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## SAMPLE VITAL REGISTRATION SYSTEM AND KEY FINDING

## 1. Introduction

Bangladesh Bureau of Statistics has been implementing BirthDeath Sample Registration System (BDSRS) since 1980. Earlier the title was Bangladesh Demographic Survey and Vital Registration system (BDSVRS) has been conducting survey throughout the country taking 210 PSU's of which 150 in rural areas and 60 in urban areas since 1880. Each PSU consists of around 250 households. A total of 57663 households consisting of 315823 population ( $0.30 \%$ of total population) with a sex- ratio of 106 were covered in 1990. On an average an enumeration area consisted of 275 households and 1504 population. Cantonments, institutions like hotels, barracks, messes, jails, etc., were excluded from the perview of the survey. Dejure definition of population was followed.

## 2. Survey design

Cluster sampling is generally used for dual record operations. Cluster sampling simplifies field work. In view of workload and payment of remuneration to local registrars, cluster sampling is more advantageous than simple random sampling. Considering these, stratified cluster random sampling of equal size has been adopted for Birth and Death Sample Registration System with households as the ultimate sampling unit. Details about survey design can be seen in Annexure-1.

## 3. Method of data collection

The project activities involves the collection of vital events (births, deaths, marriages, in and out-migration) through two Independent Systems namely recording of vital events by the local registrars (System-1) and collection of events by the headquarters staff using last three months as reference period (System-2). the
local registrars used to collect particulars of events as and when they occur on a continuous basis and send them to the headquarters in the first week of the next month. The headquarters staff collected particulars of the events occurring during the preceding three months in the same sample area independently on a quarterly basis.

## 4. Training of supervisors, enumerators and local registrars

For the collection of quality data, an intensive training for a period of 3 days was imparted to the supervisors and headquarters based enumerators by the senior trained and experienced officers at the headquarters at least once in a year. Besides, they had to undergo vigorous training about field problems and solution thereof, technique of collection of quality data through probing the items of information before each and every field visit. During training, items in each row and column of the schedules are clearly explained and the technique of how to fill the schedules properly were taught through mock survey. Supervisor in each visit by checking the works of local registrars evaluate their work and impart them training accordingly.

## 5. Supervision and quality control

Timely collection of good quality data and their quick processing was the joint responsibility of the field workers and a team of officers headed by senior officers, all of whom received intensive training on data collection technique. Both collection of data from the primary sampling units and processing of the same at headquarters were subjected to careful and intensive supervision. Special measures where adopted to ensure the operational independence of the two systems including rotation of system-2's interviewers among others and close supervision and quality control.

On completion of each quarterly round of survey by the headquarters based enumerators, events of births and deaths reported by them were matched with those reported by local registrars following the selected pre-determined criteria such as household number, mother's name, mother's relationship with head of household, baby's name, date of birth, sex of baby, age of mother, place of birth name of the deceased, age of the deceased, date of death and sex of the deceased etc. provided in tables. The events are ultimately classified into matched, partially matched, nonmatched and out of scope events. Partially matched and nonmatched, events were subjected to further verification, through field visits, for ascertaining the real status of the events. this important task was done by the trained and experienced senior officers of BDSRS through door to door visit in the sample area. this also helped catch the events missed by both the systems. The process of matching greatly reduces the possibility of erroneous inclusion of out of scope events or exclusion of bonafied events.

Household population and occurrences of events such as births, deaths, marriage, in and out migration collection through different schedules by both the systems, had to undergo systematic and rigorous cross-sectional consistency checks.
6. Matching procedures

