Subject: urban-rural variable

Posted by menonidhi on Tue, 21 Apr 2015 14:14:44 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

In my study, I have two variables - V025: which classifies place of residence as Urban/Rural and S025: which classifies residence as Mega city/Large City/Small City/Large Town/Small town/Rural.

I was able to extract the former only for females. To check if I could could substitute V025 with S025(which I was able to extract for both the sexes), I checked the distribution of urban and rural population among females. I clubbed the values of Mega city/Large City/Small City/Large Town/Small town as Urban.

I however observe few discrepancies. The number of females in the urban area is 18,442 and rural is 20,815. In the second variable, the number of females in rural area is 23,529. I have summed the values of mega city,large city,small city, large town and small town which comes to 15,728.

I observe an exact difference of 2,714 i.e. (23,529-20,815=2714) and (18,442-15,728 =2,714). I have attached my results for any reference for the values mentioned above.

Is there a reason for this difference.

File Attachments

1) urban-rural.txt, downloaded 525 times

Subject: Re: urban-rural variable

Posted by Trevor-DHS on Fri, 24 Apr 2015 19:21:50 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

It wasn't very clear from your explanation which survey and datasets you are using, but it appears that you are using the HIV tests results data, matched with other datasets. However it appears that there is a problem with the matching of your data. I would expect the number of women and men to be roughly equal, but you have twice as many men as women. Below is a short piece of code for matching with the persons recode file, and for checking the sex distribution:

cd "C:\Data\DHS Stata"

use "IAPR52FL.dta"

clonevar hivclust = hv001

clonevar hivnumb = hv002

clonevar hivline = hvidx

merge 1:1 hivclust hivnumb hivline using "IAAR51FL.dta"

keep if _merge==3

tab hv104

tab hv025

tab sh025

tab sh025 hv025

From this, I received the following output:

. tab hv104

sex of household member	•	Percent	Cum.
male female	51,641 54,016	48.88 51.12	48.88 100.00
Total	105,657	100.00	

. tab hv025

type of place of residence	Freq.	Percent	Cum
urban rural	52,697 52,960	49.88 50.12	49.88 100.00
Total	105,657	100.00	

. tab sh025

city\town\c ountryside	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
mega city	8,696	8.23	8.23
large city	21,989	20.81	29.04
small city	6,352	6.01	35.05
large town	1,671	1.58	36.64
small town	13,989	13.24	49.88
rural 3	52,960	50.12	100.00
Total 1	105,657	100.00	

. tab sh025 hv025

city\town\ type of place of						
countrysid residence						
e i	ırban ru	ıral	Γotal			
mega city	8,696	0	8,696			
large city	21,989	0	21,989			
small city	6,352	0	6,352			
large town	1,671	0	1,671			
small town	13,989	0	13,989			
rural	0 52,	960 5	52,960			
+		+				

Total | 52,697 52,960 | 105,657

As you can see in my tables (unweighted) there are about 49% men and 51% women, which is roughly what I would expect.

Also, as you can see the recoding of urban and rural makes sense in the last table.