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Introduction

The survey of the Status of Women and Fertility in Thailand (SWAFT) is part of an international project entitled 'The comparative Study of the Status of Women and Fertility among Five Asian Countries (SWAF)'. It is a three year project being conducted from October 1992 to September 1995. The participating countries include India, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippines, and Thailand. The project is co-ordinated by Dr. Karen Mason at the East-West Center Population Programs. The Thai project is funded by the Mellon Foundation through the Population Programs of the East-West Center.

The survey of Status of Women and Fertility in Thailand (SWAFT) collects information from three types of units: Non-municipal communities or villages (Community Survey), private households in municipal and non-municipal areas, and currently married women aged 15-44 and their husbands (Household and Individual Interviews). In addition, group discussions were organized for selected sites to collect qualitative information to measure community norms about the expected roles and rights of men and women.

Sample Selection

The survey of Status of Women and Fertility in Thailand was designed to cover the whole country geographically. The objective was to obtain a sample with reasonably uniform selection probabilities for household and eligible women within each domain.
The sample of SWAFT is a sub-sample of the Thai Demographic and Health Survey (TDHS). The detailed description of the TDHS sample design can be found in the appendix of its country report (Chayovan et al, 1988). In brief, the TDHS sample was designed so that approximately equal numbers of households and women would be interviewed in each domain. All 73 provinces of the country were divided into 6 domains: rural areas in each of the four major regions (namely, North, Northeast, Central and South), Bangkok Metropolitan and other provincial urban areas. Provincial urban areas are defined as all administratively defined municipal areas outside Bangkok. For each domain, equal numbers of sampling units (48 communities or blocks) were selected by either two- or three-stage PPS or systematic sampling. The ultimate sampling units are communities or villages for rural areas and blocks for provincial urban areas and Bangkok. A relatively fixed number of sampled households was systematically selected within each sampling unit. About 9,423 households and 7,201 ever-married women aged 15-49 were selected for interviews in the TDHS.

A simple random sampling was used in SWAFT to sub-sample the TDHS sampling units for each of the six domains. For each domain, 8 sampling clusters or blocks were randomly selected. Thereafter households within each selected sampling unit were listed before the survey. Approximately 125 households were originally planned to be selected for each sampling unit. The selection procedure described yields the total number of 48 ultimate area units in the sample. A village is administratively
defined as an area with a cluster of a certain number dwelling units with the same village number. The sample provinces, districts, and villages or blocks are shown in Table A.1. Figure 1 depicts the sample districts of SWAFT.

Based on previous experience and the data from the 1980 census regarding the average number of currently married women aged 15-39 per household, the original target sample size of the SWAFT survey was fixed at 2,400 interviews of currently married women aged 15-39, expected to be found in approximately 4,800 households. It was agreed that only one eligible respondent (currently married woman aged 15-39) would be interviewed per household. Thus an eligible woman would be randomly selected if the household had more than one currently married women aged 15-39.

The sample of SWAFT was later expanded to include all currently married women aged 15-44 who were usual residents of the selected households and about 100 households per sampling unit were selected. In the actual fieldwork, however, more than 100 households were selected for some sampling units to insure the achievement of the target size for the sample of women. Table A.2 shows the actual number of households and eligible women selected and interviewed, by sampling domains. Overall, 4,898 households, 2,800 currently married women aged 15-44, and 1,475 husbands were interviewed in SWAFT.

Organization of the survey

The survey of Status of Women and Fertility in Thailand was conducted by the Institute of Population Studies (IPS) of
Chulalongkorn University. IPS has made available its personnel and office facilities to the project throughout the project duration. It serves as the headquarters of the field survey. A total of 4 teams were formed for data collection. Each team consisted of one supervisor, one or two assistants, five or six interviewers, and one driver. The teams were formed according to regions, namely North, Northeast, Central, and South. Every team was assigned to conduct fieldwork in Bangkok also. On the average, each team would spend about 5 to 6 days per sampling unit, except in Bangkok.

**Supervisors and interviewers**

IPS faculty members and senior researchers were team supervisors. All of SWAFT team supervisors have extensive experience in fieldwork. IPS and SWAFT project research assistants assume the roles of team assistants. All of the assistants have a bachelor degree or higher in social sciences or related fields.

