

CENSUS OF INDIA 1981

SERIES-1

INDIA

Paper-4 of 1982

REPORT ON POST ENUMERATION CHECK

P. PADMANABHA
of the Indian Administrative Service
Registrar General & Census
Commissioner for India

FOREWORD

It has been the tradition to evaluate the results of census through Post Enumeration Checks and such checks were conducted after the 1951, 1961 and 1971 censuses. Soon after the 1981 census was conducted, a Post Enumeration Check was organized to assess the extent of omission and duplication in the count. The main objective of the Post Enumeration Check is to quantify likely omissions or duplications in enumeration and to measure errors and responses for certain selected characteristics. In other words, the Post Enumeration Check seeks to determine coverage error and content error, the latter in relation to a limited number of characteristics. The results of the Post Enumeration Check conducted after the 1981 census are presented in this report, with a description of the organisation of the survey.

2. The Post Enumeration Check also serves the important purpose of providing to some extent feedback regarding operational matters. To the extent that it helps in improving future census operations, the Post Enumeration Check would have served an important purpose.

3. In the preparation of this report, I have had the total assistance of Shri K. S. Natarajan, Assistant Registrar General, who was ably assisted by Shri A. K. Biswas, Deputy Director of Census Operations, Shri S. S. Bawa, Assistant Director of Census Operations and Shri N. Unni, Research Officer. But for their unremitting efforts the early preparation of this report would not have been possible. I must also acknowledge the enthusiasm with which the Directors of Census Operations concerned ensured that the Post Enumeration Check was carried out strictly according to instructions in their areas. In the Demography Division, which was in charge of the Post Enumeration Check including its organisation and analysis of results, many were involved in finalising the report but I must in particular mention the efforts put in by Sarvashri Karan Singh, M. L. Chittori, Investigators, Smt. D. K. Reshi, Smt. R. K. Choudhary, Sarvashri A. K. Sahu, H. K. Kaushal, Smt. S. B. Oberoi, Smt. M. Podikunju, Shri Naresh Chand, Smt. Rani Arora, Statistical Assistants, Smt. Saroj Chopra, Shri Bansi Lal, Smt. Dipali Bose, Smt. Manju Bose, Smt. Sudesh Aggarwal, Smt. Gulshan Mehandiratta, Computers, Smt. Madhulika Das, Junior Stenographer and Shri C. Selvakumar, Lower Division Clerk.

4. In editing of this report and in preparing the material for the press, I have had the valuable assistance of Shri O. P. Sharma, Deputy Director of Census Operations, Shri K. C. Verma, Confidential Assistant, Shri V. P. Kataria, Shri D. N. Dixit, Investigators, Shri N. S. Bhatnagar, Statistical Assistant and Smt. Rajni Verma, Assistant Compiler. The effort put in by them in the preparation of this report is gladly acknowledged.

5. As mentioned earlier, the results of the Post Enumeration Check serve the dual purpose of evaluating the count itself and providing some feedback on the operations concerned. To the extent that this report serves both these purposes our task would have been fulfilled.

NEW DELHI :
October 29, 1982.

P. PADMANABHA,
Registrar General, India

CONTENTS

		Page No.
Foreword		i
Chapter 1	Introduction	1—2
2	Organisation of Post Enumeration Check	3—5
3	Coverage Error	6—10
4	Content Error	11—17

TABLES

Table 1	Rates of net omission per 1000 enumerated persons—India and Zones	21
2	Net omission rates per 1000 enumerated persons by age and sex—India and Zones	22
3	Percentage distribution of persons omitted (Net) by age and sex—India and Zones	23
4	Net omission rates per 1000 enumerated persons by literacy status—India and Zones	24
5	Net omission rates per 1000 enumerated persons by family type and sex—India and Zones	24
6	Percentage distribution of enumerated persons by relationship to head—India	25
7	Net omission rates per 1000 enumerated persons by relationship to head and sex—India	25
8	Net omission rates per 1000 enumerated persons by marital status and sex—India and Zones	26
9	Indices of response bias and response variance by sex, Rural/Urban—India	26—27
10	Indices of response bias and response variance by sex for Zones	27—28
11	Proportion (in per cent) of persons whose age is reliable (P) by literacy and sex—India and Zones	29
12	Proportion (in per cent) of persons whose age is reliable by age and sex—India	30
13	Proportion (in per cent) of persons whose age is reliable by broad age groups and sex—India and Zones	31

APPENDICES

Appendix 1	Calendar for field work of PEC	35
2	Number of blocks in which the PEC was conducted	35
3	Frame for Sample Selection—Proforma-A—Rural	35
4	Frame for Sample Selection—Proforma-B—City	35
5	Frame for Sample Selection—Proforma-C—Non-City Urban	35
6	Post Enumeration Check—Instructions and Schedules	36—63
7	Methods of estimation	64—65

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Census of India 1981* was conducted from 9th February to 5th March 1981 with the sunrise of 1st March as the reference point, the revisional round being from 1st March to 5th March. Soon after the Census was conducted, a Post Enumeration Check (PEC) was carried out to assess the extent of omission and duplication in the count. Such Post Enumeration Checks were conducted after the 1951, the 1961 and 1971 censuses also.

The main objective of the Post Enumeration Check was to quantify the likely omission or duplication in enumeration or, in other words, to determine the coverage error. In conducting this survey, opportunity was also taken to measure the error in responses, or the content error, with regard to certain items such as literacy, whether one has worked any time last year and the main work. In general terms, the Post Enumeration Check was intended to provide answer to the questions :

(i) How accurate has the census count been?

(ii) How precisely have the particulars of an individual been recorded in the census with regard to certain specific characteristics ?

The coverage error investigated in the PEC consist of two components which are the following :

1. Omission or duplication of persons due to the omission or duplication of entire households, referred to as Type I error;
2. Omission or duplication of individuals in households which have been enumerated, called Type II error.

The content error arises mainly from the manner in which respondents have replied to questions, which is again dependent on how they have understood the questions, and the manner in which the enumerator has canvassed the questions.

The PEC was conducted in certain selected States and the Union Territory of Delhi to a strict time schedule, which may be seen at Appendix I.

The coverage error in the census arises mainly because the instructions relating to who should be enumerated may not have been strictly followed in the field by the enumerator or the type of persons in whose cases replies had to be given may not have been fully appreciated by the person who was answering on behalf of the household. In the census, it was specified that certain persons alone are eligible for enumeration in the household. These included only the following categories :

(i) Those who normally stay and are present in the household during the entire period of enumeration that is February 9—28, 1981, both days inclusive ;

(ii) Those who are known to be normally residing in the household and actually stayed during a part of the enumeration period but are not present at the time of enumeration;

(iii) Those who are known to be normally residing in the household and who are not present at the time of enumeration but are expected to return before 28th February 1981; and

(iv) Visitors who are present in the household during the entire enumeration period.

A person who was away from his normal or usual place of residence throughout the enumeration period was not eligible for enumeration as a member of the household in which he would be considered as a 'normal resident'. He would be enumerated wherever actually found during the enumeration period. It was particularly emphasised that persons who are absent from their normal residence for the entire enumeration period would only be enumerated in the household in which they would be located during the operations. In such cases, the enumerator was also requested to caution such persons not to get themselves enumerated in case they moved again.

As mentioned earlier the coverage error mainly arises because of the possible incorrect application of the above criteria during enumeration to

* The census was not conducted in the State of Assam due to disturbed conditions that existed there.

the members found in a given household. For example, a housewife may include her husband's name in the household even if the latter is likely to be away during the entire enumeration period unless a specific enquiry is made by the enumerator. It may also happen that persons may have come for a short visit and are included due to inadvertance by the enumerator. On the other hand, in some cases children may be omitted, particularly in the case of very young children, due to the respondent's feeling that very young children do not need to be reported in the census. Per contra, a visitor in one household may have been counted twice in the household in which he is a visitor and as part of the household in which he is a normal resident. This would be a case of duplication. The PEC is meant to assess the scale of such omissions or duplications.

In the PEC a departure was made in the manner of reckoning normal resident in a given household from the practice adopted in the enumeration itself. In the census, as will be noticed from the instructions quoted earlier regarding persons eligible for enumeration, visitors present throughout the enumeration period in a particular household were treated as residents of that household for purposes of enumeration. However, in the PEC the concept of 'normal residents absent' was adopted rather than 'visitors present'. This was because it was considered that at the time of the visit of the PEC enumerator it is more likely that normal residents are present in the household than visitors. Since the group of normal residents absent throughout the census enumeration period from their place of normal residence would be the same as the group of visitors present in the household in which they are staying throughout the enumeration period, the PEC ensured that such persons should be covered at one place only as indeed was the intention in the instructions for the census itself. The instructions also emphasised that to the extent possible information should be collected from the persons concerned directly. Since a number of quesions were asked on the residential status of a person and whether he had been enumerated elsewhere, it would seem that normal residents should be included in the survey rather than visitors present throughout. Also, the PEC instructions prescribed that addresses should be noted of the place of visit which again necessitated the inclusion in the survey of only those persons who are normal residents of the household and likely to be available at the time of the PEC. Another reason why normal residents were included rather than visitors was to cover the types of cases in which a visitor may not be known at the place of visit. For example, an official going on tour to another place for 20 days in February and staying in a guest house may be enumerated at the guest house but may not be available at the time of the visit of the PEC enumerator. Filling up the forms with particular reference to questions on residential status of such persons would have been difficult, under these circumstances. However, at the normal place of residence of such a person these details would be available.

Based on these considerations, in the PEC all normal residents were listed, including those who may have been absent throughout the *census* enumeration period, in preference to visitors. As will be noticed further, the PEC analysis indicates that the proportion of persons who were away from their normal place of residence throughout the census enumeration period is very small, being of the order of 0.37 per cent of persons at the national level.

CHAPTER 2

ORGANISATION OF POST ENUMERATION CHECK

Sample Size

The first step in the organisation of the Post Enumeration Check was to determine the required sample size. For this purpose the records of the 1971 PEC were analysed. The PEC results of both the 1961 and 1971 censuses indicate that Type I error was of a smaller order than Type II error. In the 1971 census Type I error was 0.15 per cent and Type II error was 1.5 per cent. Therefore, if Type I error is estimated with reasonable accuracy, it would be possible to estimate Type II error and the total error with reasonable accuracy.

On the basis of the 1971 PEC data that were available for the eight States of Andhra Pradesh, Bihar, Gujarat, Haryana, Madhya Pradesh, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu and West Bengal, the "intra class correlation co-efficient" (ρ) for the number of omitted houses and the proportion of missed houses (p) were 0.0138 and 0.0016 (sample value) respectively.

Assuming these values of 'ρ' and 'P' and an average block size of 120 census houses (based on 1971 PEC) and assuming a simple random sample of enumeration blocks, the sample sizes required to estimate Type I error at the national level for different levels of precision were estimated as follows :

Percentage relative standard error (PRSE)	Sample size (number of blocks required)
2.5	23,031
5.0	3,761
5.5	4,761
6.0	4,000

Taking into account the resources available, particularly of manpower requirements for conducting the survey, a sample size of 4,000 blocks at national level was considered adequate. Since each enumerator was expected to canvass two blocks, more than two thousand persons were trained for the survey, including reserves.

Area covered by PEC

The survey was planned to be conducted in the states of Andhra Pradesh, Assam, Bihar, Gujarat, Haryana, Karnataka, Kerala, Madhya Pradesh, Maharashtra, Orissa, Punjab, Rajasthan, Tamil Nadu, Uttar Pradesh, West Bengal and the Union Territory of Delhi. However, the PEC was ultimately not conducted in Assam since the census was not conducted there due to disturbed conditions. About 97 per cent of the censused population of India live in these states and Union Territory of Delhi and, therefore, limiting the survey to these areas was rational.

Allocation of the sample

The sample size of 4,000 blocks at the national level was allocated among the various states proportional to their projected population as on 1st March, 1981. The sample was rounded off to the nearest multiple of ten for operational convenience. Within each state, these blocks were further allocated to rural and urban areas in proportion to the total number of enumeration blocks in these areas. For this purpose, city and non-city urban areas were together classified as urban and in each state there were only two strata, namely rural and urban. The number of blocks included for purposes of this survey in rural and urban areas of each state are given in Appendix 2.

Frame for selection of the sample blocks

The blocks in which the survey was to be conducted were selected in the office of the Registrar General, India, New Delhi.

For the selection of the blocks for PEC, the concerned Directorates were asked to furnish, in a prescribed proforma, the number of census charges in each district separately for the rural, city and non-city urban areas as well as the number of blocks in each charge. The formats in which this information was obtained are given in Appendices 3, 4 and 5. In the case of rural areas the blocks were arranged by population size class (Appendix 3). In the case of city and non-city urban areas the information was obtained in the proforma indicated in Appendices 4 and 5. The difference in the frames in the case of the rural and urban areas was conditioned by the system of delineation of blocks and charges in these areas.

Selection procedure

From the list of blocks, the sample blocks were selected linear systematically using decimal fractional interval. For example, to select 220 blocks out of 79367 blocks in Karnataka, a sam-

2—382 R. G. India/82

pling interval of 360.7 (79367/220) was used. Starting with a random start of 167.7, blocks nos. 167, 528 etc. were selected systematically. Since the number of sample blocks at state level were allocated to rural and urban areas in proportion to the total number of blocks in these areas, the sampling interval was the same in both rural and urban areas.

The instructions for the conduct of the PEC may be seen at Appendix 6. Three forms were specified therein. These were :

(a) Form I intended to identify households which have been omitted or duplicated or in other words, to determine Type I error;

(b) Form II to find out persons omitted or duplicated in households which have been enumerated in the census or in other words to determine Type II error;

(c) Form III to be canvassed only in a sub-sample of the PEC blocks for determination of content error.

For measuring Type I error, all the households in the sample blocks were relisted. Houseless households were, however, not listed. Form I was canvassed in the entire block.

For measuring Type II error, Form II was canvassed in a 10 per cent sub-sample of censused households in each block. These households were selected at the regional tabulation offices on the basis of the Abridged Houselist and Household Schedule Part II, i.e., Population Record. From the Abridged Houselist, a sample of censused households was selected linear systematically. All the institutional and houseless households were excluded from the frame of households. Institutional households are households where usually unrelated persons live. Boarding houses, messes, hostels, orphanages, jails, hospitals or ashrams were treated as institutional households in the census. After eliminating institutional and houseless households all the censused households were re-serialised and a 10 per cent sample of households was selected systematically.

The content error was canvassed through Form III. This form was canvassed in 50 blocks which were selected linear systematically from among the total PEC blocks. In these 50 selected blocks, Form III was canvassed in the 10 per cent sub-sample of households in which Form II was canvassed.

Organisation of field work

There were three stages of work in the conduct of the PEC. These were :

(a) Listing and enumeration.

(b) Desk match between PEC and the corresponding census records.

(c) Field reconciliation.

These first stage of the operations of listing and enumeration had three components relating to—

(i) The re-listing all the census houses in the selected enumeration block,

(ii) Re-numerating the members of a 10 per cent sub-sample of the households which had been enumerated in the census, and

(iii) Collecting information on particulars like literacy and economic activity in respect of individuals in the 10 per cent sub-sample of censused households for the purpose of content error check in a sub-sample of 50 selected blocks in each state.

The second stage was the desk match between PEC and the corresponding census records. At this stage, the entries in Form I of the PEC were matched with those in the Abridged Houselist of the corresponding enumeration block. Similarly, the entries in Forms II and III of the PEC were matched with the corresponding entries in the Population Record i.e. Household Schedule, Part II. Entries were classified as match, no match and partial match. In order to establish a match between the two records certain criteria were prescribed. In the case of households in Form I the house number, the use to which the census house was put and the name of the head of the household were the items matched. If all the three items in PEC Form I matched with those in the Abridged Houselist, a match was said to have been established. In the case of individuals listed in Form II, match was said to have been established if particulars like name, relationship to head and marital status matched in both the PEC and census records. In the case of Form III, particulars relating to age, whether literate or not, whether worked any time at all last year, whether worked for major part of last year and the broad industrial classifications like cultivators, agricultural labourers, household industry or other work were tallied with the details in Part II of the Household Schedule, i.e., Population Record, for individuals whose name 'matched', in Form II.

The third stage related to field reconciliation in those cases where the entries relating to particulars of households or individuals in the PEC and the relevant census records did not match fully. Additional field probes were made in such cases to reconcile the particulars.

On the basis of work norms, it was estimated that a PEC enumerator would need eight days, excluding travel time, to complete Forms I and II for one block. In blocks in which Form III was also canvassed for content error, an additional two days were needed. In order to ensure that the PEC was conducted as close to the census as possible, it was decided to allot two blocks to each enumerator. The enumerators were drawn from the staff of the offices of the Directors of Census Operations of the areas in which the PEC was conducted. Supervisors were also appointed from the staff of the offices of the Directors of Census Operations concerned, one supervisor being in charge of about four PEC enumerators. In a few cases, supervisory staff were drawn from other agencies like the Bureau of Economics and Statistics of the State Governments. At the regional level, an Investigator or an Assistant Director was assigned the work of supervision while a Deputy Director was made responsible for the entire PEC operations in each state.

In order to ensure that the concepts and methodology of the PEC were uniformly understood, a training seminar was conducted at the national level at Delhi in June 1980 where the Deputy Directors and the Assistant Directors associated in the PEC in the various states were given necessary orientation. This was followed by regional and state level training camps conducted at Madras, Ahmedabad, Bhopal, Chandigarh, Gaya, Calcutta and Bombay. In these training seminars, the supervisory levels and other regional staff were trained with the active involvement of an officer from the headquarters. These training programmes together provided the personnel who, in turn, trained the enumerators and other field staff.

To ensure independence of the operations, instructions were laid down that different sets of persons should be engaged for relisting and re-enumeration operations in the PEC on the one hand and the desk match and field reconciliation operations on the other. The enumerators were inter-changed in such a manner that those who carried out listing and re-enumeration work did not carry out the desk match or field reconciliation in relation to the same PEC block. The latter aspects relating to desk match or field reconciliation were carried out by a different person.

A time schedule, as mentioned earlier, was drawn up to ensure that there was uniformity all over the country and also to permit monitoring. (Appendix I).

Chapter 3

COVERAGE ERROR

The number of persons omitted, net of duplication, and the number of persons enumerated have been estimated by unbiased method. The omission rate, which is the ratio of the persons omitted (net) divided by the number of persons enumerated, is a ratio of two estimated numbers. Therefore, the formula for ratio estimate assuming simple random sampling has been used to estimate the variance.

In the case of Type II error, a two stage estimation procedure has been adopted. As already indicated, at the second stage of enumeration during the PEC operations, a 10 per cent sub-sample of households was selected to make the design self-weighting. The formulae used for estimating the net omission rate and the variance assuming simple random sampling are given in Appendix 7.

In all 4,69,370 census houses were listed in the PEC Form I. In PEC Form II, the number of individuals entered was 1,99,397. For all these entries, desk matching was carried out and field reconciliation was undertaken wherever necessary.

The PEC results are presented separately for the five zones consisting of the Southern, Eastern, Central, Western and Northern Zones and also at the national level. The net omission rate at the zonal level, it was felt, could be estimated with reasonable precision.

These zones correspond to those adopted for the purposes of construction of life tables. The constituent units of the zones are as follows :

(1) Southern Zone : Andhra Pradesh, Karnataka, Kerala and Tamil Nadu.

(2) Eastern Zone : Bihar, Orissa and West Bengal.

(3) Central Zone : Madhya Pradesh and Uttar Pradesh.

(4) Western Zone : Maharashtra and Gujarat.

(5) Northern Zone : Delhi, Haryana, Punjab and Rajasthan.

The main results of the survey relating to coverage error at national and zonal levels are presented in Tables 1 to 8. In Table 1, the net omission rates at national and zonal levels and the related percentage standard error have been persented. Table 2 contains the net omission rates by age and sex. Table 3 presents the percentage distribution of omitted persons by age groups and sex. Table 4 gives the net omission rates separately for literates and illiterates. Table 5 presents data on omission rates by family types while table 8 presents similar data by marital status.

Tables 6 and 7 are presented only at the national level and not at the zonal level in view of the detailed classifications adopted in these tables. Table 6 presents omission rates by relationship to Head of the Household while Table 7 presents the percentage distribution of persons classified as enumerated in the Census in terms of relationship as in the census.

Net omission rate

The net omission rates are presented in Table 1. At the national level, the omission rate is 17.95/1000 of the persons enumerated in the census count. In the case of males, the omission rate is 17.10/1000 while in the case of females it is 18.85/1000. The rates of net omission do not differ significantly for males and females both in the rural and urban areas but the rural-urban difference in the omission rate is significant. In the rural areas the omission rate is 15.04/1000 while in the case of urban areas it is 27.63/1000. The omission rate of 17.95/1000 at the national level has a percentage relative standard error of 4.69 per cent.

The omission of persons due to entire households being missed in the census (Type I error) is very low being 1.47/1000. In particular, Type I error in the rural areas are extremely low, being 0.64/1000 as against 4.14/1000 in the urban areas. The major component of the omission rate is the omission of persons in households which have been covered during the census. In other words, the major component of the total error in the count is attributable to type II error. This is probably attributable to the fact that the thorough mapping and numbering system adopted in the census, followed by a door to door enumeration, ensures that households by and large are not missed but the persons living in such households may to some extent be missed. The coverage of households is fairly total.

Statement 1 shows the duplication rates and their percentage to the gross omission rate at the

national level. In view of their low values, the zonal break-up of duplication rates has not been attempted.

STATEMENT 1

Duplication rates (per 1000) and their proportion (per cent) to gross omission rate-India

Rural Urban Total	Duplication Rate			Percentage to Gross Omission		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Rural .	2.73	2.28	2.51	17.20	12.66	14.84
Urban .	3.54	2.59	3.09	13.21	9.83	11.63
Total .	2.92	2.34	2.64	15.85	11.78	13.81

From statement 1 it is noticed that duplication accounts for 13.81 per cent or, roughly, one-seventh of the gross omission rate. The sex differentials of duplication rate in both rural and urban areas seem to be statistically insignificant. The relative proportion duplicated is more or less the same for both males and females in rural and urban areas.

The omission rates by zones are also presented in Table 1. The omission rate is the highest in the Central Zone (25.50/1000) followed by that of the Northern Zone (21.81/1000). The omission rate in the Western Zone is close to the all-India rate. In both the Southern and Eastern Zones, the omission rates are lower than the all-India rate.

The comparison of the all-India omission rate with the omission rate obtained in relation to the 1971 census shows that the omission rate has remained fairly constant. At the all-India level, the omission rate in 1971 census was 16.74/1000 as against 17.95/1000 in the 1981 census. It must be stated that comparison is only possible in respect of the Southern and Eastern Zones since these are identical to the Zones adopted at the 1971 PEC. In both these Zones, the omission rate is the same as that noted in relation to the 1971 census.

