## A. 1 INTRODUCTION

The 2001-2002 Zambia Demographic and Health Survey (ZDHS) is a comprehensive nationally representative population and health survey carried out by the Central Statistical Office in partnership with the Central Board of Health. ORC Macro provided financial and technical assistance for the survey through the USAID-funded MEASURE DHS+ programme. Additional funding for the ZDHS was received from the Government of Japan, UNFPA, and DANIDA.

## A. 2 Survey Objectives

The principal objective of the ZDHS is to provide current and reliable data on fertility and family planning behaviour, child mortality, children's nutritional status, the utilization of maternal, child health services, knowledge and prevalence of HIV and syphilis.

The population covered by the 2001-2002 ZDHS is defined as the universe of all women age 1549 in Zambia and all men age 15-59. A sample of households was selected and all women age 15-49 identified in the households were interviewed. In addition, in a subsample of one-third of all the households selected for the ZDHS, all men 15-59 were eligible to be interviewed if they were either permanent residents or visitors present in the household on the night before the survey.

## A. 3 Sample Domains

The Zambia DHS collected demographic and health information from a nationally representative sample of women and men age 15-49 and 15-59, respectively. The primary focus of the 2001 Zambia DHS is to provide estimates of key population and health indicators, including fertility and mortality rates, for the country as a whole, and for urban and rural areas separately. Also, the sample was designed to provide estimates of key variables for the nine provinces, namely, 1) Central, 2) Copperbelt, 3) Eastern, 4) Luapula, 5) Lusaka, 6) Northern, 7) North-Western, 8) Southern, and 9) Western. In addition, the sample provides basic information for a total of 12 combined districts (not each separately) that are the special focus of the Zambia Integrated Health Programme (Livingstone, Kalomo, Chibombo, Kabwe Urban, Ndola Urban, Kitwe, Chipata, Lundazi, Chama, Kasama, Samfya, and Mwense).

## A. 4 Sample Frame

Zambia is divided into nine provinces. In turn, each province is subdivided in districts, each district into constituencies, and each constituency into wards. In addition to these administrative units, during the 2000 population census, each ward was subdivided into convenient areas called census supervisory areas (CSAs), and in turn each CSA into standard enumeration areas (SEAs). In total Zambia has 72 districts, 150 constituencies, 1,289 wards, about 4,400 CSAs, and about 16,400 SEAs. Preliminary information on the counts of households and population, as well as cartographic materials were available from the 2000 population census for the SEAs. Therefore, the sample frame for this survey was the list of SEAs developed from the 2000 population census.

## A. 5 Stratification

In the preliminary census frame, the SEAs were grouped by CSAs, by CSAs within a ward, by wards within a constituency, by constituencies within a district and by districts within a province for purposes of the ZDHS. The SEAs were further stratified separately by urban and rural areas within each province.

## A. 6 Sample Allocation

The primary sampling unit (PSU), the cluster for the 2001-2002 ZDHS, is defined on the basis of SEAs from the census frame. A minimum requirement of 85 households for the cluster size was imposed in the design. If an SEA did not have 85 households, it was combined with an adjacent SEA; thus, the ZDHS cluster comprised one or more SEAs. The number of clusters in each district was not allocated proportional to the total population due to the need to present estimates by each of the nine provinces. Zambia is a country where two-thirds of the population reside in rural areas, and one-third in urban areas. Table A. 1 shows the proportional and the squared root allocations of 320 clusters

| Province | Percentage of households (Census 2000) | Allocation for a sample of 320 clusters |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Proportional | Square root | Adjusted |
| Central | 9.81 | 31 | 35 | 31 |
| Copperbelt | 15.32 | 49 | 44 | 44 |
| Eastern | 13.57 | 44 | 37 | 40 |
| Luapula | 9.04 | 29 | 32 | 30 |
| Lusaka | 13.35 | 43 | 40 | 40 |
| Northern | 14.80 | 47 | 40 | 43 |
| North-Western | 6.10 | 19 | 26 | 30 |
| Southern | 9.90 | 32 | 35 | 32 |
| Western | 8.10 | 26 | 30 | 30 |
| Total | 100.00 | 320 | 320 | 320 |

The target for the 2001-2002 ZDHS sample was 8,000 completed interviews. Based on the level of non-response found in the 1996 ZDHS, to achieve this target, approximately 8,200 households were selected, with all women age 15-49 being interviewed. The target was to reach a minimum of 750 completed interviews per province. In each province the number of households was distributed proportionately among the urban and rural areas. Table A. 2 shows the distribution of about 8,200 households by province.