Interviewers of SWAFT were undergraduate students from various faculties of Chulalongkorn University such as the Faculty of Mass Communications, Arts, Education, Veterinary Science, Commerce and Accountancy, Dentistry, Pharmacy, and Political Science. They were selected on the basis of their ability to speak the regional dialects and fieldwork experience. A total of 24 interviewers (16 females and 8 males) were recruited. It was planned that female interviewers would interview the women or wives and the male interviewers interview the husbands. In practice this plan was followed only briefly during the first week of the fieldwork because of its impracticality. Moreover, the
experiment indicated that it was possible to have the male interviewers interview the wives and vice versa.

Training of supervisors and assistants

Supervisors and assistants were briefed about the SWAFT fieldwork process. This includes: a) the up-dating of the household listings for both rural villages and urban blocks; b) the selection of sample households, women and husbands; c) the assignment of households to interviewers; d) the spot check of the interviewers; e) the daily report of household visits and individual interviews; and f) the field editing of the questionnaires. Supervisors and assistants were also trained about how to conduct the community survey and group discussions. The community questionnaire and the group discussion guidelines were explained and discussed at length. Practice sessions with role playing the community interview and group discussions were carried out. Assistants were trained how to take notes of group discussions.

Training of interviewers

Each interviewer was supplied with a copy of the SWAFT interviewer manual (in Thai), and household, women and husband questionnaires for training. The manual provides an overview of the SWAFT project, and explains the roles of interviewers, how to contact the households, how to ask the questions and record the answers, and the purpose of each question or its definition. The training consists of a detailed item by
item explanation of household and individual questionnaires, role
playing, mock interview, field interview practice, in-class testing
on the questionnaires, and a seminar at the end to discuss field
practice problems and solutions.

About one week and two weeks were spent for the supervisor and interviewer training respectively. The project PI
and Co-PIs were trainers for both the supervisor and interviewer
training. All supervisors and assistants also attended the
interviewer training.

Period of fieldwork

The fieldwork for the entire SWAFT survey was carried
out during March to June, 1993. The period of SWAFT fieldwork was
divided into 2 phases. The first phase was from March 28 to April
10 and the second phase from April 16 to May 31. The data
collection for the rural areas and provincial urban areas of the
four regions was conducted during March 28 - April 5 and April 10 -
May 31. For Bangkok, the interviews were carried out during April
6-11 and April 20 - June 30. The longer period of fieldwork for
Bangkok stems from the fact that many more repeat visits to the
households were required due to the low level of cooperation among
Bangkok residents. In addition, fewer eligible women were
identified in Bangkok and the number of sample households in
Bangkok thus had to be increased in order to assure the target size
of the sample.

Community surveys were conducted in rural areas
(villages) only. The data collection of the community survey was
carried out at the same time as that of the individual survey. Group interviews were used to collect community level data. In general, the community survey was conducted by the supervisor on the second or the third day the team visited the village.

Group discussion sessions were generally held on the last day or next to last day that the team was in the community, with the exception of the Central region and Bangkok. In the Central region, the group discussion was conducted in a village of Kanchanaburi, a province about 250 kilometers from Bangkok. It was therefore possible to go back and the group discussion was conducted in June (almost one month after the individual survey was done). The group discussions for Bangkok were also organized toward the end of the fieldwork period.

Questionnaires

Four sets of questionnaires were administered during the SWAFT fieldwork: household, woman, husband, and community questionnaires.

1. Household questionnaire

The household questionnaire was used to list every member of the household who usually lived in the household. Information contained in the household questionnaire include the household roster, characteristics, and condition of household structure. Questions in the household roster include the relationship to household head, sex, age, birth date, marital status, and relationship to the selected eligible woman for each member of household. The desired respondent of the household
questionnaire can be the household head or spouse of the household head or any adult member of the household.

Information from the household roster was used to identify the eligible women and their husbands for individual interviews. To be eligible for the woman interview, the person has to be a currently married woman aged 15-44 who is a usual resident of the sample household. In households with more than one eligible women, the eligible respondent was randomly selected (see SC17 of the household questionnaire).

The husband questionnaire was to be administered to the husband of the selected eligible woman whose interview or questionnaire was completed. It was planned that only half of the husbands of the eligible women interviewed would be selected for the husband survey. The husbands were thus alternately selected from the completed interviews of women for each sampling unit.

2. Individual questionnaires

Two sets of individual questionnaires were administered in SWAFT, one to the selected eligible women and one to their husbands. Both woman and husband questionnaires in SWAFT were translated from the English version of the SWAF questionnaires designed and agreed upon by the project PIs of all participating countries. All the core questions agreed upon were kept in the SWAFT woman and husband questionnaires. The optional and the country specific questions are marked with one and two asterisks respectively in the SWAFT questionnaires.

