 percent and in the urban areas a net undercount of 16.2 percent. Thus while the Test Census reported a total of 15,298 persons in rural areas and 14,535 persons in urban areas covered in

10

OFF-SITE

PK
315.49 USAID/Pakistan. ✓
P152a Statistical Development Activity Report-
Pakistan Team.
Dec/1971 391-11-780-037.
For holdings see shelf.
Includes Coverage Evaluation of the Rawalpindi
Test Census, Junt 1971.

1. Statistics- PK. 2. Census- PK. 3. Evaluation- Census-
PK. I. Coverage Evaluation of the Rawalpindi Test Census.
II. Title.

32156

the Test Census, the estimated correct count based on the CES was 16,719 persons in the rural areas and 17,345 persons in the urban areas. About one-half of the missed population were located in the households which were completely missed by the Census Enumerators. (See the attached report 'Coverage Evaluation of the Rawalpindi Test Census June 1971', issued in December 1971, for methodology employed and detailed findings.)

The Village Lists for West Pakistan which were distributed in September for correction are being returned slowly. This operation was to have been completed by the end of December. Out of a total of approximately 58 districts, 11 have been returned in West Pakistan. The village lists for East Pakistan have had no activity for several months.

The analytical tables for the Rawalpindi Big Count Pretest have been completed. The tables produced were for both urban, and rural, were for single years of age by sex; and by 5 year age groups, of sex, marital status, mother tongue, religion, and literacy; plus comparative tables of the CES enumerators' reports V. S. the Big Count enumerators' reports, to show the degree of enumerator variation for each Census question.

About 50% of the Hyderabad Test Census data has been encoded and verified. It is anticipated that the balance of the Test Census enumeration schedules will be made available in January.

The Rawalpindi HED schedules have been punched, verified and proof listed. An edit program is presently being written to show inconsistencies and invalid codes. After corrections, preliminary tables as defined by the Census Organization will be produced.

Due to evacuation to Tehran and the pressure of work in processing the pretest data, very little effort was expended in the preparation of the final Big Count Edit Routine. It is anticipated that more time will be spent on this complex routine after the HED tables have been completed.

Agriculture Census: Both advisors assigned to the Agriculture Census were evacuated from Lahore to Islamabad, the Sampling Advisor Mr. Sturdevant on December 4th, and the Data Processing Advisor, Mr. Braddock, three days later. Mr. Braddock prepared an End of Tour Report, prior to being transferred to Washington, D. C. for reassignment at the Bureau of Census.

Since the cease fire on December 17, it now appears most likely that the Agricultural Census will be rescheduled for April-June 1972, although as yet an authoritative decision has not been made by the new government. Nevertheless, the staff has been kept intact and meetings have been held to work out the details of the rescheduling.

Contact with the Canadian High Commission, revealed that the high priority data processing equipment for the Agriculture Census Organization is expected to be air shipped for arrival in February. The balance of the equipment would be shipped by surface transportation for Spring delivery.

With the likelihood of the rescheduled Census enumeration, the Sampling Advisor will return to Lahore in early January, to resume his advisory duties and to participate in rescheduling plans. Any decision to recall Mr. Braddock will await the Government of Pakistan decision.

II. Advisors' Detailed Reports

Attached for Bureau of Census.

4

COVERAGE EVALUATION OF THE RAWALPINDI TEST 6ENSUS
JUNE 1971

December 1971

5

1. The Census Evaluation Survey (CES)

As part of its preparatory work for the conduct of Pakistan's Third Decennial Population Census, the Population Census Organization conducted in June 1971 a "test" or "rehearsal" census in the Rawalpindi area, consisting of complete coverage of one Urban Union Committee (divided into 16 Census Enumerator Blocks) and three Rural Patwari Circles (divided into 27 Census Enumerator Blocks). The Population Census Organization then followed up this "Big Count" test census with a test of its Census Evaluation Sample Survey designed to follow the actual Big Count in order to get an objective measure of the coverage error of the Big Count. At the request of the Population Census Organization, and under its general direction, the actual CES will be conducted by an independent statistical organization - the Central Statistical Office. Similarly the Central Statistical Office (CSO) conducted the test CES in the Rawalpindi area, to test and modify the procedures and forms to be used in the actual CES.

The test census was conducted in June 1971. The test CES conducted after the test census consisted of the following steps:

- (1) An independent re-enumeration in each CES cluster (sample area) during a 10-day period from late July through early August -- about one month to six weeks after the Test Census.
- (2) A household by household, person by person match between the CES enumeration and the Census enumeration at the CSO in Karachi.
- (3) Determination of the status of each household and each person as to whether a "match" or a "non-match" case.
- (4) For all "non-match" cases, transcription of the required information on to field follow-up forms and return to the field for reconciliation and determination from personal interview as to the correct status of the household/person at the time of the Census.
- (5) Code information as to coverage status of each household/person and tabulation of results.

The CES sample for the Rawalpindi Test Census included eight areas -- four in the rural area and four in the urban area. Each CES sample area consisted of a cluster of about thirty household or about 234 households for the total CES. The four clusters in the rural area were sampled from a set of clusters formed from an updated Malaria Eradication Program (MEP) list of structures. In the urban area, two CES clusters were based on area sampling methods and the remaining two were selected from clusters formed from an independent re-numbering of structures in two Census blocks. Thus, structures selected in all CES sample clusters were developed from sampling frames independent from the actual Census Register (structure listing). This was done so that reliable estimates of "missed households" in the Census could be made from the CES.

2. Net Error in the Test Census

The summary results for the coverage evaluation of the Rawalpindi Test Census as determined from the CES sample survey are presented in Table #1. The Rawalpindi Test Census reported a total of 15,298 persons living in the three rural patwari circles and 14,535 persons living in the Urban Test Census Union Committee. As the table shows the Test Census undercounted the actual population living in both the rural and urban areas. The net undercount in the rural area is estimated to be 8.5 percent

or 1,421 persons missed. The net undercount in the Urban area is estimated at 16.2 percent, or 2,810 persons missed. In other words the CES estimates that about 9 out of every 100 persons living in the rural areas, and 16 out of every 100 persons living in the urban area were "missed" in the Rawalpindi Test Census^{1/}

RAWALPINDI TEST CENSUS JUNE 1971

TABLE NO. 1: ESTIMATES OF "MISSED" PERSONS AND "ERRONEOUSLY INCLUDED" PERSONS
(SOURCE -- CENSUS EVALUATION SURVEY)

Test Census Area	Total Person Counted In the Test Census	Number of Persons MISSED			Number of Persons Erroneously Included	"Net Error" (Col. 6 Minus Col. 5)	Estimated Correct Count (Col. 2 Minus Col. 7)
		In Enumerated Households	In Missed Households	Total Missed			
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.
Rural	15,298	853 (5.1%)	819 (4.9%)	1,672 (10.0%)	251 (1.5%)	1,421 (-8.5%)	16,719
Urban	14,535	1,301 (7.5%)	1,544 (8.9%)	2,845 (16.4%)	35 (0.2%)	2,810 (-16.2%)	17,345

Note: Figures in parenthesis show per cent error for each error component as a proportion of the "Estimated Correct Count" (Column 8).

3. Urban-Rural Differences in Coverage

With the exception of "Persons Erroneously Included" (column 6) the various components of error are significantly larger in the urban areas as compared to the rural -- the rates range from about 50% higher for "Missed in Enumerated Households" (column 3) to 90% higher for "Net Error" (column 7). From observations during the Test Census operation there were indications that there were extra problems of enumeration in the urban areas -- more "not-at-home" in urban areas, more problems of defining and canvassing an urban census enumeration area; also, the quality of enumerators and their supervision may have been inferior in the urban area, etc.

1/ In addition to this "net error" reported by the CES, demographers would have to make an allowance for persons missed by both the test census and the test CES. The test census and the test CES were designed to measure the population of persons living in households or institutions and did not cover the "floating" population, i.e. persons with "no place" or residence.

The "floating" persons are the most difficult persons to count correct in a Population Census, and no estimate can be made of the number missed in the Test Census.

However, a minimum estimate can be made of persons residing in households or institutions, who were missed by both the test census and the CES, by use of a simple probability model often referred to as the Chandraseker-Deming correction. Using this probability model it can be estimated that the minimum undercount of net persons missed by both the census and the CES would be about 1.2 percent of the population in urban areas and 0.3 percent in rural areas. Thus the total net undercount would be about 8.8 percent in rural areas and 17.4 percent in urban areas.

