Subject: calculating prevalence of physical and/or sexual spousal violence Posted by kdelwiche on Fri, 30 Jan 2015 21:53:25 GMT

View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

For every DHS country-year that included a domestic violence module, I want to calculate the proportion of women that have experienced any physical and/or sexual violence from their spouse or partner. I am using questions d105a-d105i to construct a binary exposure variable: if the respondent indicated "yes" to one or more of the violent acts, they are "exposed". However, I am unsure as to what to do if a respondent answered some, but not all of the questions about specific acts of violence. I am wondering what the protocol was for calculating this aggregate prevalence metric for the published reports, because the prevalence I'm calculating is typically lower than the physical and/or sexual violence prevalence figures presented in the report tabulations. Are all incomplete responses dropped? Did you impute missing responses? Do you assume missing responses are "No"?

Subject: Re: calculating prevalence of physical and/or sexual spousal violence Posted by Trevor-DHS on Mon, 02 Feb 2015 22:54:47 GMT View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

First I suggest checking that you can match the denominator for the tabulation. The domestic violence (DV) questions are not asked for every woman included in the survey. Generally you need to select only the women who were selected for the DV module and who responded. Generally we select women for which v044 == 1. Additionally you may need to select to a subset of these for particular tabulations. For example, it sounds like you would need to select only those women who are married or living in union (v502==1).

Once you can match the denominator, then you will probably find just a few cases where responses were not given to particular questions - code 9 is used for these missing responses. In general we consider these missing responses to be "No" as the number of such cases is few and will have little or no effect on the results and we prefer to be conservative with our estimation of an indicator.