In each of the zones and at the national level, the omission rate in urban areas is higher than that in the rural areas. In the Central and Western Zones, the rates of omission in urban areas are above 30/1000. These omission rates would support the view that census operations have inbuilt organisational problems in the urban areas which necessitate vigorous supervision and control, to avoid an increasing omission rate due to greater urbanization by the time future censuses are taken. Also, the generally higher omission rate in the urban areas in comparison with that in the rural areas is a reflection of the community organisation in the urban areas, specially in metropolitan cities, where knowledge about neighbours is generally lacking and information rarely supplied. The rural-urban differentials are highest in the Western Zone, followed by the Eastern Zone. Incidentally, these zones contain the two large metropolitan cities of Bombay and Calcutta.

Both in rural and urban areas, the net omission rates are not significantly different for males and females. The absolute differentials are comparatively higher in the Central Zone, though not statistically significant. It would be relevant to point out that the PEC that followed the 1971 census indicated that the sex differentials in omission rates were significant in rural areas at the all-India level and in the then Group D States of Haryana, Punjab, Delhi and U.P., with females being relatively more omitted than males.

Net omission rate by age and sex

Table 2 presents the net omission rates by age groups and by sex and Table 3 the percentage distribution of persons omitted. In the age groups 5-9, 30-39, 40-49 and 50-59 the net omission rates are lower than the omission rate for all ages together. In the younger age groups 0-4 and in the age groups 10-19, 20-29 and 60+ the omission rates are higher than the rates for all ages taken together. In most of the age groups, the male and female differentials are not high except in the age group 60+ where the male-female differentials are high both in rural and urban areas, omission of females being comparatively higher. The PRSE by age groups is not available and, therefore, it has not been possible to test if the differences are statistically significant. Such larger sex differentials in the age group 60+ are particularly noticed in both the rural and urban areas of the southern and central zones. In the urbain areas of the northern zone the omission rate for females in the age group 60+ is lower than that of males. The reasons for these diffeernces are not quite clear yet. The number in this age group being small, sampling variability could be one of the reasons. In the central zone, the omission rate in the urban areas for females in the age group 0-4 seems to be distinctly higher than that among males.

Net omission rate by literacy

Table 4 presents the omission rates separately for literates and illiterates. Except for the northern zone, in all the other zones, the omission rates for illiterates appear to be numerically a little higher

than that for literates. The differences however, are insignificant. In the eastern and western zones, the differentials in the case of urban males seem to be of some significance. Illiterates seem to have been omitted more in these areas probably because these include the large metropolitan agglomerations of Calcutta and Bombay.

Omission rate by relationship to head

Table 5 presents the omission rate of nuclear family members and others. This table has been prepared from the question on "Relationship to Head". For the purposes of this table, a nuclear family is defined as consisting of the head of the household, his or her spouse and his or her sons and daughters. The sons and daughters may be never-married or ever-married. Other relations such as the father or mother of the head of the household, the brothers and sisters of the head of the household and other unrelated members have been considered as not constituting part of the nuclear family and, therefore, have been grouped under "Others". This grouping is to a certain extent arbitrary but helps in examining whether there are differences in omission rates between nuclear family members and others in the household. As will be seen from Table 5, the omission rate for others is 39.86/1000 against 11.53/1000 for nuclear family members. The differences in omission rates are high in all the zones, being particularly high in the southern zone. Both rural and urban areas show such differences. It is interesting to note that in the case of nuclear family members, the omission rate for males is slightly less than that for females (though the differences may not be significant) while in the case of non-nuclear members the omission rate in the case of males is higher than that in the case of females. The latter differences are particularly noticeable in urban areas.

Table 6 presents the percentage distribution of persons by relationship to the head with further categorisation of nuclear family members and others. It will be seen from this table that, of the total population in the country, the larger proportion are members of nuclear families with 77.15 per cent belonging to nuclear families as against 22.85 made up of others. It is important to recall at this point that the proportion of nuclear households as such is not available and that this proportion represents the distribution of persons enumerated between nuclear family members and others. In the rural areas 76.61 per cent of the population are members of nuclear families while in the urban areas the proportion is 78.98 per cent. The proportion of persons in nuclear families is 82.80 per cent and 71.11 per cent among males and females respectively. This male-female differential may partly be attributable to the fact that a large proportion of married males probably live with their parents and, therefore, get included in the nuclear family, while a large proportion of married females may have got excluded, from the nuclear family unless they have been recorded as wife of the head of the household. If, however, they had been recorded as son's wife etc. they would be classified under 'Others' and not as members of the nuclear family.

It should be noted that in the 1981 census, specific instructions were issued regarding the order of enumeration to ensure that coverage was maximised. After determining who the head of the household was, the enumerators were instructed to cover near relations such as the wife or husband of the head of the household, the sons and their families and daughters and their families, then brothers, sisters, mother, father etc., of the head of the household with domestic servants, visitors, etc. coming towards the end. This ordering may perhaps be one of the reasons why nuclear family members have been enumerated comparatively better than others.

Table 7 presents the omission rates at only the national level by relationship to head. Some of the omission rates are based on small sample values. Therefore, the corresponding zone-wise data have not been presented.

From Table 7, it is interesting to note that in the households where females were declared as head of the household, their husbands tended to get omitted often. For example, in cases where the females have been declared as the head of the household, the omission rate in the case of husbands is of the order of 74.23/1000. Similarly, in the households where the father was living with the head of the household, the former was often missed. In such cases the omission rate is of the order of 103.70/1000. This may probably be due to the enumerator's presumption in the field that in such cases the husband or father may not be living in such households. Unrelated members also seem to be omitted to some extent. Even here certain differentials are noticed, as for example, the daughter's husband living with the father-in-law tending to be omitted (53.24/1000) more than wife of the son (29.72/1000).

Net omission rates by marital status

Table 8 presents the omission rates by marital status and sex, the marital status being never-married, married and widowed/divorced/separated. The proportion of widowed/divorced/separated persons is comparatively small and therefore, their omission rates are subject to great sampling

variability. However, from Table 8 certain broad conclusions seem apparent. In urban areas, the widowed/divorced/separated males and females are omitted relatively more everywhere. Among the zones, in the rural areas of the eastern zone, central zone and northern zone, the widowed/divorced/separated females tend to be omitted relatively more than married or single females. Among males, the widowed/divorced/separated have a higher omission rate only in the rural areas of the northern zone. The very low omission rate of 1.23/1000 among rural males in the eastern zone is attributable to very small sample values.

Characteristics of PEC Population

As already mentioned, in the PEC all persons who were normal residents of the household were enumerated as such. Statement 2 indicates the proportion of the population enumerated as normal residents and the net omission rates. It must be noted that the omission rate in this case refers to Type II error only.

STATEMENT 2

Net omission rate by residential status (per 1000; Type II only)

Residential status of normal resident	Percentage of enumerated person in this category	Net omission rates (omission or duplication)
1	2	3
Present throughout .	98.97	17.47
Absent throughout .	0.37	—323.50
Present partly . .	0.66	61.40

NOTE.—Negative sign indicates not duplication.

Of the survey population, 98.97 per cent were normal residents on the day of survey and census. Normal residents who died or outmigrated during the census constituted the rest of the one per cent and odd. Further analysis of normal residents by their residential status during the census indicates that about 99 per cent were normal residents present throughout the census enumeration period at their normal residence, the remaining one per cent being normal residents present partly or absent throughout. According to the census instructions, normal residents absent throughout the census enumation period were to be enumerated at their place of visit and not at their normal place of residence. However, the omission and duplication rate of this category indicates that many of them were counted twice in the census, once at the normal place of residence and once at their place of visit. The category of normal residents who were present for part of the census enumeration period at their normal residence but visited other places temporarily has been under enumerated.

Normal residents present in their place of usual residence for part of the census enumeration period were further asked whether they left their normal place of residence before 9th Fbruary, 1981 but returned before the sunrise of 1st March, 1981, or left the normal place of residence after 9th February, 1981. A sizeable proportion of the respondents in this category (20%) were not able to recall details of their exact date of movement i.e., whether they moved out before 9th February, 1981 and returned before 1st March, 1981 or moved after 9th February, 1981. All the persons who were away from their normal place of residence for part of the census enumeration period or for the entire enumeration period were asked whether they were enumerated at their place of visit or not. If a person answered 'yes' and later, on record check, it was found that he has been enumerated at his normal place also (rightly or wrongly) he was treated as a case of duplication. If such a person had not been recorded at his usual place of residence he was treated as enumerated once.

The manner in which such persons were treated in the PEC is shown in Statement 3.

STATEMENT 3

Enumeration Status and eligibility status

	Whether enumerated at normal residence according to population record?	Whether enumerated elsewhere? (i.e. at his place of visit)	
		Yes	No
Normal residents absent thrhoughout at their normal residence.	YES	Duplication	Enumeratd once thoughe at wrong place
	NO	Enumerated once	Omitted
Normal residents present partly at their normal residence.	YES	Duplication	Enumerated once at correct place
	NO	Enumerated once though at wrong place	Omitted

In the case of persons who moved, but who did not know whether they had been enumerated at their place of visit, the address of the place of visit was collected. An attempt was made to trace them from the population Record of their place of visit to check if they had been enumerated there. This attempt, however, was not very successful. In most of the cases the addresses collected were insufficient to locate the census records. In view of this, these cases were decided on the basis of their enumeration status at the normal residence. Normal residents absent throughout or present partly but enumerated at their normal residence were treated as enumerated only once in the census. If their re-

cords were not found at their normal residence i.e., they had not been enumerated at their normal residence the normal residents absent throughout were treated as not eligible for enumeration, while those present partly were treated as omissions. As already pointed out their numbers are very small, and therefore, do not affect the over all omission rate.

From Statement 2 it will be seen that almost 99 per cent of the persons enumerated in the census are normal residents and are covered in the households to which they belong. From this it can probably be suggested that the enumeration in the Indian census could be a de-facto one since the extended de-facto system adopted now relates to a very small proportion of the population. The latter system of an extended de-facto enumeration involves rather complicated instructions which may not always be followed in the field by every enumerator. This is a matter which would bear further consideration.

Comparison of the PEC and census data

The main objective of the PEC was to estimate the accuracy of the coverage in the census as well as the content in the case of a few characteristics. For this purpose, certain essential information on sex, literacy and marital status have been collected from selected census households in Form II. The estimates derived from Form II can be compared with the actual census figures wherever possible to get an idea of the accuracy of the survey. A few selected comparisons have been attempted.

Persons enumerated in census

PEC classified all the persons as those enumerated, omitted or duplicated in the census. Statement 4 shows the number of persons enumerated in the census by sex as estimated from Form II together with the PRSE, and the actual census count.

STATEMENT 4

Population as per census and as estimated from PEC

(million)

India/Zone	Census/PEC	Males	Females
1	2	3	4
India	Census	332.8	311.6
	PEC	331.5 (0.87)	309.2 (0.87)
Southern	Census	82.9	81.4
	PEC	81.8 (1.49)	80.2 (1.50)
Eastern	Census	77.6	73.0
	PEC	79.3 (1.74)	74.2 (1.82)
Central	Census	85.6	77.3
	PEC	85.8 (2.18)	77.6 (2.16)
Western	Census	49.8	46.8
	PEC	48.4 (1.80)	45.4 (1.80)
Northern	Census	36.9	33.0
	PEC	36.2 (2.13)	31.8 (2.10)

NOTE.—Figures in brackets give the PRSE of the PEC estimates.

It should be borne in mind that theoretically the estimates derived from Form II should be less than the corresponding population count of the census as the latter include houseless and institutional populations. The proportion of houseless and institutional population is, however, small. The table clearly shows that the estimated population is in close agreement with the census count, sexwise at the zonal and national levels.

Sex ratio of estimated population

Statement 5 shows the sex ratio (males/100 females) of the population and provides a further check on their accuracy. Here again, there is close agreement at the national level. At the zonal level the agreement is close in all areas. The sex ratio is distinctly higher than the all-India average in the Central and Northern zones.

STATEMENT 5

Sex ratio from PEC and Census

(males per 100 females)

India/ Zone	Census/ PEC	Rural	urban	Total
1	2	3	4	5
All India	Census	104.81	113.55	106.83
	PEC	105.70(0.44)	112.11(0.80)	107.14(0.40
Southern	Census	100.68	104.86	101.78
	PEC	101.21(0.83)	104.17(1.36)	101.97(0.71)
Eastern	Census	103.61	120 68	106.40
	PEC	105.63(0.85)	114.98(2 31)	107.15(0.80)
Central	Census	109.43	116.45	110.71
	PEC	109.42(0.92)	114.79(1.58)	110.40(0.80)
Western	Census	102.24	115.21	106.42
	PEC	102.43(1.27)	115.08(1.86)	106.40(1.05)
Northern	Census	109.49	117.34	111.72
	PEC	111.73(1.26)	116.82(1.51)	113.20(0.99)

NOTE.—Figures in brackets indicate the related PRSE of the PEC estimates.

Marital Status

Statement 6 shows the population classified by marital status. In view of the small sample, the widowed and the divorced and separated have been grouped together. Since the 1981 census figures by marital status are not available, the 1971 figures have been adopted for broad comparisons.

STATEMENT 6

Percentage distribution of enumerated population by marital status and sex

ALL INDIA

Marital Status	Stratum	PEC 1981 Male	PEC 1981 Female	PEC 1981 Person	Census 1971 Male	Census 1971 Female	Census 1971 Person
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Never married	R	54.59	44.76	49.81	54.30	44.81	49.68
	U	58.05	48.54	53.56	57.21	49.02	53.43
	T	55.40	45.60	50.67	54.90	45.61	50.43
Married	R	42.47	46.76	44.56	42.18	45.71	43.90
	U	39.87	43.73	41.69	40.46	42.43	41.37
	T	41.86	46.08	43.90	41.82	45.08	43.39
Widowed/Divorced/ Separated	R	2.94	8.48	5.63	3.47	9.44	6.37
	U	2.08	7.73	4.75	2.10	8.45	5.03
	T	2.74	8.32	5.43	3.19	9.26	6.11

It is seen that during the decade 1971-81 the proportions of married and never married have not changed much.

CHAPTER 4

CONTENT ERROR

One of the objectives of the Post Enumeration Check was to determine how precisely particulars have been recorded in the census with regard to certain specific characteristics. This enquiry related to only the following characteristics :—

(i) Age
(ii) Literacy
(iii) Worked any time last year
(iv) If worked; whether worked for major part of last year
(v) If worked for major part of last year whether worked as Cultivator, Agricultural Labourer, in Household Industry or any Other Work

The content error for the characteristics indicated above was determined through information collected in Form III (Appendix 6). This form was canvassed in a 10 per cent sub-sample of censused households in a sub-sample of 50 PEC blocks in each of the states where the PEC was conducted. The 10 per cent sub-sample of censused households was the same as that adopted for the canvassing of Form II. In the selected enumeration blocks for this purpose, specially trained enumerators were appointed and to some extent the difficulty in obtaining such trained enumerators in large numbers was a factor that limited this study to a sub-sample of 50 PEC blocks.

In the case of those individuals who were matched in the PEC and the census, particulars relating to the characteristics concerned, as recorded in the PEC Form III were compared with the corresponding census records. The differences between the two sets of data relating to each of these characteristics were further probed in the field to ensure that the description of the characteristics was as at the time of the census. In other words, adjustment was made for the fact that there may have been a change in some of these characteristics between the time when the census was held and that when the PEC was conducted. The data, after such field reconciliation, were taken as correct and then compared with the census data. The reconciled data represented the PEC data and the reference in the discussion that follows is to such reconciled data.

The evaluation of the content error has been made by estimating five indices of response bias and response variance.

The response bias of a statistic for an area is that part of the error of response that would not tend to average out over the work of many interviewers who might be assigned to the area or the many conceivable responses of the respondents in the area. It may and often will differ between types of areas or between one survey or one census and the next, although it may tend to be consistent in direction and to a considerable degree in amount.

The response variance of a statistic arises from factors that would tend to average out through compensating errors in a large number of repetitions of the experience, but that may in a particular limited set of measurements have a significant effect on the accuracy of the result. Such errors generally may tend to balance out over a large number of enumerators but may have a substantial effect on the statistics for small areas or small tabulation cells. The differences in performance among enumerators are in many cases an important component of response variance.

Of the five indices developed, two relate to response bias and the other three to response variance. These indices are the following :—

Response bias :

(i) Net Difference Rate
(ii) Net Shift Rate

Response variance :

(i) Gross Difference Rate
(ii) Index of Inconsistency
(iii) Proportion of Standard Differently Reported

The significance of response bias and variance can be explained with reference to the work category, by way of an example. In the PEC it was determined whether a person was a worker or not based on the fact whether he worked any time at all last year or not. The PEC results relating to this characteristic can be compared with those of the census in relation to the same characteristic

3—382 R. G. India/82

and the classificatory differences can be considered on the following basis :—

Classification of workers and non-workers in PEC and census

Number of persons classified in PEC as		Number of persons classified in census as	
		Worker	non-worker
Worker (a+b)		a	b
Non-worker (c+d)		c	d
Total	n = a+b+c+d	a+c	b+d

b and c, in this example represent the classificatory differences between the PEC and the census. The indices referred to above can be developed on this basis and are explained further.

Net Difference Rate (ND)

If PEC is regarded as an improvement over the census, and as a standard by which to judge census results, then the difference between the two sets of worker figures (a+b) and (a+c) is the net difference. The net difference rate (ND) is calculated as follows :

$$ND = \frac{(a+c)-(a+b)}{n} \times 100 = \frac{c-b}{n} \times 100$$

If the sign of this index is positive it would mean that a larger number of persons have been classified as workers in the census than is really the case. If the sign is negative, it would mean that there has been an under estimation of workers in the census.

Net Shift Rate (NS)

This shows the net difference as a percentage of persons classified in PEC in a group. While in net difference rate the total population 'n' is the denominator, in net shift rate, the number of persons classified in PEC as in a group (i.e., a+b) forms the denominator. The formula for index of net shift is

$$NS = \frac{(a+c)-(a+b)}{a+b} \times 100 = \frac{c-b}{a+b} \times 100$$

Gross Difference Rate (g)

The gross difference rate is the percentage of persons for whom the classification differs in the census and PEC i.e.

$$g = \frac{b+c}{n} \times 100$$

g/2 is an estimate of simple response variance.

'g' is an extremely useful index. It provides a useful measure of the consistency or reliability of measurement process. If both the PEC and census enumerators classify a person in the same manner then 'g' will be zero. The farther the value of 'g' from zero the less reliable will be the measurement of the characteristic.

Index of Inconsistency (I)

$\frac{a+c}{n} = p$ will be the proportion of persons classified as 'worker' in census. The variance of this proportion is p (1—p). This ratio of simple response variance (g/2) to the variance p(1—p) is defined as the Index of Inconsistency.

$$I = \frac{g}{2} \div P(1-p)$$

The farther the value of I from zero, the less reliable is the measurement of the characteristic.

Proportion of standard differently reported (r)

$$\text{Symbolically } \bar{r} = \frac{b}{a+b}$$

$\bar{r}$ provides an index of the stability of the response relative to the standard. This gives an idea of the proportion of PEC group that was differently classified in census and the proportion that was identically classified.

Table 9 presents the results of the analysis. The results have been presented sex-wise, separately for rural and urban areas at national level. At zonal level, however, rural and urban data have been combined due to the small sample size. Even after combining, if 'a' was found to be based on less than 5 sample values, the indices have not been presented. It should be borne in mind that the comparison has been made only in respect of persons whose particulars matched at the desk match stage.

Statement 7 shows the net difference rate (ND) at the national level (rural and urban combined) for various characteristics. In the case of literacy and economic activity data, the ND has been tested for significance against its standard error.

STATEMENT 7

Net difference rate (per cent) for a few selected characteristics-India

Characteristic	Net difference rate		
	M	F	P
1	2	3	4
(i) Literate/not literate .	0.39	—0.32	0.04
(ii) Worked any time last year ? . .	—0.54*	—2.22**	—1.36
(iii) Worked for major part of last year . .	—0.22	—1.69**	—0.94
(a) C . . .	0.71**	—0.78**	—0.01
(b) AL . . .	0.43*	—0.21	0.11
(c) HHI . . .	0.16	—0.02	0.07
(d) OW . . .	—1.52*	—0.68*	—1.11

*Significant at 5 per cent level.

**Significant at 1 per cent level.

Table 9 also presents data on the indices of response bias and response variance for the selected characteristics at the all-India level, for both rural and urban areas. Table 10 presents these indices at the zonal level.

Literacy

If the PEC is considered as standard, it is seen that 4.74 per cent and 3.11 per cent of the literate males in rural and urban areas have been classified as illiterates in the census. In the case of females, the corresponding percentages are 8.26 and 4.59. Thus, there seems to be a larger variation in reporting of female literacy, especially in rural areas. This should not, however, be considered as the total error in the figures of literates in the census, since a large number of persons who were illiterate according to the PEC have been classified as literate in the census. The net difference in literacy rate for males (ND) after allowing for such distortions is small, being 0.47 per cent in rural areas and 0.11 per cent in urban areas. In the case of females the corresponding NDs are —0.26 per cent and —0.57 per cent. Both in rural and urban areas, the ND is insignificant for males and females. It would, therefore appear that the overall literacy rate obtained by the census is reliable, with no bias (see Statement 7). The index NS also permits a similar conclusion. The signs attached to the figures indicate that while more males have been classified as literate in the census, in the case of females, more of them have been classified as illiterates. In urban areas such bias is negligible for males, but for females it is over 1 per cent. It should be recalled that in the census and PEC the same person has been interviewed and only the interviewer has changed.

The other indices also support similar conclusions in the case of literacy. The index of inconsistency indicates that when one takes into account the differing proportion 'p' of literates among males and females and likely variance p (I—p) of the estimate 'p', response variance 'g' would constitute 9 per cent of the variance.

While at national level, the biases seem negligible, as seen from Table 10, in the western and southern zones, male literacy seems to have been overestimated in the census, the ND being 1.13 per cent and 1.35 per cent, with both these N.D.s being significant. Similarly, in the central zone, female literacy seems to have been under reported, the ND being —1.31 per cent. In all the other zones the biases are insignificant. On the whole, biases at zonal level are of compensating nature, so that at national level, as already indicated, the NDs are insignificant.

Worked anytime last year

The definition of work adopted in the PEC was identical with that adopted in the 1981 census itself. The indices relevant to this characteristic are presented in Table 9.

In the case of males there is no perceptible difference between the PEC and census results. Among those who were classified as having worked any time in the last year in the PEC, only 3.49 per cent of rural males and 3.45 per cent of urban males have been classified as non-workers in the census. The loss due to this non inclusion among workers has been compensated to some extent by the inclusion in the census of persons who, according to the PEC, did not work at all. The net difference rate is —0.41 per cent and —1.02 per cent in the case of males in the rural and urban areas respectively. Both rural and urban rates indicate significant under-reporting bias. Thus, there has been a small quantum of under-enumeration of male workers in the census. The indices of response variation for males indicate that the variability has not been high.

