

---

Subject: TV exposure decline and v159 coding error?

Posted by [Isha](#) on Mon, 19 Dec 2022 05:14:52 GMT

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

---

Hello,

I had two questions about variable v159 about TV exposure.

1. Data from NFHS-5 shows a decline in TV exposure, which does not seem plausible. From 71 to 54 percent among women. It is possible to have a decline in radio and newspaper exposure, BUT please explain why TV viewership would decrease with time. The attachment shows the graphs on this from the final reports of NFHS-4 and NFHS-5

2. I am using the couple recode file and this variable on exposure to television is not coded correctly. The codes are no, yes and 2. The IR file has different set of codes. Please suggest what these should be coded as, especially thinking about the data in Q1. The attachment shows the question and codes.

Thank you!

Hope you have a lovely start to the week.

Best,  
Isha

#### File Attachments

1) [DHS Forum\\_TV v159.docx](#), downloaded 306 times

---

---

Subject: Re: TV exposure decline and v159 coding error?

Posted by [Bridgette-DHS](#) on Mon, 19 Dec 2022 16:04:53 GMT

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

---

Following is a response from Senior DHS staff member, Tom Pullum:

If you want to assess media exposure, you will get more complete information from the IR files (for women) and the MR files (for men) than from the CR files, which are restricted to women and men who name each other as partners. The CR file will be useful if your main interest is in comparing the responses of women and men who are partners.

The NFHS-5 data files have the same value labels for (m)v157-159 as the NFHS-4 files. This is a mistake, because the response categories changed. In the NFHS-4 files, the label is correct:

. label list V159

V159:

0 not at all

1 less than once a week

2 at least once a week

3 almost every day

However, the NFHS-5 questionnaire omitted the last response category. In effect, categories 2 and 3 were combined into a new category 2. Category 3 should not have been included in the NFHS-5 label.

The data files show increases, for all three questions and for both women and men, in the percentage "not at all" or "less than once a week". There is an increase in the sum of the percentages with codes 2 and 3. We too would not have expected this but it appears to be correct. Perhaps this is due to increased use of cell phones? Let us know if you have other questions.

---