NOTE: For missed "Floating" persons, the correlation between CENSUS and CES will be very large, therefore the estimate of these persons missed in both surveys will be significantly undercounted.

4. Number of Households Missed

As can be observed from Table #2, it is estimated that 240 households out of a total 3036 in the rural area were completely missed by the Test Census. This is a "missed household rate" of 7.9%. In the urban area, the "Missed Household Rate" was even higher as 389 out of 2719 household or 14.3% were estimated to be missed in the test census. In general these "missed households" tended to be smaller than average -- the average size of the "missed" households in the rural area was estimated to be 3.8 persons V.S. the average size rural household of 5.5 persons; in the urban area the average "missed" household consisted of 4.4 persons V.S. the over-all urban average of 6.2 persons. At least in the urban area there were indications that much of the high "missed rate" could be attributed to a few poor enumerators. Of the four urban census enumerators whose work was checked in the CES it was found that two had a "missed rate" of 6%, one had a "missed rate" of 18% and the remaining had a high of 38% "missed rate". There also seemed to be a high correlation between "missed" households and the quality of the Census enumerators numbering of structures. In the same block (12020205) with the 38% "missed rate", it was found that of the 44 structures in the block 16 structure numbers or 36% were not observable at the time of the CES. For another block which was checked (12020303), it was found that only 2 structure numbers out of a total of 114 (or only 2%) were not observable at the time of the CES. The enumerator for this latter block had an estimated missed household rate of only 6%. From these limited observations it does appear that efforts on the part of the Census Organization to see that a good structure numbering operation is carried out will, besides greatly improving the execution of the HED and CES post-census surveys, also help insure good coverage in the Big Count itself.

RAWALPINDI TEST CENSUS - JUNE 1971

TABLE #2: ESTIMATES OF "MISSED" HOUSEHOLDS (SOURCE: CENSUS EVALUATION SURVEY)

Test Census Area	Total Households Enumerated in the Test Census	Estimated Number of Households Missed	Estimated Correct Total Households
1.	2.	3.	4.
Rural	2796	240 (7.9%)	3036
Urban	2330	389 (14.3%)	2719

5. Variation in "Missed Rates" by Household Member and by Age

The proportion of people missed by the Test Census in census enumerated households -- 5.1% in rural areas and 7.5% in the urban areas -- calculates to an average of 6.3% for all households in the CES sample areas. However, there were distinct differences in this rate when tabulated separately for different members of the household and for different age groups (see Table #3). The immediate members of the family (wife, son, daughter, father and mother) were missed much less than were the more distantly-related members -- "missed rate" differences from 2-5% V.S. 11-23%. The relationship between age and "missed rate" showed a distinct trend downward from the high of "Under 1" to age 15. Then from age 15 to 39 there seems to be a fairly constant above average "missed rate" which then drops to a low for age 40 and over.

RAWALPINDI TEST CENSUS - JUNE 1971

TABLE #3: ESTIMATED "PERSON MISSED" RATES IN CENSUS-ENUMERATED HOUSEHOLDS BY RELATION TO HEAD AND BY AGE (AVERAGE RATE = 6.3%)

Relationship to Head	"Person Missed" Rate	Age Group (Years)	"Person Missed" Rate
Wife	2%	Under 1	14%
Daughter	4%	1 - 4	8%
Son	5%	5 - 9	6%
Father or Mother	5%	10 - 14	5%
Daughter-in-Law or Son-in-Law	11%	15 - 19	9%
Grand son or Grand Daughter	17%	20 - 29	9%
Sister or Brother	22%	30 - 39	9%
Other Relatives	11%	40 - 49	3%
Non-Relatives	23%	Over 50	3%

6. Relation of Size of Household to Coverage of Persons within the Household

As one might expect, a strong positive correlation can be observed between the census enumerator's proneness to error and the size of the household (see Table #4). This reflects the complexities of getting complete counts of people in the larger more complicated households V.S. the smaller households. This partly accounts for the larger missed rate in the urban area than in the rural area. Households in the urban area tend to be larger (6.2 persons average size) than in the rural area (5.5 persons) per household.

RAWALPINDI TEST CENSUS - JUNE 1971

TABLE #4: RELATION OF SIZE OF HOUSEHOLD TO COVERAGE OF PERSONS WITHIN THE HOUSEHOLD

Size of Household	Proportion of Households Having One or More "Missed" Persons
6 Persons or Less	1 in 6
7 to 10 Persons	1 in 4
11 or More Persons	1 in 2

7. Adjustment Factor for "Missed Persons" by Sex and Age Groups

A somewhat higher proportion of females were missed than was the case for males. In urban areas 17.1 percent of the females were not counted in the Census Pretest, as against 15.6 percent for males. In rural areas 9.1 percent of the females were missed as against 7.8 percent of the males.

Both Sexes	Missed Rates by Sex	
	Urban	Rural
Both Sexes	16.2	8.5
Males	15.6	7.8
Females	17.1	9.1

The missed rates by age groups for all persons including those missed in completely missed households, does not show as clear a pattern as was the case for persons missed in Census-enumerated households only (see Table 3). In the latter group, a higher proportion of the younger age group were missed than in the older age groups. While this pattern of a higher missed rate among the younger age groups is apparant for urban areas, it is not apparant in the rural areas. This is due to the fact that in completely missed households, the age distribution of the population was not particularly different from the age distribution of the population in Census-enumerated households.

	<u>Missed Rates by Age Group</u>	
	<u>Urban</u>	<u>Rural</u>
All Age Groups	16.2	8.5
Under 1 Year	20.0	7.7
1 - 4	21.6	5.2
5 - 9	14.0	8.9
10 - 14	11.4	5.2
15 - 19	17.3	11.3
20 - 29	22.4	11.2
30 - 39	17.1	7.4
40 - 49	14.4	7.8
50 and Over	7.9	9.1

Table 5 shows the effect of the varying missed rates by sex and age when adjustments are made to the totals reported in the Rawalpindi Test Census. In Urban Areas the proportion of the population which is female increases from 44.1 percent unadjusted to 44.5 percent adjusted. In rural areas the proportion of the total population which is female increases from 51.4 percent to 51.8 percent. The very substantial adjustment for missed persons in toto has very little effect on the very substantially different sex ratio patterns reported by the Test Census between urban and rural areas. In urban areas the number of males reported by the Test Census was 126.7 per 100 females, while in rural areas the number of males was only 94.5 per 100 females. After adjustment for missed persons, these sex ratios are 124.6 and 93.1 respectively, substantiating the pattern of male migration to urban areas from rural areas, especially amongst the working age groups. (See Appendix Tables 1 to 3. See also Age-Sex Correction File Appendix Tables 4 and 5, for a detailed statement of the methodology followed).

The adjustments shown in Table 5 are for under-enumerated population only. No adjustment is made here for age mis-reporting or age heaping, which is a very serious problem in Pakistan. (See Appendix Table 6 for evidence of age heaping. See also table 7 for evidence of enumerator response variation in reporting ages.

RAWALPINDI TEST CENSUS - JUNE 1971

TABLE No. 5: SUMMARY COMPARISON OF TOTALS UNADJUSTED, AND TOTALS ADJUSTED FOR UNDERCOUNT, BY AGE & SEX

Items	U R B A N A R E A				R U R A L A R E A			
	UNADJUSTED		ADJUSTED		UNADJUSTED		ADJUSTED	
	Number of Persons	Percent						
BOTH SEXES	14535	100.0	17345	100.0	15298	100.0	16719	100.0
Males	8123	55.9	9624	55.5	7433	48.6	8062	48.2
Females	6412	44.1	7721	44.5	7865	51.4	8657	51.8
No. of Males Per 100 Females	126.7		124.6		94.5		93.1	
BOTH SEXES	14535	100.0	17345	100.0	15298	100.0	16719	100.0
Under 1 Year	340	2.3	423	2.4	378	2.5	411	2.5
1 - 4 Years	1746	12.0	2187	12.6	1755	11.5	1858	11.1
5 - 9 Years	2104	14.5	2494	14.4	2259	14.8	2489	14.9
10 - 14 Years	1977	13.6	2220	12.8	1894	12.4	2005	12.0
15 - 19 Years	1587	10.0	1910	11.0	1445	9.4	1635	9.8
20 - 24 Years	1298	8.9	1604	9.2	1085	7.1	1216	7.3
25 - 29 Years	1128	7.8	1503	8.7	1060	6.9	1215	7.3
30 - 39 Years	1740	12.0	2090	12.0	1670	11.0	1800	10.8
40 - 49 Years	1248	8.6	1447	8.4	1372	8.9	1464	8.7
50 and Over	1367	9.3	1467	8.4	2380	15.5	2626	15.6

Note: See Age-Sex Correction File, Appendix Tables 4 and 5, for a detailed statement of how the Correction was made.

