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|  |  |
| --- | --- |
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| ZOI | Zone of Influence |
|  |  |
|  |  |

# Background

Feed the Future is the U.S. government’s global food security initiative that seeks to reduce poverty, hunger, and undernutrition among women and children and to increase, resilience, income, women’s empowerment, dietary diversity, and appropriate feeding practices. Feed the Future’s programmatic efforts are concentrated in zones of influence (ZOI) in a number of countries, including [COUNTRY].

Progress in achieving the objectives of the Feed the Future initiative is tracked using information collected through representative cluster sample household surveys, known as ZOI surveys. These surveys are designed to provide information on Feed the Future indicators with an acceptable level of statistical accuracy (95% level of confidence).

The Feed the Future indicators include the following:

* Prevalence of poverty: Percent of people living on less than $1.90/day 2011 PPP
* Depth of poverty of the poor: Mean percent shortfall of the poor relative to the $1.90/day 2011 PPP poverty line
* Prevalence of stunted (HAZ < -2) children under five (0-59 months)
* Prevalence of wasted (WHZ < -2) children under five (0-59 months)
* Prevalence of underweight (BMI < 18.5) women of reproductive age
* Prevalence of healthy weight (WHZ ≤ 2 and ≥-2) among children under five (0-59 months)
* Prevalence of children 6-23 months receiving a minimum acceptable diet
* Prevalence of exclusive breastfeeding of children under six months of age
* Prevalence of women of reproductive age consuming a diet of minimum diversity
* Percentage of households below the comparative threshold for the poorest quintile of the Asset-Based Comparative Wealth Index
* Prevalence of moderate and severe food insecurity in the population, based on the Food Insecurity Experience Scale (FIES)
* Ability to recover from shocks and stresses index
* Index of social capital at the household level
* Proportion of households that believe local government will respond effectively to future shocks and stresses
* Proportion of households participating in group-based savings, micro-finance or lending programs
* Percentage of households with access to a basic sanitation service
* Percentage of households with soap and water at a hand-washing station commonly used by family members
* Abbreviated Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index (A-WEAI)
* Yield of targeted agricultural commodities within target areas
* Proportion of producers who have applied targeted improved management practices or technologies
* Average percentage of women achieving adequacy across the six indicators of the Abbreviated WEAI (A-WEAI) [Context Indicator]
* Prevalence of people who are ‘Near-Poor’, living on 100 percent to less than 125 percent of the $1.90 2011 PPP poverty line [Context Indicator]

# Field-check tables

This guide describes the field-check tables used to evaluate the effectiveness of the data collection process in the field. The field-check tables can help detect misunderstandings in data collection procedures and gaps in quality control of interview team performance. The findings derived from the field-check tables can guide the survey management team and field supervisors in taking corrective actions and interviewer retraining.

## 2.1 Producing the field-check tables

Several procedures and quality checks help ensure that the highest quality of data are collected for ZOI surveys. These include field supervisor review of questionnaires, interviewer observations by field supervisors and members of the Quality Control and Support Teams, checks of the consistency of respondent answers to selected interview questions, and checks on the structure of data collected in each cluster. In addition to these field procedures, data are sent to the [SUBCONTRACTOR’s] head office, where data are reviewed further and field-check tables are produced.



*Field-check tables should never be used as a substitute for other fieldwork supervision methods. They are, however, the only means to detect certain data collection errors in time to remedy the problems in the field.*



Field-check tables constitute a key method for monitoring data quality while fieldwork is still in progress. These field-check tables are produced periodically by the [SUBCONTRACTOR’s] in-country data manager and shared weekly with survey management and the [CONTRACTOR] data manager. Each table focuses on an important aspect of data quality, allowing the survey management team to identify specific data quality concerns in the data overall. The field check tables are tabulated according to the field team that collected the data, allowing the survey management team to monitor the performance of each field team separately. Use of these tabulations is particularly crucial during the early fieldwork while there is still time to provide targeted retraining to interviewers and supervisors to improve results for the remaining fieldwork.

