
Subject: Third Party Present Measures
Posted by [nmcco](#) on Mon, 11 Sep 2023 18:06:52 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hello:

I have a question regarding the third party presence variables for a few of the surveys. For Bolivia 2003 (Round 4) there is no "not present" option for the variables v812, v813, v814. They only have the options "yes-listening" and "yes-not listening". Most other surveys for the DHS have the options "no" and "yes", or "no", "yes- listening", and "yes-not listening". The lack of the "no" option makes it seem that there were others present in 100% of interviews for this particular survey. I have also encountered this for Colombia 2004-2005 (Round 4) and Dominican Republic 2002 (Round 4), where the responses for the variables v812, v813, v814 are "yes-not listening" and "yes-listening" but there is no "no " option. How should analysts interpret these cases where there is no "no" option for v812, v813, and v814? I am currently interpreting it as 100% of interviews for this survey had a husband, other men, and adult women (respectively) present. But, this doesn't seem to be plausible.

In a related observation, while looking through the other surveys it appears that El Salvador, Mexico, Tunisia, and Yemen (all years, all rounds) don't have observations for the v812, v813, v814 variables. This isn't necessarily a problem as there isn't a way to make a mistake about it.

Thank you!

File Attachments

1) [Strange_Observation.png](#), downloaded 117 times

Subject: Re: Third Party Present Measures
Posted by [Janet-DHS](#) on Fri, 15 Sep 2023 21:35:07 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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

For the Bolivia 2003 survey, using the IR file I entered (in Stata) "tab v501 v812,m" to look at how the responses about the husband being present varied according to the marital status of the woman. Here is the result:

```
. tab v501 v812,m
```

```
current marital |   pres. husband (sec 7)
      status | yes - lis yes - not   . | Total
-----+-----+-----
never married |     5   5,587     8 |  5,600
  married |   275   6,890   12 |  7,177
living together |    88   3,355    6 |  3,449
  widowed |     1    244    0 |    245
```

divorced	0	317	0	317
not living together	0	865	1	866
-----+-----+-----				
Total	369	17,258	27	17,654

We see that almost all of the women who are not currently married have a response "yes-not listening", which does not make sense. Here is the value label for v812:

```
. label list v812
v812:
    0 no
    1 yes - listening
    2 yes - not listening
```

The label includes 0 for "no" but there is not a single reported case with 0. It's pretty clear that in this survey the "no" cases that should have been given code 0 were actually assigned to code 2. My guess is that there was confusion between two alternative schemes for coding yes/no types of questions. There are many variables for which 1 is "yes" and 2 is "no", just as there are many questions for which 0 is "no" and 1 is "yes". Apparently the label for v812 was not followed correctly. This is intended to be a 3-category variable and in effect it has just 2 categories. I think "no" and "yes-not listening" were consolidated with code 2.

If your Spanish is better than mine, you may find the relevant question(s) in the questionnaire. There may have been some ambiguity there.

You are right, a few surveys do not have the "listening" variables at all.

Subject: Re: Third Party Present Measures
 Posted by [nmcco](#) on Sat, 02 Dec 2023 19:18:39 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

Hi Tom,

Thank you for the helpful reply!

It seems to be recorded well in the other Bolivia surveys, but 2003 doesn't seem to be reliable.