8. Response Variance for Each Census Item

Enumerator response variation for all items i.e. "Sex", "Age", "Marital Status", "Religion", "Mother Tongue", and "Literacy" is worked out by undertaking a person by person match between the census information for these items and the information as reported in the CES enumeration. The results are summarized in Tables 6 to 11.

If response variability were zero, i.e. there were complete agreement when the responses from the Census and CES are classified by the above mentioned characteristics then all entries for the matched persons would appear on the diagonal of the tables (the underlined entries). The degree to which entries lie off the diagonal indicates the degree of response variability when information is collected for the same person on two different occasions. As one will note this divergence from the diagonal is substantial in case with the item "Age" (Table 7). Other items studied showed less variability.

RAWALPINDI TEST CENSUS - JUNE 1971

TABLE NO. 6: ENUMERATOR REPORTING VARIATION: CENSUS ENUMERATORS REPORT COMPARED TO CES ENUMERATORS REPORT FOR OFFICE MATCHED PERSONS ONLY URBAN & RURAL AREAS COMBINED

REPORTING OF SEX

CES Enumerator Reported Sex	CENSUS ENUMERATOR REPORTED SEX AS							
	TOTAL		MALE		FEMALE		SEX NOT REPORTED	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	1207	100.0	634	52.5	572	47.4	1	1
Male	620	51.4	<u>604</u>	50.0	16	1.3	-	-
Female	553	45.8	12	1.0	<u>540</u>	44.7	1	1
Sex Not Reported	34	2.8	18	1.5	16	1.3	-	-

12

TABLE NO. 7: ENUMERATOR REPORTING VARIATION: CENSUS ENUMERATORS REPORT COMPARED TO CES ENUMERATORS REPORT FOR OFFICE MATCHED PERSONS ONLY

URBAN & RURAL AREAS COMBINED

REPORTING OF AGE

PART I

CES Enumerator Reported Age As	C E N S U S E N U M E R A T O R R E P O R T E D A G E A S																	
	Total		Under 1 Year		1-4 Years		5-9 Years		10-14 Years		15-19 Years		20-24 Years		25-29 Years		30-34 Years	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	1207	100.0	19	1.6	119	9.9	193	16.0	172	14.3	131	10.9	102	8.5	77	6.4	76	6.3
Under 1 Year	20	1.7	16	1.3	2	.2	1	.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1 - 4 Years	121	10.0	3	.2	92	7.6	22	1.8	2	.2	-	-	1	.1	-	-	-	-
5 - 9 Years	177	14.7	-	-	23	1.9	129	10.7	21	1.7	4	.3	-	-	-	-	-	-
10 - 14 Years	170	14.1	-	-	2	.2	38	3.1	118	9.8	12	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
15 - 19 Years	136	11.3	-	-	-	-	3	.2	31	2.6	86	7.1	12	1.0	1	.1	1	.1
20 - 24 Years	105	8.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26	2.2	56	4.6	17	1.4	5	.4
25 - 29 Years	69	5.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	19	1.6	36	3.0	12	1.0
30 - 34 Years	66	5.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.1	8	.7	13	1.1	37	2.2
35 - 39 Years	62	5.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.1	5	.4	5	.4	15	1.2
40 - 44 Years	60	5.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.1	1	.1	3	.2	7	.6
45 - 49 Years	67	5.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	.2	2	.2
50 - 54 Years	48	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	.3
55 - 59 Years	29	2.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.1
60 - 64 Years	25	2.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	.2
65 - 69 Years	15	1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
70 - 74 Years	18	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
75 and Over	19	1.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

(Contd. on next page)

13

TABLE NO. 7: REPORTING OF AGE (Contd.)

- 9 -

PART II

CES Enumerator Reported Age As	C E N S U S E N U M E R A T O R R E P O R T E D A G E A S																	
	35-39 Years		40-44 Years		45-49 Years		50-54 Years		55-59 Years		60-64 Years		65-69 Years		70-74 Years		75 and Over	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	64	5.3	54	4.5	59	4.9	48	4.0	20	1.7	26	2.2	17	1.4	17	1.4	13	1.1
Under 1 Year	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
1 - 4 Years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
5 - 9 Years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
10 - 14 Years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
15 - 19 Years	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
20 - 24 Years	1	.1	-	-	-	-	1	.1	1	.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
25 - 29 Years	2	.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
30 - 34 Years	12	1.0	2	.2	3	.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
35 - 39 Years	21	1.7	9	.7	2	.2	3	.2	1	.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
40 - 44 Years	15	1.2	18	1.5	12	1.0	2	.2	1	.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
45 - 49 Years	9	.7	15	1.2	24	2.0	10	.8	3	.2	2	.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
50 - 54 Years	2	.2	5	.4	9	.7	14	1.2	6	.5	6	.5	2	.2	-	-	-	-
55 - 59 Years	1	.1	2	.2	4	.3	11	.9	3	.2	5	.4	1	.1	1	.1	-	-
60 - 64 Years	-	-	3	.2	1	.1	5	.4	-	-	8	.7	2	.2	4	.3	-	-
65 - 69 Years	-	-	-	-	1	.1	2	.2	5	.4	3	.2	1	.1	2	.2	1	.1
70 - 74 Years	1	.1	-	-	2	.2	-	-	-	-	1	.1	6	.5	7	.6	1	.1
75 and Over	-	-	-	-	1	.1	-	-	-	-	1	.1	5	.4	3	.2	9	.7

14

TABLE NO. 8: ENUMERATOR REPORTING VARIATION: CENSUS ENUMERATORS REPORT COMPARED TO CES ENUMERATORS REPORT FOR OFFICE MATCHED PERSONS ONLY

URBAN & RURAL AREAS COMBINED

REPORTING OF MARITAL STATUS

CES Enumerator Reported Marital Status	CENSUS ENUMERATOR REPORTED MARITAL STATUS AS											
	TOTAL		NEVER MARRIED		MARRIED		WIDOWED		DIVORCED		NOT REPORTED	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	1207	100.0	715	59.2	436	36.1	55	4.6	1	.1	-	-
Never Married	715	59.2	<u>699</u>	57.9	14	1.2	2	.2	-	-	-	-
Married	436	36.1	13	1.1	<u>417</u>	34.5	6	.5	-	-	-	-
Widowed	53	4.4	2	.2	4	.3	<u>47</u>	3.9	-	-	-	-
Divorced	1	1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	<u>1</u>	.1	-	-
Not Reported	2	.2	1	.1	1	.1	-	-	-	-	-	-

15

RAWALPINDI TEST CENSUS - JUNE 1971

TABLE NO. 9: ENUMERATOR REPORTING VARIATION: CENSUS ENUMERATORS REPORT COMPARED TO CES ENUMERATORS REPORT FOR OFFICE MATCHED PERSONS ONLY

URBAN & RURAL AREAS COMBINED

REPORTING OF RELIGION

CES Enumerator Reported Religion As:	CENSUS ENUMERATOR REPORTED RELIGION AS							
	Total		Muslim		Scheduled Caste		Caste Hindu	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Total	1207	100.0	1205	99.8	-	-	2	.2
Muslim	1191	98.7	1191	98.7	-	-	-	-
Schedule Caste	1	.1	1	.1	-	-	-	-
Caste Hindu	14	1.2	12	1.0	-	-	2	.2
Budhist	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Christian	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Parsi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Others	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not Reported	1	.1	-	-	-	-	-	-

TABLE NO. 10: ENUMERATOR REPORTING VARIATION: CENSUS ENUMERATORS REPORT COMPARED TO CES ENUMERATORS REPORT FOR OFFICE MATCHED PERSONS ONLY