2.1 The woman questionnaire - The SWAFT woman
questionnaire has 11 sections:

A & B. Background data of woman
C. Birth history
D. Contraception
E. Work or economic activities
F. Relationships within the family
G. Marriage history
H. Issues between men and women
J. Background data of husband
K. Living conditions and assets
L. Observations of interviewer

2.2 The husband questionnaire - The SWAFT husband questionnaire consists of 9 sections:

A. Background data of respondent
B. Work or economic activities
C. Income and wealth
D. Relationships within the family
E. Birth history
F. Contraception
G. Marriage history
H. Issues between men and women
J. Observations of interviewer

3. Community questionnaire

The SWAFT community questionnaire was based on the SWAF community questionnaire with a slight modification. Again the additional questions were marked with an asterisk. The community
survey was conducted in 32 sampling units in rural areas (villages). The community questionnaire collects information on village characteristics.

A community was defined according to official administrative boundaries of a village. It is generally referred to by the village number. A group interview was used as a mode of data collection for the community survey. The team supervisor was assigned to conduct the group interview. Respondents of the group interview were community leaders (typically 3-5 persons). Persons qualified as respondents include village headmen or their assistants, tambon council members, teachers, health officers, village health volunteers, village health communicators, and members of existing groups, in particular women’s group.

4. Group discussion

Twelve group discussion sessions were held, two in each of the four regions and Bangkok, except in the South where two additional group discussions were conducted in a Muslim village. Group discussions were held separately for men and women (six groups for each sex).

The selection of the sites for group discussion was purposive. In general the sample village of a relatively large size would be chosen. The selected villages for the group discussions are marked with an asterisk in the sampling list (see Table A.1).

The team supervisor was assigned to be the key moderator of the group discussions with the assistance of the team
assistants. In all regions, except one Muslim village in the South, the project PI served as the moderator of one of the groups. Group discussion sessions for the Muslim community were moderated by a professor of a university in the South. She is an experienced researcher and able to speak the local Malay dialect (Yawee) used in the Muslim communities of the four southernmost provinces of Thailand. She also helped in translating the transcriptions of the Muslim group discussions into standard Thai. The language used in moderating the other group discussions was standard Thai; although some comments by participants were in regional dialects, but they were still understandable. It was noted that in most of the groups, one or two participants were likely to dominate the discussion. This problem required the skill of the moderator to handle, and unfortunately the effort was not always successful. The dominance of a few participants in the discussions obviously influences the content of the data they generate.

Interviewers were briefed about the content of the guidelines for the discussions and assigned the tasks of note-taking and tape recording. The group discussion sessions for men and women were normally held at the same time to avoid the spread of information on the group discussions and format. The session generally lasted an average of two hours.

The task of conducting group discussions in Bangkok was relatively difficult. In addition to the problem of recruiting the participants, a few of those recruited did not show up. The number of participants in the group discussions for Bangkok is thus fewer
on average than for other regions.

The full transcripts (in Thai) were generally completed a few days after the session. For the sessions that the PI was the moderator, the main conclusions of the discussion were usually written up right after the end of the session. This was done as a precaution in case the full transcripts would not be transcribed.

Changes

Following changes or modifications have been made during the course of the fieldwork:

a) The number of selected households per sampling unit - It was estimated that an average of 60 currently married women aged 15-44 (or ER) would be identified and interviewed per sampling unit. In a sampling unit where the number of ERs identified was less than expected, the number of households selected would be increased to more than 100. Thus the rule of a fixed number of selected households (100) for each cluster was deviated for some sampling units to ensure the achievement of the target number of ERs. The increase of the number of households selected was more common in the urban blocks or clusters. In Bangkok the number of households selected for all blocks was increased. The final number of households selected was thus more than the original size.

b) The selection of husbands - As described earlier, in each cluster, the interviewers were instructed to alternately select husbands from the completed interviews of women. This rule was followed only during the first phase of the fieldwork. During the mid-fieldwork seminar, the difficulties of interviewing the
husbands were discussed and it was decided that the rule would be
relaxed. Substitutions of the husbands were allowed to ensure the
achievement of the husband sample size target. The decisions and
the selection of the replaced husbands were done by the
supervisors. As expected, the interview of husbands in Bangkok was
so difficult that in the end it was decided that any available
husbands would be interviewed.

c) D2 - If the answer was 'no', the skip was changed from
D7 to D6a.

