with current contraceptive use (couple method vs. nonuse, and non–couple method vs. nonuse). As the proportion of women who were older than their partner was very small (2%), such women were combined with women who were 0–4 years younger than their partner in the bivariate and multivariate analyses.

It is important to note the possibility of bias in the analytic sample, as men older than 59 were not interviewed in the NDHS. Thus, some women may have been interviewed but not included in the couples sample because their partner was older than 59. Tabulation reveals that the distribution of couples’ age differences varied significantly by women’s age. The percentage of women who were 10 or more years younger than their partner was smallest among women aged 35 or older (Table 1). This is likely due to the exclusion from the couples sample of some older women (especially those aged 45–49) whose partner was 10 or more years older than they were.

Analysis of the NDHS individual data set showed that 11% of women reported that their partner was older than 59 (and therefore ineligible for the couples data set). However, a comparison between women’s reports of their partner’s age and men’s reports of their own age indicated that only 75% of women in the couples data set correctly reported their partner’s age. It is thus difficult to reliably estimate the proportion of women who were excluded from the couples data set (or from the analytic sample of current contraceptive use).