URBAN & RURAL AREAS COMBINED

REPORTING OF MOTHER TONGUE

CES Enumerator Reported Mother Tongue As:	CENSUS ENUMERATOR REPORTED MOTHER TONGUE AS																			
	Total		BENGALI		URDU		PUNJABI		PUSHTO		SINDHI		BALUCHI		OTHERS		FOREIGN NTLS.		NOT REPORTED	
	Number	Per- cent	Number	Per- cent	Number	Per- cent	Number	Per- cent	Number	Per- cent	Number	Per- cent	Number	Per- cent	Number	Per- cent	Number	Per- Cent	Number	Per- cent
Total	1207	100.0	-	-	91	7.5	1093	90.6	8	.7	-	-	-	-	15	1.2	-	-	-	-
Bengali	7	.6	-	-	7	.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Urdu	85	7.0	-	-	69	5.7	10	.8	-	-	-	-	-	6	.5	-	-	-	-	-
Punjabi	1074	89.0	-	-	15	1.2	1048	86.8	3	.2	-	-	-	-	8	.7	-	-	-	-
Pushtu	37	3.1	-	-	-	-	32	2.7	5	.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sindhi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Baluchi	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Others	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Foreign Nationals	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Not Reported	4	.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1	.1	-	-	-	-	-

17

TABLE NO. 11: ENUMERATOR REPORTING VARIATION: CENSUS ENUMERATORS REPORT COMPARED TO CES ENUMERATORS REPORT FOR OFFICE MATCHED PERSONS ONLY

URBAN & RURAL AREAS COMBINED

REPORTING OF LITERACY

CES Enumerator Reported Literacy As:	CENSUS ENUMERATOR REPORTED LITERACY AS												Persons Not Able to Read & Write with Understanding		Not Reported	
	Persons Able to Read and Write with Understanding In															
	Total		Bengali Only		Urdu Only		Bengali & Others		Urdu & Others		Others Only					
Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Total	1207	100.0	-	-	144	11.9	-	-	180	14.9	-	-	882	73.1	-	-
Persons Able to Read & Write With Understanding:																
Bengali Only	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Urdu Only	287	23.8	-	-	73	6.0	-	-	62	5.1	-	-	152	12.6	-	-
Bengali & Others	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Urdu & Others	165	13.7	-	-	36	3.0	-	-	98	8.1	-	-	31	2.6	-	-
Others Only	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Persons Not Able to Read & Write With Understanding	751	62.2	-	-	35	2.9	-	-	20	1.7	-	-	695	57.6	1	.1
Not Reported	4	.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4	.3	-	-

18

9. Other Discrepancies

(a) No Identification of Institutional Households

In the "Manual of Instructions for Enumerators" (Census 71 P No. 3), the census enumerator is requested to encircle the household serial number of all "institutional household". However, in the whole Test Census there was not one case where an institutional-type household was so identified. Several institutional-type households were uncovered in census blocks 12020101 and 12020102. These consisted of such things as fire brigades, workers working and living together in timber godowns and some other types of godowns, etc. In the one case, Census Block _____, the workers were considered to be one large regular household; in the other block the census enumerator treated each worker as a separate household of one, although it is highly probable that these workers were living and eating together.

(b) Defining of Census Blocks

The general problems which have been known for some time concerning the definition of census enumeration blocks, especially in urban areas, also show up in the Rawalpindi Test Census. These problems concern the defining of about equal size blocks with well-defined boundaries. In the Rawalpindi Test Census it was specified that Census blocks of about 100 households (about one-half the size proposed for the actual Big Count) should be formed so as to carry out the enumeration in a shortened period of time. The results show for the urban area that one-half of the actual blocks formed were within 50% of the specified size while the other half were more than 50% larger. About 1/5 of the blocks were more than twice the specified size. The actual range of block sizes was from 60 households to 295 households. As to the defining of block boundaries, one discrepancy was noted in the CES work in the southwest corner of block 12020402 where it borders 12020303. The boundary shown on the Census map when actually checked on the ground runs through the center of a house, which opened on two different streets.

10. A Note on the Relation of Results from the Rawalpindi Test Census and the Expected Undercount in the Actual Population Census

It is interesting to speculate on the basis of the Rawalpindi Test Census what might be the expected "net error" for the country at the time of the actual Population Census. However it is necessary to point out that the Rawalpindi Test Census was carried out under conditions considerably different than what is expected at the time of the actual census. The major differences relate to the quality of the training of the Census enumerators, and to the average population size of the Census enumerators assignment areas.

In the Rawalpindi Test Census the training of the Census enumerators was conducted by top professional staff of the Population Census Organization, followed by field work, and a review and correction of the enumerators field work. This type of training is considered ideal but will not be possible at the time of the real census. At the time of the real census, some 200,000 enumerators will be "trained" by some 20,000 (local non-professional) circle supervisors, who in turn will have received training from some 2000 (local non-professional) charge superintendents, who in turn will have been trained by some 130 (local non-professional) census district officers. Under these conditions, it is impossible to have the quality of training achieved in the Rawalpindi Test Census.

The size of each enumerator's assignment will have a substantial effect on the quality of work performed by the enumerator. In general, the larger the assignment, the greater the fatigue factor working on the enumerator and the greater the pressure on the enumerator not to spend an adequate amount of time at each household making sure he has covered all persons associated with the household. In the Rawalpindi Test Census, the average enumerator assignment was about 700 persons. In the real census the average size aimed for is 1000-1500 persons per enumerator, but this may range upto 6000 in some instances due to faulty determination of enumerator assignment areas.

In addition, the presence in the test areas of a host of "officials", i.e. supervisors, trainers and observers from the Population Census Organization, and from the Central Statistical Office, undoubtedly provided a sense of importance to the work that the Census enumerator was charged within the Test Census that very likely acted as an added incentive to do good work. This will not be the case at the time of the Big Count.

Considering these factors, any projection of the "net error" experienced in the Rawalpindi area to what might be expected at the time of the real Census, should presently be avoided. The Population Census Organization has already conducted a second census test in Hyderabad, observing the same training procedures as is to be used in the actual Big Count. At least one test is expected to be held in each province. When the CES is completed in this Hyderabad area, and in other provinces there will exist a better basis for estimating the expected all-Pakistan "net error" in coverage.

RAWALPINDI TEST CENSUS - JUNE 1971

APPENDIX TABLE NO: 1: POPULATION BY AGE AND SEX

URBAN AND RURAL AREAS COMBINED

Age Group	BOTH SEXES		MALES		FEMALES		Males Per 100 Females
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Under 1 Year	718	2.4	365	2.3	353	2.5	103.4
1 - 4	3501	11.7	1782	11.5	1719	12.0	103.7
5 - 9	4363	14.6	2250	14.5	2113	14.8	106.5
10 - 14	3871	13.0	2060	13.2	1811	12.7	113.7
15 - 19	3032	10.2	1601	10.3	1431	10.0	111.9
20 - 24	2383	8.0	1223	7.9	1160	8.1	105.4
25 - 29	2188	7.3	1028	6.6	1160	8.1	88.6
30 - 34	1776	6.0	885	5.7	891	6.2	99.3
35 - 39	1634	5.5	832	5.3	802	5.6	103.7
40 - 44	1450	4.9	743	4.8	707	5.0	105.1
45 - 49	1170	3.9	631	4.1	539	3.8	117.1
50 - 54	1118	3.7	609	3.9	509	3.6	119.6
55 - 59	586	2.0	342	2.2	244	1.7	140.2
60 - 64	793	2.7	470	3.0	323	2.3	145.5
65 - 69	378	1.3	220	1.4	158	1.1	139.2
70 - 74	434	1.5	260	1.7	174	1.2	149.5
75 and Over	438	1.5	255	1.6	183	1.3	139.3
TOTAL	29833	100.0	15556	100.0	14277	100.0	109.0

RAWALPINDI TEST CENSUS - JUNE 1971

APPENDIX TABLE NO. 2: POPULATION BY AGE AND SEX

URBAN AREA

Age Group	BOTH SEXES		MALES		FEMALES		Males Per 100 Females
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Under 1 Year	340	2.3	175	2.2	165	2.6	106.1
1 - 4	1746	12.0	885	10.9	861	13.4	102.8
5 - 9	2104	14.5	1112	13.7	992	15.5	112.1
10 - 14	1977	13.6	1062	13.1	915	14.3	116.1
15 - 19	1587	10.9	895	11.0	692	10.8	129.3
20 - 24	1298	8.9	772	9.5	526	8.2	146.8
25 - 29	1128	7.8	614	7.6	514	8.0	119.5
30 - 34	911	6.3	526	6.5	385	6.0	136.6
35 - 39	829	5.7	464	5.7	365	5.7	127.1
40 - 44	696	4.8	415	5.1	281	4.4	147.7
45 - 49	552	3.8	341	4.2	211	3.3	161.6
50 - 54	486	3.3	309	3.8	177	2.8	174.6
55 - 59	198	1.4	121	1.5	77	1.2	157.1
60 - 64	280	1.9	174	2.1	106	1.7	164.2
65 - 69	128	.9	81	1.0	47	.7	172.3
70 - 74	152	1.0	102	1.3	50	.8	204.0
75 and Over	123	.8	75	.9	48	.7	156.3
TOTAL	14535	100.0	8123	100.0	6412	100.0	126.7
PERCENT OF TOTAL	100.0		55.9		44.1		