In the case of females the picture is somewhat different. From Table 9, it will be seen from the index $\bar{r}$ that 18.04 per cent in the rural areas and 18.86 per cent in the urban areas of females classified as workers in the PEC have been reported as non-workers in the census. As in the case of males, this has been compensated to a large extent by errors in the opposite direction. Even with this compensation, the net difference rate is —2.31 per cent and —1.91 per cent for females in rural and urban areas respectively and both these rates are significant. It will be seen from Statement 7 that there has been a net bias of —2.22 per cent

on the average in reporting work participation rate in the case of females at the national level. The index of inconsistency also indicates that in the case of females the data are comparatively less reliable than those in the case of males.

Taking these biases into consideration, it would seem that the percentage of workers in the census seems to have been under-reported by 1.36 per cent at the national level (Statement 7).

In Table 10 the relevant indices for each of the zones have been presented. Here again, it is noticed that there has been significant under-reporting of the male worker participation rate in the northern, southern and eastern zones. In the western and central zones the bias in the case of males is negligible. Similarly, the female work participation rates seems to have been under reported in all the zones, except in the western zone. The bias is rather high in the northern and southern zones, followed by the central and eastern zones. The index of proportion of the standard differently reported ($\bar{r}$) and the index of inconsistency (I) are also high in the case of females. In the eastern zone, for females the indices of response variance are high but the ND and NS are relatively lower. In the western zone, however, such high indices are not noticed in the case of both response bias and response variance.

Worked major part of last year

Another work characteristic which was tested in the PEC was that relating to whether one has worked for the major part of the year preceding enumeration. The various indices for this characteristic are also presented in Table 9.

The low and insignificant net difference rate in the case of males would indicate that in the case of main workers the reporting has been fairly complete. At the national level the ND is —0.22 per cent as indicated in Statement 7 which would mean that there has been a slight under-estimation of male workers but it is not significant. Among male main workers, the ND is —0.01 per cent in the rural areas and —0.95 per cent in the urban areas implying that there has been a slight under-reporting of male main workers in the urban areas but that in the rural areas it is negligible. Since urban areas form a small proportion, the overall response bias for male main workers is negligible.

In contrast to male main workers, female main workers have been under-reported in both the rural and urban areas, the ND being —1.73 per cent and —1.55 per cent respectively. Both these rates are significant.

The zonewise indices presented in Table 10 indicate that in all the zones male main workers have been reported correctly but that in the case of females there has been significant under-reporting of main workers in the northern, southern, central and western zones, the ND being —3.44 per cent, —2.19 per cent, —2.04 per cent and —1.47 per cent respectively in this case.

In the case of males, there has not been much difference in the identification of main workers between the PEC and the census both at the all-India and the zonal levels, as will be seen from the level of indices of gross differences, index of inconsistency and proportion standard differently reported. In the case of rural females, the classification with regard to this work characteristics seems to be more variable as seen from the index of inconsistency. Both with regard to the characteristic relating to whether one has worked anytime last year or whether one has worked for the major part of the last year, there would seem to be under estimation in the case of females.

Table 9 also presents the indices in relation to each of the industrial categories under main activity of cultivator, agricultural labourer, household industry and other worker. The net difference and net shift indices at the national level indicate that there is under-reporting in the census in the category of other worker both in rural and urban areas and among both males and females. In the case of rural males this has been partly compensated by over reporting in the category of cultivator and agricultural labourer. These compensating factors together result in net difference rate in the case of male main workers being negligible in the rural areas as indicated earlier. It is likely that persons who are cultivators and also have other work as their main activity tend to be included as cultivators rather than as other workers in rural areas. This may in the absence of a detailed probe, be partly due to predilection on the part of the respondent to indicate that he is a cultivator in preference to being an other worker, given the strong bias in the rural areas in relation to land. Partly, this may also be due to the enumerator's lack of detailed investigation or a desire to avoid work since instructions require collection of further details in the case of other workers and not in the case of cultivators or agricultural labourers. In urban areas, however, the under-reporting of other workers is not compensated by over-reporting under any other category. As a result, among male main workers, the under reporting of main workers is about one per cent.

The indices relating to response variance, namely, I and $\bar{r}$ have comparatively large values in the case of household industry and other work in the rural areas in contrast to their levels in the case of cultivators and agricultural labourers among males. In urban areas the index of response variance is generally smaller for household industry and other work.

Among females in the rural areas, their participation as cultivators and as other workers seem to have been under-reported in the census. Among females in the urban areas more than half the net differences of —1.55 per cent among female main workers is attributable to the net differences of —0.87 per cent in the other worker category. The difference is significant. As in the case of workers and main workers the indices of response variance are high for all the industrial categories in the case of females.

Broadly, similar patterns are observed in all the zones with net difference being significant in the case of both males and females. These results, taken together, would imply that the category of other workers seems to have been under-estimated in the census among both males and females. Cultivators have been over-estimated among males but under-estimated among females, resulting in more or less a correct estimation of cultivators. Similarly, in the case of agricultural labourers and those in household industries, the biases are in opposite directions for both males and females. Male agricultural labourers seem to have been slightly over-estimated.

Age

The determination of age has always been subject to constraints. Many respondents, especially those who are illiterate, are normally not aware of their ages in completed years. The age returns were also checked for content error as part of the PEC operations and the indices referred to earlier have been developed with regard to this characteristic also. However, the standard errors have not been worked out. In the discussions that follow it is important to note that what is being considered is the age distribution of the enumerated population and that omissions as such in these age groups have not been accounted for. These omissions do not, in any case, emerge from the content error operations of the PEC. Thus, a negative ND would imply that the particular age group has been relatively under-reported in the census compared to the PEC.

The net difference rates for various age groups and other indices have been indicated in Table 9 at national level. Broadly, the following conclusions emerge :

(i) The proportions in the age groups 0-4, 5-9 among males have been slightly over-estimated in the census. In the case of females, however, the proportion in the age group 0-4 has been slightly over-estimated while that in the age group 5-9 under estimated.

(ii) The proportions in the age groups 10-14, 15-19 and 20-24 among males are relatively under-reported. Among females, the proportion in the age group 15-19 seems to have been more or less correctly reported while in the case of the other two age groups there appears to be a slight under reporting.

(iii) In the age groups 25-29 and 30-34 the net difference rate in the case of males is positive, indicating a tendency to the over-reporting of the proportions in these age groups in the census. Beyond the age group 30-34, in the case of males the net difference rate alternates in sign till the age group 50-54. This evidently is due to adherence to the well-known preference for ages with digits ending in zero.

(iv) In contrast, in the case of females, the net difference rate is positive for the entire reproductive age range of 25 to 44, suggesting that the number of women reported in these age groups in the census may be a slight overcount. Above the age 45, in the case of females the sign of the net difference rate alternates.

(v) Indices of response variance such as the index of consistency and proportion standard differently reported indicate a progressive deterioration in age reporting from younger ages to the older ages. This pattern is observed both in males and females.

The conclusions mentioned above are based on the premise that age reporting in the PEC is better than that in the census. This premise is based on the assumption that the enumerator in the PEC was more carefully selected and better trained and supervised. However, the degree to which there has been improvement in the recording of ages in the PEC would still appear open to doubt in view of the fact that quite a large number

of respondents are not aware of their exact ages and, therefore, the careful investigation during the PEC could at best result only in marginal improvement.

In discussing the reliability of age distribution a little later in this report, it has been pointed out that only about two-thirds of the population are able to recollect their date of birth or their age with certainty. In view of this finding, the age recorded by the PEC enumerated can have only limited utility in assessing the quality of the census age returns themselves. It would be useful, in view of these limitations, to assess the quality of the age distribution recorded by the PEC enumerator. This can be done by working out the age ratio score, the sex ratio score and the joint score for the PEC and census age distributions. Statement 8 indicates the relevant scores.

STATEMENT 8

Age ratio, sex ratio and joint scores for PEC and Census

Index	PEC		Census	
	Males	Females	Males	Females
1	2	3	4	5
Age ratio score . .	11.94	7.66	11.97	11.68
Sex ratio score . . .	6.80		5.43	
Joint score . . .	40.00		39.94	

It will be seen that the PEC age distribution cannot be said to be very much better than that of the census. The indices presented in Table 9 have therefore, to be used with caution and with a recognition of this limitation. Operationally, it would seem that the attempt to check content error in the case of age through the PEC is only of limited utility. It may perhaps be a better approach to restrict the PEC to a very small sample and check age returns in relation to other sources such as school certificates, etc. Even if this were done, there are well known limitations in relation to such secondary sources also.

In view of the small sample size and the detailed classification by age groups, the indices of response bias and response variance have not been presented in the case of age data at the zonal level. Statement 9 indicates the proportion of persons whose ages have been recorded both in the Census and in the PEC, within the same age group.

STATEMENT 9

Percentage of persons whose ages have been reported in the same age group in PEC and Census

Zone	Stratum	Persons	Males	Females
1	2	3	4	5
All India . .	Rural	80.93	81.28	80.56
	Urban	82.83	81.30	84.53
	Total	81.34	81.29	81.40
Southern . .	Rural	80.70	81.44	79.93
	Urban	84.24	84.38	84.11
	Total	81.52	82.13	80.89
Eastern . .	Rural	84.83	85.43	84.20
	Urban	83.52	84.20	82.79
	Total	84.62	85.24	83.98
Central . .	Rural	75.00	75.07	74.94
	Urban	79.93	77.76	82.47
	Total	75.72	75.47	75.99
Western . .	Rural	85.64	84.91	86.40
	Urban	89.38	88.55	90.32
	Total	86.90	86.16	87.69
Northern . .	Rural	79.49	80.69	78.12
	Urban	72.52	65.73	80.28
	Total	77.32	76.03	78.79

In the central and northern zones the age reported in both in PEC and the census were in the same age groups for about 75 per cent of the population. In the eastern and western zones, this proportion is around 85 per cent while in the southern zone this proportion is slightly above 81 per cent, which is the national level also. Roughly in the case of about 20 per cent of the population, the ages reported in the PEC and the census do not fall in the same age groups.

Reliability of age distribution

The PEC enumerator was asked to record his assessment as to whether the age returned by respondent was reliable or not. If a person was able to recollect his date of birth or if, after local enquiry, the enumerator felt that the respondent's age in completed years was correct, he was asked to record that the age was reliable.

There is doubtless a subjective element in this view of the PEC enumerator but, nevertheless, the proportions in whose cases ages were considered as reliable by the PEC enumerator would be the upper limit.

The proportions of those in whose cases age can be considered as reliably reported have been presented in Table 11, 12, and 13. Table 11 shows proportion for literates and illiterates at the national and zonal levels and Table 12 by five year

age groups and literacy but at national level only. In Table 13 similar data has been presented at the zonal level where, however, due to smaller sample size, the age groups have been collapsed and literacy has not been taken into consideration.

From Table 11 it will be seen that age data are reliable for less than two-thirds of the population without any significant difference in the case of males or females. Age data is more reliable in the case of literates than in the case of illiterates both in rural and urban areas while these returns are more reliable among illiterates in the urban areas than in the rural areas. Table 11 also presents by zones the proportion of persons whose age is reliable. There are variations among the zones in these proportions. The lowest proportion is in the central zone where it is only in the case of about 40 per cent that age reporting can be considered as reliable followed by the eastern zone where this is about 67 per cent.

Except in the case of literates in the western zone and the illiterates in the central zone, in all the other zones, the proportion in whose cases age can be considered as reliable is higher in the urban areas than in the rural areas.

Table 12 presents the proportion of persons in whose case the age is reliable by age groups at the all India level. Upto the age group 20-24 this proportion is higher than the overall average but thereafter remains lower. In general, as age increases the proportion of reliability decreases both in the case of males and females. In all the age groups the data are more reliable in urban areas than in rural areas. In the case of literates, age data seems relatively more reliable upto the age 25 in sharp contrast to the situation in the case of illiterates where age reliability is better, in the age groups below 10. Broadly speaking, age reliability is better in the case of literates than in the case of illiterates in all ages.

Table 13 represents data on the proportion of persons in whose cases age is reliable by broad age groups and by sex. The highest reliability would appear to be in ages below 15, with the proportion decreasing progressively with age. The central zone seems to have the smallest proportion in whose cases age can be considered as reliable this being so even in the younger age group 0-14.

TABLES

-382 R G India/82

Table 1

RATES OF NET OMISSION PER 1000 ENUMERATED PERSONS—INDIA AND ZONES

Type	Sex	RATE-PRSE	India			Southern Zone			Eastern Zone			Central Zone			Western Zone			Northern Zone		
			Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21
TYPE-I	M	RATE	0.68	4.48	1.60	0.98	4.80	2.00	0.33	3.89	0.98	1.00	7.17	2.17	0.15	2.56	0.97	0.63	3.52	1.51
		PRSE	11.67	11.61	8.73	17.30	20.12	14.33	29.00	32.36	24.62	20.86	22.75	16.31	70.67	20.21	19.49	36.34	34.82	27.02
	F	RATE	0.61	3.75	1.33	0.83	4.45	1.77	0.31	4.09	0.95	0.98	4.97	1.71	0.08	2.18	0.74	0.52	2.26	1.04
		PRSE	12.87	12.58	9.34	16.74	21.44	15.19	36.18	35.79	27.69	22.62	24.29	16.79	137.96	23.34	23.87	40.47	33.88	26.20
	P	RATE	0.64	4.14	1.47	0.91	4.63	1.89	0.32	3.99	0.96	0.99	6.14	1.95	0.12	2.38	0.86	0.58	2.94	1.29
		PRSE	11.79	11.65	8.71	15.81	20.23	14.26	31.26	33.63	26.72	21.30	22.85	16.12	91.03	20.66	20.51	37.09	31.36	24.55
TYPE-II	M	RATE	13.11	23.25	15.50	11.72	19.21	13.55	8.68	19.36	10.54	19.59	24.02	20.49	8.56	30.86	16.12	16.15	22.96	18.19
		PRSE	7.28	9.21	5.72	15.18	19.13	11.91	15.91	25.81	13.66	12.44	22.59	10.90	23.07	16.95	13.53	18.35	18.33	13.35
	F	RATE	15.73	23.75	17.52	11.56	17.11	12.94	9.37	19.76	11.00	25.86	31.91	26.93	10.94	27.74	16.21	22.46	24.88	22.16
		PRSE	6.22	9.18	5.14	14.17	10.13	11.39	15.14	24.82	12.92	10.32	21.69	9.34	16.22	17.20	11.85	14.53	15.84	11.08
	P	RATE	14.40	23.49	16.48	11.59	18.19	13.25	9.01	19.64	10.76	22.63	27.67	23.55	9.74	29.40	16.17	19.11	23.84	20.52
		PRSE	6.25	8.51	5.04	14.16	16.84	10.93	13.78	23.57	11.95	10.60	21.16	9.48	17.49	16.31	11.89	14.75	14.77	10.88
TYPE I+II	M	RATE	13.82	27.73	17.10	12.70	24.01	15.55	9.01	23.25	11.52	20.69	31.19	22.66	8.71	33.42	17.09	16.78	26.48	19.70
		PRSE	6.94	7.99	5.26	13.98	15.80	10.50	15.37	22.42	12.79	11.91	18.52	10.04	22.69	15.75	12.82	17.75	16.24	12.46
	F	RATE	16.34	27.50	18.85	12.39	21.56	14.71	9.68	23.85	11.95	26.84	36.88	28.64	11.04	29.92	16.95	22.98	27.14	23.20
		PRSE	6.00	8.17	4.84	13.24	15.70	10.15	14.68	21.54	12.10	9.99	19.38	8.89	16.19	16.09	11.39	14.26	14.75	10.67
	P	RATE	15.04	27.63	17.95	12.50	22.82	15.14	9.33	23.63	11.72	23.62	33.81	25.50	9.86	31.78	17.03	19.69	26.78	21.81
		PRSE	6.00	7.49	4.69	13.13	13.98	9.69	13.35	20.41	11.16	10.21	18.13	8.90	17.34	15.21	11.37	14.38	13.32	10.31

Table 2

NET OMISSION RATES PER 1000 ENUMERATED PERSONS BY AGE AND SEX—INDIA AND ZONES

Age Group	Stratum	India			Southern Zone			Eastern Zone			Central Zone			Western Zone			Northern Zone		
		Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
0—4	Rural	22.31	24.36	23.32	16.34	23.07	19.71	13.69	15.47	14.56	36.22	34.39	35.32	8.72	11.35	10.02	32.52	35.20	33.83
	Urban	41.48	40.53	41.01	37.03	24.69	30.82	32.94	22.90	27.78	51.24	80.56	65.96	45.33	40.30	42.94	39.68	35.64	37.74
	Total	26.26	27.73	26.98	21.48	23.47	23.48	16.19	16.52	16.35	38.57	41.80	40.17	21.90	21.48	21.70	34.37	35.31	34.83
5—9	Rural	13.28	16.56	14.87	6.66	8.69	7.68	10.35	13.34	11.81	19.87	27.97	23.67	8.60	10.66	9.60	21.51	19.10	20.38
	Urban	29.56	23.20	26.53	19.63	11.12	15.53	29.13	15.17	22.54	41.78	34.05	37.99	38.02	35.78	36.99	19.48	23.49	21.36
	Total	16.64	17.90	17.25	10.04	9.28	9.66	12.92	13.58	13.24	23.25	28.98	25.96	17.59	17.82	17.70	20.99	20.22	20.63
10—19	Rural	15.00	19.21	17.02	16.79	15.05	15.91	8.98	9.60	9.28	22.09	30.16	25.79	9.35	17.30	13.25	14.49	30.18	21.63
	Urban	28.43	25.76	27.12	24.60	21.07	22.87	14.93	25.86	20.28	36.85	26.20	31.46	35.79	25.37	30.73	29.90	36.25	32.94
	Total	18.05	20.76	19.36	18.86	16.58	17.72	9.95	12.36	11.10	24.74	29.33	26.89	18.07	19.93	18.98	18.54	31.89	24.70
20—29	Rural	19.25	17.02	18.13	23.27	15.51	19.23	11.48	6.77	9.14	25.44	30.23	27.79	16.83	11.55	14.10	16.83	23.08	19.87
	Urban	29.19	34.41	31.70	25.55	24.70	25.13	29.60	31.74	30.59	19.07	40.84	30.26	35.79	44.59	41.40	32.89	33.45	33.14
	Total	21.90	21.36	21.63	23.92	17.95	20.85	15.11	11.24	13.21	24.19	32.46	28.29	25.32	22.94	24.13	22.33	26.31	24.22
30—39	Rural	9.64	8.70	9.19	10.31	6.85	8.77	6.50	4.72	5.63	17.00	15.58	16.28	4.20	8.24	6.17	4.25	4.80	4.52
	Urban	27.41	15.94	22.11	23.33	11.05	17.43	30.11	14.78	23.32	35.50	23.64	29.59	24.58	11.94	19.07	26.64	24.69	25.75
	Total	14.24	10.45	12.43	13.90	8.13	11.28	11.26	6.35	8.90	20.50	17.06	18.75	12.12	9.50	10.89	11.18	10.37	10.79
40—49	Rural	9.86	9.74	9.80	7.64	7.72	7.68	7.64	3.23	5.52	17.25	22.78	19.84	5.38	2.21	3.77	6.13	7.97	7.02
	Urban	14.73	20.34	17.25	9.62	18.83	13.88	12.65	20.94	16.19	15.94	22.43	19.07	24.56	24.55	24.56	10.92	12.55	11.63
	Total	11.05	12.08	11.54	8.16	10.39	9.23	8.63	6.16	7.47	17.02	22.72	19.70	12.29	8.71	10.56	7.61	9.24	8.39
50—59	Rural	6.19	10.83	8.40	8.68	15.20	11.81	2.56	4.97	3.72	10.35	11.93	11.10	1.32	9.47	5.17	3.90	13.34	8.20
	Urban	20.13	22.15	21.07	29.91	26.22	28.15	2.48	24.06	16.94	12.05	15.89	13.91	22.37	31.96	26.92	18.56	7.02	15.18
	Total	9.24	13.21	11.12	13.74	17.78	15.67	4.51	7.67	5.98	10.61	12.55	11.54	7.41	16.01	11.48	7.98	11.32	9.55
60+	Rural	9.68	24.83	17.01	7.61	19.07	13.40	6.53	22.42	14.24	13.07	37.68	24.45	2.65	9.76	6.30	20.88	33.96	26.65
	Urban	26.62	36.70	31.73	20.66	40.41	31.20	37.31	40.45	38.87	29.41	50.83	40.36	18.96	25.79	22.27	36.09	18.74	27.59
	Total	12.73	27.14	19.75	10.30	23.88	17.24	10.64	24.91	17.58	15.02	39.54	26.51	7.47	14.12	10.83	24.17	30.14	26.87
All Ages	**Rural**	**13.82**	**16.34**	**15.04**	**12.70**	**12.39**	**12.50**	**9.01**	**9.68**	**9.33**	**20.69**	**26.84**	**23.62**	**8.71**	**11.04**	**9.86**	**16.78**	**22.98**	**19.69**
	Urban	**27.73**	**27.50**	**27.63**	**24.01**	**21.56**	**22.82**	**23.25**	**23.85**	**23.63**	**31.19**	**36.88**	**33.81**	**33.42**	**29.92**	**31.78**	**26.48**	**27.14**	**26.7**
	Total	**17.10**	**18.85**	**17.95**	**15.55**	**14.71**	**15.14**	**11.52**	**11.95**	**11.72**	**22.66**	**28.64**	**25.50**	**17.09**	**16.95**	**17.03**	**19.70**	**23.20**	**21.81**

