
Subject: Re: FGC--The Gambia: DHS 6--2013.
Posted by [Jawla](#) on Sat, 13 Aug 2016 02:42:32 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Shireen,

I played with the data after trying:
svyset v021 [pw=wt], strata(v022) singleunit(centered)

(Did not need to use -- gen wt =v005/1000000 -- as wt is already defined.)

after playing with some tabulation, the "population size" is still coming out approximately the same as the "number of observations." I think there is a problem -- I may be wrong. Evidence that I could be wrong is that a simple tab and a tab that includes the probability weights yield different answers. For example:

```
tab g119 [iweight=wt]
```

Female circumcision: continue or be stopped	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+			
1. Continued	6,594.629	64.96	64.96
2. Stopped	3,392.317	33.42	98.38
8. Don't know	161.738423	1.59	99.97
9	3.19361798	0.03	100.00
-----+			
Total	10,151.878	100.00	

```
. tab g119
```

Female circumcision: continue or be stopped	Freq.	Percent	Cum.
-----+			
1. Continued	6,305	62.12	62.12
2. Stopped	3,674	36.20	98.32
8. Don't know	165	1.63	99.94
9	6	0.06	100.00
-----+			
Total	10,150	100.00	

However, as the Stata manual says better than I could:
pweights, or sampling weights, are weights that denote the inverse of the probability that the observation is included because of the sampling design.

So it seems to me that the population size reported in tabulations should be much higher than the number of observations used to create that tabulation.

Why is that when you do a two-way tabulation (for example), the number of observations and the population size are reported to be very similar to one another?

Thank you and I look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience.
Best, Jawla.

File Attachments

1) [Gambia DHS 2013 women's dataset.docx](#), downloaded 837 times