| Table A.2. Expected number of selected households to reach the target of completed interviews by province |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Province | Expected number of completed interviews 2001-2002 ZDHS | Completed interviews $1996 \text { ZDHS }$ | Selected households 1996 ZDHS | $\begin{gathered} \begin{array}{c} \text { Expected } \\ \text { households } \\ \text { selected } \\ 2001-2002 \\ \text { ZDHS } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ |
| Central | 775 | 748 | 861 | 892 |
| Copperbelt | 1,100 | 1,129 | 845 | 823 |
| Eastern | 1,000 | 1,118 | 1,154 | 1,032 |
| Luapula | 750 | 896 | 866 | 725 |
| Lusaka | 1,000 | 1,074 | 867 | 807 |
| Northern | 1,075 | 783 | 941 | 1,292 |
| North-Western | 750 | 567 | 861 | 1,139 |
| Southern | 800 | 846 | 711 | 672 |
| Western | 750 | 860 | 910 | 794 |
| Total | 8,000 |  |  | 8,176 |

The urban-rural distribution was also considered in distributing the sample. The selected households were distributed in 320 clusters in Zambia, 100 clusters in the urban areas, and 220 clusters in the rural areas. Table A. 3 shows the distribution of urban and rural clusters selected for the 2001-2002 ZDHS.

| Province | Expected number of completed interviews | Number of clusters |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Urban | Rural | Total |
| Central | 775 | 8 | 23 | 31 |
| Copperbelt | 1,100 | 32 | 12 | 44 |
| Eastern | 1,000 | 3 | 37 | 40 |
| Luapula | 750 | 5 | 25 | 30 |
| Lusaka | 1,000 | 33 | 7 | 40 |
| Northern | 1,075 | 5 | 38 | 43 |
| North-Western | 750 | 3 | 27 | 30 |
| Southern | 800 | 8 | 24 | 32 |
| Western | 750 | 3 | 27 | 30 |
| Total | 8,000 | 100 | 220 | 320 |

Under this final allocation, the 12 combined districts of the Zambia Integrated Health Programme have 77 selected clusters, 36 in urban areas and 41 in rural areas.

## A. 7 Sample Selection

The 2001-2002 ZDHS sample was selected using a stratified two-stage cluster design consisting of 320 clusters, 100 in urban and 220 in rural areas. Once the number of households was allocated to each combination of province by urban and rural areas, the number of clusters was calculated based on an average sample take of 25 completed interviews among women 15-49 years. In each urban or rural area in a given province, clusters were selected systematically with probability proportional to the number of households in each cluster. The selection was done using the following formula:

$$
P_{1 i}=\left(a * M_{i}\right) /\left(\Sigma M_{i}\right)
$$

where
$a \quad$ is the number of clusters to be selected in the given combination of province by residence area,
$M_{i} \quad$ is the number of households of the $i^{\text {th }}$ clusters reported in the 2000 summary census information,
$\Sigma M_{i}$ is the number of households in the urban (or rural) area in the province according to the 2000 summary census information.

In each selected cluster, a complete household listing operation was carried out and households were selected to achieve a self-weighted sampling fraction in each province. However, since the 20012002 ZDHS sample is unbalanced among provinces, a final weighing adjustment procedure is required to provide estimates at every other domain of study.

In a given province, if the overall sampling fraction $(f)$ has been calculated, and if $c_{i}$ is the number of households selected out of the total households $\left(L_{i}\right)$-found in the 2001 listing process-for the $i^{\text {th }}$ cluster, then the self-weighting condition can be expressed as

$$
f=P_{1 i} *\left(c_{i} / L_{i}\right)
$$

The final number of households in the $i^{\text {th }}$ cluster could be calculated as

$$
c_{i}=\left(f^{*} L_{i}\right) / P_{1 i}
$$

and the household selection interval for the $i^{t h}$ cluster is given as

$$
\begin{aligned}
& I_{i}=L_{i} / c_{i} \\
& I_{i}=P_{1 i} / f
\end{aligned}
$$

## A. 8 Response Rates

Information on the household and individual interviews for women and men is presented in Tables A. 4 and A.5. A total of 8,050 potential households were selected for the 2001-2002 ZDHS, of which 7,261 were actual households. Household interviews were completed for 98.2 percent of the actual households. A total of 7,944 eligible women were found in these households, and 96.4 percent of the women were successfully interviewed. The overall response rate for women was 94.6 percent.