Table 3

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF PERSONS OMITTED (NET) BY AGE AND SEX—INDIA AND ZONES

Age Group	Stratum	India			Southern Zone			Eastern Zone			Central Zone			Western Zone			Northern Zone		
		Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
0— 4	Rural	19.60	18.51	19.03	14.33	19.77	17.08	18.48	19.92	19.20	21.49	17.27	19.23	17.53	14.40	15.78	26.31	21.84	23.82
	Urban	16.11	17.17	16.62	17.13	13.78	15.60	12.48	10.53	11.58	18.43	25.92	22.40	15.11	15.23	15.16	16.59	15.70	16.17
	Total	18.32	18.08	18.20	15 41	17.74	16.55	16.40	16.97	16.68	20.78	19.25	19.96	15.93	14.86	15.41	22.40	19.85	21.07
5— 9	Rural	13.84	14.49	14.18	6.62	8.56	7.60	17.11	20.79	18.95	14.91	16.06	15.53	14.14	13.08	13.55	19.37	12.31	15. 52
	Urban	13.70	10.86	12.35	10.95	6.88	9.09	14.39	7.67	11.26	18.68	13.02	15.68	14.08	14.21	14.14	9.04	10.97	9.94
	Total	13.79	13.32	13.55	8.28	7.99	8.14	16.16	16.66	16.40	15.79	15.37	15.56	14.10	13.71	13.91	15.21	11.88	13.48
10—19	Rural	24.01	25.11	24.59	27.45	24.42	25.92	22.70	21.73	22.21	23.21	23.24	23.23	24.00	33.57	29.36	21.93	30.76	26.81
	Urban	22.82	22.12	22.49	23.12	22.77	22.96	13.72	26.16	19.51	27.81	17.96	22.59	23.12	19.27	21.41	23.95	30.32	26.92
	Total	23.57	24.15	23.86	25.78	23.86	24.84	19.58	23.12	21.32	24.29	22.03	23.08	23.42	25.67	24.52	22.74	30.62	26.85
20—29	Rural	20.53	16.42	18.36	27.60	19.48	23.49	19.24	11.09	15.15	16.71	16.59	16.65	29.83	17.18	22.75	15.90	16.65	16.31
	Urban	19.28	23.40	21.23	19.15	21.86	20.39	23.38	24.76	24.02	9.98	20.03	15.31	22.38	28.26	25.00	24.04	22.98	23.55
	Total	20.06	18.66	19.35	24.35	20.29	22.36	20.68	15.39	18.08	15.13	17.38	16.34	24.90	23.30	24.11	19.18	18.69	18.92
30—39	Rural	7.91	5.98	6.89	9.46	4.88	7.14	8.48	5.89	7.18	8.60	7.04	7.76	5.80	8.51	7.31	2.88	2.54	2.69
	Urban	13.38	7.41	10.55	13.00	6.78	10.16	13.64	7.90	13.64	13.69	8.05	10.70	11.06	5.17	8.44	12.03	10.69	11.41
	Total	9.93	6.44	8.15	10.82	5.52	8.24	12.00	6.52	9.32	9.79	7.27	8.44	9.28	6.66	8.00	6.57	5.18	5.84
40—49	Rural	6.54	5.32	5.93	5.83	5.46	5.64	7.71	2.99	5.34	7.56	7.61	7.58	5.70	1.90	3.57	3.12	3.07	3.08
	Urban	5.40	6.74	6.03	4.12	8.23	6.00	5.94	8.39	7.08	4.91	5.70	5.33	7.49	7.03	7.28	3.82	3.89	3.85
	Total	6.11	5.82	5.97	5.17	6.40	5.77	7.10	4.69	5.92	6.94	7.17	7.06	6.88	4.73	5.83	3.40	3.33	3.36
50—59	Rural	2.92	4.14	3.57	4.63	7.28	5.97	1.77	3.17	2.48	3.18	2.86	3.00	1.07	5.44	3.52	1.53	3.55	2.64
	Urban	4.53	4.79	4.65	7.95	7.50	7.74	3.98	5.51	4.69	2.17	2.38	2.28	3.79	6.10	4.82	4.19	1.84	3.09
	Total	3.52	4.35	3.94	5.91	7.36	6.62	2.54	3.91	3.21	2.94	2.75	2.84	2.87	5.81	4.31	2.60	3.00	2.81
60 +	Rural	4.65	9.96	7.45	4.08	10.15	7.16	4.51	14.42	9.49	4.34	9.33	7.02	1.93	5.92	4.16	8.96	9.28	9.13
	Urban	4.78	7.51	6.08	4.58	12.20	8.06	7.47	9.08	8.22	4.33	6.94	5.71	2.97	4.73	3.75	6.34	3.61	5.07
	Total	4.70	9.18	6.98	4.28	10.84	7.48	5.54	12.74	9.07	4.34	8.78	6.71	2.62	5.26	3.91	7.90	7.45	7.67
Total	**Rural**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**
	Urban	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**
	Total	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**	**100.00**

NOTE.—Percentages are calculated excluding "Age not stated" from the total.

Table 4
NET OMISSION RATES PER 1000 ENUMERATED PERSONS BY LITERACY STATUS INDIA AND ZONES

India/Zone	Stratum	RATES OF OMISSION								
		Literate			Illiterate			Total		
		Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
INDIA	**Rural**	**13·06**	**13·99**	**13·32**	**14·35**	**16·86**	**15·72**	**13·82**	**16·34**	**15·04**
	Urban	**25·42**	**25·23**	**25·35**	**33·02**	**29·69**	**30·96**	**27·73**	**27·50**	**27·63**
	Total	**17·21**	**18·81**	**17·75**	**17·90**	**18·86**	**18·06**	**17·10**	**18·85**	**17·96**
Southern . .	Rural	12·08	8·30	10·47	13·35	13·79	13·69	12·70	12·39	12·50
	Urban	22·77	23·20	22·85	26·27	20·05	22·78	24·01	21·56	22·82
	Total	15·56	13·90	14·76	15·54	15·65	15·56	15·55	14·71	15·14
Eastern . .	Rural	8·29	10·63	8·99	9·48	9·50	9·49	9·01	9·68	9·33
	Urban	17·68	19·74	18·51	34·71	27·44	33·57	23·25	23·85	23·63
	Total	10·75	13·97	11·75	12·15	11·42	11·70	11·52	11·95	11·72
Central . .	Rural	20·87	26·87	22·28	20·59	26·84	24·07	20·69	26·84	23·62
	Urban	31·89	29·24	31·35	29·98	43·94	36·97	31·19	36·88	33·81
	Total	24·21	27·51	25·36	21·54	28·81	25·56	22·66	28·64	25·50
Western . .	Rural	8·28	9·42	8·61	9·11	11·54	10·56	8·71	11·04	9·86
	Urban	29·14	27·07	28·24	43·98	33·37	37·94	33·42	29·92	31·78
	Total	17·24	18·51	17·65	16·90	16·21	16·52	17·09	16·95	17·03
Northern . .	Rural	16·28	31·98	20·23	17·05	21·56	19·51	16·78	22·98	19·69
	Urban	24·69	27·05	25·65	30·18	27·23	28·43	26·48	27·14	26·78
	Total	20·29	28·40	23·29	19·21	21·58	20·81	19·70	23·20	21·81

Table 5
NET OMISSION RATES PER 1000 ENUMERATED PERSONS BY FAMILY TYPE AND SEX—INDIA AND ZONES

India/Zone	Stratum	Nuclear Family Members			Others			Total		
		Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
INDIA . .	**Rural**	**8·87**	**9·92**	**9·34**	**37·95**	**31·93**	**34·23**	**13·82**	**16·34**	**15·04**
	Urban	**17·77**	**19·64**	**18·61**	**74·42**	**50·15**	**60·76**	**27·73**	**27·50**	**27·63**
	Total	**10·96**	**12·24**	**11·53**	**46·65**	**35·53**	**39·86**	**17·10**	**18·85**	**17·95**
Southern . .	Rural	7·93	6·67	7·34	42·44	32·04	35·84	12·70	12·39	12·50
	Urban	12·66	13·33	12·97	86·44	46·81	63·00	24·01	21·56	22·82
	Total	9·15	8·38	8·79	54·94	35·72	42·96	15·55	14·71	15·14
Eastern . .	Rural	5·16	6·00	5·53	26·12	18·42	21·33	9·01	9·68	9·33
	Urban	16·40	23·83	19·66	53·46	24·57	37·70	23·25	23·85	23·63
	Total	7·02	8·92	7·86	31·20	19·29	23·94	11·52	11·95	11·72
Central . .	Rural	14·42	16·84	15·45	49·42	47·32	48·12	20·69	26·84	23·62
	Urban	20·77	23·17	21·82	80·94	73·62	76·71	31·19	36·88	33·81
	Total	15·67	18·12	16·72	54·73	51·12	52·51	22·66	28·64	25·50
Western . .	Rural	4·61	8·13	6·20	29·33	19·13	22·92	8·71	11·04	9·86
	Urban	22·48	22·18	22·35	76·46	56·71	66.24	33·42	29·92	31·78
	Total	10·53	12·74	11·53	47·03	29·50	36·63	17·09	16·95	17·03
Northern . .	Rural	11·35	16·16	13·52	37·39	34·24	35·47	16·78	22·98	19·69
	Urban	19·03	20·69	19·75	73·52	47·21	58·12	26·48	27·14	26·78
	Total	13·56	17·72	15·35	46·72	37·34	41·04	19·70	23·20	21·81

Nuclear Family : Head, Wife/Husband and Son/Daughter.

Table 6

PERCENTAGE DISTRIBUTION OF ENUMERATED PERSONS BY RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD—INDIA

Relationship to Head	Rural			Urban			Total		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Nuclear Family Members	**82·85**	**69·99**	**76·61**	**82·58**	**74·96**	**78·98**	**82·80**	**71·11**	**77.15**
Head	31·97	3·32	18·04	32·84	3·39	18·66	32·06	3·33	18·19
Wife/Husband	0·43	29·83	14·73	0·55	30·88	14·89	0·47	30·07	14·75
Son/Daughter	50·45	36·84	43·84	49·69	40·69	45·43	50·27	37·71	44·21
Others	**17·15**	**30·01**	**23·39**	**17·42**	**25·04**	**21·02**	**17·20**	**28·89**	**22·85**
Father/Mother	0·75	5·09	2·86	0·77	4·41	2·49	0·75	4·94	2·78
Son's Wife/Daughter's Husband	0·45	9·64	4·92	0·46	6·79	3·45	0·45	8·99	4·58
Son's/Daughter's Son/Daughter	7·37	6·94	7·16	5·30	5·28	5·29	6·88	6·57	6·73
Brothers/Sisters	3·95	1·90	2·95	4·82	1·98	3·47	4·15	1·92	3·07
Brother's Wife/Sister's Husband	0·09	1·73	0·88	0·11	1·61	0·82	0·09	1·70	0·87
Brother's/Sister's Son/Daughter	1·91	1·49	1·71	1·71	1·36	1·55	1·87	1·47	1·67
Other relations	2·30	3·13	2·70	2·92	3·20	3·05	2·44	3·14	2·78
Unrelated	0·33	0·09	0·21	1·33	0·41	0·90	0·57	0·16	0·37
TOTAL	**100·00**	**100·00**	**100·00**	**100·00**	**100·00**	**100·00**	**100·00**	**100·00**	**100·00**

Table 7

NET OMISSION RATES PER 1000 ENUMERATED PERSONS BY RELATIONSHIP TO HEAD AND SEX—INDIA

Relationship	Rural			Urban			Total		
	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Nuclear Family	8·87	9·92	9·34	17·77	19·64	18·61	10·96	12·24	11·53
Head	0·38	4·37	0·74	8·12	18·62	9·02	2·22	7·64	2·70
Wife/Husband	59·91	5·24	6·08	111·04	13·87	15·78	74·23	7·24	8·34
Son/Daughter	13·80	14·56	14·11	23·01	24·11	23·47	15·95	16·89	16·33
Others	37·95	31·98	34·23	74·42	50·15	60·76	46·65	35·53	39·86
Father/Mother	105·54	34·30	43·86	97·98	53·26	60·59	103·70	38·13	47·33
Son's Wife/ Daughter's Husband	47·83	27·87	28·80	70·40	38·70	49·92	53·24	29·72	30·91
Son's/Daughter's Son/Daughter	27·91	27·51	27·72	58·60	44·60	52·00	33·47	30·62	32·13
Brother/Sister	37·24	31·19	35·35	74·04	39·24	64·69	47·30	33·07	43·01
Brother's Wife/Sister's Husband Brother's Son/Daughter	64·71	26·16	28·09	58·30	51·04	51·57	62·86	31·46	33·19
Sister's Son/Daughters	29·21	33·12	30·87	88·63	68·46	80·24	42·06	40·53	41·41
Other relatives	46·44	48·76	47·74	90·47	75·26	82·93	58·82	54·84	56·64
Unrelated	88·29	66·08	84·30	74·42	70·55	73·58	80·89	68·66	78·32
GRAND TOTAL	**13·82**	**16·34**	**15·04**	**27·73**	**27·50**	**27·63**	**17·10**	**18·85**	**17.95**

Table 8

NET OMISSION RATES PER 1000 ENUMERATED PERSONS BY MARITAL STATUS AND SEX INDIA AND ZONES

India/Zone	Stratum	Never Married			Married			Widowed, Divorced Separated			Total		
		Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons	Males	Females	Persons
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
INDIA	**Rural**	**17·03**	**17·40**	**17·17**	**9·70**	**14·35**	**12·08**	**13·70**	**21·78**	**19·68**	**13·82**	**16·34**	**15·04**
	Urban	**31·07**	**27·67**	**29·59**	**22·36**	**25·15**	**23·79**	**37·23**	**39·62**	**39·30**	**27·73**	**27·50**	**27·63**
	Total	**20·51**	**19·85**	**20·20**	**12·53**	**16·65**	**14·65**	**17·92**	**25·51**	**23·64**	**17·10**	**18·85**	**17·95**
Southern . .	Rural	15·08	12·85	14·25	9·78	11·93	11·78	9·65	12·29	12·22	12·70	12·39	12·50
	Urban	29·87	16·15	23·94	13·04	22·92	18·47	47·37	41·85	42·39	24·01	21·56	22·82
	Total	18·97	13·84	16·64	10·85	14·60	12·77	16·66	18·94	18·71	15·55	14·71	15·14
Eastern . .	Rural	11·11	11·23	11·15	6·66	5·97	6·30	1.23	21·16	16·51	9·01	9·68	9·33
	Urban	23·08	24·75	23·92	23·12	20·50	22·03	33·48	36·84	35·89	23·25	23·85	23·63
	Total	13·18	13·50	13·31	9·71	8·22	8·95	4·88	23·49	19·20	11·52	11·95	11·72
Central . .	Rural	25·54	27·74	26·49	14·85	24·27	19·66	20·38	39·52	32·32	20·69	26·84	23·62
	Urban	36·70	43·26	39·29	23·35	29·42	26·42	27·51	40·14	37·73	31·19	36·88	33·81
	Total	27·78	30·80	29·02	16·36	25·14	20·85	21·45	39·72	33·26	22·66	28·64	25·50
Western . .	Rural	11·64	11·15	11·39	5·12	11·00	8·15	6·70	10·65	9·93	8·71	11·04	9·86
	Urban	40·43	28·98	35·40	24·07	29·18	25·98	40·76	40·21	40·84	33·42	29·92	31·78
	Total	21.49	17·00	19·45	11·50	16·53	14·04	16·43	19·41	19·01	17·09	16·95	17·03
Northern . .	Rural	22·15	27·71	24·47	8·57	17·42	13·08	31·74	32·17	31·99	16·78	22·98	19·69
	Urban	21·80	30·28	25·17	35·29	22,83	28·33	32·64	35·45	33·99	26·48	27·14	26·78
	Total	22·08	28·38	24·78	14·99	18·13	17·04	32·30	32·54	32·17	19·70	23·20	21.81

Table 9

INDICES OF RESPONSE BIAS AND RESPONSE VARIANCE BY SEX, RURAL/URBAN—INDIA

Line Number				Response Bias						Response Variance			
				Net Difference ND(%)		Net Shift Relative to standard NS(%)		Gross Difference g (%)		Index of Inconsistency (I)		Proportion standard Differently Reported $\bar{r}$(%)	
				Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
1	2			3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1	Literacy	R		0·47	—0·26	1·10	—1·39	4·50	2·81	9·19	9·39	4·74	8·26
2		U		0·11	—0·57	0·17	—1·18	4·29	3·85	9·72	7·71	3·11	4·59
3	Worked Any Time Last Year .	R		—0·41*	—2·31†	—0·77	—10·15	3·33	5·89	6·68	18·13	3·49	18·04
4		U		—1·02*	—1·91†	—2·04	—16·22	2·44	2·53	4·89	14·23	3·45	18·86
5	Worked Major Part of Last Year	R		—0·01	—1·73†	—0·33	—9·89	3·38	5·01	6·77	18·87	3·29	19·27
6	. . . . .	U		—0·95*	—1·55†	—1.93	—15·19	2·47	2·03	4·95	12·84	3·49	17·54
7	Main Activity "C" Last Year .	R		0·88†	—0·96†	3·40	—14·09	4·00	3·11	10·21	28·28	6·04	29·92
8		U		0·14	—0·15	6·03	—16·27	0·73	0·43	15·76	28·66	13·30	31·95
9	"AL"	R		0·56*	—0·18*	4·43	—2·43	3·37	2·59	14·76	19·46	11·17	18·84
10		U		—0·04	—0·35†	—1·15	—12·91	0·72	0·43	10·34	9·46	10·42	14·49
11	HHI	R		0·15	0·03	9·60	3·16	0·71	0·54	21·28	27·67	18·13	26·68
12		U		0·21	—0·19	14·46	—12·85	0·54	0·28	16·76	11·03	11·64	15·91
13	OW	R		—1·60†	—0·62†	—13·76	—26.10	3·02	0·97	16·74	27·83	19·87	33·26
14		U		—1·25*	—0·87†	—2·99	—16·87	3·13	1·23	6·48	15·01	5·24	20·38
15	Age Groups . .	0—4	R	0·20	0·17	1·74	1·28	1·66	1·65	7·93	7·27	6·23	5·76
16			U	0·52	—0·01	4·89	—0·05	1·57	1·15	7·97	5·21	4·99	4.68
17		5—9	R	0·14	—0·95	0·95	—6·13	3·45	4·32	13·75	17·35	11·37	16·98
18			U	0·21	—0·22	1·73	—1·77	2·05	1·87	9·44	8·65	7·54	8·33
19		10—14	R	—0·11	—0.25	—0·80	—1·94	3·49	3·56	14·73	16·04	13·00	14·70
20			U	—0·01	0·35	—0·11	2·75	2·22	1·79	10·67	7·87	9·45	5·66
21		15—19	R	—0·26	0·05	—2·80	0·53	3·05	3·27	18·30	19·81	17·56	17·85
22			U	—0·20	0·41	—1·89	4·03	2·13	2·44	11·54	12·90	11·10	9·98
23		20—24	R	—0·41	—0·25	—4·85	—2·97	3·28	3·65	21·95	24·40	21·61	23·24
24			U	—0·34	—0·79	—3·34	—7·00	2·83	3·44	15·99	18·27	15·61	18·70

Table 9

INDICES OF RESPONSE BIAS AND RESPONSE VARIANCE BY SEX RURAL/URBAN—INDIA (concld.)

Line Number				Response Bias						Response Variance			
				Net Difference ND(%)		Net Shift Relative To standard NS(%)		Gross Difference g(%)		Index of Inconsistency I		Proportion standand Diferently Reported $\bar{r}$(%)	
				Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
1	2			3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
25	Age Groups .	25—29	R	0·14	0·08	1·99	1·18	3·21	3·49	23·80	26·11	21·52	23·93
26			U	0·19	—0·17	2·18	—2·00	3·21	3·38	19·94	22·61	17·49	21·35
27		30—34	R	0·15	0·06	2·76	0·91	2·85	3·31	26·54	27·84	24·34	25·86
28			U	—0·70	0·32	—8·45	4·80	3·56	2·52	25·50	19·40	25·81	16·51
29		35—39	R	—1·34	0·11	—19·04	1·91	1·72	3·48	16·04	30·79	21·77	28·53
30			U	0·04	0·07	0·74	1·22	2·95	2·25	26·91	20·01	25·16	18·44
31		40—44	R	0·10	0·10	2·06	1·99	2·88	2·98	30·33	30·14	28·37	28·15
32			U	0·47	0·37	8·19	8·40	2·79	2·23	23·95	24·41	20·21	20·99
33		45—49	R	—0·31	—0·39	—6·20	—7·84	2·74	2·80	31·06	34·06	30·88	33·96
34			U	0·66	0·23	14·77	6·10	2·42	2·28	24·92	29·76	19·75	27·27
35		50—54	R	—0·13	0·38	—3·05	10·34	2·43	2·26	31·80	28·62	31·13	25·21
36			U	—0·15	0·08	—3·90	2·35	2·32	1·59	31·51	23·00	31·08	21·52
37		55—59	R	0·09	—0·19	3·65	—6·96	1·64	1·57	34·14	31·19	32·69	31·69
38			U	—0·10	—0·13	—3·57	—4·80	1·25	1·41	24·62	28·24	24·91	28·59
39		60—64	R	0·08	0·29	2·72	9·96	1·55	1·68	25·48	27·09	23·99	23·87
40			U	0·12	—0·22	6·01	—10·00	1·19	1·61	28·57	41·35	26·64	41·47
41		65—69	R	—0·13	—0·17	—7·53	—10·53	1·16	1·17	38·80	41·71	38·43	42·05
42			U	—0·37	—0·33	—24·76	—16·74	0·86	1·13	38·80	34·77	41·25	36·84
43		70+	R	0·21	—0·00	9·39	—0·05	0·68	0·70	14·50	16·72	10·79	16·37
44			U	—0·00	0·03	—0·11	1·79	0·61	0·59	16·81	19·66	16·53	18·81

*Significant (at 5% level)

† Highly significant (at 1% level)

Table 10

INDICES OF RESPONSE BIAS AND RESPONSE VARINANCE BY SEX FOR ZONES

Characteristics	Zone	Response Bias						Response Variance			
		Net difference ND(%)		Net Shift relative to standard NS(%)		Gross Difference G(%)		Index of Inconsistency (I)		Proportion standard differently Reported (R)	
		Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Literacy . . .	Southern	1·35£	—0·04	2·50	—0·11	5·61	4·60	11·34	10·16	3·94	6·68
	Eastern	0·43	0·44	0·89	1·97	3·64	2·70	7·28	7·76	3·33	5·06
	Central	—0·70	—1·31£	—1·78	—9·70	5·46	2·79	11·54	13·04	7·86	15·18
	Western . .	1·13£	—0·46	2·08	—1·50	3·29	2·41	6·65	5·68	2·00	4·64
	Northern	—0·37	—0·44	—0·80	—1·75	3·51	1·80	7·09	4·88	4·24	4·50
Worked any time Last year	Southern	—0·91*	—3·30£	—1·69	—11·16	3·76	7·13	7·54	18·91	4·34	17·64
	Eastern	—0·63£	—1·14£	—1·20	—9·77	3·31	3·57	6·62	19·00	3·75	20·23
	Central	0·06	—2·15£	0·11	—12·69	3·92	5·38	7·84	21·37	3·76	22·25
	Western	—0·40	—0·81	—0·73	—2.83	1·28	4·14	2·57	10·29	1·55	8·63
	Northern	—1·06£	—4·81£	—2·02	—27·58	2·38	5·95	4·77	26·98	3·28	30·86

Table 10

INDICES OF RESPONSE BIAS AND RESPONSE VARIANCE BY SEX FOR ZONES—(concld.)

