

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Post Enumeration Survey (PES) of the population enumeration of Census 2001 was conducted in all the 35 States and Union territories of the country shortly after the population enumeration during April through July 2001. It was conducted in the 2993 Enumeration Blocks of the country. The primary objective of the PES was to estimate the magnitude of omissions (under-count) and duplication (over-count) of individuals in the Census 2001 in terms of omission rate. In conducting this survey, opportunity was also taken to measure error in responses or content error, in the recorded individual characteristics, with regard to certain items canvassed in the census like age, literacy, fertility etc. Important findings based on the analysis of Post Enumeration Surveys are as under: -

- At the national level, the PES has shown a net omission of 23 persons for every 1000 persons enumerated. This is from an estimated undercount of 24 persons for every 1000 persons, offset by 1 person for every 1000 persons being counted more than once. In comparison, the 1991 PES showed that 18 persons per 1000 enumerated persons were omitted net of duplication.
- At the national level, the PES 2001 indicates that the Census 2001 may have missed more persons in urban than rural areas. The net omission was 40 persons (per thousand persons) for the former compared to 17 persons (per thousand persons) for the latter. There is no significant differential by sex in the omission rates in the country though females have a slightly under count (38 per 1000 persons) in urban areas.
- Zone –wise comparison of the omission rates shows that the proportion of persons missed is high in the northern zone at 49 per 1000 persons, followed by 34 and 20 per 1000 persons respectively in southern and eastern zones.
- The urban areas of the northern zone, which includes Delhi, have an omission rate of 81 per 1000 for males against 70 per 1000 for females. Greater mobility in city like Delhi may be the reason for these omission rates.
- The central zone has duplication rate of 3 per 1000 persons, followed by 1 per 1000 persons in the northern zone, while it is negligible in other zones.
- The omission rate is 32 per 1000 persons in each of the age groups of 0-4 and 20-24 years. In the age-group 40-59, the omission rates are low. Males have an omission rate of 32-33 per 1000 persons in the age-group 20-29 years. This is due to higher omission in urban areas, where it is in the range of 55- 61 per 1000 persons.
- In northern and southern zones, the omission rates are higher in all the age-groups compared to other zones.
- Omission rates between literates and illiterates do not differ significantly among both the sexes. However, omission rates among illiterates are higher (more than 10 points) than literates in urban areas.
- Currently married persons have omission rate of 23 per 1000 persons followed by never married persons (26 per 1000 persons). Higher omission rate has been observed among ‘divorced or separated’, with 48 per 1000 persons, with the sex differential in this category being high (17 points).

- The net omission rates by sex and relationship to head shows that the head of the household and the spouse are least omitted, with their proportion being 20 and 18 per 1000 persons respectively. In contrast, parents of the head of the household have been omitted more, the proportions of father and mother being 52 and 39 per 1000 persons respectively. Omission rates of other relatives is about 40 per thousand persons.
- Mobility of persons in the urban areas can be gauged from the fact that between the period of population enumeration and the PES, 3 percent people have arrived in the households, the urban contribution being 5 percent.
- The proportion of responses matched between the census and the PES for different characteristics, information on which was collected from individuals, show that agreement rate (percentage) is lowest in case of reporting of levels of education by respondents; the proportion being 94 percent. This is followed by the response regarding relationship of the individuals to the head of the households (98 percent).
- It is observed that mis-classification resulting from response errors varies among different characteristics for which information was gathered from the individuals in the census. For example, in case of question on literacy status, about 1 percent of the individuals have been classified in the census to be literates, which they are not, as per the PES.
- In case of the questions on disability, information on speech and hearing disorders seem to be over estimated in census to the extent of 0.7 and 0.2 percents respectively and consequently, mental and movement disorders have been under estimated.
- Main workers appears to have been under-estimated to the extent of 3.6 percent in lieu of same proportion of marginal workers.