| Matching Variables | Tolerance Limit |
| :---: | :---: |
| For Birth |  |
| 1. Household Number | : a. Exact agreement |
| 2. Mother's Name | : a. Exact spelling <br> b. Two names sound alike |
| 3. Baby's name/Father's name | : a. As item no.(2) above |
| 4. Date of birth | : a. Exact agreement <br> b. +1 day <br> c. +7 days <br> d. +14 days <br> e. +31 days |
| 5. Age of mother | : a. Exact agreement <br> b. +1 year <br> c. +2 years <br> d. +5 years |
| 6. Mother's relationship with head of household | : a. Exact agreement |
| 7. Place of birth | : a. Exact agreement |
| 8. Sex of baby | : a. Exact agreement |
|  | Death |
| 1. Household number | : a. Exact agreement |
| 2. Name of deceased | : a. As item (2) for birth |
| 3. Date of death | : a. As item (4) for birth |
| 4. Age of deceased | a. Exact agreement b. $\quad+\quad 1$ week c. $\quad+\quad 2$ weeks d. +52 weeks e. +1 year f. +2 years g. $\quad+\quad 5$ years |
| 5. Sex of deceased | : a. Exact agreement |
| 6. Relationship to head of household | : a. Exact agreement |

Updating of the sample population and household
Updating of individuals' characteristics is done annually in January each year through the administration of $O M R$ form of questionnaire used in the population census, 1991 and updating of persons in the sample area is made giving due consideration of the effect of the occurrences of births, deaths, marriages, in and out migration of both individual and household collected continuously through both the systems.

Similarly, updating of the household and the sketch map of the sample areas is made annually in January each year. The continuous monitoring of the change of household numbers during the year due to the formation of new household, decay of household and/or cluster of households due to river erosion, household migration, etc. is made continuously throughout the year independently by the two systems. The specially developed household listing schedule is used for the purpose of household \& population updating. The updated household and population are used as denominator for the purpose of estimation of different measures. the continuously updating of household and population, thus facilitate removal of possible sampling discrepancy likely to associate with the continuous use of the sample areas.

### 8.1 Estimation Procedure <br> The following differnt estimates of the vital events are yielded

 from this system.(1) System-1 : N1=M+n1
(2) System-2 : N2=M+n2
(3) Dual Record: $N^{1}=M+n 1+n 2$
$=$ Total events N1 caught independent by the system-1 (local registrars) where $M$ are the events common to both the systems and $n 1$ are the number of events report by sysmen-1 : only;
$=$ Total events N 2 caught independently by the system-2 (quarterly interviewers), where n2 are the number of events reported by system- 2 only;
$=$ Joint coverage of the two systems, i.e., dual record coverage;
(4) Chandrasekaran Deming adjusted Dual Record Estimate:
(5) Total events:

$$
\mathrm{N}=\mathrm{M}+\mathrm{n} 1+\mathrm{n} 2+\mathrm{n} 3+\frac{\mathrm{n} \mathrm{xn}}{\mathrm{M} 2} \mathrm{M}
$$

$=$ Where $(\mathrm{n} 1 \times \mathrm{n} 2) / \mathrm{M}$ are the estimated events assumed to be missed by both the systems.
$=$ Where n3 are those events detected in the verification check;

### 8.2 Completion Rate

The estimates of completeness of events for 1986 by administrative division have been shown in Table-1. The completeness of the events for either of these systems in rural areas varies from around 90 percent to around 95 percent. The common proportion varies from around 82 percent to around 88 percent. At the aggregate level, the common proportion is about 86 percent. The dual record coverage ( $M+n 1+n 2=85.74+6.76=99.45$ ) of events in rural areas comes to about 99.5 percent. The extent of coverage in urban areas is a little lower, where common proportion ranges from 70 percent to 94 percent among divisions. The urban total coverages for system-1 and system-2 are 87.5 and 87.3 percent respectively. The dual record coverage is about 98.3 percent. About 7 \& 12 percent of the events are missed due to nonsampling errors by either of these systems respectively in rural and urban areas. These errors are adjusted by estimation procedures stated above.

