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Overall, it seems that even in terms of ever-married women, the Census shows a younger population than the MFFS, but the differences are very small.

An obviously crucial set of data obtained from the MFFS was the complete pregnancy history of the respondents — providing information such as number of live-births by date of occurrence, number of live-births which ended in death, number of still-births, etc. From the history of live-births, it is possible to estimate the Age Specific Fertility Rates (ASFR). Also from the number of live-births and births ended in death we can estimate the mortality rates using the Brass technique; both rates are shown below.

In estimating the ASFR, the number of cases from the survey, for yearly estimates, would be subject to very large sampling errors. We attempted to minimize this effect by combining the frequencies for four years — 1970 to 1973.

The age specific fertility rates appear to be reasonable and consistent with published vital statistics, and if we recognize that the vital registration system in Peninsular Malaysia is complete, there are sound reasons for feeling confident of the quality of the data from the MFFS. The ASFR from the MFFS and the published vital statistics rates are given in Table 3.11 and also shown in Figure 3.3.

The mortality estimates obtained from the MFFS are almost identical to those previously published for the country, confirming the quality of the MFFS data. The comparison is shown in Table 3.12 and Figure 3.4.

We can extend these reliability comparisons to a whole range of other data, but this does not seem necessary since the data presented so far do not present any major differences and thus justify confidence in the MFFS.

**Table 3.11: Age Specific Fertility Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>1957</th>
<th>1970</th>
<th>MFFS (Average of 1970 to 1973)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15 – 19</td>
<td>0.123</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 – 24</td>
<td>0.329</td>
<td>0.226</td>
<td>0.221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 29</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>0.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 34</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 39</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.140</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 44</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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