Characteristics	Zone	Response Bias						Response Variance			
		Net difference ND(%)		Net Shift relative to standard NS(%)		Gross Difference G(%)		Index of Inconsistency (I)		Proportion Standard Differently Reported (R)	
		Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
Worked Major Part of Last Year	Southern	—0·37	—2·19£	—0·72	—9·23	4·13	6·70	8·26	19·88	4·36	18·76
	Eastern	—0·44	—0·38	—0·87	—4·49	3·13	2·59	6·25	17·32	3·53	17·44
	Central	0·47	—2·04£	0·93	14·95	3·96	4·63	7·93	22·54	3·49	24·42
	Western	—0·42	—1·47£	—0·79	—6·16	1·20	3·43	2·40	9·87	1·52	10·27
	Northern	—0·54	—3·44£	—1·08	—31·82	2·50	4·57	5·00	33·44	3·02	37·03
Main Activity 'C' .	Southern	0·63	—3·78£	3·87	—7·33	4·23	3·03	14·97	33·32	10·96	33·06
	Eastern	0·46	0·54	2·33	32·87	2·65	0·85	8·21	19·69	5·54	9·15
	Central	1·78£	—2·13£	6·67	—28·31	4·83	4·38	11·86	42·89	5·71	43·24
	Western	0·42*	—0·50*	2·54	—5·65	1·08	1·29	3·85	8·63	2·02	10·16
	Northern	—0·34	—2·47	—1·37	—35·97	2·64	3·47	7·17	41·20	6·04	43·21
Main Activity 'AL' .	Southern	0·60	—0·56	4·93	—5·06	4·20	3·67	18·90	19·52	14·85	19·11
	Eastern	0·29	—0·36*	2·19	—8·70	2·54	1·32	11·02	18·40	8·67	20·52
	Central	1·06*	0·64	1·23	16·70	3·39	2·39	19·38	28·16	13·51	23·05
	Western	—0·43	—0·71*	—3·75	—6·78	1·55	1·94	7·83	11·04	8·58	12·68
	Northern	0·29	—0·24	5·90	—19·95	0·97	0·46	9·89	24·06	6·98	29·05
Main Activity 'HHI' .	Southern	0·20	0·05	8·63	1·97	1·05	0·84	21·65	16·62	18·63	15·53
	Eastern	—0·01	—0·17*	—0·43	—20·89	0·69	0·29	19·13	22·46	18·91	28·10
	Central	0·22	@	31·58	@	0·60	@	32·41	@	26·46	@
	Western	0·29*	0·22	20·94	23·46	0·40	0·29	11·99	10·85	3·76	3·72
	Northern	0·18	@	15·91	@	0·43	@	16·58	@	11·01	@
Main Activity 'OW' .	Southern	—1·80£	—1·30£	—8·63	—26·36	4·24	2·11	13·73	30·16	14·47	34·58
	Eastern	—1·18£	—0·40£	—7·38	—20·46	2·62	0·67	10·39	21·92	11·89	27·39
	Central	—2.60£	—0·59£	—18·51	—28·70	3·93	0·68	19·41	23·84	23·26	31·10
	Western	—0·69£	—0·48*	—2·93	—13·21	0·40	0·29	11·99	10·85	3·76	3·72
	Northern	—0·67*	—0·49*	—3·41	—20·73	1·93	0·64	6·27	17·38	6·62	23·89

* Significant (at 5% level)

£Highly significant (at 1% level)

@Response Bias and Response Variance not calculated due to Small Sample Size.

Table 11

PROPORTION (IN PER CENT) OF PERSONS WHOSE AGE IS RELIABLE (P) BY LITERACY AND SEX—INDIA AND ZONES

Literacy Status	Sex	India			Southern Zone			Eastern Zone			Central Zone			Western Zone			Northern Zone		
		Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
Literate	Males	68.13	74.84	70.29	77.06	83.91	79.19	70.44	86.75	73.95	45.68	47.70	46.21	78.52	69.69	74.37	73.00	85.08	78.38
	Females	73.65	74.92	74.18	77.43	81.19	78.65	77.06	91.27	81.36	44.21	48.03	46.01	82.49	68.44	74.39	72.85	86.50	81.54
	Persons	69.75	74.87	71.56	77.20	82.84	78.99	72.34	88.15	76.24	45.40	47.82	46.16	79.72	69.20	74.38	72.96	85.65	79.38
Illiterate	Males	58.83	62.17	59.30	69.19	75.38	70.07	61.51	68.86	62.32	39.40	30.15	38.25	72.09	71.90	72.04	68.50	71.40	69.06
	Females	58.43	60.67	58.78	67.76	74.40	68.93	62.52	63.03	62.57	39.34	25.00	37.60	71.49	73.91	72.06	64.50	66.78	64.99
	Persons	58.60	61.28	59.00	68.39	74.77	69.42	62.10	65.41	62.47	39.37	27.03	37.89	71.74	73.10	72.05	66.37	68.78	66.82
Total	**Males**	**62.59**	**70.54**	**64.38**	**72.63**	**80.18**	**74.56**	**65.48**	**80.18**	**67.88**	**41.79**	**40.26**	**41.52**	**74.95**	**70.32**	**73.30**	**70.11**	**80.54**	**73.21**
	Females	**61.16**	**67.28**	**62.50**	**70.40**	**77.50**	**71.98**	**65.19**	**75.40**	**66.77**	**39.86**	**34.09**	**38.87**	**73.69**	**81.06**	**72.80**	**65.60**	**76.74**	**68.84**
	Persons	**61.90**	**68.99**	**63.47**	**71.53**	**79.38**	**73.29**	**65.34**	**77.91**	**67.34**	**40.86**	**37.32**	**40.25**	**74.33**	**70.67**	**76.06**	**67.97**	**78.77**	**71.16**

NOTE.—Age not stated is not included in the calculations.

Table 12

PROPORTION (IN PER CENT) OF PERSONS WHOSE AGE IS RELIABLE BY AGE AND SEX—INDIA

Age Group	Sex	Literate			Illiterate			Total		
		Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
0	Males	..	..	..	82·51	82·20	82·45	82·51	82·20	82·45
	Females	..	..	..	79·26	75·87	78·34	79·26	75·87	78·34
	Persons	..	..	..	80·02	78·50	80·35	80·02	78·50	80·35
1—4	Males	..	..	..	68·80	72·61	69·60	68·80	72·61	69·60
	Females	..	..	..	72·37	70·30	71·97	72·37	70·30	71·97
	Persons	..	..	..	70·63	71·49	70·80	70·63	71·49	70·80
5—9	Males	72·60	74·22	72·81	63·87	63·35	63·80	66·15	68·31	66·57
	Females	75·08	81·90	77·73	65·29	63·43	65·03	66·90	71·33	67·77
	Persons	73·52	77·17	74·78	64·61	63·39	64·43	66·52	69·79	67.15
10—14	Males	66·80	80·12	70·30	58·28	53·55	57·83	63·31	75·61	65·79
	Females	77·43	76·78	78·21	57·61	57·80	57·63	64·60	71·21	65·96
	Persons	70·50	78·66	72·89	57·89	56·15	57·72	63·92	73·51	65·87
15—19	Males	71·99	77·87	73·73	52·13	52·03	52·12	63·90	73·31	66·08
	Females	79·83	81·08	80·33	59·90	68·54	60·95	67·03	77·73	69·70
	Persons	74·66	79·34	76·23	56·58	61·72	57·20	65·34	75·45	67·77
20—24	Males	71·35	82·14	74·94	55·15	49·36	54·52	65·00	77·66	68·29
	Females	67·40	74·56	70·54	54·73	54·67	54·72	58·31	66·52	60·53
	Persons	70·14	79·04	73·43	54·89	53·33	54·65	61·75	72·09	64·49
25—29	Males	67·12	72·63	69·09	55·14	47·00	54·04	61·74	67·84	63·41
	Females	65·78	68·04	66·77	55·45	54·33	55·27	57·75	61·59	58·70
	Persons	66.75	71.03	68.38	55.33	51.95	54.81	59.80	65.01	61.16
30—34	Males	64·20	73·13	67·53	51·02	62·83	52·72	57·69	70·91	61·35
	Females	71·39	73·89	72·72	50·11	61·46	51·60	53·20	68·49	56.68
	Persons	65.79	73.40	68.97	50.45	62.00	52.01	55.45	69.86	59.10
35—39	Males	64·06	67·28	65·16	55·33	59·32	55·75	59·11	65·45	60·54
	Females	79·29	68·48	74·05	53·83	52·72	53·67	57·09	59·86	57·67
	Persons	67·48	67·70	67·57	54·43	54·86	54·48	58·11	62·81	59·13
40—44	Males	71·70	68·98	70·60	51·59	48·81	51·26	59·05	64·00	60·29
	Females	68·80	75·84	72·02	51·77	57·15	52·51	53·92	65·25	56·16
	Persons	70·89	71·19	71·02	51·70	54·27	52·03	56·34	64·56	58·17
45—49	Males	65·78	73·53	68·08	53·74	67·54	55·83	59·03	71·43	61.78
	Females	65·78	59·11	62·26	51·35	64·36	53·15	52·97	61·90	54·86
	Persons	65·78	68·34	66·68	52·38	65·81	54·32	56·28	67·25	58·67
50—54	Males	66·47	74·53	69·36	56·81	58·86	57·05	60·30	69·96	62·44
	Females	60·91	67·15	63·87	49·43	61·74	51·40	50.55	63·57	53·24
	Persons	65·44	72·55	68·17	52·81	60·69	53·91	55·84	67·18	58·28
55—59	Males	60·07	64·03	61·90	49·33	65·06	50·88	53·33	64·96	55·96
	Females	67·98	84·32	76·13	52·42	44·69	51·30	53·56	57·23	54·25
	Persons	61·44	69·90	64·83	51·22	50·65	51·14	53·45	61·45	55·10
60—64	Males	70·34	68·90	69·87	50·16	34·56	48·18	56·55	55·38	56·32
	Females	75.61	63.83	70.38	45.99	43.44	45.58	48.13	48.41	48.19
	Persons	71.30	67.53	69.98	47.78	39.78	46.67	52.39	52.05	52.32
65—69	Males	51·37	71·55	56·94	47·09	52·65	47·91	48·52	62·57	51·26
	Females	65·53	64·27	64·90	45·47	48·07	45·95	46·74	51·75	47·83
	Persons	53·33	69·40	58·44	46·21	49·85	46·82	47·70	57·25	49·66
70+	Males	62·54	63·42	62·81	40·91	45·20	41·39	46·59	55·27	48·09
	Females	51·75	60·18	56·49	49·06	47·12	48·74	49·19	50·46	49·45
	Persons	60·90	62·30	61·41	45·35	46·45	45·51	47·84	52·72	48·76
Total*	Males	68.13	74.84	70.29	58.83	62.17	59.30	62.59	70.54	64.38
	Females	73·65	74·92	74·18	58·43	60·67	58·78	61·16	67·28	62·50
	Persons	79·75	74·87	71·56	58·60	61·28	59·00	61·90	68·99	63.47

*Do not include Age not stated.

Table 13

PROPORTION (IN PER CENT) OF PERSONS WHOSE AGE IS RELIABLE BY BROAD AGE GROUPS AND SEX—INDIA AND ZONES

Age Group	Sex	India			Southern Zone			Eastern Zone			Central Zone			Western Zone			Northern Zone		
		Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total	Rural	Urban	Total
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
0—14	Males	66.75	72.69	67.95	78.28	87.98	80.36	71.60	81.55	72.93	46.79	44.14	46.38	75.68	68.69	73.41	73.33	81.14	75.32
	Females	68.32	71.41	68.95	78.80	83.90	79.89	75.19	80.29	75.86	47.13	40.15	46.01	78.16	73.56	76.66	73.15	81.56	75.54
	Persons	67.52	72.05	68.44	78.53	86.00	80.13	73.88	80.94	74.38	46.95	42.13	46.20	76.88	71.06	74.84	73.22	81.35	75.42
15—34	Males	62.58	72.62	65.17	71.99	80.66	74.12	64.90	78.20	67.45	40.40	43.75	41.08	76.63	77.03	76.79	72.23	82.60	75.81
	Females	59.79	69.01	62.10	68.78	78.27	71.03	60.85	73.34	63.24	37.81	41.02	38.46	73.14	71.89	72.66	65.94	76.37	69.35
	Persons	61.24	70.92	63.70	70.39	79.50	72.59	62.94	75.84	65.41	39.22	42.52	39.90	74.91	74.62	74.80	69.24	79.76	72.78
35—59	Males	58.62	67.09	60.57	67.46	75.75	69.32	59.28	82.71	63.51	37.33	28.76	35.81	72.40	65.60	70.11	65.61	78.89	69.74
	Females	54.03	61.86	55.63	64.58	72.71	66.37	55.99	76.67	58.73	31.11	18.05	29.14	69.36	66.19	68.39	55.43	70.31	59.64
	Persons	56.37	64.73	58.19	66.04	74.27	67.87	57.65	80.26	61.21	34.26	23.98	32.57	70.92	65.87	69.29	60.87	75.18	65.14
60+	Males	51.07	57.32	52.26	63.21	64.73	63.48	50.59	73.85	53.67	32.37	35.00	32.73	71.35	54.66	65.40	54.27	67.28	57.31
	Females	48.15	50.00	48.52	53.96	55.88	54.35	53.71	61.05	55.07	28.79	8.33	25.15	65.35	65.83	65.49	49.18	65.91	52.69
	Persons	49.67	53.66	50.45	58.58	60.04	58.86	52.09	66.44	54.37	30.79	21.23	29.30	68.23	59.45	65.44	51.78	66.66	55.09
Total	**Males**	**62.59**	**70.54**	**64.38**	**72.63**	**81.18**	**74.56**	**65.48**	**80.18**	**67.88**	**41.79**	**40.26**	**41.52**	**74.95**	**70.32**	**73.30**	**70.11**	**80.54**	**73.21**
	Females	**61.16**	**67.28**	**62.50**	**70.40**	**77.50**	**71.98**	**65.19**	**75.40**	**66.77**	**39.86**	**34.09**	**38.87**	**73.69**	**71.06**	**72.80**	**65.60**	**76.74**	**68.84**
	Persons	**61.90**	**68.99**	**63.47**	**71.53**	**79.38**	**73.29**	**65.34**	**77.91**	**67.34**	**40.86**	**37.32**	**40.25**	**74.33**	**70.67**	**73.06**	**67.97**	**78.77**	**71.16**

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

Calendar for field work of PEC

Sl. No.	Items of work	Period
1	2	3
1.	Communication of the Census frame i.e. the number of blocks by size class in rural areas and the total number of blocks in urban areas to the headquarters at New Delhi.	Before 1-1-1981
2.	First training of suprvisors, enumerators, Investigators.	November, 1980
	Second training . . .	January, 1981
3.	Assembling of Abridged Houselist, notional map and sketch maps for the sample blocks and adjoining blocks—selection of a sub-sample of households, collection of Population Record for the sample blocks.	To be finished before the 15th March, 1981.
4.	Communication of the information on contrel sheet to the headquarters at New Delhi for the selected blocks.	Before 20th March 1981.
5.	Field work i.e. listing, desk match and Field reconciliation at the rate of two blocks per person.	15th March to 8th April, 1981.
6.	Edit of the filled-in schedules.	8th April to 15th April, 1981.
7.	Despatch of the edited schedules to the punching centre after preparation of inventory.	20th April, 1981.

APPENDIX 2

Number of blocks in which the PEC was conducted

Zone	State	Coverage Error		Content Error	
		Rural	Urban	Rural	Urban
1	2	3	4	5	6
Southern	Andhra Pradesh	253	57	41	9
	Karnataka	165	54	37	13
	Kerala	131	29	41	9
	Tamil Nadu	191	99	33	17
Eastern	Bihar	362	48	44	6
	Orissa	154	16	45	5
	West Bengal	246	94	36	14
Central	Madhya Pradesh	287	43	44	6
	Uttar Pradesh	393	100	40	10
Western	Gujarat	136	64	34	16
	Maharashtra	236	134	32	18
Northern	Haryana	93	27	39	11
	Punjab	98	32	38	12
	Rajasthan	160	40	40	10
	Delhi	10	110	2	48
		2,915	947	546	204

APPENDIX 3

POST ENUMERATION CHECK

Frame For Sample Selection

PROFORMA A– RURAL

State———————

Name of District and Code	Name of Tehsil/Taluka Anchal/Police Station/ Dev. Block/Circle etc. and Code	Number of enumeration blocks by size class 300	300-499	500-749	750 +
1	2	3	4	5	6

APPENDIX 4

POST ENUMERATION CHECK

Frame for Sample Selection

PROFORMA B—CITY

State———————

District	Name of city	Location Code	Total number of enumeration blocks in the city
1	2	3	4

APPENDIX 5

POST ENUMERATION CHECK

Frame for Sample Selection

PROFORMA C—NON CITY URBAN

State———————

District	Name of the town	Location Code	Number of enumeration blocks
1	2	3	4

Appendix 6
POST ENUMERATION CHECK
Instructions and Schedules*
INSTRUCTIONS FOR FIELD WORK

16. General

16.1. There are three distinct stages of operations in the Post Enumeration Check Survey. These are :

(i) Listing and enumeration of (a) all the Census houses in the selected blocks and (b) all the individuals residing in a sub-sample of households selected for the purpose.

(ii) Desk matching of particulars collected in (i) with those contained in Abridged Houselist (AHL) and Census Household Schedule Part II—Population Record.

(iii) Field reconciliation of the particulars regarding houses and individuals who are not matched in PEC forms and relevant Census forms.

16.2. You have to fill up three forms viz. PEC Form I, PEC Form II and PEC Form III, for content error. PEC Form I is intended to identify households which have been omitted or duplicated. PEC Form II is intended to find out the persons omitted or duplicated in households which have definitely been enumerated in the Census. Form III is to be canvassed only in a sub-sample of PEC blocks and is intended to check the accuracy of reporting of certain selected items in respect of individuals in Census.

17. Instructions to enumerators for listing and enumeration

17.1. When you go to field you should carry with you (i) the notional map and sketch map of the particular PEC, block selected, (ii) notional and sketch maps of all the adjoining blocks and (iii) list of households selected for type II error and their identification particulars, like the building number the Census house number and the name of the head of household.

17.2. Utmost care has to be exercised in filling the schedule, requiring a lot of probe. You should also be thorough with the instructions for enumeration given in the Census. The concept of building, Census house, Census household and whom to enumerate, must be specially studied. It will be advantageous, if you carry with you a copy of the instructions for enumerators for filling the Individual Slips as you may be able to refer to Census instructions in case of doubt.

INSTRUCTIONS TO ENUMERATORS FOR LISTING OF HOUSES—FORM I

18. Instructions for filling up Section-I of Form I

18.1. Fill in particulars like State/UT, district, tehsil/taluka/Anchal/P.S./development block, circle etc. name of village/town, name or No. of ward/mohalla/hamlet, enumerator's block No. and the corresponding codes in the relevant spaces provided against them. If a ward does not have a name but is known as ward number 6 or 7, write only the number. The code number will be entered in the space provided.

18.2. While listing the Census houses in the block assigned to you for PEC, take care about covering the houses falling on the border of two blocks properly. For this purpose, you should study the notional map of the block assigned to you as well as the adjoining block carefully and identify the block without confusion. In case you come across a few houses in the border of two blocks which might have been inadvertently left out from both the blocks, include them in your listing. In such a case write in the remarks column "New inclusion". Note that this applies only to houses on the border of two blocks, which might not have been included on the notional map of either block. Special attention should be given to houses which are in obscure places, congested localities, multi-structure buildings etc. You must look for houses which are unconventional like garages, temples, gurdwaras, mandaps, school buildings, hospital buildings, where people, though not expected to live, do live. For example, in many school and office buildings, chowkidars live. You should enumerate all such structures. If a house is found locked, ascertain its use whether it is vacant, or residential or used for some other purposes from knowledgeable person in the neighbourhood. Surely, there must be some one in the vicinity who will be able to tell you the use to which particular Census house is put. Careful inquiry will bring out the correct picture.

19. Instructions for filling up Section II (Columns 1 to 5) of Form I

Col. 1 : *Sl. No.*

19.1. Every line is to be numbered serially within each block. International numerals should be used for this purpose.

*This is an extract from 'Instructions for Post Enumeration Check and Census Evaluation Study using Sample Registration System Records'.

Cols. 2 & 3: Building No. and Census house No.

19.2. Ascertain the building number and Census house number and enter here. Building No. and Census house No. would have been marked on the house door itself. The house that you visit might be a new construction which has not been given a number in the Census. In such cases assign a fresh number according to the general Census instructions on house number and note this in remarks column 'new number allotted'.

19.3. It is also quite possible that in a few cases, though a number was allotted in Census, the number is not visible. For example, the house might have been recently whitewashed. In such cases, refer to the layout sketch with you and assign the appropriate Census house number.

Col. 4: Purpose for which Census house is used

19.4. Ascertain the use to which the Census house is put. It may be used as residence, shop-cum-residence, workshop-cum-residence, factory, office, bank, business house, hospital, dispensary, school, other educational institution, hostel, sarai, dharamshala, place of worship etc. If in a Census house, at least one person lives, it becomes a residential Census house and the fact that it is being used as residence should be brought out clearly in this column. If in a bank premises, a chowkidar lives, it should be recorded as bank-cum-residence. Record the use to which the Census house is put in full.

Col. 5: Name of the head of household

19.5. In case of wholly residential or partly residential houses, enter the name of the head of the household. Special probe must be made to find out if a single member household or households in which all the members go for work, live in this Census house. For example, there may be a person who is unrelated to members of a household living in a separate room. You must try to note such 'households'. If in a Census house, more than one household lives, use more than one line. In such cases columns 2, 3, 4 need not be filled up. Put a dash '—' in these columns.

19.6. After listing all the houses in your block draw a line in red pencil through columns 1 to 15. This line indicates that you have listed all the houses in your block.

20. Instructions for filling up PEC Form II

20.1. After finishing the listing of all the houses in your enumeration block in PEC Form I, you should enumerate the members who are living or who were living in selected households indicated to you by your supervisor. The supervisor would have given you a list of households which have definitely been enumerated in the Census. The list would indicate the building number, the Census house number, the household number and the name of the head of the household.

20.2. If a particular household given to you is not residing at the house number given to you, enquire from neighbours about that household. If that household has moved to some other house in the same *enumeration block*, enumerate the house hold at that house. But give household number as given to you by the supervisor. The house number can, however, be number of the house to which household newly has moved in. You should in such cases note in the space against the house number in Form II, the old house number given to you by your supervisor in brackets. This will help to identify the household at the field reconciliation stage.

20.3. If, however, the household has moved to the neighbouring Census block or any other Census block and in its place no other household has moved in, note in the space against the house number in Form II, the fact that the household has moved out and the house is vacant now.

20.4. If in the place of the out-migrating household a new household has moved in from outside the block, enquire from the household whether they have been censused elsewhere or not. If they say yes, list them in Form II. Note the fact that this *in-migrated censused household* is a substitute household, on the top of the form in bold letters.

20.5. If an in-migrated household says that they have not been enumerated elsewhere or they do not know about their enumeration, do not list them in Form II, as they will be listed in Form I at the field reconciliation stage.