Field-check tables are produced weekly using raw survey data that are transferred from the team supervisors daily. During the early stages of fieldwork, when quality control is especially important and problems more likely, field-check tables should be produced after the first few days of fieldwork and more frequently if requested. After teams have completed approximately one cluster each, tables can be analyzed to provide feedback to all teams. Although the field-check tables are usually produced on the entire dataset available at the time, the [CONTRACTOR] data manager may produce tables for only data processed since the previous set of tables or for a specific period of fieldwork, if required. In addition, while field-check tables are typically produced and analyzed at the team level, tables can be produced at the interviewer level to determine sources of issues.

The field-check tables presented in this document are designed to flag statistics indicators that appear to be lower or higher than anticipated. These indicators can help identify interviewers and teams that are responsible for serious lapses in field procedures, intentional or otherwise. Although it is acceptable to run a few more tables than the ones described here, it is important that the total number not exceed 15 tables. If too many tables are run, quick analysis and prompt feedback to management and the field are difficult.

## 2.2 Reporting field-check table findings

The [CONTRACTOR] survey manager and data manager work together with the in-country field manager and survey coordinators to thoroughly review the tables and identify the data collection issues as soon as possible. If data collection problems are discovered at the team level, individual-level tabulations can be produced to determine whether problems are team-wide or restricted to one or two of the team members. Immediate action should be taken to address problems, either by contacting the team supervisor by telephone or by visiting the team to review the findings. In cases of serious problems, a brief written report should be produced to describe the nature and extent of the observed problems, the cause of the problems, and what actions were taken.

## 2.3 Feedback to interview teams

The field manager should promptly contact a team’s field supervisor if the field-check tables show problems in data collection, and inform the field supervisor of the specific problems observed. Field supervisors are responsible for reviewing relevant sections of the questionnaire or procedures with their teams. If significant problems persist after the field supervisor has informed the interviewers, it may be necessary to stop the data collection temporarily to re-train the interviewers on relevant questions and procedures. During re-visit interviews and monitoring of teams, the field supervisor should focus on problem areas found in field-check table reviews. If the problems persist after additional training, or if the problem is severe enough that the survey management is concerned, interviewers and/or supervisors may need to be dismissed from the survey.

## 2.4 Field-check tables interpretation

The following sections describe the field-check tables at the household and individual levels and their content, the reasons for inclusion, and guidance on interpretation of the results. The senior survey staff, trainers, in-country data manager, data processing manager, and field supervisor should meet during the pretest and interviewer training to discuss the field-check tables, ensure understanding of the content, and for training on how to review and analyze field-check tables.

### 2.4.1 Household response rates

Table FC.1 monitors response rates for the household questionnaire. Serious bias can be introduced to the data when a significant proportion of the sampled households are not interviewed. The level of non-response should be kept low (below 5 percent) so that the results from the Feed the Future ZOI surveys (2018–2019) are representative of all ZOI areas, and are not based only on households that are convenient to find and interview.

The response rate is not simply the percentage of households completed (result code 1). Rather, the response rate is computed as the number of households completed divided by the sum of the number of completed households plus those that were not at home, were unavailable, refused to be surveyed, households in which the respondent was ill or impaired, and dwellings that the interview team did not find. The response rate, therefore, excludes households that are permanently vacant or all household members were away for an extended period of time; structures that were sampled, but during fieldwork were discovered not to be residences; dwellings that had been destroyed; and other results not included on the questionnaire. Even in a survey with an adequate response rate, it is important to review the percentages of households that were not completed for other reasons because these may also indicate a serious problem during fieldwork.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table FC.1: Household Response Rates  Percent distribution of sampled households by result of household interview and household response rate by interviewer team. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | **Result of household interview** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Team** | **Completed** | **Not at home** | **Extended absence** | **Refused** | **Dwelling vacant** | **Not a dwelling** | **Dwelling destroyed** | **Dwelling not found** | **Ill or impaired** | **Other** | **Total number** | **Total percentage** | **House-hold response rate (%)\*** |
| **(1)** | **(2)** | **(3)** | **(5)** | **(6)** | **(7)** | **(8)** | **(9)** | **(10)** | **(96)** |
| Team 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |
| Team 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |
| Team 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |
| Team 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |
| Team 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |
| All teams |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |
| \*Household response rate = (1)/[(1)+(2)+(3)+(5)+(10)]\*100; target is 95 percent for household response rate. | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