Similarly, a total of 2,658 potential households were selected for the men's survey, of which 2,408 were actual households. Household interviews were completed for 98.3 percent of the actual households. A total of 2,418 eligible men were found in these households and interviews were completed with 88.7 percent of the men. The overall response rate for men was 87.2 percent.

There is no difference by urban-rural residence in the overall response rate for eligible women; however rural men are more likely than urban men to have completed the interview ( 89.4 percent and 83.0 percent, respectively). The overall response rate among women by province is relatively high and ranges from 90.1 percent for Western province to 97.3 for Luapula province. The overall response rate for men ranges from 78.1 for Western province to 96.9 for Luapula province.

Table A. 4 Sample implementation: women's sample
Percent distribution of households and eligible women by results of the household and individual interviews, and household, eligible women and overall response rates, according to urban-rural residence and province, Zambia 2001-2002

| Result | Residence |  | Province |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Urban | Rural | Central | Copperbelt | Eastern | Luapula | Lusaka | Northern | NorthWestern | Southern | Western |  |
| Selected households |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Completed (C) | 92.9 | 86.9 | 89.0 | 92.9 | 90.1 | 87.9 | 95.4 | 88.0 | 84.1 | 88.3 | 82.2 | 88.5 |
| HH present but no competent respondent at home (HP) | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.7 | 0.1 | 1.5 | 0.2 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 2.5 | 0.9 |
| Refused (R) | 0.5 | 0.2 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.3 |
| Dwelling not found (DNF) | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.8 | 0.0 | 0.9 | 0.0 | 1.4 | 1.0 | 0.5 |
| Household absent (HA) | 0.5 | 2.2 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 1.3 | 1.1 | 0.5 | 2.1 | 4.1 | 0.7 | 3.7 | 1.8 |
| Dwelling vacant/address not a dwelling (DV) | 3.3 | 6.3 | 6.8 | 3.9 | 5.2 | 4.9 | 2.0 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 7.7 | 6.9 | 5.5 |
| Dwelling destroy (DD) | 1.2 | 3.0 | 2.0 | 1.1 | 2.3 | 5.2 | 0.0 | 2.4 | 4.7 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 2.5 |
| Other (O) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.5 | 0.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100 |
| Number of sampled households | 2,167 | 5,883 | 848 | 793 | 1,070 | 717 | 789 | 1,273 | 1,074 | 698 | 788 | 8,050 |
| Household response rate (HRR) | 97.8 | 98.3 | 98.6 | 98.4 | 98.9 | 98.9 | 97.9 | 98.3 | 98.5 | 97.6 | 95.7 | 98.2 |
| Eligible women |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Completed (EWC) | 96.3 | 96.5 | 97.1 | 95.1 | 94.4 | 98.4 | 96.9 | 97.6 | 96.4 | 97.8 | 94.1 | 96.4 |
| Not at home (EWNH) | 2.3 | 2.3 | 1.4 | 3.2 | 4.3 | 0.6 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 2.2 | 1.0 | 4.9 | 2.3 |
| Postponed (EWP) | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 |
| Refused (EWR) | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.3 | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.3 | 0.9 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.3 | 0.1 | 0.5 |
| Partly completed (EWPC) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.1 |
| Incapacitated (EWI) | 0.6 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 0.6 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 0.4 | 0.7 |
| Other (EWO) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.3 | 0.1 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of women | 2,650 | 5,294 | 918 | 987 | 947 | 636 | 925 | 1,200 | 914 | 723 | 694 | 7,944 |
| Eligible woman response rate (EWRR) | 96.3 | 96.5 | 97.1 | 95.1 | 94.4 | 98.4 | 96.9 | 97.6 | 96.4 | 97.8 | 94.1 | 96.4 |
| Overall response rate (ORR) | 94.1 | 94.8 | 95.7 | 93.6 | 93.3 | 97.3 | 94.8 | 96.0 | 94.9 | 95.5 | 90.1 | 94.6 |

${ }^{1}$ Using the number of households falling into specific response categories, the household response rate (HRR) is calculated as: $100 \times \mathrm{C}$

$$
\mathrm{C}+\mathrm{HP}+\mathrm{R}+\mathrm{DNF}
$$

${ }^{2}$ Using the number of eligible women falling into specific response categories, the eligible woman response rate (EWRR) is calculated as:
$100 \times$ EWC
$\mathrm{EWC}+\mathrm{EWNH}+\mathrm{EWR}+\mathrm{EWPC}+\mathrm{EWI}+\mathrm{EWO}$