Important note : You should list the household in Form II, if and only if, they have been censused elsewhere outside the block. If they say that they have moved in during the Census enumeration period and have been censused at this block, they *should not be treated as substitute households.*

21. Instructions for filling Section I of PEC Form II

21.1. Fill in the identification particulars of the household in Section 1 of PEC Form II. These identification particulars are to be filled in respect of each household that you are required to enumerate. Besides particulars like name of the State/U.T., district, taluka/tahsil/P.S./development block, name of the village or town, ward/mohalla, hamlet/enumeration block No. and the name of the present head of the household as given to you by respondent must also be entered. As soon as you identify the house and the household, check whether the person whom you are enumerating as the head of the household is the same as the one

who has been reported as head in Census. If he/she was the same person put code 1, otherwise code 2 in the appropriate box. If he/she is a different person, then note the relationship of the present head to the head enumerated in the Census and enter it in full in the appropriate box.

22. Instructions for filling up Section II of PEC Form II

22.1. In this Section enumerate the following categories of persons in the household, according to the order shown :

(a) Normal residents on the date of survey. He/she need not necessarily be present in the village/town of enumeration on the date of survey. This would include all the normal residents of the household who were present at the household during the entire Census enumeration period, who were present for part of the Census enumeration period, and also the normal residents who were absent for the entire Census enumeration period.

(b) Normal resident in the Census enumeration period (9th February—28 February, 1981), but not a normal resident on the date of survey; he/she might have out migrated or died during the intervening period between Census and PEC (i.e. between 1-3-81 and date of PEC).

22.2. This is a crucial stage in the survey. You should, therefore, make every effort to enumerate all the persons in the categories stated above. Enquire without fail about new born babies and children who are liable to be missed unless specifically asked for. Enquire if there was any birth in the household during the period following 9-2-1981. If there was any birth and the child was surviving enumerate it. Note that some persons who are not usual members during the Census enumeration period might have on the date of survey become so, by birth or in-migration in the intervening period. Such persons should be caught in category (a). Even if a normal resident of the household is absent during your visit, enumerate him.

22.3. After enumerating all the normal residents as on survey date, enquire if there were any other normal residents who were present in the household during the Census enumeration period, but who are no longer normal residents now. They may have moved out to another place or might have died.

22.4. Columns 1 to 12 are to be filled by you. Since these columns involve a lot of probing into the movement details of individuals, try to contact as far as possible the persons concerned and ask him/her the questions. If a particular person is absent, write his/her name in column 2 but fill up the particulars of the person after his/her return. This may require that you have to visit the household more than once but it is worthwhile.

Col. 1 : *Sl. No.*

22.5. This column hardly needs any elaboration.

Col. 2 : *Name*

22.6. If a new born child has not yet been named write new born son/daughter of so and so (write the name of mother).

Col. 3 : *Membership type during survey (Code)*

22.7. In column 2 you have listed out all the persons according to a specified order. You probe further whether each of the normal resident on survey day, was also the normal resident on Census day and record answers in codes as indicated below :

(a) For all the normal residents on date of survey who were also normal residents of the household on Census reference date i.e. 1-3-1981 give Code 1.

(b) For persons who were normal residents of the household during the Census enumeration period but who are not normal residents now, enquire the whereabouts. If they have out-migrated or died, enquire if the out-migration or death occurred after the Census reference date i.e. 1-3-1981 or during the Census enumeration period i.e. between 9-2-1981 and 28-2-1981 and assign codes as under :

If the out-migration or death occurs after 1-3-1981	Code 2
If out-migrated during the Census enumeration period	Code 3
If died during the Census enumeration period	Code 4

(c) For normal residents who are born or have in migrated after 1-3-1981 — Code 5

22.8. If you have enumerated any other person e.g. visitor, delete the name. For persons with code 5, you need not fill up the subsequent columns. Put a line through columns 4 to 18. subsequent columns will be filled only for persons with codes 1 to 4 in this column. Before entering code 5 ensure that these respondents are able to fix the date 1-3-1981, accurately. If you are doubtful give them code 1. They can be deleted later. For members in the substitute households, codes have

to be assigned with reference to their previous place of residence from which they out-migrated.

Col. 4 : Relationship to head

22.9. In this column, record the relationship to head in full. In the case of the head write 'Head'. For others write the full relationship. Do not use words like 'nephew', 'niece', or 'uncle', 'aunt', but state whether brother's or sister's son or daughter (for nephew or niece) or father's or mother's brother, father's or mother's sister's husband (for uncle) or father's or mother's sister or father's or mother's brother's wife (for aunt). Son or daughter will include adopted son or adopted daughter or step son/daughter. For brother-in-law, write wife's brother or sister's husband as the case may be. For grandson, write son's son or daughter's son as the case may be. In the case of boarders, or domestic servant/cook etc, who are enumerated as members of the household, write boarder or domestic servant/cook, as the case may be.

Col 5: Sex

22.10. For males enter code 1 and for females enter code 2.

Col. 6: Age

22.11. Record the age of the person in total years completed as on 1-3-1981. Very often there is a tendency on the part of an individual to return running rather than the "years completed". Make sure that only the actual number of years completed is recorded. In respect of infants who might have not completed one year by the day of enumeration, age in completed years must he shown as zero. Do not enter the age in months in case of infants. Many persons, particularly in rural areas, often do not give their ages correctly. They should be assisted to state the correct age by stimulating their memory with reference to any historic event well-known in the areas. Some time the age can be ascertained with reference to the age of another person of a known age who may be living in the same household or in the neighbouring household or that of a well known person of the village such as headman of the village. A person can easily say whether he was older or younger than such a person and by how many years. This will help you to record the age more precisely.

Col. 7: Marital status

22.12. In answering this question use the following codes :

Never married	...NM
Currently married	... M
Widowed	...W
Separated or Divorced	...S

22.13. The entry is to be made in the manner indicated below.

(a) For a person who has never been married at any time before, write 'NM'.

(b) For a person currently married, whether for the first or second time and whose marriage is subsisting at the time of enumeration with the spouse living, write 'M'. Write 'M' also for persons who are recognised by custom or society as married and for the persons in stable *de facto* union. Even, if a marriage is disputed in the locality, write 'M' if the person concerned says he or she is married or is in stable *de facto* union.

(c) For a widowed person whose husband or wife is dead, and who has not been married again, write 'W'.

(d) For a person who has been separated from wife or husband and is living apart with no apparent intention of living together again or who has been divorced either by decree of a law court or by an accepted social or religious custom but who has not re-married, write 'S'.

(e) For an independent woman return her marital status as declared by her.

22.14. This question must be answered for all persons irrespective of age. For very young children, though we know that they are not married, the appropriate abbreviation must be entered.

22.15. 'M' is the abbreviation for 'currently married'. The word 'currently' does not mean 'recently'. It only means 'at present'. For example a man may be 80 years old and may have been married 50 years ago; if his wife is still alive and the marriage subsists, they are 'currently married'.

22.16. The conditions for the marital status to be reckoned as 'currently married' are that the man and woman are both alive and that their marriage subsists i.e. they are not divorced or separated. Please note that we are not concerned with the legality of a union.

Col 8: Literate-1
Illiterate-2

22.17. Definition of a Literate/Illiterate : A person who can both read and write with understanding in any language is to be taken as literate. A person who can merely read but cannot write is not literate. It is not necessary that a person who

is literate should have received any formal education or should have passed any minimum educational standard.

22.18. For a person who is literate, i.e., who can both read and write with understanding in any language, enter code '1' in this column. If there is any doubt about a person's ability to read or write, the test that may be applied for reading is his/her ability to read any portion of the printed matter in the enumerator's instruction booklet (provided the person is familiar with the language used in the booklet) and similarly, for writing, he/she should be able to write a simple letter. Ability merely to sign one's name is not adequate to qualify a person as being able to write with understanding. If a person claims to be literate in some other language with which the enumerator is not acquainted, the respondent's word has to be taken as correct. Other members of the household may also be able to testify to the literacy of the person enumerated.

22.19. For a person who is illiterate, i.e., who can neither read nor write or can merely read but cannot write in any language, write '2' in this column. All children of the age of 4 years or less should be treated as illiterate even if the child is going to a school and may have picked up reading and writing and a few odd words.

Cols. 9-12

22.20. These columns are the key columns in the entire PEC Form II and should be filled up after thorough probe. These columns help to determine whether a person was eligible for enumeration in the Census and if so whether he has been enumerated, once, or more than once, or not enumerated at all in the Census. *For persons who died or out-migrated during the Census enumeration period (codes 3 or 4 in column 3) put a dash '—' in these columns.* For others these columns have to be filled up. For the sake of convenience, the Census enumeration period has been referred to as between 9-2-1981 and 28-2-1981 (both days inclusive). It is quite possible that in many areas, the respondent may know any local calendar better. In such cases you should refer to the local calendar. If any important festival has occurred during the Census enumeration period, you probe with reference to the festival date.

Col 9: Residential status during Census enumeration period, (codes). If '3' go to col 10

22.21. Enquire from every person whether he was present throughout the Census enumeration period viz; 9-2-1981 to 28-2-1981 (both days inclusive) in his block of enumeration. If so give code 1 in this column for such a person. If the person was absent from the block during the entire Census enumeration period give code 2. If the person says that during that period he/she had visited some other places outside the block give code 3. He/she should have at least spent a night outside the village/town of enumeration. If you have recorded code 1 in this column, put a dash '—' in columns 10, 11 and 12. If you have recorded code 2 in this column, put a dash '—' in column 10 and fill up column 11. If you have recorded code 3 in this column, fill up columns 10 and 11. Please note that in case of 'substitute' household i.e. in migrated censused households, this column must be filled up with reference to their residential status in the *block in which they were enumerated and not their present place. For such* a household, you need not fill up column 10. Put a dash '—' in that column.

Col. 10 : If '3' in *col.* '9' *period of journey*

22.22. This question will be asked to only those persons who have stated that they were present in this block for part of the enumeration period. Ask them if they had left their normal place of residence before 9-2-1981 or after 9-2-1981. If the person had left the normal place of residence before 9-2-1981 but had returned to the place before the sun rise of 1st March, 1981, enter code 1 in this column. If the person had left the normal place of residence after 9-2-1981 enter code 2 in this column. If the person is unable to recollect the date of his/her movement, enter code 3 in this column. If in this probe, it comes to your knowledge that the person had left the normal place before 9-2-1981 but returned only after 1-3-1981 correct the code in column 9 as '2'.

Col 11: For codes 2 & 3 in Col. 9 whether enumerated elsewhere Yes-1, No-2, Not known-3

22.23. This column is to be filled for persons who have reported code 2 or 3 in column 9 i.e. persons who were absent throughout the Census enumeration period from the place of enumeration and persons who were present at place of enumeration for part of the Census enumeration period. Ask them whether they had been enumerated in the Census anywhere else ? If they say 'Yes', record code 1, if they have not been enumerated elsewhere record code 2. If the person is not able to recollect whether he/she has been enumerated or not, record code 3. In case you record code 3, fill up col. 12; otherwise put a dash '—' in col. 12.

22.24. In case of 'substitute households' enquire for each member irrespective of the code recorded in col. 9, if he/she has been enumerated at the place from which he/she has out-migrated. If he/she says 'yes' record code 1; if he/she says that he/she has not been enumerated record code 2. If that person is not able to recollect whether he/she has been enumerated or not, record code 3.

Col. 12: For '3' *in col.* 11 *and persons in substitute household, Sl. No. in Section III.*

22.25. If you come across a person who says that he/she does not know whether he/she has been enumerated elsewhere or not i.e., code 3 in column 11, you should collect the particulars of the places visited by the person in Section III. The detailed instructions are given in relevant paras. In this column you enter the serial number of the entry in Section III. For persons for whom you have entered '3' in col. 11 copy down in Section III the particulars like Census house number, household number, name, sex, age, residential status, from Secion II.

22.26. In case of substitute households the address of the place from which the household has out-migrated should be noted in Section III. All the persons in such households listed in Section II of Form II should be copied down in Section III. The serial number in Section III should be noted in this column.

23. Instructions for filling up Section III of Form II

23.1. This form will be filled up for following two sets of people.

(i) Persons who have moved out of their houses during Census enumeration period, but who do not know whether they have been enumerated elsewhere or not and the substitute households of Form II.

(ii) During field reconciliation stage, you may come across some persons for whom code '3' has been entered in col. 11 of Section IV. For such persons also this form will be filled up.

23.2. Repeat the identification particulars of the block you are enumerating in Section I. After that fill up Section III.

Col. 1:

23.3. This column is self explanatory.

Cols. 2–8 :

23.4. Write the Census house number and household number, the name of the person for whom you are taking down the address, sex, age and his residential status as recorded in col. 9 of Section II. These columns are to be copied from Section II. After filling up these columns write down the serial number of the related entry in Section II in column 8 (a) for cross reference. Remember also to write the serial number of the entry in this section in column 12 of Section II.

Cols. 9—14

23.5. In these columns write down the addresses of the places visited by the concerned person. The address should contain the name of the place(s) visited; the name of the head of the household where the person stayed, the house number, street name or mohalla name, whether the place is rural or urban, the tehsil or taluka, district and state where the place is located. You must write as many particulars as possible of the places where he/she stayed. In case a person has visited more than one place draw a line through columns 8 to 13 below the first address and then enter the second place and its address etc. The particulars in column 9 should be as detailed as possible to facilitate identification.

23.6. If the person concerned stayed at a hotel or a guest house but not at any normal household enquire the name of the hotel or guest house and enter it.

23.7. In case of substitute households the address of the place from which the household has moved in should be entered here. Since it is likely to be same for all the members of such a household you may bracket the lines pertaining to the members of the household and write the address against them. In the remarks column, note that this is a substitute household.

24. Instructions for filling up Section II of Form III (Content error)

24.1. You are already acquainted with the PEC Form II and how to fill various columns of the same. For the purpose of detecting content error in respect of certain particulars of each individual, you will be provided with additional sheet called PEC Form III besides PEC Form II. Your supervisor will inform you for which block you are to canvass PEC Form III alongwith PEC Form II. In the selected block, Form III will be canvassed in addition to Form II, *in the selected households.* The procedure of filling PEC Form III is as follows :

24.2. Fill in the identification particulars in Section I in all the sheets used and page the sheets properly.

24.3. After completion of Section I, proceed to Section II. Fill in columns 2, 3, 4, 6 & 8 of Section II of Form III by transcribing the related information in respect of each individual from the appropriate columns of PEC Form II. In case of columns 7, 9 to 11 of PEC Form III, enquire from the respondent the following additional particulars :

Col. 7 : *Reliability of age. Reliable*-1, *Not reliable*-2

24.4. In this question you are expected to indicate the extent of reliability of 'age' reported. For this ask from the respondent, date of birth for each individual and note it against the line 'PEC'.

24.5. If a person is able to recollect his date of birth or if you feel that the person's age in completed years is correct, write code 1. If the person is unable to give any idea of his/her age give code 2.

24.6. For the purposes of this column it is not necessary that the person should know his/her date of birth in christian calendar. In many parts of the country a person may be able to recall his/her date and month of birth in local calendar. If he/she is able to tell his/her date, month and year of birth in local calendar, give code 1. What is important is to find if a person knows his/her age in completed year or not.

Cols. 9, 10 & 11

24.7. These questions are inter-linked and it would be advantageous if they are canvassed together. These are meant to get details of the work done by the person with reference to the last year. For filling these it is essential to know the definition of 'work' and the 'reference period for work'.

24.8. *Definition of work* : Work may be defined as participation in any economically productive activity. Such participation may be physical or mental in nature. Work involves not only actual work but also effective supervision and direction of work.

24.9. *Reference period* : In all the questions, the reference period is the one year preceding the date of enumeration. Certain types of work such as agriculture, household industry, like gur making etc. are carried on either throughout the year or only during certain seasons or parts of the year, depending on the local circumstances. In such cases what we are concerned with is the broad time-span of the agricultural season preceding the enumeration.

24.10. The scope of cols. 9, 10 and 11 should be clearly understood. Col. 9 seeks to find out if a person has done any work at all during the last year or whether he or she did not work at all or if it is the latter how he or she spent his or her time as a non-worker. Col. 10 seeks to find out who among the persons returning 'yes' in col. 9 worked for major part of the last year i.e., for six months or more. Col. 11 seeks to clearly elicit information on the main activity of the workers i.e., those for whom 'Yes' has been recorded in col. 10 and marginal workers i.e., those for whom 'No' has been recorded in col. 10. The definitions used for these columns are the same as Census. You should, therefore, read the instructions for filling up economic questions in Census thoroughly.

Col. 9: *Worked any time at all last year? Yes*-1, *No*-2

24.11. This question is intended to divide the population into two broad streams on the basis of a liberal definition of work. The reference period is one year. This question is expected to net all workers irrespective of the amount of time they have spent on work. In other words, this question will find out the number of all workers which will include full-time workers, part time workers, marginal workers and even workers whose contribution would otherwise be considered insignificant.

24.12. The reference period is one year and this includes the agricultural seasons also. A person may have worked as a cultivator or as an agricultural labourer throughout the year or in some season such as only kharif or rabi, or only for a few days. In all these cases this person has worked at some time in the year and the answer to this question should be 'yes'. 'Yes' should be written on the line. One may have been a cultivator, an agricultural labourer, or engaged in a household industry or any other work. The definitions of these terms are given later, but the important point is that we are determining the fact that one has done some work some time during the last one year.

24.13. Obviously, probing questions will have to be asked specially in the case of those who are not regular workers. *It is particularly important to ask suchprobing questions regarding the work done at any time last year or any of the seasons in the reference period in the case of women and children in the rural areas.* Women and children in the rural areas work in the fields in the sowing, harvesting or other seasons and this may be in their own land or as labourers on someone else's land. This is usually seasonal work only, while they run the house and do all the household work. Unless questions are asked about such work, the usual answer may be that they do only household work.

24.14. It must be remembered that a man or a woman who is doing only household duties or making something only for domestic consumption (and *not* for sale) is not doing any work in Census terminology. It is true that a housewife may be working harder than the others in the home because she has to cook, look after the children, run the house etc. but for the purposes of Census, she is not a worker.

24.15. In this question every worker (even marginal worker) will be identified and in their cases the answer will be 'Yes'. You must enquire from each person that you enumerate, whether he or she has worked any time at all during the last year. Even if the person has worked only for a few days, you have to record him/her as 'yes', against this question. If the answer is 'yes', record code 1 in this column.

24.16. If the individual has not worked at all during the last year, the answer will be 'No'. In this case record '2' in the column.

Col. 10: *If 'yes' in col.* 9, *did you work for major part of last year*? *Yes*-1, *No*-2

24.17. As mentioned earlier, through column 9, you have classified all people into two broad streams of workers and non-workers. In doing so, workers would include all those who have worked irrespective of the quantum of their contribution to the economy. Even marginal workers are categorised as workers in col. 9.

24.18. Having found out that the person had worked any time at all during the last year (Yes in col. 9) you have now to ascertain whether the person worked for major part of the last year. By major part of last year, is meant that the person had worked for 183 days or more, or in other words, worked for six months or more. If the answer to this question is in the affirmative you should record '1' in this column. If the person has worked for less than six months or 183 days during the last year, you should record '2' for that person in this column.

24.19. A person may have worked in different capacities during last year. For example, he/she may have worked as a daily wage labourer for four months, as an agricultural labourer for 1 month and as a cultivator for 2 months. There could even be breaks in between the different types of work performed by him/her. In computing whether the person worked for major part of the year, you should reckon all the three spells of economic activity and if it satisfies the concept of work for major part of the year, treat him/her as 'Yes' for col. 10 and record '1'. Similarly, if the total period of work falls short of six months or 183 days, treat him/her as 'No' and record '2'. For such persons, put a dash '—' in col. 11.

Col. 11 : *Main activity C, AL, HHI, OW*

24.20. In col. 10 you will have ascertained whether a person had worked for major part of the year or not. Now in col. 11, you will be required to ascertain his or her main activity during last year. That is to say how he or she engaged himself or herself mostly. Main activity of a person who was engaged in more than one activity will be reckoned in terms of time disposition. For example, if a person has worked as a daily wage labourer for 4 months, as an agricultural labourer for 1 month and as cultivator for 2 months and for him/her, you have recorded '1' against col. 10, then that person will be reckoned as daily wage labourer for col. 11 and you will record 'OW', since he/she spent more time in this activity than as a cultivator or agricultural labourer.

24.21. The main activity of workers is classified into four categories viz., cultivator, agricultural labourer, household industry and other work. These terms are explained in the instructions for filling up Individual Slip which may be referred to, if necessary.

24.22. As indicated already, if a person spent his/her time mostly as non-worker, put a dash '—' in this column.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR DESK MATCH FOR THE PEC FORMS I, II & III

25. Desk Match for PEC Section II of Form I

25.1. For desk matching you will need besides the filled in PEC Form I the Abridged Houselist (AHL) of the block. In this operation, you are required to compare the Census house number, the use to which the Census house is put and the name of the head of the household in PEC and in AHL. For this you have to compare columns 3, 4 and 5 of the PEC Form I with columns 3, 4 and 6 of the AHL section II and section III in case of occupied residential houses. In this process of comparison you will fill in columns 6 to 10 of the form. Instructions for filling each column are explained below.

Col. 6: *Does the house number match Yes*-1 (*go to col.* 7) *No*-2

25.2. Taking the first house in the PEC list, look for an entry in the AHL bearing the same house number. If you find a Census house bearing the same house number, write code 1 in column 6, otherwise write code 2 in column 6. If you have code 1 in column 6, i.e. identified the houses in PEC and Census, tick serial number of the entry in the AHL and continue to fill up columns 7,

8, 9 and 10 wherever applicable. If you are not able to identify the PEC house number in the AHL you would have code 2 in column 6. In this case, you need not fill up columns 7, 8, 9 and 10. Put a dash '—' in these columns. As explained in the instructions for filling column 11, you will have to find out the reasons for not finding the house listed in PEC in the Census when you go for field reconciliation.

Col. 7: Is the use R/PR in both the records? Yes-1 (go to col. 8) In one record only-2 (go to col. 9) Use Not R/PR in either-3

25.3. This column is to be filled up only if there is code 1 in column 6, i.e. only when the house number matches in Census and PEC. For such houses check whether the purpose for which the Census house is used, i.e. entry in column 4 of PEC Form I is the same as the purpose entered in column 4 of the AHL. If in both the records the house has been recorded as occupied residential house, i.e. residential or partly residential you may assume that a match is established. In such a case, enter code 1 in column 7. If in PEC the house is entered as occupied residential and in AHL it has been entered as either vacant or non-residential, enter code 2. Similarly, if in AHL, the particular house had been entered as occupied residential, and in PEC, it is entered as non-residential or vacant, enter code 2. If in both the cases, the house is entered as vacant or non-residential, use code 3.

25.4. If you have recorded code 1 in this column, continue to fill up column 8. If you have recorded code 2 you need not fill up col. 8 but go to fill up cols. 9 and 10. In col. 9, copy the use of the Census house and in col. 10, the name of the head of household recorded in Census. Put a dash '—' in col. 8. If you have recorded code 3, put a dash '—' in cols. 8, 9 and 10 i.e. no further desk match is needed in this case.

Col. 8: If '1' in Col. 7 does the name(s) of the head of household agree? Yes-1, No-2 (go to col. 10).