22

RAWALPINDI TEST CENSUS - JUNE 1971

APPENDIX TABLE NO. 3: POPULATION BY AGE AND SEX

RURAL AREA

Age Group	BOTH SEXES		MALES		FEMALES		Males Per 100 Females
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Under 1 Year	378	2.5	190	2.6	188	2.4	101.1
1 - 4	1755	11.5	897	12.1	858	10.9	104.5
5 - 9	2259	14.8	1138	15.3	1121	14.3	101.5
10-14	1894	12.4	998	13.4	896	11.4	111.4
15-19	1445	9.4	706	9.5	739	9.4	95.5
20-24	1085	7.1	451	6.1	634	8.1	71.1
25-29	1060	6.9	414	5.6	646	8.2	64.1
30-34	865	5.7	359	4.8	506	6.4	70.9
35-39	805	5.3	368	5.0	437	5.6	84.6
40-44	754	4.9	328	4.4	426	5.4	77.0
45-49	618	4.0	290	3.9	328	4.2	88.4
50-54	632	4.1	300	4.0	332	4.2	90.4
55-59	388	2.5	221	3.0	167	2.1	132.3
60-64	513	3.4	296	4.0	217	2.8	136.4
65-69	250	1.6	139	1.9	111	1.4	125.2
70-74	282	1.8	158	2.1	124	1.6	127.4
75 and Over	315	2.1	180	2.4	135	1.7	133.3
TOTAL	15298	100.0	7433	100.0	7865	100.0	94.5
PERCENT OF TOTAL	100.0		48.6		51.4		

23

APPENDIX TABLE NO. 4: POPULATION BY AGE & SEX, CORRECTED FOR UNDERCOUNT

URBAN AREA

Age Group	BOTH SEXES		MALES		FEMALES		Males Per 100 Females
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Under 1 Year	423	2.4	210	2.2	213	2.8	98.6
1 - 4	2187	12.6	1074	11.2	1113	14.4	96.5
5 - 9	2494	14.4	1306	13.6	1188	15.4	109.9
10 - 14	2220	12.8	1217	12.6	1003	13.0	121.3
15 - 19	1910	11.0	1081	11.2	829	10.7	130.4
20 - 24	1604	9.2	905	9.4	699	9.1	129.5
25 - 29	1503	8.7	846	8.8	657	8.5	128.8
30 - 34	1093	6.3	613	6.4	480	6.2	127.7
35 - 39	997	5.7	566	5.9	431	5.6	131.3
40 - 44	760	4.4	463	4.8	297	3.8	155.9
45 - 49	687	4.0	388	4.0	299	3.9	129.8
50 - 54	539	3.1	334	3.5	205	2.7	162.9
55 - 59	197	1.1	151	1.6	46	0.6	328.3
60 - 64	307	1.8	199	2.1	108	1.4	184.3
65 - 69	127	0.7	81	0.8	46	0.6	176.1
70 - 74	163	0.9	102	1.1	61	0.8	167.2
75 and Over	134	0.8	88	0.9	46	0.6	191.3
TOTAL	17345	100.0	9624	100.0	7721	100.0	124.6
PERCENT OF TOTAL	100.0		55.5		44.5		

24

RAWALPINDI TEST CENSUS - JUNE 1971

APPENDIX TABLE NO. 5: POPULATION BY AGE & SEX, CORRECTED FOR UNDERCOUNT

RURAL AREA

Age Group	BOTH SEXES		MALES		FEMALES		Males Per 100 Females
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Under 1 Year	411	2.5	229	2.8	182	2.1	125.8
1 - 4	1858	11.1	969	12.0	889	10.3	109.0
5 - 9	2489	14.9	1291	16.0	1198	13.8	107.8
10 - 14	2005	12.0	1089	13.5	916	10.6	118.9
15 - 19	1635	9.8	779	9.7	856	9.9	91.0
20 - 24	1216	7.3	508	6.3	708	8.2	71.8
25 - 29	1215	7.3	466	5.8	749	8.7	62.2
30 - 34	932	5.6	434	5.4	498	5.8	87.1
35 - 39	868	5.2	370	4.6	498	5.8	74.3
40 - 44	757	4.5	264	3.3	493	5.7	53.5
45 - 49	707	4.2	318	3.9	389	4.5	81.7
50 - 54	705	4.2	302	3.7	403	4.7	74.9
55 - 59	419	2.5	240	3.0	179	2.1	134.1
60 - 64	541	3.2	323	4.0	218	2.5	148.2
65 - 69	287	1.7	140	1.7	147	1.7	95.2
70 - 74	326	1.9	159	2.0	167	1.9	95.2
75 and Over	348	2.1	181	4.3	167	1.9	108.4
TOTAL	16719	100.0	8062	100.0	8657	100.0	93.1
PERCENT OF TOTAL	100.0		48.2		51.8		

25

RAWALPINDI TEST CENSUS - JUNE 1971

APPENDIX TABLE 6: DISTRIBUTION OF TOTAL POPULATION BY SINGLE YEARS OF AGE
URBAN & RURAL AREAS COMBINED

Single Years of Age	Number	Percent	Single Years of Age	Number	Percent
Under 1 Year	719	2.5	55 Years	453	1.5
1 Year	632	2.1	56 Years	51	.2
2 Years	914	3.1	57 Years	23	.1
3 Years	964	3.2	58 Years	46	.2
4 Years	990	3.3	59 Years	13	-
5 Years	979	3.3	60 Years	715	2.4
6 Years	1003	3.4	61 Years	8	-
7 Years	812	2.7	62 Years	47	.2
8 Years	964	3.2	63 Years	11	-
9 Years	605	2.0	64 Years	12	-
10 Years	1010	3.4	65 Years	314	1.1
11 Years	536	1.8	66 Years	15	.1
12 Years	967	3.2	67 Years	10	-
13 Years	621	2.1	68 Years	32	.1
14 Years	736	2.5	69 Years	7	-
15 Years	605	2.0	70 Years	396	1.3
16 Years	758	2.5	71 Years	7	-
17 Years	422	1.4	72 Years	25	.1
18 Years	912	3.1	73 Years	4	-
19 Years	335	1.1	74 Years	2	-
20 Years	855	2.9	75 Years	113	.4
21 Years	218	.7	76 Years	6	-
22 Years	636	2.1	77 Years	4	-
23 Years	334	1.1	78 Years	5	-
24 Years	339	1.1	79 Years	4	-
25 Years	1013	3.4	80 Years	175	.6
26 Years	395	1.3	81 Years	-	-
27 Years	232	.8	82 Years	6	-
28 Years	479	1.6	83 Years	1	-
29 Years	69	.2	84 Years	2	-
30 Years	1259	4.2	85 Years	27	.1
31 Years	36	.1	86 Years	3	-
32 Years	291	1.0	87 Years	-	-
33 Years	98	.3	88 Years	4	-
34 Years	92	.3	89 Years	1	-
35 Years	1186	4.0	90 Years	48	.2
36 Years	170	.6	91 Years	1	-
37 Years	54	.2	92 Years	1	-
38 Years	185	.6	93 Years	-	-
39 Years	38	.1	94 Years	-	-
40 Years	1191	4.0	95 Years	6	-
41 Years	23	.1	96 Years	1	-
42 Years	158	.5	97 Years	-	-
43 Years	42	.1	98 Years	1	-
44 Years	36	.1	99 Years	7	-
45 Years	943	3.2	100 Years	14	-
46 Years	66	.2	101 Years	-	-
47 Years	28	.1	102 Years	1	-
48 Years	125	.4	103 Years	-	-
49 Years	8	-	104 Years	-	-
50 Years	986	3.3	105 Years	1	-
51 Years	9	-	106 Years	1	-
52 Years	73	.2	107 Years	1	-
53 Years	24	.1	108 Years	1	-
54 Years	26	.1	109 Years	-	-
			120 Years	3	-
			TOTAL	29,833	100.0

26

RAM PINDI CENSUS/CES PRETEST: COVERAGE EVALUATION OF CES SAMPLE AREA NO. CV-1

A. CES SAMPLE AREA

CENSUS BLOCK(S) : 12010108 (RURAL)

MOUZA : DOHMAN

SAMPLE SIZE : 28 Households

TYPE OF SAMPLING: Segment from Updated MEP List

B. COVERAGE SUMMARY FOR CENSUS

Total Persons Counted	Number of Persons MISSED			Number of Persons Erroneously Included	Net Error (Col.5 Minus Col.4)	Estimated Correct Count
	In Enumerated Households	In Missed Households	Total Missed			
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
161	6	114/	17	8	-0	170
	(3.5%)	(6.5%)	(10.0%)	(4.7%)	(-5.3%)	

C. DETAILS OF COVERAGE ERRORS: 1. In four missed households 2. Between Census and CES two daughters married and left home but one persons returned from foreign country.

