
Subject: Re: Variable name and computation of indicator
Posted by [Bridgette-DHS](#) on Thu, 23 Dec 2021 16:09:35 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Following is a response from DHS Research & Data Analysis Director, Tom Pullum:

I use Stata, not SPSS, and my response will be in Stata. It should be clear even if you do not use Stata.

I can match the Agra Fact Sheet with the following code. I am not removing women who had a hysterectomy. It is possible that such women should have been removed in the coding for the Fact Sheet, but it appears that they were NOT removed, because if they are removed the percentages are too high (as you found). The percentages are the same if you use v005 or sv005 for the weights; your use of sv005 was ok. I do not have time to go through the data processing archives to find the actual CPro code.

In this kind of a situation, if you are planning to do more in-depth analysis of these responses, you have two options. The first is to use the code that matches the Fact Sheet but is not consistent with the definition Fred Arnold gave you. The second would be to use the definition Fred Arnold gave you, in which case you will not be consistent with the Fact Sheet. Personally, I do not see a good reason why the definition should include any reference to a hysterectomy. There are many women who have not had a hysterectomy but are unable (for other reasons) to have more children. Also, if there had been an adjustment for hysterectomy I would have expected it to be given in a footnote. For these reasons, I would recommend that you NOT include any adjustment based on a hysterectomy.

```
* Define "told" to include 0 for women for whom s351 is NA
gen told=0
replace told=1 if s351==1
tab told v025 if sdistri==146 & v302a==0 [iweight=v005/1000000], col
```

File Attachments

1) [told.png](#), downloaded 614 times