25.5. This column is to be filled only for those houses for which 1 has been recorded in column 7. For those houses for which codes 2 and 3 have been recorded in column 7, you should put a dash '—' in this column. For those houses for which code 1 has been recorded in column 7, check if the name of the head of the household is the same in PEC and in AHL. You may come across a situation in which PEC, enumerator has recorded two or three names of the heads of the households in a Census house, but the Census enumerator has recorded only one household. For each household recorded by PEC enumerator, check if the name recorded in AHL is the same. If they agree write code 1 in this column against the particular household. If the name differs or the name does not occur in AHL write code 2. In case of code 2 put a dash '—' in column 9 and fill up column 10. Write the name of the head as recorded in AHL in column 10. If the name does not find a place put a dash '—' in columns 9 and 10.

25.6. While matching for household from AHL, both Sections II and III must be scrutinised. It is quite possible that of the two households residing in a Census house, one household is recorded in Section II and another in Section III of the AHL. In such a case, there may be no entry in columns 2, 3 and 4 of Section III. You have to identify such households, only with reference to the household number entered in column 5 of Section III. For example, the household number may be given as 45 (b), which would indicate that Census house number in which the household resides is 45.

Col 9: if code '2' in col. 7, use recorded in AHL in full

25.7. This column is to be filled up in case of those houses for which you have recorded '2' in column 7, i.e. for those houses in which the house numbers matched in PEC Form I and AHL, but whose use has been reported differently in PEC and Census. In these houses either the use has been given as residential or partly residential in PEC and vacant or non-residential in Census or vice-versa. For such houses copy the use recorded in Census in this column from column 4 of the AHL. This will help you when you go for field reconciliation of the entries. In case such a house has been recorded as residential or partly residential in AHL, but non-residential in PEC, you would also copy the name of the head of the household in column 10 from AHL. If according to AHL there are more than one household in this particular Census house, enter only the name of the head of the first household in this line. The name(s) of the head(s) of the remaining household(s) may be entered at the end of Section II of Form I, after drawing a line with a red pencil. The red line indicates that houses households listed above the line are as listed in PEC. The extra households found in AHL in a Census house are to be recorded below the red line. For such households copy down the name of the head of household in col. 10. Note down the serial number where you have entered each household in remarks column. For cross reference, the serial number of the related PEC house should be entered in the remarks column of the related row below the red

line. If the Census house has been recorded as residential or partly residential in PEC, but as non-residential in AHL, enter the use recorded in AHL in column 9, and put a dash '—' in column 10.
Col. 10: *Name of the head of household.*

25.8. This column will be filled up if code 2 is entered in either column 7 or column 8. The instructions for filling up have already been given under columns 7 and 8. Copy the name of the head of the household from the AHL.

Important Note : After exhausting the Desk Match of all the entries in Form I, you would have a few houses left in AHL for which no matching house number has been found in Form I. These houses would not have a tick against their serial number in the AHL. Copy the particulars in columns 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of the AHL in Section III of Form I. After that continue the desk matching for individuals listed in Form II.

26. Instructions for filling up Section III of Form I (To be filled during Desk Match)

Cols. 1-6: *Sl. No. Building No., Census house No. Use to which the Census house is put; Household No. Name of the head of household.*

26.1. In this form you would list out all the houses and household which do not find a 'match' in Section II. You have already been told in instructions for Section II that there would be a few houses left in the AHL, which do not find a matching house number in PEC Form I, and consequently these houses would not have a tick against their serial number in the AHL. Copy the particulars in columns 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of Sections II and III of the AHL in columns 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6 of Section III. Columns 5 and 6, giving the household number name of the head of the household would be applicable only in cases where the house was used for wholly residential or partly residential purposes during Census. If more than one household lives in the house, use separate lines. In other cases, where the house was reportedly used for non-residential purposes or was vacant, put a dash '—' in cols. 5 and 6.

27. Desk Match for the PEC Section II of Form II

27.1. The procedure for desk match is similar to the one indicated for Census houses i.e. PEC Form I. During the Desk Match you have to match the particulars like name, relationship to head, and marital status in both the records and copy down the particulars of name, relationship to head, sex, age and marital status for certain individuals in the selected households from the Population Record in Section IV. Before you start copying, ensure that all the entries in the Population Record have been verified from the Individual Slips and no entry has been omitted in Population Record. The Desk Match should be carried out entry by entry. Take the first entry relating to the first selected household and verify if the name appears in the Population Record. Since the first entry invariably relates to the head of the household and the household is known to have been enumerated in the Census this should have a matching entry. If there is no matching entry, check if the head has changed in the household. This is quite possible since the Survey and Census have been conducted at two different points of time and also because different instructions are followed on whom to enumerate.

27.2. In case of 'substitute households' the columns relating to Desk Match and field reconciliation need not be filled up. Put a cross across in the columns relating to Desk Match and Field Reconciliation.

Col 13: *Whether agreement regarding Name? yes-*1 (*go to col.* 14) *No-*2.

27.3. Check if the name of the person that the PEC enumerator recorded in column 2 tallies with that of any person recorded in the corresponding Population Record. Ignore minor variations in spelling. If the name matches, record code 1 and proceed to fill up column 14. If not, record code 2, and stop desk match for this person. This person may not have a matching entry in the Census and the reasons for this can be found out only at the field reconciliation stage. For this person put a dash '—' in column 14 and 15.

Col 14: *Whether agreement regarding Relationship to head Yes-*1 (*go to col.* 15) *No-*2.

27.4. Relationship to head : For persons for whom the name tallies in both the records check if the 'relationship to head' also tallies in both the lists. If the same person was head at the two points of the time, i.e. of Census and PEC, the relationship must be identical. If the heads are different in PEC and Census, derive the relationship with the help of the information given in Section I of this form regarding the change in the head. This will help you in establishing the correspondence in most of the cases. If the relationship tallies, in both the records, write code I and proceed to fill the next column. If the relationship does not tally, write code 2 and put a dash '—' in col. 15. For persons for whom name and relationship to head tallies, check if the sex also tallies. In most of the cases where 'relationship to head' itself is entered as 'son's wife', 'brother's wife' etc. the sex should tally in such cases. There may, however, be a few households where the 'relationship' might be entered as 'unrelated',

'servant' or 'visitor' etc. In such cases it is essential to check if the sex also tallies.

Col 15: *Whether agreement regarding Marital status? Yes-*1 *No-*2.

27.5. For the persons for whom the names and the relationship to head tally, check if the marital status also tallies. If it tallies record code 1; otherwise enter code 2.

Important Note : If you have recorded code 1 in columns 13, 14 and 15 tick the serial number of the corresponding entry in Population Record. This would indicate that you have been able to match the person enumerated in PEC with the person enumerated in the Census. If after seeing all the entries in the household, you find that there are a few persons for whom you have not ticked off the entries in the Population Record, it would mean that these persons are different in PEC and Census, copy down the name, relationship to head, sex, age, marital status, literate/illiterate particulars of these persons in Section IV of PEC Form II.

28. Instructions for Desk Match in Section IV of Form II

Cols. 1-7

28.1. These columns are to be filled up during 'Desk Match'. During the 'Desk Match' of entries in Section II, you would have in Household Schedule Part II (Population Record) ticked off entries relating to persons for whom the name, relationship to head and marital status agree in PEC and Population Record. For others, only a few of the above particulars may agree or none of the above particulars may agree. For such persons, copy down the particulars like name, relationship to the head, sex, age, marital status, literate or illiterate from the Population Record in column 1 to 7.

29. Instructions for Desk Match of Form III (Content error)

29.1. Having completed the Desk Match for PEC Form I and PEC Form II, identify the individuals recorded in Form II for whom you have written code 1 in column 13. From the Population Record note down for each such individual the particulars like age, literate or not, whether worked any time at all last year. If worked anytime, whether worked for major part of last year; and if worked for major part of last year whether as Cultivator 'C' or as Agricultural Labourer 'AL' or in Household Industry 'HHI' or as Other Worker 'OW'. These particulars as recorded in Census are to be entered against the line CEN in Form III. For this you have to refer to columns 6 and 10 to 19 for males and cols. 6 and 24 to 33 in case of females of Population Record. In case of sex, if male, write M, if female, write F. Similarly, if literate, write code 1, if illiterate write code 2. Entries in columns 12 to 19 and 26 to 35, as the case may be, have to be similarly transcribed.

29.2. There may be some individuals in PEC Form II whose names do not match with Population Record. For such individuals code 2 would have been recorded in col. 13 of Form II. Strike the names of such persons from PEC Form III.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FIELD RECONCILIATION

30. Instructions for field reconciliation in respect of PEC of Form I

30.1. After completing the Desk Match you would have a number of houses listed by the PEC enumerator for which either the house number, or its use or the number and name of head of household do not match in AHL. There are also houses whose numbers match, but the use has been reported differently in PEC and Census. Their use(s) might have been reported as residential or partly residential either in PEC or in Census. There are also a number of houses whose house numbers and use match in the two lists, but the number of households reported differs or the name of the head of the household differs in the two forms. In the latter two cases, you would have copied the particulars of the use to which Census house is put and the name of the head of the household recorded in Census in columns 9 and 10 of Section II. Similarly, there would be houses in AHL whose numbers do not find matching entries in PEC. It is now your duty to find out why such differences have occurred; whether the difference is genuine or due to wrong recording by Census enumerator or PEC enumerator. For this purpose you have to make a number of probing enquiries in the field. Instructions for these probes are given below.

30.2. For the purpose of reconciliation of the entries in two records, you keep with you the following materials besides the filled in PEC forms.

(a) AHL, notional map and layout sketch for the concerned block and the adjoining blocks.

(b) Blank forms of abridged Population Record.

31. Instructions for field reconciliation in respect of Section II of Form I

Col. 11: *If '*2*' in col.* 6, *reasons for no match in house number (in codes) (If '*2*' and R/PR go to col.* 14)

31.1. This column will be filled up for houses with code 2 in column 6. For others put a dash '—' in this column. You might recall

that for all these houses which were listed by the PEC enumerator, no matching entries were found in AHL. Enquire the reasons for the discrepancy and enter it in codes as given below.

31.2. You should enter the codes only after thorough probe. Enquire if the house was constructed after Census enumeration i.e. after 1-3-1981. If the house is on the boundary of two blocks, check from the AHL of the particular block and the adjoining block if the house has been listed there. If you find that the house has not been included either in this block or in the adjoining block, it should be given code 2. If the house is shown in the adjoining block, but PEC enumerator has covered it, give code 3.

	Code
(a) Constructed after 1-3-1981 . .	1
(b) Existed at the time of Census but missed in Census . . .	2
(c) Wrongly included in this block by PEC enumerator . . .	3
(d) Others (specify in remarks column)	4

31.3. In case the house existed at the time of the Census but was missed in Census i.e. if you had given code 2 probe further whether any household was living in this house at the time of Census. If it was used for non-residential purpose, put dashes '—' in all the subsequent columns i.e. cols. 12, 13, 14, 15. If the Census house was used for residential purposes, put dashes '—' in columns 12 and 13 and go to column 14. As explained in the instructions for column 14, you have to enquire whether the household living in this house has been enumerated elsewhere or not.

Col 12: *If* '2' *in col.* 7 *reasons for change in use of the house* (*in codes*) (*If* '2' *go to col.* 14)

31.4. This column will be filled if there is code 2 in col. 7. You may recall that these are the houses for which the house numbers agree in PEC and AHL, but the use differs. In the Census, the use may be residential (wholly or partly) and in the PEC non-residential or vacant. Alternately in the Census the use may be non-residential or vacant and in the PEC residential (wholly or partly). You have to probe the reasons for this change in the use between Census and the PEC. The use recorded in PEC is available in column 4 and the use recorded in Census is available in column 9 for your ready reference.

31.5. We are interested in probing only the cases where residential/partly residential house in AHL has been reported as non-residential or vacant in PEC and vice-versa as these are the cases where people are likely to be omitted. Thus, this column will not apply if a 'vacant' house at the time of Census, has been reported as 'shop' at the time of PEC. If, however, it has been reported as fully residential or 'shop-cum-residence' you have to probe the reasons for change. Explain to the respondent, that the Census enumerator who visited the house during 9th February to 28th February, 1981 had recorded the use as given in column 9 and that the PEC enumerator who visited the house in the 2nd/3rd week had recorded the use as given in column 4 and ask him which is correct. This will bring out the reasons for difference. Use following codes to enter the reasons for change in use:

	Code
(a) Change in use after enumeration in Census	1
(b) Residential/partly residential in Census also, but wrongly recorded as vacant or non-residential in Census	2
(c) Wrongly recorded as residential/ partly residential in PEC . .	3
(d) Others (specify in remarks column)	4

31.6. If you have coded '2', go to column 14. As explained in the instructions for column 14, enquire whether the household living therein has been enumerated in Census or not. If not enumerated, fill up columns 1-7 of the abridged population record. If 'Others' i.e. code 4, enter the reasons in 'remarks' column.

Col. 13: *If* '2' *in col.* 8, *reasons for no match in head of household* (*in codes*) (*if* '2' *and* '3' *go to col.* 14).

31.7. This column will be filled in for those houses for which you have entered '2' in column 8. You may recall that for such houses, the Census house number and the use to which the Census house is put agree in PEC and AHL but:

(a) number of households differs in PEC and Census

or

(b) the names of the head of the households do not agree in PEC and Census.

31.8. If for example, out of two households recorded by PEC and Census enumerators, one name tallies, but not the other, the probes should not be made in respect of households where the name of heads tallies in both. For such households you would have already entered 1 in col. 8. In other case, you may have two households recorded in PEC but only one household recorded in Census. Alternatively, you may have two households in both Census and PEC but the names of the heads of the households may differ. In such cases the reasons for the difference in the name of

the head of the household should be probed. For example, if one household has been recorded in AHL, but two households have been recorded by PEC enumerator, you explain to the respondent in the house, that when the Census enumerator visited the house he had recorded one household with its head's name as given in column 10 (read out the name). However, the PEC enumerator when he visited the house had recorded two households and had recorded the names of the head of the household as given in column 5. (Read out the names recorded in column 5).

31.9 Enquire whether these households are the same. This will bring out if the households are same or whether any household has been omitted or there is any other reason for the change in name. This probe is to be made in respect of each household reported as living in the house and recorded as such by PEC enumerator but whose head's name does not match with Census record.

Codes for column 13	*Code*
(a) Same household but head of the household has changed or been differently reported . . .	1
(b) Household living here at the time of Census also but not enumerated in this house	2
(c) Household has moved in after the sunrise of 1-3-1981 . .	3
(1) Others (specify in remarks column)	4

31.10. You may, for example, come across cases where the Census has recorded one household only but PEC has recorded more than one household. On reading the household number and reading out the names of the head of household(s) in both the records you may be told that these are members of the same family, but have been recorded as different households in PEC. In such cases give code 4, as no omission is involved.

Col. 14: *Has the household been enumerated? Yes*-1. No-2. *Not known*-3.

31.11. This column will be filled for those households with code 2 in column 11 or code 2 in column 12 or codes 2 and 3 in column 13. In all such cases, you would have noticed that the household was living in this Census house at the time of Census itself but the Census enumerator has not enumerated the household for one reason or other or the household has inmigrated either during the Census enumeration period or after the Census enumeration period. Enquire from the household whether the household has been enumerated elsewhere in Census or not. If they say 'Yes' give code 1, if they say 'No' give code 2. If the household is not aware of their enumeration give code 3. If the household says that they have not been enumerated or if they say that they are not aware of their enumeration status, enter code 2 or 3 as appropriate, for the entire household. For members of such households with codes 2 and 3, you should fill up the abridged population records prescribed for the purpose. Please note that you should consider enumerating only those people in the household who would be eligible for enumeration in the household had the Census enumerator visited it at the time of Census. This means that you should probe for each individual whether he was present at the place of enumeration for the entire Census enumeration period or not. In case of the non-censused in-migrating household, the residential status will be as at the place from which they have out-migrated. If they were present throughout the Census enumeration period or were partly present during the Census enumeration period, enumerate them and fill up abridged population record. If any member was absent throughout the Census enumeration period, do not enumerate him. Enquire if the household had any visitors who stayed with them at their previous place of residence throughout the Census enumeration period, and if so, enumerate them also. If there are more than one household, use separate abridged population records. These abridged population records must be tagged with the PEC Form I and total number of members for whom you have filled in population records should be given in the remarks column. For the purpose of cross check, write the serial number of the related entry i.e. number in column 1 of Section II at the top of the population record. Also enter the code recorded in column 14 in bracket.

31.12. In case of non-censused in-migrated household, if you enter code 3 (not known) in this column, you should also take down the address of the place from which the household has out-migrated. Record the address in Section IV, Form I. Fill up the particulars of the household like building number, Census house number, name of the head of household, from Section II of Form I. For each household only one entry should be made i.e. do not copy down the name of each member of the household. The address should contain as many details as possible. No separate instructions have been prescribed for filling up this form as the columns of that form are self explanatory.

Col. 15: *Remarks*

31.13. This column is to be used wherever you feel that some information has to be noted. If during the desk match, you find that in a particular house, there are more than one households, the name of the head of the household, to be entered in column 10 should be shifted here for second and third households. Similarly, in case in columns

11 or 12 or 13 code 4, has been entered, the reason in full should be noted here. You should also enter the number of members pertaining to inmigrating households and listed in the abridged population record with some of their particulars in this column 15.

32. Instructions for field reconciliation : Section III of Form I

32.1. The field reconciliation is to be done only in respect of houses which have been reported as wholly residential or partly residential in Census. If in column 4, the use is recorded as other than residential/partly residential, put a dash '—' in all these columns.

Col. 7: Reasons for no match (in codes)

32.2. Enquire why this house enumerated in Census, does not find a place in PEC listing. It may be that the house does not belong to the particular enumeration block and has been wrongly included by Census enumerator, or the PEC enumerator has omitted the house by mistake, or it might have been duplicated in AHL. For this purpose you have to consult the notional map, sketch map and AHL of the concerned block and its neighbouring blocks. Record the answers in code as follows :

(a) House does not belong to the block and has been wrongly included in Census in this block . . .	1
(b) The house seems to have been duplicated in AHL by mistake . .	2
(c) House has been omitted by PEC enumerator	3
(d) While the Census enumerator has recorded it as separate Census house, PEC enumerator did not consider it as separate Cnesus house . .	4
(e) House demolished after Census or merged with another Census house	5

32.3. In case of code 1 and 2, fill in column 8. In all other cases stop at this stage.

Col. 8: If '1' or '2' in Col. 7, whether duplicated? Yes-1, No-2.

32.4. This column is to be filled up if you have recorded code 1 or 2 in column 7. If you have recorded code 1 in column 7, check up from the AHL of the adjoining block if the house has been enumerated in the adjoining block also.

32.5. If the house has been enumerated in both the places, then enter code 1 in this column. Otherwise code 2. Similarly, if you have recorded code 2 in column 7, i.e. the house number duplicated in AHL, it is quite probable that Census enumerator had by mistake written the house number against this household also. Recall that in the instructions for AHL, if two households live in the same house, the Census house number is to be entered against the first house only. Perhaps this might not have been strictly followed. In such a case, enter code 2 in this column. On the other hand, if the same house and household have been entered in AHL twice and the household allotted separate serial number in AHL in column 7, this would imply that the household has been enumerated twice. In such cases enter code 1 in this column.

32.6. If you enter code 1 in this column fill up the abridged population record form for all the members of the household. Please note that you should enumerate only those members or the persons who would be eligible for enumeration in the household during Census period. These abridged population records must be tagged on with PEC Form I and the total number of members for whom you have filled in the abridged population record form must be entered in the remarks column. For the purpose of cross check write down the serial number of the related entry in Section III, at the top of the abridged population record.

33. Instructions for field reconciliation : Section II of Form II.

33.1. As already indicated in case of 'substitute households' the columns relating to field reconciliation need not be filled up. These columns would have already been crossed. If not done so, please cross them now.

Col. 16: Match-1 No Match-2

33.2. The field reconciliation is to be done in case of persons for whom entries other than code 1 are recorded in columns 13, 14 and 15. For persons for whom code 1 is recorded in all the three columns above write 1 in this column and put a dash '—' in col. 17.

33.3. In case of others you will recall that some or all particulars differ in two records. For example, there may be some persons for whom :

(a) the name agrees in the two lists but the relationship to head differs,

(b) the name and the relationship to head agree but the marital status differs, or

(c) the name itself differs.

33.4. For all such persons, you will enquire whether they are the same. Visit the particular household and explain to the respondent in the household, that the PEC enumerator and the Census enumerator had visited the household at diffe-

rent points of time and recorded the names of individuals who were living in the household. Read out the names of the persons not matched in the PEC and recorded in Census which you have entered in Section IV and ask them if they relate to the same person. If they relate to the same person enter code 1 in column 16. Otherwise enter code 2. In such cases (i.e., those with code 1) enter in column 17 the serial number of the related entries in Section IV. Also strike out the entry from Section IV after recording the serial number of the related entry in Section II, in column 8 of Section IV.

Col. 17.61. *No. of related entry in Section IV*

33.5. The instructions for filling up this column have already been given in the previous para. In case where you have not established a match during field reconciliation stage, i.e. for those for whom code 2 has been recorded in column 16, put a dash '—' in this column.

Col. 18: *Remarks*

33.6. If at any particular point of time during field enumeration or Desk Match or field reconciliation you want to record any particulars which you think will be useful, record them here.

34. Instructions for field reconciliation in Section IV of Form II

Col. 8: *Sl. No. of related entry in Section II*

34.1. As already indicated in the instructions for field reconciliation of entries in Section II, you would enquire whether person recorded in Section II is the same person recorded in Section IV.

34.2. If you are convinced that the persons in the two lists are the same, you would have recorded code 1 in column 16 of Section II and struck down the related entry in Section IV, after entering the serial number in column 17 of Section II. For such matched persons write down the serial number in Section II, in this column. After this you may still be left with a few persons who may be in Section IV only and you have to probe about these persons.

Col. 9 : *Normal resident or visitor*

34.3. Enquire if the person was a normal resident of the household during the Census period or a visitor. If he was a normal resident, enter code 1 and proceed to fill up column 10. If he was a visitor, enter code 2 and stop field reconciliation in respect of this person. If the person is a normal resident, obviously the PEC enumerator has missed him during listing. You should probe his residential status further as was done in case of other normal residence earlier.

Col. 10: *Residential status during Census enumeration period (in codes)*

34.4. This column is to be filled up in respect of persons who were normal residents during Census enumeration period i.e. for persons for whom code 1 has been recorded in col. 9. Enquire whether they were present in the household during the entire Census enumeration period (code 1), were absent throughout the Census enumeration period (code 2), or present for part of the Census enumeration period (code 3). If the person was present throughout the Census enumeration period, record code 1 in this column. In this case, the subsequent columns need not be filled up. It is quite possible that a person enumerated in Census had died or outmigrated before the sunrise of 1-3-1981, but his/her name had not been deleted in Individual Slip in revisional round. Such cases should also be probed and answers recorded in codes.