TYPE OF ERRORS.	House NO. OR Malaria NO.	Structure NO.	Census Household NO.	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	REMARKS
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.

CENSUS ERRORS

Missed in Enumerated Households	313	052	042	5	Shahzara	F	Daughter	18	
"	317	060	049	5	Allah Ditta	M	Brother	21	
"	320	063	052	11	Fakhra	F	Grand Daughter	04	
"	322	066	054	7	Wazir	M	Son	19	
"	326	070	056	6	Sarwar	M	Brother	26	
"	E-25	121	092	9	Mrs.Mirza	F	Wife	50	
Missed in Missed Households	312	-	-	4	Mrs.Fazal Ahmed	F	Head	45	
"					Rahim	M	Son	27	
"					Mrs.Rahim	F	Daughter-in-law	23	
"					Azra	F	Daughter	16	

Continued on page....2

C. DETAILS OF COVERAGE ERRORS (Contd)

	House NO. OR Malaria NO.	Structure NO.	Census Household NO.	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	REMARKS
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
Missed in Missed Households	324	-	-	4	Mrs. Ashraf	F	Wife	38	
"					Maroof	F	Daughter	13	
"					Rashida	F	Daughter	6	
"					Ghulam Fareed	M	Son	2	
"	328	-	-	2	Khaliq	M	Head	45	
"					Beni	F	Mother	70	
"	381	-	-	1	Kirshan Bi	F	Sister	40	
Erroneously Included	307	110	086	6	Phelan	F	Wife	35	Was listed twice by Census enumerator.
"	308	057	046	7	Rubina Bi	F	Grand Daughter	02	Names are not known to household.
"					Sakina Bi	F	Grand Daughter	03	"
"	313	052	042	5	Hunza Bi	F	Daughter	12	Census listed same person under 2 names.
"	316	059	048	7	Mohd. Akram	M	Brother	25	Living in a foreign country.
"	325	068	055	8	Sartaj	M	Son	40	Lives and work away
"	330	073	059	5	Mohd. Bashir	M	Son	30	Serving in army
"					Manzoor Hussain	M	Son	20	"

S.H/

28

RAWALPINDI CENSUS/CES PRETEST: COVERAGE EVALUATION OF CES SAMPLE AREA NO. CV-2

A. CES SAMPLE AREA

B. COVERAGE SUMMARY FOR CENSUS

CENSUS BLOCK(S) : 12010107 & 12010201
 MOUZA : DHOREY & BARKI BEIDAR
 SAMPLE SIZE : 26 Households
 TYPE OF SAMPLING: Segment from Updated MEP List

Total Persons Counted	Number of Persons Missed			Number of Persons Erroneously Included	Net Error (Col.5 Minus Col.4)	Estimated Correct Count
	In Enumerated Households	In Missed Households	Total Missed			
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
130	8 (5.7%)	1/ (2.1%)	11 (7.8%)	1 (0.7%)	-10 (7.1%)	140

C. DETAILS OF COVERAGE ERRORS

1. In one missed household

Type of Errors	House No. OR Malaria NO.	Structure NO.	Census Household NO.	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	REMARKS
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
<u>CENSUS ERRORS</u>									
Missed in Enumerated Households	200/28	087	62	5	Fateh Bi	F	Mother	70	
"	202/28	089	64	7	Rehmat Bi	F	Sister	35	Usual member of household temporarily absent during Census
"	E16/19	-	68	5	Rasham Jan	F	Wife	45	
"					Mohd. Younus	M	Son	27	
"					Ruftan Bi	F	Daughter	14	
"	212	-	68	11	Sakina Bibi	F	Dau-in-law	17	
					Kaniz Fatima	F	Dau-in-law	17	
					Rubina Kausar	F	Grand Daughter	1	

S.H /

LAWALPINDI CENSUS/CES PRETEST: COVERAGE EVALUATION OF CES
SAMPLE AREA NO.CV - 2.

Type of Errors	House No. OF Malaria No.	Structure No.	Census Household No.	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	REMARKS
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10

CENSUS ERRORS

Missed in Missed Households.	E 17/28	-	-	3	Rehman	M	Head	24	
"					Shaista Parveen	F	Wife	22	
"					Kaniz Fatima	F	Mother	50	
Erroneously Included	185/A/23	016	16	11	Baby Shahnaz	F	Grand Daughter	8	

RAWALPINDI CENSUS/CES PRETEST: COVERAGE EVALUATION OF CBS SAMPLE AREA NO.CV-3

A. CBS SAMPLE AREA

B. COVERAGE SUMMARY FOR CENSUS

CENSUS BLOCK(S): 12010304(Rural) and 12010302(Rural)
 MOUZA : Supyali Farm Siyal & Dulmi Khatrel)
 SAMPLE SIZE: 30 Households
 TYPE OF SAMPLING: Segment from Updated MEP List

Total Persons Counted	Number of Persons MISSED			Number of Persons Erroneously Included	Net Error (Col.5 Minus Col.4)	Estimated Correct Count
	In Enumerated Households	In Missed Households	Total Missed			
	1.	2.	3.			
192	13 (6.3%)	0	13 (6.3%)	0	-13 (-6.3%)	205 ^{1/}

C. DETAILS OF COVERAGE ERRORS

1. One person discharged from army and returned home between CENSUS and CES.

TYPE OF ERRORS	House NO. Or Malaria NO.	Structure NO.	Census Household NO.	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	R E M A R K S
	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.

CENSUS ERRORS

Missed in Enumerated Households	42/9	027	23	10	Mutlub	M	Son	20	
"	47/10	025	19	6	Khalida Bibi	F	Sister	18	
"	61/14	003	001	13	Mohd.Nazir	M	Son	12	
"					Mohammed Rashid	M	Son	30	
"					Razia Bibi	F	Dau-in-law	26	
"					Abdul Hafiz	M	Grand Son	8	
"					Amjad Ali	M	Grand Son	5	
"					Asjad Mahmood	M	Grand Son	2	
"	62/4	004	004	012	Noor Jan	F	Sister	45	
"	65/15	051	048	2	Mubarak Bibi	F	Sister	65	

31 S.H/

Contd on page.....2

RAWALPINDI CENSUS/CES PROTEST: COVERAGE EVALUATION OF CES SAMPLE / AREA NO. CV-3

C. DETAILS OF COVERAGE ERRORS (Contd.)

TYPE OF ERRORS	House NO. OR Malaria NO.	Structure NO.	Census Household NO.	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	REMARKS
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
"	66/15	052	049	5	Rashid Ahmed	M	Son	30	
"	82/47	045	043	12	Azhar Hussain	M	Son	8	
"	72/15	058	54	7	Qamar Zamir	M	Son	6 Mon.	

S.E/

32

RAWALPINDI CENSUS/CES PRETEST: COVERAGE EVALUATION OF CES SAMPLE AREA NO. CV-4

A. CES SAMPLE AREA

CENSUS BLOCK(S) : 12010302 (Rural) and
12010207 (Rural)

MOUZA : DULMI KHATREI &
DULMI TUMMA.

SAMPLE SIZE : 17 Households 1/

TYPE OF SAMPLING : Segment from updated
MEP List.

