
Subject: Re: Reproduction of marriage data in report
Posted by [JanSchuele](#) on Wed, 03 Sep 2014 09:01:29 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Through searching the forum, I found others who had the same problem, for example here: http://userforum.dhsprogram.com/index.php?t=msg&goto=778&S=5dcb679460c61ba540f2f0c0c0f91b2b&srch=reproduce#msg_778 /"Rwanda DHS 2010: Discrepancy in result of Hb measurements"

1. A helpful answer was that you still have to use certain filters. In my case, I had to filter out those who were not "de facto" residents. The de-facto-variable, which helped me to get almost the same results as in the report was "slept last night" (in the household). That way, I (still) only have 4383 instead of the correct 4306. Additionally using the residence-variable brings it below the correct number!

There still is something else to consider, which I don't know!

2. Then besides weight, I read that there is also stratification and clustering (in SPSS done in the menu for complex samples", in STATA: svyset). I'll try that and see whether there is a change.

3. The Guide to DHS statistics (for example p.69) shows that even when both married and unmarried women are looked at as denominator (in Household or household member dataset), the ever-married sample denominators are adjusted by the all women factors. So this one I will also try, but have to get that variable from the women/individual dataset, which is more complicated.

-> Now in the meantime I tested the complex samples command, but in frequencies there has been little difference, maybe for other tests there will be more. Am now with 4382

-> I used all women factor (total), divided by 100, and then multiplied with the HV/V-105 weight. The problem is that these women factors are all 1.0 or bigger, for example 1.3, so my total numbers become bigger, not smaller.

-> When searching for more possible filter variables, I tested V135 about residence or visiting of the ever-married woman:

There are 76 cases, who slept there, but are visitors. 76 is exactly the difference between the report number and my result.

So I guess, they took the slept variable for all women plus in addition the residence variable for ever-married women. I'm trying to implement all my findings now.

...unfortunately that number 76 was for all ages, for ages 15-19 such are only 16, which would bring me to 4367.

I don't know what else to do!?!