d) Some question numbers and wordings, particularly in
section E and F in the SWAFT questionnaire are slightly different
from the last version of the project questionnaire. This is
because the SWAFT questionnaire had been sent to the printer before
the final version of the questionnaire was received. There was no
time to change them due to the tight schedule of fieldwork. The
questionnaire number referred to in this report is thus the
questionnaire number of the SWAFT questionnaire. A more detailed
discussion of changes and problems of the questionnaire is
presented in the next section.

e) In G7 of the SWAFT questionnaire, women whose husbands
married only once were skipped to G9.

f) H9c was split into two questions: H9c.1 - help taking
care of children, and H9c.2 - help doing the housework. This
change stemmed from the experience obtained during the practice
interviews that some respondents answered 'yes husband should help
taking care of children but not the housework' or vice versa.
Languages

As described earlier, the interviewers were selected based on their ability to speak the regional dialects so that they could conduct the interview in the assigned regional dialect. In Thailand, standard Thai is the most common language and it can be spoken and understood by most Thais. The other three main regional dialects include the Northern, Northeastern, and Southern dialects which are spoken by people in the corresponding regions. The interviews were thus conducted according to the regional dialects if it were found necessary. The interviewers were expected to make an on-the-spot translation of the questionnaire. Since the eligible respondents are relatively young, a substantial portion of them could speak and understand standard Thai. In these cases, the language used for the interview was standard Thai. However, Muslim communities in the four southernmost provinces of Thailand speak mostly a Malay dialect (Yawee), and two Muslim villages in the SWAFT sample happened to speak the this language. Health officers and teachers in those villages were thus hired as translators. Having translators lengthened the interview time per questionnaire for the two Muslim villages. It is noted that the language problems may affect the data quality in those two villages.

General Impressions

The task to collect data for the SWAFT project was an ambitious one. This in fact was recognized even before the start of the fieldwork. The heavy workload of everyone in the team was
obvious during the visit to the team by the PI. The supervisors and the assistants had many tasks to complete in the field. This included going to the district office to copy the household lists and notify them of our visit to the selected village for safety reasons; the up-dating of the household lists with the village head and his assistants or mapping the households in the blocks; selection of the sample households; assignment of the households to the interviewers; making appointments for the community survey; spot-checking the interviewers; helping interviewers to find the households; editing the questionnaires; meeting with interviewers every night to discuss and find solutions to any problems they might have regarding the questionnaires or the interview; and planning the work for the next day. In the village where the group discussions were to be held, the supervisors and the assistants had extra tasks of selecting and visiting the participants as well as preparing and arranging the sessions. Interviewers themselves were responsible for conducting up to 10 hours of interviews per day. They also had a role in the group discussions such as tape recording, note taking, serving food and drinks, and welcoming and sending off the participants. Most of them worked in high spirits. As expected, some teams had problems among team members; however, efforts were made to solve the conflicts.

The tasks for the supervisors and assistants were more than could be comfortably handled. In retrospect, it could have been preferable to have dropped or postponed the community survey and group discussions.
Respondents in rural areas were generally cooperative and hospitable. This was not so for respondents in provincial urban and Bangkok as evident in their lower response rates (see Table A.2). The overall response rates were 87.6 percent and 90.5 percent for the household and women interviews respectively. For Bangkok, the response rate for household survey was 75.5 percent and for the woman survey was 83.1 percent.

The questionnaire was relatively long. The average interview duration was ...for the household questionnaire, .... for the woman questionnaire, and .... for the husband questionnaire.

Willingness to work hard among team members was highly appreciated. Interviewers were fresh in their minds and enthusiastic to learn. Using university students as interviewers has certain advantages. They are more welcome or trusted by the respondents. Students tend to follow the interviewing and recording instructions relatively strictly. They are also skilled in taking notes.

The fieldwork period was longer than optimal. However, this was unavoidable since the sample size of SWAFT was relatively large. It appeared that towards the end of the fieldwork period some interviewers were less motivated to work because of exhaustion. A few of them left before the fieldwork was completed. We could have had more teams but that would also create other problems such as management, greater variability of data quality, and budgets.

The period of office editing and coding was longer than
planned because of the high turn over rate of project assistants and coders. This may affect the data quality even though recoding and consistency checks were made to minimize the data errors.

Notes on some problems of the questionnaire

During the course of fieldwork and data codings, problems were encountered on the following questions:

Woman questionnaire:

A3 and E13 - The type of children is not clearly defined in these questions. The number of children aged under 10 living with R should include step and adopted children if the questions were to measure the responsibility of the woman. Some women in SWAFT have step or adopted children whom they have to bring up like their own natural children.