B. COVERAGE SUMMARY FOR CENSUS

Total Persons Counted	Number of Persons MISSED			Number of Persons Erroneously Included	Net Error (Col.5 Minus Col.4)	Estimated Correct Count
	In Enumerated Households	In Missed Households	Total Missed			
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
78	4 (4.1%)	16 <u>2/</u> (16.3%)	20 (20.4%)	0	-20 (-20.4%)	98

1. 10 of the 27 households in the sample were determined to be outside the Rawalpindi test Census

2/In three missed households

C. DETAILS OF COVERAGE ERRORS

Type of Errors	House No. OR Malaria No	Structure No	Census Household No	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	R E M A R K S
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.

CENSUS ERRORS

Missed in Enumerated Households	E/19	080	072	6	Zahir Nisa	F	Daughter	2	
"	149	107	094	8	Mrs. Fiaz Alam	F	Wife	38	
"	153	-	087	8	Abdur Rehman	M	Head	45	
"	157/B	-	094	7	Tahira	F	Niece	8	
Missed in Missed Households	157/A	-	-	5	Jan Mohd.	M	Head	60	
"					Walayat Bi	F	Wife	55	

C. DETAILS OF COVERAGE ERRORS(Contd.)

Type of Errors	House No. OR Malaria No.	Structure No	Census Household No	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	REMARKS
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
Missed in Missed Households	157/A	-	-	5	Mohd. Sultan	M	Son	32	
"					Sanober Shaheen	F	Daughter	29	
"					Naseem	F	Daughter	20	
"	151	-	-	1	Mrs. Bostan	F	Head	75	
"	160	-	-	10	Bostan Khen	M	Head	55	Verified that household
"					Mrs. Bostan Khan	F	Wife	50	in Dulmi Tumme Mouza(12010207)
"					Iftikhar Ahmed	M	Son	18	"
"					Shaukat Ali	M	Son	15	"
"					Minawar Perwez	M	Son	13	"
"					S. Sajjad	M	Son	12	"
"					Zahir Ahmed	M	Son	9	
"					Basharat	M	Son	22	
"					Tahira Naheed	F	Daughter	8	
"					Farat Neved	F	Daughter	6	

34

RAWAIPINDI CENSUS/CES PRETEST: COVERAGE EVALUATION OF CES SAMPLE AREA NO. CU-1

A. CES SAMPLE AREA

CENSUS BLOCK(S) : 12020205 (URBAN)
 SAMPLE SIZE : 24 Households
 TYPE OF SAMPLING : Segment of Renumbered (Structures) Census Block.

B. COVERAGE SUMMARY FOR CENSUS

Total Persons Counted	Number of Persons MISSED			Number of Persons Erroneously Included	Net Error (Col.5 Minus Col.4)	Estimated Correct Count
	In Enumerated Households	In Missed Households	Total Missed			
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
83	0	41 ^{1/}	41	0	-41	124
		(33.3%)	(33.3%)		(-333%)	

C. DETAILS OF COVERAGE ERRORS

1/ In nine missed households.

Type of Errors	House No. OR Malaria No.	Structure No "M" DENOTES MISSING CENSUS NUMBER	Census Household No	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	REMARKS
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.

CENSUS ERRORS

Missed in Missed Households	A/626	M-4	-	8	Mohd.Nazir Jeera Khan	M	Head	50	Census struct-
"					Mrs.Mohd.Nazir	F	Wife	26	ure numbering
"					Khalid Mahmood	M	Son	6	was very bad
"					Taric Mahmood	M	Son	4	in this CES
"					Khalida Bibi	F	Daughter	9	are less than
"					Zahida Bibi	F	Daughter	7	half the numbers
"					Sajada Bibi	F	Daughter	3	were observable
"					Razia Bibi	F	Daughter	6	Mon.

C. DETAILS OF COVERAGE ERRORS

Type of Errors	House No OR Malaria No.	Structure No. DENOTES MISSING CENSUS NUMBER	Census Household No.	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	REMARKS
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
Missed in Missed Households	A/626	M-4	-	2	Abdul Majid	M	Head	23	
"					Abdul Rashid	M	Brother	22	
"	A/623	M-6	-	12	Abdul Shakoor	M	Head	40	
"					Saeeda Begum	F	Wife	37	
"					Fahmeeda Begum	F	Daughter	20	
"					Sujeeda Begum	F	Daughter	18	
"					Fareeda Begum	F	Daughter	14	
"					Hamida Begum	F	Daughter	12	
"					Khurshids Begum	F	Daughter	8	
"					Shagufta Begum	F	Daughter	6	
"					Musarat Begum	F	Daughter	4	
"					Manzoor Ahmed	M	Son	16	
"					Anwar Sultan	M	Son	10	
"					Muhammed Masood	M	Son	5	
"	A/623	M-6	-	3	Abdul Islam	M	Head	45	
"					Zuhra Begum	F	Wife	35	
"					Qamrul Islam	M	Son	18	

36

RAWALPINDI CENSUS/CES PRETEST: COVERAGE EVALUATION OF CES SAMPLE
AREA NO. CU-2

A. CES SAMPLE AREA

CENSUS BLOCK(S) : 12020303 (URBAN)
 SAMPLE SIZE : 32 Households
 TYPE OF SAMPLING: Segment of Renumbered
 (Structures) Census Block.

B. COVERAGE SUMMARY FOR CENSUS

Total Persons Counted	Number of Persons MISSED			Number of Persons Erroneously Included	Net Error (Col.5 Minus Col.4)	Estimated Correct Count.
	In Enumerated Households	In Missed Households	Total Missed			
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
195	29 (12.3%)	11 ^{1/} (4.7%)	40 (17.0%)	0	-40 (-17.0%)	235

C. DETAILS OF COVERAGE ERRORS.

1/ IN TWO MISSED HOUSEHOLDS

Type of Errors	House No. OR Malaria No.	Structure No.	Census Household No.	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	REMARKS
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.

CENSUS ERRORS

Missed in Enumerated Household.	A/521/AA	042	98	10	M. Rashid	M	Brother	25	
"					Kaniz Fatima	F	Daughter	18	
"					Sakina Begum	F.	Daughter	16	
"					Nasreen	F	Daughter	13	
"					Nighat Yasmin	F	Daughter	10	
"					Ghulam Safia	F	Sister	-	Also missed in CES

38

Contd. on page..... 2

RAVALPINDI CENSUS/CES PRETEST: COVERAGE EVALUATION OF CES
SAMPLE AREA NO. CU-2

C. DETAILS OF COVERAGE ERRORS (Contd.)

Type of Errors	House No. OR Malaria No.	Structure No.	Census Household No.	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	REMARKS
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
<u>CENSUS ERRORS</u>									
Missed in Enumerated Household		043	99	2	Mrs. Mohd. Aziz	F	Wife	30	
"		047	109	14	Nazamuddin	M	Son	17	
"					Mohiuddin	M	Son	30	
"					Mrs. Mohiuddin	F	Daughter-in-law	28	
"					Jameluddin	M	Grand Son	12	
"					Ijaz Ahmed	M	Grand Son	3	
"					Faiz Ahmed	M	Grand Son	7 Mon.	
"					Naziruddin	M.	Son	25	
"					Mrs. Naziruddin	F	Daughter-in-law.	27	
"					Riaz Ahmed	M	Grand Son	2	
"					Shahide	F	Grand Dau	8	
"					Iftikhar	M	Grand Son	1	
"					Imtiaz Ahmed	M	Grand Son	10	
"		049	114	12	Mohd. Younus	M	Brother-in-law.	35	

C. DETAILS OF COVERAGE ERRORS (Contd.)

Type of Errors	House No. OR Malaria No.	Structure No.	Census Household No.	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	REMARKS
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
Missed in Enumerated Households		52	120	18	Muzafar Ali	M	Son	24	
"					Khaksar Begum	F	Daughter-in-law	20	
"					Shazia	F	Grand Daughter	2	
"					Fozia	F	Grand Daughter	1	
"			123	10	Qadar Gul	M	Son	8	
"					Pushin Bibi	F	Daughter	5	
"		054	124	11	Mohd. Hussain	M	Father-in-law	85	
"		056	129	5	Sarwar Khan	M	Son	18	
"	61		147	5	Shamin Akhtar	F	Daughter	21	
Missed in Missed Households		57	-	3	Ghulam Rasool	M	Head	50	
"					Mrs. Ghulam Rasool	F	Wife	45	
"					Azhar	M	Nephew	13	
"	-	057	157	8	Mrs. Ibrehim	F	Wife	48	
"					Mohd. Aftab	M	Son	11	
					Mohd. Iftikhar	M	Son	10	
					Mohd. Abrar	M	Son	8	
					Mohd. Israr	M	Son	5	

40.