### 2.4.2 Male and female decisionmakers

Table FC.2 compares the percentages of households with male and female adults to the percentages with male and female primary decisionmakers. Table FC.2 shows the percentage of households with at least one primary decisionmaker. The household roster (module 1) is used to identify both the male and female primary decisionmakers who will be interviewed in module 6. Proper identification of primary decisionmakers is important for completing module 6. This table identifies interviewers who may be ignoring male or female primary decisionmakers to avoid interviewing them for modules 6 and 6M.

The percentages of adults and primary decisionmakers should be very close, although the percentage of adults may be slightly higher. Most households with at least one male member age 18 or older will also include a primary male decisionmaker. Households with at least one female member age 18 or older will also include a primary female decisionmaker. Consistent differences between the percentages of households with decisionmakers and the total of households with men and women over age 18 likely indicate a problem. Primary decisionmakers should be identified in at least [100% - expected prevalence of child-only households] percent of households.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table FC.2: Primary Male and Female Decisionmakers  Number of households with a completed roster and, among those households, the percentage with at least one male member age 18+, the percentage with a male decisionmaker, the percentage with at least one female member age 18+, the percentage with a female decisionmaker, and the percentage of households with at least one decisionmaker. | | | | | | |
| **Team** | **HH with module 1 completed (N)** | **Male** | | **Female** | | **HH with at least one primary adult decisionmaker (%)** |
| **HH with at least one male member 18+ (%)** | **HH with primary adult male decisionmaker (%)** | **HH with at least one female member 18+ (%)** | **HH with primary adult female decisionmaker (%)** |
| Team 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All teams |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target is [100% - expected prevalence of child-only households]. | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | |

### 2.4.3 Household age heaping

Table FC.3 reports the degree to which the age data reported in the household roster are heaped on numbers ending in 5 or 0. Such heaping is a common occurrence in all surveys, but a high rate of heaping can introduce serious bias to the survey results and indicate less careful interviewing.

The degree of age heaping is particularly important for the upper cutoff for eligibility of women (age 49) for module 4. With age heaping, a higher percentage of women age 50 than age 49 is expected, but the heaping percentages for the age group 48-52 years should be no higher than the heaping for the other age groups. A higher percentage suggests that an interviewer may be modifying the ages of women to avoid module 4 interviews. Target levels for age heaping are less than 30 percent in each column of Table FC.3; higher levels may indicate a problem in data collection. Field supervisors should verify household rosters and increase re-visit interviews if age heaping is problematic, and consider retraining for interviewers demonstrating higher levels of age heaping.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table FC.3: Age Heaping in the Household Roster  Percentage of household members in 5-year age groups with ages recorded as ending in 5 or 0. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Team** | **Ages of household members** | | | | | | | | | | **All ages ending in 5 or 0 (%)** | **Number of HH members** |
| **Ages 3-7 recorded as 5 (%)** | **Ages 8-12 recorded as 10 (%)** | **Ages 13-17 recorded as 15 (%)** | **Ages 18-22 recorded as 20 (%)** | **Ages 23-27 recorded as 25 (%)** | **Ages 28-32 recorded as 30 (%)** | **Ages 33-37 recorded as 35 (%)** | **Ages 38-42 recorded as 40 (%)** | **Ages 43-47 recorded as 45 (%)** | **Ages 48-52 recorded as 50 (%)** |
| Team 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All teams |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Note: The target for all age ranges is 30 percent. | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | |

### 2.4.4 Eligible women

Table FC.4 is used to track the average number of women ages 15-49 per household who are eligible for interview in module 4. The number of eligible women and the total number of completed households is used to compute the mean number of eligible women per household, which is then compared to the expected number of women per household. The expected number of women per household is based on other known data sources, such as the latest census. Results showing fewer than XXX eligible women per household may indicate that an interviewer is modifying eligibility, either by gender or age, to avoid interviewing respondents for module 4. Field supervisors’ results that show insufficient numbers of eligible women should verify household rosters and increase re-interviews.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table FC.4: Eligible Women per Household  Mean number of eligible women ages 15-49 years per household. | | | |
| **Cluster** | **Completed HH (N)** | **Eligible women in completed HH (N)** | **Mean number of eligible women per HH** |
| Cluster 1 |  |  |  |
| Cluster 2 |  |  |  |
| Cluster 3 |  |  |  |
| Cluster 4 |  |  |  |
| Cluster 5 |  |  |  |
| All clusters |  |  |  |
| Note: The target is XXX number of eligible women per household. | | | |

### 2.4.5 Age displacement

The concept of age displacement is similar to age heaping. Tables FC.5a and FC.5b show the results of age displacement, which is more significant than heaping ages of young women ages 12-17 because heaping could increase the number of eligible women. Women who are displaced out of eligibility likely will be assigned ages 13 or 14, rather than their actual age of 15 or older.

If the data were perfect, the number of young women ages 12-17 would be nearly the same for each age in the group; the numbers would gradually decrease due to mortality. If age displacement occurs, a larger number of women ages 13 and 14 than ages 15 and 16 will result. If this occurs, the field supervisor should include a revisit interview in at least one household that has a woman age 13 or 14 to confirm her age. Similar tables are shown below to detect age displacement of women ages 18 and 19 to 16 and 17, as well as displacement of women age 49 and younger to 50 or older. If the data were collected inaccurately, the interviewer should receive additional training.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table FC.5a: Female Age Displacement  Number of all women ages 12-17 years listed in the household roster by single years of age and age ratios, by team. | | | | | | | | |
| **Team** | **Age of women in years (N)** | | | | | | **Age ratio (15/14)** | **Extended age ratio (15+16)/(13+14)** |
| **12** | **13** | **14** | **15** | **16** | **17** |
| Team 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All teams |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Note: Targets are ratios greater than 0.80. | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table FC.5b: Female Age Displacement  Number of all women ages 47-52 years listed in the household roster by single years of age and age ratio disaggregated by interviewer team. | | | | | | | | |
| **Team** | **Age of women in years (N)** | | | | | | **Age ratio (49/50)** | **Extended age ratio (48+49)/ (50+51)** |
| **47** | **48** | **49** | **50** | **51** | **52** |
| Team 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All teams |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Note: Targets are ratios greater than 0.80. | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table FC.5c: Female Age Displacement  Number of all women ages 16-20 years listed in the household roster by single years of age and age ratios, by team. | | | | | | | | |
| **Team** | **Age of women in years (N)** | | | | | | **Age ratio (18/17)** | **Extended age ratio (18+19)/(16+17)** |
| **15** | **16** | **17** | **18** | **19** | **20** |
| Team 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All teams |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Note: Targets are ratios greater than 0.80. | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table FC.5d: Male Age Displacement  Number of all men ages 16-20 years listed in the household roster by single years of age and age ratios, by team. | | | | | | | | |
| **Team** | **Age of men in years (N)** | | | | | | **Age ratio (18/17)** | **Extended age ratio (18+19)/(16+17)** |
| **15** | **16** | **17** | **18** | **19** | **20** |
| Team 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All teams |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Note: Targets are ratios greater than 0.80. | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |

### 2.4.6 Eligible children

Table FC.6 shows the average number of children younger than age 6 years per household in the survey, which should be close to the same average in the district or region of the interview, based on recent census or other data. Avoiding bias in the sample requires that a representative sample of children are found and included in module 5. Teams that find fewer than XXX children per household may indicate a systematic avoidance of accurately recording the ages of eligible children and should be reported to the field supervisor. To determine the target children per household, refer to the central statistics agency, the latest Demographic and Health Survey, or other nationally representative data source.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table FC.6: Eligible Children per Household  Mean number of eligible children younger than 6 years per household. | | | |
| **Team** | **Completed households (N)** | **Eligible children in HH (N)** | **Mean number of eligible children per HH** |
| Team 1 |  |  |  |
| Team 2 |  |  |  |
| Team 3 |  |  |  |
| Team 4 |  |  |  |
| Team 5 |  |  |  |
| Note: The target is XXX number of eligible children per household. | | | |
|  | | | |