34.5. If the persons recorded in Census had died before the sunrise of 1-3-1981, you should give code 4. Even if the persons had out-migrated before the sunrise of 1-3-1981 code 3 will apply. If you record codes 2 and 3 then proceed to fill up column 11.

Col 11: *If '2' or '3' in Col.* 10, *whether enumerated elsewhere? Yes-*1, *No-*2, *Not known-*3.

34.6. This column will be filled up for normal residents who were absent throughout the enumeration period from their place of residence (code 2 in column 10) or those who were absent from their normal residence for part of the Census enumeration period (code 3 in column 10). Enquire if these persons were enumerated elsewhere at the place of visit. If they say 'yes' write code 1. If 'No' write code 2. If 'not known' write code 3.

Col. 12: *If '3' in Col.* 11, *Sl. No. of related entry in Section III.*

34.7. This column will be filled up if you have entered '3' in column 11. For such persons, enquire the address of their place of visit and enter it in Section III. Note down the related serial number in Section III, in this column.

Col. 13: *Remarks.*

34.8. This column is intended to write down any observation that you may like to make.

35. Instructions for field reconciliation : PEC Form III Content error)

35.1. Note that PEC enumerator and the Census enumerator had filled up the particulars at different points of time. This could have been partly responsible for the difference, if any between

the corresponding entries in PEC and Census. You must take note of the changes that might have occurred during the period between the date of Census enumerator's visit and PEC enumerator's visit and record the entries correctly.

35.2. In case of difference between Census and PEC, if on enquiry, you find that the Census information is correct as on Census enumerator's visit, rewrite the same against the line FR. However, if the informant says that the PEC information is correct, make sure that it applies to the date when the Census enumerator visited the household. Enter correct information against FR. If respondent says both Census and PEC information are not correct, ascertain the information as on Census enumerator's visit and record the correct answer in FR.

35.3. For your convenience, a set of probes for reconciliation of difference between the PEC and Census are given below.

35.4. At the time of field reconciliation, you should tell the respondent about the very purpose of your visit and then proceed as follows :

(a) The PEC enumerator visited your house and collected a few particulars of each member of the household with reference to Census enumeration period. When the Census enumerator, visited your house, he also collected the particulars regarding the members of household. While comparing information recorded in Census with that of PEC for each individual, some differences have been noticed in respect of certain particulars for a few individuals of your household. In order to reconcile the discrepancies, I have come to consult with you and obtain particulars of these individuals which, according to you, are accurate.

(b) After proceeding as above, you now show the respondent both the sets of information recorded in Census and PEC for each individual and try to reconcile very carefully through probes as detailed below.

35.5. For example, if you have observed discrepancies in respect of age completed for one of the individuals and 'Main Activity last year' for another individual, proceed as follows :

STEP 1: Tell the respondent that the age completed for the concerned individual according to Census is (specify) but as per PEC it is recorded as (specify). Then ascertain which information is correct, if the respondent says that Census information is correct, then rewrite the same against the line FR. Otherwise, go to step 2.

STEP 2: If the respondent says that PEC information is correct, probe if the particulars could have changed in the intervening period between Census and PEC and write correct information against the line FR. Otherwise, go to step 3.

STEP 3: If the respondent says that neither PEC nor Census information is correct, then ascertain the correct position as of Census enumeration period. If the respondent does not recollect the exact date of Census enumerator's visit, then ask him to recollect any day close to the period 9th-28th February, 1981. Thereafter, enter the correct information against the line FR.

35.6. The steps mentioned above may be repeated for other individuals for different set of questions and thus you can reconcile all discrepancies as observed during Desk-Matching.

35.7. In case of any doubt at any stage, you should consult your supervisor.

35.8. At the end, attach Form III with Form II of the concerned household.

FORM I

CENSUS OF INDIA 1981

POST ENUMERATION CHECK

PAGE NO. ————

Section I : Identification Particulars

Name of State/Union Territory ———— Code No. ———— Name of Village/Town ———— Code No. ————

Name of District ———— Code No. ———— Name or No. of Ward/Mohalla/Hamlet ———— Code No. ————

Name of Tehsil/Taluka/Anchal/

P.S./Dev. Block/Circle etc. ———— Code No. ———— Enumerator's Block No. ————

SECTION II : Listing, matching with AHL and Field reconciliation

	Listing				Desk Math					Field Reconciliation				
						If '1' in Col. 6								
Sl. No.	Building No.	Census house No.	Purpose for which Census house is used	Name of the head of household	Does the house No. match ? Yes-1 (go to Col 7) No- 2	Is the use R/PR in both the records ? Yes-1 (go to Col. 8); In one record only 2 (go to Co. 9) use Not R/PR in either-3	If '1' in Col. 7 does the name(s) of the head of household agree? Yes-1, No-2 (go to Col. 10)	If Code '2' use recorded in AHL in full	Name of the head of household	If '2' in Col. 6 reasons for no match in house No. (in codes) (If '2' and R/PR go to Col. 14)	If '2' in Col. 7 reasons for change in use of the house (in codes) (If '2' go to Col. 14)	If '2' in Col. 8 reasons for no match in head of household (in codes) (If '2' and '3' go to Col. 14)	Has the household been enumerated ? Yes-1 No-2 Not known-3	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1														
2														
3														
4														
5														
6														
7														
8														
9														
0														

Codes for Col. 11 :

(a) Constructed after the sunrise of 1-3-81 —1
(b) Existed at the time of Census but missed in census —2
(c) Wrongly included in this block by PEC Enumerator —3
(d) Others (specify in remarks col.) —4

Codes for Col. 12:

(a) Change in use after enumeration in Census —1
(b) R/PR in Census also, but wrongly recorded as non-residential in Census —2
(c) Wrongly recorded R/PR in the PEC —3
(d) Others (specify in remarks col.) —4

Codes for Col 13:

(a) Same household but head of household has changed or been differently reported —1
(b) Household living here at the time of Census also, but not enumerted in this house —2
(c) Household has moved in after the sunrise of 1-3-81 —3
(d) Others (specify in remarks Col.) —4

Signature (with date) ——————————

	Listing	Desk Match	Field Reconciliation
Enumerator			
Supervisor			

FORM NO. I — CENSUS OF INDIA 1981 — PAGE NO.———

POST ENUMERATION CHECK

Section I : Identification of Particulars

Name of State/Union Territory ——— Code No. ——— Name of Village/Town ——— Code No. ———

Name of District ——— Code No. ——— Name or No. of Ward/Mohalla/Hamlet — Code No. ———

Name of Tehsil/Taluka/Anchal/

P.S./Dev. Block/Circle etc. ——— Code No. ——— Enumerator's Block No. ———

SECTION III : Houses and Households found in AHL but not in PEC

Sl. No.	Desk Match					Field Reconciliation		Remarks
	Building No.	Census house No.	Use to which the Census house is put	If R/PR in Col. 4		Reasons for no match (in codes)	If '1' or '2' in Col. 7 whether duplicated Yes-1, No-2	
				Household No.	Name of the head of household			
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1								
2								
3								
4								
5								
6								
7								
8								
9								
0								

Codes for Col 7 :

(a) House does not belong to the block and has been wrongly included in Census in this block —1

(b) House seems to have been duplicated in AHL by mistake —2

(c) House has been omitted by PEC enumerator —3

(d) While the Census enumerator has recorded it as separate Census house PEC enumerator did not consider it as separate Census house —4

(e) House demolished after Census or merged with another Census house —5

Signature (with date)

	Desk Match	Field Reconciliation
Enumerator		
Supervisor		

FORM I

CENSUS OF INDIA 1981

PAGE No.——

POST ENUMERATION CHECK

Section I : Identification of Particulars

Name of State/Union Territory ——— Code No. ——— Name of Village/Town ——— Code No. ———

Name of District ——— Code No. ——— Name or No. of Ward/Mohalla/Hamlet ——— Code No. ———

Name of Tehsil/Taluka/Anchal/P.S./Dev. Block/Circle etc. ——— Code No. ——— Enumerator's Block No. ———

SECTION IV : Address of place from where out-migrated (for households with code 3 in Column 14 of Section II of PEC Form I)

Sl. No.	Building No.	Cesus house No.	Name of the head of Household	Related Sl. No. in Section II of Form I	Address of place from where out-migrated					
					Name of place	Name of the head of household, house No. Locality, Street No. and name of post office	Rural/ Urban	Tehsil/ P.S./ Town	District	State
1	5	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1										
2										
3										
4										
5										
6										
7										
8										
9										
0										

Signature (with date) ———

	Listing	Field Reconciliation
Enumerator		
Supervisor		

FORM I

CENSUS OF INDIA 1981
POST ENUMERATION CHECK
Abridged Population Record

Name of State/Union Territory ———— Location code in full of the enumerator's block ————

Name of District ———— Related Section of the Form I: II/III(Delete which is not applicable)

Name of Tehsil/Taluka/Anchal/
P.S./Dev. Block/Circle etc. ———— Sl. No. of the related household ————

Sl. No.	Name	Relationship to head	Sex	Age	Marital Status	Literate -1 Illiterate-2
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

FORM II

CENSUS OF INDIA 1981
POST ENUMERATION CHECK
Section I : Identification Particulars

PAGE NO.————

Name of State/Union Territory ———— Code No. ———— Name of Village/Town ———— Code No. ————

Name of District ———— Code No. ———— Name or No. of Ward/Mohalla/Hamlet ———— Code No. ————

Name of Tehsil/Taluka/Anchal/
P.S./Dev. Block/Circle etc. ———— Code No. ———— Enumerator's Block No. ————

Name of the head of household ———— Was he/she the head at the time of Census?

Yes-1, No-2 [ ] If 'NO' relation to former head ————

House No.———— Household No. ————

SECTION II : Listing of members of the household, Desk Match with Population Record and Field Reconciliation

	Listing											Desk Match			Field Reconciliation		
												Whether agreement regarding					
Sl. No.	Name	Membership type during survey (code)	Relationship to head	Sex	Age	Marital status	Literate-1 Illiterate-2	Residential Status during Census enumeration period (codes) If '3' go to Col. 10 (code)	If '3' in Col.9 period of journey	For codes 2 & 3 in Col. 9 whether enumerated elsewhere Yes -1, No-2, Not known-3	For '3' in Col. 11 and persons in substitute household Sl. No. in Section III	Name Yes- 1 go to Col. 14) No-2	Relationship to head Yes-1 (go to Col. 15) No -2	Marital status Yes-1 No-2	Match -1 No Match-2	Sl. No. of related entry in section-IV	Remarks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1																	
2																	
3																	
4																	
5																	
6																	
7																	
8																	
9																	
0																	

Codes for Col. 3 :

(a) N.R. on date of Survey & Census —1
(b) N.R. out-migrated/died after sunrise of 1-3-81 —2
(c) N.R. out-migrated during census enumeration period —3
(d) N.R. dead during Census enumeration period —4
(e) N.R. born/in-migrated after the sunrise of 1-3-81 —5

Codes for Col. 9 :

(a) Present throughout the census enumeration period —1
(b) Absent throughout the census enumeration period —2
(c) Present for part of census enumeration period —3

Codes for Col. 10 :

(a) Left the normal place before 9 Feb. 1981, but returned before the sunrise of 1-3-1981 —1
(b) Left the normal place of residence after 9 Feb. 1981 —2
(c) Not known —3

Signature (with date) ————————————

	Listing	Desk Match	Field Reconciliation
Enumerator			
Supervisor			

FORM II

CENSUS OF INDIA 1981

POST ENUMERATION CHECK

Section I : Identification Particulars

PAGE NO———

Name of State/Union Territory ——— Code No. ——— Name of Village/Town ——— Code No. ———

Name of District ——— Code No. ——— Name or No. of Ward/Mohalla/Hamlet ——— Code No. ———

Name of Tehsil/Taluka/Anchal/P.S./Dev. Block/Circle etc. ——— Code No. ——— Enumerator's Block No. ———

SECTION III: Addresses of places of visit during Census enumeration period.

(a) For persons with code 3 in Column 11 of Section II

(b) For persons in substitute households from Section II

(c) For persons with code 3 in Column 11 of Section IV

Sl. No.	Census house No.	Household No.	Name of the persons	Sex	Age	Residential status during Census enumeration period	Related Sl. No. in Section II	Related Sl. No. in Section IV	Address of place(s) visited during Census enumeration period: Name of place visited	Name of the head of household house No., locality or street No. and name of post office	Rural/ Urban	Tehsil/ P.S/Town	District	State
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8(a)	8(b)	9	10	11	12	13	14
1														
2														
3														
4														
5														
6														
7														
8														
9														
0														

Signature (with date) ———

	Listing	Field Reconciliation
Enumerator		
Supervisor		

FORM II CENSUS OF INDIA PAGE No.——

POST ENUMERATION CHECK

Section I : Identification Particulars

Name of State/Union Territory ——— Code No.——— Name of Village/Town——— Code No.———

Name of District ——— Code No.——— Name or No. of Ward/Mohalla/Hamlet— Code No.———

Name of Tehsil/Taluka/Anchal/
P.S./Dev. Block/Circle etc.——— Code No.——— Enumerator's Block No.———

Name of the head of household ———

Household No. ——— SECTION IV: Persons listed in Population Record who have not been fully 'Matched' in PEC

	To be filled during Desk Match						Filed Reconciliation					
Sl. No.	Name	Relation ship to head	Sex	Age	Marital Status	Literate —1 Illiterate —2	Sl. No. of related entry in Section-II	Normal Resident or Visitor	Reside-ntial status during Census enume-ration-peripd (in codes)	If '2' or '3' in Col. 10 whether enume-rated elsewhere? Yes-1, No-2, Not known-3	If '3' in Col. 11 Sl. No. of related entry in Section III	Rema-rks
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
1												
2												
3												
4												
5												
6												
7												
8												
9												
0												

Codes for Col. 10 :

(a) Present throughout Census enumeration period —1
(b) Absent throughout Census enumertion period —2
(c) Present for part of Census enumeration period —3
(d) Normal resident but died before sunrise of 1-3-81- —4

Signature (with date) ———

	Desk Match	Field Reconciliation
Enumerator		
Supervisor		

FORM III (Content Error) CENSUS OF INDIA PAGE NO.———

POST ENUMERATION CHECK

Section I : Identification Particulars

Name of State/Union Territory———— Code No.——— Name of Village/Town———————— Code No.——
Name of District———————— Code No.——— Name or No. of Ward/Mohalla/Hamlet——— Code No. ——

Name of Tehsil/Taluka/Anchal/
P.S./Dev. Block/Circle etc. ———————— Code No. ——— Enumerator's Block No. ————————

Name of the head of household ———— Was he/she the head at the time of Census? Yes-1, No -2
If 'No' relation to former head ————————

House No. ———————————— Household No. ————————————

SECTION II: Particulars of persons recorded in Section II of Form II

Sl. No.	Name	Sex	Marital Status	Stage of Operation	Age		Literate-1 Illiterate-2	Worked any time at all last year Yes-1 No-2	If 'Yes' in Col. 9 did you work for major part of last year ? Yes-1 No -2	Main activity C, AL, HHI, OW	Remarks
					Age completed	Reliability of age: Reliable-1 Not Reliable-2					
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1				PEC							
				CEN		—					
				FR		—					
2				PEC							
				CEN		—					
				FR		—					
3				PEC							
				CEN		—					
				FR		—					
4				PEC							
				CEN		—					
				FR		—					
5				PEC							
				CEN		—					
				FR		—					
6				PEC							
				CEN		—					
				FR		—					
7				PEC							
				CEN		—					
				FR		—					
8				PEC							
				CEN		—					
				FR		—					

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
9				PEC							
				CEN		—					
				FR		—					
0				PEC							
				CEN		—					
				FR		—					

Signature (With date) _____

	Listing	Desk Match	Field Reconciliation
Enumerator			
Supervisor			

APPENDIX 7

METHODS OF ESTIMATION

Notation

The suffix h denotes the stratum; i, the enumeration block within the stratum and j, the household. The following symbols all refer to stratum h. In each state h = 2 as there were two strata namely rural and urban. In each zone number of strata varied.

N_h = Number of enumeration blocks

n_h = Number of enumeration blocks in the sample

Type I error

Y_{hi} = Number of persons omitted in the i^{th} block.

X_{hi} = Number of persons enumerated in census in the i^{th} block.

S Stands for summation

Estimated number of persons omitted (Type I)

$$\hat{Y}_{h1} = \frac{N_h}{n_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_h} y_{hi}$$

Estimated number of persons enumerated in census (Type I)

$$\hat{X}_{h1} = \frac{N_h}{n_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_h} x_{hi}$$

Rate of Omission (Type I)

$$\hat{r}_{h1} = \frac{\hat{Y}_{h1}}{\hat{X}_{h1}}$$

Variance of Type I error is obtained assuming simple random sampling. Estimated variance of $\hat{r}_{h1}$ is given by

$$V(\hat{r}_{h1}) = \frac{(1-f_h)}{n_h \bar{X}^2} \left[S^2_{y_{h1}} + \hat{r}^2_{h_1} S^2_{x_{h1}} - 2\hat{r}_{h1} S_{x_{h1} y_{h1}} \right]$$

Where $\bar{X}_{h1} = \hat{X}_{h1}/N_h$ and $f_h = n_h/N_h$

Percentage Relative Standard Error (PRSE)

$$= \frac{\sqrt{V(\hat{r}_{h1})}}{\hat{r}_{h1}} \times 100$$

Type II error :

Notation :

y_{hij} = Number of persons omitted in the j^t household of i^{th} block in h^{th} stratum.

x_{hij} = Number of persons enumerated in the j^{th} household of i^{th} block in h^{th} stratum.

M_{hi} = Number of households in the i^{th} block of h^{th} stratum.

m_{hi} = Number of households selected in the i^{th} block of h^{th} stratum.

$M_{hi}/m_{hi} = 10$ as 10% of the households were surveyed.

Estimated number of persons omitted ($\hat{Y}_{h2}$) and number of persons enumerated ($\hat{X}_{h2}$) are given by

$$\hat{Y}_{h2} = \frac{10\, N_h}{n_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_h} \sum_{j=1}^{m_{hi}} y_{hij}$$

$$\hat{X}_{h2} = \frac{10\, N_h}{n_h} \sum_{i=1}^{n_h} \sum_{j=1}^{m_{hi}} X_{hij}$$

Rate of omission (Type II)

$$\hat{r}_{h2} = \frac{\hat{Y}_{h2}}{\hat{X}_{h2}}$$

Assuming simple random sampling the variance of Type II error is obtained as

$$V(\hat{r}_{h2}) = \frac{1}{n_h \bar{X}^2_{h2}} \left[S^2_{y_{h2}} + \hat{r}^2_{h2} S^2_{x_{h2}} - 2\, \hat{r}_{h2}\, S_{x_{h2}\, y_{h2}} \right]$$

Where $\bar{X}_{h2} = \hat{X}_{h2}/N_h$

Even though the second stage variance has been omitted this may give a slight over estimate as finite population correction has been ignored. Omission of second stage variance is justified as first stage sampling fraction is negligible in every stratum. The quantum of over estimation is not likely to be high since n_h/N_h is small in all strata. It is less than 0.005 every where. For easy computation the above has been taken as variance of Type II error.

Percentage relative standard error (PRSE)

$$= \frac{\sqrt{V(\hat{r}_{h2})}}{\hat{r}_{h2}} \times 100$$

Total Omission Rate at Stratum level

The type I and type II omission rates were added to get the total omission rate.

i.e.; $\hat{r} = \hat{r}_{h1} + \hat{r}_{h2}$

The veriance of the total omission rate is given by;

$$V(\hat{r}_h) = V(\hat{r}_{h1}) + V(\hat{r}_{h2}) + 2\,\mathrm{Cov}(\hat{r}_{h1}\ \hat{r}_{h2})$$

Where $\mathrm{Cov}(\hat{r}_{h1}\hat{r}_{h2})$ is estimated as

$$\frac{1}{n_h \bar{x}_{h1} \bar{x}_{h2}} \left[S_{y_{h1} y_{h2}} + \hat{r}_{h1}\hat{r}_{h2} S_{x_{h1} x_{h2}} - \hat{r}_{h1} S_{y_{h2} x_{h1}} - \hat{r}_{h2} S_{y_{h1} x_{h2}} \right]$$

Zonal and National Estimates

Omission rates were obtained for zonal and national level by adding the estimated number of omitted persons and enumerated persons separately and taking the ratios for different zones as shown below :

$$\hat{r}_1 = \sum_h \hat{Y}_{h1} / \sum_h \hat{x}_{h1}$$

$$\hat{r} = \sum_h Y_{h2} / \sum_h X_{h2}$$

$$\hat{r} = \hat{r}_1 + \hat{r}_2$$

To estimate the variance the stratum level variances were recalculated using the combined $\hat{r}$ and $\bar{X}$. These stratum variances were weighed by N^2_h/N^2 to give the variance of the combined rates. This gives

$$V(r_1) = \frac{1}{\bar{X}_1^2} \sum_h \left[\frac{N^2_h (1-f_h)}{N^2 n_h} \left(S_{y_{h1}} + \hat{r}_1 S_{x_{h1}} - 2\hat{r}_1 S_{x_{h1} y_{h1}} \right) \right]$$

$$V(r_2) = \frac{1}{\bar{X}_2^2} \sum_h \left[\frac{N^2_h}{N^2 n_h} \left(S_{y_{h2}} + \hat{r}_2 S_{x_{h2}} - 2\hat{r}_2 S_{x_{h2} y_{h2}} \right) \right]$$

It should be noted that in case of $\hat{r}_2$, $(1-f_h)$ is omitted giving a slight over estimate.

GIPN—S4—382 R.G.India/ND/82—18-2-83—1,500.

CENSUS OF INDIA 1981

Paper 4 of 1982

Report on Post Enumeration Check

ERRATA

S. No.	Page No.	Paragraph	Line No.	Column No.	Particulars	For	Read
1	6	3	3	1		199397	199497
2	21			12	Type I, Persons PRSE	26.72	25.72
3	21			8	Type II, Female PRSE	10.13	19.13
4	22			11	Age Group 10-19, Total	11.10	12.12
5	22			18	Age Group 40-49, Total	7.61	7.64
6	22			20	All Ages, Urban	26.7	26.78
7	24			7	Table-4, Central Zone Total	28.81	28.91
8	27			10	Table-10, Literacy Eastern Zone	7.76	7.67
9	29			16	Total, Females	81.06	71.06
10	29			17	Total, Persons	76.06	73.06
11	30			3	Total, Persons	79.75	69.75
12	65		11	2	$V(r_1)$	$S_{y_{h_1}} + \hat{r}_1 S_{x_{h_1}}$	$S^2_{y_{h_1}} + \hat{r}^2_1 S^2_{x_{h_1}}$
13	65		13	2	$V(r_2)$	$S^2_{y_{h_2}} + \hat{r}_2 S_{x_{h_2}}$	$S^2_{y_{h_2}} + \hat{r}^2_2 S^2_{x_{h_2}}$