Table -1 : Estimates of number births and percentage distribution thexeof for principles of dual estimation by division, 1989.

| Division | Matched events M | Events Recorded only by |  | Total events recorded by |  | Events missed by both $\frac{\mathrm{n} 1 \times \mathrm{n} 2}{\mathrm{M}}$ | Total events NC |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | System-1 | System-2 | System- | System-2 |  |  |
|  |  | N1 | N2 | N1 | N2 |  |  |
| Rural | Number: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chittagong | 1762 | 158 | 151 | 1920 | 1913 | 14 | 2085 |
| Dhaka | 1823 | 143 | 139 | 1966 | 1962 | 9 | 2114 |
| Khulna | 1234 | 97 | 110 | 1331 | 1344 | 9 | 1450 |
| Rajshahi | 1751 | 131 | 114 | 1882 | 1865 | 9 | 2005 |
| Total | 6570 | 529 | 514 | 7099 | 7084 | 41 | 7654 |
| Urban |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chittagong | 437 | 52 | 54 | 489 | 491 | 7 | 550 |
| Dhaka | 765 | 120 | 133 | 885 | 898 | 21 | 1039 |
| Khulna | 280 | 37 | 31 | 317 | 311 | 4 | 352 |
| Rajshahi | 247 | 27 | 24 | 274 | 261 | 2 | 290 |
| Total | 1729 | 236 | 232 | 1965 | 1961 | 34 | 2231 |

Rural

| Chittagong | 84.5 | 7.6 | 7.2 | 92.1 | 91.7 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Dhaka | 86.2 | 6.8 | 6.6 | 93.0 | 92.8 | 0.4 | 100.0 |
| Khulna | 85.1 | 6.7 | 7.6 | 91.8 | 92.7 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
| Rajshahi | 87.3 | 6.5 | 5.7 | 93.8 | 93.0 | 0.5 | 100.0 |
| Total | 85.8 | 6.9 | 6.7 | 92.7 | 92.5 | 0.6 | 100.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Urban |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chittagong | 79.4 | 9.5 | 9.9 | 88.9 | 89.3 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| Dhaka | 73.6 | 11.5 | 12.8 | 85.1 | 86.4 | 2.1 | 100.0 |
| Khulna | 89.6 | 10.5 | 8.7 | 90.1 | 88.3 | 1.2 | 100.0 |
| Rajshahi | 85.1 | 9.2 | 5.0 | 94.3 | 90.1 | 0.7 | 100.0 |
| Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 87.4 | 10.6 | 10.5 | 88.0 | 87.9 | 1.5 | 100.0 |

Percent:

Chittagong

Rajshahi
85.8
6.9
6.7
9.9
12.8
85.1
$86.4 \quad 2.1 \quad 100.0$
88.31 .2100 .0
10.5
88.0
87.9
1.5100 .0

Estimates of CBR and CDR for 1989 and 1990 derived by applying different approaches are presented in Table 2 and Table 3 respectively.

Table-2 : Estimates of crude birth rates per 1000 population by division for 1989 and 1990 by applying different approaches.

| Division | 1989 |  |  | 1990 |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | System <br> 1 | System <br> 2 | Dual <br> Record <br> System | Chandra <br> Sekaran <br> Deming | System <br> 1 | System <br> 2 | Dual <br> Record <br> System | Chandra <br> Sekaran <br> Deming |

Rural

| Chittagong | 32.6 | 33.1 | 36.0 | 36.3 | 31.9 | 31.7 | 34.4 | 34.6 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Dhaka | 31.4 | 31.4 | 34.0 | 34.2 | 31.3 | 31.3 | 33.7 | 33.7 |
| Khulna | 30.5 | 30.9 | 33.0 | 33.2 | 28.8 | 29.1 | 31.1 | 31.3 |
| Rajshahi | 33.2 | 33.1 | 36.3 | 36.6 | 33.7 | 33.4 | 35.8 | 36.0 |
| Total | 32.0 | 32.2 | 34.9 | 35.1 | 31.6 | 31.5 | 33.8 | 34.0 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Urban |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chittagong | 23.2 | 24.0 | 25.7 | 25.9 | 21.9 | 22.0 | 24.3 | 24.6 |
| Dhaka | 26.2 | 24.3 | 28.6 | 28.8 | 21.7 | 22.0 | 24.9 | 25.4 |
| Khulna | 23.9 | 24.3 | 26.3 | 26.5 | 20.2 | 19.8 | 22.2 | 22.4 |
| Rajshahi | 21.6 | 22.3 | 23.1 | 23.2 | 23.2 | 22.1 | 24.3 | 24.5 |
| Total | 24.3 | 23.9 | 26.5 | 26.8 | 21.2 | 21.6 | 24.2 | 24.6 |

