Subject: Results not Matching
Posted by raman.mishra10@gmail.com on Sat, 28 Jul 2018 10:11:05 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

I have used the Stata program to create Revised unmet need variable as described in, Analytical Study 25: Revising Unmet Need for Family Planing by Bradley, Croft, Fishel, and Westoff, 2012, published by ICF International using NFHS-4 (2015-16) India. The percentage of unmet need given in dataset (variable 626a) and my results are not the same.
Thanking You.

File Attachments
1) unmet putin.do, downloaded 551 times

Subject: Re: Results not Matching
Posted by Trevor-DHS on Mon, 30 Jul 2018 16:47:30 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

There are a few problems in your code:
1) you replaced v222 with v221. v222 is time from last birth to interview, v221 is time from marriage to first birth. v222 is marked as na but this is incorrect and it actually has data. Change this back to v222.
2) you changed m6_1==99 to m6_1==98. This is incorrect and you should leave it as m6_1==99. There are no cases of m6_1==99 in the India data, but that is not a problem.
3) you changed wantedlast==9 to wantedlast==3. This is incorrect too - leave as wantedlast==9. There are no cases of wantedlast==9 in the India data, but that is not a problem.
4) you added in recode sexact .=1 if v528==98. This is not part of the standard and should be removed.
5) you removed replace infec=1 if v215==993, but this is needed for NFHS-4
6) I added the labeling of variable unmet back into the code.
I am attaching a corrected version of your code.
At the end you will see a tab command crosstabbing unmet and v626a for currently married women and you will see that they match exactly.

File Attachments
1) unmet+putin_TC.do, downloaded 559 times

Subject: Re: Results not Matching
Posted by raman.mishra10@gmail.com on Tue, 31 Jul 2018 08:55:18 GMT
View Forum Message <> Reply to Message

Thank you very much, Sir, I had tried several times to correct the codes even discussed with

some of my friends but couldn't find the mistake. Thanks once again for the correction.