## Table A. 5 Sample implementation: men's sample

Percent distribution of households and eligible men by results of the household and individual interviews, and household, eligible men and overall response rates, according to urban-rural residence and province, Zambia 2001-2002

| Result | Residence |  | Province |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Urban | Rural | Central | Copperbelt | Eastern | Luapula | Lusaka | Northern | North- <br> Western | Southern | Western |  |
| Selected households |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Completed (C) | 92.9 | 87.7 | 91.2 | 92.7 | 91.5 | 88.7 | 96.5 | 88.4 | 83.1 | 89.5 | 81.9 | 89.1 |
| HH present but no competent respondent at home (HP) | 1.3 | 0.7 | 0.7 | 1.1 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.8 | 0.5 | 1.1 | 0.9 | 2.3 | 0.9 |
| Refused (R) | 0.1 | 0.3 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.2 | 0.6 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.2 |
| Dwelling not found (DNF) | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.0 | 1.3 | 1.2 | 0.4 |
| Household absent (HA) | 0.6 | 2.5 | 0.7 | 0.4 | 0.6 | 1.3 | 0.0 | 3.3 | 5.6 | 0.0 | 3.8 | 2.0 |
| Dwelling vacant/address not a dwelling (DV) | 3.6 | 5.9 | 5.3 | 3.4 | 6.0 | 5.5 | 2.7 | 5.0 | 5.4 | 7.4 | 6.9 | 5.3 |
| Dwelling destroy (DD) | 1.0 | 2.4 | 1.4 | 1.5 | 1.4 | 4.2 | 0.0 | 1.9 | 4.2 | 0.4 | 2.7 | 2.0 |
| Other (O) | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.4 | 0.8 | 0.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of sampled households | 720 | 1,938 | 283 | 261 | 352 | 238 | 259 | 421 | 355 | 229 | 260 | 2,658 |
| Household response rate (HRR) | 98.1 | 98.4 | 98.5 | 98.4 | 99.4 | 99.5 | 99.2 | 98.4 | 98.0 | 97.6 | 95.5 | 98.3 |
| Eligible men |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Completed (EMC) | 84.6 | 90.8 | 93.9 | 85.5 | 85.3 | 97.3 | 84.5 | 89.1 | 91.5 | 91.1 | 81.8 | 88.7 |
| Not at home (EMNH) | 12.0 | 5.9 | 4.1 | 11.3 | 13.3 | 0.5 | 11.3 | 5.7 | 6.5 | 3.1 | 14.1 | 7.9 |
| Postponed (EMP) | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 | 0.1 |
| Refused (EMR) | 2.1 | 1.1 | 0.0 | 2.3 | 0.0 | 1.1 | 2.8 | 1.9 | 0.8 | 2.7 | 1.6 | 1.4 |
| Partly completed (EMPC) | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.1 |
| Incapacitated (EMI) | 0.7 | 0.9 | 1.7 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 0.0 | 0.7 | 0.8 | 0.4 | 0.4 | 1.0 | 0.8 |
| Other (EMO) | 0.4 | 1.2 | 0.3 | 0.0 | 0.3 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 2.5 | 0.8 | 2.7 | 0.5 | 0.9 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| Number of men | 814 | 1,604 | 294 | 311 | 300 | 186 | 283 | 367 | 260 | 225 | 192 | 2,418 |
| Eligible man response rate (EMRR) | 84.6 | 90.8 | 93.9 | 85.5 | 85.3 | 97.3 | 84.5 | 89.1 | 91.5 | 91.1 | 81.8 | 88.7 |
| Overall response rate (ORR) | 83.0 | 89.4 | 92.4 | 84.1 | 84.8 | 96.9 | 83.8 | 87.7 | 89.7 | 88.9 | 78.1 | 87.2 |

${ }^{1}$ Using the number of households falling into specific response categories, the household response rate (HRR) is calculated as:
$100 \times \mathrm{C}$

$$
\mathrm{C}+\mathrm{HP}+\mathrm{R}+\mathrm{DNF}
$$

${ }^{2}$ Using the number of eligible women falling into specific response categories, the eligible woman response rate (EWRR) is calculated as:
$100 \times$ EWC
$\mathrm{EWC}+\mathrm{EWNH}+\mathrm{EWR}+\mathrm{EWPC}+\mathrm{EWI}+\mathrm{EWO}$