Table-3: Estimates of crude death rates per 1000 population by division for 1989 and 1990 by Applying different Approaches.

| Division | 1989 |  |  |  | 1990 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { System } \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { System } \\ 2 \end{gathered}$ | Dual Record System | Chandra <br> Sekaran <br> Deming | $\begin{gathered} \text { System } \\ 1 \end{gathered}$ | $\underset{2}{\text { System }}$ | Dual <br> Record <br> System | Chandra Sekaran Deming |
|  | Rural |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chittagong | 11.7 | 12.0 | 13.1 | 13.2 | 11.3 | 10.8 | 12.1 | 12.3 |
| Dhaka | 11.3 | 11.7 | 12.2 | 12.3 | 10.9 | 10.5 | 11.8 | 11.9 |
| Khulna | 9.8 | 9.7 | 10.3 | 10.3 | 9.4 | 10.0 | 10.3 | 10.3 |
| Rajshahi | 11.3 | 10.9 | 11.8 | 11.9 | 11.6 | 11.6 | 12.3 | 12.3 |
| Total | 11.1 | 11.2 | 12.0 | 12.0 | 10.9 | 10.8 | 11.7 | 11.8 |
|  | Urban |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Chittagong | 7.9 | 8.0 | 8.7 | 8.8 | 8.6 | 8.6 | 9.0 | 9.1 |
| Dhaka | 6.0 | 5.3 | 6.5 | 6.6 | 5.9 | 6.2 | 7.0 | 7.1 |
| Khulna | 5.5 | 5.4 | 5.8 | 5.8 | 6.7 | 6.7 | 7.3 | 7.3 |
| Rajshahi | 8.0 | 7.9 | 8.7 | 9.0 | 6.5 | 6.8 | 7.2 | 7.2 |
| Total | 6.7 | 6.3 | 7.2 | 7.3 | 6.8 | 6.9 | 7.6 | 7.6 |

SVRS.KEY/

## SELECTED INDICATORS <br> FROM <br> BIRTH AND DEATH SAMPLE REGISTRATION SYSTEM

A. POPULATION AND AGE-STRUCTURE

1. Population 1992 (January) (in million)

2. Sex Ratio
3. Age Structure Number (in million)

National
Rural
Urban


Total 109.5


105.8
103.3
123.0
5. Density (SQ.Km.), 1991
B. NUPTIALITY MEASURES
6. Crude Marriage Rate

|  | National | Rural | Urban |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1987 | 11.6 | 12.2 | 6.9 |
| 1988 | 11.3 | 12.1 | 6.6 |
| 1989 | 11.2 | 11.6 | 8.3 |
| 1990 | 11.1 | 11.6 | 7.9 |
| 1991 | 11.0 | 11.2 | 7.4 |
| 1992 | 10.7 | 11.0 | 7.2 |

7. Mean age at Marriage $\begin{array}{ll}1986 \\ 1987 \\ 1988 \\ & 1989 \\ & 1990 \\ & 1991 \\ & 1992\end{array}$

National
Rural
Urban

1987
198
1990
1992

745
8262

$$
1992
$$

17.5
17.9
18.0
18.0
18.0
18.1
18.2
8. Female Marital Status
in percent, Never married, All ages : 1961 1974 1981 1987 1988 1990 1991 1992

