

---

Subject: Re: Benin 2011-2012 Daughter's circumcision status

Posted by [Janet-DHS](#) on Mon, 12 Sep 2022 21:05:05 GMT

[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

---

Following is a response from DHS staff member Tom Pullum:

I looked in detail at the last case you describe: "31 13 2 - gidx has 1, 10, 11, but kids 2 and 5 are also female. Only girls 1 and 2 meet the age requirement. Kid in bidx 5 is 19 years old and kid 11 is 31."

This is the case in BJIR61FL.dta with v001==31, v002==13, v003==2. I reduced the file to just this case and the b\*\_\* and g\*\_\* variables and then looked at how these two sets of variables match up.

Yes, gidx\_01 is 1, gidx\_02 is 10, and gidx\_03 is 11, identifying cases 1, 10, and 11 in the birth histories. If you then enter these three lines:

```
list b4_*, table clean
```

```
list b5_*, table clean
```

```
list b8_*, table clean
```

you will get a readable list of the sex (b4), survival status (b5), and age (b8) of all the children this woman had. You will see that kids 2 and 5 are female, yes, BUT they have b5=0, that is, they were not survivors. To be eligible for the FGC questions the daughter must be living. So no problem there. You just didn't check the survival status.

Kids 10 and 11 are daughters and are surviving, but their ages are 26 (not 19) and 31. They were not eligible for the FGC questions. This does appear to me to be an error during data collection.

I think the other cases you cite are similar to this one, in that the questions may have been asked about daughters who were out of range in terms of current age. Looking at item 1109 in the questionnaire (in an appendix to the final report) I see that the questions were to be asked only about living daughters born in 1996 or later.

Although I believe that you have indeed identified examples of a type of error that occurred during fieldwork, I am sure that superfluous cases such as these were not included in the tables in the report. In general, the construction of an indicator or a table includes checks that have the effect of removing such cases. The tables on FGC would omit these extra cases, because the daughters are outside the age range 0-14.

So this is good detective work on your part, but such errors during fieldwork would not have carried over to the report.