B5 and *G1.1 or *G11.1 (Age at first marriage) - In SWAFT *G1.1 and *G11.1 are additional questions. They were added in section G again to probe the marriage date. If the woman married only once, answers to B5 and *G1.1 should be the same. If the woman married more than once, answers to B5 and *G11.1 should be the same. There was a reliability problem about information on the marriage date (G1 and G11), age at first marriage or age of the last or current marriage (*G1.1, *G1.2, *G11.1 and *G11.2), and the number of times married (G6, G6a, and G7). A number of respondents gave inconsistent responses to these questions. There was a tendency to underreport the number of times married among women who married more than once. Efforts were made to detect and correct the errors. However, they were not always successful.
C21a, C21b, C23a and C23b (Number of additional sons or daughter wanted)— In the case where the wife was currently pregnant, it was not always possible to obtain the number of additional sons or daughters wanted. The common response tended to be 'it depends on the sex of the child in the belly'. Thus this response was given an additional code category (code 6).

D5a (the contraceptive method currently using) — There were two or three cases that gave two or more incompatible methods, such as pill and IUD or pill and injection. Randomly selection of one method was decided on for those cases.

Section B — The criteria to define work or job or activity (E3 and E3a) was somewhat problematic in Thailand which in turn led to the problem of counting number of jobs or activities. For example, one respondent worked in her own rubber plantation. She grew the rubber trees and also scraped the matured rubber trees that could produce rubber latex. In the second case, a respondent worked in her own rubber plantation. She scraped the matured rubber trees in one part of the plantation and rented out the rest. She had to manage and make a regular check on the land that was rented out and received the payment in the form of sharing products or rubber latex(60:40). In the third case, a respondent worked in her own rubber plantation and others'. Her work included growing new rubber trees and scraping the matured rubber tress as well as a laborer in other people's plantations. In the fourth case, the respondent reported that she was a teacher during office hours in a private school and in the evening and week ends she also tutored
students privately at school or at home. In each of these cases, does the respondent have one or more than one job?

Since the survey took place during the school summer vacation, some women who were teachers reported that they did not work during the week prior to the survey (E1). These cases were corrected and classified as 'worked in the last week'.

E3f (duration of work or number of months worked on the job last year) - This question is problematic due to unclear explanation or definition of 'month'. A respondent worked as a factory worker during the working days, but on the week ends or whenever she had time she was a direct salesperson for a cosmetic company. She has been doing these two jobs for a few years. How many months should she be considered to be working as a direct salesperson last year? It was noted that the total number of months worked last year for all jobs tended to add up to more than 12. This is because if the person was doing that job regularly, regardless of the number of hours worked per day or number of days worked per week, she would be considered to be working the full month on that job.

F5a to F5n - There were some cases in which the person who did a household activity was not a household member but was living in the same compound or nearby. It was thus decided that the phrase 'household member' should be dropped from answer categories 5 and 6.

F6.a to F6.i - The word 'senior or elder' was deleted from answer categories 3 and 4 because it was found that the word
'senior' was not clearly defined. In addition, for some cases the decision makers were living in the same compound or nearby not in the household. Thus the answer categories 'Male member' and 'Female member' include both members and non-members of the household. There is no answer category 'Other' in SWAPT; instead the answer category 'Children' was added to F6.g to F6.i.

It was noted that there are many 'DK' answers for F6.e to F6.i. This could be attributed to two main factors: the unclear definitions of the type and the residence of children. These questions were to be asked to women who have children. It was not clearly explained or defined whether 'children' here includes only natural children, or also adopted or step children. In SWAPT, all women who have children, regardless of the type of children, were to be asked these questions because it was felt that women who had step or adopted children living with them were likely to be in charge of those decisions. Information of this section thus may not be consistent with the birth history or husband interviews.

Many interviewers did not ask F6.e to F6.i because they misunderstood that if children were not living in the household at the time of the survey or when the children were younger, these questions were not to be asked. This misunderstanding stemmed from the fact that some women who had children living with parents or relatives didn't make decisions on the issues asked in F6.e to F6.i. It thus appeared awkward to ask those questions to women whose children were living elsewhere or did not live with them when the children were younger. A code category indicating 'children
living elsewhere' (code 00) was added in F6a.e to F6a.i. There were also problems related to the reference period, sex and order of the children in asking F6.e to F6.i. For F6.h, it was unclear to which level of school the question was referred. In SWAFT, it was decided that the question referred to the primary school.