15-19 : 1961 1974 1981 1987 1988 1990 1991 1992
29-24

1961 1974 1981 1987 1988 1990 1991 1992

Currently married, all age :
1961
1974
1981
1987
1988
1990
1991
1992

1961
1974
1981
1987
1988
1990
1991
1992

1961
1974
1981
1987
1988
1990
1991
10.5
24.4
23.7
26.2
27.5
28.0
28.4
29.0
8.3
24.5
31.3
47.0
48.1
48.9
50.0
50.4
1.3
3.2
5.1
9.2
9.6
9.8
9.5
9.9
9.9
70.7
61.2
63.4
62.3
62.2
62.4
62.6
62.3
89.4
71.8
65.4
50.4
49.4
48.0
47.6
47.2
95.6
92.9
90.9
87.4
86.5
86.0
85.6
85.1
65.0

$$
64.0
$$

63.0
66.9
67.0
67.0
66.6

| -7 | - |
| :---: | :---: |
| 73.9 | 53.2 |
| 67.8 | 52.7 |
| 53.7 | 31.3 |
| 52.5 | 31.6 |
| 52.0 | 61.0 |
| 51.8 | 60.6 |
| 51.4 | 60.2 |


| - | - |
| :---: | :---: |
| 93.7 | 86.3 |
| 91.8 | 85.7 |
| 89.0 | 76.8 |
| 88.3 | 76.4 |
| 87.3 | 75.8 |
| 86.8 | 75.2 |
| 86.2 | 74.6 |

## C. FERTILITY MEASURES

| 9. Crude Birth Rate |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| (CBR) per 1000 |  |
| Population | 1983 |
|  | 1988 |
|  | 1989 |
|  | 1990 |
|  | 1991 |
|  | 1992 |


| National | Rural | Urban |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 35.0 | 36.4 | 27.1 |
| 33.2 | 34.5 | 24.9 |
| 33.0 | 34.5 | 24.4 |
| 32.8 | 34.3 | 24.6 |
| 31.6 | 34.1 | 24.6 |
| 30.8 | 32.2 | 23.7 |
| 3477 | 3101 | 367 |
| 3531 | 3133 | 398 |
| 3559 | 3141 | 408 |
| 3561 | 3160 | 401 |
| 3575 | 3176 | 399 |
| 6.6 | 5.9 | 0.7 |
| 6.7 | 6.0 | 0.7 |
| 6.8 | 6.0 | 0.8 |
| 6.8 | 6.1 | 0.8 |
| 6.9 | 6.1 | 0.8 |
| 5.07 | 5.36 | 3.10 |
| 4.45 | 4.70 | 3.08 |
| 4.35 | 4.59 | 2.88 |
| 4.33 | 4.57 | 2.95 |
| 4.24 | 4.51 | 2.92 |
| 4.18 | 4.33 | 2.88 |


| 13. Net Reproduction |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Rate (NRR) | 1988 |
|  | 1989 |
|  | 1990 |
|  | 1991 |
|  | 1992 |

D. MORTALITY MEASURES
14. Crude death Rate (CDR)
per 1000 Population 1983
1988
12.3
11.3
11.3
11.4
11.2
11.0

| 13.2 | 7.5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 11.9 | 7.5 |
| 11.9 | 7.3 |
| 11.8 | 7.9 |
| 11.4 | 7.8 |
| 11.3 | 7.5 |

15. Number of Deaths
$(000)$
1988
1989
1990
1206
1230

| 1065 | 114 |
| :--- | :--- |
| 1091 | 115 |
| 1103 | 127 |
| 1109 | 130 |
| 1110 | 132 |


|  |  | National | Rural | Urban |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16. Death per minute | 1988 |  | 2.2 | 2.0 |
|  | 1989 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 0.2 |
|  | 1990 | 2.3 | 2.1 | 0.2 |
|  | 1991 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 0.2 |
|  | 1992 | 2.2 | 2.1 | 0.2 |

17. Infant Mortality Rate (IMR) per 1000, live births 1983

| Both Sex | 117 | 121 | 99 |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Male | 119 | 121 | 107 |
| Female | 116 | 121 | 91 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1988 |  |  |  |
|  | 110 | 112 | 91 |
| Both Sex | 116 | 118 | 96 |
| Male | 105 |  | 86 |
| Female |  | 97 | 71 |
| 1990 | 94 | 101 | 73 |
| Both sex | 98 | 93 | 68 |

1991

| Both Sex | 92 | 94 | 69 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Male | 95 | 98 | 72 |
| Female | 90 | 95 | 65 |

1992

| Both sex | 88 | 91 | 65 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Male | 90 | 95 | 68 |
| Female | 86 | 90 | 62 |

