
Subject: Re: gender matching interviewer / participant in Zimbabwe & Burundi
Posted by [jwilliamrozelle](#) on Mon, 04 Oct 2021 23:19:18 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

First of all, huge thanks to Tom and Bridgette for the really quick response. Tom, I've read through your interviewer effects report and nerded out about it - love the work.

Normally I use R, but I pulled up STATA and followed your code - and still ended up with the same number of unmatched gender in the men's recode Burundi dataset (BU7), and in the men and women's recode in Zimbabwe (ZW7). See here in ZW7, 71 observations with male interviewers. See the tab results below (prior to dropping everything but _merge3)

```
. tab _merge interviewer_sex
```

	fieldworker sex		
_merge	male	female	Total
2	49	1	50
3	71	9,884	9,955
Total	120	9,885	10,005

Additionally - the IR dataset starts with 9955 observations, which is the same number of observations I have in my final R dataframe (and also the merge==3 dataset)

To narrow this down further, it looks like there are observations from interviewers 201, 207, 605, 606, 820, 904 and 926 who are male.

```
tab interviewer_id interviewer_sex if interviewer_sex == 1
```

interviewer_id	fieldworker sex	Total
interviewer_id	male	
121	2	2
200	2	2
201	33	33
207	24	24
400	1	1
605	1	1
606	2	2
820	2	2
904	1	1

926	3	3
-----+-----+-----		
Total	71	71

Similarly, for Burundi men's recode (prior to dropping everything but _merge==3):

```
tab _merge interviewer_sex
```

	fieldworker sex		
_merge	male	female	Total
-----+-----+-----			
2	34	92	126
3	6,738	276	7,014
-----+-----+-----			
Total	6,772	368	7,140

But in Burundi, it seems that it was all one enumerator (id 2104)

```
tab interviewer_id interviewer_sex if interviewer_sex == 2
```

interviewer		
r fieldworker		
identification	r sex	
tion	female	Total
-----+-----+-----		
2104	276	276
-----+-----+-----		
Total	276	276

Also, as long as I'm connected with you - had a few quick questions about some missingness in interviewer info. I'm picking up some missing - and Tom, looks like you had the same issue in the methodological report based on table 2.2.

Curious if there's a broad sense about why that's missing in some countries - but also understand that there's a degree of removal from the actual survey implementation.

Thanks again!