An error occurred in F6a.a to F6a.i because the instructions stated that 'if more than one mentioned, ask F6a'. In the SWAFT questionnaire, the answer category 'R and husband' for F6a to F6i was kept and thus created confusion. Although a special instruction was given that if only the answer 'R and husband' was reported or circled, interviewers must continue asking F6a.a to F6a.i; some interviewers, however, forgot to do so. Code 99 was thus assigned to those cases.

The difference between the date of first marriage (G1 or G11) and the date of first birth may be less than 7 months for women who married only once and whose premarital sex was reported (*G9.1).

G16a – The reference period of this question is not clear. Although it was assumed that the question wanted the distance to the parents at the time of the first marriage, however, it was not always sure that the respondents reported the distance to parents now or at the time of the first marriage. In addition, those who gave answer tended to give the name of the place because the knowledge of distance from one place to another is not common in Thailand. The information on distance thus had to be estimated from the name of the reported province.
H1a - This question appeared to be inapplicable to the majority of Thai society. Many interviewers reported that the respondents expressed puzzled look when they were asked this question. A substantial of respondents said that they could go anywhere if they just told or informed their husbands where they would go. Some respondents reported 'yes I told my husband every time I left the house or went to the market'. Does this mean that she has to get the permission before going? It is noted that the code categories in SWAFT include not only the places but also the timing of going.

H5c and H5d - There was the problem of the reference period in asking H5c and H5d. Some respondents reported that they used to discuss very often during their early years of marriage but not now, in particularly among women who have completed their desired family size or who are using contraception.

K6 - It was noted that not only was it difficult to ask about income, but there was also a problem of reliability of data.

L6 - This information is not reliable at all because it is subjective. It was noted that most interviewers would circle '2' or 'moderate'.

Husband questionnaire

C6 - This question has the problem of the reference period. Some respondents reported that 'they used to rent out but not this year'.

C10b.1 to C10b.10 and C12 - These questions were difficult to ask and the data obtained appear to be unreliable.
Section E - It was sometimes difficult to detect if the number of children the husband reported referred to his natural children or step children, even though the question asked for the natural children. Some husbands intentionally reported the step or adopted children as their natural children because it was the second marriage for the wives and they could no longer have children of their own or the husbands did not want to hurt the wives or the children by saying that the children were not his. There were a few cases where both the husband and wife were reported as married only once, but the number of children or the sex of children reported in the woman questionnaire and the husband questionnaire disagreed.
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## Survey Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Oct - Nov, 1992</td>
<td>- Translation (English to Thai) of the questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov - Dec, 1992</td>
<td>- Sample selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec, 1992</td>
<td>- Pretest of the questionnaires</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Sample selection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Preparation of interviewer manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feb 22 to Mar 5, 1993</td>
<td>- Update household maps in BKK sample blocks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 10 - 11, 1993</td>
<td>- Training of supervisors and assistants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 12 - 27, 1993</td>
<td>- Training of interviewers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mar 28 - Apr 10, 1993</td>
<td>- Phase 1, fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 15, 1993</td>
<td>- Mid-fieldwork seminar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr 16 - May 31, 1993</td>
<td>- Phase 2, fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 1, 1993</td>
<td>- Seminar closing the fieldwork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June 2 - 30, 1993</td>
<td>- Extension of fieldwork and group discussion for BKK and Central region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June - July, 1993</td>
<td>- Preparation of coding instructions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aug - Dec, 1993</td>
<td>- Office editing and coding of individual questionnaires</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Oct - Nov, 1993 - Preparation of data entry program (PC Edit)

Dec, 1993 - May, 1994 - Data entry

April - May, 1994 - Preparation of coding instructions, and coding of the community questionnaires

May - July, 1994 - Checking of data entry files, data consistency and combine data files

June, 1994 - Preparation of the field report

June - July, 1994 - Preparation of the SPSS programs to run with the data files
Table A.2 Number of households and women selected and successfully interviewed, by domain, SWAFT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Household</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Women</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Husband</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>Successfully interviewed</td>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>Selected</td>
<td>Successfully interviewed</td>
<td>Response rate</td>
<td>Successfully interviewed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>783</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>509</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>747</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>523</td>
<td>495</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>249</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central</td>
<td>1,024</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>537</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>284</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>504</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>276</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other urban</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>877</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>214</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangkok</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>479</td>
<td>398</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>193</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5,594</td>
<td>4,898</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>3,094</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>1,475</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>