18. Neo-Natal Mortality,1988

| Both sex | 73 | 75 | 58 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 79 | 81 | 64 |
| Female | 67 | 68 | 58 |
| 1990 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 69 | 48 |
| Both Sex | 67 | 73 | 51 |
| Male | 71 | 64 | 48 |
| Female | 62 |  |  |
| 1991 |  |  |  |
|  |  | 66 | 44 |
| Both sex | 64 | 60 | 48 |
| Male | 68 |  | 43 |
| Female | 61 |  |  |
|  |  | 64 | 43 |
| l992 | 62 | 68 | 46 |
| Both Sex | 65 |  |  |


| 19. Post Neo-Natal Mortality | 1988 | National | Rural | Urban |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Both sex | 37 | 38 | 33 |
|  | Male | 36 | 37 | 32 |
|  | Female | 38 | 39 | 33 |
|  | 1990 |  |  |  |
|  | Both Sex | 28 | 28 | 23 |
|  | Male | 27 | 28 | 22 |
|  | Female | 29 | 29 | 24 |
|  | 1991 |  |  |  |
|  | Both sex | 27 | 28 | 23 |
|  | Male | 26 | 28 | 23 |
|  | Female | 28 | 28 | 24 |
|  | 1992 |  |  |  |
|  | Both Sex | 26 | 27 | 22 |
|  | Male | 25 | 27 | 22 |
|  | Female | 28 | 28 | 22 |
| 20. Child Death Ra (1-4 Years) | 1988 | 13.5 | 14.1 | 8.7 |
|  | 1989 | 13.7 | 14.3 | 8.6 |
|  | 1990 | 14.2 | 15.0 | 8.3 |
|  | 1991 | 13.6 | 14.4 | 8.2 |
|  | 1992 | 13.2 | 14.0 | 8.0 |
| 21. Probability o by age 5 per |  |  |  |  |
|  | 1988 |  |  |  |
|  | Both sex | 169 | 173 | 127 |
|  | Male | 172 | 176 | 135 |
|  | Female | 165 | 171 | 118 |
|  | 1990 |  |  |  |
|  | Both Sex | 151 | 158 | 100 |
|  | Male | 154 | 160 | 103 |
|  | Female | 149 | 155 | 96 |
|  | 1991 |  |  |  |
|  | Both sex | 146 | 154 | 96 |
|  | Male | 148 | 156 | 98 |
|  | Female | 144 | 153 | 94 |
|  | 1992 |  |  |  |
|  | Both Sex | 144 | 152 | 93 |
|  | Male | 146 | 154 | 95 |
|  | Female | 142 | 150 | 92 |


| 22. Maternal Mortaity Rate (MMR) per 1000 | 1988 | 5.72 | 5.98 | 5.31 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 1989 | 5.08 | 5.78 | 4.60 |
|  | 1990 | 4.78 | 5.02 | 4.25 |
|  | 1991 | 4.72 | 4.84 | 4.02 |
|  | 1992 | 4.68 | 4.80 | 3.98 |
| 23. Life Expectancy at Birth (Years) | 1988 | National | Rural | Urban |
|  | Both Sex | 56.4 | 56.1 | 60.0 |
|  | Male | 56.4 | 56.5 | 60.5 |
|  | Female | 56.0 | 55.6 | 59.5 |
|  | 1990 |  |  |  |
|  | Both sex | 55.4 | 55.5 | 60.1 |
|  | Male | 56.4 | 56.0 | 60.3 |
|  | Female | 55.4 | 54.0 | 59.0 |
|  | 1991 |  |  |  |
|  | Both Sex | 55.8 | 55.5 | 60.1 |
|  | Male | 56.4 | 56.0 | 60.4 |
|  | Female | 55.6 | 55.2 | 60.0 |
|  | 1992 |  |  |  |
|  | Both Sex | 56.0 | 55.6 | 62.2 |
|  | Male | 56.7 | 56.3 | 60.3 |
|  | Female | 55.6 | 54.4 | 60.1 |
| E. NATURAL GROWTH OF POP | JLATION |  |  |  |
| 24. Natural Growth Rat |  |  |  |  |
| (NGR) Percent, | 1983 | 2.27 | 2.32 | 1.96 |
|  | 1988 | 2.19 | 2.28 | 1.75 |
|  | 1989 | 2.16 | 2.24 | 1.71 |
|  | 1990 | 2.15 | 2.23 | 1.67 |
|  | 1991 | 2.06 | 2.18 | 1.60 |
|  | 1992 | 1.98 | 2.08 | 1.58 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| Minute (No.) | 1988 | 4.4 | 3.9 | 0.5 |
|  | 1989 | 4.4 | 3.9 | 0.5 |
|  | 1990 | 4.5 | 3.9 | 0.6 |
|  | 1991 | 4.5 | 4.0 | 0.7 |
|  | 1992 | 4.6 | 4.0 | 0.7 |
| F. HEADS OF HOUSEHOLDS |  |  |  |  |
| 26. Male Headed Househ (percent) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { old } \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ | 84.7 | 83.5 | 93.1 |
| 27. Female Headed Hous (Percent) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ehold } \\ & 1982 \end{aligned}$ | 15.3 | 16.5 | 6.9 |