### 2.4.7 Eligible children age displacement

Table FC.7 monitors age displacement of children during the collection of the household roster. Children whose ages are reported as younger than 6 years in the roster are eligible for inclusion in module 5. During data collection, interviewers can avoid collecting data for an eligible child by recording the child’s age as 6 years or older. The ratio of children ages 5 to 6, and the extended ratio of ages 4 and 5 to 6 and 7 should be at least 0.80.

The numbers shown in Table FC.7 should be similar for all ages, declining slightly with age as a result of mortality. Higher numbers of children ages 6-8 are likely the result of age displacement to avoid module 5 interviewing. Field supervisors should increase re-interviews, with special attention to age displacement of eligible children for interviewers with poor age ratios.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table FC.7: Child Age Displacement  Number of all children ages 2-8 listed in the household roster by single years of age and the age ratio 5/6 and the extended age ratio (4+5/(6+7), by interviewer team. | | | | | | | | | |
| **Team** | **Age of children in years (N)** | | | | | | | **Age ratio (5/6)** | **Extended age ratio (4+5)/(6+7)** |
| **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** | **6** | **7** | **8** |
| Team 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 5 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All teams |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Note: Target is 0.80 for ratios. | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | |

### 2.4.8 Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index response rates

Tables FC.8a and FC.8b monitor response rates for the Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Index (WEAI) questionnaire for female and male respondents. Only the female and male primary adult decisionmakers in the household are interviewed for modules 6 and 6M. Serious bias can be introduced to the data when a significant proportion of the eligible men or women are not interviewed. The response rate should be kept high (above 95%) so that the results are representative of all ZOI areas, and not based only on those men and women that are convenient to find and interview. To determine the target number of households that have primary decisionmakers, refer to the central statistics agency, the latest Demographic and Health Survey, or other nationally representative data source for the percentage of child-only households, and subtract from 100%.

The result codes shown in Tables FC.8a and FC.8b are similar to those used for the household overall, and the response rate differs from the percentage of modules completed. Even in a survey with an adequate response rate, it is important to review the percentages of non-complete interviews because these may also indicate a data collection problem in the fieldwork.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table FC.8a: Module 6 (Women) Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Module, Eligibility and Response Rate  Percent distribution of all eligible women (primary adult female decisionmaker) by result of individual outcome. | | | | | | | | |
| **Team** | **Result of module** | | | | | **Total (%)** | **Number of women** | **Response rate\*** |
| **Completed (code 1)** | **Respondent not at home, or extended absence (code 3)** | **Refused (code 5)** | **Household member too ill to respond or cognitively impaired (code 10)** | **Other (code 96)** |
| Team 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Team 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Team 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Team 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Team 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| All teams |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Note: The response rate is the percentage of households completed divided by the number with response codes 1 and 5. The target response rate is 95 percent. | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table FC.8b: Module 6(M) (Men) Women’s Empowerment in Agriculture Module, Eligibility and Response Rate  Percent distribution of all eligible men (primary adult male decisionmaker) by result of individual outcome. | | | | | | | | |
| **Team** | **Result of module** | | | | | **Total** | **Number** | **Response rate\*** |
| **Completed (code 1)** | **Respondent not at home or extended absence (code 3)** | **Refused (code 5)** | **Household member too ill to respond or cognitively impaired (code 10)** | **Other (code 96)** |
| Team 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Team 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Team 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Team 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Team 5 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| All teams |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| \* The response rate is the percentage of households completed divided by the number with response codes 1 and 5. The target response rate is 95 percent. | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |

### Women’s anthropometry and dietary diversity response rates

Table FC.9 tracks response rates to module 4, the women’s anthropometry and dietary diversity module, similar to the previous response rate tables. All women ages 15-49 in the household are included in module 4. Serious bias can be introduced to the data when a significant proportion of the women are not measured for anthropometry and interviewed about their diets. The response rate should be kept high (above 95 percent for women) so that the results are representative of all ZOI areas, and not based only on those women that are convenient to find.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table FC.9: Module 4 Results (Women’s anthropometry and dietary diversity)  Percent distribution of all eligible women by result of individual outcome. | | | | | | | | |
| **Result of module 4:**  **Women’s anthropometry and dietary diversity response rates** | | | | | | | | |
| **Team** | **Completed (code 1)** | **Extended absence (code 3)** | **Refusal (code 5)** | **Ill or impaired (code 10)** | **Other (code 11)** | **Total (%)** | **Number** | **Response rate \*** |
| Team 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Team 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Team 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| Team 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| All teams |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |  |  |
| \* The response rate is the percentage completed divided by the number with response codes 1 and 5. Target response rates are 95 percent. | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |

In general, the result codes shown in Table FC.9 are like those used for the household overall, and it is important to review the percentages of non-completed interviews because these may also indicate a serious problem during fieldwork.

### 2.4.10 Child anthropometry and infant and young child feeding response rates

Tables FC.10a and FC.10b monitor response rates for module 5, child anthropometry and infant and young child feeding. Children are found eligible for module 5 anthropometry if they are younger than age 6, and they continue to be eligible for the remainder of module 5 if they are younger than 36 months. Serious bias can be introduced to the data when a significant proportion of the eligible children are not measured for anthropometry or are not included in the infant and young child feeding section. Table FC.10a shows the results of module 5 for all children younger than age 6 years and the overall response rate should be at least 95 percent. Table FC.10b shows the results of the anthropometry measurements for both height and weight. The combined percentage of children measured should be at least 95 percent.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table FC.10a: Module 5 Results (Children’s nutrition)  Percent distribution of all children younger than 6 years by result of module 5. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Result of module 5** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Team** | | **Completed (1)** | | **Extended absence (3)** | | **Refusal (5)** | | **Too ill to respond/ cognitive impairment (10)** | | | **Other (96)** | | **Total (%)** | | **Number** | | **Response rate\*** | |
| Team 1 | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  | | 100 | |  | |  | |
| Team 2 | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  | | 100 | |  | |  | |
| Team 3 | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  | | 100 | |  | |  | |
| Team 4 | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  | | 100 | |  | |  | |
| All teams | |  | |  | |  | |  | | |  | | 100 | |  | |  | |
| \* The response rate is the percentage of completed divided by the number with response codes1 and 5. Target response rates are 95 percent. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Table FC.10b: Module 5 Results (Children’s Anthropometry)  Percent distribution of all children younger than 6 years by result of module 5. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Result of module 5** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| **Team** | | **Height** | | | | | | | | **Weight** | | | | | | |  | | | |
| **Measured** | | **Not present (code 9994)** | | **Refused (code 9995)** | | **Other (code 9996)** | | **Measured** | **Not present (code 9994)** | | **Refused (code 9995)** | | **Other (code 9996)** | | **Number of children** | | **Measured for both height and weight (%)** | |
| Team 1 | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| Team 2 | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| Team 3 | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| Team 4 | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| All teams | |  | |  | |  | |  | |  |  | |  | |  | |  | |  | |
| Target for both height and weight measured is 95 percent. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

