
Subject: Table on Fertility Planning Status from NFHS-4 data

Posted by [preejayan](#) on Sun, 04 Feb 2018 06:53:05 GMT

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

Dea DHS Team-

I am using NFHS-4 data to recreate Table 4.18 on Fertility Planning Status of India Report (2015-16). I used the following set of variables in different permutation and combination but couldn't create this table exactly what was published.

I used birth history data (IABR71FL.DTA) and variables v005 (weight), v208, v213, v225, b10, v013 and bord.

I ended up with 275,648 cases however, India (NFHS-4) report states 281,067 cases.

Secondly, I used both types of weights, i.e., "aweight" and "iweight" while generating this table. No of cases in "aweight" is more than the number of cases if we use "iweight". This is opposite when we use previous rounds of NFHS datasets (like NFHS 1, 2, & 3) where number of cases are more when use "iweight".

Please help me - i) in providing the stata code for Table 4.18 and ii) explain why number of cases are more while using "aweight" in NFHS-4 compared to number of cases in "iweight" calculations, which is exactly opposite with other NFHS previous rounds.

Thanks for your help!

- Jayachandran

Subject: Re: Table on Fertility Planning Status from NFHS-4 data

Posted by [Bridgette-DHS](#) on Fri, 09 Feb 2018 11:52:17 GMT

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

Following is a response from Data Processing Specialist, Mianmian Yu:

Tables in the NFHS-4 Final Report, like most of other final report tables under The DHS Program, are produced using CPro. If you would like to know our tabulation codes in CPro for Table 4.18, we will be happy to share them with you. Alternatively, if you can post your Stata codes here and in particular, if you can elaborate the confusion of "aweight" and "iweight", we may be able to make more comments.

Subject: Re: Table on Fertility Planning Status from NFHS-4 data

Posted by [Bridgette-DHS](#) on Mon, 26 Feb 2018 18:43:18 GMT

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

Following is a response from Senior DHS Stata Specialist, Tom Pullum:

I apologize for the delay in this response to your Feb. 4 posting. The table on "fertility planning

status"--table 4.18 in the India 2015-16 report--is a relatively difficult table to reproduce in Stata. I am attaching a Stata program, as a text file, that reproduces table 4.18, and the accompanying log file. To use the program you must change the paths. The structure of the program, with subprograms, may seem too complex, but it is actually much easier to segment the procedure as I have done, because the IA71 files are huge and you waste time just waiting for them to open.

Everything can be done from the IR file. You first break out the births in the past five years, using "reshape long" and save them. Then you return to the IR file and break out the pregnancies. You then append the pregnancies to the births. There are actually two problems with table 4.18 as it appears in the report, both of them with the "number of births" column for "mother's age at birth". The problem is for the cases that are current pregnancies, rather than actual births. The mother's age at birth, for current pregnancies, is calculated by assuming that the cmc of the birth will be the cmc of interview plus 9 minus the number of months pregnant. The number of months pregnant is given by v214. The distribution of v214 has two problems. One is that there are 7 cases in which the woman says she is pregnant but the duration of pregnancy is not given. The numbers given do not actually add up to 281,067 because of those 7 cases. More important, there are 75 women who give the duration of their current pregnancy as 10 months. The calculation that I just gave, in those cases, would mean that the child with whom the woman is pregnant was already born, the month before the interview! It would have been better to recode duration=10 months to 9 months. Of course, there are actually many errors in the reporting of v214, and the effect of those 75 cases is negligible. In the program I indicate where this particular problem could be "corrected".

File Attachments

- 1) [fert_planning_log_26Feb2018.smcl](#), downloaded 740 times
 - 2) [fert_planning_do_26Feb2018.txt](#), downloaded 855 times
-

Subject: Re: Table on Fertility Planning Status from NFHS-4 data

Posted by [Bridgette-DHS](#) on Mon, 02 Apr 2018 14:02:44 GMT

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

The following is from Senior DHS Stata Specialist, Tom Pullum:

This is an update to my Feb. 26 posting on the calculation of "fertility planning status". The Stata program attached (as a text file) will calculate the indicator to match the table in the report. The program is set up for Nepal rather than India but if you just change the file name (and the path) you should get a match.

File Attachments

- 1) [fert_planning_do_20Mar2018.txt](#), downloaded 807 times
-

Subject: Re: Table on Fertility Planning Status from NFHS-4 data

Posted by [akwarae@gmail.com](#) on Mon, 07 Sep 2020 06:30:38 GMT

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

Dear Tom/Bridgette,

Can you assist in how the family planning status can be disaggregated by marital status. I.e. using the code provided, what would be the STATA code for unmarried vs. married groups?

Many thanks,
Elsie

Subject: Re: Table on Fertility Planning Status from NFHS-4 data
Posted by [Bridgette-DHS](#) on Tue, 08 Sep 2020 17:54:28 GMT
[View Forum Message](#) <> [Reply to Message](#)

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

Marital status is given by v501 and v502. You could do a separate analysis within each category of marital status. I don't see a reason to do anything more complicated than that.
