
Subject: Re: Need Clarification: DV weight
Posted by [Jasminc](#) on Fri, 08 Mar 2019 16:50:53 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Thank you, Bridgette, for facilitating the discussion.

Thank you, Tom, for your response.

We have a follow-up question to clarify the statistical methodology and analyses.

We did what you suggested, and we got the weighted observations.

For CR (couple) dataset for 2015-16 cycle, we had a total sample of 63,696. Among those, we wanted to see who among women in couple had experienced intimate partner violence (IPV). Therefore, we had a missing response observation of 16,182.

Here are our results:

The weighted observations of IPV among women in couple (DV weight divided by 1 million) is 42,419.

Unweighted observations of IPV among women in couple is 47,514.

We would like to review these numbers with you.

First, as we pointed out earlier, the weighted observations was smaller than the unweighted observations. If the weighted observation (42,419) was to be represented of the number of couples nationally, then it seems way too small. What do you think?

Second, we came across Dr. Stan Becker's literature on the sampling weights for couple data analyses. I saw that you mentioned in other threads regarding Becker's article. You have stated that Becker's methodology was, "although theoretically superior, the effect of using these alternatives is small." After reviewing Becker's literature and your other responses in DHS threads, we would like inquire about the detailed weighting procedures for DHS India Couple dataset.

For India DHS 2015-16 survey, the report states that "601,509 households were interviewed...interviews were completed with 699,686 women... interviews were completed with 112,122 men." We would like to know what is the weighting procedure in order to generate the appropriate weighted results that is represented to the country. For example, if 32.5% among women in couple dataset ever reported IPV (based on our computation and weighted DV by million), then this should represent the national women in couple's experience of IPV. Going back to our weighted observations, 42,419 seems like an undercount of nationally weighted observations compared to the prevalence.

Hope this follow-up question was clearer.

Thank you so much for all your help. I cannot emphasize enough how much your guidance and DHS team support have been tremendously helpful in our research endeavor.

Sincerely,
Jasmin and the team.