### 2.4.11 Child age heaping

Table FC.11 shows the distribution of age heaping of children that may be occurring at 6-month intervals. Unlike the household roster, potential age heaping in module 5 is in months instead of years and often occurs at 6-month intervals. Table FC.11 will indicate if there is age heaping for children reported at 6, 12, 18, and 24 months. Nutrition statistics for children are particularly sensitive to the ages of children in the data. An error of 1 or 2 months can skew the results and lead to incorrect conclusions. It is, therefore, extremely important that correct ages be reported during the fieldwork. The target for each column, including the last, of these reports is that no more than 30 percent of children will be reported at each 6-month mark. Results much larger than 30 percent can indicate that the interviewer needs to probe more carefully for the child’s correct age if it is provided in 6-month intervals or whole years.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table FC.11: Age Heaping in Months of Age  Percentage of children in module 5 in each age group with age reported as 6, 12, 18, or 24 months. | | | | | | | |
| **Team** | **Children’s age in months** | | | | | | **Average percentage of children ages 0-24 months recorded at 6 months intervals\*** |
| **Ages 4-8 months, recorded as 6 months (%)** | **Ages 10-14 months, recorded as 12 months (%)** | **Ages 16-20 months, recorded as 18 months (%)** | **Age recorded as “1 year” (%)** | **Ages 22-26 months, recorded as 24 months (%)** | **Ages 34-38 months, recorded as 36 months (%)** |
| Team 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All teams |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \*This column shows an average of all other columns in the table. The target is 30 percent or lower for children with 6-month age intervals. | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | |

### 2.4.12 Child birth date and age reporting

Table FC.12 reports the completeness of information on children’s birth date and age. The percentage of information completeness (column 1) should be at least 95 percent, and the percentage of no information on birth date and age should be less than 5 percent. If completeness of birth date and age information does not meet these levels, the field supervisor should be alerted that monitoring and training may need to be increased for those interviewers.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table FC.12: Birth Date and Age Reporting  Percentage of distribution of the completeness of birth date and age information. | | | | | | |
| **Team** | **Completeness for children whose caretakers have been interviewed** | | | | | **Total (%)** |
| **Age for both year and month of birth and age in months** | **Age only for year and month of birth** | **Age only in months** | **Age only in years** | **No data** |
| Team 1 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Team 2 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Team 3 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Team 4 |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| All teams |  |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Note: Birth date may be reported in questions 502 or 506. Targets are 95 percent or higher complete and 5 percent or lower with no data. | | | | | | |

### 2.4.13 Child height and weight

Tables FC.13 reports on the percentage of children with a height and weight that fall within age-appropriate ranges. The World Health Organization (WHO) provides reasonable ranges for the heights and weights of children based on the child’s gender and age in months. Teams should obtain heights and weights that are in the WHO ranges for at least 95 percent of children to avoid bias in the final data. Heights and weights that are outside of their ranges (shown in the second and fourth columns) can indicate problems in the measuring of children, recording of those measurements, or in the recording of birth dates.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Table FC.13a: Children’s Anthropometry Ranges  Percentage of children under age 6 years with heights and weights in the WHO range for gender and age. | | | | | | |
| **Team** | **Height** | | **Weight** | | **Number of children measured** | **All children with valid measurements (%)** |
| **In range** | **Out of range** | **In range** | **Out of range** |
| Team 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All teams |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target is 95 percent of children with heights measured in range. | | | | | | |

### 2.4.14 Agricultural practices and land measurement

Table FC.14 monitors response rates for modules 7.1 – 7.3, agricultural technologies for [VCC1], [VCC2], and [VCC3], and modules 7A – 7F, land area measurement and soil assessment. Members of the household are found to be eligible for responding if they cultivated any of three country-specific VCC crops. Serious bias can be introduced to the data when a significant proportion of the eligible farmers are not interviewed about their agricultural practices and allow for their land to measured and soil to be assessed. Table FC.14 shows the results of the agriculture modules for all members of the household who cultivated each of the VCC crops. The expected response rate should be at least 95 percent.

Table FC.14: Agricultural Practices and Land Measurement

Percent distribution of household members who cultivated VCC crops, responded to agricultural technology modules, and who allowed their crops to be measured and soil to be assessed.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Team** | **Module 7.1 [VCC1]** | | **Module 7.2 [VCC2]** | | **Module 7.3 [VCC3]** | | **Plot measurement and soil assessment** | | |
| **Total eligible member**  **(N)** | **Completed**  **(%)** | **Total eligible member**  **(N)** | **Completed**  **(%)** | **Total eligible member**  **(N)** | **Completed**  **(%)** | **Total plots**  **(N)** | **Measured**  **(%)** | **Soil assessed**  **(%)** |
| Team 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Team 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| All teams |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Target is 95 percent of interviews be completed. | | | | | | | | | |