G. Religious Composition
28. Religious Composition (percent)

1988

| Muslim | 86.5 | 86.4 | 87.0 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Non-Muslim | 13.5 | 13.6 | 13.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1991 |  |  |  |
| Muslim | 86.6 | 86.5 | 87.0 |
| Non-Muslim | 30.4 | 13.5 | 13.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| 1992 |  |  |  |
| Muslim | 86.6 | 86.5 | 87.0 |
| Non-Muslim | 13.4 | 13.5 | 13.0 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

## H. EDUCATION AND LITERACY

29. Literacy Rate of Population aged $5+1987$

| Both Sex | 27.8 | 24.1 | 51.2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Male | 34.6 | 31.0 | 58.3 |
| Female | 20.3 | 16.7 | 43.6 |
| 1990 |  |  |  |
| Both Sex | 36.0 | 30.2 | 52.0 |
| Male | 38.2 | 34.3 | 54.4 |
| Female | 23.0 | 22.3 | 46.0 |
| 1991 |  |  |  |
| Both Sex | 36.2 | 30.4 | 52.4 |
| Male | 38.4 | 34.8 | 56.5 |
| Female | 23.0 | 22.5 | 46.2 |
| 1992 |  |  |  |
| Both sex | 37.0 | 31.2 | 52.8 |
| Male | 38.9 | 35.0 | 56.7 |
| Female | 23.5 | 22.5 | 46.4 |

30. Adult Literacy Rate of Population aged $15+$
```
1987
```

| Both Sex | 33.8 | 29.5 | 61.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Male | 44.0 | 39.6 | 71.6 |
| Female | 22.9 | 18.7 | 50.5 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1990 | 36.9 | 30.7 | 62.5 |
| Both Sex | 45.5 | 39.3 | 70.0 |
| Male | 24.2 | 20.3 | 50.5 |

1991

| Both Sex | 38.8 | 33.2 | 63.2 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Male | 46.2 | 39.9 | 70.6 |
| Female | 24.5 | 22.7 | 51.0 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1992 |  |  |  |
|  | 39.7 | 33.7 | 63.6 |
| Both Sex | 46.8 | 40.2 | 71.0 |
| Male | 25.0 | 23.1 | 51.9 |

## I. MIGRATION

31. Migration for Economic Reason, 1990

| Direction | Migration per <br> 1000 population | Number of <br> Migrants |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Rural to Rural | 8.50 | 57965 |
| Rural to Urban | 4.46 | 74900 |
| Urban to Rural | 1.36 | 4949 |
| Urban to Urban | 29.83 | 78999 |
|  |  |  |
| 1991 |  |  |
| Rural to Rural | 8.60 | 58342 |
| Rural to Urban | 5.62 | 76823 |
| Urban to Rural | 1.42 | 5245 |
| Urban to Urban | 28.02 | 77835 |