RAWALPINDI CENSUS/CES PRETEST: COVERAGE EVALUATION OF CES SAMPLE AREA NO. CU-2C. DETAILS OF COVERAGE ERRORS (Contd.)

Type of Errors	House NO. OR Malaria NO.	Structure NO.	Census Household NO.	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	REMARKS
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
Missed in Missed Households	—	057	—	8	Shaheen Kausar	F	Daughter	4	
"					Shahnaz Kausar	F	Daughter	3	
"					Pahla Kausar	F	Daughter	2	

S.H/

41

RAWALPINDI CENSUS/CES PRETEST: COVERAGE EVALUATION OF CES SAMPLE AREA NO. CU - 3

A. CES SAMPLE AREA

B. COVERAGE SUMMARY FOR CENSUS

CENSUS BLOCK(S) : 12020201 (URBAN)	Persons Counted	Number of Persons MISSED			Number of Persons erroneously included	Net Error (Col. 5 Minus (Col. 4))	Estimated Correct Count				
		In Enumerated Households	In Missed Households	Total Missed							
		1.	2.	3.				4.	5.	6.	7.
		364	26 (6.5 %)	9 ¹ / ₁ (2.3 %)				35 (8.8 %)	2 (0.5 %)	- 33 (- 8.3 %)	397

SAMPLE SIZE : 50 Households

TYPE OF SAMPLING : INDEPENDENT AREA SAMPLE

C. DETAILS OF COVERAGE ERRORS

¹/₁ In three missed household

Type of Errors	House No. OR Malaria No.	Structure No.	Census Household No.	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	REMARKS
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.

CENSUS ERRORS

Missed in Enumerated Households	CE/2	077	079	2	Mohd. Sadiq	M	Chowkidar	35	
"	CE/3	078	080	31	Mohd. Saleem	M	Worker	30	Workers' groups quarters
"			081						
"			081/A		Mohd. Nazir	M	Worker	35	"
"					Surandar Kumar	M	Son	25	"
"					Sardar Syed Khan	M	Worker	45	"
"					Sadiq Khan	M	Worker	30	"
"					Mohd. Abbas	M	Worker	25	"

Contd. on page.....2

C. DETAILS OF COVERAGE ERRORS (Contd.)

Type of Errors	House No. OR Malaria No.	Structure No.	Census Household No.	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	R E M A R K S
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
Missed in Enumerated Households	CE/6	084	084	6	Mohd. Yousuf	M	Worker	60	Workers' group quarters
"					Afsar Ali	M	Worker	21	"
"	CE/9	012	013	9	Abdul Sattar	M	Head	35	Workers' group quarters
"					Sharif	M	Worker	28	"
"	E/16	049	053/A	11	Razia Begum	F	Daughter	16	
"	E/17	050	054	22	Shahnaz	F	Grand Daughter	3	
"	E/24	056	062	22	Sajjad Aziz	M	Son	6	
"					Nisar	M	Son	3	
"					Arzana	F	Sister	5	
"					Asghar	M	Servant	22	
"					Altaf Din	M	Servant	18	

Contd. on page3

C. DETAILS OF COVERAGE ERRORS (Contd.)

Type of Errors	House No. OR Malaria No.	Structure No.	Census Household No.	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	REMARKS
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
Missed in Enumerated Households	E/27	060	066	21	Hussina Begum	F	Auntie	45	
"	E/28	061	067	19	Frina	F	Daughter	1 Mon.	
"					Shafiq	M	Servant	13	
"					Yousuf	M	Servant	19	
"	E/31	064	070/A	10	Nadeem	M	Son	5	
"	E/37	004	003	9	Ruqya Akhtar	F	Sister	35	
"					Rahila Manzer	F	Niece	12	
"	E/42	009	009	4	Kala Khan	M	Nephew	25	
Missed in Missed Household	CE/10	-	-	1	Mohd. Rafiq	M	Head	40	
"	CE/11	-	-	5	Mohd. Aslam	M	Head	36	
"					Mrs. Aslam	F	Wife	26	
"					Sajad Hussain	M	Son	9	
"					Zakir Hussain	M	Son	5	
"					Ayaz Hussain	M	Son	3	
"	E/21	-	-	3	Shezeda Amanullah	M	Head	28	
"					Mrs. Amanullah	F	Wife	22	
"					Urfan	M	Son	1	
Erroneously Included	CE/3	078	081	31	Mohd Ilyas	M	Friend	24	Person counted twice in workers group quarters
"	E/21	054	081/h 060	11	Khalid	M	Son	20	

44

RAWALPINDI CENSUS/CES PRETEST: COVERAGE EVALUATION OF CBS SAMPLE AREA NO. CU-4

A. CBS SAMPLE AREA

B. COVERAGE SUMMARY FOR CENSUS

CENSUS BLOCK(S) : 12020102(URBAN)
 SAMPLE SIZE : 27 Households
 TYPE OF SAMPLING : INDEPENDENT AREA SAMPLE

Total Persons Counted	Number of Persons Missed			Number of Persons Erroneously Included	Net Error (Col.5 Minus Col. 4)	Estimated Correct Count
	In Enumerated Households	In Missed Households	Total Missed			
	1.	2.	3.			
151	16 (8.4%)	23 (12.1%)	39 (20.5%)	0	-39 (-20.5%)	190

C. DETAILS OF COVERAGE ERRORS

1. In five missed households

TYPE OF ERRORS	House NO. OR Malaria NO.	Structure NO.	Census Household NO.	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	R E M A R K S
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.

CENSUS ERRORS

Missed in Enumerated Households	E/2	071	172	16	Mohd.Nasir	M	Brother	29	
"	"	"	"	"	Hasnet Bibi	F	Mother	70	
"	"	"	"	"	Shahzad	M	Son	9	
"	E/3	072	178	5	Khalda Bibi	F	Niece	10	
"	E/7	076	182	8	Sardar Begum	F	Daughter	25	
"	"	"	"	"	Mohd.Azam	M	Son	17	
"	"	"	"	"	Dr.G.A.Khan	M	Son-in-law	30	
"	"	"	"	"	Nourin Begum	F	Grand Daug	5	
"	"	"	"	"	Faizullah	M	Grand Son	4	
"	"	"	"	"	Aliya	F	Grand Daug	3	
"	E/9	076	187	3	Zaheeruddin	M	Brother	18	
"	-	101	238	9	Sher Afzal	M	Servant	18	

S.H/

C. DETAILS OF COVERAGE ERRORS (Contd.)

TYPE OF ERRORS	House NO. OR Malaria NO.	Structure NO.	Census Household NO.	Number of Persons Living In the Household	Name of Person	Sex	Relation to Head	Age	REMARKS
1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.	10.
"	E/13	103	240	5	Shamim	F	Wife	25	Census Household No. 240 was determined to be more than one household in the CES
"	E/13	103	240	7	Razia	F	Wife	28	
"	E/14	104	241	8	Mohd. Younis Mohd. Riaz	M M	Brother Brother	22 19	
Missed in Missed Households	E/5	074	-	6	Murad Ali	M	Head	55	
"	"	"	"	"	Safooran Bibi	F	Wife	35	
"	"	"	"	"	Asif	M	Son	8	
"	"	"	"	"	Zulfiqar	M	Son	5	
"	"	"	"	"	Safia	F	Daughter	4	
"	"	"	"	"	Rafia	F	Daughter	1	
"	E/10	079	-	1	Qari Mohammaddin	M	Head	41	
"	E/10	070	-	3	Mohd. Siddiq	M	Head	25	
"	"	"	"	"	Mohabat Khan	M	Room Mate	20	
"	"	"	"	"	Munir Khan	M	Room Mate	18	
"	E/11	080	-	6	Akhtar Rashid	M	Head	31	
"	"	"	"	"	Khursheed Begum	F	Mother	50	
"	"	"	"	"	Ali Mohd.	M	Uncle	40	
"	"	"	"	"	Mushtri Begum	F	Sister	21	
"	"	"	"	"	Ishrat Parveen	F	Sister	19	
"	"	"	"	"	Shaheen Akhtar	F	Sister	16	

Contd on page...3

S.H/

4/6